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Abstract

Over the last sixty years, voting patterns in the United States have changed dramatically, and this is especially true in the state of Florida. Though there is some literature in the field of political science that outlines the voting and election history of Florida and identifies some trends, this literature is extremely limited and is not comprehensive of the data that is available up to the present day. This study seeks to find Florida’s voting patterns and to explain how they can be understood by both the casual observer and the political scientist. To do so, unique methodology was applied that used the “relative margin” of both a county and a region in a particular election to give the Democratic nominee’s performance context both in the election in question and in history, by comparing the actual margin of victory or defeat of the Democratic nominee to the statewide margin of victory or defeat. This was an illuminating process that ultimately revealed some truths about the election history of Florida: the counties and regions most likely to vote for Democratic nominees in the 1950s and early 1960s are now among the least likely to do so, and the counties and regions most likely to vote for Republican nominees in the 1950s and early 1960s are now considered to be “swing” or “tossup” areas that are regularly and alternatively won by Democratic and Republican nominees. Additionally, the pattern of each region in how it voted in presidential elections was compared to forty seven other states in the country to provide further context as to how the election patterns can be understood in context.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

It was likely in 2000, during the hotly-contested presidential election that saw the fate of the country come down to several thousand contested ballots in Florida, that the country began paying attention to the politics of Florida. Some of this was based in novelty and humor—how ironic that then-Governor George W. Bush’s victory was sealed in a state that his brother, then-Governor Jeb Bush, controlled, and how ironic that the confusing setup of ballots utilized in the Democratic bastions of Broward and Palm Beach Counties closed the door on then-Vice President Al Gore’s presidential ambitions.

But Floridian politics and elections have interested political scientists long before the 2000 debacle; long before Tim Russert, the late former host of Meet the Press, proclaimed that the election came down to, “Florida! Florida! Florida!”; and long before national candidates seeking to advance their political careers came down to Florida to stump for gubernatorial and Senate candidates.

Part of this interest and intrigue comes down to a fundamental question—is Florida a southern state, or not? If it is not a southern state, then what is it? It is the most Southern state in the continental United States in terms of geography, but is regularly excluded from culturally “Southern” states, and is always excluded from culturally “Deep Southern” states by political geographers and demographers. Does this exclusion apply politically, as well?

In answering that critical question, and the broader question of how voting patterns in Florida have changed over the last sixty years, this line of inquiry was pursued. Initially, the line
of inquiry focused on the impact of a Democratic candidate’s hometown on their performance in statewide elections—were candidates hailing from the critical I-4 corridor inherently better Democratic nominees than were candidates from South Florida or the Panhandle? Gubernatorial and state cabinet candidates’ performances from 1994 to 2010 in each individual county were compared to the performance of the most recent Democratic presidential nominee, and the changes were illustrated in colored graphs—for example, the 2006 performance of Jim Davis, the Democratic nominee for Governor, was compared to the 2004 performance of John Kerry, the Democratic nominee for President; if Davis performed better than Kerry in a given county, it would be shaded in a green color, but if he performed worse than Kerry, the county would be shaded in a red color. Though this led to interesting results, it was difficult to account for the changes and to determine how they could be quantitatively measured. How, exactly, were candidates’ hometowns going to be categorized? Jim Davis, the 2006 gubernatorial nominee, and Alex Sink, the 2010 gubernatorial nominee, were both from Hillsborough County, though Davis was from Tampa and Sink from Thonotosassa—would they both be coded as being from the same place?

The author’s would-be thesis committee chairman suggested going back further, to the 1950s, and examining those election results for additional data points and clarification. This suggestion, as it turned out, radically reshaped the line of inquiry in the project. It was assumed that this would be a pointless method of analyzing the impact of a candidate’s hometown on their statewide performance due to the fact that electoral trends in Florida have changed, but
this led to a different question: how exactly have electoral patterns in Florida changed, and how can we better understand them?

Therefore, the focus of the thesis was recalibrated to a much more interesting research question: over the last sixty years, how can we understand the changes and patterns that have been observed in Florida, and what changes have individual counties and regions gone through individually? To address this question, four different types of elections were considered, which amounts to fifty-two different elections over sixty years that were closely and exhaustively examined for the purposes of understanding the voting patterns in Florida. These fifty-two different elections were examined in each of Florida’s sixty-seven counties, which were then grouped into eight different regions that corresponded with geographic, economic, demographic, and political similarities.

Throughout this inquiry, the research question is answered repeatedly, given the context of different regions, different counties, and different climates in individual election years.

In particular, the East Central Region of Florida is paid careful attention, given two different realities: this thesis was published at the University of Central Florida, and the region, which includes the smaller “I-4 corridor,” is generally considered by political analysts to be one of the “swing” regions not just in the state, but in the entire country. As described by Dr. Aubrey Jewett, a member of this thesis committee, in Central Florida: The Politics of Growth and Change, a chapter in Florida’s Politics: Ten Media Markets, One Powerful State, the region has historically had a strong tendency to vote for Republican nominees, and, following decades
of organization by the Republican Party’s institution, became a vulnerability for Democrats, at least at the federal level. At the state level, it remained competitive, especially for Democratic candidates winning by a solid margin statewide. However, explosive population growth, combined with the fact that Florida played an increasingly determinative role in presidential elections, made the East Central Region more and more competitive, though the situation at the legislative level for Democratic nominees has largely worsened (Jewett, 2004, 195-222). Specific regional and county-level trends will be examined more thoroughly and completely in Chapter 4, as will all regional and county-level trends in Florida’s seven other regions, as well.

What is the end result? How do the different regions of Florida stack up compared to other states and regions in the country? All of these questions and more are thoroughly addressed throughout this thesis.
Chapter 2: Election History

Tier I: Presidential Elections

In 1952, the first year of election data collection embodied in this work, the State of Florida gave its electoral votes to Dwight Eisenhower, the Republican nominee for President of the United States. This represented the first time that the state voted for the Republican presidential nominee since 1928, and only the second time after Reconstruction. In 1956, Florida again voted for the Republican nominee, and in 1960, as well. When many Deep South states voted for Republican nominee Barry Goldwater in 1964, however, Florida voted for the Democratic nominee, Lyndon Johnson. In 1968, however, Florida swayed back to the Republican camp, giving the Republican nominee, Richard Nixon, a plurality of the vote in an election that was buoyed by the third-party candidacy of segregationist George Wallace. Florida voted to re-elect Nixon in 1972, and voters’ decision to support Jimmy Carter, the Democratic nominee, in 1976 was the only instance of a Democratic nominee winning Florida until Bill Clinton in 1996. In fact, over the course of twelve presidential elections conducted over the course of the last sixty years, Florida only voted for the Democratic nominee five times, in 1964, 1976, 1996, 2008, and 2012; additionally, in all of those years, the Democratic nominee only won the state by a thin majority or plurality.

