Party Asymmetry in the 2016 Presidential Nomination Contest

David A. Hopkins

Boston College

david.hopkins@bc.edu

Abstract

The 2016 presidential nomination season was marked by the surprising success of Donald Trump, who defied most predictions to prevail over 16 other candidates in the Republican contest, and Bernie Sanders, who surpassed conventional expectations in his race against Hillary Clinton for the Democratic nomination. Some analysts have concluded from these results that Democratic primary voters have become more ideologically purist while the Republican electorate has abandoned conservatism for non-ideological group-based populism. This paper analyzes 2016 exit poll data to determine the partisan, ideological, and demographic bases of the major candidates' popular support in both parties. It concludes that characterizations of the Democratic race as an ideological referendum are substantially overstated, with the Clinton-Sanders contest instead representing an "insider-versus-outsider" contest marked by significant group-based differences in candidate preference. On the Republican side, the evidence is more mixed, but Trump's sources of support resemble those of a mainstream conservative more than an ideological centrist—including a strong showing among evangelical Christians. The results of 2016 thus suggest that each party retains a unique character visible in the distinctive behavior of its national voting base.

Introduction

For politicians, pundits, and political scientists alike, the 2016 presidential nomination process produced far more than the usual degree of surprise. In the Democratic primaries, former first lady, U.S. senator, and secretary of state Hillary Clinton was widely expected to coast to the nomination over Bernie Sanders, an

independent senator from Vermont who initially seemed to be running a message campaign designed more to gain public exposure for his left-wing ideas than to seriously challenge Clinton for a majority of presidential delegates. Yet Sanders nearly toppled Clinton in the first-in-the-nation Iowa caucus on February 1, routed her by more than 20 percentage points in the New Hampshire primary eight days later, and ultimately won 22 primaries and caucuses nationwide, fueled by more than $225 million in campaign donations (OpenSecrets.org 2016).

But the Democratic nomination race was a paragon of predictability compared to the Republican contest. Donald Trump's June 2015 announcement that he would seek the presidency itself represented an unexpected development that permanently reshaped news media coverage of the election, drawing valuable attention away from rival candidates and allowing Trump to set the terms of public debate. Trump soon established a stable lead in opinion surveys of Republican voters, proceeded to place second in Iowa and first in New Hampshire, and seized a commanding advantage in the race after winning seven state primaries on March 1. Trump's success helped to push ex-Florida governor Jeb Bush, the Republicans' initial leader in financial donations and elite endorsements, out of the race within weeks of the Iowa result. After March 15, when a home-state defeat at the hands of Trump forced Florida senator Marco Rubio to withdraw, Trump faced just two remaining active candidates (from an initial field of 17) in Texas senator Ted Cruz and Ohio governor John Kasich. By early May, Trump had dispatched both Cruz and Kasich as well, leaving himself standing alone as the presumptive Republican nominee.

As the dramatic events of the 2016 primary season unfolded, media analysts and other observers attempted to make sense of what seemed to be a new political world where familiar rules and expectations no longer applied. The surprising popularity of

the Sanders candidacy was widely interpreted as demonstrating the sudden rise of a formerly quiescent leftist sentiment in the Democratic Party that was poised to pull the party in a sharply ideological direction (e.g. Yglesias 2016, Heer 2016). It appeared to many commentators as if a significant proportion of Democratic voters were supporting Sanders in order to register their dissatisfaction with the "Third Way" centrism associated with Bill Clinton, and even the more conventionally liberal approach of the Obama administration, by abandoning Clinton's spouse and Obama's heir apparent in favor of a self-proclaimed socialist who railed against the political power of "millionaires and billionaires" and who called for a political "revolution."

Trump's rise inspired an even more prolific genre of punditry attempting to make sense of his unforeseen popular success. Many conservative intellectuals viewed Trump as an interloper in Republican politics, citing his ideologically heterodox position on international trade, his somewhat perfunctory advocacy of moral traditionalism and small-government values, and his previous support of Democratic candidates (including Hillary Clinton herself). To these critics on the right, several of whom contributed to a special January 2016 anti-Trump edition of the conservative opinion journal *National Review*, Trump's electoral triumphs revealed that many Republican voters were less devoted to principle than they had previously assumed (e.g. Morrissey 2016). Left-leaning commentators pointed to Trump's best-known and most distinctive policy positions—advocacy of strict immigration restrictions and the construction of a wall across the Mexican border—as confirming beyond doubt that mass support for the Republican Party is largely the product of racial and religious prejudice; Trump's candidacy was frequently described as mobilizing "identity politics for white people" (e.g. Walsh 2016).

One common perspective suggested that the Sanders and Trump campaigns were two manifestations of a single underlying phenomenon (e.g. Zeitz 2016, Vanetik 2016).. Both candidates supposedly benefited from a populist rebellion against an increasingly discredited "establishment" associated in the public mind with economic stagnation, governing dysfunction, and corporate co-optation. Neither Sanders nor Trump received significant support from their party's population of elected officials, top fundraisers, or national committee members, and both made opposition to free-trade agreements—one of the few contemporary policy issues on which most Democratic and Republican national leaders take similar positions—central themes of their campaigns.

Previous studies have found that important asymmetries exist between the two parties, including their degree of support for extreme policies (Hacker and Pierson 2005), relative capacity to govern effectively (Mann and Ornstein 2012), and reliance upon ideology as opposed to group identity as a definitional foundation of partisanship (Grossmann and Hopkins 2015, 2016). But the surprising events of the 2016 presidential nomination race raise the question of whether these characterizations remain accurate. Both Trump's strained relationship with many traditional conservative elites and Sanders's success in mobilizing popular support for a "democratic socialist" platform could be construed as demonstrating that ideological orientations play a lesser role in the Republican Party, and a greater role in the Democratic Party, than previously believed. Moreover, evidence that a broad populist or anti-establishment sentiment had indeed become mobilized in the mass public would suggest that contemporary American politics is being transformed by a large-scale popular rebellion that stretches across the partisan aisle—and perhaps even international boundaries as well, given the results of the June 23 "Brexit" referendum in the United Kingdom.

