



AGENDA
CHARTER REVIEW BOARD
CITY OF PORT ORANGE

Meeting Date: Monday, May 14, 2018

Time: 5:00 PM

Type of Meeting: Regular

Location: Council Chambers
City Hall, 1000 City Center Circle

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. Roll Call

B. DISCUSSION/ACTION

2. Consideration of Minutes - April 9, 2018
3. Voting Methodology

C. ADJOURNMENT

ANY PERSON WHO DECIDES TO APPEAL ANY DECISION MADE BY THE **CHARTER REVIEW BOARD** WILL NEED A RECORD OF THE PROCEEDINGS, AND FOR SUCH PURPOSE HE OR SHE MAY NEED TO ENSURE AT HIS OR HER OWN EXPENSE FOR THE TAKING AND PREPARATION OF A VERBATIM RECORD OF ALL TESTIMONY AND EVIDENCE OF THE PROCEEDINGS UPON WHICH THE APPEAL IS TO BE BASED. NOTE: IF YOU ARE A PERSON WITH A DISABILITY WHO NEEDS AN ACCOMMODATION IN ORDER TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS PROCEEDING, YOU ARE ENTITLED, AT NO COST TO YOU, TO THE PROVISION OF CERTAIN ASSISTANCE. PLEASE CONTACT THE CITY CLERK FOR THE CITY OF PORT ORANGE, 1000 CITY CENTER CIRCLE, PORT ORANGE, FLORIDA 32129, TELEPHONE NUMBER 386-506-5563, CITYCLERK@PORT-ORANGE.ORG, AS FAR IN ADVANCE AS POSSIBLE, BUT PREFERABLY WITHIN 2 WORKING DAYS OF YOUR RECEIPT OF THIS NOTICE OR 5 DAYS PRIOR TO THE MEETING DATE. IF YOU ARE HEARING OR VOICE IMPAIRED, CONTACT THE RELAY OPERATOR AT 7-1-1 or 1-800-955-8771. UPON REQUEST BY A QUALIFIED INDIVIDUAL WITH A DISABILITY, THIS DOCUMENT WILL BE MADE AVAILABLE IN AN ALTERNATE FORMAT. IF YOU NEED TO REQUEST THIS DOCUMENT IN AN ALTERNATE FORMAT, PLEASE CONTACT THE CITY CLERK WHOSE CONTACT INFORMATION IS PROVIDED ABOVE.

CHARTER REVIEW BOARD MEETING MINUTES
CITY OF PORT ORANGE
COUNCIL CHAMBERS – CITY HALL
1000 CITY CENTER CIRCLE
APRIL 9, 2018 AT 5:00 P.M.

A Regular Meeting of the Charter Review Board was called to order by Vice Chairman Newton White at 5:08 p.m.

Present: Debbie Connors, Chair Person (arrived at 5:19 p.m.)
Newton White, Vice Chairman
Willie Scales
Wayne Wilcox

Absent: Stan Hetrick

Also Present: Jake Johansson, City Manager
Margaret Roberts, City Attorney
Robin Fenwick, City Clerk

DISCUSSION/ACTION

2. Consideration of Minutes - March 12, 2018

Jake Johansson, City Manager, read the minutes into the record.

Motion to approve the March 12, 2018 meeting minutes was made by Member Wilcox and Seconded by Member Scales. Motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

3. Contract Term for City Manager

Mr. Johansson discussed the articles he sent to the Board relating to issues other cities have run into with contracts. Vice Chair White summarized the discussion previously held by the Board and asked the Board for comments.

Margaret Roberts, City Attorney, suggested changing the language to read "shall set the term" instead of "indefinite". The Board was favorable to this suggestion.

Motion to recommend changing the Charter language for the City Manager's contract term to read "shall set the term" instead of "indefinite" was made by Vice Chairman

White, and Seconded by Member Wilcox.
Motion carried unanimously by roll call vote.

4. Voting Methodology

Chair Person Connors opened the voting methodology discussion. She believes the Council Members should represent the entire City not just their districts. Vice Chair White discussed the issues with money expenses when running city-wide. Member Scales asked for some pros and cons to switching. Mr. Johansson explained the cross-pollination of Council Members. They will need to be in tune and care about all city issues rather than potentially just one district.

Vice Chair White asked for data regarding population size vs. voting methodology.

This item will continue to next month when all members are present.

PUBLIC COMMENTS - There were none

ADJOURNMENT - 5:48 p.m.

Debbie Connors, Chair

Attest:

Robin Fenwick, CMC
City Clerk

Lisa Lewis

Supervisor of Elections

Volusia County, FL

Date 5/7/2018

Time 05:11 PM

Totals by City and City/Wards

<u>City Ward Name</u>		Registered Voters					Inactive Voters			
		<u>Total</u>	<u>Dems</u>	<u>Reps</u>	<u>NPA</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>Dems</u>	<u>Reps</u>	<u>NPA</u>	<u>Other</u>
0	Unincorporated Areas	80,347	23,763	32,929	23,154	501	891	848	1,130	12
1	Daytona Beach	43,414	20,856	10,277	11,992	289	2,001	603	1,333	13
11	Daytona Beach Zone 1	7,125	2,839	2,061	2,173	52	246	98	219	1
12	Daytona Beach Zone 2	6,773	3,010	1,808	1,907	48	175	91	148	3
13	Daytona Beach Zone 3	7,082	3,501	1,420	2,108	53	660	112	366	4
14	Daytona Beach Zone 4	8,904	2,967	3,272	2,600	65	225	159	197	2
15	Daytona Beach Zone 5	7,720	4,686	1,128	1,862	44	330	86	203	0
16	Daytona Beach Zone 6	5,810	3,853	588	1,342	27	365	57	200	3
		43,414	20,856	10,277	11,992	289	2,001	603	1,333	13
2	Daytona Beach Shores	4,545	1,086	2,160	1,268	31	53	91	77	2
20	Daytona Beach Shores	4,545	1,086	2,160	1,268	31	53	91	77	2
		4,545	1,086	2,160	1,268	31	53	91	77	2
3	DeBary	15,622	4,213	6,766	4,543	100	154	179	181	0
30	DeBary	15,622	4,213	6,766	4,543	100	154	179	181	0
		15,622	4,213	6,766	4,543	100	154	179	181	0
4	DeLand	21,075	7,973	7,093	5,852	157	361	185	361	5
40	DeLand	21,075	7,973	7,093	5,852	157	361	185	361	5
		21,075	7,973	7,093	5,852	157	361	185	361	5
5	Deltona	60,697	23,202	16,483	20,699	313	907	538	1,010	6
51	Deltona District 1	9,468	3,719	2,383	3,333	33	141	77	164	1
52	Deltona District 2	10,640	3,998	3,123	3,457	62	142	107	155	1
53	Deltona District 3	10,211	3,937	2,614	3,597	63	198	80	188	0
54	Deltona District 4	10,508	4,191	2,726	3,544	47	145	100	177	4
55	Deltona District 5	9,904	3,798	2,690	3,364	52	145	66	162	0
56	Deltona District 6	9,966	3,559	2,947	3,404	56	136	108	164	0
		60,697	23,202	16,483	20,699	313	907	538	1,010	6
6	Edgewater	16,201	5,077	5,941	5,085	98	243	190	275	0
61	Edgewater District 1	3,623	1,191	1,276	1,132	24	77	47	75	0
62	Edgewater District 2	3,972	1,257	1,469	1,220	26	50	42	79	0
63	Edgewater District 3	3,802	1,211	1,364	1,202	25	36	33	49	0
64	Edgewater District 4	4,804	1,418	1,832	1,531	23	80	68	72	0
		16,201	5,077	5,941	5,085	98	243	190	275	0
7	Holly Hill	7,794	3,023	2,258	2,454	59	208	104	184	1
71	Holly Hill District	1,927	694	585	627	21	67	23	55	0
72	Holly Hill District	1,951	812	489	639	11	49	16	37	1
73	Holly Hill District	1,899	712	611	564	12	40	40	50	0
74	Holly Hill District	2,017	805	573	624	15	52	25	42	0
		7,794	3,023	2,258	2,454	59	208	104	184	1
8	Lake Helen	2,126	722	799	593	12	17	24	26	0
80	Lake Helen	2,126	722	799	593	12	17	24	26	0
		2,126	722	799	593	12	17	24	26	0

Lisa Lewis

Supervisor of Elections

Volusia County, FL

Date 5/7/2018

Time 05:11 PM

Totals by City and City/Wards

<u>City Ward Name</u>		<u>Registered Voters</u>					<u>Inactive Voters</u>			
		<u>Total</u>	<u>Dems</u>	<u>Reps</u>	<u>NPA</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>Dems</u>	<u>Reps</u>	<u>NPA</u>	<u>Other</u>
9 New Smyrna Beach		21,254	6,378	8,925	5,775	176	235	220	291	9
91	New Smyrna Bch Zone	5,309	1,526	2,405	1,342	36	52	61	56	1
92	New Smyrna Bch Zone	4,615	1,453	1,812	1,298	52	65	50	105	2
93	New Smyrna Bch Zone	5,239	1,412	2,291	1,493	43	49	64	68	2
94	New Smyrna Bch Zone	6,091	1,987	2,417	1,642	45	69	45	62	4
		21,254	6,378	8,925	5,775	176	235	220	291	9
10 Oak Hill		1,504	489	587	420	8	18	15	24	0
100	Oak Hill	1,504	489	587	420	8	18	15	24	0
		1,504	489	587	420	8	18	15	24	0
11 Orange City		7,712	2,583	2,692	2,399	38	139	93	151	2
111	Orange City Seat 1	1,526	609	403	510	4	45	21	46	0
112	Orange City Seat 2	1,379	449	485	436	9	32	17	37	0
113	Orange City Seat 3	1,570	522	515	523	10	28	23	34	0
114	Orange City Seat 4	1,438	445	553	431	9	11	15	15	1
115	Orange City Seat 5	1,799	558	736	499	6	23	17	19	1
		7,712	2,583	2,692	2,399	38	139	93	151	2
12 Ormond Beach		32,543	9,987	13,336	9,020	200	401	388	456	10
121	Ormond Beach Zone 1	8,769	2,497	3,902	2,316	54	71	81	81	2
122	Ormond Beach Zone 2	7,185	2,528	2,485	2,129	43	142	91	136	3
123	Ormond Beach Zone 3	8,650	2,460	3,892	2,248	50	82	108	122	4
124	Ormond Beach Zone 4	7,939	2,502	3,057	2,327	53	106	108	117	1
		32,543	9,987	13,336	9,020	200	401	388	456	10
13 Pierson		818	294	299	220	5	5	4	10	0
130	Pierson	818	294	299	220	5	5	4	10	0
		818	294	299	220	5	5	4	10	0
14 Ponce Inlet		3,139	727	1,624	763	25	17	54	31	0
140	Ponce Inlet	3,139	727	1,624	763	25	17	54	31	0
		3,139	727	1,624	763	25	17	54	31	0
15 Port Orange		43,660	13,442	16,585	13,339	294	537	444	681	12
151	Port Orange District	9,548	3,160	3,163	3,164	61	175	109	217	4
152	Port Orange District	10,399	3,384	3,692	3,252	71	154	135	196	4
153	Port Orange District	12,278	3,546	4,913	3,729	90	123	114	155	3
154	Port Orange District	11,435	3,352	4,817	3,194	72	85	86	113	1
		43,660	13,442	16,585	13,339	294	537	444	681	12
16 South Daytona		8,499	3,123	2,776	2,539	61	216	110	203	1
160	South Daytona	8,499	3,123	2,776	2,539	61	216	110	203	1
		8,499	3,123	2,776	2,539	61	216	110	203	1
17 Flagler Beach		55	25	15	15	0	2	3	3	0
170	Flagler Beach	55	25	15	15	0	2	3	3	0
		55	25	15	15	0	2	3	3	0

The Context Matters:
The Effects of Single Member vs. Multimember Districts on Diversity

Jessica Trounstone *Princeton University*

Melody Ellis Valdini *University of California San Diego*

Abstract:

Research on the election of under-represented groups to legislatures under different electoral systems has reached divergent conclusions depending on the cases studied. Women have been found to be more successful in multimember systems, while racial and ethnic minorities have seemed to benefit from single member district systems. We find that single member district systems can increase diversity only when under-represented groups are highly segregated.