What can explain the tendency of Florida voters to behave in such a manner? Part of the answer can be found in understanding the changes that were underway in the entire southern United States; Lublin tracks the change all the way back to 1948, which was the first election in which the Democratic share of the white vote dipped below 75%, and explains that the change
took place because of “[t]he movement of the national Democratic Party in the direction of a more racially liberal platform under the leadership of President Harry Truman” (Lublin, 2004, p. 34). Craig elaborates on this, positing that the combination of a “continued influx of Republican newcomers from other parts of the country,” (Craig, 1998, p. 38) who were “disproportionately old and retired or young and ambitious” (Seagull, 1975, p. 73) mostly settled in “the larger cities and suburban towns of Central and South Florida,” (Craig, 1998, p. 36) with the fact that the Democratic Party “evidenced too much sympathy for the cause of black civil rights,” ultimately allowed Republicans to start winning elections at the presidential level in Florida. This geographically-based voting bloc formed what is referred to by Lamis as the “urban horseshoe,” which ran up the Gulf Coast from Sarasota to Tampa Bay, stretched across to Orlando and then to Melbourne on the Atlantic Coast, and then traveled down to Broward County (Lamis, 1984, p. 180).

Ultimately, Craig argues, despite the fact that Eisenhower’s support for racial integration in the 1950s dampened the nascent support for Republican presidential nominees in traditionally Democratic areas in Florida, Barry Goldwater’s 1964 presidential campaign, which was predicated in part on his opposition to the Civil Rights Act of 1964, attracted large numbers of white voters who had formerly supported Democratic nominees. In 1968, when Richard M. Nixon was elected President, he managed to win Florida despite the fact that former Governor of Alabama George Wallace was on the ballot and managed to inherit the “Black Belt Dixiecrat vote” in the northern regions of the state, which, Craig suggests, represented a “sort of ‘half-way house’ for conservative whites who were disenchanted with their old party but not yet
ready to become full-fledged presidential Republicans” (Craig, 1998, p. 39). However, by 1972, Nixon was able to unify his own 1968 supporters and most of Wallace’s supporters into a single cohesive voting bloc, which remained largely unified for several decades (Craig, 1998, p. 39-40).

Tier II: Gubernatorial Elections

Up until 1966, Florida conducted its gubernatorial elections during presidential election years; however, a change in the state constitution caused Governor W. Haydon Burns to only serve a two year term from 1965 to 1967. In 1952, Daniel McCarty, the Democratic nominee for Governor, was overwhelmingly elected over Harry Swan, the Republican nominee, with nearly 75% of the vote. McCarty passed away in 1953 after his inauguration, and Charley Johns ascended to the office. Johns ran for re-election in a special gubernatorial election in 1954, but was defeated in the Democratic primary by LeRoy Collins, who won the general election handily with 80.43% of the vote. Democratic success continued in 1956, 1960, and 1964, though the Democratic nominees received smaller and smaller majorities—in 1956, incumbent Governor LeRoy Collins received 73.69% of the vote; in 1960, Democratic nominee C. Farris Bryant received 59.85% of the vote; in 1964, Democratic nominee J. Haydon Burns received 57.63% of the vote. In 1966, for the first time since Reconstruction, Florida elected a Republican, Claude Kirk, as Governor by a surprisingly robust 10.27% margin of victory. As it turned out, Kirk would be the last Republican Governor for nearly twenty years, as he was unseated in 1970 by Democratic nominee Reubin Askew, who won 56.88% of the vote. Askew was re-elected in 1974 with 61.20% of the vote, and was succeeded in 1978 by Democratic nominee Bob
Graham, who won 55.59% of the vote. Graham was re-elected in a landslide in 1982, receiving 64.70% of the vote. In 1986, however, Republican nominee Bob Martinez defeated Democratic nominee Steve Pajcic with 54.56% of the vote. Martinez was defeated for re-election in 1990 by Democratic nominee Lawton Chiles, who scored 56.51% of the vote. Though Chiles’s performance in 1994 against future Governor and Republican nominee Jeb Bush was sharply reduced to 50.75% of the vote, he still managed to win re-election. Chiles ended up being the last Democratic nominee to win a gubernatorial election in Florida, as Bush, the Republican nominee, would end up winning his first term in 1998 with 55.27% of the vote and his second term in 2002 with 56.01% of the vote. Then-Lieutenant Governor Buddy MacKay, the 1998 Democratic nominee for Governor, was burdened with a weak campaign that limped out of the gate, harmed in part by the fact that then-United States Senator Bob Graham, a former Governor himself, was bored with the gridlock in the Senate and was considering another campaign for Governor, and unrest in the state’s African-American political establishment (MacKay & Edmonds, 2010, 201-224). In 2006, Republican nominee Charlie Crist won with 52.18% of the vote, and in 2010, Republican nominee Rick Scott won with 48.87% of the vote. He would later win re-election against former Governor Crist, who was the Democratic nominee in 2014, with the slightly-reduced 48.14%.

As it turned out, Republican gains in the 1966 gubernatorial elections in Arkansas and Florida represented the first part of their gains in southern governor’s mansions. They were short-lived, however, as both Republican governors were defeated in 1970 re-election campaigns. Lublin opines that Republican successes in gubernatorial elections from the 1960s
to the 1980s were caused by “flukes and deep divisions among the Democrats,” (Lublin, 2004, p. 42) which can help to explain Kirk’s 1966 victory over the Democratic nominee, Robert King High. Kirk, who won the Republican nomination entirely unopposed, was able to defeat High with relative comfort due to the fact that High, the liberal Mayor of Miami, had defeated conservative J. Haydon Burns in the Democratic primary (Dyckman, 2011, p. 10). The general election, argues Colburn, was essentially “a repeat battle between Democratic voters of North Florida, representing natives, Crackers, and racial conservatives, against those of South Florida, representing migrants from the Northeast, refugees from Cuba, and political moderates and liberals” (Dyckman, 2011, p. 10). Kirk was able to convince the conservative North Florida Democrats who had voted for Burns in the Democratic primary to support him in the general election (Grunwald, 2006, p. 249), and attacked High as an “ultraliberal.” Additionally, High was hurt by the fact that the bruises from the primary had not healed, and Burns refused to endorse him (Dyckman, 2011, p. 11). Ultimately, Colburn’s assessment seems poignant, as Southeast Florida was the only region in the state to support High, which it did only narrowly.

