GOVERNMENT REFORM:
Elections and Redistricting
April 2018

Fielded by: Nielsen Scarborough   **Fielding Dates:** September 7 - October 3, 2017
Sample size: 2,482 registered voters   **Margin of Error:** 2.0%

Today we are doing a survey on a number of proposals for changing the way the federal government operates. If at any time you find that you do not want to answer a question feel free to skip it and move on to the next one. (Note: Text in [Brackets] was not presented during the survey)

Q1-29. Questions released previously

[Beyer Bill on Elections and Redistricting]
A current bill in Congress proposes a new way of electing Members of Congress when there are more than two candidates. Proponents say this method addresses the following two issues with the current system:

- It is now difficult for independent and third-party candidates to get traction. While some voters might favor them, those voters often select other candidates from a major party out of concern they'd be throwing away their vote.
- In an election with three or more candidates, the winner may not have anywhere near a majority of votes and might even be opposed by the majority of voters.

Opponents of the bill say these issues are not significant enough to warrant overhauling the way that Members of Congress are elected.

So, here is the proposal. It is called ranked choice voting or instant runoff voting.

In this proposed system, voters select not only their most preferred candidate, but also their second choice, third-choice and so on. Here is how the winner is then selected.

- All the first-choice votes are counted and if any candidate gets the majority he or she is the winner.
- If no candidate gets a majority based on voters' first choice, the candidate with the lowest number of votes is removed from the race. Those who gave that candidate their first-choice vote, then have their votes redirected to their second choice. This may result in a candidate getting a majority and being declared the winner.
- If there is still not a majority, the process of eliminating the lowest candidate and redirecting their votes is repeated until a candidate has a majority and is declared the winner.

This method is now used in elections in a number of U.S. cities and in some other countries, notably Australia.

Here are two arguments **in favor of** this proposal

Q35. In the current system, a candidate can win even without a majority of votes—in fact a majority might actually oppose that candidate. Candidates with a small following can become a spoiler, taking votes away from a popular candidate, and enabling a less popular candidate to win. Ranked choice voting would ensure that the candidate elected is, in fact, the most popular candidate.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref./Don't know
National	27.4%	45.2%	**72.6%**	15.2%	11.1%	**26.3%**	1.0%
GOP	21.3%	45.9%	**67.2%**	16.6%	15.1%	**31.7%**	1.1%
Dem.	34.5%	44.4%	**78.9%**	13.4%	6.9%	**20.3%**	0.8%
Indep.	23.9%	45.8%	**69.7%**	16.6%	12.5%	**29.1%**	1.2%

Cook's PVI (D-R)

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref./Don't know
Very red	30.7%	41.0%	**71.7%**	19.0%	8.5%	**27.5%**	0.9%
Red	25.5%	49.8%	**75.3%**	12.5%	10.4%	**22.9%**	1.7%
Lean red	30.0%	42.1%	**72.1%**	14.7%	12.7%	**27.4%**	0.5%
Lean blue	22.2%	50.7%	**72.9%**	17.1%	9.8%	**26.9%**	0.1%
Blue	29.5%	43.1%	**72.6%**	14.6%	11.3%	**25.9%**	1.6%
Very blue	25.8%	44.7%	**70.5%**	13.8%	14.4%	**28.2%**	1.4%

Note: In the analysis above and throughout, the survey was divided into sextiles, with "Very red" districts having a Cook PVI rating (D-R) of -33 to -14, "Red" districts a PVI rating of -13 to -8, "Lean red" districts a PVI rating of -7 to -1, "Lean Blue" districts a PVI rating of +1 to +8, "Blue" districts a PVI rating of +9 to +17, and "Very blue" districts a PVI rating of +18 to +44.