This paper examines these questions by analyzing the bases of electoral support for the major Democratic and Republican presidential candidates in 2016, as measured by media-sponsored exit polls of participating voters. It finds that the common interpretation of the Democratic contest as constituting an ideological conflict between Hillary Clinton and Bernie Sanders is substantially overstated; several group-related characteristics played a more central role in accounting for individual voters' choice of candidate. On the Republican side, Donald Trump's success did not reflect an imposition of the preferences of non-conservative or non-Republican voters on the traditional mass base of the GOP. Rather, Trump appealed to a broad cross-section of groups within the Republican electorate, and the pattern of his popular support suggests that most Republican voters did not perceive him as a partisan or ideological maverick. In addition, the demographic distribution of candidate preferences casts doubt on interpretations of the results that treat Sanders and Trump as equivalent candidates drawing from similarly-situated voters. The conclusion that the parties remain asymmetric in several fundamental ways thus remains intact despite the numerous surprises supplied by the 2016 primary season.

The Democratic Race in 2016

Much of the media coverage of the 2016 Democratic presidential nomination contest framed the electoral competition between Hillary Clinton and Bernie Sanders as fundamentally ideological in nature. This common interpretation accepted Sanders's own characterization of his campaign as representing an idealistic challenge to a Democratic "establishment" (personified by Clinton) that had become compromised by political power, corrupted by wealthy interests, and excessively timid in the face of conservative opposition. Sanders described his political agenda as the product of a

commitment to the abstract principles of democratic socialism, and he made it clear that he viewed the existence of economic inequality in American society as the central injustice of the age, affecting nearly every specific policy domain. While Sanders received little support from among the ranks of Democratic elected officials and top interest group leaders, he appeared to be the preferred candidate of leftist activists and intellectuals who had long criticized the Democratic Party for insufficient devotion to ideological principle. Sanders's unexpected success in the nomination race, especially in the New Hampshire primary and state caucuses elsewhere in the nation, was frequently cited as evidence of a surging purist sentiment in the Democratic Party—his presidential campaign was regularly described as a "movement" by a visibly impressed press corps—that could signal an imminent end to the party's traditional reluctance to openly identify itself with left-wing politics.

Given the amount of media attention directed at the supposed emergence in 2016 of a full-scale internal battle for the philosophical soul of the Democratic Party, it would be natural to assume that the division of citizen preferences between Clinton and Sanders in the Democratic electorate primarily reflected differing ideological positions, separating the "Sandersista" left from the pro-Clinton center. This hypothesis can be tested using data from the nomination entrance and exit polls, which were conducted by a news media consortium in 27 states in 2016. Nearly all of the states omitted from this survey effort either conducted caucuses instead of primaries (entrance polls were conducted in only two caucus states, Iowa and Nevada) or held their primaries in the final few weeks of the primary season when both parties' nomination races had been effectively decided. In total, the states covered by exit polls included more than 90 percent of the total votes cast between February 1 and May 10, 2016. The analysis presented in this paper weights the individual state-level polling results by the number

of votes cast in each state in order to simulate a national sample of participants in the Democratic and Republican primaries.

Table 1 summarizes the relationship between self-identified ideology and candidate choice among Democratic primary voters in 2016. (All tables in this paper display the results for the nation as a whole and for the 12 most populous states in which exit polls were conducted, in order to reveal state-level variation if present.) While Clinton ran somewhat more strongly among moderate and conservative Democrats than among liberals, the difference is much more modest than might be assumed from the conventional interpretation of the salient characteristics separating her supporters from those of Sanders. In fact, liberal Democrats collectively preferred Clinton to Sanders by a margin of 53 percent to 46 percent, while non-liberals opted for Clinton by a moderately wider ratio of 61 percent to 36 percent. The difference in vote share between the two ideological subgroups thus stood at 8 percentage points for Clinton and 10 points for Sanders (since the vast majority of popular votes were cast for either of these two candidates, these figures correspond very closely).

[Table 1 here]

The exit poll surveys allowed respondents to report whether they were "very" or "somewhat" liberal. Nationally, 25 percent of Democratic primary voters classified themselves as "very liberal," compared to 36 percent who chose "somewhat liberal," 32 percent who chose "moderate," and 7 percent who chose "conservative." One might naturally expect that the minority of "very liberal" voters would represent the most fervent pro-Sanders bloc among the Democratic electorate. However, this group split their votes evenly between the candidates, with 50 percent supporting Sanders and 49

percent preferring Clinton. ("Somewhat liberal" voters opted for Clinton by a margin of 56 percent to 43 percent.) While relative ideological liberalism was positively associated with increasing rates of support for Sanders, the strength of the relationship was not particularly strong. Characterizations of Clinton as indifferent or hostile to left-of-center political goals, while rampant among pro-Sanders online activists, did not persuade liberal—or even very liberal—voters in the wider Democratic electorate to oppose her en masse. At the same time, more than one-third of moderate and conservative Democrats reported supporting a self-described socialist for the presidency, suggesting a limited sensitivity to ideological positioning across the breadth of the party.

The Clinton-Sanders race was also frequently presumed to engage voters' economic interests. Sanders adopted the cause of reducing economic inequality as the central theme of his campaign, advocating an ambitious policy agenda that included a single-payer health care system, free tuition at public universities, a $15 national minimum wage, a youth employment initiative, increased infrastructure spending, and opposition to international trade agreements thought to take jobs from working-class Americans. He accused Clinton of excessive coziness with the financial industry while criticizing her for supporting a 2001 bankruptcy reform measure in Congress backed by lenders, suggesting that she did so in exchange for campaign contributions from "big money interests" (Wilhelm 2016). The Clinton campaign's refusal to release the text of paid speeches that Clinton had given at events sponsored by Wall Street firms prior to her candidacy added fuel to these attacks, which received considerable attention in the political press.

Yet little evidence exists to substantiate the expectation that the 2016 nomination race produced a rift between more and less affluent Democrats. In fact, the exit poll data estimates Clinton's share of the vote as an identical 56 percent among respondents with

income of over and under $50,000 per year (see Table 2). In only one state—Massachusetts—did the income gap in candidate support reach at least 10 percentage points; nearly everywhere, Clinton and Sanders received comparable vote shares among lower- and higher-income voters. The oft-posited emergence of an anti-establishment popular revolt led by economically anxious working-class citizens does not seem to be a plausible explanation for Sanders's unexpectedly strong performance in the 2016 nomination race.

[Table 2 here]

The salient factors separating Clinton supporters from Sanders supporters involved forms of group identity rather than ideology or economic interest. Party identification generated a particularly large gap in relative candidate preference. As Table 3 indicates, Clinton prevailed over Sanders among self-identified Democrats by a roughly 2-to-1 ratio, while Sanders outpaced Clinton among political independents by a near-identical margin. Clinton won at least 50 percent of the vote among Democrats in every state surveyed except West Virginia (where she won 49 percent), New Hampshire (48 percent), and Sanders's home state of Vermont (18 percent). Sanders carried the independent vote in every state except Georgia (48 percent), Alabama (44 percent), and Mississippi (34 percent).