Jessica Trounstone is an assistant professor of politics and public affairs Princeton University. Melody Ellis Valdini is a graduate student in political science at the University of California, San Diego. Please address correspondence to Jessica Trounstone at the Woodrow Wilson School, 303 Robertson Hall, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ 08544. Tel. 609-258-8990 Email jessica@trounstone.com or Melody Ellis Valdini at Department of Political Science, University of California, San Diego, 9500 Gilman Dr. MC0521, La Jolla, CA 92093-0521. Email mellis@weber.ucsd.edu.

This paper was prepared for presentation at the Center for the Study of Democratic Politics at Princeton University. The authors would like to thank Zoltan Hajnal for the extremely generous use of his data.

Extensive research has been devoted to understanding the continuing under-representation of women and people of color in America and abroad. A variety of cultural, structural, and institutional explanations have been suggested and supported. Nearly all theories of female electoral success in legislatures find that women are more likely to be elected in multimember electoral systems¹ than in single member districts. The data have borne out this prediction in a number of different settings, from local to national level elections, across and within countries. This stands in sharp contrast to the theory and empirical findings of those studying city politics in the United States. Here single member district elections have long been heralded as the key to producing racial and ethnic diversity, especially in places where at-large elections² were implemented to dilute the vote strength of racial groups such as in the South. We argue that these contradictory findings can be best explained by the degree of segregation of the underrepresented group. We demonstrate that single member districts only serve to increase diversity when groups are segregated.

Before we begin this analysis, it is important to show that there is something here to analyze. There remain great disparities in the representation of African American, Latino, Asian, and women city council members compared to their population proportions. Table 1 shows the proportion of racial/ethnic minority and female councilors in our data set compared to the proportion of each group in the United States population as a whole.

¹ By multi-member we mean any electoral set-up that allows voters to cast votes for more than one candidate in a single election.

² An at-large system is one in which members of the city council are selected by the entire city electorate. In most cities this means that voters are offered a slate of candidates and receive the same number of votes as there are seats available. Cities often have majoritarian requirements such that if a candidate does not receive 50% of the vote he or she is forced into a run-off election. Some cities designate seats or residency requirements for at-large positions turning the election into a series of single member votes. Other cities vote for only one at-large member in any given election which might minimize the operation of a fairness norm. In general the number of cities using pure at-large systems has declined over the past 20 years, but at-large elections remain a common feature in city politics.

Table 1				
	% Black	% Latino	% Asian	% Women
City Council Representation	6.2%	3.1%	0.4%	20.0%
1990 United States Population	11.8%	9%	2.8%	51.3%
Ratio: Council %/Population % ³	53.6%	34.5%	14.3%	39.4%

As the bottom line of the table suggests, each group analyzed in this study was underrepresented on city councils. The closer the value is to 1, the better a group is represented on councils. Yet for all four groups there is substantial variation among municipalities. Table 2 displays the mean and standard deviation for each group's proportion on city councils.

Table 2				
	% Black	% Latino	% Asian	% Women
Mean	6.2%	3.1%	0.4%	20.0%
Standard Deviation	13.4%%	12.5%	3.2%	16.5%

In nearly every case the standard deviation is nearly double the mean. Thus it remains to be explained why some cities do better than others at electing women and people of color.

Single Member Districts: An institutional solution?

One of the most persistent findings by scholars of urban politics is that single member district elections increase representation of under-represented racial and ethnic groups on city councils therefore increasing council diversity. This effect has been found to be particularly strong for African Americans (Davidson and Grofman 1994, Sloan 1969, Karnig 1976, Robinson and Dye 1978; Engstrom and McDonald 1981 & 1982, Vedlits and Johnson 1982, Welch 1990, Bullock and MacManus 1990, Polinard, Wrinkle and Longoria 1991, Arrington and Watts 1991,

³ This figure represents the average council proportion of each group divided by the population proportion. A value of 1 reflects parity in representation.

Meier and England 1984, Robinson and England 1981, Stewart, England, and Meier 1989).⁴ Not just important to academics, these arguments have led directly to court mandated changes in electoral law in many municipalities so that pure at-large systems are nowhere near as common as they once were. Additionally, districts have been found to be beneficial to people with lower incomes and limited education (Bledsoe and Welch 1985, Hamilton 1978), those with diverse occupational backgrounds (Hamilton 1978, Rice 1977, Flammang 1985) and Latinos (Taebel 1978, Davidson and Korbelt 1981, Heilig and Mundt 1983).⁵ These statistical findings have been supported by extensive case study, historical, and narrative research as well (Bridges 1997, Trounstein 2004, Slater 1935, Rice 1977).⁶ In sum “the effect of ...districts is unequivocally...greater equity.” (Mundt and Heilig 1982).

The literature on the representation of women, however, predicts precisely the opposite effect for single member districts. While there are minor exceptions, the vast majority of the literature has concluded that multimember districts are advantageous for women candidates, while single member districts are detrimental (Norris 1985, Darcy, Welch, & Clark 1987, Rule 1987, 1994, Rule & Norris 1992, Matland 1995). Thus, two predictions have emerged: if one is a candidate of an under-represented race, it is best to run in a single member district election. However, if one is a candidate of an under-represented gender, it is best to run in a multimember district election.

⁴ But see Cole 1974, MacManus 1978, Alozie 1990, Welch 1990, Welch and Karnig 1978, Bullock and MacManus 1993, who find that districts were not superior; and Thernstrom 1987 and Welch 1990 who find that the effect of districts has substantially weakened over time.

⁵ But see Welch 1990 and Mladenka 1989 who find that at-large systems offer better representation for Latinos

⁶ Many scholars have found that the effects of districts are mitigated by other factors like black community resources (Bullock 1975, Karnig 1976, 1979, Latimer 1979, Karnig and Welch 1980; Engstrom and McDonald 1981, 1982; Bullock and MacManus 1987; Welch and Bledsoe 1988), size of the minority population (Brace, Grofman, and Handley 1988, Grofman and Handley 1989), socio-economic status of the community (Cole 1974), size of the council (Taebel 1978)

To establish differential effect of districts for racial and ethnic minorities and women, we begin by testing the relationship between electoral structure and diversity at the city level. We focus on elections to the city council under single member district elections versus city-wide, at-large systems. Our data come from surveys by The International City/County Manager's Association (ICMA) conducted in 1986, 1992, and 1996. The ICMA survey is mailed to city clerks in all cities in the United States with more than 2,500 residents and has a response rate of about 64%.⁷ The survey provided us with demographic information about council members as well as institutional variables for the cities. We then merged in census data from 1990 to control for city level demographics.⁸ In total we have 6,647 cities in the data set although many cities did not have data for all three years.