Q36. This system makes it possible for voters to vote for the candidate they most support, including an independent or third-party candidate, without worrying they'll be throwing away their vote. They'll know that their second preference will be counted if their first choice is not popular enough to win.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref./Don't know
National	32.1%	42.7%	**74.8%**	15.2%	9.1%	**24.3%**	1.0%
GOP	26.7%	44.3%	**71.0%**	15.6%	12.3%	**27.9%**	1.2%
Dem.	38.8%	41.3%	**80.1%**	13.5%	5.4%	**18.9%**	1.0%
Indep.	27.3%	42.4%	**69.7%**	18.6%	10.9%	**29.5%**	0.7%

Cook's PVI (D-R)

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref./Don't know
Very red	34.2%	40.9%	**75.1%**	15.8%	8.2%	**24.0%**	0.9%
Red	31.1%	46.2%	**77.3%**	14.5%	6.1%	**20.6%**	2.1%
Lean red	31.3%	39.6%	**70.9%**	16.9%	11.3%	**28.2%**	0.9%
Lean blue	30.7%	48.0%	**78.7%**	13.4%	7.3%	**20.7%**	0.6%
Blue	32.1%	43.3%	**75.4%**	14.6%	9.2%	**23.8%**	0.8%
Very blue	33.4%	39.1%	**72.5%**	15.5%	11.2%	**26.7%**	0.8%

Here are two arguments **against** this proposal

Q37. Our system of elections has worked for more than two centuries. This new method is too complicated, will cost the taxpayers a lot of money, strain our vote counting system, and dramatically delay the final announcement of the

winners. While in principle this system could help a third party or independent candidate, it is so unlikely that they could actually win that it is really not worth all the trouble.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref./Don't know
National	18.1%	30.8%	**48.9%**	26.3%	23.8%	**50.1%**	0.9%
GOP	26.2%	34.8%	**61.0%**	23.3%	14.8%	**38.1%**	0.8%
Dem.	11.4%	27.7%	**39.1%**	29.6%	30.2%	**59.8%**	1.1%
Indep.	16.2%	29.0%	**45.2%**	25.2%	29.2%	**54.4%**	0.5%

Cook's PVI (D-R)

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref./Don't know
Very red	14.4%	35.9%	**50.3%**	18.2%	31.2%	**49.4%**	0.4%
Red	22.1%	28.8%	**50.9%**	24.3%	23.4%	**47.7%**	1.4%
Lean red	18.2%	28.7%	**46.9%**	30.9%	21.5%	**52.4%**	0.6%
Lean blue	17.6%	33.4%	**51.0%**	28.2%	20.2%	**48.4%**	0.6%
Blue	19.7%	30.0%	**49.7%**	27.3%	22.0%	**49.3%**	0.9%
Very blue	16.5%	28.3%	**44.8%**	29.7%	23.9%	**53.6%**	1.6%

Q38. Explaining this new method to voters will be very challenging. People may get confused and this might discourage them from voting. There will be more doubts about the accuracy of the outcomes, leading to more demands for recounts. People will end up having less confidence in the final results weakening the legitimacy of our democratic system.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref./Don't know
National	20.1%	34.2%	**54.3%**	25.8%	19.2%	**45.0%**	0.7%
GOP	27.0%	34.3%	**61.3%**	23.1%	14.7%	**37.8%**	0.9%
Dem.	15.3%	34.3%	**49.6%**	28.2%	21.4%	**49.6%**	0.8%
Indep.	15.8%	33.5%	**49.3%**	26.3%	24.2%	**50.5%**	0.3%

Cook's PVI (D-R)

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref./Don't know
Very red	17.2%	33.2%	**50.4%**	24.8%	24.4%	**49.2%**	0.4%
Red	20.8%	32.4%	**53.2%**	25.5%	19.8%	**45.3%**	1.4%
Lean red	20.0%	33.8%	**53.8%**	28.4%	17.2%	**45.6%**	0.6%
Lean blue	20.0%	35.6%	**55.6%**	26.7%	17.2%	**43.9%**	0.5%
Blue	20.6%	32.8%	**53.4%**	28.7%	17.2%	**45.9%**	0.8%
Very blue	21.9%	37.9%	**59.8%**	20.8%	18.7%	**39.5%**	0.8%

So again, here is the proposal. Voters select not only their most preferred candidate, but also their second choice, third-choice and so on. The winner is then selected as follows:

- All the first-choice votes are counted and if any candidate gets the majority he or she is the winner.
- If no candidate gets a majority based on voters' first choice, the candidate with the lowest number of votes is removed from the race. Those who gave that candidate their first-choice vote, then have their votes redirected to their second choice. This may result in a candidate getting a majority and being declared the winner.