[Table 3 here]

Sanders's rousing success among self-identified independents further demonstrates the limitations of citizen ideology in driving Democratic candidate

preferences, as independents are collectively a more moderate group than partisans. The wide differences in candidate choice produced by party identification suggests strongly that the 2016 Democratic race was defined less by a conflict between the left and the center than by a dynamic separating a veteran party regular from an independent insurgent. Disgruntled Sanders supporters who suspected that the nomination process had been unfairly tilted, or even intentionally rigged, against their candidate cited election rules in some states that restricted participation in primaries to registered members of the Democratic Party; Sanders himself described the existence of these closed primaries as "wrong" and something that "has to change" (Keneally and Parks 2016). Traditionally, however, closed primaries are assumed to systematically benefit liberal or conservative ideologues over more centrist rivals. In 2016, the presence of closed primaries indeed represented an impediment to Sanders, but not a decisive one—self-identified Democrats outnumbered independents in every state regardless of whether the state held an open or closed primary, and Sanders simply did not win enough support from partisans to overtake Clinton in the overall delegate count (as Table 3 shows) despite his consistent advantage among independent voters.

The sizable generation gap that emerged in the 2016 Democratic nomination contest further reinforces the picture of an insider-vs.-outsider competition. As Table 4 demonstrates, Sanders received nearly 60 percent of the votes cast by primary participants between the ages of 18 and 44, who collectively constituted 40 percent of the total vote. Voters under the age of 30 were particularly attracted to the Sanders campaign, supporting him over Clinton by margins of 3-to-1 or greater in most states. However, Clinton maintained a strong numerical advantage among older voters, winning 2 of every 3 votes from the over-45 age group. This dramatic cohort difference was replicated in nearly every state; only in Massachusetts did the difference fail to

reach 10 percentage points, and most states produced at last a 20-point or even 30-point gap.

[Table 4 here]

Clinton and Sanders supporters were also divided by racial identity. White Democratic voters split their loyalties almost evenly between the candidates, giving Sanders a slim 2-point advantage (see Table 5). But Clinton carried the non-white vote in every state polled except New Hampshire (Vermont and West Virginia contained insufficient populations of minority voters for exit poll analysts to estimate candidate preferences among this subgroup), winning in many cases by lopsided margins. She received more than 70 percent of the nonwhite vote overall, which itself represented 38 percent of the Democratic electorate.

[Table 5 here]

It is not immediately clear why Sanders faced such particular difficulties in attracting support from black and Latino Democrats. But the narrow focus of the Sanders campaign on ameliorating economic inequality left little room for targeted appeals to other party constituencies with their own separable policy concerns. The Clinton campaign clearly perceived this omission as a political weak spot for Sanders. Clinton herself made a point of declaring in one debate that she was "not a single-issue candidate, and I do not believe that we live in a single-issue country," proceeding to specifically mention racial discrimination as a social problem that could not be resolved merely by regulating Wall Street firms or enacting campaign finance reform. Sanders

compounded this vulnerability by frequently responding to questions about race with answers that equated minority group membership with economic disadvantage; asked by a debate panelist about his personal racial blind spots, for example, Sanders replied that "when you're white, you don't know what it's like to be living in a ghetto, [and] you don't know what it's like to be poor."

The Sanders campaign lacked Clinton's public support among prominent African-American and Latino politicians (including explicit endorsements from national leaders like John Lewis, Cory Booker and Dolores Huerta as well as implicit backing from Barack Obama, whom Clinton had served as secretary of state and who had previously been the subject of criticism from Sanders). It is also possible that Sanders's insistently purist persona fit awkwardly with the historically pragmatic style of minority politics in the United States. As Jonathan Chait of *New York* magazine noted, the "conception of voting as an act of performative virtue has largely confined itself to white left-wing politics, because it is at odds with the political tradition of a community that has always viewed political compromise as a practical necessity" (Chait 2016). Charles Blow of the *New York Times* explained that "black folks are trying to keep their feet planted in reality and choose from among politicians who have historically promised much and delivered little. . . . Sanders's proposals, as good as they sound, can also sound too good to be true" (Blow 2016).

One other key form of social identity, gender, was also activated by the contest between Clinton and Sanders. Recognizing that a majority of the ballots in the Democratic race would be cast by women (58 percent, according to the exit poll results), the Clinton campaign regularly reminded voters of the opportunity that it presented them to shatter the presidential glass ceiling by nominating their candidate for the office. Clinton also placed particular emphasis in her public speeches and paid

advertisements on women's rights issues such as legalized abortion, equal pay requirements, affordable childcare, and anti-discrimination measures. As Table 6 demonstrates, a consistent gender gap emerged in the Democratic electorate, with Clinton running 11 points better among women than among men nationwide.

[Table 6 here]

In summary, the competition between Clinton and Sanders divided voters much more by demography and partisanship than by ideology, despite assumptions to the contrary by many political analysts. Sanders succeeded well beyond expectations in galvanizing popular support for his outsider candidacy among young voters and political independents. But he could not cut sufficiently into Clinton's superior popularity among self-identified Democrats, older voters, racial minorities, and women—perhaps reflecting a campaign message that took insufficient account of the full mosaic of the party's various distinct group constituencies. Any future Democratic presidential candidate who attempts to build on Sanders's base of support will need to address this limitation in order to successfully capture the party's nomination.

The Republican Race in 2016

Just as Democratic primary campaigns are habitually dominated by dueling group appeals, Republican nomination races usually involve disputes over ideological credentials. Republican candidates commonly seek to substantively and rhetorically establish themselves as conservatives in good standing while simultaneously questioning their opponents' devotion to party principles. Candidates who fail in their first attempt to gain the party's nomination maneuver to redefine themselves as more

loyally conservative in preparation for repeat bids in future years, as George H. W. Bush, Bob Dole, John McCain, and Mitt Romney all successfully did in recent decades.

But Donald Trump's 2016 campaign departed from the standard Republican strategic playbook in several noteworthy respects. Compared to most other Republican candidates, Trump talked little about limited government or the Constitution. He departed from conservative doctrine on the issue of international trade and dismissed the Iraq War as a mistake. He promised to protect middle-class entitlement programs from budget cuts and made critical comments about Wall Street interests and corporate executives who moved factories and jobs overseas.