While Kirk was able to take advantage of a split in the Democratic base to win in 1966, Askew took advantage of a split in the Republican base to win in 1970 as a fresh candidate. In 1970, Republicans had the chance to pick up retiring Senator Spessard Holland’s seat and had a strong candidate in Congressman William Cramer, who was personally persuaded by President Nixon to run for the Senate. However, Kirk bucked the Republican Party and instead supported the ultimately doomed candidacy of J. Harold Carswell, a federal judge. Cramer ended up demolishing Carswell in the primary, but he emerged badly bruised and faced a strong
Democratic nominee. Kirk, for his part in the disastrous primary, received a primary challenger in the form of businessman Jack Eckerd, who was closely aligned with Cramer and forced Governor Kirk into a runoff in the primary. After Kirk emerged from a difficult primary, Reubin Askew, the Democratic nominee, ran a strong campaign and won convincingly over Kirk, “sweeping black, Jewish, and working-class white precincts in the cities and carrying every county category except rural south Florida” (Bartley & Graham, 1975, 145-147).

Tier III: Class I and Class III United States Senate Elections

Class I United States Senate Elections

In 1952, incumbent United States Senator Spessard Holland, a Democrat, was re-elected without opposition. He was challenged in 1958 by Leland Hyzer, the Republican nominee, and won in a landslide with 71.23%. In 1964, he was opposed by Claude Kirk, the Republican nominee and the future Governor, and his performance declined to 63.93%. When Holland declined to seek re-election in 1970, he was succeeded by Lawton Chiles, the Democratic nominee, who received 53.86% of the vote against Jim Cramer, the Republican nominee. As mentioned in the previous section, Chiles, along with future Governor Reubin Askew, benefitted from a split in the Republican Party and from his own strength as a candidate. Cramer was “unable to make stick his charges that Chiles was a radical and a busing candidate,” which, combined with Chiles’s own identification as a “progressive conservative” and Spessard Holland’s endorsement, allowed Chiles to win convincingly over Cramer. Indeed, Chiles, just like Askew, performed strongly in every region of the state, except the South Central Region
Chiles performed significantly better in 1976, when he received 62.97% of the vote against Republican nominee John Grady, and in 1982, when he received 61.72% of the vote against Van Poole, the Republican nominee. When Chiles retired in 1988, however, he was succeeded by Connie Mack, the Republican nominee, who defeated Buddy MacKay, the Democratic nominee, with 50.42% of the vote. Mack was re-elected in a landslide in 1994 against Hugh Rodham, the Democratic nominee and Bill Clinton’s brother-in-law, receiving 70.50% of the vote and winning every county in the state.

Mack declined to seek a third term in 2000, and Bill Nelson, the Democratic nominee, defeated Bill McCollum, the Republican nominee, with 51.04% of the vote, winning over McCollum by a solid, albeit narrow, margin of 4.85%, even as the state was hotly contested in that year’s presidential election. Nelson was easily re-elected in 2006 against Katherine Harris, the Republican nominee, receiving 60.30% of the vote. In 2012, though his performance against Republican nominee Connie Mack, the son of his predecessor, dropped, he still won re-election with 55.23% of the vote.

Class III United States Senate Elections

In 1950, George Smathers defeated incumbent United States Senator Claude Pepper in the Democratic primary and advanced to the general election, where he defeated John P. Booth, the Republican nominee, in a landslide, receiving 76.30% of the vote. Smathers was re-elected without opposition in 1956, and in 1962, he was opposed by Emerson Rupert, the Republican nominee, whom he defeated convincingly, receiving 70.03% of the vote. In 1968,
when Smathers declined to seek a fourth term, Congressman Edward Gurney, the Republican nominee, defeated former Governor Leroy Collins, the Democratic nominee, by a relatively wide margin, receiving 55.90% of the vote. Gurney did not seek re-election in 1974, and an unusual three-person race developed in his absence. Richard Stone, the Democratic nominee, defeated Jack Eckerd, the Republican nominee, and John Grady, the American Party nominee, but only with 43.38% of the vote. Stone was then narrowly defeated for re-election in 1980 by Paula Hawkins, the Republican nominee, who received 51.66% of the vote to Stone’s 48.34%. Hawkins, in turn, was defeated for re-election in 1986 when she ran against Governor Bob Graham, the Democratic nominee, who won the general election convincingly with 54.74% of the vote. Opposed by Republican nominee Bill Grant in 1992, Graham won re-election in a landslide with 65.40% of the vote, and then won his final term in office in 1998, when he defeated Republican nominee Charlie Crist with 62.47% of the vote. Graham declined to seek re-election in 2004, and a contentious election to replace him occurred, with Mel Martinez, the Republican nominee, narrowly defeating Betty Castor, the Democratic nominee, with a plurality of 49.43% of the vote. Martinez declined to seek re-election in 2010, and resigned from the Senate in 2009. His replacement in the Senate, George LeMieux, also declined to seek re-election. After dropping out of the Republican primary, incumbent Governor Charlie Crist ran as an independent candidate, and, along with Democratic nominee Kendrick Meek, was defeated by Republican nominee Marco Rubio, who won 48.89% of the vote to Crist’s 29.71% and Meek’s 20.20%.
The first Republican success in the United States Senate from the Class III seat in 1968 can be attributed to factors similar to the Republican success in the 1966 gubernatorial election—a strongly conservative Republican candidate, in this case, Congressman Edward Gurney, was able to fuse the “economically conservative and Republican-oriented affluent whites with the socially conservative and Wallace-inclined rural and lower-status whites” to win a majority against former Governor LeRoy Collins, who, in the Democratic primary, fared quite poorly among North Floridians and rural Floridians. Gurney was able to exploit Collins’s weaknesses with his Democratic base, which, combined with Gurney’s nascent Republican base, allowed him to emerge victorious with a solid majority of the vote (Bartley & Graham, 1975, 132-133).
Chapter 3: Methodology

Data Collection

In seeking to understand the electoral changes that have taken place in Florida over the last sixty years, it is first important to narrow the focus and identify individual elections from which broader patterns can be derived. In seeking to understand the tendency of individual counties and regions to vote for Democratic candidates for office, it was important to divide elections into three tiers: Tier I (Presidential), Tier II (Senatorial), and Tier III (State-level), due to the fact that individual counties, regions, and voters have different tendencies to vote for Democratic candidates for office depending on whether the election taking place is federal or state-level, as Lublin explains. At Tier I, from 1952 to 2012, twelve different presidential elections occurred, in 1952, 1956, 1960, 1964, 1968, 1972, 1976, 1980, 1984, 1988, 1992, 1996, 2000, 2004, 2008, and 2012, and Florida obviously voted in each of those elections, and each of these elections were at least nominally contested by both political parties. At Tier II, from 1952 to 2012, twenty one different United States Senate elections occurred, with ten occurring in the Class I Senate seat in 1958, 1964, 1970, 1976, 1982, 1988, 1994, 2000, 2006, and 2012, and eleven occurring for the Class III Senate seat in 1950, 1956, 1962, 1968, 1974, 1980, 1986, 1992, 1998, 2004, and 2010. With the exception of 1956, each of these elections were at least nominally contested by both political parties. At Tier III, from 1952 to 2010, twelve different gubernatorial elections occurred, in 1952, 1956, 1960, 1964, 1966, 1970, 1974, 1978, 1982, 1986, 1990, 1994, 1998, 2002, 2006, and 2010, and each of those elections were at least nominally contested by both political parties. Though there are other statewide offices in
Florida that could have been examined, it would not have been possible to do so, due to the fact that a change in the State Constitution of Florida in 1962 consolidated the amount of statewide offices and due to the fact that a number of statewide offices went entirely uncontested by at least one political party, even as recently as 2002.

