

ELECTING MINORITY-PREFERRED  
CANDIDATES TO  
LEGISLATIVE OFFICE:  
The Relationship Between Minority  
Percentages in Districts and the  
Election of Minority-Preferred  
Candidates<sup>1</sup>

Lisa Handley, Bernard Grofman, and Wayne Arden

THE ELECTIONS FOLLOWING THE 1990S ROUND of redistricting led to dramatic changes in the composition of state legislatures and the U.S. Congress. More minorities assumed legislative office following these elections than at any other time in our nation's history. Despite continuing debate over the benefits of creating majority minority districts, it is clear that the majority minority districts created in the 1990s redistricting were responsible for the significant increase in the number of African-Americans and Hispanics elected to legislative office.

Minority concentrations short of a majority also affect the election of legislators. There is a very distinct relationship between the percentage minority in a district and the party affiliation of the legislator elected: the higher the percentage minority, the greater the probability of electing a Democrat to office. If the district is a majority minority district, there is a high probability that a African-American or Hispanic Democrat will be elected. If the district is less than majority minority, but has a significant concentration of minorities, it is likely that a white Democrat will be elected to legislative office. This suggests that white Democrats are the minority-preferred candidates in districts in which minorities have influence, but are unable to elect a minority candidate.

<sup>1</sup> An earlier version of this paper was prepared for presentation at the Hendricks Symposium on Legislative Districting in the 1990's, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska, April 8-9, 1994

This chapter reviews how the 1990s round of redistricting impacted the election of minority-preferred candidates, both minority and white Democrats, in Congress and state legislatures. The chapter is divided into two sections: the first section focuses specifically on majority minority districts and the election of minority candidates to office, the second section examines the relationship between minority concentrations in districts and the election of Democrats to legislative office.

**MINORITY DISTRICTS AND THE ELECTION OF MINORITY CANDIDATES**

To determine the impact of the 1990s round of redistricting on the creation of majority minority districts and the election of minority candidates, we have prepared two sets of tables. Both sets of tables summarize minority representation prior to the 1990s round of redistricting and following the next set of elections (1991 or 1992, depending on the legislative office and the state). One set of tables examines African-American representation in states with a black population in excess of 10 percent. The second set of tables examines Hispanic representation in states with a Hispanic population greater than 10 percent.

**African-American Representation and the Creation of Majority African-American Districts**

As expected, the 1990s redistricting process led to significant gains in the number of African-American legislators and majority black districts. Table 1 indicates that African-Americans were underrepresented relative to population proportions following the 1990 elections. This underrepresentation continued to be more pronounced in the South than in other parts of the country (see Grofman and Handley, 1991, for a summary of African-American representation in southern state legislatures prior to 1990). For example, in 1990 African-Americans comprised only 14 percent of the Louisiana state house despite a black population state-wide of almost 31 percent, and less than 4 percent of the Mississippi senate despite a state-wide black population of slightly less than 36 percent. The majority of southern states had no African-American representation in Congress.

Table 2 provides the results of the first post-1990 redistricting elections. The elections led to major gains in African-American representation in the South: the number of African-Americans serving in Congress rose from 5 to 17, and the number of African-American state legislators increased in every southern state with the largest gains in Louisiana and Mississippi. In fact, the increase in African-American representation in the South far surpassed the increase elsewhere in the country. For the first time since Reconstruction, African-Americans are better represented (i.e., closer to proportional representation) in southern state legislatures than in state legislatures elsewhere in the country. Two non-southern states examined, Illinois and Michigan, actually experienced a decrease in the number of African-American state legislators.

**TABLE 1. Percent African-American Elected Legislators in the South and Non-South in 1990<sup>1</sup>**

	Percent Black Population	State House (N)	State Senate (N)	U.S. Congress (N)
<b>South</b>				
Alabama	25.3	18.1 (105)	14.3 (35)	0.0 (7)
Arkansas	15.9	9.0 (100)	8.6 (35)	0.0 (4)
Florida	13.6	10.0 (120)	5.0 (40)	0.0 (19)
Georgia	27.0	14.4 (180)	14.3 (56)	10.0 (10)
Louisiana	30.8	14.3 (105)	10.3 (39)	12.5 (8)
Mississippi	35.6	16.4 (122)	3.8 (52)	20.0 (5)
N. Carolina	22.0	11.7 (120)	10.0 (50)	0.0 (11)
S. Carolina	29.8	12.1 (124)	13.0 (46)	0.0 (6)
Tennessee	16.0	10.1 (99)	9.1 (33)	11.1 (9)
Texas	11.9	8.7 (150)	6.5 (31)	3.7 (27)
Virginia	18.8	7.0 (100)	7.5 (40)	0.0 (10)
<b>Total</b>	<b>19.2</b>	<b>12.1 (1325)</b>	<b>9.4 (457)</b>	<b>4.3 (116)</b>
<b>Non-South</b>				
Delaware	16.9	4.9 (41)	4.8 (21)	0.0 (1)
Illinois	14.8	11.9 (118)	11.9 (59)	13.6 (22)
Maryland	24.9	17.0 (141)	14.9 (47)	12.5 (8)
Michigan	13.9	10.9 (110)	7.9 (38)	11.1 (18)
Missouri	10.7	8.0 (163)	8.8 (34)	22.2 (9)
New Jersey	13.4	7.5 (80)	5.0 (40)	7.1 (14)
New York	15.9	11.3 (150)	8.2 (61)	11.8 (34)
Ohio	10.6	11.1 (99)	6.1 (33)	4.8 (21)
<b>Total</b>	<b>14.6</b>	<b>11.0 (902)</b>	<b>9.0 (333)</b>	<b>11.0 (127)</b>

<sup>1</sup>The states listed above are states with black populations of 10 percent or greater (according to the 1990 U.S. Census). The percent African-American elected legislators reflects officeholders following the 1989/1990 elections (as reported in *Black Elected Officials: A National Roster 1991*, Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies Press, 1992).

districts and Ohio drew one less majority black state senate district. Of the two states, however, only Michigan suffered a corresponding decrease in the number of African-American state legislators.

TABLE 3. Percent Majority African-American Districts in 1990<sup>1</sup>

	Percent Black Population	State House (N)	State Senate (N)	U.S. Congress (N)
<b>South</b>				
Alabama	25.3	19.0 (105)	17.1 (35)	0.0 (7)
Florida	13.6	7.5 (120)	2.5 (40)	0.0 (19)
Georgia	27.0	18.9 (180)	19.6 (56)	10.0 (10)
Louisiana	30.8	18.1 (105)	15.4 (39)	12.5 (8)
Mississippi	35.6	26.2 (122)	26.9 (52)	20.0 (5)
N. Carolina	22.0	7.5 (120)	6.0 (50)	0.0 (11)
S. Carolina	29.8	21.0 (124)	21.7 (46)	0.0 (6)
Tennessee	16.0	11.1 (99)	9.1 (33)	11.1 (9)
Texas	11.9	6.0 (150)	3.2 (31)	0.0 (27)
Virginia	18.8	9.0 (100)	5.0 (40)	0.0 (10)
<b>Total</b>	<b>19.3</b>	<b>14.5 (1225)</b>	<b>13.5 (422)</b>	<b>3.4 (116)</b>
<b>Non-South</b>				
Delaware	16.9	4.9 (41)	4.8 (21)	0.0 (1)
Illinois	14.8	11.9 (118)	10.2 (59)	13.6 (22)
Maryland	24.9	17.0 (141)	17.0 (47)	12.5 (8)
Michigan	13.9	14.5 (110)	10.5 (38)	11.1 (18)
Missouri	10.7	8.6 (163)	11.8 (34)	11.1 (9)
New York	15.9	8.6 (150)	6.6 (61)	5.9 (34)
Ohio	10.6	4.0 (99)	6.1 (33)	4.8 (21)
<b>Total</b>	<b>14.7</b>	<b>10.5 (822)</b>	<b>10.2 (239)</b>	<b>8.7 (127)</b>

<sup>1</sup>The states listed are states with black populations of 10 percent or greater. No state legislative data was available for Arkansas or New Jersey therefore these two states have been excluded. The percentages reported in this table reflect the districting plans in place for the 1989/1990 elections. Single member districts are counted once; multimember districts (both those that are majority black and those that are not) have a value equal to the number of delegates elected.