At the same time, it is possible to overstate Trump's ideological apostasy. Trump identified himself as a conservative and praised the presidency of Ronald Reagan. He courted the support of evangelical leaders such as James Dobson and Jerry Falwell Jr. and promised that he would appoint conservative judges to the federal bench if elected president. His criticisms of national Republican leaders for being weak-willed and ineffectual in the age of Obama echoed the themes of the purist Tea Party movement. He proposed a large federal tax cut and complained about excessive government regulations. And, perhaps most importantly, he staked out the most aggressive positions in the Republican presidential field on the subjects of immigration and Islamic terrorism—two issues that increasingly appear to motivate Republican voters. Rather than adopt a signature theme of small-government libertarianism or religiously-infused cultural traditionalism, as previous Republican candidates have done, Trump built his personal appeal around a vigorous nationalism that invoked collective social nostalgia for a bygone historical era, promising to "make America great again."

Critics, especially on the intellectual right, frequently claim that Trump is not a conservative—raising the questions of how he managed to secure the presidential

nomination of a Republican Party that traditionally rewards candidates for convincing voters of their superior conservative credentials. As Trump secured a lead in the early stages of the 2016 nomination race, anti-Trump conservatives like Ross Douthat of the *New York Times* argued that he did not represent a majority of party supporters but merely benefited from the fact that a more ideologically principled non-Trump vote was divided among a large field of opposing candidates (Douthat 2016). Once the race narrowed to two or three contenders, they argued, Trump would reach a natural ceiling of popular support that would leave him vulnerable to defeat by a consolidated "true conservative" opposition.

In practice, however, this consolidation never occurred; Trump's vote share increased over the course of the campaign season as his number of opponents declined and his campaign gained momentum. Had the Republican electorate abandoned its commitment to conservatism? Or, alternatively, were Republican voters more likely that Republican intellectuals to accept Trump as a conservative in good standing?

Table 7 presents the relative standing of Trump and his three main rivals—Texas senator Ted Cruz, Ohio governor John Kasich, and Florida senator Marco Rubio— among both conservative and non-conservative Republican primary voters, as measured by exit polls. (Because Rubio dropped out of the race on March 15, he is omitted from states that held subsequent primaries; the total figures for Rubio in the top row are based on pre-March 15 states only.) Not only did Trump hold his own among self-identified conservatives (who collectively constituted 76 percent of all Republican voters), winning 41 percent among this group to 31 percent for Cruz, 16 percent for Rubio, and 11 percent for Kasich, but he performed just as well among conservatives as among liberal and moderate Republicans.

[Table 7 here]

Trump's consistent level of support across ideological categories contrasts dramatically with his two main rivals. Cruz, who campaigned as a conservative purist motivated by unmatched devotion to individual liberty, Christian morality, and the American Constitution, ran much more strongly among conservatives than among moderates. Kasich, who presented himself as a good-humored, problem-solving pragmatist, attracted substantial support among moderates but failed to win over conservatives. Both candidates produced numerical differences across ideological categories that nearly doubled those generated by the Clinton-Sanders contest on the Democratic side. Rubio drew about equally from conservatives and non-conservatives, though he performed a bit better among the latter group.

Many conservative elites viewed the 2016 Republican race as pitting the maverick Trump against a field of conventional conservatives who frustratingly divided the "principled" anti-Trump vote among themselves. But the findings presented in Table 7 are much more consistent with the conclusion that Trump successfully staked out the ideological middle of the party in the eyes of its primary electorate, with Cruz occupying the far-right pole and Kasich (perhaps along with Rubio, though this is less clear) positioned on Trump's left flank. Even the 33 percent of Republican voters who described themselves as "very conservative" only preferred Cruz to Trump by a margin of 41 percent to 37 percent, with Rubio receiving 13 percent and Kasich far behind at 7 percent.

Table 8 presents the relationship between candidate choice and party identification. While Bernie Sanders's insurgent candidacy on the Democratic side in 2016 was fueled largely by independent voters, Trump attracted more support from

Republicans than from self-identified independents (as did Cruz). Consistent with his perceived position as the relative centrist in the race, Kasich proved more popular with independents than with Republican partisans, running better among the former than the latter in 27 of the 28 states surveyed (with his home state of Ohio serving as the lone exception).

[Table 8 here]

The pattern of support received by Trump differed from that of Sanders in another important respect, as demonstrated by Table 9. Sanders's challenge to the "establishment" of his party was strikingly popular among the youngest cohort of voters, producing a massive generation gap in the relative support of the two Democratic candidates. But if the Trump candidacy represents an analogous popular uprising against the entrenched leadership of the Republican Party, it is a conspicuously gray-tinged rebellion. Trump's support among Republican primary voters over the age of 45 exceeded his vote share among the younger electorate by 7 percentage points nationwide; only in Arkansas and New Hampshire did this pattern narrowly fail to hold at the level of individual states. Cruz and Kasich produced little change in relative support across age groups, but Rubio—who consciously presented himself as representing a "new generation of conservatives"—did a bit better among younger Republicans.

[Table 9 here]

Media accounts often portray the Trump nomination as fueled by working-class voters opposed to free-trade policies and resistant to conventional Republican leaders' advocacy of entitlement reform. Table 10 confirms that—unlike Bernie Sanders—Trump did receive proportionately greater support among voters earning less than $50,000 per year than among wealthier citizens. It is possible, however, that this difference is the product of other factors besides variation in economic vulnerability. For example, support for Trump is associated with elevated levels of white identity and racial prejudice (Tesler and Sides 2016), which may be disproportionately concentrated among less affluent Republicans. In any event, the numerical difference is not dramatic, and the role of middle-class and white-collar voters in helping to deliver Trump the nomination deserves acknowledgment as well.

The Republican mass electorate does not contain the same extensive array of discrete social groups as the Democratic coalition, and those groups that can be identified within the GOP are seldom as politically distinctive as their counterparts in the opposite party (Grossmann and Hopkins 2016, chapter 2). One conscious group that is often identified as playing a central role in Republican politics is evangelical or born-again Christians, who supply much of the Republican activist population and hold party candidates to traditional views on issues such as abortion and homosexuality. Evangelicals represent a majority of the Republican electorate in many southern and rural western states, and it is common for at least one candidate in every Republican presidential field—from Pat Robertson to Mike Huckabee to Ted Cruz—to claim to be their political champion in an ongoing battle against the forces of secularism and cultural permissiveness.

