

Response Expert Report of Brian J. Gaines

Expert in Political Science for the Wisconsin Legislature,
Response Report Regarding Continuity and Congruence in Redistricting
and Transaction Costs of Political Engagement

Johnson v. Wisconsin Elections Commission

December 30, 2021

Experience

I am Brian J. Gaines, a Professor of Political Science at the University of Illinois. I hold a BA (with honours) from the University of British Columbia (1988), and AM (1989) and PhD (1995) degrees from Stanford University. My professional research includes work on elections, electoral behavior, electoral institutions, and on public opinion. I have published articles in numerous academic journals, including *The American Journal of Political Science*, *The American Statistician*, *Election Law Journal*, *The Journal of Politics*, *Political Analysis*, and *Political Behavior*. I am a past editor (2011-15) of *American Politics Research* and past co-editor (2010-13, with Wendy Cho and Jake Bowers) of the *The Political Methodologist*. I was on the staff of the Royal Commission for Electoral Boundaries that redrew the districts for the provincial legislature of British Columbia (the “Fisher Commission”) in 1987 and 1988. I offered expert testimony in *Susan C. Hileman v. Sharon McGinness and Louis Maze* (Circuit Court of Alexander County, No. 2000-MR-24) regarding alleged voter fraud. I wrote a preliminary expert report for *Gustafson, et al., v. Illinois State Board of Elections*, et al., David H. Coar, N.D. Ill. 1:06-cv-1159, a challenge to administration of early voting process in 2006. I wrote reports and was deposed for *Whitford v. Gill*, Case No. 15-cv-421-jdp, related to partisanship in redistricting in 2018-19. I wrote a report and offered expert testimony on election administration for *American Women v. Missouri*, 2020, Circuit Ct. 20 AC-CC00333. My complete CV is included as Exhibit 1. I am being compensated at the rate of \$350 per hour.

Assignment

It is my understanding that redistricting plans proposed by the parties in this case take varying approaches to maintaining district lines, including some plans that treat identifiable groups differently from one another with respect to the maintenance of existing boundaries. In response to those plans, this report discusses some benefits from the maintenance of existing boundaries and costs for groups where those existing boundaries are changed.

Executive Summary

Maintenance of existing district boundaries “continuity” for brevity reduces transaction costs for voters, campaigners, organizers, and candidates.

Continuity is maximized when no districts are altered. When shifting populations must be rebalanced across districts, continuity can be only *conditionally* maximized.

Redistricting criteria can be in tension, but do not always conflict. Continuity is one of several desiderata, along with, for instance, compactness, congruence of boundaries with other salient political boundaries, and complying with requirements in regard to minority representation. Following natural boundaries such as a county and city lines (“congruence”)

and minimizing alteration of existing boundaries (“continuity”) can both be understood as making politics easier for citizens.

Individuals residing in newly drawn districts with little resemblance to their prior districts can face somewhat higher costs of mobilizing for political action. Empirical studies confirm that boundary shifts can lower public familiarity with candidates and, in turn, induce abstention and disengagement (e.g., Hayes and McKee 2009, 2012; Winburn and Wagner 2010). Such costs should ideally not be concentrated geographically. Nor should these disruptions be imposed overwhelmingly on particular racial or partisan subsets of the population.

By a similar logic, congruence between electoral boundaries and pre-existing county and municipal boundaries somewhat reduces transaction costs for individual political participation.

Public-opinion-survey data confirm that following such lines is a preferred criterion among the general public. Boundaries defining more local jurisdictions are often more salient and thus more deserving of employment as district boundaries.

Transaction Costs of Political Engagement

Voting is necessarily a costly activity. Even in the absence of poll taxes or other obstacles to voting, citizens who opt to express their political preferences on ballots incur opportunity costs, particularly if they devote time to evaluation of candidates in advance of voting. For a variety of reasons, these costs tend to be higher in the United States, where elections are comparatively frequent and ballots are comparatively long, providing many choices across a variety of offices. Much public debate on election administration relates to how best to reduce voting costs, without negatively affecting other desirable features in elections, particularly integrity and security, but also efficiency and economy for administrators. Across a range of logistical issues, continuity is recognized as a benefit for voters. Changes in location of in-person voting sites, for instance, whether motivated by population shifts, cost reduction, or even public-health emergency, are understood to impose costs on citizens (Vasiligambros, Levine, and Rebala 2020). Likewise, such discontinuities as changes in voting procedure and/or mode clearly impose costs on voters and, accordingly, are justifiable primarily if they are also expected to deliver tangible benefits in ease, security, or another identifiable goal for elections.

Benefits and Measurement of District Continuity

Somewhat less noticed is that changes in electoral districts can also increase the costs of voting. Indeed, much political engagement campaigning and participating in other “grassroots” political actions is potentially disrupted by redrawing of boundaries, which shuffle individuals into new blocs and can thereby demolish the justification for cooperation across individuals or groups. This point is complicated by the fact that the multiplicity of

electoral offices in the United States ensures that given individuals will normally reside in many electoral districts, for seats in the U.S. House, state legislative chambers, municipal or county offices, and so on. However, nearly all discussion of district and map traits is done office by office.

Moreover, “similar” and “different” are vague. Districts are geographic entities, but the term is used, in metonymy, as a shorthand for electorates and/or populations residing therein. Even when boundaries are unchanged, their electorates subject to in- and out-migration and the life cycles of humans, who die, reach majority age, and sometimes gain or lose eligibility to vote according to citizenship or, in some jurisdictions, status as a felon or ex-felon will always change somewhat over time. Hence, the shorthand of describing a district as “unchanged” (etc.) is slightly misleading when interest is, strictly, in the people, not the territory.

Figure 1 presents a highly stylized depiction of a redistricting task, for illustration. A polity (state) has 16 counties, arrayed in a 4×4 grid, that must be mapped into four districts. A prior census found two residents in each county, and the resulting map, labelled “old map,” had four simple and compact rectangular districts. Subsequently, some counties gained and other lost one resident, with the total population unchanged. Each county’s new population is shown. The new maps, A-E, each solve the population malapportionment by construction of four new, identically sized (eight-person) districts, but they do so in different manners, with differing continuity.




Figure 1. A Stylized Redistricting Example

To evaluate extent of change in new maps, one might focus on how many districts have altered boundaries. Maps A and D both retain two old districts and alter two; map C alters three and leaves one intact; maps B and E revise all four. While A and D could thus tie for “least change” because they leave two districts intact, that claim ignores the extent of changes made in the remaining two districts in map D (more change) versus map A (less change). Viewing the problem from the perspective of residents, one could ask how many of each resident’s fellow electors in a new district shared their old district. Counties with red

population counts in Figure 1 are those whose residents are not part of a majority in the new district in regard to prior district. Thus, in map A, only the 2 residents in the county shifted from district 4 (in the southeast) to district 3 (in the northeast) constitute such a minority; all others reside in districts wherein they are part of a continuous majority. Western districts 1 and 2, with unchanged boundaries, house only voters with entirely familiar electorates. The revised southeastern district 4, though smaller than its predecessor, also includes only voters previously united by the old map. That is, all of the residents of the new 4th district previously resided in a common districts (the old 4th district, as it happens, though the coincidence of district *number* is, of course, immaterial). The voters in the northeast corner of the state, previously in district 3, constitute 75% (6/8) of their new district 3. By contrast, using the same measure, in map D, both district 3 and district 4 feature 62.5% (5/8) continuity, with 37.5% of their residents (3/8) new to the group. Continuity is thus lower, by this standard, in map D than in map A. Map D's grouping of residents into distinct electorates places more people in largely unfamiliar crowds.