Our dependent variables are the proportion of city councils that are African American, Latino, Asian and female.⁹ We also specify the model using a new measure of diversity – the number of different racial or ethnic groups represented on the city council.¹⁰ We do this to try and get at the possibility that diversity may not be reflected by the percentage of the council that is “non-white.” Diversity and the representation of people of color may not be the same. In Tuskegee, Alabama, for example, the council is 100% African American, which means that a traditionally underrepresented group is well represented, but the council is not diverse.

⁷ The response rate was 65.6% in 1986 and 62.1% in 1996.

⁸ We intend to collect and merge in 2000 census data and use interpolated variables at a later date. We were unable to collect census data for a substantial portion of the cities due to problems in merging. We are working on fixing the problems, but for now it reduces the total number of cities we can use in our models.

⁹ Early studies of minority representation used either a ratio measure (e.g. percentage of the city council that is black divided by the percentage of the population that is black) or a subtractive measure (e.g. the proportion of blacks in the population subtracted from the proportion of black on the council). Both measures create methodological problems (see Welch 1990 for a discussion). Instead we follow Welch 1990 and Hajnal and Trounstein 2005 and use this straight percentage measure as the dependent variable and control for varying minority populations in our multivariate regression.

¹⁰ This is a simple count of the different racial categories indicated by the ICMA survey for a given city. The survey allows respondents to say how many member of the city council are white, African American, Latino/Hispanic, Asian, and Native American. Regrettably this does not allow us to capture the incredible diversity within each of these groups, or those members who represent a combination of these categories, like Hispanics who consider themselves white.

For our primary independent variable we use the percentage of councilors elected by district in each city. The majority of cities in our data set have a city council that is either elected wholly by districts or at-large, but there is a substantial portion with mixed systems. Research has found that mixed systems tend to have representation rates that fall somewhere in between the two ends of the spectrum (Welch 1990, Karnig and Welch 1982). In order to capture this variation, we use this continuous version of the variable.¹¹ We add to these regressions a number of other institutional variables that have been found linked to minority council representation including nonpartisan vs. partisan elections, mayor council vs. council manager systems, the size of the city council¹², and the presence of term limits. We include city wide socio-economic variables to account for the possibility that female or minority presence on the council is linked to wealthier or more educated communities. We control for potential region effects and the racial and ethnic makeup of the city population. To account for liberal leaning communities that might be more likely to elect women and minorities, we include a measure of the countywide vote for the Democratic Presidential candidate in 1988 and a dummy variable for central cities.¹³ Finally, to control for the possibility that more female and minority members are elected over time we include a trend variable.¹⁴

Unlike most research on this topic we do not restrict our results to cities with substantial minority populations. We are theoretically more interested here in how district elections affect

¹¹ The results are extremely similar when we use a dummy variable coded one if a majority of the city council members are elected by district and zero otherwise.

¹² Council size has been used a proxy for competitiveness or desirability of seats. The argument being that in smaller councils the value of each seat is greater and therefore less likely to be represented by minorities or women (see Welch and Karnig 1979).

¹³ City level data are not widely available for presidential elections. This measure may underestimate the liberalness of a community if central cities vote significantly differently from their suburban counterparts.

¹⁴ Autocorrelation is present in a number of models. A GLS regression with first order autocorrelation effects allowed to vary across panels strengthened our results in nearly every case. We do not present these findings because it forces us to drop observations that only appeared in one year. The N is still high (between 1100 and 3500) but because it made little substantive difference to our results we choose to present the OLS regressions. GLS results are available from the authors.

diversity not just whether or not groups can gain proportionate representation on councils.¹⁵ We test directly the proposition that the size of the group matters for the effectiveness of the electoral system below.

Our results confirm recent findings that district elections continue to aid minority members in getting elected and are a detriment to women. Table 3 shows that the use of single member districts has a significant positive impact on minority council presence, and a significant negative impact on female council presence.

	% Black	% Latino	% Asian	Racial/Ethnic Diversity	% Women
% District	.019 (.003)**	.005 (.004)	.003 (.001) **	.088 (.015)**	-.018 (.006)**
% Black	.742 (.009)**	-.040 (.011)**	-.001 (.004)	1.730 (.047)**	.071 (.018)**
% Asian	-.035 (.033)	-.202 (.032)**	.360 (.011)**	1.301 (.144)**	.065 (.056)
% Latino	.029 (.010)**	.671 (.009)**	.002 (.004)	1.009 (.044)**	-.060 (.017)**
Total Pop (millions)	.014 (.015)	-.017 (.015)	-.003 (.007)	.683 (.073)**	.077 (.027)**
Median Income	-.000 (.000)*	-.000 (.000)**	-.000 (.000)**	-.000 (.000)**	-.000 (.000)
% College Graduates	.027 (.016)*	.081 (.016)**	-.009 (.006)	.095 (.067)	.217 (.026)**
Term Limits	-.003 (.005)	.009 (.005)*	-.001 (.002)	.008 (.022)	.020 (.008)**
Nonpartisan	.005 (.003)	-.007 (.004)**	-.002 (.001)	-.005 (.015)	-.005 (.006)
Mayor Council	.000 (.003)	.005 (.003)*	.001 (.001)	-.017 (.012)	-.010 (.005)**
Council Size	-.000 (.000)	.000 (.001)	-.000 (.000)	.018 (.003)**	-.000 (.001)
Democratic Vote 1988	-.003 (.010)	.033 (.010)**	.000 (.004)	-.097 (.043)**	-.001 (.016)
Central City	.015 (.004)**	-.002 (.004)	.000 (.002)	.168 (.017)**	.015 (.006)**
West	.014 (.004)**	-.026 (.004)**	.001 (.002)	-.032 (.018)*	.091 (.007)**
Northeast	.013 (.004)**	-.017 (.005)**	-.002 (.002)	-.091 (.019)**	.014 (.008)*
Midwest	.012 (.003)**	-.002 (.004)	.001 (.001)	-.073 (.015)**	.033 (.006)**

¹⁵ When we ran the regressions on cities with minority populations over 5% we found a significantly stronger effect for blacks. The impact of district elections nearly doubled. We saw similar results on the district coefficients for Latinos or Asians, but the results were not significant.