- If there is still not a majority, the process of eliminating the lowest candidate and redirecting their votes is repeated until a candidate has a majority and is declared the winner.

Q39. Please select how acceptable this proposal for ranked choice voting in federal elections would be to you.

[RESPONSES WERE PRESENTED EQUIDISTANT FROM EACH OTHER ON THE SCREEN]										
Not at all acceptable 0	1	2	3	4	Just tolerable 5	6	7	8	9	Very acceptable 10

	Mean	Unacceptable (0-4)	Just Tolerable (5)	Acceptable (6-10)	Ref./Don't know
National	5.6	29.2%	18.3%	51.7%	0.8%
GOP	4.9	37.4%	18.1%	43.7%	0.7%
Dem.	6.2	21.4%	18.8%	58.9%	0.9%
Indep.	5.6	29.9%	17.5%	52.2%	0.5%

Cook's PVI (D-R)					
Very red	5.5	31.9%	19.5%	48.0%	0.6%
Red	5.7	26.1%	19.2%	53.3%	1.3%
Lean red	5.5	30.5%	17.6%	51.9%	0.0%
Lean blue	5.5	31.4%	18.4%	49.3%	0.9%
Blue	5.7	28.5%	17.3%	53.8%	0.4%
Very blue	5.8	26.2%	18.2%	54.1%	1.5%

Q40. Would you recommend that your Members of Congress vote in favor of or against this proposal for ranked choice voting in federal elections?

	In Favor of	Against	Ref./Don't know
National	55.4%	42.9%	1.7%
GOP	46.2%	52.4%	1.4%
Dem.	64.3%	33.7%	2.1%
Indep.	54.5%	44.1%	1.4%

Cook's PVI (D-R)			
Very red	55.7%	43.1%	1.2%
Red	54.9%	43.0%	2.1%
Lean red	57.8%	41.1%	1.1%
Lean blue	52.7%	45.1%	2.2%
Blue	55.6%	42.6%	1.8%
Very blue	55.0%	43.1%	2.0%

[IF "In favor of" Q40=1, PRESENT Q41]
Q41. How important do you think it is to have this new system of ranked choice voting in federal elections?
(Note: results are percent of total)

	Very	Somewhat	Slightly	Not at all	Ref./Don't know
National	22.9%	25.2%	6.4%	0.8%	0.1%
GOP	15.0%	24.2%	5.8%	1.0%	0.1%
Dem.	28.7%	27.4%	7.3%	0.8%	0.0%
Indep.	27.0%	21.9%	5.0%	0.4%	0.1%
Cook's PVI (D-R)					
Very red	22.8%	26.7%	4.5%	1.6%	0.1%
Red	24.3%	23.1%	6.6%	0.9%	0.0%
Lean red	20.7%	27.9%	8.1%	0.9%	0.2%
Lean blue	20.2%	25.4%	7.1%	0.0%	0.0%
Blue	24.3%	25.4%	4.8%	1.1%	0.0%
Very blue	25.5%	22.4%	6.6%	0.3%	0.2%

[Congressional Redistricting by Non-Partisan Commissions of Citizens]

Another debate in Congress is about how the districts for the House of Representatives of the US Congress are designed. As you may know, every 10 years, with the new US Census, these districts are redesigned by state governments to adjust for population shifts. Usually this is done by state legislatures.

Some Members of Congress are concerned that state legislatures, which are often dominated by one party or the other, try to design districts that favor their party. When legislatures do this, it is called gerrymandering. There is a bill that sets federal regulations for redistricting that proponents say will reduce gerrymandering. Opponents say that the federal government should not step in and that it should be left to the states.

In Congress, there is a proposal to have the shape of Congressional districts set by a commission of citizens within each state. Such citizen commissions are already being used in a few states.