While map A is probably an easy choice on continuity grounds here, the example also illustrates how disruption for voters can be geographically concentrated. The total number of voters outnumbered in their new district by members of a different old district are, respectively, six for B and D and eight for C. These are the sums of the red population counts. So, if one looks at only the total number of voters "moved" in this sense, map D ties with map B and beats map C. But in map D, all of the voters newly in a minority reside in the northeast, whereas maps B and C more evenly disperse the cost of newness on voters throughout the state. Map E, with the least continuity, concentrates its limited continuity in the southeast, much as map D concentrated discontinuity in the northeast. Map E tasks a great many voters with adjusting to new electoral context; maps A, B, C, and D create less disruption for residents. That map D inflicts its disruption on only one area could be troubling, especially if areas differ systematically in voter traits such as race, occupation, age, and so on.

The example, is of course, greatly simplified. Whether a voter is or is not in a majority according to prior district is only one possible measure of individual-level district continuity. The degree of familiarity between residents of a district could depend on length of co-residence, and measures of continuity could thus incorporate information not only about *which* district populations on a map about to be replaced have changed, but *when* and *how* they did so. Breaking up a district that has remained mostly the same (e.g. abiding by a county or city line) for many redistricting cycles will cause more disruption than altering a district that has been recurrently redrawn. And while continuity of population is not the sole criterion for judging map fairness—after all, residents have interests in their districts' traits beyond the identities of fellow residents in regard to prior boundaries—the simple point remains that concentration of boundary change geographically to affect only one set of residents can concentrate harm on those residents.

Public Interest in Congruence

In popular and academic discussion of redistricting, uniting "communities of interest" is a very commonly cited principle. The phrase is quite elastic, and varyingly defined. The

National Conference of State Legislatures elaborates on the relevant interests, “Geographical areas, such as neighborhoods of a city or regions of a state, where the residents have common political interests that do not necessarily coincide with the boundaries of a political subdivision, such as a city or county.” The latter qualification reflects that the NCSL lists “Preservation of counties and other political subdivisions” as a distinct criterion. Whether these relevant interests are described as “political” or “legislative,” they are to be distinguished from interests arising from, e.g. occupation, race, recreational pastimes, and so on. Of course, often interests of many kinds will be somewhat clustered geographically, as when a particular area is a hotspot for hunters or bird watchers or a town is dominated by a single employer. Most people in an area might favor construction of a bridge or highway, or prison or school, or such a project might divide locals, but the issue and interests would be local by nature. In a broad sense, a community of interest might be all of those affected by a geographically targeted policy, whether or not they agree.

In turn, boundaries, whether they are permanent or semi-permanent, like state and county lines, or short-term, like electoral districts, can create common interests. County and municipal lines automatically structure politics at their own (local) level, and can also have effects on politics higher up. County residents may elect the same sheriff, coroner and district attorney; municipal residents elect the same common council and receive the same city services, own the same public spaces, share tax base, and so on. A rationale for congruence between salient boundaries, in turn, is that it can simplify political life for ordinary citizens.

Electoral districts match sets of residents to particular office-holders, creating a bond that can, again, be positive or negative. Like city or county lines, they structure political debate and choices, and so the interest in continuity relates to lowering transaction or information costs.

Empirical Evidence of Benefits from District Continuity and Congruence

Evidence that contextual changes can affect political behavior is ample. A long-standing finding is that length-of-residence is a positive predictor of voting and other political engagement, while moving dampens participation (e.g. Squire, Wolfinger and Glass 1987). Changing homes can be disruptive because of logistical challenges such as registering to vote in a new location, but also because of disruption of social ties, and both seem to matter for political activity (Highton 2000). When residents stay put, but boundaries shift, altering which households and individuals are legislatively combined, social ties can also be scrambled.

An academic literature, dating at least from Niemi et al. (1986) chronicles various effects of redistricting on political engagement. Winburn and Wagner (2010), for example, employ national survey data from the American National Election Studies fielded between 1994 and 2002 to show that voters’ ability to recall names of candidates is markedly lower for those who were, roughly, drawn into a different district from most of their fellow county residents. This average effect, moreover, displayed interesting heterogeneity wherein “...less

sophisticated voters are differentially negatively affected by living in the part of a county or media market that is drawn into a district outside those voters' natural communities of interest" (2010: 382). In turn, Engstrom (2005) and others have shown that recall and recognition of candidate names is a significant predictor of voting. In the motivating example behind Robert Putnam's celebrated *Bowling Alone* (2000), citizens can pick up valuable political information incidentally or even accidentally from chitchat between frames on bowling night. But low congruence between electoral boundaries and neighborhood lines dislocates such information channels.

Likewise, Hayes and McKee (2009, 2012) demonstrate with data from select states from the 2000s, that "rolloff," or selective abstention on down-ballot races for ballot casters, increases when voters are placed in new districts, away from their previous representatives. Moreover, they detect the strongest such effects for African Americans (2012: 115). They attribute the effects to higher "information costs" meaning, the additional work it would take any resident to familiarize herself with new down-ballot candidates (such as Assembly representatives) in a new district. It is quite intuitive that some voters, less attuned to institutions, might, in the first election on a new map, be surprised to encounter only unfamiliar candidate names and then skip past the race altogether.

A very large literature on "the personal vote" has shown that some of the well-known incumbents' vote bonus in American elections is a function of representatives seeking out opportunities to assist constituents with navigating bureaucracy and otherwise dealing with government in their existing districts (e.g. Cain, Ferejohn, and Fiorina 1987). So, when citizens are shifted into new districts and separated from incumbents who represented their old districts, their ability to cope with government might be marginally diminished.

Incumbents, of course, have no inherent right to familiar and friendly electorates. But, viewed from the other side of the relationship, residents probably obtain some benefits from having experienced representatives who have invested in specialized knowledge of their constituents' needs. Retirement and defeat will periodically sever public-representative ties, but redistricting is different in kind from electoral defeat or voluntary exit, and so its impact on continuity of representation merits attention. Likewise, the geography of redistricting-induced breaks in representational continuity is worthy of consideration, lest costs fall heavily on systematic subsets of voters.

Public Opinion on Redistricting Principles

Survey data on redistricting criteria are rare. Christensen and Makse (2015) is one notable exception. The authors mounted "clustered" surveys in Massachusetts to gauge what qualities respondents valued in a district, using realistic hypotheticals tailored for respondents' locales. They found comparatively little attention to partisan or ideological composition, but not an absence of preferences because of the topic's technical or arcane nature. Instead, "[c]itizens appear to value districts that respect 'invisible lines' and in which communities share issue priorities....[possessing] intuitive and issue-oriented conceptions


about which communities belong together and which districts capture true communities of interest” (472).

I have done my own redistricting surveys. Gaines (2021), updating Gaines and Kuklinski (2010), reports results of some survey questions about redistricting I included in the 2020 Cooperative Election Study, a large online survey organized by researchers at Harvard and administered by YouGov on behalf of paying teams from over 60 institutions.¹ One question asked respondents to rank seven possible map traits by importance. Continuity with the prior map was not an option, but the second most highly ranked criterion was “boundaries should follow existing county and city lines as much as possible.” Congruence is thus comparatively popular with ordinary citizens.

Conclusions

The observation that districts themselves organize political activity, to some degree, should not be controversial. The implication that making boundaries coincide and altering boundaries little, when possible, can assist potential voters with voting and other political activities is also not new. The companion point, that when re-arranging boundaries to equalize populations, map makers might aim to avoid concentrating the disruption geographically, lest they impose costs on residents in one region or county, need not be, but can be, a point about racial minorities. Without making claims based on the Voting Rights Act (VRA), one can nonetheless worry that a map which deprives African Americans of incumbents at a much higher rate than others is unfair.

Submitted: December 30, 2021



Dr. Brian J. Gaines

¹ Details on the CES and its many predecessors, dating from 2006 and previously labelled “Cooperative Congressional Election Studies” or CCES, may be found at cces.gov.harvard.edu.