Year	.006 (.000)**	.004 (.000)**	.001 (.000)**	.007 (.001)**	.011 (.001)**
Constant	-.541 (.031)**	-.413 (.034)**	-.110 (.013)**	.374 (.119)**	-.84 (.046)**
N	4554	4295	4143	6057	5778
Adj. R ²	.66	.63	.25	.40	.15

* = p<.10, ** = p<.05

For blacks the effect of districts on representation is about two percent. We run simulations of predicted values in order to clarify these relationships.¹⁶ With all variables set at their means, the impact of changing from wholly at-large to district elections changes the expected proportion of blacks on a city council from 6.3% to 8.2%. The relationship between district elections and Latinos on the council is not significant at conventional levels.¹⁷ For Asians the effect is positive but extremely small given the tiny number of Asian councilors in the data set. In an at-large setting Asians can be expected to represent .4% of the council; with districts the number increases to .7%. When considering racial diversity of the council on the whole, districts also have a positive and significant effect. The mean number of different races on city councils with at large elections is 1.3 and is 1.4 for those with district elected members.¹⁸ In sum, we conclude that single member district elections have a positive though modest effect on increasing racial and ethnic diversity on city councils.¹⁹ The effect of single member districts is significantly negative for women. Holding all other variables at their means, the effect

¹⁶ Michael Tomz, Jason Wittenberg, and Gary King. 2003. CLARIFY: Software for Interpreting and Presenting Statistical Results. Version 2.1. Stanford University, University of Wisconsin, and Harvard University. January 5. Available at <http://gking.harvard.edu/>

¹⁷ A correction for autocorrelation using a GLS regression makes this relationship significant, but the effect is very small at .06 percent.

¹⁸ We also regressed the model on the total proportion of minority council members. The effect of districts was about 2% and significant at the .01 level. The simulations estimated an average of 7% members of color in at-large cities and 9% in district cities

¹⁹ It is interesting to note that these results confirm conventional wisdom on some factors and go against it on others. For instance, in every case wealthier communities were less likely to elect minorities to the council. The reverse was true for more educated populations. Council size had no effect in three of the equations, but had a substantial effect when diversity is considered on the whole. Other classic reform institutions had no effect on diversity. This confirms recent scholarship that suggests that electoral systems are changed to enhance the power of incumbent organizations and may have no standard beneficiaries over time (Trounstein 2004). Diversity has increased over time according to all of the models.

moving from a single member district system to an at-large system increases the predicted percentage of women legislators from 2% to 2.2%. We grant that these results are not substantively meaningful, but the differential effect of districts is clear.

The reason may lie in the residential segregation of the groups. As opposed to women, African-American, Latino, and Asian voters can be heavily segregated, with African Americans tending to be the most segregated of all. The theory that segregation drives the relationship between district elections and representation of racial and ethnic minorities has a substantial number of subscribers (Vedlitz and Johnson 1982, Brace, Grofman, and Handley 1988, Engstrom and McDonald 1982, Davidson and Korbel 1981, Mladenka 1989).²⁰ Yet there have been few attempts to actually test this claim directly. We use 1990 Census data on segregation in 331 metropolitan areas²¹ to do so here.

Demographers predominately rely on two measures of segregation, the dissimilarity index and the isolation index both based on demographic data collected at the census tract level (Massey and Denton 1988). We have selected the isolation index here because it is more sensitive to a group's total size rather than just its distribution throughout a community, and so more theoretically relevant to a group's ability to transform group membership into voting strength. The index ranges from 0 to 1 and measures the group composition of census tracts. The score represents the probability that group members will meet members of their own group in their census tract. For example a score of .6 for African Americans means that the average African American lives in a census tract that is 60% black. It is calculated by averaging a

²⁰ Other theorists have suggested that it is the smaller campaign finance demands, the ability to use networking skills, ability to avoid direct competition with dominant groups, and more candidate visibility that help underrepresented groups in district settings, (Karnig 1979).

²¹ It would clearly be better to have segregation data at the level of municipalities. Unfortunately the Census did not begin producing such analysis until 2000. With a larger data collection in the future we plan to test these relationships more directly.

weighted minority proportion in each area. We transform the isolation index into a dummy variable, *isolated*, coded 1 if the score is greater than 50% and 0 otherwise. We do this to represent the possibility that a group could comprise a voting majority in a geographic area smaller than the city.²² If a group has an average isolation index of less than .5, it means that the average group member lives in a neighborhood that is less than 50% Black, Asian, or Latino. We hypothesize that the benefits of district elections should be most likely if a group can reasonably generate a voting majority in some neighborhoods.

The results in Table 4 are clear. Once interacted with segregation, the effect of districts for black and Latino representation completely disappears. Only when a group is segregated will districts promote diversity.

²² Using the more detailed version of the variable yields significant results for blacks in all cases but only when we control for autocorrelation for Latinos and Asians