TABLE 2. Percent African-American Elected Legislators in the South and Non-South in 1992<sup>1</sup>

	Percent Black Population	State House (N)	State Senate (N)	U.S. Congress (N)
<b>South</b>				
Arkansas	15.9	10.0 (100)	8.6 (35)	0.0 (4)
Florida	13.6	11.7 (120)	10.0 (40)	13.0 (23)
Georgia	27.0	17.2 (180)	16.1 (56)	27.3 (11)
Louisiana	30.8	22.9 (105)	20.5 (39)	28.6 (7)
Mississippi	35.6	26.2 (122)	19.2 (52)	20.0 (5)
N. Carolina	22.0	15.0 (120)	12.0 (50)	16.7 (12)
S. Carolina	29.8	14.5 (124)	15.2 (46)	16.7 (6)
Tennessee	16.0	12.1 (99)	9.1 (33)	11.1 (9)
Texas	11.9	9.3 (150)	6.5 (31)	6.7 (30)
Virginia	18.8	7.0 (100)	12.5 (40)	9.1 (11)
<b>Total</b>	<b>18.8</b>	<b>14.8 (1220)</b>	<b>13.5 (422)</b>	<b>13.6 (125)</b>
<b>Non-South</b>				
Delaware	16.9	4.9 (41)	4.8 (21)	0.0 (1)
Illinois	14.8	10.2 (118)	13.6 (59)	15.0 (20)
Michigan	13.9	10.0 (110)	8.8 (34)	12.5 (16)
Missouri	10.7	8.0 (163)	5.0 (40)	22.2 (9)
New Jersey	13.4	12.5 (80)	8.2 (61)	7.7 (13)
New York	15.9	13.3 (150)	8.2 (61)	12.9 (31)
Ohio	10.6	12.1 (99)	9.1 (33)	5.3 (19)
<b>Total</b>	<b>13.8</b>	<b>10.5 (761)</b>	<b>8.9 (248)</b>	<b>12.8 (117)</b>

<sup>1</sup>The states listed above are states with black populations of 10 percent or greater, excluding Alabama and Maryland (which do not have any 1992 state legislative elections), and the Michigan state senate (which did not have any 1992 elections). The percent African-American elected legislators reflects officeholders following the 1991/1992 elections.

The primary reason for the surge in African-American representation was the increase in the number of majority black districts drawn. A comparison of Tables 3 and 4 indicates an increase in the number of majority black districts in almost every state, although the growth was greater overall in the South. In only two states—neither of which are southern—did the number of majority black districts actually decrease: Michigan drew three fewer majority black state house

TABLE 4. Percent Majority African-American Districts in 1992<sup>1</sup>

	Percent Black Population	State House (N)	State Senate (N)	U.S. Congress (N)
<b>South</b>				
Arkansas	15.9	13.0 (100)	8.6 (35)	0.0 (4)
Florida	13.6	10.8 (120)	7.5 (40)	13.0 (23)
Georgia	27.0	23.3 (180)	23.2 (56)	27.3 (11)
Louisiana	30.8	24.8 (105)	23.1 (39)	28.6 (7)
Mississippi	35.6	31.1 (122)	23.1 (52)	20.0 (5)
N. Carolina	22.0	13.3 (120)	8.0 (50)	16.7 (12)
S. Carolina	29.8	22.6 (124)	23.9 (46)	16.7 (6)
Tennessee	16.0	11.1 (99)	9.1 (33)	11.1 (9)
Texas	11.9	7.3 (150)	3.2 (31)	6.6 (30)
Virginia	18.8	12.0 (100)	12.5 (40)	9.1 (11)
Total	18.8	17.2 (1220)	15.2 (422)	13.6 (125)
<b>Non-South</b>				
Delaware	16.9	4.9 (41)	4.8 (21)	0.0 (1)
Illinois	14.8	15.3 (118)	13.6 (59)	15.0 (20)
Maryland	24.9	19.9 (141)	19.1 (47)	25.0 (8)
Michigan	13.9	11.8 (110)	13.2 (38)	12.5 (16)
Missouri	10.7	8.6 (163)	11.8 (34)	11.1 (9)
New Jersey	13.4	7.5 (80)	7.5 (40)	7.7 (13)
New York	15.9	10.0 (150)	11.5 (61)	9.7 (31)
Ohio	10.6	6.1 (99)	3.0 (33)	5.3 (19)
Total	14.6	11.3 (902)	11.4 (333)	11.1 (117)

<sup>1</sup>The states listed are states with black populations of 10 percent or greater. Alabama has not yet redistricted its state legislature and therefore has been excluded. The percentages reported in this table reflect the districting plan in place for the 1991/1992 elections. Single member districts are counted once; multimember districts (both those that are majority black and those that are not) have a value equal to the number of delegates elected.

Not only did states draw more majority black districts, but jurisdictions were apparently also more successful in the 1990s than in the 1980s in drawing "effective" minority districts (i.e., districts in which minority voters have a realistic opportunity to elect candidates of their choice).<sup>2</sup> The percentage of majority black districts that elected African-Americans to office increased, as evidenced by comparing Table 5 (A) and (B) to Table 6 (A) and (B).<sup>3</sup> The proportion of

<sup>2</sup>The one notable exception is the Illinois state house. Although the number of majority black districts in the Illinois state house increased, a number of these districts failed to elect African-American candidates to office, which led to a retrogression in African-American representation.

majority black districts that elected African-Americans to office in 1992 was slightly greater than .8 (.81 in the state house and .82 in the state senate).<sup>4</sup> This proportion may well increase over the course of the decade as majority black districts that failed to elect African-Americans in 1992 proceed to do so in subsequent elections.

TABLE 5(A). Percentage of Majority African-American and Non-Majority African-American Districts that Elected African-American State House Members in the South and Non-South in 1990

	Percent Majority Black Districts Electing African-American Legislators (N)	Percent Non-Majority Black Districts Electing African-American Legislators (N)
<b>South</b>		
Alabama	95.0 (20)	0.0 (85)
Florida	100.0 (9)	2.7 (111)
Georgia	73.5 (34)	.7 (146)
Louisiana	78.9 (19)	0.0 (86)
Mississippi	59.4 (32)	0.0 (90)
N. Carolina	100.0 (9)	4.5 (111)
S. Carolina	61.5 (26)	0.0 (98)
Tennessee	81.8 (11)	1.1 (88)
Texas	100.0 (9)	2.8 (141)
Virginia	77.8 (9)	0.0 (91)
Total	77.0 (178)	1.3 (1047)
<b>Non-South</b>		
Delaware	100.0 (2)	0.0 (39)
Illinois	92.9 (14)	1.0 (104)
Maryland	87.5 (24)	3.4 (117)
Michigan	68.8 (16)	1.1 (94)
Missouri	78.6 (14)	1.3 (149)
New York	92.3 (13)	3.6 (137)
Ohio	100.0 (4)	7.4 (95)
Total	85.1 (87)	2.7 (735)

<sup>3</sup>Tables 7 (C) and 8 (C) indicate that every majority black congressional district created elected an African-American to office—and this was true in 1990 as well as 1992.