References

- Cain, Bruce, John Ferejohn and Morris Fiorina. 1987. *The Personal Vote: Constituency Service and Electoral Independence*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Engstrom, Richard N. 2005. District Geography and Voters. In *Redistricting in the New Millennium*, ed. Peter F. Galderisis, Lanham, MD: Lexington, 64-85.
- Gaines, Brian J. and James H. Kuklinski. 2010. To Gerrymander or Not? What Kind of Electoral Districts Does the Public Want? *Illinois Issues* 36, 9 (September): 30-33.
- Gaines, Brian J. May 28, 2021. Public Preferences on Redistricting Revisited. *NPR Illinois*. Accessed December 26, 2021 at <https://www.nprillinois.org/politics/2021-05-28/public-preferences-on-redistricting-revisited>.
- Hayes, Danny and Seth C. McKee. 2009. The Participatory Effects of Redistricting. *American Journal of Political Science*, 53, 4 (October): 1006-1023
- Hayes, Danny and Seth C. McKee. 2012. The Intersection of Redistricting, Race, and Participation. *American Journal of Political Science* 56, 1 (January): 115-130.
- Highton, Benjamin. 2000. Residential Mobility, Community Mobility, and Electoral Participation. *Political Behavior* 22, 2 (June): 109-120.
- National Conference of State Legislatures. No date. Redistricting Criteria. Accessed at <https://www.ncsl.org/research/redistricting/redistricting-criteria.aspx>, December 26, 2021.
- Niemi, Richard G., Lynda W. Powell, and Patricia L. Bicknell. 1986. The Effects of Congruity Between Community and District on Salience of U.S. House Candidates. *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 11, 2 (May): 187-210.
- Putnam, Robert D. 2000. *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. New York, NY: Simon and Schuster.
- Squire, Peverill, Raymond E. Wolfinger, and David P. Glass. 1987. Residential Mobility and Voter Turnout. *American Political Science Review* 81, 1 (March): 45-66.
- Vasilogambros, Matt, Carrie Levine, and Pratheek Rebala. 2020. National Data Release Sheds Light On Past Polling Place Changes. *Stateline*. Accessed at <https://www.pewtrusts.org/en/research-and-analysis/blogs/stateline/2020/09/29/national-data-release-sheds-light-on-past-polling-place-changes>, December 26, 2021.
- Winburn, Jonathan and Michael W. Wagner. 2010. Carving Voters Out: Redistricting's Influence on Political Information, Turnout, and Voting Behavior. *Political Research Quarterly* 63, 2 (June): 373-386.

Exhibit 1 – Curriculum Vitae

BRIAN JOHN GAINES

Department of Political Science
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
420 David Kinley Hall, MC-713
1407 W. Gregory Dr.
Urbana, Illinois 61801
fax: 217-244-5712

Institute of Government & Public Affairs
University of Illinois
1007 W. Nevada St.
Urbana, Illinois 61801-3812
fax: 217-244-4817

<http://www.pol.illinois.edu/people/bjgaines>
<http://igpa.uillinois.edu/expert/brian-j-gaines>

217-333-4367
bjgaines@illinois.edu

Education

Ph.D., Stanford University (1995)
Incumbency Advantage and the Personal Vote in the Anglo-Atlantic Democracies
(Douglas Rivers, John Ferejohn, David Brady, Geoffrey Garrett)
A.M., Stanford University (1989)
B.A. (Honours), University of British Columbia (1988)

Academic Appointments

Department of Political Science, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
Professor (2011-); Associate Professor (2001-11); Assistant Professor (1995-2001)
Institute of Government and Public Affairs, University of Illinois
Senior Scholar (2020-); Professor (2011-2019); Associate Professor (2003-11)
European Union Center, University of Illinois (2005-)
Cline Center for Democracy, University of Illinois
Merriam Professorial Scholar (2012-14)
Hoover Institution
W. Glenn Campbell and Rita Ricardo-Campbell National Fellow and Arch W. Shaw
National Fellow (2011-13)
Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, Belgium
Visiting Scholar, Department of Management, Strategy, and Innovation (summer 2019);
Visiting Scholar, Department of Applied Economics (summers 1997, 1999)
School of International Relations and Public Affairs, Fudan University, Shanghai, China
Guest Instructor, (summer 2002)

Research Interests

elections, electoral institutions and laws, public opinion, political behaviour, statistical
methods, legislatures, game theory

Teaching Experience

Undergraduate

1. Introduction to Political Science
2. Introduction to Rational-Choice Analysis of American Politics
3. Introduction to Political Research (Statistics for Political Science)
4. Introduction to American Government
5. Political Behavior
6. Elections and Electoral Behaviour
7. Government and Politics of the United Kingdom

Graduate

1. Statistical Methods in Political Science I (Introduction)
2. Statistical Methods in Political Science II (Regression)
3. Statistical Methods in Political Science III (Topics)
4. Game Theory I: Introduction
5. Game Theory II: Advances and Applications
6. Panel Data Analysis*
7. Contemporary Theories of Voting Behaviour
8. Research Practicum in Civic Leadership (MA)

* Interactive live-video course to U. Illinois, U. Minnesota, Ohio State U., and U. Wisconsin

Faculty, CIC British Parliamentary Internship Programme, 1997–2011

Supervised internships and research projects for students from U. Illinois, U. Michigan, U. Wisconsin, and Purdue (select years) in London, mostly in the UK House of Commons

University of Illinois Political Science Graduate Student Top Mentor Award, 2003, 2007

Publications

Articles in Peer-Reviewed Journals

- A31. Survey Design, Order Effects, and Causal Mediation Analysis (with Stephen Chaudoin and Avital Livny). *Journal of Politics* 83, 4 (October 2021): 1851-1856.
- A30. Conclusion: Prospects for Analysing Committees in Comparative Perspective (with Mark Goodwin, Stephen Holden Bates, and Gisela Sin). *Journal of Legislative Studies* 25, 3 (September 2019): 434-441.
- A29. A Bouncy House? UK Select Committee Newsworthiness, 2005-18 (with Mark Goodwin, Stephen Holden Bates, and Gisela Sin). *Journal of Legislative Studies* 25, 3 (September 2019): 409-433. DOI: [10.1080/13572334.2019.1662612](https://doi.org/10.1080/13572334.2019.1662612)
- A28. The Study of Legislative Committees (with Mark Goodwin, Stephen Holden Bates, and Gisela Sin). *Journal of Legislative Studies* 25, 3 (September 2019): 331-339.
- A27. The Myth of the Bipartisan National Popular Vote Plan (with Jillian Evans). *The Forum* 17, 2 (July 2019): 345-373. DOI: [10/1515/for-2019-0020](https://doi.org/10.1515/for-2019-0020)
- A26. Flat is Fair: American Public Opinion on Taxes and the Myth of Egalitarianism. *The Independent Review* 22, 1 (Summer 2017): 93-104.
- A25. Absentee and Early Voting: Weighing the Costs of Convenience (with Barry C. Burden). *Election Law Journal* 14, 1 (March 2015): 32-37. DOI: [0.1089/elj.2014.0270](https://doi.org/0.1089/elj.2014.0270)