The proposal specifies that the commission of citizens would:

- be committed to designing districts in a way that is geographically natural and compact without creating a favorable distribution for either party
- be one third Republicans, one third Democrats, and one third independents,
- reflect the balance of the state according to gender, race, ethnicity and the geographic areas of the state.

Decisions on the shape of districts would be made by a majority of the commission members that includes at least one member from both parties and an independent.
Here are two arguments **in favor of** this proposal for a citizen commission.

Q42. When one party has control of the redistricting process, they tend to make great efforts to ensure that their party wins more districts, often creating weirdly shaped districts. The representatives from a particular state can be completely or almost completely from one party, though this does not reflect the real partisan balance in the state. This means that voters from the party not in control of the legislature get less representation in Congress, even though they may live in an area of the state where they are a majority.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref./Don't know
National	42.7%	37.9%	**80.6%**	12.8%	5.2%	**18.0%**	1.4%
GOP	33.9%	42.9%	**76.8%**	14.2%	7.4%	**21.6%**	1.6%
Dem.	52.2%	33.0%	**85.2%**	10.9%	2.4%	**13.3%**	1.5%
Indep.	39.1%	38.4%	**77.5%**	14.3%	7.2%	**21.5%**	0.9%
Cook's PVI (D-R)							
Very red	41.5%	38.4%	**79.9%**	14.8%	4.5%	**19.3%**	0.8%
Red	43.1%	34.9%	**78.0%**	15.3%	4.5%	**19.8%**	2.2%
Lean red	41.3%	39.0%	**80.3%**	13.4%	5.1%	**18.5%**	1.1%
Lean blue	42.7%	39.9%	**82.6%**	11.6%	4.2%	**15.8%**	1.7%
Blue	44.0%	38.0%	**82.0%**	8.8%	7.6%	**16.4%**	1.6%
Very blue	44.3%	35.9%	**80.2%**	13.1%	5.3%	**18.4%**	1.5%

Q43. When partisan politicians use gerrymandering to create safe districts for their party, the general election is not competitive, so the only really important election is the primary of the majority party in the district. Candidates who only need to appeal to the views of primary voters tend to be more ideologically extreme and, when in Congress, are less likely to find common ground with the other party. When nonpartisan commissions of citizens design districts, the districts are more likely to be competitive between the parties; candidates are more likely to appeal to and be responsive to the whole district, and are less partisan in Congress.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref./Don't know
National	34.4%	40.4%	**74.8%**	18.1%	5.9%	**24.0%**	1.3%
GOP	28.6%	40.6%	**69.2%**	21.3%	8.1%	**29.4%**	1.4%
Dem.	43.1%	39.3%	**82.4%**	13.3%	2.9%	**16.2%**	1.4%
Indep.	25.5%	42.6%	**68.1%**	22.6%	8.4%	**31.0%**	0.9%
Cook's PVI (D-R)							
Very red	30.8%	37.7%	**68.5%**	24.0%	6.5%	**30.5%**	1.0%
Red	36.4%	39.5%	**75.9%**	18.0%	5.0%	**23.0%**	1.1%
Lean red	33.3%	42.0%	**75.3%**	17.0%	6.7%	**23.7%**	1.0%
Lean blue	33.9%	46.8%	**80.7%**	14.8%	3.3%	**18.1%**	1.1%
Blue	36.6%	38.7%	**75.3%**	16.9%	5.9%	**22.8%**	1.9%
Very blue	35.9%	37.2%	**73.1%**	17.7%	7.3%	**25.0%**	2.0%

Here are two arguments **against** this proposal for a citizen commission:

Q44. The federal government should not step in and tell the states how to design their Congressional districts. Doing so overrides the state legislatures that have been elected by and are accountable to the people. Giving the authority to redistrict to unelected citizen commissioners actually takes power away from the people.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref./Don't know
National	21.2%	30.5%	**51.7%**	24.3%	22.8%	**47.1%**	1.2%
GOP	31.7%	36.0%	**67.7%**	21.5%	9.7%	**31.2%**	1.2%
Dem.	11.8%	26.2%	**38.0%**	25.4%	35.5%	**60.9%**	1.2%
Indep.	20.6%	28.4%	**49.0%**	28.2%	21.3%	**49.5%**	1.4%
Cook's PVI (D-R)							
Very red	21.5%	31.5%	**53.0%**	22.9%	23.6%	**46.5%**	0.6%
Red	22.8%	31.1%	**53.9%**	22.9%	22.2%	**45.1%**	1.1%
Lean red	25.8%	26.5%	**52.3%**	24.4%	22.6%	**47.0%**	0.7%
Lean blue	18.5%	33.4%	**51.9%**	24.6%	22.2%	**46.8%**	1.2%
Blue	20.8%	33.2%	**54.0%**	21.0%	22.7%	**43.7%**	2.3%
Very blue	17.1%	28.1%	**45.2%**	29.5%	23.7%	**53.2%**	1.6%

Q45. The way citizen commissions draw the lines will not necessarily lead to more competitive districts. People increasingly cluster in areas with others who are of the same party. So, whatever the citizen commission does, the districts are still likely to be dominated by one party. This will all be a lot of effort with no real gain.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref./Don't know
National	10.4%	34.0%	**44.4%**	30.6%	23.7%	**54.3%**	1.3%
GOP	16.1%	40.2%	**56.3%**	28.0%	14.1%	**42.1%**	1.6%
Dem.	5.8%	28.1%	**33.9%**	32.1%	32.7%	**64.8%**	1.4%
Indep.	8.4%	34.2%	**42.6%**	33.4%	23.4%	**56.8%**	0.6%
Cook's PVI (D-R)							
Very red	11.9%	34.2%	**46.1%**	29.8%	23.0%	**52.8%**	1.1%
Red	11.2%	36.3%	**47.5%**	30.1%	20.4%	**50.5%**	1.9%
Lean red	11.9%	36.7%	**48.6%**	27.6%	23.0%	**50.6%**	0.7%
Lean blue	8.3%	35.2%	**43.5%**	33.9%	21.2%	**55.1%**	1.3%
Blue	9.6%	34.5%	**44.1%**	28.6%	25.6%	**54.2%**	1.7%
Very blue	8.8%	26.4%	**35.2%**	35.9%	27.4%	**63.3%**	1.5%

So now, again, here is the proposal:

The shape of Congressional districts would be set by a commission of citizens within each state which would:

- be committed to designing districts in a way that is geographically natural and compact without creating a favorable distribution for either party
- be one third Republicans, one third Democrats, and one third independents,
- reflect the balance of the state according to gender, race, ethnicity and the geographic areas of the state.

Decisions on the shape of districts would be made by a majority of the commission members that includes at least one member from both parties and an independent.

Q46. Please select how acceptable this proposal would be to you.

[RESPONSES WERE PRESENTED EQUIDISTANT FROM EACH OTHER ON THE SCREEN]										
Not at all acceptable 0	1	2	3	4	Just tolerable 5	6	7	8	9	Very acceptable 10

	Mean	Unacceptable (0-4)	Just Tolerable (5)	Acceptable (6-10)	Ref./Don't know
National	6.5	19.2%	17.5%	62.0%	1.3%
GOP	5.6	28.8%	17.0%	52.6%	1.6%
Dem.	7.4	10.2%	17.5%	71.2%	1.1%
Indep.	6.4	19.5%	18.8%	60.8%	1.0%

Cook's PVI (D-R)					
Very red	6.2	25.1%	15.4%	58.8%	0.8%
Red	6.6	17.9%	16.0%	64.6%	1.5%
Lean red	6.3	21.2%	17.2%	60.4%	1.3%
Lean blue	6.6	17.2%	21.5%	60.5%	0.8%
Blue	6.8	16.4%	17.8%	64.8%	1.1%
Very blue	6.8	17.0%	17.2%	63.7%	2.1%

Q47. Would you recommend that your Members of Congress:

1. vote in favor of the proposal for having such a citizen commission set the shape of Congressional districts
2. vote against the proposal, thus preserving the current situation in which state legislatures mostly set the shape of Congressional districts

	In Favor of	Against	Ref./Don't know
National	66.2%	31.7%	2.0%
GOP	52.9%	45.4%	1.8%
Dem.	80.3%	17.5%	2.3%
Indep.	62.0%	36.1%	1.9%

Cook's PVI (D-R)			
Very red	59.1%	38.3%	2.6%
Red	67.5%	30.8%	1.7%
Lean red	62.8%	35.6%	1.6%
Lean blue	67.5%	30.0%	2.5%
Blue	71.7%	27.6%	0.6%
Very blue	70.3%	26.7%	3.0%

[IF "vote in favor of . . ." Q47=1, PRESENT Q48a]
Q48a. How important do you think it is have a citizen commission set the shape of Congressional districts?
(Note: results are percent of total)

	Very	Somewhat	Slightly	Not at all	Ref./Don't know
National	33.6%	26.6%	5.3%	0.5%	0.3%
GOP	19.5%	26.4%	6.1%	0.6%	0.4%
Dem.	47.8%	27.5%	4.4%	0.4%	0.2%
Indep.	31.0%	24.6%	5.6%	0.6%	0.3%
Cook's PVI (D-R)					
Very red	30.3%	23.2%	4.8%	0.3%	0.6%
Red	33.5%	28.4%	5.4%	0.2%	0.0%
Lean red	32.1%	24.6%	5.4%	0.2%	0.4%
Lean blue	32.1%	29.3%	4.7%	1.5%	0.0%
Blue	32.6%	31.2%	7.5%	0.3%	0.0%
Very blue	41.3%	23.6%	4.2%	0.8%	0.5%

[IF "vote against . . ." Q47=2, PRESENT Q48b]
Q48b. How important do you think it is preserve the current system in which state legislatures mostly set the shape of Congressional districts? **(Note: results are percent of total)**

	Very	Somewhat	Slightly	Not at all	Ref./Don't know
National	9.3%	14.1%	6.6%	1.6%	0.1%
GOP	16.6%	19.4%	7.5%	1.8%	0.1%
Dem.	3.0%	8.6%	4.7%	0.9%	0.2%
Indep.	8.2%	15.4%	9.3%	3.1%	0.2%
Cook's PVI (D-R)					
Very red	12.2%	18.6%	5.9%	1.4%	0.2%
Red	9.0%	12.9%	7.0%	1.9%	0.0%
Lean red	12.5%	17.3%	4.3%	1.2%	0.3%
Lean blue	6.5%	15.1%	7.2%	1.2%	0.0%
Blue	7.6%	10.8%	8.4%	0.9%	0.0%
Very blue	7.5%	8.3%	7.3%	3.3%	0.3%

[Multi-Member Districts]
A current bill in Congress proposes a new way of structuring districts in the US House of Representatives. Proponents say this proposal addresses two issues

- In some states, all of their Members of Congress are from one party, even though a very large portion of the population identifies with the other party.
- Independents and third-party candidates have little chance of getting elected, even though a substantial number of voters might favor them.

As you know, under current law, a Congressional district is represented by one Member of Congress, and each state elects two Senators, who represent the entire state.

The idea of this proposal is one that is allowed by the Constitution. This proposal would make larger US House districts that would be represented by more than one Member of Congress. This would increase the likelihood Members of Congress would more accurately mirror the partisan mix of the population. Here is how it would work:

- In a state with five or fewer Congressional districts, the state would still have the same number of House Members, but they would be elected by all of the state's voters and represent the whole state.

For example, for a state with five Congressional districts, on the ballot there would be at least five Republicans and five Democrats, as well as possible independent and third-party candidates. Five U.S. House Members would be elected by all voters in the state.

Research has been done on what the likely effect would be: election results would more closely mirror the partisan balance of the state. For example, Connecticut is a state in which all five House seats are currently held by Democrats and Oklahoma is one in which all five House seats are currently held by Republicans. The proposed system would likely result in 1-2 Republicans being elected in Connecticut and 1-2 Democrats in Oklahoma.