Table 4: Determinants of Diversity on City Councils With Segregation			
	Blacks	Latinos	Asian Americans ²³
Isolated * % District	.021 (.007)**	.038 (.017)**	.007 (.021)
Isolated	-.016 (.004)**	-.014 (.006)**	-.035 (.008)**
% District	.001 (.010)	.001 (.005)	.003 (.003)
% Black	.765 (.012)**	-.050 (.013)**	.004 (.005)
% Asian	-.013 (.037)	-.187 (.037)**	.376 (.015)**
% Latino	.040 (.012)**	.683 (.013)**	.006 (.005)
Total Population (millions)	.013 (.015)	-.017 (.016)	.003 (.008)
Median Income	-.000 (.000)	-.000 (.000)	-.000 (.00)**
% College Graduates	.026 (.017)	.059 (.018)**	-.008 (.007)
Term Limits	-.002 (.005)	.007 (.006)	.001 (.002)
Nonpartisan	.003 (.004)	-.007 (.004)	-.001 (.002)
Mayor Council	.002 (.003)	.007 (.003)**	.001 (.001)
Council Size	.000 (.001)	.000 (.001)	-.001 (.000)*
Democratic Vote 1988	-.006 (.012)	.018 (.012)	-.003 (.005)
Central City	.014 (.004)**	.004 (.004)	-.001 (.002)
West	.009 (.005)*	-.031 (.005)**	.005 (.002)**
Northeast	.012 (.005)**	-.018 (.005)**	-.000 (.002)
Midwest	.010 (.004)**	-.003 (.004)	.003 (.002)
Year	.005 (.000)**	.004 (.000)**	.002 (.000)**
Constant	-.474 (.037)**	-.409 (.040)**	-.124 (.016)**
N	3361	3199	3096
Adj. R ²	.65	.62	.24

When blacks are isolated, district elections increase their estimated proportion of city council seats to 7.7% from 5.4% under at-large systems; near parity with the 7.9% average proportion of African American residents in these cities. When blacks are not isolated districts have no significant effect on representation. For Latinos the effect of the interaction between districts and segregation is even more striking. Under at-large systems Latinos represent on average 2.3% of city councils. This nearly triples in district settings at 6.3%. Again districts bring council representation close to the average Latino population of 7%. The results of the interaction are not significant for Asians. This is likely to do the generally low residential

²³ The isolation index is only above .5 in three metropolitan areas so the dichotomous version of the variable can not be used to estimate the equation. The results are presented for the more detailed version of the variable.

segregation of Asians combined with low proportion of Asians in the city wide populations and the very small number of Asian council members in the data set. There is simply not much variation to explain. In general though, these data provide strong support for our hypothesis, that in the United States the benefit of single member district elections for minority groups operates through patterns of segregation.²⁴

Other Possibilities

Another strong result of the tables presented above, is that a group's population proportion above all else effects the election of their members to the city council. It is possible that districts should interact with group size as well. Perhaps districts are most effective when groups are midsize. If a group is very small, even if highly segregated, the electoral system should have little direct effect on members' ability to get elected.²⁵ Additionally, if a group is very large, at-large systems may work even better than districts at electing members to the city council. To test this possibility, we add additional independent variables to the base model – size of the group squared and an interaction term between group size and districts. The data do not confirm these predictions. The relationship between districts and group size are strong, significant, and positive in multiple tests. For African Americans the predicted effect of changing to district elections even where the group is a very large portion of the population is still about 2%. The interaction is striking however. A small African American population in an at-large setting can be expected to win .9% of the council seats. A very large African American population in a district setting can be expected to win 90% of the seats. For Latinos districts

²⁴ These results do not suggest however, that minorities fare better in at-large elections when they are not segregated. Clearly more research needs to be done to explore the reasons further, but at this time we can not conclude that United States voters treat racial and ethnic minority groups as they do women in at-large settings

²⁵ The electoral system could have substantial indirect effects for small groups though. For instance district systems might encourage coalition building more than at-large systems.

appear to be even more effective. At the maximum value of percent Latino in the population the predicted value of the proportion of councilors jumps from 88% in at large systems to 100% in district systems. At small to moderate levels of the population Latinos are aided by the at-large system. The predicted percentage of Asian councilors when Asians are a large portion of the population increases from 39% in at-large settings to 43% in districts. Unlike Latinos, Asians appear to be aided by districts at all population levels, though the effects are extremely small.²⁶

TABLE 5 HERE

In sum, it appears that there remains a strong, positive effect for districts in creating racial and ethnic diversity on city councils, particularly when minority groups are highly segregated and make up a large portion of the resident population. The logic of segregation works to explain the different effects of districts for people and color and women. While people of color may be highly segregated, women are rarely (if ever) segregated in a community. However, group size does little to help us explain the continued under-representation of women, the variation across cities, or the mildly positive effect of at-large systems on the election of female councilors.²⁷

When are single member districts detrimental?

While there are minor exceptions, the vast majority of the literature has concluded that multimember districts are advantageous for women candidates, while single member districts are detrimental (Norris 1985, Darcy, Welch, & Clark 1987, Rule 1987, 1994, Rule & Norris 1992, Matland 1995). In the literature on women's representation, scholars have argued that parties are

²⁶ We still don't know why this is working out this way. Maybe racially polarized voting has something to do with it.

²⁷ One might note too the very low R2 in our female councilor model. Clearly we are not capturing the variation much at all. This could be because we don't have percent women in the population included in the model. We don't have this variable yet and are working on getting it.

more likely to slate women in multi-member elections compared to single member settings. The logic behind this conclusion is drawn from assumptions made about the different type of voter calculations employed in each form of electoral system. In the single member district system, the presence of only one candidate from each party creates a zero-sum game in the mind of the voter. That is, the single member district election is an ‘all or nothing’ electoral arena, and thus the political risk is higher for both the parties and the voters who support those parties (Darcy, Welch, & Clark 1987). Even though some research has determined that women win elections at rates equal to men when they run (Burrell 1994, Darcy, Welch, & Clark 1994, Fox & Oxley 2003), this perception of the ‘more risky’ female candidate will prevent parties from nominating women in numbers equal to those of men.

In the multimember context, however, the incentive structure for running female candidates completely changes: the presence of a female candidate in this electoral arena is not considered a risk, but rather a necessity. By including women in the party lists, parties can maximize their appeal to voters through representing as many different groups or cleavages as possible (Rule 1994, Norris 2004). Further, if parties resist including women on the party list, the absence of any women in a large group of men could be an overt sign of prejudice, which could in turn generate negative reaction from the voters (Matland 1995). Thus it could be that women are less likely to run and therefore win elections to council in the absence of party organization.²⁸ To test for the possibility that party organizations aid women by slating females for office in an at-large setting we created an interaction for partisan and at-large elections. The results (not shown) were utterly insignificant.

²⁸ This of course would only help us understand the difference between women and minority representation if urban party organizations treated the groups differently – e.g. slating women in at large races but minorities in district settings.