<sup>4</sup>The proportion of majority black districts that elect African-Americans to office depends in part on the percentage black of the district. For example, in 1992, when all districts over 50 percent black are considered, 80 percent of the districts elected African-Americans, but when only districts that are over 60 percent black are considered, 84 percent elected African-Americans. Similarly, when only districts over 65 percent black are included in the analysis, the proportion of districts that elected African-Americans increases to 86 percent. Black success may also depend on the percent of Hispanics in the district—a factor that needs to be controlled for (see Grofman and Handley, 1989b).

TABLE 5(B). Percentage of Majority African-American and Non-Majority African-American Districts that Elected African-American State Senate Members in the South and Non-South in 1990

	Percent Majority Black Districts Electing African-American Legislators	(N)	Percent Non-Majority Black Districts Electing African-American Legislators	(N)
South	83.3	(6)	0.0	(29)
Alabama	100.0	(1)	2.6	(39)
Florida	72.7	(11)	0.0	(45)
Georgia	66.7	(6)	0.0	(33)
Louisiana	14.3	(14)	0.0	(38)
Mississippi	100.0	(3)	4.3	(47)
N. Carolina	50.0	(10)	0.0	(36)
S. Carolina	100.0	(3)	0.0	(33)
Tennessee	100.0	(1)	3.3	(30)
Texas	100.0	(2)	2.6	(38)
Virginia	59.6	(57)	1.4	(368)
Total				
Non-South	100.0	(1)	0.0	(20)
Delaware	100.0	(6)	0.0	(53)
Illinois	87.5	(8)	0.0	(39)
Maryland	75.0	(4)	0.0	(34)
Michigan	75.0	(4)	0.0	(30)
Missouri	50.0	(4)	5.3	(57)
New York	0.0	(2)	6.9	(29)
Ohio	75.9	(29)	2.3	(262)
Total				

TABLE 5(C). Percentage of Majority African-American and Non-Majority African-American Districts that Elected African-American Congressional Representatives in the South and Non-South in 1990

	Percent Majority Black Districts Electing African-American Legislators	(N)	Percent Non-Majority Black Districts Electing African-American Legislators	(N)
South	—	(0)	0.0	(7)
Alabama	—	(0)	0.0	(4)
Arkansas	—	(0)	0.0	(19)
Florida	100.0	(1)	0.0	(9)
Georgia	100.0	(1)	0.0	(7)
Louisiana	100.0	(1)	0.0	(4)
Mississippi	—	(0)	0.0	(11)
N. Carolina	—	(0)	0.0	(6)
S. Carolina	100.0	(1)	0.0	(8)
Tennessee	—	(0)	3.7	(27)
Texas	—	(0)	0.0	(10)
Virginia	100.0	(4)	9	(112)
Total				

TABLE 5(C) (continued). Percentage of Majority African-American and Non-Majority African-American Districts that Elected African-American Congressional Representatives in the South and Non-South in 1990

	Percent Majority Black Districts Electing African-American Legislators	(N)	Percent Non-Majority Black Districts Electing African-American Legislators	(N)
Non-South	—	(0)	0.0	(1)
Delaware	100.0	(3)	0.0	(19)
Illinois	100.0	(1)	0.0	(7)
Maryland	100.0	(2)	0.0	(16)
Michigan	100.0	(1)	12.5	(8)
Missouri	100.0	(1)	0.0	(13)
New Jersey	100.0	(2)	6.3	(32)
New York	100.0	(1)	0.0	(20)
Ohio	100.0	(11)	2.6	(116)
Total				

TABLE 6(A). Percentage of Majority African-American and Non-Majority African-American Districts that Elected African-American State House Members in the South and Non-South in 1992

	Percent Majority Black Districts Electing African-American Legislators	(N)	Percent Non-Majority Black Districts Electing African-American Legislators	(N)
South	76.9	(13)	0.0	(87)
Arkansas	92.3	(13)	1.9	(107)
Florida	71.4	(42)	7	(138)
Georgia	92.3	(26)	0.0	(79)
Louisiana	84.2	(38)	0.0	(84)
Mississippi	93.8	(16)	2.9	(104)
N. Carolina	64.3	(28)	0.0	(96)
S. Carolina	100.0	(11)	1.1	(88)
Tennessee	100.0	(11)	2.2	(139)
Texas	58.3	(12)	0.0	(88)
Virginia	81.0	(210)	1.0	(1010)
Total				
Non-South	100.0	(2)	0.0	(39)
Delaware	66.7	(18)	0.0	(100)
Illinois	76.9	(13)	1.0	(97)
Michigan	78.6	(14)	1.3	(149)
Missouri	66.7	(6)	8.1	(74)
New Jersey	93.3	(15)	4.4	(135)
New York	100.0	(6)	6.5	(93)
Ohio	79.7	(74)	3.1	(687)
Total				

TABLE 6(B). Percentage of Majority African-American and Non-Majority African-American Districts that Elected African-American State Senate Members in the South and Non-South in 1992

	Percent Majority Black Districts Electing African-American Legislators	(N)	Percent Non-Majority Black Districts Electing African-American Legislators	(N)
<b>South</b>				
Arkansas	100.0	(3)	0.0	(32)
Florida	100.0	(3)	2.7	(37)
Georgia	69.2	(13)	0.0	(43)
Louisiana	88.9	(9)	0.0	(30)
Mississippi	83.3	(12)	0.0	(40)
N. Carolina	100.0	(4)	4.3	(46)
S. Carolina	63.6	(11)	0.0	(35)
Tennessee	100.0	(3)	0.0	(30)
Texas	100.0	(1)	3.3	(30)
Virginia	100.0	(5)	0.0	(35)
Total	82.3	(64)	1.1	(338)
<b>Non-South</b>				
Delaware	100.0	(1)	0.0	(20)
Illinois	87.5	(8)	2.0	(51)
Missouri	75.0	(4)	0.0	(30)
New Jersey	66.7	(3)	0.0	(37)
New York	71.4	(7)	0.0	(54)
Ohio	100.0	(1)	6.3	(32)
Total	79.2	(24)	1.3	(224)

TABLE 6(C). Percentage of Majority African-American and Non-Majority African-American Districts that Elected African-American Congressional Representatives in the South and Non-South in 1992

	Percent Majority Black Districts Electing African-American Legislators	(N)	Percent Non-Majority Black Districts Electing African-American Legislators	(N)
<b>South</b>				
Alabama	100.0	(1)	0.0	(6)
Arkansas	-	(0)	0.0	(4)
Florida	100.0	(3)	0.0	(20)
Georgia	100.0	(3)	0.0	(8)
Louisiana	100.0	(2)	0.0	(5)
Mississippi	100.0	(1)	0.0	(4)
N. Carolina	100.0	(2)	0.0	(10)
S. Carolina	100.0	(1)	0.0	(5)
Tennessee	100.0	(1)	0.0	(8)
Texas	100.0	(2)	0.0	(28)
Virginia	100.0	(1)	0.0	(10)
Total	100.0	(17)	0.0	(109)

TABLE 6(C) (continued). Percentage of Majority African-American and Non-Majority African-American Districts that Elected African-American Congressional Representatives in the South and Non-South in 1992

Non-South		(N)		(N)
Delaware	-	(0)	0.0	(1)
Illinois	100.0	(3)	0.0	(17)
Maryland	100.0	(2)	0.0	(6)
Michigan	100.0	(2)	0.0	(14)
Missouri	100.0	(1)	12.5	(8)
New Jersey	100.0	(1)	0.0	(12)
New York	100.0	(3)	3.6	(28)
Ohio	100.0	(1)	0.0	(18)
Total	100.0	(13)	1.9	(104)

Tables 5 and 6 serve to illustrate another point: the vast majority of African-American legislators are elected from majority black districts. In 1990, 86 percent of the African-Americans serving in state legislatures represented majority African-American districts. In 1992, the percentage increased slightly to 89 percent. The percentage increase for Congress was more dramatic in the states studied: in 1990, 79 percent of the African-Americans in office were elected from majority black districts; in 1992, 94 percent of the African-American congressional representatives served majority black districts. Thus the gain in African-American representation cannot be attributed to an increase in the number of African-Americans being elected from non-majority black districts, at least in states with significant black populations. African-American representation increased only because the number and effectiveness of majority black districts increased.