- A24. More on Measuring Two-Party Competition (with Rein Taagepera). *Journal of Elections, Public Opinion, and Parties* 24, 3 (August 2014): 386-392. DOI: [10.1080/17457289.2014.913597](https://doi.org/10.1080/17457289.2014.913597)
- A23. How To Operationalize Two-Partyness (with Rein Taagepera). *Journal of Elections, Public Opinion, and Parties* 23, 4 (November 2013): 387-404. DOI: 10.1080/17457289.2013.770398
- A22. Is Four Twice as Nice as Two? A Natural Experiment on Electoral Effects of Legislative Term Length (with Timothy P. Nokken and Collin Groebe). *State Politics and Policy Quarterly* 12, 1 (March 2012): 43-57. DOI: [10.1177/1532440011433588](https://doi.org/10.1177/1532440011433588)
- A21. Experimental Estimation of Heterogeneous Treatment Effects Related to Self-Selection (with James H. Kuklinski). *American Journal of Political Science* 55, 3 (July 2011): 724-736. DOI: [10.1111/j.1540-5907.2011.00518.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-5907.2011.00518.x)
- A20. Apportionment Matters: Fair Representation in the House and Electoral College (with Jeffery A. Jenkins). *Perspectives on Politics* 7, 4 (December 2009): 847-855. DOI: [10.1017/S1537592709991848](https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592709991848)
- A19. The Effect of Local Political Context on How Americans Vote (with Joshua J. Dyck and Daron R. Shaw). *American Politics Research* 37, 6 (November 2009): 1088-1115. DOI: 10.1177/1532673X09332932
- A18. Typing Together? Clustering of Ideological Types in Online Social Networks (with Jeffery J. Mondak). *Journal of Information Technology and Politics* 6, 3-4 (July-December 2009): 216-231. DOI: 10.1080/19331680903031531
- A17. Interpreting Iraq: Partisanship and the Meaning of Facts (with James H. Kuklinski, Paul J. Quirk, Buddy Peyton, and Jay Verkuilen). *Journal of Politics* 69, 4 (November 2007): 957-974. DOI: 10.1111/j.1468-2508.2007.00601.x
- A16. Breaking the (Benford) Law: Statistical Fraud Detection and Campaign Finance (with Wendy K. Tam Cho). *The American Statistician* 61, 3 (August 2007): 218-223. DOI: 10.1198/000313007X223496
- A15. The Logic of the Survey Experiment Reexamined (with James H. Kuklinski and Paul J. Quirk). *Political Analysis* 15, 1 (Winter 2007): 1-20. DOI: 10.1093/pan/ mpl008
- A14. On California's 1920 Alien Land Law: The Psychology and Economics of Racial Discrimination (with Wendy K. Tam Cho). *State Politics and Policy Quarterly* 4, 3 (Fall 2004): 271-293. DOI: 10.1177/153244000400400302
- A13. Another Look at Connections Across German Elections (with Christophe Crombez). *Journal of Theoretical Politics* 16, 3 (July 2004): 289-319. DOI: 10.1177/0951629804043204
- A12. The Limits of Ecological Inference: The Case of Split-Ticket Voting (with Wendy K. Tam Cho). *American Journal of Political Science* 48, 1 (January 2004): 152-171. DOI: 10.1111/j.0092-5853.2004.00062.x
- A11. Where's the Rally? Approval and Trust of the President, Cabinet, Congress, and Government Since September 11. *PS: Political Science and Politics* 35, 3 (September 2002): 530-536. DOI: 10.1017/S1049096502000793
- A10. Actions Do Speak Louder than Words: Deterring Plagiarism with the Use of Plagiarism-Detection Software (with Bear Braumoeller). *PS: Political Science and Politics* 34, 4 (December 2001): 835-839. DOI: 10.1017/S1049096501000786
- A9. Popular Myths about Popular Vote-Electoral College Splits. *PS: Political Science and Politics* 34, 1 (March 2001): 70-75. DOI: 10.1017/S1049096501000105
- A8. A Further Look at Universalism and Partisanship in Congressional Roll-Call Voting (with Brian R. Sala). *Political Analysis* 8, 4R (Autumn 2000): 399.
- A7. From Duverger to Cox, and Beyond: The State-of-the-Art in Electoral Law Studies. *Japanese Journal of Political Science* 1, 1 (May 2000): 151-156.
- A6. Duverger's Law and the Meaning of Canadian Exceptionalism. *Comparative Political Studies* 40, 1 (October 1999): 836-862. DOI: 10.1177/0010414099032007004

- A5. The Impersonal Vote? Constituency Service and Incumbency Advantage in British Elections, 1950–92. *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 23, 2 (May 1998): 167–195.
- A4. Where To Count Parties. *Electoral Studies* 16, 1 (March 1997): 49–58. DOI: 10.1016/S0261-3794(96)00056-XA3.
- A3. The Perils of Presidential Support: How the Republicans Took the House in 1994 (with David Brady, John Cogan, and Douglas Rivers). *Political Behavior* 18, 4 (December 1996): 345–367. DOI: 10.1007/BF01499093
- A2. The Calculus of Dissent: Party Discipline in the British Labour Government of 1974–1979 (with Geoffrey Garrett). *Political Behavior* 15, 2 (June 1993): 113–136. DOI: 10.1007/BF00993850
- A1. The Fallacy of Democratic Elitism: Elite Competition and Commitment to Civil Liberties (with Paul M. Sniderman, Joseph F. Fletcher, Peter H. Russell, and Philip E. Tetlock). *British Journal of Political Science* 21, 3 (July 1991): 349–370. DOI: 10.1017/S0007123400006190

Book Chapters

- C15. How Motivation Influences Political Decision Making (with Benjamin Kantack). In *Oxford Encyclopedia of Political Decision Making*. David P. Redlawsk, ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020. DOI: 10.1093/acrefore/9780190228637.013.1017
- C14. Taxes and the Myth of Egalitarianism. In *In All Fairness: Equality, Liberty and the Quest for Human Dignity*. Robert M. Whaples, Michael C. Munger, and Christopher J. Coyne, eds. Oakland, CA: Independent Institute, 2019, 183-196. Reprinted from *The Independent Review*.
- C13. A Possible Next Frontier in Political Communication Research: Merging the Old with the New (with James H. Kuklinski). In *Oxford Handbook of American Public Opinion and the Media*. Robert Y. Shapiro and Lawrence R. Jacobs, eds. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011, 43-58. DOI:10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199545636.003.0003
- C12. Treatment Effects (with James H. Kuklinski). In *Cambridge Handbook of Experimental Political Science*, James N. Druckman, Donald P. Green, James H. Kuklinski, and Arthur Lupia, eds. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge, 2011, 445-458.
- C11. Compact Risk: Some Downsides to Establishing National Plurality Presidential Elections. In *Electoral College Reform: Challenges and Possibilities*, Gary Bugh, ed. Farnham, UK: Ashgate, 2010, 113-126.
- C10. Does the United Kingdom Obey Duverger's Law? In *Duverger's Law of Plurality Voting: The Logic of Party Competition in Canada, India, the United Kingdom and the United States*, Bernard Grofman, André Blais, and Shaun Bowler, eds. New York, NY: Springer, 2009, 115-134. DOI: 10.1007/978-0-387-09720-6_8
- C9. The Logic of the Survey Experiment Reexamined (with James H. Kuklinski and Paul J. Quirk). In *Selecting Research Methods*, W. Paul Vogt, ed. London, UK: Sage, 2008. Reprinted from *Political Analysis*.
- C8. International Perspectives on Democracy in the Twenty-First Century (with Peter F. Nardulli). In *International Perspectives on Contemporary Democracy*, Peter F. Nardulli, ed. Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2008, 1-10.
- C7. Democracy Challenged: Demography, Technology and Democratic Possibilities (with Peter F. Nardulli). In *Domestic Perspectives on Contemporary Democracy*, Peter F. Nardulli, ed. Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2008, 1-8.
- C6. Gubernatorial Incapacity and Succession Provisions (with Brian D. Roberts). In *The Book of the States 2005 (Vol. 37)*, Keon S. Chi, ed. Lexington, KY: Council of State Governments, 2005, 208–214.