- For states with more than five districts, the state would keep the same number of House Members, but the districts would be redesigned to be larger and have 3-5 Members each. The 3-5 House Members would be elected by all of the voters in these larger districts.

Here is an argument **in favor of** this proposal

Q49. Right now, in some states, people who are part of the minority party have no representation in Congress, even though they are a substantial portion of the population. Using this new system would make it more likely that people from both parties would have at least one Member from their party representing their concerns. In many cases, independents are the swing voters and are likely to vote for candidates from more than one party. With multiple choices, even partisan voters are more likely to choose someone from the other party, an independent or a third-party candidate. The elected Members from that state would more accurately mirror the partisan balance in their state, making Congress more accountable.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref./Don't know
National	26.7%	46.1%	**72.8%**	16.5%	8.1%	**24.6%**	2.6%
GOP	21.3%	44.7%	**66.0%**	18.6%	13.1%	**31.7%**	2.3%
Dem.	33.2%	46.8%	**80.0%**	13.3%	3.8%	**17.1%**	2.9%
Indep.	23.0%	47.7%	**70.7%**	19.8%	7.2%	**27.0%**	2.3%
Cook's PVI (D-R)							
Very red	25.6%	44.2%	**69.8%**	19.2%	8.2%	**27.4%**	2.7%
Red	25.1%	49.1%	**74.2%**	14.6%	9.3%	**23.9%**	1.9%
Lean red	24.2%	45.0%	**69.2%**	18.6%	10.3%	**28.9%**	1.9%
Lean blue	23.7%	51.3%	**75.0%**	18.4%	5.3%	**23.7%**	1.3%

Blue	30.3%	42.4%	**72.7%**	15.4%	8.1%	**23.5%**	3.8%
Very blue	32.6%	44.0%	**76.6%**	13.0%	6.5%	**19.5%**	3.8%

Here is an argument **against** this proposal

Q50. This idea is too complicated and requires too much from voters. They would have to get to know many more candidates than they do now. That would probably discourage some people from even trying to vote. With so many candidates to choose from, more people would be making uninformed decisions. The people who would put in the time and effort to get to know so many candidates, are more likely to be highly partisan. It would just make districts too big. These members would be more distant and less accessible to the people, just like Senators. Overall, it could have all kinds of problems that people have not even considered.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref./Don't know
National	14.5%	36.2%	**50.7%**	28.0%	18.7%	**46.7%**	2.5%
GOP	22.1%	38.4%	**60.5%**	24.8%	13.0%	**37.8%**	1.8%
Dem.	10.3%	34.2%	**44.5%**	28.9%	23.9%	**52.8%**	2.7%
Indep.	7.3%	36.3%	**43.6%**	33.8%	19.2%	**53.0%**	3.4%

Cook's PVI (D-R)

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref./Don't know
Very red	13.7%	33.1%	**46.8%**	31.5%	18.7%	**50.2%**	2.9%
Red	14.7%	35.9%	**50.6%**	30.2%	16.3%	**46.5%**	2.9%
Lean red	14.4%	39.8%	**54.2%**	26.5%	17.8%	**44.3%**	1.5%
Lean blue	15.8%	38.7%	**54.5%**	24.9%	18.5%	**43.4%**	2.2%
Blue	15.5%	33.5%	**49.0%**	28.2%	20.3%	**48.5%**	2.4%
Very blue	12.7%	37.0%	**49.7%**	27.5%	19.7%	**47.2%**	3.1%

So, here again is the proposal:

In a state with five or fewer Congressional districts, the state would still have the same number of House Members, but they would be elected by all of the state's voters and represent the whole state.

For states with more than five districts, the state would keep the same number of House Members, but the districts would be redesigned to be larger and have 3-5 Members each. The 3-5 House Members would be elected by all of the voters in these larger districts.

Q51. Please select how acceptable this proposal would be to you.