One might expect that Donald Trump would be a particularly unattractive candidate to evangelical Christians for a myriad of reasons ranging from his eventful

romantic history and impious demeanor to his previous support for legalized abortion and transparent lack of personal religious practice. Yet as Table 11 reveals, Trump outpolled the conspicuously devout Cruz among evangelical Christians, running only 5 points behind his vote share among all other voters. The patterns of candidate support closely mirror those of Tables 7 and 8, suggesting that evangelicals are best understood as part of the wider conservative Republican base rather than a strongly differentiated interest group with unique political sensibilities.

[Table 11 here]

The evidence presented here suggests that Trump successfully captured the 2016 Republican presidential nomination by appealing to the broad heart of the party electorate rather than by mobilizing a specific ideological, partisan, or demographic faction. Rather than viewing Trump as a political maverick who benefited from a divided field of conventionally conservative opponents, it is arguably more accurate to conclude that he successfully battled candidates like Jeb Bush and Marco Rubio to claim the ideological midpoint of the party and proceeded to defend it against two remaining rivals who could not sufficiently expand their own popular appeal beyond hard-right purists (in the case of Ted Cruz) and moderate independents (in the case of John Kasich). Kasich's 2016 strategy is particularly difficult to defend in retrospect; his career in Congress and as governor of Ohio gave him an opportunity to position himself as a more conventional conservative, but he chose instead to fill a niche role as a genial bipartisan centrist—à la John McCain in 2000 and Jon Huntsman in 2012—that could claim little historical record of success in Republican primary contests.

Yet it is also apparent that Trump's appeal among Republican voters partially reflected his successful priming of white racial resentment that, while often associated with ideological conservatism, is not a definitional component of it. Whites are a less politically monolithic group than non-whites, even within the Republican Party, and many do not consciously perceive their own status as a member of a social group rather than as part of a "regular American" mainstream of whom other groups make demands. But the visible resurgence of anti-black, anti-immigrant, and anti-Muslim sentiment among Republicans during the Obama presidency, and Trump's association with these phenomena dating back to his endorsement of the claim that Obama was not born in the United States, confirms that racial identity plays a significant—and perhaps growing—role in structuring the political attitudes of white Republicans.

Beyond their shared antipathy to trade agreements and lack of enthusiastic support among the elected officials of their party, there is no clear parallel between Trump and Bernie Sanders. As the exit poll results demonstrate, each drew support from a distinct coalition of voters and exposed a unique set of internal partisan fault lines. While it is tempting to proclaim the emergence in 2016 of a large-scale, cross-party populist rebellion against a discredited monolithic establishment, the evidence points instead to the coincidental success of two candidates running without broad support from the elected leadership of their respective parties—only one of whom proved successful in securing a presidential nomination. Rather than converge onto a single symmetrical pattern, each major party continues to evolve along its own distinctive trajectory.

Conclusion

The Democratic Party remains at heart a coalition of social groups, each imposing its own set of policy demands on party leaders and seeking descriptive as well as substantive representation from elective institutions. Democratic candidates traditionally appeal to their partisan base by adopting a pragmatic approach to governing and by emphasizing their commitment to an array of specific policy initiatives intended to address the multitude of interests and problems prioritized by these various constituencies. Devotion to abstract ideology is less commonly claimed than dedication to the pursuit of real-world accomplishments.

Bernie Sanders, who had pointedly declined to join the Democratic Party during his 26-year congressional career prior to seeking the presidency, departed from this familiar approach in 2016. Sanders presented himself as an ideological purist, promoting the virtues of democratic socialism. Like leftists of previous generations, Sanders described financial exploitation by wealthy and corporate interests as the central ill of modern society, and tended to view nearly every specific issue under discussion—from immigration reform to racial discrimination—as a permutation of this "rigged" political system. He dismissed concerns about the feasibility of his policy proposals by arguing that a "political revolution" led by a newly-mobilized American public would compel members of Congress from both parties to acquiesce or else risk facing a popular backlash.

But Sanders, despite running as openly ideological a campaign as any Democratic presidential candidate in memory, failed to win over the majority of Democratic primary voters who identified as liberals—or even the smaller group of "very liberal" Democrats. Out in the electorate at large, Democratic voters took sides in the Clinton-Sanders contest on the basis of partisanship, race, gender, and age more than by ideological preference or economic interest. Confounding the expectation that

independent leaners do not differ substantially from partisans—except for their relative collective policy moderation—the race produced a wide rift between Democrats and independents as well as between younger and older voters, whites and non-whites, and (to a lesser extent) women and men.

Some analysts have responded to Sanders's surprising performance (and particular dominance among young voters) by arguing that he portends a more ideologically purist future for the Democratic Party. But it seems more likely that Sanders owed his electoral success (such as it was) more to his idealistic style and independent persona than to his left-wing positioning. A future Democratic candidate who wishes to model his or her campaign on Sanders's efforts will need to expand this "outsider" appeal to the other key groups within the Democratic party base. Barack Obama's narrow defeat of Clinton in the 2008 Democratic primaries, for example, required him to combine strong support from independents and younger voters with a numerically overwhelming advantage among African-Americans (Fisher 2011).

To be sure, the 2016 Democratic contest confirmed that the party has collectively moved noticeably leftward since the Bill Clinton era of the 1990s. From crime to deficits to social issues, the positions of the Hillary Clinton campaign hewed more closely to contemporary liberal doctrine than those of her husband's administration; she also declined to mimic his strategy of "triangulating" between the left and right wings of American politics. National Democrats in the Obama era have become more dependent on the votes of racial minorities and suburban professionals than the southern whites and working-class Catholics who once served as the popular base of the party—as the Republican opposition has moved far to the right, largely abandoning its own previous constituency among white-collar moderates. Yet the Democratic Party is still not organized around the political goals of an ideological movement, and Clinton—like

previous Democratic candidates—won the party's presidential nomination by assembling a formidable coalition of social group constituencies behind a politically realistic governing approach.

On the other side of the partisan aisle, Donald Trump's march to the Republican nomination has produced a sharply divided reaction among conservative elites that remains intact months after the rest of the candidate field conceded the race. A number of leading conservative public intellectuals such as Bill Kristol, Charles Krauthammer, Ross Douthat, Rich Lowry, and George F. Will have ruled Trump unacceptable on ideological (and, in some cases, other) grounds. Trump also attracted sparse public support from top Republican elected officials during his primary campaign, although his main rivals Ted Cruz and John Kasich fared little better on that score. Even after his nomination, several key conservative politicians remain unwilling to support to Trump—with Cruz a particularly notable holdout—while others have offered merely perfunctory endorsements.

