|  |
| --- |
| **Table 3.1 Variants of Electoral College Reform** |
| |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **No.** | **Name** | **Two‐Seat Bonus** | **Unit Rule** | **Number of Inversions** | | **1** | EC | √ | √ | 4 | | **2** | EC without two‐seat bonus |  | √ | 3 | | **3** | State‐unit population proportionality |  | √ | 3 | | **4** | Whole‐number proportionality with two‐seat bonus | √ |  | 2 | | **5** | Whole‐number proportionality without two‐seat bonus |  |  | 3 | | **6** | Fractional proportionality with two‐seat bonus | √ |  | 3 | | **7** | Fractional proportionality without two‐seat bonus |  |  | 1 | | **8** | District rule with two‐seat bonus | √ | √+ | 5\* | | **9** | District rule without two‐seat bonus |  | √+ | 5\* | | **10** | Direct popular vote |  |  | – | |
| Note:  + district-level winner-take-all rule.  \*The number of inversions is five (31.25 percent) for the 16 elections for which we have district-level data. In comparison, in the full set of 38 elections, thre are at most four inversions (10.5 percent). |