[RESPONSES WERE PRESENTED EQUIDISTANT FROM EACH OTHER ON THE SCREEN]										
Not at all acceptable 0	1	2	3	4	Just tolerable 5	6	7	8	9	Very acceptable 10

	Mean	Unacceptable (0-4)	Just Tolerable (5)	Acceptable (6-10)	Ref./Don't know
National	5.6	27.0%	21.4%	49.5%	2.1%
GOP	5.0	34.2%	21.7%	42.6%	1.4%
Dem.	6.3	19.9%	21.9%	56.2%	2.0%
Indep.	5.6	27.9%	19.6%	48.4%	4.2%

Cook's PVI (D-R)

	Mean	Unacceptable (0-4)	Just Tolerable (5)	Acceptable (6-10)	Ref./Don't know
Very red	5.5	30.8%	20.8%	45.7%	2.7%
Red	5.6	26.0%	23.7%	47.5%	2.8%
Lean red	5.4	31.7%	19.5%	48.1%	0.7%
Lean blue	5.6	26.7%	22.4%	49.9%	1.1%
Blue	6.0	20.6%	22.1%	54.9%	2.4%
Very blue	5.9	24.3%	20.4%	52.1%	3.2%

Q52. Would you recommend that your Members of Congress vote in favor or against this proposal?

	In Favor of	Against	Ref./Don't know
National	55.0%	41.9%	3.1%
GOP	43.8%	53.1%	3.1%
Dem.	65.6%	31.7%	2.7%
Indep.	54.1%	41.6%	4.4%

Cook's PVI (D-R)

	In Favor of	Against	Ref./Don't know
Very red	48.5%	47.4%	4.1%
Red	57.7%	40.4%	1.9%
Lean red	50.2%	48.0%	1.7%
Lean blue	57.5%	38.8%	3.7%
Blue	60.0%	37.0%	3.0%
Very blue	58.0%	37.3%	4.8%

[IF "In favor of . . ." Q52=1, PRESENT Q53a]
Q53a. How important do you think it is to have this new system for electing House Members? **(Note: results are percent of total)**

	Very	Somewhat	Slightly	Not at all	Ref./Don't know
National	20.8%	25.3%	7.8%	0.9%	0.2%
GOP	13.9%	20.8%	8.3%	0.6%	0.2%
Dem.	27.8%	28.6%	7.8%	1.3%	0.1%
Indep.	19.0%	27.7%	6.7%	0.5%	0.1%

Cook's PVI (D-R)

	Very	Somewhat	Slightly	Not at all	Ref./Don't know
Very red	17.8%	23.9%	5.7%	1.1%	0.0%
Red	24.2%	21.7%	11.2%	0.7%	0.0%

	Very	Somewhat	Slightly	Not at all	Ref./Don't know
Lean red	20.6%	24.3%	4.5%	0.8%	0.0%
Lean blue	17.3%	29.2%	9.7%	1.2%	0.2%
Blue	18.5%	32.9%	6.7%	1.5%	0.4%
Very blue	25.5%	21.5%	10.3%	0.2%	0.4%

[IF "Against . . ." Q52=2, PRESENT Q53b]
Q53b. How important do you think it is to preserve the current system for electing House Members? **(Note: results are percent of total)**

	Very	Somewhat	Slightly	Not at all	Ref./Don't know
National	13.4%	17.9%	7.5%	2.3%	0.8%
GOP	21.9%	21.9%	6.3%	1.9%	1.2%
Dem.	5.9%	14.5%	8.1%	2.7%	0.4%
Indep.	12.5%	17.1%	8.8%	2.2%	0.9%

Cook's PVI (D-R)

	Very	Somewhat	Slightly	Not at all	Ref./Don't know
Very red	17.2%	19.0%	7.5%	2.4%	1.3%
Red	11.7%	16.1%	8.8%	2.4%	1.4%
Lean red	17.2%	23.8%	5.0%	1.1%	0.9%
Lean blue	11.6%	17.7%	8.6%	0.9%	0.0%
Blue	10.7%	14.4%	8.6%	2.8%	0.4%
Very blue	11.2%	14.5%	7.3%	3.6%	0.6%