**Hispanic Representation and the Creation of Majority Hispanic Districts**

The 1990s redistricting process also led to significant gains in the number of Hispanic legislators, although the increases were not as dramatic as for African-Americans. (African-American gains, especially in the South, surpassed Hispanic gains in Congress and state senates and were comparable in state houses.) African-Americans are currently better represented, proportionally, than Hispanics - although Hispanics were better represented than African-Americans in the South prior to 1992.

Table 7 indicates that Hispanics were dramatically underrepresented relative to population proportions in 1990. For example, Hispanics comprised over 25 percent of the population in California, but held only 5 percent of the state house seats and less than 8 percent of the state senate seats. In 1992, the percentage of California state house seats occupied by Hispanics increased to 10 percent but the percentage of state senate seats held by Hispanics remained the same (see Table 8). Hispanic representation actually decreased at the state legislative level in two states: Arizona and Colorado. Two states also decreased the number of majority

Hispanic districts, Colorado and Florida—although Florida maintained 3 Hispanic state senators from 1990 to 1992, despite its decrease in the number of majority Hispanic state senate seats.

TABLE 7. Percent Hispanic Elected Legislators in 1990<sup>1</sup>

	Percent Hispanic Population	State House (N)	State Senate (N)	U.S. Congress (N)
Arizona	18.8	10.0 (60)	16.7 (30)	0.0 (5)
California	25.8	5.0 (80)	7.5 (40)	6.7 (45)
Colorado	12.9	10.8 (65)	8.6 (35)	5.0 (6)
Florida	12.2	6.7 (120)	7.5 (40)	5.3 (19)
Nevada	10.4	0.0 (42)	4.8 (21)	0.0 (2)
New Mexico	38.2	35.7 (70)	35.7 (42)	33.3 (3)
New York	12.3	2.7 (150)	3.3 (61)	2.9 (34)
Texas	25.5	13.3 (150)	16.1 (31)	14.8 (27)
Total	20.2	10.0 (737)	12.3 (300)	7.1 (141)

<sup>1</sup>The states listed above are states with Hispanic populations of 10 percent or greater (according to the 1990 U.S. Census). The percent Hispanic elected legislators reflects officeholders following the 1990 elections (as reported in 1991 National Roster of Hispanic Elected Officials, National Association of Latino Elected and Appointed Officials, 1992).

TABLE 8. Percent Hispanic Elected Legislators in 1992<sup>1</sup>

	Percent Hispanic Population	State House (N)	State Senate (N)	U.S. Congress (N)
Arizona	18.8	10.0 (60)	10.0 (30)	16.7 (6)
California	25.8	10.0 (80)	7.5 (40)	7.7 (52)
Colorado	12.9	9.2 (65)	5.7 (35)	0.0 (6)
Florida	12.2	8.3 (120)	7.5 (40)	8.7 (23)
Nevada	10.4	0.0 (42)	4.8 (21)	0.0 (2)
New Mexico	38.2	37.1 (70)	35.7 (42)	33.3 (3)
New York	12.3	4.7 (150)	6.6 (61)	6.5 (31)
Texas	25.5	18.0 (150)	19.4 (31)	16.7 (30)
Total	20.2	12.2 (737)	12.3 (300)	9.8 (153)

<sup>1</sup>The states listed above are states with Hispanic populations of 10 percent or greater according to the 1990 U.S. Census. The percent Hispanic elected legislators reflects officeholders following the 1992 elections.

The largest percentage increase between 1990 and 1992 in both African-American and Hispanic representation occurred at the congressional level rather than the state legislative level. This is somewhat surprising because it is easier to create minority districts at smaller levels of geography than larger levels such as congressional districts (Grofman and Handley, 1989b). One reason for the more dramatic gains at the congressional level may be the national attention focused on electing more minorities to federal office.

TABLE 9. Percent Majority Hispanic Districts in 1990<sup>1</sup>

	Percent Hispanic Population	State House (N)	State Senate (N)	U.S. Congress (N)
California	25.8	12.5 (80)	7.5 (40)	8.9 (45)
Colorado	12.9	3.1 (65)	0.0 (35)	0.0 (6)
Florida	12.2	5.8 (120)	10.0 (40)	5.3 (19)
Nevada	10.4	0.0 (42)	0.0 (16)	0.0 (2)
New York	12.3	6.7 (150)	4.9 (61)	2.9 (34)
Texas	25.5	17.3 (150)	19.4 (31)	18.5 (27)
Total	19.9	9.1 (607)	7.2 (223)	8.3 (133)

<sup>1</sup>The states listed are states with Hispanic populations of 10 percent or greater. No data was available for Arizona or New Mexico therefore these two states have been excluded. The percentages reported in this table reflect the districting plan in place for the 1990 elections. Single member districts are counted once, multimember districts (both those that are majority Hispanic and those that are not) have a value equal to the number of delegates elected.

TABLE 10. Percent Majority Hispanic Districts in 1992<sup>1</sup>

	Percent Hispanic Population	State House (N)	State Senate (N)	U.S. Congress (N)
Arizona	18.8	13.3 (30)	13.3 (30)	16.7 (6)
California	25.8	12.5 (80)	10.0 (40)	13.5 (52)
Colorado	12.9	0.0 (65)	0.0 (35)	0.0 (6)
Florida	12.2	7.5 (120)	7.5 (40)	8.7 (23)
Nevada	10.4	0.0 (42)	0.0 (16)	0.0 (2)
New Mexico	38.2	32.9 (70)	35.7 (42)	0.0 (3)
New York	12.3	7.3 (150)	6.6 (61)	6.5 (31)
Texas	25.5	20.0 (150)	22.6 (31)	23.3 (30)
Total	20.2	12.3 (707)	12.5 (295)	12.4 (153)

<sup>1</sup>The states listed are states with Hispanic populations of 10 percent or greater. The percentages reported in this table reflect the districting plan in place for the 1992 elections. Single member districts are counted once, multimember districts (both those that are majority Hispanic and those that are not) have a value equal to the number of delegates elected.

Why were Hispanic gains less substantial between 1990 and 1992 than African-American gains? Although Hispanic legislators appear no less likely to be elected to office from majority white seats than African-American legislators (compare Table 6 with Table 12), it appears that (1) a smaller percentage of Hispanic seats were created than African-American seats, relative to population proportions (compare Table 4 with Table 10) and (2) African-American seats were more likely to elect candidates of choice to office than Hispanic districts (compare Table 6 with Table 12). Undoubtedly, one of the primary reasons that fewer Hispanic districts were created is that it is easier to draw majority African-American seats than majority Hispanic seats: African-Americans tend to be more residentially segregated than Hispanics. Hispanic districts are less successful at electing Hispanics to office in large part because there is a greater proportion of

non-voters among the Hispanic population. This is largely a product of the lower citizenship rates among the Hispanic population.