- C5. Candidates, Donors, and Voters in California's Blanket Primary Elections (with Wendy K. Tam Cho). In *Voting at the Political Fault Line: California's Experiment with the Blanket Primary*, Bruce E. Cain and Elisabeth R. Gerber, eds. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press / Institute of Governmental Studies, 2002, 171–191.
- C4. Crossover Voting Before the Blanket: Primaries Versus Parties in California History (with Wendy K. Tam Cho). In *Voting at the Political Fault Line: California's Experiment with the Blanket Primary*, Bruce E. Cain and Elisabeth R. Gerber, eds. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press / Institute of Governmental Studies, 2002, 12–35.
- C3. A House Discarded? Evaluating the Case for a Unicameral California Legislature (with David W. Brady). In *Constitutional Reform in California: Making State Government More Effective and Responsive*, Bruce E. Cain and Roger G. Noll, eds. Berkeley, CA: Institute of Governmental Studies Press, 1995, 195–238.
- C2. The Fallacy of Democratic Elitism: Elite Competition and Commitment to Civil Liberties (with Paul M. Sniderman, Joseph F. Fletcher, Peter H. Russell, and Philip E. Tetlock). In *The Puzzles of Power*, Michael Howlett and David Laycock, eds. Toronto: Copp Clark Longman, 1994 (1st ed.), 1998 (2nd ed.), 107–128. Reprinted from the *British Journal of Political Science*.
- C1. The Personal Vote in Canada (with John Ferejohn). In *Representation, Integration and Political Parties in Canada*, Herman Bakvis, ed. vol. 14 of the research studies of the Royal Commission on Electoral Reform and Party Financing. Toronto: Dundurn Press, 1991, 275–302.

Op Eds, Commentaries, and Newspaper Articles

- N79. By Now, We're Used to this Type of Partisan Gerrymandering. *News-Gazette*, Saturday October 16, 2021: A-1, A-10.
- N78. Pritzker's Electoral Fate... *News-Gazette*, Tuesday July 27, 2001: A-5.
- N77. Come Together. *News-Gazette*, Wednesday January 20, 2021: A-1.
- N76. Stakes in Georgia. *News-Gazette*, Tuesday January 5, 2021.
- N75. When, Exactly, Will the Winner Win? *News-Gazette*, Thursday November 5, 2020: A-4.
- N74. And Away We Go.... *News-Gazette*, Tuesday November 3, 2020: A-1.
- N73. Debate Night: Here's What You'll Hear. *News-Gazette*, Thursday October 22, 2020: A-1.
- N72. Now It's Running Mates' Turn To Take Debate Stage. *News-Gazette*, Wednesday October 7, 2020: A-1.
- N71. Presidential Debate No. 1: What's in Store. *News-Gazette*, Tuesday September 29, 2020: A-1.
- N70. Eye on the Election. *News-Gazette*, Tuesday September 1, 2020: B-2.
- N69. Kamala Harris Selection. *News-Gazette*, Friday August 14, 2020: A-1.
- N68. Fair or Not? Voters' Faith in the System Matters Most (with Kent Redfield and Christopher Mooney). *News-Gazette*, Tuesday June 23, 2020: B-2.
- N67. Illinois Must Start Now to Prevent A November Election Disaster (with Kent Redfield and Christopher Z. Mooney). *Crain's Chicago Business*, Tuesday April 7, 2020.
- N66. And Then There Were Two... *News-Gazette*, Sunday March 15, 2020: A-8.
- N65. It's Judgment Day. *News-Gazette*, Tuesday March 3, 2020: A-1.
- N64. Can Anyone Beat Bernie? *News-Gazette*, Tuesday February 25, 2020: A-1.
- N63. Bloomberg to Hit Vegas Stage. *News-Gazette*, Wednesday February 19, 2020: A-1.
- N62. Talking Points. *News-Gazette*, Friday February 7, 2020: A-3.
- N61. Rules of the Road. *News-Gazette*, Sunday February 2, 2020: C-4.

- N60. The Election. *News-Gazette*, Tuesday January 21, 2020: A-1.
- N59. Final Chance to Impress. *News-Gazette*, Tuesday January 14, 2020: A-1.
- N58. 'Twas the Night of Debate 6. *News-Gazette*, Thursday December 19, 2019: A-1.
- N57. Checking In: How Could A Trump Trial Play Out on the Campaign Trail? *News Gazette*, Wednesday December 11, 2019: A-1.
- N56. It's Round 5 for 10 Dems. *News-Gazette*, Wednesday November 20, 2019: A-1.
- N55. Round 4: 12 Dems to Share Stage. *News-Gazette*, Tuesday October 15, 2019: A-1.
- N54. Biden Blunders, Race for No. 2 Debate Storylines. *News-Gazette*, Thursday September 12, 2019: A-1.
- N53. Debate Preview. *News-Gazette*, Monday June 24, 2019: A-1.
- N52. State Still Needs A Proper Gubernatorial-Incapacity Law. *The Southern*, Monday January 24, 2019 (also *News-Gazette*, Sunday January 27, 2019: C-5.)
- N51. In Focus. *News-Gazette*, Wednesday January 2, 2019: A-1.
- N50. Fearless Forecast. *News-Gazette*, Sunday October 14, 2018: A-5.
- N49. No Time for A Coup: Incivility is Not Inability. *State Journal-Register*, Friday September 21, 2018 (also *News-Gazette*, Sunday September 23, 2018: C-6.)
- N48. Little Momentum for NPVIC (with Jillian Evans). *News-Gazette*, Sunday June 3, 2018: C6.
- N47. Anderson: A Prophetic, Kindred Spirit. *News-Gazette*, Wednesday December 6, 2017: B1.
- N46. Be Careful What You Wish for on Electoral-College Reform. *Peoria Journal-Star*, Wednesday November 23, 2016 (also *Southern Illinoisan* and *News-Gazette*, Sunday November 27: C-3, *State Journal-Register*, Tuesday December 6).
- N45. Just a Heartbeat Away.... *News-Gazette*, Monday October 3, 2016: A1.
- N44. Ask the Expert: 55 Days Away. *News-Gazette*, Wednesday September 14, 2016: A1.
- N43. Turnaround Agenda? *News-Gazette*, Wednesday August 10, 2016: A1.
- N42. Independent Map Amendment Would Not Harm Racial Representation. *Chicago Tribune*, Tuesday June 28, 2016.
- N41. They're Still Berning. *News-Gazette*, Tuesday June 7, 2016: A1.
- N40. Shoring Up the Base. *News-Gazette*, Monday May 23, 2016: A1.
- N39. That's the Ticket. *News-Gazette*, Tuesday April 26, 2016: A1.
- N38. Primary Concerns. *News-Gazette*, Tuesday March 15, 2016: A1.
- N37. 6-Step Plan for Dumping Trump. *News-Gazette*, Tuesday March 1, 2016: A1.
- N36. Another Shot at Spotlight. *News-Gazette*, Saturday February 6, 2016: A1.
- N35. Nomination Nod. *News-Gazette*, Sunday January 24, 2016: A3.
- N34. More to Say. *News-Gazette*, Tuesday November 10, 2015: A3.
- N33. No Bid for Biden. *News-Gazette*, Thursday October 22, 2015: A1.
- N32. Obstacles in Her Way. *News-Gazette*, Tuesday October 13, 2015: A1.
- N31. Now Hear This. *News-Gazette*, Wednesday September 16, 2015: A1.
- N30. Republicans Up for Debate. *News Gazette*. Thursday August 6, 2015: A1.
- N29. Packed House. *News-Gazette*, Wednesday June 10, 2015: A1.
- N28. Scouting the Field. *News-Gazette*, Tuesday April 14, 2015: A1.
- N27. Prepare for the Inevitable Now, Not Later: Legislature Should Avoid the Next Crisis by Improving Laws on Orderly Succession. *Dixon Telegraph/Sauk Valley Media*, Saturday December 20, 2014: A-6. (also as Illinois Needs A Succession Law, *News-Gazette*, Tuesday