In evaluating each surveyed election, it was critical to develop a metric by which the county-level and regional results could be understood given the context of nationwide and statewide political and electoral trends; that is to say, given that the United States and Florida have both experienced changes in voting behavior over the last sixty years, understanding the results while controlling for these changes, however possible, became crucial to actually understanding the results. To arrive at this metric, which will be referred to as the “relative margin,” the percentages received by the Democratic nominee in each election, the Republican nominee in the election, and any independent candidates in the election in each of Florida’s sixty-seven counties were calculated; and then the margin of victory (or defeat) for the Democratic candidate was determined by subtracting the Democratic candidate’s percentage from the Republican candidate’s percentage. For instance, in Alachua County in 1952, Adlai Stevenson, the Democratic nominee, received 41.53% of the vote, and Dwight Eisenhower, the Republican nominee, received 58.47% of the vote, which means that the Democratic margin in the county was -16.93%. Then, the overall Democratic margin for the state as a whole was calculated; for example, in 1952, Stevenson received 44.99% and Eisenhower received 55.01%, meaning that the overall Democratic margin was -10.02%. Then the statewide Democratic margin was subtracted from the Democratic margin of each individual county; in Alachua
County, -10.02%, the statewide margin, was subtracted from -16.93%, the county margin, equaling -6.91%, which is the “relative margin” of Alachua County. In this way, the “relative margin” effectively functions as an adapted version of the Cook Partisan Voting Index (PVI), which assesses the relative performance of each congressional district in presidential elections, by assessing the relative performance of each county and region in surveyed elections. Therefore, -6.91% means that Alachua County was 6.91% less Democratic than the state as a whole.

The decision to study the various election results with regard to relative Democratic margins as opposed to absolute Democratic margins, relative Democratic performance, or absolute Democratic performance was made in order to “standardize” the elections as much as possible and to allow for a more thorough examination of county-level trends. To explain why “Democratic performance,” which means the percentage of the vote that the Democratic nominee received in a county, is not the best tool to properly analyze voting trend shifts, consider the following comparison. In the 1956 presidential election, the Democratic nominee, Adlai Stevenson, received 46.46% of the vote. In the 1960 presidential election, the Democratic nominee, John F. Kennedy, received 47.95% of the vote. If the relative Democratic margin of the county is disregarded, the two data points could be examined and it could be concluded that Alachua County became more Democratic from 1956 to 1960. However, these data points are missing critical context—in 1956, Stevenson received 42.73% of the vote statewide, and in 1960, Kennedy received 48.49% of the vote statewide. Stevenson’s performance in Alachua County, where he performed better than his statewide margin, is much more impressive than
Kennedy’s performance, where he performed worse than his statewide margin. Though Kennedy received a greater percentage of the vote in Alachua County in 1960 than Stevenson did in 1956, the county swung from a +7.46% relative margin in 1956 to a -4.10% relative margin in 1960, indicating that the county was more likely to favor the Republican candidate in 1960 compared to the state overall.

Using the relative margin as opposed to the absolute margin is also preferable, but for a different reason altogether—an absolute margin shows great fluctuations over time and is particularly sensitive to landslide elections. Consider, for instance, Palm Beach County. In 1980, the Democratic nominee, Jimmy Carter, received 36.38%, and the Republican nominee, Ronald Reagan, received 56.78%, leading to a -20.40% margin overall. In 1984, the Democratic nominee, Walter Mondale, received 38.33%, and the Republican nominee, Reagan, received 61.66%, leading to a -23.34% margin overall. If only absolute margins were considered, it would appear as though Palm Beach County was more hostile to Democratic candidates in 1984 than it was in 1980. However, looking at the relative margin demonstrates clearly that such an assumption is incorrect. In 1980, Reagan won statewide in Florida with 55.52% of the vote to Carter’s 38.50%, leading to an absolute Democratic margin of -17.02%. While this is not particularly close, it is much closer than in 1984, when Reagan won statewide with 65.32% and Mondale received 34.66%, which results in an absolute Democratic margin of -30.66%. Therefore, the fact that Mondale’s margin in Palm Beach County was 2.94% worse than Carter’s margin is impressive, given that Mondale’s margin at the statewide level was 13.64% worse than Carter’s margin. Therefore, what is actually being seen in Palm Beach County is not a trend
towards a tendency to vote for Republicans, but a trend towards a tendency to vote for Democrats. Indeed, the relative Democratic margin in 1980 in Palm Beach County was -3.38%, and in 1984, it was 7.32%, which is part of a larger trend that started in the 1950s and continued until the mid-2000s. Therein lies the inherent problem in looking at absolute margins—in years where either the Republican nominee or the Democratic nominee is winning the overall state in a landslide, the county-level margins are going to fluctuate greatly. It is for this reason that Cook PVIs are not calculated with raw percentages, but rather with comparative percentages.

**Blocking**

In order to be able to analyze the electoral patterns that developed more effectively and concisely, Florida’s sixty-seven counties were divided into eight regions, as defined by the Florida Economic Development Council. Northwest Region (Bay, Calhoun, Escambia, Franklin, Gadsden, Gulf, Holmes, Jackson, Jefferson, Leon, Liberty, Okaloosa, Santa Rosa, Wakulla, Walton, and Washington Counties), North Central Region (Alachua, Bradford, Columbia, Dixie, Gilchrist, Hamilton, Lafayette, Levy, Madison, Marion, Suwannee, Taylor, and Union Counties), Northeast Region (Baker, Clay, Duval, Flagler, Nassau, Putnam, and St. Johns Counties), East Central Region (Brevard, Lake, Orange, Osceola, Seminole, Sumter, and Volusia Counties), Tampa Bay Region (Citrus, Hernando, Hillsborough, Manatee, Pasco, Pinellas, Polk, and Sarasota Counties), Southeast Region (Broward, Indian River, Martin, Miami-Dade, Monroe, Palm Beach, and St. Lucie Counties), South Central Region (DeSoto, Glades, Hardee, Hendry,
Highlands, and Okeechobee Counties), and Southwest Region (Charlotte, Collier, and Lee Counties).