TABLE 11(A). Percentage of Majority Hispanic and Non-Majority Hispanic Districts That Elected Hispanic State House Members in 1990

	Percent Majority Hispanic Districts Electing Hispanic Legislators	(N)	Percent Non-Majority Hispanic Districts Electing Hispanic Legislators	(N)
California	30.0	(10)	1.4	(70)
Colorado	100.0	(2)	7.9	(63)
Florida	100.0	(7)	.9	(113)
Nevada	-	(0)	0.0	(42)
New York	30.0	(10)	.7	(140)
Texas	73.1	(26)	.8	(124)
Total	61.8	(55)	1.6	(552)

TABLE 11(B). Percentage of Majority Hispanic and Non-Majority Hispanic Districts That Elected Hispanic Senate Members in 1990

	Percent Majority Hispanic Districts Electing Hispanic Legislators	(N)	Percent Non-Majority Hispanic Districts Electing Hispanic Legislators	(N)
California	66.7	(3)	2.7	(37)
Colorado	-	(0)	8.6	(35)
Florida	75.0	(4)	0.0	(36)
Nevada	-	(0)	4.8	(21)
New York	66.7	(3)	0.0	(58)
Texas	66.7	(6)	4.0	(25)
Total	68.8	(16)	2.8	(212)

TABLE 11(C). Percentage of Majority Hispanic and Non-Majority Hispanic Districts That Elected Hispanic Congressional Representatives in 1990

	Percent Majority Hispanic Districts Electing Hispanic Legislators	(N)	Percent Non-Majority Hispanic Districts Electing Hispanic Legislators	(N)
Arizona	-	(0)	0.0	(5)
California	75.0	(4)	0.0	(41)
Colorado	-	(0)	0.0	(6)
Florida	100.0	(1)	0.0	(18)
Nevada	-	(0)	0.0	(2)
New Mexico	-	(0)	33.3	(3)
New York	100.0	(1)	0.0	(33)
Texas	80.0	(5)	0.0	(22)
Total	81.8	(11)	.8	(130)

TABLE 12(A). Percentage of Majority Hispanic and Non-Majority Hispanic Districts That Elected Hispanic State House Members in 1992

	Percent Majority Hispanic Districts Electing Hispanic Legislators	(N)	Percent Non-Majority Hispanic Districts Electing Hispanic Legislators	(N)
Arizona	62.5	(8)	1.9	(52)
California	60.0	(10)	2.9	(70)
Colorado	-	(0)	9.2	(65)
Florida	100.0	(9)	.8	(131)
Nevada	-	(0)	0.0	(42)
New Mexico	78.3	(23)	17.0	(47)
New York	63.6	(11)	0.0	(139)
Texas	86.7	(30)	.9	(120)
Total	78.0	(91)	2.9	(666)

TABLE 12(B). Percentage of Majority Hispanic and Non-Majority Hispanic Districts That Elected Hispanic State Senate Members in 1992

	Percent Majority Hispanic Districts Electing Hispanic Legislators	(N)	Percent Non-Majority Hispanic Districts Electing Hispanic Legislators	(N)
Arizona	50.0	(4)	3.8	(26)
California	25.0	(4)	5.6	(36)
Colorado	-	(0)	5.7	(35)
Florida	100.0	(3)	0.0	(37)
Nevada	-	(0)	4.8	(21)
New Mexico	86.7	(15)	7.4	(27)
New York	100.0	(4)	0.0	(57)
Texas	71.4	(7)	4.5	(24)
Total	75.7	(37)	3.4	(263)

TABLE 12(C). Percentage of Majority Hispanic and Non-Majority Hispanic Districts That Elected Hispanic Congressional Representatives in 1992

	Percent Majority Hispanic Districts Electing Hispanic Legislators	(N)	Percent Non-Majority Hispanic Districts Electing Hispanic Legislators	(N)
Arizona	100.0	(1)	0.0	(5)
California	57.1	(7)	0.0	(45)
Colorado	-	(0)	0.0	(6)
Florida	100.0	(2)	0.0	(21)
Nevada	-	(0)	0.0	(2)
New Mexico	-	(0)	33.3	(3)
New York	100.0	(2)	0.0	(29)
Texas	71.4	(7)	0.0	(23)
Total	73.7	(19)	.7	(134)



MINORITY PERCENTAGES IN LEGISLATIVE DISTRICTS AND THE ELECTION OF DEMOCRATS

In addition to measuring the impact of redistricting on African-American and Hispanic representation, we attempted to determine whether there is a relationship between the minority population percentages in a district more generally and the election of a minority-preferred candidate. We assumed that, given the large percentage of African-Americans and non-Cuban Hispanics that are Democrats, Democrats would be the candidate of choice—and this assumption appears to be correct given the strong relationship between minority concentrations across districts and the election of Democrats to legislative office.

TABLE 13. Percent Democrats in State Houses by Percent African-American in District 1990<sup>1</sup>

South	Percent African-American in District			
	10-	20-	30-	40-
0-9.9 (N)	19.9 (N)	29.9 (N)	39.9 (N)	49.9 (N)
50+	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)
Alabama	59.4 (32)	75.0 (28)	91.7 (12)	85.7 (7)
Florida	41.0 (61)	71.0 (31)	90.9 (11)	100.0 (7)
Georgia	52.2 (46)	70.6 (34)	89.7 (29)	100.0 (24)
Louisiana	43.8 (16)	81.0 (21)	81.0 (21)	100.0 (19)
Mississippi	46.2 (13)	80.0 (20)	81.8 (22)	86.4 (22)
N. Carolina	37.9 (29)	52.9 (34)	83.3 (24)	95.0 (20)
S. Carolina	30.8 (13)	32.4 (34)	71.4 (21)	90.0 (20)
Tennessee	42.1 (57)	76.5 (17)	60.0 (5)	66.7 (6)
Texas	55.6 (81)	56.1 (41)	81.8 (11)	100.0 (4)
Virginia	38.9 (36)	51.7 (29)	69.2 (13)	88.9 (9)
Total	46.4 (384)	62.3 (289)	81.7 (169)	92.8 (138)
93.3 (60)	98.9 (178)			
Non - South				
Illinois	43.6 (78)	93.8 (16)	83.3 (6)	100.0 (2)
Maryland	65.2 (46)	79.4 (34)	89.5 (19)	100.0 (9)
Michigan	40.8 (76)	80.0 (10)	66.7 (6)	100.0 (2)
Missouri	50.4 (121)	73.3 (15)	85.7 (7)	100.0 (1)
New York	46.5 (101)	95.2 (21)	100.0 (4)	100.0 (6)
Ohio	50.7 (71)	75.0 (12)	100.0 (3)	100.0 (5)
Total	48.5 (493)	83.3 (108)	86.7 (45)	100.0 (25)
100.0 (28)	100.0 (85)			

<sup>1</sup> Information for Arkansas, Delaware and New Jersey unavailable

African-American Population Concentrations and the Election of Democrats to Office

As is evident from Tables 13-18, a very clear pattern exists between the percentage African-American in a district and the election of a Democrat. Regardless of region or type of district examined, the higher the percentage African-American in the district, the greater the percentage of Democrats elected to office. This pattern holds true in both 1990 and 1992, for both the South and the non-South, and for all three types of legislative districts examined—state house, state senate and congressional districts.