Another rationale that scholars have provided to explain the different effects of the two types of electoral systems is incumbency turnover (Darcy, Welch, & Clark 1987, Norris 2004). Incumbency turnover refers to the rate at which incumbents are replaced, and is thus a measurement of the amount of ‘new blood’ circulating in the legislative body. In every democracy, the majority of incumbents are men, which in turn means that the oft-discussed incumbency advantage is gendered. Because turnover rates are higher in multimember districts than single member district systems (Matland & Studlar 2004), more women can run as challengers to open, competitive seats, rather than face an incumbent. This, in turn, causes multimember districts to have higher levels of female representation than single member districts. We tested this possibility by interacting the variable term-limits with at-large elections. While term limits represent a poor proxy for incumbency advantage, it is the best measure we have here.²⁹ Again the results were insignificant.³⁰

Conclusions

There are two final possibilities for the differing effect of districts for racial and ethnic minorities and women – women may be less likely to run in district elections and/or the polarization of the vote. It might be that voters are more polarized along racial lines than along gender lines, and that the degree of polarization is more extreme for African Americans than for Latinos or Asians. Testing these theories will require data that we have not yet collected.

While there are a number of theories still to be tested here. We believe that we have taken a strong step forward in explaining the effect of electoral systems on under-represented groups. By taking advantage of the huge institutional variation across cities in the United States,

²⁹ We are in the process of collecting data on incumbent win rates for a more direct test of the theory.

³⁰ Interestingly, this interaction was highly significant and substantively interesting for Latinos. It appears that Latinos gain from forced turn over on councils.

we have gained a more nuanced understanding of the representation of women and racial minorities. Single member district systems can increase diversity only when under-represented groups are highly segregated. Our findings demonstrate the need for caution when making declarations of the benefit or detriment of institutional settings; while the electoral rules certainly have an effect, the context in which they are employed is also crucial to gain a complete understanding.

Works Cited

- Alozie, Nicholas O. 1990. "Socioeconomic Factors and Black Electoral Gains: Black Resources and White Middle-Class Expansion." Presented at the annual meeting of the Southwestern Political Science Association.
- Arrington, Theodore, and Thomas Gill Watts. 1991. "The Election of Blacks to School Boards in North Carolina." *The Western Political Science Quarterly* 44: 1099-1105.
- Brace, Kimball; Grofman, Bernard; Handley, Lisa; and Niemi, Richard. 1988. "Minority Voting Equality: The 65 Percent Rule in Theory and Practice." *Law and Policy* 10: 43-62.
- Bridges, Amy. 1997. *Morning Glories: Municipal Reform in the Southwest*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Bullock, Charles and Susan MacManus. 1987. "Staggered Terms and Black Representation." *Journal of Politics* 49: 543-52
- Bullock, Charles and Susan MacManus. 1990. "Structural Features of Municipalities and the Incidence of Hispanic Councilmembers." *Social Science Quarterly* 71: 665-81
- Bullock, Charles S. 1987. "Redistricting and Changes in the Partisan and Racial Composition of Southern Legislatures." *State and Local Government Review* 19: 62-67.
- Bullock, Charles S., III, and Susan A. MacManus. 1991. "Municipal Electoral Structure and the Election of Councilwomen." *Journal of Politics* 53:75-89.
- Bullock, Charles S., III, and Susan A. MacManus. 1993. "Testing Assumptions of the Totality-of-the-Circumstances Test: An Analysis of the Impact of Structures on Black Descriptive Representation." *American Politics Quarterly* 21:290-306.
- Bullock, Charles. 1975. "The Election of Blacks in the South: Preconditions and Consequences." *American Journal of Political Science* 4: 727-39
- Burrell, Barbara. 1994. *A Woman's Place is in the House: Campaigning for Congress in the Feminist Era*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Cole, Leonard A. 1974. "Electing Blacks to Municipal Office." *Urban Affairs Quarterly* 10: 17-39.
- Darcy, R., Susan Welch, and Janet Clark. 1994. *Women, Elections, and Representation*. 2nd ed. Lincoln, Neb: Nebraska University Press.
- Davidson, Chandler and Bernard Grofman (Eds.), *Quiet Revolution in the South: The Impact of the Voting Rights Act, 1965-1990*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1994.

Davidson, Chandler and George Korbel. 1981. "At-large elections and Minority-Group Representation: A Re-Examination of Historical and Contemporary Evidence," *The Journal of Politics* 43, No. 4

Davidson, Chandler, and George Korbel. 1981. "At Large Elections and Minority Group Representation: A Reexamination of Historical and Contemporary Representation on City Councils." *Social Science Quarterly* 63: 99-114.

Dye, Thomas R., and Susan A. MacManus. 2003. *Politics in States and Communities, Eleventh Edition*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Engstrom, Richard, and Michael McDonald. 1981. "The Election of Blacks to City Councils." *American Political Science Review* 75: 344-55.

Engstrom, Richard, and Michael McDonald. 1982. "The Underrepresentation of Blacks on City Councils: Comparing the Structural and Socioeconomic Explanations for South/ Nonsouth Differences." *Journal of Politics* 44: 1088-99.

Engstrom, Richard, and Michael McDonald. 1986. "The Effect of At-Large Versus District Elections on Racial representation in U.S. Municipalities." In *Electoral Laws and Their Political Consequences*. B. Grofman, and A. Lijphart, eds. New York: Agathon Press.

Flammang, Janet A. 1985. "Female Officials in the Feminist Capital: The Case of Santa Clara County." *Western Political Quarterly* 38: 94-118.

Fox, Richard L., and Zoe M. Oxley. 2003. "Gender Stereotyping in State Executive Elections: Candidate Selection and Success." *Journal of Politics*. Vol.65: pp.833-850.

Grofman, Bernard, and Lisa Handley. 1989. "Black Representation: Making Sense of Electoral Geography at Different Levels of Government." *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 14: 265-79.

Hamilton, Howard D. 1967. "Legislative Constituencies: Single-Member Districts, Multi-Member Districts, and Floterial Districts." *Western Political Quarterly* 20: 321-40.

Handley, Lisa, and Bernard Grofman. 1994. The Impact of the Voting Rights Act on Minority Representation: Black Officeholding in Southern State Legislatures and Congressional Delegations. In *Quiet Revolution in the South: The Impact of the Voting Rights Act, 1965-1990*, edited by C. Davidson and B. Grofman. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Heilig, Peggy and Robert J. Mundt. 1981. "Do Districts Make a Difference?" *Urban Interest*: 62-75.

