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Most research focused on elite effects—*who* is elected:
- Incumbency advantage.
- Policy representation of minorities.
- Descriptive representation.

Limited research on effects on *constituents*.
- Reduced recognition and recall of candidates (McKee 2008; Hood and McKee 2010; Winburn and Wagner 2010).
- Reduced voter turnout (Hayes and McKee 2009).
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After Redistricting
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Telephone survey conducted September 23–30, 2012.

981 complete or partial interviews with registered voters in district.
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Some awareness of redistricting; lower awareness of being in new district.

- 33.5% of respondents unaware of redistricting.
- 39.5% of respondents aware of redistricting and aware they were in a new district.
- Low ability to identify counties in/not in new district (> 50% don't know).
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## Awareness of the New District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Knew was in district</th>
<th>Knew district existed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Intercept)</td>
<td>-4.843***</td>
<td>-3.382***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.559)</td>
<td>(0.523)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge items</td>
<td>0.357***</td>
<td>0.314*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.103)</td>
<td>(0.133)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0.137*</td>
<td>0.252***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.065)</td>
<td>(0.070)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political awareness</td>
<td>0.268*</td>
<td>0.420***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.121)</td>
<td>(0.108)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.016**</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female (1/0)</td>
<td>-0.197</td>
<td>0.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.169)</td>
<td>(0.179)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black (1/0)</td>
<td>0.136</td>
<td>-0.319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.205)</td>
<td>(0.196)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iwr eval of knowledge</td>
<td>0.421***</td>
<td>0.388***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.079)</td>
<td>(0.083)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>0.141***</td>
<td>0.108**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.039)</td>
<td>(0.042)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aldrich-Nelson R-sq.</td>
<td>0.182</td>
<td>0.193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood-ratio</td>
<td>171.807***</td>
<td>183.896***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log-likelihood</td>
<td>-485.630</td>
<td>-438.858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ePCP</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ePRE</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Who benefits from the new district?

- More respondents believed new district would improve representation than not.
- Near-majority believed it would make no difference.
- Around 25% believed Horry County/Myrtle Beach/coastal area would get more attention than other parts of district.
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New district will improve representation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Intercept)</td>
<td>-2.358***</td>
<td>(0.521)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge items</td>
<td>0.363***</td>
<td>(0.096)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-0.050</td>
<td>(0.064)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political awareness</td>
<td>0.351**</td>
<td>(0.121)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>(0.005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female (1/0)</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>(0.164)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black (1/0)</td>
<td>0.535*</td>
<td>(0.236)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivr eval of knowledge</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td>(0.074)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>(0.039)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal county (Georgetown/Horry)</td>
<td>0.313†</td>
<td>(0.170)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican identifier/leaner</td>
<td>0.439*</td>
<td>(0.203)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Aldrich-Nelson R-sq.                    | 0.060       |
| Likelihood-ratio                       | 47.837***   |
| Log-likelihood                         | -511.229    |
| N                                       | 750         |
| ePCP                                    | 58.0%       |
| ePRE                                    | 5.0%        |
Expected vote in November 2012 (Republican=1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Upper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Intercept)</td>
<td>-7.054***</td>
<td>1.309</td>
<td>-10.664</td>
<td>-3.440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0.127</td>
<td>0.141</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female (1/0)</td>
<td>-0.084</td>
<td>0.387</td>
<td>-0.755</td>
<td>0.604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black (1/0)</td>
<td>-2.445***</td>
<td>0.598</td>
<td>-3.633</td>
<td>-1.257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.098</td>
<td>-0.192</td>
<td>0.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Party ID (7 point, D→R)</td>
<td>1.134***</td>
<td>0.117</td>
<td>0.907</td>
<td>1.360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideology (5 point, Lib→Con)</td>
<td>0.607**</td>
<td>0.212</td>
<td>0.193</td>
<td>1.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married (1/0)</td>
<td>0.763†</td>
<td>0.444</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.526</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Aldrich-Nelson R-sq. 0.517
Likelihood-ratio 713.519***
Log-likelihood -121.455
N 666
ePCP 90.8%
ePRE 81.3%
Conclusions

- Even a competitive, open-seat contest did not lead to high knowledge of the new district.
- Reinforced recent findings that redistricting disrupts constituent–representative connections.
- Raises questions about strictly following “one person, one vote.”

Future Directions:
- Consider additional states/districts.
- Need longer-term study of constituents in new/changed districts.
Conclusions

- Even a competitive, open-seat contest did not lead to high knowledge of the new district.
- Reinforced recent findings that redistricting disrupts constituent–representative connections.
- Raises questions about strictly following “one person, one vote.”

Future Directions:
- Consider additional states/districts.
- Need longer-term study of constituents in new/changed districts.
Conclusions

- Even a competitive, open-seat contest did not lead to high knowledge of the new district.
- Reinforced recent findings that redistricting disrupts constituent–representative connections.
- Raises questions about strictly following “one person, one vote.”

Future Directions:
- Consider additional states/districts.
- Need longer-term study of constituents in new/changed districts.
Conclusions

- Even a competitive, open-seat contest did not lead to high knowledge of the new district.
- Reinforced recent findings that redistricting disrupts constituent–representative connections.
- Raises questions about strictly following “one person, one vote.”

Future Directions:
- Consider additional states/districts.
- Need longer-term study of constituents in new/changed districts.
Conclusions

- Even a competitive, open-seat contest did not lead to high knowledge of the new district.
- Reinforced recent findings that redistricting disrupts constituent–representative connections.
- Raises questions about strictly following “one person, one vote.”

Future Directions:
- Consider additional states/districts.
- Need longer-term study of constituents in new/changed districts.
Even a competitive, open-seat contest did not lead to high knowledge of the new district.

Reinforced recent findings that redistricting disrupts constituent–representative connections.

Raises questions about strictly following “one person, one vote.”

Future Directions:
- Consider additional states/districts.
- Need longer-term study of constituents in new/changed districts.