Though there are countless ways to group Florida’s counties into different regions, the division used by the Florida Economic Development Council ended up serving the needs of the research the best, as the regions closely matched the ten media markets in the state, as covered in *Florida’s Politics: Ten Media Markets, One Powerful State*, and contained counties that displayed similar (but not identical) voting patterns, but, most importantly, made sense visually, politically, and economically.
Chapter 4: East Central Region

At the beginning of the surveyed timeline, the East Central Region of Florida, which is pictured above, had a greater tendency to vote against Democratic nominees than the state as a whole, though, depending on the election, by varying degrees of intensity. In the 1950 Class III United States Senate election, the absolute margin in the region was 51.22% (Figure 14.1), which, combined with the statewide margin of 52.60%, resulted in a relative margin of -1.38% (Figure 14.11). This placed the East Central Region as the second-least-likely region to vote for Democratic nominees in 1950. Continuing, in the 1952 presidential election, the absolute margin was -30.86%, indicating that the Democratic nominee lost the region (Figure 11.1), which, combined with the statewide margin of -10.02%, results in a relative margin of -20.84% (Figure 11.17). Ultimately, in the 1952 presidential election, the East Central Region had the
lowest tendency in the state to vote for the Democratic nominee. In the 1952 gubernatorial
election held the same year, though the East Central Region had an absolute margin of 46.10%
(Figure 12.1), compared to the statewide margin of 49.67%, gave the East Central Region a
relative margin of -3.57% (Figure 12.18), which was the third-lowest relative margin in the state
for that election.

In the 1956 presidential election, the East Central Region’s absolute margin decreased
to -35.58%, resulting in a relative margin of -21.04%, slightly lower than in 1952, and still the
lowest in the state. Though the statewide margin for the gubernatorial election that year
decreased only a few percentage points from four years earlier, the absolute margin in the East
Central Region collapsed to 28.17%, resulting in a relative margin of -19.21%, the lowest in the
state. In the 1958 Class I United States Senate election two years later, the East Central Region
had an absolute margin of 38.73%, slightly lower than the statewide margin of 42.46%,
resulting in a relative margin of -3.73%.

The East Central Region’s absolute margin in the 1960 presidential election increased to
-28.08% from -35.58% the year before, but the state still remained significantly less likely to
vote for the Democratic nominee, with the relative margin at -25.05%, still the lowest in the
state. In the 1960 gubernatorial election, the East Central Region was the only region in the
state to actually have a negative absolute margin of -4.43%, which, compared to the statewide
margin of 19.69%, resulted in a relative margin of -24.12%, about a five percentage point
decrease from four years earlier. In the 1962 Class III United States Senate election, the region
gave the Democratic nominee a 35.36% absolute margin, but with a statewide margin of
40.07%, this resulted in the relative margin dropping a few points from twelve years earlier to -4.71%.

In 1964, the relative margin in the presidential election increased dramatically from -25.05% four years earlier to -5.07% that year, a nearly 20% increase. The same trend can be observed in that year’s gubernatorial election, with the relative margin increasing from -24.12% four years earlier to -7.04% that year. The Class I United States Senate election saw a smaller increase, but an increase nevertheless, with the relative margin improving from -3.73% six years prior to 1.05%.

The gubernatorial election held in 1966 following a constitutional change, however, saw a sharp change in the relative margin and a reversal from the previous improvement; the relative margin decreased from -7.04% to -18.81%. In the 1968 presidential election, a smaller change was observed, reducing the relative margin from -5.07% to -10.93%. The 1968 Class III United States Senate election saw a much sharper decline, however, going from -4.71% to -21.96%, and in the 1970 Class I United States Senate election, another sharp decline was reported, with the relative margin decreasing from 1.05% to -20.62%. In the 1970 gubernatorial election, a smaller decline, though still significant, occurred, with the relative margin sinking from -18.81% to -24.88%. In the 1972 presidential election, a very small change in the relative margin occurred, decreasing from -10.93% to -11.98%.

By 1974, however, the across-the-board decrease was replaced by an across-the-board increase; in the gubernatorial election, the relative margin increased from -24.88% to -8.35%,
while in the Class III United States Senate election, it increased from -21.96% to -10.57%. In the 1976 Class I United States Senate election, the relative margin dramatically increased from -20.62% to -1.79%. This is also observed in 1976, though less obviously in the presidential election, with the relative margin increased from -11.98% to -7.39%.

In 1978, the trend continued, though it was slowed significantly, with the relative margin increased from -8.35% to -6.41% in the gubernatorial election that year. The same was true in 1980, with the relative margin slightly increasing from -7.39% to -6.89% in the presidential election, and increasing from -10.57% to -0.03% in the Class III United States Senate election.

However, this trend started showing signs of dulling by 1982, when the relative margin in the gubernatorial election dipped slightly from -6.41% to -6.70%, and decreased more significantly in the Class I United States Senate election from -1.79% to -13.55%. This continued into 1984, when, in the presidential election that year, the relative margin decreased from -6.89% to -10.67%. Though there was a slight increase in the relative margin in the 1986 gubernatorial election from -6.70% to -5.10%, there was also a slight decrease in the relative margin in the Class III United States Senate election also held that year, decreasing from -0.03% to -4.70%. In 1988, the relative margin in the presidential election dipped a small amount from -10.67% to -11.71%, though increased in the Class I United States Senate election from -13.55% to -10.86%. In 1990, the relative margin slipped from -5.10% to -8.24% in that year’s gubernatorial election.
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As the 1990s got underway, this trend began to reverse itself; in the 1992 presidential election, the relative margin increased slightly from -11.71% to -7.24%. This continued into 1994, when the relative margins in both the gubernatorial election and the Class I United States Senate election increased slightly from -8.24% to -5.06%, and from -10.86% to -7.85%, respectively. In 1996, the relative margin in the presidential election continued to increase, improving from -7.24% to -6.62%. Despite a slip in the relative margin from -5.06% to -7.75% in the 1998 gubernatorial election, the overall trend remained, helped in part by an increase in the relative margin in the 1998 Class III United States Senate election from -8.34% to -7.16%.

Indeed, the trend continued into 2000, when, in the presidential election, the relative margin increased from -6.62% to -2.80%, and, in the Class I United States Senate election, it increased from -7.85% to -0.25%. It also continued in 2002, when, in that year’s gubernatorial election, the relative margin increased from 7.75% to -6.72%.