Heilig, Peggy and Robert Mundt. 1983. "Changes in Representational Equity: The Effect of Adopting Districts." *Social Science Quarterly* 64: 393-97

Karnig, Albert, and Susan Welch. 1982. "Electoral Structure and Black Representation on City Councils." *Social Science Quarterly* 63: 99-114.

- Karnig, Albert, Susan Welch. 1980. *Black Representation and Urban Policy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Karnig, Albert. 1976. "Black Representation on City Councils" The Impact of District Elections and Socioeconomic Factors." *Urban Affairs Quarterly* 12: 223-42.
- Karnig, Albert. 1979. "Black Resources and City Council Representation." *Journal of Politics* 41:134-49
- Latimer, Margaret K. 1979. "Black Political Representation in Southern Cities: Election Systems and Other Causal Variables." *Urban Affairs Quarterly* 15: 65-86
- MacManus, Susan. 1978. "City Council Election Procedures and Minority Representation." *Social Science Quarterly* 59: 133-41.
- Massey, Douglas S. and Denton, Nancy A.1988. "The Dimensions of Residential Segregation," *Social Forces* 67: 281-315.
- Matland, Richard E. 1995. "How The Electoral System has Helped Women Close the Representation Gap in Norway", in Lauri Karvonen and Per Selle *Closing the Gap: Women in Nordic Politics*. Dartmouth Press: London.
- Matland, Richard E. and Deborah Dwight Brown. 1992. "District Magnitude's Effect on Female Representation in U.S. State Legislatures." *Legislative Studies Quarterly*. Vol.17, no.4: pp.469-492.
- Matland, Richard E. and Donley T. Studlar. 2004. "Determinants of Legislative Turnover: A Cross-National Analysis." *British Journal of Political Science*. Vol.34: pp.87-108.
- Meier, Kenneth J. and Robert England. 1984. "Black Representation and Educational Policy: Are They Related?" *American Political Science Review* 78: 392-403
- Mladenka, Kenneth R. 1989. Barriers to Hispanic Employment Success in 1200 Cities. *Social Science Quarterly* 70 (2):391-407.
- Mundt, Robert and Peggy Heilig. 1982. "District Representation: Demands and Effects in the Urban South." *Journal of Politics* 44: 1035-1048
- Norris, Pippa. 1985. "Women's Legislative Participation in Western Europe." *Western European Politics*. Vol.8: pp.90-101.
- Norris, Pippa. 2004. *Electoral Engineering: Voting Rules and Political Behavior*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Polinard, Jerry, Robert Wrinkle, and Tomas Longoria. 1991. "The Impact of District Elections on the Mexican American Community: The Electoral Perspective." *Social Science Quarterly* 72: 608-14

- Rice, Bradley Robert. 1977. *Progressive Cities*. Austin: University of Texas Press
- Robinson, Theodore P. and Robert E. England. 1981. "Black Representation and Central City School Boards Revisited." *Social Science Quarterly* 62: 495-502
- Robinson, Theodore P., and Thomas R. Dye. 1978. "Reformism and Black Representation on City Councils." *Social Science Quarterly* 59 (June): 133-141.
- Rule, Wilma. 1987. "Electoral Systems, Contextual factors, and Women's Opportunity for Election to Parliament in Twenty-Three Democracies." *Western Political Quarterly* Vol.40: pp. 477-98.
- Rule, Wilma. 1994. "Parliaments of, by, and for the People: Except for Women?" In *Electoral Systems in Comparative Perspective: Their Impact on Women and Minorities*, ed. Wilma Rule and Joseph F. Zimmerman. Westport, CT: Greenwood.
- Silva, Ruth C. 1964. "Compared Values of the Single-and the Multi-Member Legislative District." *Western Political Quarterly* 17(3): 504-16.
- Slater, J.T. 1935. *Boss Rule* New York: McGraw-Hill
- Sloan, Lee. 1969. "Good Government and the Politics of Race." *Social Problems* 17:161-75
- Stewart, Joseph, Robert England, and Kenneth Meier. 1989. "Black Representation in Urban School Districts: From School Board to Office to Classroom." *Western Political Quarterly* 42 (June): 287-305.
- Taebel, Delbert. 1979. "Minority Representation on City Councils." *Social Science Quarterly* 60: 142-52.
- Thernstrom, Abigail. 1987. *Whose Votes Count? Affirmative Action and Minority Rights*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press
- Timothy Bledsoe and Susan Welch. 1985. "The Effect of Political Structure on the Partisan and Socio-Economic Characteristics of Urban City Council Members," *American Politics Quarterly* 13: 467-483.
- Trounstine, Jessica. 2004. "Urban Empires: Causes and Consequences of Biased Electoral Systems in American Cities." PhD Dissertation. University of California, San Diego.
- Vedlitz, Arnold and Charles Johnson. 1982. "Community Racial Segregation, Electoral Structure, and Minority Representation." *Social Science Quarterly* 63:729-36
- Welch, Susan, and Albert Karnig. 1978. "Minority Representation on City Councils." *Social Science Quarterly* 59: 162-22.
- Welch, Susan, and Albert Karnig. 1979. "Correlates of Female Office Holding in City Politics." *Journal of Politics* 41: 478-91.

Welch, Susan, and Timothy Bledsoe. 1988. *Urban Reform and Its Consequences*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Welch, Susan. 1990. The Impact of At-Large Elections on the Representation of Blacks and Hispanics. *Journal of Politics* 52:1050-76.

Table 1 % in pop				
	% Black	% Latino	% Asian	
At Large	6.2%	7.8%	2.8%	
Mixed	11.4%	5.9%	1.5%	
District	11.9%	4.4%	1.6%	
Total	7.9%	7.0%	2.4%	

Table 1 % on councils				
	% Black	% Latino	% Asian	% Women
At Large	4.3%	3.3%	0.4%	20.6%
Mixed	10.4%	2.8%	0.3%	19.5%
District	11.3%	2.1%	0.4%	18.8%
Total	6.3%	3.1%	0.4%	20.2%