Yet Trump has been accepted, and often embraced, by most of the leading voices of the conservative media empire. Prominent Trump promoters or defenders within this realm include Rush Limbaugh, Sean Hannity, Michael Savage, Laura Ingraham, Ann Coulter, Bill O'Reilly, and Lou Dobbs. Even Fox News Channel host Megyn Kelly, who famously tussled with Trump over questions in a 2015 debate that he judged excessively hostile, reconciled with the candidate in a friendly May 2016 interview.

Rather than label Trump a non-conservative, it is more fitting to view his electoral success in the 2016 presidential primaries as representing the ascendance of talk-show conservatism over opinion-journal conservatism. Trump's public persona was hardly that of a conciliatory moderate, but he demonstrated his conservative credentials not by pledging fealty to the virtues of American constitutional principles

but rather by employing aggressive nationalist rhetoric that emphasized the existential threats to the American homeland supposedly posed by terrorism, crime, and illegal immigration. He attracted broad mass support among self-identified Republicans and conservatives, including evangelical Christians and middle-class voters, demonstrating his acceptability to a party base that is often prone to evaluate politicians through an ideological lens.

Ever since William F. Buckley Jr. wrote in the inaugural 1955 issue of *National Review* that the role of the American conservative movement's flagship magazine was to "stand athwart history, yelling Stop," conservatives have often defined themselves and their beliefs in reference to their perceived enemies on the left. It is impossible to fully comprehend the character of Republican politics over the past three decades without acknowledging the outsized role that Bill Clinton, Hillary Clinton, and Barack Obama have played as villains and foils in the conservative imagination—both at the elite and mass levels. Perhaps it is no accident that the Republican electorate selected out of an initial field of 17 presidential candidates the single most outspoken opponent of Obama, whose attacks were sufficiently fierce that the president himself had seen fit to respond (with mockery) as early as 2011, and to grant him conservative bona fides despite his own imperfect adherence to ideological doctrine. In any event, the simultaneous nomination of Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump for the office of the presidency in 2016 surely confirms that American party politics remains decidedly out of balance.

REFERENCES

Blow, Charles M. 2016. "Stop Bernie-Splaining to Black Voters." *New York Times*, February 10. <http://www.nytimes.com/2016/02/11/opinion/campaign-stops/stop-bernie-splaining-to-black-voters.html>

Chait, Jonathan. 2016. "The Pragmatic Tradition of African-American Voters." *New York*, April 6. <http://nymag.com/daily/intelligencer/2016/04/pragmatic-tradition-of-black-voters.html>.

Douthat, Ross. 2016. "How Donald Trump Loses." *New York Times*, January 7. <http://www.nytimes.com/2016/01/07/opinion/campaign-stops/how-donald-trump-loses.html>

Fisher, Patrick. 2011. "The Gapology of the Obama Vote in the 2008 Democratic Presidential Primaries." *Society* 48(6): 502–509.

Grossmann, Matt, and David A. Hopkins. 2015. "Ideological Republicans and Group Interest Democrats: The Asymmetry of American Party Politics." *Perspectives on Politics* 13(1): 119–139.

_____. 2016. *Asymmetric Politics: Ideological Republicans and Group Interest Democrats*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Hacker, Jacob S., and Paul Pierson. 2005. *Off Center: The Republican Revolution and the Erosion of American Democracy*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Heer, Jeet. 2016. "Bernie Sanders Is the Future of the Democratic Party." *New Republic*, February 9. <https://newrepublic.com/article/129569/bernie-sanders-future-democratic-party>

Keneally, Meghan, and Maryalice Parks. 2016. "Bernie Sanders Condemns Closed Primaries But Facing 4 of Them Next Week." ABC News, April 22. < http://abcnews.go.com/Politics/bernie-sanders-condemns-closed primaries-facing-week/story?id=38597392>

Mann, Thomas E., and Norman J. Ornstein. 2012. *It's Even Worse Than It Looks: How the American Constitutional System Collided with the New Politics of Extremism*. New York: Basic Books.

Morrissey, Edward. 2016. "Trump's Hard Truth for the GOP: Conservatism Doesn't Matter." *Fiscal Times*, May 5. <http://www.thefiscaltimes.com/Columns/2016/05/05/Trump-s-Hard-Truth-GOP-Conservatism-Doesn-t-Matter>

OpenSecrets.org. 2016. "Bernie Sanders, (D): Candidate Summary, 2016 Cycle."
    <https://www.opensecrets.org/pres16/candidate.php?id=N00000528>

Tesler, Michael, and John Sides. 2016. "How Political Science Helps Explain the Rise of
    Trump: The Role of White Identity and Grievances." *Washington Post*, Monkey
    Cage blog, March 3.
    <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/monkeycage/wp/2016/03/03/how
    -political-science-helps-explain-the-rise-of-trump-the-role-of-white-identity-and-
    grievances/>

Vanetik, Yuri. 2016. "It's Not Just Donald Trump and Bernie Sanders—The Whole
    World Is Turning On Its Elites." *Daily Beast*, July 30.
    <http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2016/07/30/it-s-not-just-donald-
    trump-and-bernie-sanders-the-whole-world-is-turning-on-its-elites.html>

Walsh, Joan. 2016. "This Is What Happens When Republican Voters Get What They
    Want." *The Nation*, May 4. <https://www.thenation.com/article/this-is-what-
    happens-when-republican-voters-get-what-they-want/>

Wilhelm, Colin. 2016. "Sanders Taunts Clinton Again on Wall Street Ties." *Politico*,
    April 17. <http://www.politico.com/story/2016/04/sanders-says-clinton-
    made-more-in-one-speech-than-he-made-last-year-222058>.

Yglesias, Matthew. 2016. "Bernie Sanders Is (Still) the Future of the Democratic Party."
    Vox, April 20. <http://www.vox.com/2016/4/20/11466376/bernie-sanders-
    future-democrats>

Zeitz, Josh. 2016. "Why Bernie's Bros Might Go For Trump." *Politico*, May 25.
    <http://www.politico.com/magazine/story/2016/05/why-bernies-bros-might-
    go-for-trump-213915>

TABLE 1
2016 Democratic Presidential Vote by Ideology

	Liberal Clinton	Mod/Con Clinton	Liberal Sanders	Mod/Con Sanders	Diff Clinton	Diff Sndrs
TOTAL	**53**	**61**	**46**	**36**	**-8**	**+10**
Florida	59	70	41	26	-11	+15
Georgia	66	78	33	22	-12	+11
Illinois	48	56	52	43	-8	+9
Indiana	44	54	56	46	-10	+10
Mass.	52	45	47	54	+7	-7
Michigan	46	52	54	43	-6	+11
New York	52	66	48	34	-14	+14
N. Carolina	52	58	47	35	-6	+12
Ohio	51	62	48	36	-11	+12
Penn.	56	53	43	45	+3	-2
Texas	62	73	38	24	-11	+14
Virginia	60	70	40	29	-10	+11

Note for all tables: Figures represent percentages of the total vote in each category received by each candidate. "Total" denotes the composite figure for all 27 states in which exit polls were conducted (Alabama, Arkansas, Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, Nevada, New Hampshire, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia, and Wisconsin). The 12 most populous states in which exit polls were conducted are listed separately for comparative purposes.