- December 23, 2014; Illinois Must Draft Orderly Succession Rules, *State Journal-Register*, Thursday January 1, 2015).
- N26. Why Illinois (Still) Needs Redistricting Reform. *Crain's Chicago Business*. Thursday October 9, 2014. (also in *News Gazette* (Sunday October 5: C-3), *State Journal-Register* (Thursday October 2), Sauk Valley Media (Friday October 3: A-6)).
- N25. The Case of the Vanishing Millionaire's Tax. *Chicago Sun Times*, Friday April 11, 2014 (also in *State Journal-Register* (Monday April 15), *News Gazette* (Tuesday April 16)).
- N24. Public of Two Minds on Millionaire's Tax. *Herald Review*, Friday April 11, 2014.
- N23. A Few Pointers on Political Polls. *Chicago Sun Times*, Sunday September 9, 2012 (also in *News Gazette*, *Quad Cities Dispatch-Argus*, *State Journal-Register*, and *Peoria Journal-Star*)
- N22. Marathons More than Runs, They're Glue that Binds Us. *News-Gazette*, Wednesday May 2, 2012: A4.
- N21. What's a 'Fair' Tax for the Mega Millionaires? (with Douglas Rivers). *Wall Street Journal*, Wednesday April 11, 2012: A13.
- N20. Incumbent State Senators Leaving Nothing to Chance? *News-Gazette*, Sunday February 5, 2012: C2.
- N19. National Popular Vote Compact Has Serious Flaws. *San Jose Mercury News*, Monday August 29, 2011: A9.
- N18. Transparent Redistricting Still Possible (with James H. Kuklinski). *Daily Herald*, Monday August 2, 2010.
- N17. Transparent Redistricting in Illinois is Still Possible (with James H. Kuklinski). *News-Gazette*, Sunday August 1, 2010, C-1, 5.
- N16. Transparent Remap Effort Must be Goal (with James H. Kuklinski). *Springfield State Journal-Register*, Sunday August 1, 2010.
- N15. Absentee Voting Bill Is a Good Candidate for a Veto (with James H. Kuklinski). *News-Gazette*, Sunday May 24, 2009, C-3.
- N14. Leave Blagojevich Case to Legislature, Not Courts (with Brian D. Roberts). *News-Gazette*, Wednesday December 17, 2008, A-6.
- N13. Giving Democracy the Old College Try. *The Public I*, August/September 2008: 5.
- N12. Pay No Attention to Popular Vote. *News-Gazette*, Friday May 16, 2008, A-9.
- N11. Media Gloss Over Delegate Count, Focus on 'Winners'. *Peoria Journal-Star*, Sunday February 3, 2008.
- N10. Look Past the Headlines to See the Real Primary Picture. *Springfield State Journal-Register*, Tuesday January 15, 2008.
- N9. The Misleading Media Fixation on Primary 'Winners'. *News-Gazette*, Sunday January 13, 2008: B-3.
- N8. Mob Rule or People Power? *Kankakee Daily Journal*, Sunday November 25, 2007.
- N7. Voters Have Brains—Let Them Use Them for Recalls. *Springfield State Journal-Register*, Wednesday September 5, 2007.
- N6. Recall Would Allow Illinoisans to Flex Their Democratic Muscle. *Peoria Journal-Star*, Sunday September 2, 2007. Excerpted in A Matter of Opinion: Should Illinoisans get the recall option? *Illinois Issues* 33, 10 (October 2007): 12.
- N5. Land of Lincoln Should Embrace More Democracy. *News-Gazette*, Sunday September 2, 2007: B-1, B-4.
- N4. Line of Succession is Blurry in Illinois. *News-Gazette*, Sunday April 22, 2007: B-4.
- N3. Some Pros and Cons of Making Decisions by Referenda. *The Public I*, October 2006: 7.

- N2. Sharon Situation Ought to be Wake-Up Call for Illinois. *Springfield State Journal-Register*, Wednesday January 18, 2006: 7.
- N1. Was Illinois Out of Step in the Midterm Elections? *The Public I*, December 2-January 3, 2002: 6-7.

Other (Magazine Articles, Policy Briefs, Reviews, Encyclopedia Entries, Blog Posts, etc.)

- O52. [Is the New Illinois State Legislative District Map Fair?](#) University of Illinois News Bureau, August 27, 2021.
- O51. [Public Preferences on Redistricting, Revisited](#). *Illinois Issues* (May 2021).
- O50. [After 2020: On Politics](#). *LAS News* Spring 2021, Urbana, IL: University of Illinois, p. 17.
- O49. [Pandemic Stress Indicator: Expert Panel Survey Reports](#) (May-December 2020). Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Institute of Government and Public Affairs.
- O48. [Ongoing Expert Advice on Pandemic Policies](#). *Policy Spotlight* (September 2020). Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Institute of Government and Public Affairs.
- O47. [In Person or By Mail? What to Consider in Choosing How to Vote](#). University of Illinois News Bureau, September 14, 2020.
- O46. [COVID-19 and the Election: What Can We Expect?](#) University of Illinois College of Liberal Arts and Sciences web news, August 21, 2020.
- O45. [How Will Illinois' Push for Mail-In Balloting Affect Voter Confidence in the November 2020 Election?](#) (with Kent Redfield and Christopher Z. Mooney). *Policy Spotlight* (July 2020). Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Institute of Government and Public Affairs.
- O44. [The Pandemic on Main Street: As State Restrictions Relax, Local Leaders Face Tough Choices](#) (with Robin Fretwell Wilson, Don Fullerton, J. Fred Giertz, Sage Kim, Kent Redfield and Julian Reif). *Illinois Issues* (May 2020).
- O43. [Supporting the Healthcare Workforce in Response to the COVID-19 Pandemic](#) (with 22 others). Institute of Government and Public Affairs, University of Illinois, April 16, 2020.
- O42. [Mobilizing Community and Family Resilience Across Illinois](#) (with 25 others). Institute of Government and Public Affairs, University of Illinois, April 16, 2020.
- O41. [What Policymakers Should Know about the Fiscal Impact of COVID-19 on Illinois](#) (with 25 others). (Economic & Fiscal Impact Group Report; No. 1). Institute of Government and Public Affairs, University of Illinois, April 9, 2020.
- O40. [When Select Committees Speak, Do Newspapers Listen?](#) (with Mark Goodwin, Stephen Holden Bates, and Gisela Sin) *LSE Democratic Audit*, October 8, 2019
- O39. [Can the Anti-Pelosi Faction Change the US House? History Lessons for House Democrats](#) (with Gisela Sin). *Vox*, Nov. 19, 2018
- O38. [Polling and the Election: What to Believe?](#) UI News Bureau, Oct. 29, 2018.
- O37. [Review of Read My Lips: Why Americans Are Proud to Pay Taxes](#) by Vanessa S. Williamson. *The Independent Review* 22, 4 (Spring 2018).
- O36. [How Could So Many Be So Wrong Predicting the Presidential Election?](#) UI News Bureau, Nov. 11, 2016.
- O35. [Europe and the Death Penalty](#). *Defining Ideas*, Hoover Institution, February 2016.
- O34. [Supreme Court Ok's Redistricting Commissions. But Do They Produce Fairer Maps?](#) UI News Bureau, June 20, 2015.
- O33. [What Next Now that Scotland has Said 'No' to Independence?](#) UI News Bureau, Sept. 22, 2014.
- O32. [Public Opinion and Political Viability of the Budget Tools](#). The Illinois Budget Policy Toolbox. Urbana, IL: Institute of Government and Public Affairs, March 25, 2014.