By the mid-2000s, the trend halted a bit, but did not reverse itself, as the relative margin in the 2004 presidential election decreased slightly from -2.80% to -3.29% but increased in the Class III United States Senate election from -7.16% to -4.82%. In 2006, the relative margin in the gubernatorial election increased a small amount from -6.72% to -6.00% while decreasing an equally small amount from 0.25% to -1.00%. 2008 saw a slightly larger increase in the relative margin in the presidential election, increasing from -3.29% to 0.60%, and so did 2010, with the relative margin in the gubernatorial election increasing from -6.00% to -2.27% and the relative margin in the Class III United States Senate election increasing from -4.82% to -2.07%. Finally, in the 2012 presidential election, there was a small decrease in the relative margin from 0.60% to
-0.07%, while in the Class I United States Senate election, there was a small increase in the relative margin from -1.00% to 1.70%.

Ultimately, as Figure 10.1 demonstrates clearly, the region started out with a slightly negative relative margin in the early 1950s before plummeting to a pronounced negative relative margin in the late 1950s and early 1960s. By the mid-1960s, however, the relative margin increased dramatically, before collapsing again by the late 1960s and early 1970s. Following a brief increase in the late 1970s and a decrease from the early 1980s to the early 1990s, the region’s relative margin started steadily increasing, albeit with a few small dips in individual elections along the way. Ultimately, by the early 2010s, the region’s relative margin was close to zero, with the presidential and Class I Senate elections’ relative margins slightly above zero and the gubernatorial and Class III Senate elections’ relative margins slightly below zero. Extrapolating to 2014 and beyond, it would be in accordance with the established trend for the relative
margin to continue increasing until it was above zero, and then significantly above zero, for all of the surveyed elections.

To further understand how the East Central Region has behaved electorally, one can look to the performances of individual counties. For example, consider Figure 9.48, which displays the relative margins of the four surveyed elections in Orange County, the largest county in the region. As can be plainly seen, Orange County went from a relative stronghold for Republicans in the state to a county with an increasing tendency to vote for Democratic nominees; the overall trend lines show global increases in the relative margins since the mid-1980s and early 1990s. As Orange County has grown more likely to vote for Democratic nominees, and given that Orange County anchors more of the region’s population than any other county, this has helped the East Central Region weather the steady decline in the relative margins in areas like Sumter County. In Sumter County, as Figure 9.60 shows, the county’s relative margins have sharply declined, first registering around forty percent before rapidly
deteriorating into negative forty percent, mirroring those of a prototypical North Central, Northeastern, or Northwestern Region county. For additional analysis, consider the trends demonstrated in Brevard County (Figure 9.5), Lake County (Figure 9.34), Osceola County (Figure 9.49), Seminole (Figure 9.57), and Volusia County (Figure 9.64).

Another way to understand the East Central Region’s voting patterns is to compare its patterns to those of other states in the country; to that end, the percentage received by the Democratic nominee for President in every presidential election from 1952 to 2012 in the East Central Region was compared to the same percentage of all forty-seven other states that voted in all of those elections as well, and then the two percentages were correlated and a correlation coefficient was derived. The $R^2$, or correlation coefficient, value was the lowest when comparing East Central Florida to the Deep Southern states of Alabama, Georgia, and Mississippi; West Virginia; and the Western and Great Plains states of Montana, South Dakota, Utah, and Wyoming. It was highest, meanwhile, when comparing East Central Florida to the
Mid-Atlantic states of Delaware (Figure 1.7), Maryland (Figure 1.17), and Virginia (Figure 1.43). Indeed, consider the trends found in Figure 17.1, which graphs the electoral trends between Delaware and the East Central Region in chronological order, which demonstrate clearly that, though Delaware has consistently had a greater tendency to vote for Democratic nominees than has the East Central Region, the peaks and dips mirrored each other very similarly over the last sixty years.
starting in the 1950 Class III United States Senate election, the North Central Region displayed a strong tendency to vote for Democratic nominees, as the absolute margin was an astounding 81.53%, and the relative margin was a very high 28.93%. This continued into 1952, when, in the presidential election, the relative margin was 22.42%, and, in the gubernatorial election, the relative margin was 30.17%.

In 1956, the relative margin sharply deviated in comparing the presidential and gubernatorial elections—in the presidential election, it increased by a significant amount, from 22.42% to 33.33%, while in the gubernatorial election, it decreased by an even more significant amount, from 30.17% to 10.91%. In the 1958 Class I United States Senate election, meanwhile, the relative margin stood at 34.57%. 
1960 saw another sharp deviation between the presidential and gubernatorial elections—while the relative margin in the presidential election declined by a large amount from 33.33% to 17.52%, the relative margin in the gubernatorial election massively increased from 10.91% to 46.39%. In the 1962 Class III United States Senate election, the relative margin slightly increased from 28.93% to 32.16%.

The 1964 elections saw massive decreases in the relative margins, with the relative margin in the presidential election crashing from 17.52% to -4.23%, the relative margin in the gubernatorial election collapsing from 46.39% to 10.10%, and the relative margin in the Class I United States Senate election decreasing significantly from 34.57% to 17.50%. These continued into 1966 with the gubernatorial election, as the relative margin decreased from 10.10% to 1.90%.

In 1968, the relative margin in the presidential election rebounded, increasing from -4.23% to 11.12%. Simultaneously, however, the relative margin in the Class III United States Senate election, the relative margin decreased from 32.16% six years earlier to -8.32%. In 1970, another slight rebound occurred, with the relative margin increasing to 7.91% from 1.90%, and to 29.39% from 17.50% in the Class I United States Senate election.

The relative margin decreased from 11.12% to 3.01% in the 1972 presidential election, and from 7.91% to -4.33% in the 1974 gubernatorial election. However, owing to the already-established precedence for erratic electoral decision-making, the relative margin in the 1974 Class III United States Senate election massively increased from -8.32% to 14.33%.
In the 1976 presidential election, the relative margin increased from 3.01% to 18.47% in the North Central Region, while decreasing from 29.39% to 15.99% in the Class I United States Senate election. Following the 1978 gubernatorial election, it increased from -4.33% to 7.37%. Meanwhile, in 1980, the relative margin increased slightly in the presidential election from 18.47% to 19.83%, while increasing more significantly from 14.33% to 22.51% in the Class III United States Senate election. The relative margin increased from 7.37% to 16.66% in the 1982 gubernatorial election, and decreased only very slightly from 15.99% to 15.80% in the 1982 Class I United States Senate election.

