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Nationalization in State Legislatures

![Graph showing R-Squared values over years for President Vote State-Level, President Vote District-Level, Presidential Approval CCES, and Legislature Approval CCES. The graph illustrates trends from 1990 to 2020.](image)
Nationalization of Governor Elections

Fig. 3. Spatial models of Nationalization in Presidential, Senatorial & Gubernatorial Elections, 1872–2020.
### Party Performance in Michigan Midterm Elections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>President</th>
<th>Gubernatorial Elections</th>
<th>Legislative Gains</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Winner</td>
<td>Margin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 Obama</td>
<td>Snyder</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 Obama</td>
<td>Snyder</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006 W. Bush</td>
<td>Granholm</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002 W. Bush</td>
<td>Granholm</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998 Clinton</td>
<td>Engler</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994 Clinton</td>
<td>Engler</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990 H. W. Bush</td>
<td>Engler</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986 Reagan</td>
<td>Blanchard</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982 Reagan</td>
<td>Blanchard</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978 Carter</td>
<td>Milliken</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974 Ford</td>
<td>Milliken</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970 Nixon</td>
<td>Milliken</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966 Johnson</td>
<td>Romney</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962 Kennedy</td>
<td>Romney</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958 Eisenhower</td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954 Eisenhower</td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950 Truman</td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946 Truman</td>
<td>Sigler</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942 Roosevelt</td>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938 Roosevelt</td>
<td>Fitzgerald</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934 Roosevelt</td>
<td>Fitzgerald</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Party Out of Presidency Does Better**
## 2022 Michigan Among Most Competitive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>R-held</th>
<th>D-held</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leans R</td>
<td>2 (MI-HOUSE, MN-SEN)</td>
<td>1 (AK-HOUSE)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toss-up</td>
<td>1 (MI-SEN)</td>
<td>3 (ME-HOUSE, ME-SEN, MN-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HOUSE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leans D</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (CO-SEN, NV-SEN, OR-SEN)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### LEAN D
- ME-Mills
- NM-Lujan Grisham
- PA-Open

### TOSS UP
- KS-Kelly
- MI-Whitmer
- NV-Sisolak
- WI-Evers

### LEAN D
- MD-Open
- AZ-Open
- GA-Kemp
Michigan Redistricting

The partisan breakdown of Michigan's new state House map
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The partisan breakdown of Michigan's new state Senate map
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Partisan Fairness

Figure 41. Efficiency Gap given 2018 US Senate Election Results
State Legislative Candidates

Figure 2 – The Candidate Funnel in State Legislatures
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Polarization

Figure 4 – Polarization of the Candidate Pool in State Legislatures Over Time, 1996-2020. Plots the absolute difference between each party’s median incumbent legislator (blue line) and between each party’s median non-incumbent candidate (black line), across all states, by year. Non-incumbent includes both challengers and open-seat candidates.
2018 & 2020: High Turnout

Turnout: Higher in Presidential Elections, Higher Under Trump
But Turnout Doesn’t Change Partisanship
Presidential Shift 2016 to 2020 (but $r = .99$)

Change in win margin 2016-20, scaled by population density

Elliott Morris, The Economist
Hispanics & White Educated Voters Moved

White college-educated voters
Predicted change in margin of victory
2016 +17 Dem 2020 +21 Dem
+4 Dem

Actual change in margin of victory
↑ More Democratic than in 2016

Hispanic voters
Predicted change in margin of victory
2016 +38 Dem 2020 +34 Dem
+4 Rep

Actual change in margin of victory
↓ A lot more Republican than in 2016

Elliott Morris, The Economist
Polling Error

2020 State Polling Error in (Recent) Historical Context
Overestimation of Democratic Vote % Margin in 2004-2020 Presidential Elections across Key States

Data sources: actual results from NYT and Leip Election Atlas, poll averages from various aggregators.
Note: overestimation = (D%_poll - R%_poll) - (D%_actual - R%_actual). Poll averages from Upshot (2020), HuffPost (2012-16), and RCP (2004-08).
More Liberal Laws -> Conservative Backlash

Democrats Gain

Republicans Gain

The Democratic popular vote share decreased by 9 points in the 2010 election, after that Congress passed 13 net liberal laws.
State Politics: America Turned Red, 1992-2017
Democrats Not Regaining Ground in States

Red State Blues, updated