- O31. [Administration of Absentee Ballot Programs](#) (with Barry C. Burden). White Paper prepared for Presidential Commission on Election Administration, July 2013.
- O30. [Revisiting Redistricting: Who Should be Afraid of Partisan Mapmaking?](#) (with James H. Kuklinski and Christopher Z. Mooney). *Illinois Report* 2013. Urbana and Chicago, IL: University of Illinois Institute of Government and Public Affairs, 70-80.
- O29. [The Electoral College: Is That Any Way to Run an Election?](#) UI News Bureau, Oct. 29, 2012.
- O28. Foreword. *Identity Politics as An Alternative to Conservatism and Social Democracy: The Emergence of Neo-Volkism in Advanced Western Societies*. Alan Arwine and Lawrence Mayer. Lewiston, NY: Edward Mellen Press (2011): v-x.
- O27. [What Does 'Fair' Mean When It Comes to Redistricting?](#) UI News Bureau, June 1, 2011.
- O26. [What Is Fair Redistricting?](#) In *Rethinking Redistricting: A Discussion About the Future of Legislative Mapping in Illinois*. Urbana-Champaign, Chicago, and Springfield, IL: Institute of Government and Public Affairs 2011, 6-10.
- O25. What Does the Public Know about Redistricting? What Does the Public Want from Redistricting? (with James H. Kuklinski). In *Rethinking Redistricting: A Discussion About the Future of Legislative Mapping in Illinois*. Urbana-Champaign, Chicago, and Springfield, IL: Institute of Government and Public Affairs 2011, 11-17.
- O24. [Picking the President by Popular Plurality? Prospects and Partisan Politics](#) (with Neil Baer). *Policy Forum* 23, 2 (January 2011). University of Illinois Institute of Government and Public Affairs.
- O23. [Where the Midterm Election is Headed, and Why](#). UI News Bureau, Oct. 19, 2010.
- O22. To Gerrymander or Not? What Kind of Electoral Districts Does the Public Want? (with James H. Kuklinski). *Illinois Issues* 36, 9 (September 2010): 30-33.
- O21. Will New Limits on Campaign Donations Clean Up Illinois Politics? UI News Bureau, Dec. 22, 2009. <https://news.illinois.edu/view/6367/198723>
- O20. Some Implications of the 2008 Presidential Election: Three Brief Observations (with James H. Kuklinski and Christopher Z. Mooney). *Illinois Report* 2009. Urbana and Chicago, IL: University of Illinois Institute of Government and Public Affairs, 127-136.
- O19. [Sizing Up President Obama's First 100 Days](#) (with Bill Bernhard). UI News Bureau, Apr. 22, 2009.
- O18. "Apportionment" and "Malapportionment" in *Political Encyclopedia of US States and Regions*. Washington, DC: CQ Press (2009), 671-672 and 866-867, respectively.
- O17. Wall Street Weakly, or How and When Obama Won the Presidential Race. *Policy Forum* 21, 1 (December 2008). University of Illinois Institute of Government and Public Affairs.
- O16. Meanwhile North of the Border... *Illinois International Review* 8 (Fall 2008): 5.
- O15. [How Significant is the 'Post-Convention Bounce' and What's to be Made of All Those Election Polls?](#) UI News Bureau, Aug. 26, 2008.
- O14. [Poll: Most Still Undecided about Constitutional Convention for Illinois](#). UI News Bureau, Apr. 15, 2008.
- O13. No Marks for Civility: Nastiness is Part of Politics, Past and Present (with Brianna K. Lawrence). *Illinois Issues* 34, 5 (May 2008): 28-30.
- O12. Keep Them Separated? *Illinois Issues* 34, 1 (January 2008): 19-21.
- O11. "Alternative Vote" and "Ballots" in *International Encyclopedia of Social Sciences*, 2nd Ed., William A. Darity Jr., ed. Detroit, MI: Macmillan Reference USA (2008): 643-645 and 242-243 (respectively).
- O10. Long Odds for Sale of the Illinois Lottery? (with James H. Kuklinski). *Policy Forum* 19, 3 (March 2007). University of Illinois Institute of Government and Public Affairs.

- O9. Elect, Indict, Repeat: Will Democracy, Illinois Style, Ever Change? *Illinois Issues* 33, 1 (January 2007): 24-26.
- O8. "Conservatism", "Dobson, James", "Heritage Foundation", "Liberalism", "Tea Party Movement" in *World Book Encyclopedia 2005-*: 227-28, online only, online only, 991-92, online only (respectively).
- O7. Gubernatorial Incapacity: A Review of Succession Provisions. *Spectrum: The Journal of State Government* 8, 4 (Winter 2005): 699-701.
- O6. Review of *Why the Electoral College is Bad for America* by George C. Edwards III. *Rhetoric and Public Affairs* 8, 4 (Winter 2005): 699-701.
- O5. Review of *Why Americans Split Their Tickets: Campaigns, Competition, and Divided Government* by Barry C. Burden and David C. Kimball (with Wendy K. Tam Cho). *Party Politics* 10, 2 (January 2004): 241-243.
- O4. An Accident Waiting to Happen? Legal Provisions on Incapacity of American Governors. *Policy Forum* 16, 4 (2003). University of Illinois Institute of Government and Public Affairs.
- O3. On Partisan Fairness. In *Redistricting Illinois 2001*, Paul J Quirk, ed. Urbana-Champaign, IL: Institute of Government and Public Affairs/University of Illinois, 6-12. Reprinted in *Policy News* 14, 2 (2001): 3-12.
- O2. Who Guards the Guardians? *Public Choice* 106, 1-2 (January 2001). (back-cover comment)
- O1. A Jury of One's Peers. *Public Choice* 96, 1-2 (July 1998). (back-cover comment)

Works in Progress

- W1. *Fair Taxes: A Public-Opinion Approach* (monograph)
- W2. *Parties and Partisans in Seven Democracies* (monograph, with David Brady, Christophe Crombez)
- W3. Trueling for Dollars: Some Theory and Empirics on High-Stakes Decision Making
- W4. Showing Your Colors: Some Predictors of Behavioral Patriotism or Political Exhibitionism (with Zachary Elkins)
- W5. Party Strategies Under Cumulative Voting (with Jillian Evans)
- W6. Outcomes of (Small) Selections with Random Voting
- W7. Benford's Laws and the Census
- W8. The Health and Wealth of Nations: Effects of Cross-National and Internal Inequality (with Lloyd Gruber)
- W9. The Strange, Connected Cases of the Disappearing Discharge Reform and the Vanishing Speaker (with Gisela Sin)
- W10. Placebos as Diagnostics for Intervention Variables in Panel Analyses (with Gina Reynolds)

Professional Activities

Editorial

- Editor, *American Politics Research*, 2011-2015
- Co-Editor (with Jake Bowers and Wendy Cho), *The Political Methodologist*, 2010-2013
- Editor, UI Institute of Government & Public Affairs *Policy Forum*, 2006-08, 2009-11
- Editorial Advisory Board, *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 2007-2010
- Editorial Board, *American Politics Research*, 2010-2011, 2015-

Reviewing

Manuscript reviewer:

| | |
|---|---|
| <i>American Journal of Political Science</i> | <i>Legislative Studies Quarterly</i> |
| <i>American Political Science Review</i> | <i>New England Journal of Political Science</i> |
| <i>American Politics Research</i> | <i>Party Politics</i> |
| <i>American Sociological Review</i> | <i>Political Analysis</i> |
| <i>British Journal of Political Science</i> | <i>Political Behavior</i> |
| <i>Canadian Journal of Political Science</i> | <i>Political Communication</i> |
| <i>Canadian Political Science Review</i> | <i>Political Psychology</i> |
| <i>Comparative Political Studies</i> | <i>Political Research Quarterly</i> |
| <i>Comparative Politics</i> | <i>Political Science Quarterly</i> |
| <i>Election Law Journal</i> | <i>Political Studies</i> |
| <i>Electoral Studies</i> | <i>Politics & Gender</i> |
| <i>European Journal of Political Research</i> | <i>PS: Political Science and Politics</i> |
| <i>Government and Opposition</i> | <i>Public Choice</i> |
| <i>International Journal of Press/Politics</i> | <i>Public Opinion Quarterly</i> |
| <i>Intern'l Journal of Public Opinion Research</i> | <i>Publius: Journal of Federalism</i> |
| <i>Japanese Journal of Political Science</i> | <i>Quarterly Journal of Political Science</i> |
| <i>Journal of Computer-Mediated Communic'n</i> | <i>Regional Studies</i> |
| <i>Journal of Economics & Management Strategy</i> | <i>Research & Politics</i> |
| <i>Journal of Elections, Public Opinion & Parties</i> | <i>Revue of Economics & Statistics</i> |
| <i>Journal of Empirical Legal Studies</i> | <i>Revista Internacional de Sociología</i> |
| <i>Journal of Experimental Political Science</i> | <i>Sankhya B, Indian Journal of Statistics</i> |
| <i>Journal of Information Technology & Politics</i> | <i>Social Science Computer Review</i> |
| <i>Journal of Legislative Studies</i> | <i>Social Science Quarterly</i> |
| <i>Journal of Mathematical Psychology</i> | <i>Social Science Research</i> |
| <i>Journal of Policy History</i> | <i>Social Science Journal</i> |
| <i>Journal of Political Science Education</i> | <i>Sociological Methods and Research</i> |
| <i>Journal of Politics</i> | <i>Southeastern Political Review</i> |
| <i>Journal of Public Admin. Research & Theory</i> | <i>State Politics and Policy Quarterly</i> |
| <i>Journal of Theoretical Politics</i> | <i>World Politics</i> |