TABLE 14. Percent Democrats in State Senates by Percent African-American in District 1990<sup>1</sup>

South	Percent African-American in District			
	10-	20-	30-	40-
0-9.9 (N)	19.9 (N)	29.9 (N)	39.9 (N)	49.9 (N)
50+	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)
Alabama	42.9 (7)	80.0 (10)	87.5 (8)	100.0 (2)
Florida	31.3 (16)	66.7 (18)	100.0 (4)	100.0 (1)
Georgia	54.5 (11)	66.7 (12)	80.0 (10)	100.0 (9)
Louisiana	0.0 (2)	77.8 (9)	100.0 (10)	100.0 (3)
Mississippi	100.0 (3)	55.6 (9)	77.8 (9)	92.3 (13)
N. Carolina	45.5 (11)	41.7 (12)	93.3 (15)	100.0 (8)
S. Carolina	60.0 (5)	50.0 (8)	76.9 (13)	75.0 (8)
Tennessee	47.4 (19)	57.1 (7)	100.0 (2)	100.0 (2)
Texas	64.3 (14)	70.0 (10)	100.0 (4)	100.0 (1)
Virginia	75.0 (12)	71.4 (14)	60.0 (5)	75.0 (4)
Total	52.0 (100)	64.2 (109)	86.3 (80)	92.6 (54)
95.2 (21)	96.4 (56)			
Non - South				
Illinois	27.8 (36)	81.8 (11)	100.0 (2)	100.0 (4)
Maryland	56.3 (16)	90.9 (11)	83.3 (6)	100.0 (3)
Michigan	36.0 (25)	42.9 (7)	100.0 (1)	100.0 (1)
Missouri	57.7 (26)	100.0 (3)	100.0 (1)	100.0 (4)
New York	18.9 (37)	58.3 (12)	100.0 (3)	100.0 (3)
Ohio	22.7 (22)	33.3 (6)	100.0 (2)	100.0 (1)
Total	34.0 (162)	68.0 (50)	92.9 (14)	100.0 (12)
100.0 (8)	100.0 (27)			

<sup>1</sup> Information for Arkansas, Delaware and New Jersey unavailable

TABLE 15. Percent Democrats in Congress by Percent African-American in District  
1990

	Percent African-American in District				
	0-9.9	10-19.9	20-29.9	30-39.9	40-49.9
South	0.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Alabama	0.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Arkansas	42.9	37.5	66.7	100.0	100.0
Florida	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Georgia	—	0.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Louisiana	—	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Mississippi	0.0	75.0	50.0	100.0	100.0
N. Carolina	—	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
S. Carolina	—	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Tennessee	50.0	50.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Texas	57.1	85.7	80.0	100.0	100.0
Virginia	50.0	66.7	66.7	50.0	50.0
Total	53.1	64.5	74.1	70.0	100.0
Non-South	—	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Delaware	53.3	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Illinois	50.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Maryland	41.7	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Michigan	57.1	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Missouri	33.3	66.7	100.0	100.0	100.0
New Jersey	45.5	83.3	100.0	100.0	100.0
New York	41.7	62.5	80.0	100.0	100.0
Ohio	46.1	76.2	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total	46.1	76.2	100.0	100.0	100.0

Overall, the probability of electing a Democrat to the state legislature and Congress decreased between 1990 and 1992.<sup>5</sup> Although the decline was not great (no more than 5 percent for any set of districts), it is found at all three levels; 64% to 60% in Congress; 66% to 61% in state senates; and 67% to 63% for state houses. This decline occurred in both the South and the non-South, considered separately as well. In absolute terms, among states with comparable data, Democrats lost 31 house and 26 senate seats in the South and 10 house and 9 senate seats in the non-South. In Congress, Democrats lost 10 seats in the non-South and no seats in the South in 1992.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>5</sup>No state legislative elections were held in Alabama, Maryland and the Michigan state senate in 1991 or 1992, therefore only 16 states have been compared at the state legislative level. All 19 states have been compared at the congressional and state house level.

TABLE 16. Percent Democrats in State Houses by Percent African-American in District  
1992<sup>1</sup>

	Percent African-American in District				
	0-9.9	10-19.9	20-29.9	30-39.9	40-49.9
South	0-9.9	19.9	29.9	39.9	49.9
Alabama	83.6	55	100.0	100.0	75.0
Arkansas	40.0	75	84.6	100.0	100.0
Florida	35.7	56	68.9	45	92.6
Georgia	55.6	18	77.8	27	90.5
Louisiana	41.7	12	60.0	35	72.7
Mississippi	38.5	39	46.7	30	95.5
N. Carolina	4.3	23	25.9	27	78.3
S. Carolina	48.3	60	84.6	13	71.4
Tennessee	50.0	96	71.9	32	100.0
Texas	40.5	42	55.6	27	76.9
Virginia	48.3	476	65.4	280	86.2
Total	48.3	476	65.4	280	86.2
Non-South	—	—	—	—	—
Delaware	43.8	16	37.5	14	33.3
Illinois	43.5	85	77.8	9	83.3
Michigan	34.2	79	87.5	8	71.4
Missouri	52.7	129	92.9	14	75.0
New Jersey	8.0	50	20.0	10	66.7
New York	51.5	101	100.0	17	100.0
Ohio	44.2	77	71.4	7	0.0
Total	42.6	537	70.9	79	73.3

<sup>1</sup>Alabama and Maryland did not have state house elections in 1991 or 1992.

Much of the decrease in the number of Democrats elected to office is attributable to the increase in the number of districts with less than 10 percent black populations and the lower probability of Democrats being elected from these districts. This is the only category in which the percentage of Democrats elected clearly decreased between 1990 and 1992; furthermore, this category experienced the largest increase in the number of districts—there were far more dis-

<sup>6</sup>It should be noted that as a result of reapportionment the South gained 9 congressional seats and the non-South lost 10 congressional seats.

tricts with less than 10 percent black in 1992 than there were in 1990. For example, in the non-South the number of districts with black populations below 10 increased by 24 in state houses, 14 in state senates and 2 in Congress; in the South the increase in the number of districts with less than 10 black was 69 in state houses, 37 in state senates and 19 in Congress. Moreover, following the 1992 elections, the only category in which Democrats controlled a minority of the seats were those districts below 10 percent. This is true regardless of region or level of office. In every other black percentage range, Democrats held a majority of the seats. The percentages of Democrats elected in each percentage category (0 to 10, 10 to 20, 20 to 30, 30 to 40, 40 to 50 and over 50 black), as well as the number of districts falling into each category can be found in Tables 15 and 16 for state houses, Tables 14 and 17 for state senates and Tables 15 and 18 for Congress.