From 1980 to 1984, the relative margin decreased from 19.83% to 4.82% in the presidential election, reflecting the first instance of the four elections beginning to move in tandem; in 1986, the gubernatorial election relative margin decreased significantly from 16.66% to 0.31%, while the Class III United States Senate relative margin decreased from 22.51% in 1980 to 9.16%. The presidential election relative margin decreased from 4.82% to 1.52% in 1988, while the Class I United States Senate relative margin, however, bucked the trend, actually increasing from 15.80% in 1982 to 20.00%. In 1990, a small decrease in the gubernatorial election relative margin occurred, reducing from 0.31% to -0.17%. A slight increase in the presidential election relative margin occurred in 1992, moving from 1.52% to 5.91%, but, given the overall trend present in Figure 10.2, this looks like an exception, not a change in the trend. Indeed, at the same time, the Class III United States Senate election relative margin decreased from 9.16% to 4.18%.
In 1994, the gubernatorial election relative margin decreased slightly from -0.17% to -1.55%, and this was accompanied by a sharp decline in the Class I United States Senate election margin, which massively decreased from 20.00% to -1.11%. 1996 recorded an additional decline in the relative margin, this time in the presidential election, decreasing from 5.91% to -1.90%. In 1998, a slight increase in the gubernatorial election relative margin occurred, inflating to -0.30% from -1.55%, while simultaneously dipping from 4.18% to 1.40% in the Class III United States Senate election. The overall downward trend continued, with the presidential election relative margin reducing to -5.39% from -1.90% in the 2000 presidential election, though the 2000 Class I United States Senate election clocked in a slight increase in the relative margin from -1.11% to 1.48%. The 2002 gubernatorial election saw a more sizable increase in the relative margin, growing to 3.99% from -0.30%.

By 2004, however, the trend was clear—the relative margin in that year’s presidential election decreased from -5.39% to -7.54% and decreased from 1.40% to -0.48% in the Class III United States Senate election that year. It continued into 2006, with a noticeable decrease in the relative margin in the gubernatorial election, which saw a decrease from 3.99% to -2.38%, and the Class I United States Senate election, which saw a decrease from 1.48% to -2.31%. In 2008, the downward trend saw a decrease from -7.54% to -11.32%, a nearly ten percent decrease since 1996. The relative margin in the 2010 gubernatorial election decreased from -2.38% to -4.70%, and from -0.48% to -3.41% in the Class III United States Senate election that year. Finally, in the 2012 presidential election, the relative margin bottomed out, decreasing to -13.43% from -11.32%.
Ultimately, at the beginning of the timeline of surveyed elections, the North Central Region behaved erratically—in some elections, the relative margin would increase dramatically, while in others, it would decrease dramatically. Though all four elections started out in similar places in the 1950s, they quickly deviated soon thereafter. For example, while the gubernatorial and Class III United States Senate elections saw an increase in the relative margin in the early 1960s, the presidential and Class I United States Senate elections saw a collapse in the relative margin. Three out of the four elections showed modest increases in the relative margin in the late 1960s, while the fourth, the Class III United States Senate election, saw a sharp decline. In the early 1970s, the same three saw modest decreases. By the late 1970s, three saw modest increases in the relative margin, while the fourth, the Class I United States Senate election, saw a slight dip. The same three saw significant decreases in the mid-1980s, while the fourth saw a slight blip. However, by the 1990s, all four elections began moving in tandem, save for some small increases and decreases in individual elections, and, following the mid-2000s, all four
registered negative relative margins in an increasingly downward trend for the first time in the surveyed timeline.

In order to further understand the voting trends in the North Central Region, consider a few county-level trends. Bradford County, for example, which is displayed in Figure 9.4 above, shows the relative margin from 1950 to 2012, which closely tracks with Figure 10.2, the graph displaying the relative margin in the entire North Central Region. As can be seen plainly, Bradford County gradually transitioned from a Democratic stronghold to a swing county to a Democratic stronghold again very briefly, and then into a Republican stronghold. This pattern is mostly replicated in every single county in the region, and graphs of the relative margins in Columbia County (Figure 9.12), Dixie County (Figure 9.14), Gilchrist County (Figure 9.20), Hamilton County (Figure 9.23), Lafayette County (Figure 9.33), Levy County (Figure 9.37), Madison County (Figure 9.39), Marion County (Figure 9.41), Suwannee County (Figure 9.61),
Taylor County (Figure 9.62), and Union County (Figure 9.63). However, there is a single exception to this—Alachua County (Figure 9.1).

In Alachua County, which is the only exception to the overall trend in the North Central Region, the county has mostly remained the same in its voting patterns since the early 1950s, though there are a few exceptions to the rule. In all but a few elections, Alachua County has had a relative margin around twenty percent. This stands in stark contrast to the transition of the other counties from Democratic strongholds to Republican strongholds—Alachua County remains secure for Democrats.
To further understand the North Central Region’s voting patterns, they can be compared to voting patterns all throughout the country. Just as was done for the East Central Region, the $R^2$ value for the percentage received by Democratic presidential nominees in the East Central Region and in forty-seven other states in the country in every presidential election from 1952 to 2012 was mapped out, as Figure 15.2 demonstrates. The $R^2$ values are the highest in other southern states, and, among those, they are highest in the Deep South states of Georgia (Figure 2.8), South Carolina (Figure 2.37), and North Carolina (Figure 2.30). As Figure 17.2 illustrates, the percentage of the vote received by Democratic presidential nominees from 1952 to 2012 in the North Central Region and Georgia have always been very close to one another, and they follow nearly identical trends.
At the beginning of the surveyed timeline, the 1950 Class III United States Senate election clearly put the Northeast Region in the hands of the Democratic Party, with an absolute margin of 64.70% and a relative margin of 12.10%. This continued with the 1952 presidential election, which had a relative margin of 13.75%, and the gubernatorial election held that same year, which had a relative margin of 15.74%. As the 1950s continued, the relative margin held relatively steady, as it increased only slightly in the 1956 presidential election, when it was bumped from 13.75% to 14.17%. In the 1956 gubernatorial election, it slightly decreased from 15.74% to 9.70%. The Class I United States Senate election in 1958, however, put the relative margin much higher, at 22.12%.
In 1960, the presidential election relative margin decreased slightly from 14.17% to 13.03%, while in the 1960 gubernatorial election, it increased dramatically from 9.70% to 32.54%. Meanwhile, the relative margin increased slightly in the 1962 Class III United States Senate election from 12.10% to 18.04%. In 1964, the relative margin in all three elections that took place that year decreased significantly—in the presidential election, it was reduced from 13.03% to -5.18%, in the gubernatorial election it was reduced from 32.54% to 16.89%, and in the Class I United States Senate election, it was reduced from 22.12% to 8.69%, all of which represented significant changes. The gubernatorial election in 1966 continued this downward trend, with a decrease from 16.89% to -9.64%.