Addison Wesley, Cambridge University Press, Columbia University Press, Congressional Quarterly Press, Houghton-Mifflin, McGraw-Hill, Ohio State University Press, Prentice-Hall, Routledge, Sage, Thomson/Wadsworth; AACU (STIRS), Austrian Science Fund, National Science Foundation, TESS, University of Illinois Research Board

Promotion and tenure reviewer, external evaluator or examiner:

Boston University; Georgia State University; Texas Tech University; University of British Columbia; University of California-Riverside; University of Houston; University of North Texas; Washington University

Consulting

Member, Champaign County Redistricting Advisory Group, 2021

Consultant on *American Women v. Missouri*, 2020 (election administration), Circuit Ct. 20 AC-CC00333

Consultant on *Whitford v. Gill*, Case o. 15-cv-421-jdp (partisan redistricting), 2018-19

Consultant to Center for Strategic Initiatives, 2012-15

Consultant to Presidential Commission on Election Administration, 2013

Consultant on *Gustafson, et al., v. Illinois State Board of Elections, et al.*, David H. Coar, N.D. Ill. 1:06-cv-1159 (challenge to administration of early voting process), 2006

Consultant to Polimetrix, 2003-05

Consultant to Law Offices of Morris Lane Harvey, Mt. Vernon, Illinois, *Susan C. Hileman v. Sharon McGinness and Louis Maze*, Circuit Court of Alexander County, No. 2000-MR-24 (successful election contest on grounds of vote fraud), 2001

Consultant to Corcoran, California (performed and analyzed public opinion survey), 1994 (with Douglas Rivers)

Consultant to Tulare, California (drew school-district boundaries), 1994 (with Douglas Rivers)

Consultant to Canadian Royal Commission on Electoral Reform and Party Financing, 1990-91 (with John Ferejohn)

Staff, British Columbia Ministry of Crown Lands, 1989

Researcher, British Columbia Royal Commission on Electoral Boundaries, 1987-88

Department, College, and University Service

UI Political Science Department Placement Director, 2003-10

UI Political Science Department Advisory Committee, 2002-03, 2003-04, 2006-07, 2007-08, 2009-10, 2015-16, 2017-18, 2019-20

UI Institute of Government & Public Affairs Faculty Advisory Committee, 2005-06, 2006-07, 2007-08, 2008-09, 2009-10, 2010-11, 2012-13, 2013-14, 2014-15

UI College of Liberal Arts and Sciences Committee on Admission and Academic Standards, 2003-06

UI College of Liberal Arts and Science Honors Council, 2005-07

UI College of Liberal Arts and Science Prestigious Scholarship Committee, 2009

UI Truman Scholarship Campus Review Committee, 2016-19

UI College of Liberal Arts and Science Courses and Curriculum Committee, 2017-19

Saint John's Catholic Newman Center at UI Leadership Council, 2008-11

UI Senate Associate Parliamentarian, 2013-

UI College of Liberal Arts and Sciences Parliamentarian, 2015-

UI European Union Center Executive Committee, 2020-21

Select Grants

Dirksen Congressional Center, 1996, \$2,500

UI CC Initiative/EU (with B. Murray), 2003, \$32,000

Dirksen Congressional Center, 2017, \$3,500

MIT Election Data and Science Lab, New Initiatives 2017, \$5,000

BRIDGE (with S. Bates, M. Goodwin, G. Sin), 2017, \$9,000 + £8,500

UI Chancellor's Grant (with R. F. Wilson and J. Mazzone), 2021, \$100,000

Doctoral Students (PhD Year; Current Position)

Mauricio Bugarin (PhD in Economics, 1997; Professor, Brasilia)
 Jeffery Jenkins (1999; Professor, University of Southern California)
 Timothy Nokken (1999; Associate Professor and Chair, Texas Tech University)
 David Paul (2001; VP, Skagit Valley College)
 Jennifer Jerit (2002; Professor, Stonybrook University)
 William Cunion (2003; Associate Dean, Cuyahoga Community College)
 David Darmofal (2003; Associate Professor, University of South Carolina)
 Oana Armeanu (2005; Associate Professor and Chair, University of Southern Indiana)
 Philip Habel (2006; Professor and Chair, University of South Alabama)
 Rebecca Harris (2006; Professor, Washington and Lee University)
 Michael Lewkowicz (2006; Associate Professor, Georgia Gwinnett College)*
 Seden Akcinaroglu (2008; Associate Professor, Binghamton University)
 Florin Fesnic (2008; Researcher, Babeş-Bolyai University)*
 Dona-Gene (Mitchell) Barton (2008; Associate Professor, University of Nebraska)
 James Melton (2009; Melton Seed & Service)
 Nathaniel Swigger (2009; Associate Professor, Ohio State University at Newark)
 Sergio Wals (2009; Associate Professor, University of Nebraska)
 Daniel Pemstein (2010; Associate Professor, North Dakota State University)
 Brian D. Roberts (2010; Professor, Principia College)*
 Steve Meserve (2011; Assistant Professor, Northern Arizona University)
 Dashiell E.A. Fryer (PhD in Math, 2011; Assistant Professor, San Jose State University)
 Jason Coronel (2012; Assistant Professor, Ohio State University)
 Aya Kachi (2012; Associate Professor, University of Basel)
 Matthew Hayes (2012; Assistant Professor, Rice University)
 Melinda (Molly) Ritchie (2015; Assistant Professor, University of California, Riverside)
 Evangeline (Gina) Reynolds (2016; Assistant Professor and Data Manager, United States Military Academy)
 Paul F. Testa (2016; Assistant Professor, Brown University)
 David Bowden (2017; Lecturer, University of Pennsylvania)
 Benjamin Kantack (2017; Assistant Professor, Lycoming College)
 Wenshuo (Nini / Natalia) Zhang (2017; Data Scientist, Apple)*
 Amanda Burke (2019; Research Data Specialist, California Department of Justice)
 Charla Waeiss (2019; Research Analyst, Stanford Center for Research on Education Outcomes)*
 Jillian Evans (2019; Manager, Voter Participation Center)*
 Luke Plutowski (2020; Statistician, LAPOP)
 Ekrem Baser (2020; postdoc, NYU-Abu Dhabi)
 Julian Scheirer (2020; Research Data Specialist, California Department of Justice)
 Alice Iannantuoni (2020; postdoc, University of Geneva)
 Wei Zhong (2021; postdoc, George Washington University)*
 Bernard Brennan (2021; Assistant Professor, Johnson & Wales University)
 Nuole (Lula) Chen (2021; postdoc, Massachusetts Institute of Technology)

current: Rebeca Agosto Rosa, Yuan-Ning Chu, Tolgahan Dilgin, Justin Pierce, Navida Chun-Han Wang

* principal advisor / dissertation chair