TABLE 17. Percent Democrats in State Senates by Percent African-American in District 1992<sup>1</sup>

South	Percent African-American in District					
	0-9.9	10.	20.	30.	40.	50+
Arkansas	78.9 (19)	85.7 (7)	100.0 (4)	100.0 (2)	100.0 (2)	100.0 (3)
Florida	26.9 (26)	85.7 (7)	100.0 (1)	100.0 (2)	100.0 (1)	100.0 (3)
Georgia	35.7 (14)	68.8 (16)	85.7 (7)	100.0 (5)	100.0 (1)	100.0 (13)
Louisiana	25.0 (4)	72.7 (11)	100.0 (8)	100.0 (6)	100.0 (1)	100.0 (9)
Mississippi	100.0 (2)	35.7 (14)	81.8 (11)	90.0 (10)	66.7 (3)	100.0 (12)
N. Carolina	40.0 (15)	83.3 (6)	94.7 (19)	100.0 (4)	100.0 (2)	100.0 (4)
S. Carolina	33.3 (6)	41.7 (12)	37.5 (8)	100.0 (8)	100.0 (1)	100.0 (11)
Tennessee	52.4 (21)	0.0 (4)	100.0 (2)	100.0 (3)	100.0 (1)	100.0 (3)
Texas	55.6 (18)	50.0 (10)	100.0 (1)	100.0 (1)	100.0 (1)	100.0 (1)
Virginia	25.0 (24)	50.0 (14)	50.0 (6)	100.0 (1)	100.0 (1)	100.0 (5)
Total	43.6 (149)	57.4 (101)	82.1 (67)	97.6 (41)	90.0 (10)	100.0 (64)
Non-South						
Delaware	50.0 (8)	87.5 (8)	66.7 (3)	100.0 (1)	100.0 (1)	100.0 (1)
Illinois	32.6 (43)	25.0 (4)	100.0 (2)	100.0 (2)	100.0 (2)	100.0 (8)
Missouri	44.0 (25)	100.0 (3)	100.0 (1)	100.0 (1)	100.0 (1)	100.0 (4)
New Jersey	12.0 (25)	40.0 (5)	66.7 (6)	100.0 (1)	100.0 (1)	100.0 (3)
New York	26.2 (42)	33.3 (6)	100.0 (4)	100.0 (2)	100.0 (2)	100.0 (7)
Ohio	20.0 (25)	100.0 (3)	100.0 (1)	100.0 (2)	100.0 (1)	100.0 (1)
Total	28.6 (168)	62.1 (29)	81.2 (16)	100.0 (7)	100.0 (2)	100.0 (24)

<sup>1</sup>Alabama, Maryland and Michigan did not have state senate elections in 1991 or 1992.

On the other hand, most districts over 30 percent black continue to elect Democrats to office. In fact, in the non-South, every state house, state senate and congressional district over 30 percent black elects a Democrat to office (this is true for both 1990 and 1992) except for one.<sup>7</sup> The pattern is not quite as stark in the South. (Actually, in the South, not even every district over 50 percent black elects a Democrat to office, at least at the state legislative level).

TABLE 18. Percent Democrats in Congress by Percent African-American in District 1992

South	Percent African-American in District					
	0-9.9	10.	20.	30.	40.	50+
Alabama	30.0 (2)	100.0 (1)	33.3 (3)	39.9 (N)	49.9 (N)	100.0 (1)
Arkansas	0.0 (1)	100.0 (2)	0.0 (1)	100.0 (1)	100.0 (1)	100.0 (1)
Florida	25.0 (16)	66.7 (3)	100.0 (1)	100.0 (2)	100.0 (1)	100.0 (3)
Georgia	50.0 (2)	50.0 (4)	50.0 (2)	100.0 (1)	100.0 (1)	100.0 (3)
Louisiana	33.3 (3)	50.0 (2)	100.0 (1)	100.0 (2)	100.0 (2)	100.0 (2)
Mississippi	100.0 (1)	100.0 (1)	100.0 (1)	100.0 (1)	100.0 (1)	100.0 (1)
N. Carolina	0.0 (4)	100.0 (2)	100.0 (4)	100.0 (1)	100.0 (1)	100.0 (2)
S. Carolina	0.0 (1)	33.3 (3)	100.0 (1)	100.0 (1)	100.0 (1)	100.0 (1)
Tennessee	50.0 (4)	66.7 (3)	100.0 (1)	100.0 (1)	100.0 (1)	100.0 (1)
Texas	32.6 (19)	100.0 (7)	100.0 (2)	100.0 (1)	100.0 (1)	100.0 (2)
Virginia	66.7 (3)	40.0 (5)	100.0 (1)	100.0 (1)	100.0 (1)	100.0 (1)
Total	39.2 (51)	68.8 (32)	66.7 (21)	100.0 (3)	100.0 (1)	100.0 (17)
Non-South						
Delaware	0.0 (1)	100.0 (2)	100.0 (1)	100.0 (1)	100.0 (1)	100.0 (3)
Illinois	46.7 (15)	100.0 (2)	100.0 (1)	100.0 (1)	100.0 (1)	100.0 (2)
Maryland	0.0 (3)	66.7 (3)	100.0 (1)	100.0 (1)	100.0 (1)	100.0 (2)
Michigan	50.0 (12)	100.0 (2)	100.0 (1)	100.0 (1)	100.0 (1)	100.0 (2)
Missouri	57.1 (7)	100.0 (1)	100.0 (1)	100.0 (1)	100.0 (1)	100.0 (1)
New Jersey	16.7 (6)	83.3 (6)	100.0 (1)	100.0 (1)	100.0 (1)	100.0 (1)
New York	50.0 (22)	33.3 (3)	100.0 (3)	100.0 (1)	100.0 (1)	100.0 (3)
Ohio	38.5 (13)	100.0 (3)	0.0 (1)	100.0 (1)	100.0 (1)	100.0 (1)
Total	43.6 (78)	75.0 (20)	50.0 (2)	100.0 (4)	100.0 (1)	100.0 (13)

Not surprisingly, the categories of districts that experienced the largest decrease in number were those districts with black populations between 30 and 50 percent. For example, in the South there were 18 fewer congressional districts, 90 fewer state house districts and 22 fewer senate seats with black populations between 30 and 50 percent. In the non-South, the decrease in districts with black populations between 30 and 50 percent was 16 in state houses, 5 in state senates and no change in congressional districts. This decrease in districts between 30

<sup>7</sup>The exception is a 31% black state house district in Delaware that elects a Republican to office.

and 50 percent black is not unexpected given the increase in the number of districts over 50 percent black—the logical place to begin drawing additional majority black districts is in areas of the state with substantial black populations and no currently existing majority black district. Since Democrats control an overwhelming percentage of districts between 30 and 50 percent black, some of the Democratic losses in 1992 must be attributed to the elimination of these strong minority influence districts.

A review of the relationship between black population concentrations and the election of Democrats to office in the individual states across the region reveals some differences across states. South Carolina and New Jersey are the least likely to elect Democrats at low black percentages, Arkansas appears to be the most likely. In 1992, all congressional and legislative districts in Florida, Texas and New York with black populations greater than 20 percent elected Democrats to office. On the other hand, black percentages of 50 percent or more were required before every district in Louisiana, Mississippi and South Carolina elected a Democrat.<sup>8</sup> Overall, the patterns in the South and non-South, especially with regard to Congress, are becoming increasingly similar. This is due in large part to the decreasing likelihood of Democrats being elected from the South, particularly from districts less than 10 percent black.

#### Hispanic Population Concentrations and the Election of Democrats to Office

Although the pattern is not as marked, the same relationship noted for African-American population concentrations and the election of Democrats exists for Hispanics: the higher the percentage of Hispanics in districts, the greater the percentage of Democrats elected to office.<sup>9</sup> This is true of all three levels of legislative districts but, as will be discussed below, there are some significant differences in the three levels of offices studied.

In states with Hispanic populations greater than 10 percent, the probability of electing a Democrat to the state house and Congress actually increased between 1990 and 1992, while the probability of electing Democrats to the state senate decreased slightly. The percentage of seats held by Democrats increased from 58 in 1990 to 61 in 1992 in the seven state houses considered (Table 19); but the percentage of the seats held by Democrats in the state senates decreased from 54 to 50 (Table 20). In actual numbers, Democrats gained 24 house and 4 congressional seats (these states gained 8 seats as a result of reapportionment) and lost 9 state senate seats.

The Hispanic population percentage which elects a majority of Democrats to

<sup>8</sup>In 1990, no category of districts we analyzed in these three states elected only Democrats.

