



SINGLE MEMBER HOUSE DISTRICTS vs. AT LARGE DISTRICTS

<i>Single Member House Districts</i>	<i>At Large Districts</i>
Single Member House Districts have helped communities elect their own candidate into office.	At Large districts can dilute the votes of racial minorities/communities of interest because they cover a larger geographic area.
Single Member House Districts could create a district that contained a majority of Native American voters.	At Large Districts make it more difficult for a Native American candidate to be elected to the State Legislature because they are running in legislative districts that have a larger pool of non-native voters.
Single Member House Districts encourage local people to run for office because they would only need to campaign in a smaller geographic area that contained less voters and therefore would in theory allow for a less expensive campaign.	At Large Districts are based on the idea that elected officials will be more likely to work toward the best result for the whole community rather than the specific demands in parts of the community.
Single Member House Districts increase civic participation from constituents because they may have an easily identifiable representative to engage with and have more access.	At Large Districts make it difficult for local people to be elected because the votes of communities of interest are diluted in elections that cover a broader area.
Single Member House Districts allow for a closer relationship between elected officials and their constituents.	At Large Districts must be redrawn every ten years to maintain populations of relatively equal size.
Single Member House Districts were implemented due to lawsuits such as Thornburg v. Gingles in 1986 alleging the At Large Districts unduly discriminated against cohesive groups of people of color to participate equally in the process by electing disproportionately white officials	At Large Districts are usually artificial geographic entities whose boundaries do not delineate clearly identifiable communities, and as a consequence, the entities have no particular relevance to citizens. This is also known as "gerrymandering".
Single Member House Districts could also split up the concentration of communities of interest depending on how district lines are drawn.	At Large Districts have a tendency to create a super majority party and under-represent other parties and demographics.
Single Member House Districts allow representatives to be intimately aware of the issues of their local community.	At Large Districts give the ability to the super majority to protect incumbency when legislative maps are being redrawn.
Single Member House Districts encourage constituency service by providing voters with an easily identifiable person engage with	
DISADVANTAGE: Single Member House Districts must be redrawn on a regular basis to maintain populations of relatively equal size.	
DISADVANTAGE: Single Member House Districts are usually artificial geographic entities whose boundaries do not delineate clearly identifiable communities, and as a consequence, the entities have no particular relevance to citizens.	
DISADVANTAGE: Single Member House Districts have a tendency to over-represent the majority party and under-represent other parties and therefore cannot produce proportional representation for political parties.	

* https://uh.edu/hobby/cpp/white-paper-series/_images/hspa-white-paper-series_no.-14.pdf

* <https://aceproject.org/main/english/bd/bda02a02.htm>