Source for all tables: 2016 presidential primary exit poll data (available at http://www.cnn.com/election/primaries/polls and other online sources).

TABLE 2
2016 Democratic Presidential Vote by Income

	Under $50K Clinton	Over $50K Clinton	Under $50K Sanders	Over $50K Sanders	Diff Clinton	Diff Sndrs
TOTAL	**56**	**56**	**42**	**43**	**0**	**-1**
Florida	65	65	34	32	0	+2
Georgia	70	72	29	28	-2	+1
Illinois	56	48	44	51	+8	-7
Indiana	49	46	51	54	+3	-3
Mass.	43	53	56	46	-10	+10
Michigan	48	48	51	49	0	+2
New York	58	57	42	43	+1	-1
N. Carolina	52	51	46	44	+1	+2
Ohio	55	54	43	46	+1	-3
Penn.	54	56	45	43	-2	+2
Texas	66	66	33	32	0	+1
Virginia	60	65	40	35	-5	+5

TABLE 3
2016 Democratic Presidential Vote by Party Identification

	Dem Clinton	Ind Clinton	Dem Sanders	Ind Sanders	Diff Clinton	Diff Sndrs
TOTAL	**64**	**34**	**35**	**64**	**+30**	**-29**
Florida	71	41	28	55	+30	-27
Georgia	77	51	22	48	+26	-26
Illinois	57	30	42	69	+27	-27
Indiana	53	28	47	72	+25	-25
Mass.	60	33	40	66	+27	-26
Michigan	58	28	40	71	+30	-31
New York	62	28	38	72	+34	-34
N. Carolina	65	34	34	58	+31	-24
Ohio	64	33	35	66	+31	-31
Penn.	63	26	38	72	+37	-34
Texas	75	46	25	52	+29	-27
Virginia	71	42	29	58	+29	-29

TABLE 4
2016 Democratic Presidential Vote by Age

	18-44 Clinton	45+ Clinton	18-44 Sanders	45+ Sanders	Diff Clinton	Diff Sndrs
TOTAL	**41**	**67**	**58**	**31**	**-26**	**+27**
Florida	51	71	48	26	-20	+22
Georgia	58	80	42	19	-22	+23
Illinois	30	63	70	36	-33	+34
Indiana	32	60	68	40	-28	+28
Mass.	46	54	54	45	-8	+9
Michigan	32	62	65	37	-30	+28
New York	45	66	55	34	-21	+21
N. Carolina	40	64	59	30	-24	+29
Ohio	34	70	65	29	-36	+36
Penn.	37	66	63	33	-29	+30
Texas	50	78	49	20	-28	+29
Virginia	46	77	53	23	-31	+30

TABLE 5
2016 Democratic Presidential Vote by Race

	White Clinton	Nonwhite Clinton	White Sanders	Nonwhite Sanders	Diff Clinton	Diff Sndrs
TOTAL	**48**	**71**	**50**	**29**	**-23**	**+21**
Florida	53	74	43	25	-21	+18
Georgia	58	81	41	19	-23	+22
Illinois	42	63	57	37	-21	+20
Indiana	41	63	59	37	-22	+22
Mass.	49	59	50	41	-10	+9
Michigan	42	63	56	34	-21	+22
New York	50	68	50	32	-18	+18
N. Carolina	43	74	52	25	-31	+27
Ohio	53	67	47	32	-14	+15
Penn.	51	64	47	36	-13	+11
Texas	57	73	41	25	-16	+16
Virginia	57	76	42	24	-19	+18

TABLE 6
2016 Democratic Presidential Vote by Gender

	Men Clinton	Women Clinton	Men Sanders	Women Sanders	Diff Clinton	Diff Sndrs
TOTAL	**50**	**61**	**49**	**37**	**-11**	**+12**
Florida	57	70	40	28	-13	+12
Georgia	66	76	33	23	-10	+10
Illinois	45	55	53	45	-10	+8
Indiana	43	50	57	50	-7	+7
Mass.	41	57	58	42	-16	+16
Michigan	44	51	55	45	-7	+10
New York	50	63	50	37	-13	+13
N. Carolina	49	59	47	37	-10	+10
Ohio	48	63	51	36	-15	+15
Penn.	49	60	50	39	-11	+11
Texas	61	70	38	28	-9	+10
Virginia	57	70	42	30	-13	+12

TABLE 7
2016 Republican Presidential Vote by Ideology

	Conserv Trump	Mod/Lib Trump	Conserv Cruz	Mod/Lib Cruz	Conserv Kasich	Mod/L Kasich
TOTAL	**41**	**41**	**31**	**14**	**11**	**25**
Florida	48	40	19	12	4	13
Georgia	39	41	26	11	4	11
Illinois	39	39	36	16	14	34
Indiana	51	59	41	23	6	14
Mass.	50	47	13	3	11	31
Michigan	36	39	29	13	20	34
New York	65	47	16	13	19	41
N. Carolina	40	39	42	20	9	27
Ohio	37	31	17	4	42	59
Penn.	56	58	26	11	16	28
Texas	27	32	47	27	3	8
Virginia	38	23	20	8	5	21

	Conserv Rubio	Mod/Lib Rubio	Diff Trump	Diff Cruz	Diff Kasich	Diff Rubio
TOTAL	**16**	**19**	**0**	**+17**	**-14**	**-3**
Florida	27	28	+8	+7	-9	-1
Georgia	23	31	-2	+15	-7	-8
Illinois	9	9	0	+20	-20	0
Indiana	--	--	-8	+18	-8	--
Mass.	20	15	+3	+10	-20	+5
Michigan	11	8	-3	+16	-14	+3
New York	--	--	+18	+3	-22	--
N. Carolina	6	9	+1	+22	-18	-3
Ohio	2	4	+6	+13	-17	-2
Penn.	--	--	-2	+15	-12	--
Texas	17	24	-5	+20	-5	-7
Virginia	29	40	+15	+12	-16	-11