<sup>9</sup>We analyzed seven of the eight states with Hispanic populations greater than 10 percent. The states reviewed were Arizona, California, Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, New York and Texas. Florida, although it has an Hispanic population greater than 10 percent, was excluded because of the large number of Cuban voters who exhibit little similarity with non-Cuban Hispanics (and tend to vote for Republicans rather than Democrats).

office is dependent on the level of office. For example, in 1992 Democrats held 62 of the state house districts with Hispanic populations between 10 and 20 percent (see Table 19), however, Democrats did not control a majority of state senate seats until the Hispanic population concentration reached 30 to 40 percent—at that point Democrats were elected to 78 percent of the seats (see Table 20). Furthermore, there is no category of state house districts or congressional districts that elect only Democrats; but all state senate districts over 40 Hispanic elect Democrats to office (see Table 21).

Since the populations of New York and Texas are both over 10 percent black and 10 percent Hispanic, a more detailed review of these two states provides a good indication of the role played by these two groups in electing Democrats to office. In New York, there appears to be little measurable difference between the two minority groups; in the New York Assembly, Democrats control all of districts over 10 percent black and all of the districts over 10 percent Hispanic (see Tables 16 and 19). The likelihood of electing a Democrat to the state senate or to Congress in New York is also comparable regardless of whether a district contains a significant African-American or Hispanic population.

TABLE 19: Percent Democrats in State Houses by Percent Hispanic in District 1992

	Percent Hispanic in District			
	0-9.9	10.	20.	40.
1992	(N) 19.9	(N) 29.9	(N) 39.9	(N) 49.9
Arizona	9.1 (22)	36.4 (22)	100.0 (2)	83.3 (6)
California	33.3 (9)	61.8 (34)	35.7 (14)	60.0 (5)
Colorado	35.0 (40)	71.4 (14)	60.0 (5)	0.0 (1)
Nevada	60.0 (25)	81.3 (16)	100.0 (1)	100.0 (1)
New Mexico	100.0 (2)	38.5 (13)	52.8 (17)	85.7 (7)
New York	50.5 (99)	100.0 (23)	100.0 (13)	100.0 (3)
Texas	45.8 (48)	51.1 (45)	66.7 (15)	71.4 (7)
Total	44.1 (245)	61.7 (167)	63.6 (66)	76.7 (30)
				92.6 (27)
				97.6 (82)
				50+ (N)
1990	0-9.9 (N) 19.9	10- (N) 20- (N) 29.9	30- (N) 39.9	40- (N) 49.9
California	36.4 (11)	51.9 (27)	35.3 (17)	91.7 (12)
Colorado	30.8 (39)	50.0 (10)	55.6 (9)	100.0 (1)
Nevada	36.0 (25)	71.4 (14)	100.0 (2)	100.0 (1)
New York	45.5 (99)	95.7 (23)	100.0 (14)	100.0 (1)
Texas	73.5 (34)	42.5 (40)	66.7 (21)	72.7 (11)
Total	45.7 (208)	59.6 (114)	65.1 (63)	84.6 (26)
				80.0 (15)
				93.8 (48)

<sup>1</sup>Information for Arizona and New Mexico not available

TABLE 20: Percent Democrats in State Senates by Percent Hispanic in District

	1992			
	0-9.9	10-19.9	20-29.9	30-39.9
Arizona	18.2 (11)	27.3 (11)	100.0 (1)	66.7 (3)
California	50.0 (2)	46.7 (15)	50.0 (12)	100.0 (2)
Colorado	23.8 (21)	75.0 (8)	50.0 (2)	100.0 (2)
Nevada	33.3 (12)	66.7 (9)	---	---
New Mexico	100.0 (1)	28.6 (7)	22.2 (9)	57.1 (7)
New York	21.6 (37)	64.3 (14)	66.7 (3)	100.0 (2)
Texas	33.3 (9)	30.0 (10)	100.0 (3)	100.0 (2)
Total	25.8 (93)	48.6 (74)	50.0 (30)	77.8 (18)

  

	1990 <sup>1</sup>			
	0-9.9	10-19.9	20-29.9	30-39.9
California	100.0 (2)	53.3 (15)	62.5 (8)	85.7 (7)
Colorado	10.5 (19)	28.6 (7)	83.3 (6)	---
Nevada	40.0 (15)	83.3 (6)	---	---
New York	23.7 (38)	54.5 (11)	85.7 (7)	---
Texas	71.4 (7)	50.0 (8)	85.7 (7)	100.0 (1)
Total	29.6 (81)	53.2 (47)	78.6 (28)	87.5 (8)

<sup>1</sup>Information for Arizona and New Mexico is unavailable

In Texas, on the other hand, there appears to be a difference in the ability of the two minority groups to affect the election of a Democrat. As discussed previously, every district in Texas with a black population over 20 percent elects a Democrat to office (see Tables 16, 17 and 18). This is not the case in districts with Hispanic populations greater than 20 percent; in fact, no category elects only Democrats except for state senate districts over 20 percent Hispanic. The differences between Hispanic and African-American population concentrations appear to be narrowing, at least at the state legislative level, when the 1990 and 1992 tables are compared.

Some possible explanations for the differences between the African-American and the Hispanic population percentages necessary to elect Democrats to office include: (1) the large number of non-citizens in the Hispanic community who are ineligible to vote; and, (2) the lower proportion of Hispanic voters compared with African-American voters who are Democrats. For example, in New York—where a large proportion of the Hispanics are Puerto Rican and thus eligible to vote—the difference between African-Americans and Hispanics in their ability to elect Democrats to office is minimal.

Table 21. Percent Democrats in Congress by Percent Hispanic in District

	1992			
	0-9.9	10-19.9	20-29.9	30-39.9
Arizona	0.0 (1)	50.0 (4)	---	---
California	33.3 (3)	70.0 (20)	16.7 (12)	71.4 (7)
Colorado	33.3 (3)	0.0 (2)	100.0 (1)	---
Nevada	0.0 (1)	100.0 (1)	---	---
New Mexico	---	---	---	50.0 (2)
New York	35.0 (20)	100.0 (6)	100.0 (2)	---
Texas	50.0 (8)	66.7 (12)	100.0 (3)	---
Total	36.1 (36)	68.9 (45)	44.4 (18)	66.7 (9)

  

	1990			
	0-9.9	10-19.9	20-29.9	30-39.9
Arizona	0.0 (1)	0.0 (3)	---	---
California	33.3 (6)	58.8 (17)	33.3 (6)	77.8 (9)
Colorado	0.0 (2)	66.7 (3)	100.0 (1)	---
Nevada	0.0 (1)	100.0 (1)	---	---
New Mexico	---	---	---	33.3 (3)
New York	36.8 (19)	87.5 (8)	100.0 (4)	---
Texas	57.1 (7)	80.0 (5)	62.5 (8)	0.0 (1)
Total	36.1 (36)	64.9 (37)	63.2 (19)	61.5 (13)

CONCLUSION

The 1990s redistricting process led to significant growth in the number of African-American and Hispanic elected officials. These gains were due to the increase in the number of majority minority districts created; they were not the result of additional minority representatives being elected from majority white districts. In fact, in 1992 fewer African-Americans represented majority white minority districts than in 1990. Thus, we have found no evidence to indicate that majority minority districts are no longer necessary to ensure African-Americans and Hispanics fair representation in our legislative bodies.

Our research also indicates a strong relationship between the minority composition of a district and the likelihood of electing a Democrat to office. The majority of districts over 10 percent black or Hispanic elect Democrats. For example, in 1992 Democrats controlled an overwhelming majority of districts containing black populations in excess of 10 percent, but a minority of districts