TABLE 8
2016 Republican Presidential Vote by Party Identification

	Rep Trump	Ind Trump	Rep Cruz	Ind Cruz	Rep Kasich	Ind Kasich
TOTAL	**42**	**38**	**29**	**24**	**12**	**18**
Florida	47	43	17	18	5	9
Georgia	39	39	25	20	4	9
Illinois	41	34	34	24	15	28
Indiana	53	54	39	33	7	9
Mass.	51	50	12	8	13	20
Michigan	37	36	28	22	22	27
New York	64	50	14	20	22	30
N. Carolina	42	35	39	36	12	15
Ohio	36	35	14	14	47	44
Penn.	59	50	21	25	18	23
Texas	29	24	46	38	2	9
Virginia	37	29	18	16	6	15

	Rep Rubio	Ind Rubio	Diff Trump	Diff Cruz	Diff Kasich	Diff Rubio
TOTAL	**17**	**16**	**+4**	**+5**	**-6**	**+1**
Florida	28	25	+4	-1	-4	+3
Georgia	26	23	0	+5	-5	+3
Illinois	9	10	+7	+10	-13	-1
Indiana	--	--	-1	+6	-2	--
Mass.	18	17	+1	+4	-7	+1
Michigan	10	9	+1	+6	-5	+1
New York	--	--	+14	-6	-8	--
N. Carolina	6	9	+7	+3	-3	-3
Ohio	3	4	+1	0	+3	-1
Penn.	--	--	+9	-4	-5	--
Texas	18	19	+5	+8	-7	-1
Virginia	32	31	+8	+2	-9	+1

TABLE 9
2016 Republican Presidential Vote by Age

	18-44 Trump	45+ Trump	18-44 Cruz	45+ Cruz	18-44 Kasich	45+ Kasich
TOTAL	**36**	**43**	**28**	**26**	**14**	**15**
Florida	43	47	17	17	6	8
Georgia	35	42	26	22	3	7
Illinois	31	43	29	31	24	18
Indiana	48	57	39	35	11	6
Mass.	43	53	9	10	17	18
Michigan	31	41	29	22	25	23
New York	50	63	21	13	28	24
N. Carolina	34	43	43	35	9	15
Ohio	31	38	14	13	47	47
Penn.	56	58	22	21	20	19
Texas	26	28	41	44	2	5
Virginia	30	36	16	17	8	10

	18-44 Rubio	45+ Rubio	Diff Trump	Diff Cruz	Diff Kasich	Diff Rubio
TOTAL	**20**	**16**	**-7**	**+2**	**-1**	**+4**
Florida	32	26	-4	0	-2	+6
Georgia	26	24	-7	+4	-4	+2
Illinois	11	8	-12	-2	+6	+3
Indiana	--	--	-9	+4	+5	--
Mass.	27	14	-10	-1	-1	+13
Michigan	11	9	-10	+7	+2	+2
New York	--	--	-13	+8	+4	--
N. Carolina	11	5	-11	+8	-6	+6
Ohio	6	2	-7	+1	0	+4
Penn.	--	--	-2	+1	+1	--
Texas	22	17	-2	-3	-3	+5
Virginia	37	29	-6	-1	-2	+8

TABLE 10
2016 Republican Presidential Vote by Income

	Under $50K Trump	Over $50K Trump	Under $50K Cruz	Over $50K Cruz	Under $50K Kasich	$50K+ Kasich
TOTAL	**46**	**39**	**25**	**27**	**12**	**16**
Florida	48	46	16	15	5	8
Georgia	49	35	16	25	3	7
Illinois	46	37	34	29	13	22
Indiana	55	54	35	38	7	8
Mass.	50	49	11	9	10	19
Michigan	42	34	23	25	22	26
New York	52	63	24	11	25	26
N. Carolina	50	36	29	42	10	13
Ohio	41	32	18	12	38	52
Penn.	58	56	24	20	15	23
Texas	39	27	30	47	5	3
Virginia	51	29	25	16	4	12

	Under $50K Rubio	Over $50K Rubio	Diff Trump	Diff Cruz	Diff Kasich	Diff Rubio
TOTAL	**14**	**18**	**+7**	**-2**	**-4**	**-4**
Florida	26	29	+2	+1	-3	-3
Georgia	21	28	+14	-9	-4	-7
Illinois	7	8	+9	+5	-9	-1
Indiana	--	--	+1	-3	-1	--
Mass.	19	18	+1	+2	-9	+1
Michigan	8	11	+8	-2	-4	-3
New York	--	--	-11	+13	-1	--
N. Carolina	7	7	+14	-13	-3	0
Ohio	2	3	+9	+6	-14	-1
Penn.	--	--	+2	+4	-8	--
Texas	13	18	+12	-17	+2	-5
Virginia	13	37	+22	+9	-8	-24

TABLE 11
2016 Republican Presidential Vote by Religious Identity

	Evang Xian Trump	Non EX Trump	Evang Xian Cruz	Non EX Cruz	Evang Xian Kasich	Non E Kasich
TOTAL	**39**	**44**	**34**	**19**	**10**	**20**
Florida	46	48	21	13	6	7
Georgia	39	41	26	17	4	9
Illinois	35	41	37	27	19	21
Indiana	51	57	43	28	5	12
Mass.	49	49	13	9	10	20
Michigan	37	39	32	17	19	30
New York	48	64	22	12	30	24
N. Carolina	40	38	45	23	7	25
Ohio	36	35	20	8	42	52
Penn.	55	59	30	16	13	23
Texas	26	32	51	31	2	6
Virginia	36	31	20	13	6	14

	Evang Xian Rubio	Non EX Rubio	Diff Trump	Diff Cruz	Diff Kasich	Diff Rubio
TOTAL	**15**	**19**	**-5**	**+15**	**-10**	**-5**
Florida	24	29	-2	+8	-1	-5
Georgia	23	28	-2	+9	-5	-5
Illinois	6	9	-6	+10	-2	-3
Indiana	--	--	-6	+15	-7	--
Mass.	19	17	0	+4	-10	+2
Michigan	9	10	-2	+15	-11	-1
New York	--	--	-16	+10	+6	--
N. Carolina	6	9	+2	+22	-18	-3
Ohio	1	4	+1	+12	-10	-3
Penn.	--	--	-4	+14	-10	--
Texas	14	25	-6	+20	-4	-11
Virginia	28	37	+5	+7	-8	-9