1968 saw two divergent changes in the relative margin—while it increased significantly in the presidential election from -5.18% to 10.32%, it decreased with near-equal significance from 18.04% to -4.16%. In 1970, more divergence happened, with the gubernatorial election relative margin decreasing from -9.64% to -15.78% and the Class I United States Senate election relative margin increasing slightly from 8.69% to 10.92%. The 1970s continued to produce split results; the presidential election relative margin decreasing from 10.32% to -3.64% in 1972 while, in 1974, the gubernatorial election relative margin increased from -15.78% to -5.66% and the Class III United States Senate election relative margin increased from -4.16% to 3.92%. This continued into the 1976 presidential election, where the relative margin for the Northeast Region increased significantly from -3.64% to 11.69% despite the relative margin in the Class I United States Senate election decreasing from 10.92% to 2.93%. In 1978, the gubernatorial election relative margin decreased to -6.78% from -5.66%. 
The early 1980s marked the transition period between the erratic and divergent trends of the 1950s through the 1970s and the late 1980s. In the 1980 presidential election, the relative margin decreased slightly from 11.69% to 9.78% while increasing slightly in the 1980 Class III United States Senate election from 3.92% to 7.85%. The 1982 gubernatorial election saw a significant increase in the relative margin from -6.78% four years earlier to 16.78%, a change that mirrored the trend in the Class I United States Senate election, which saw the relative margin increase from 2.93% to 11.05%. 1984 saw the relative margin continuing to decline in the presidential election, dropping from 9.78% to 0.89%. In the 1986 gubernatorial election, the relative margin declined as well, dropping from 16.78% to 4.27%, and in the 1986 Class III United States Senate election, the relative margin also dropped, reducing from 7.85% to -0.10%.

By the late 1980s, save for a few exceptions, all four elections demonstrated the same trends—decreases in the relative margins, as shown clearly in Figure 10.3. In the 1988 presidential election, the relative margin decreased from 0.89% to -7.62%. The 1988 Class I United States Senate election saw a much more radical and dramatic decrease in the relative margin, from 11.05% to -12.81%. This was followed in 1990 with another sharp decline in the relative margin in the gubernatorial election, from 4.27% to -20.24%. In 1992, the relative margin in the presidential election declined from -7.62% to -12.57%, and in the Class III United States Senate election from -0.10% to -7.47%. The 1994 gubernatorial election saw a marginal increase in the relative margin from -20.24% to -19.96% as well as a more substantial increase in the Class I United States Senate election from -12.81% to -7.40%.
By the late 1990s, most elections continued to show a noticeable decline in the relative margins. In 1996, the presidential election relative margin declined from -12.57% to -16.34%. In 1998, the gubernatorial election relative margin showed a marginal improvement from -19.96% to -16.10% at the same time that the Class III United States Senate election relative margin decreased from -7.47% to -12.01%. The 2000 presidential election saw the relative margin bottom out at -22.24%, a decrease from -16.34% four years prior. The Class I United States Senate election conducted the same year saw a sharper decline, from -7.40% to -19.19%. In 2002, the gubernatorial election resulted in a slim decrease in the relative margin to -17.56% from -16.10%.

The mid-to-late 2000s saw, in the aggregate, slim increases in most of the relative margins in most elections, as Figure 10.3 demonstrates, and this was true in the 2004 presidential election, which saw a slight increase in the relative margin from -22.24% to -19.98% in the Northeast Region. It was not the case, however, in the Class III United States Senate election held that same year, as the relative margin decreased substantially from -12.01% to -18.18%. Nor was it true in the 2006 gubernatorial election, which saw a small decrease from -17.56% to -19.05%, or the 2006 Class I United States Senate election, which saw a smaller decrease from -19.19% to -19.79%. The 2008 presidential election, however, saw a slight reduction in the relative margin from -19.98% to -17.61%; the 2010 gubernatorial election and the 2010 Class III United States Senate election, which saw an increase from -19.05% to -16.22% and from -18.18% to -9.01%, respectively. Finally, the 2012 presidential election saw a slight decrease in the relative margin from -17.61% to -19.40%.
Ultimately, the Northeast Region saw its relative margins start at about the same place in the 1950s, but during the 1960s and 1970s, they saw a great amount of divergence. While the presidential and Class III United States Senate elections saw sharp drops in the late 1960s and early 1970s, the gubernatorial and Class I United States Senate elections saw slight upticks. Most of the elections showed modest increases in the relative margin in the Northeast Region in the late 1970s and early 1980s, and virtually all saw dramatic decreases in the relative margin in the late 1980s and early 1990s. From the mid-1990s to the present, however, though the overall trend has been decreasing, there has been a fair amount of positive movement since the mid-2000s.
As was the case in the North Central Region, most of the county-level graphs of relative margins in the Northeast Region show almost exactly what the graph of the regional relative margin (Figure 10.3) does. Consider Figure 9.2, which shows how Baker County moved from a Democratic stronghold in the 1950s and 1960s to a competitive county in the 1970s, then to a Democratic stronghold in the 1980s briefly, and then to a Republican stronghold by the 2000s. Almost every single county-level relative margin graph shows this same trend, except for one: Duval County.
In Duval County, the initial trend is the same—Duval moves from a Democratic stronghold to a competitive county to a Democratic stronghold to a relative Republican stronghold, but, unlike the other counties, the relative margin in the county starts to significantly recover in the mid-2000s, indicating that the Democratic performance in the county is starting to rebound.

Figure 9.15 Duval County Relative Margin of Surveyed Elections, 1950-2012

Figure 17.3 Comparison of Electoral Trends in the Northeast Region and Georgia in Presidential Elections, 1952-2012
For a further analysis of the voting trends in the region, we can look to the map of the $R^2$ values for the percentage received by Democratic presidential nominees in the East Central Region and in forty-seven other states in the country in every presidential election from 1952 to 2012. As Figure 15.3 illustrates plainly, the strongest correlations occurred in the South, particularly in the Deep Southern states of Georgia (Figure 3.8), North Carolina (Figure 3.30), and South Carolina (Figure 3.37). In Figure 17.3, it can be observed that the voting trends of the Northeast Region and Georgia are remarkably similar, though not as similar as the trends of the North Central Region and Georgia.
Chapter 7: Northwest Region

At the start of the timeline, the Northwest Region was the most likely of Florida’s eight regions to vote for Democratic nominees; in the 1950 Class III United States Senate election, the absolute margin in the region was an astoundingly high 84.36%, which, combined with the statewide margin of 52.60%, put the relative margin at 31.76%. This remained true in the 1952 presidential and gubernatorial elections as well, as the relative margin in the presidential election was 41.72%, the highest in the state, and the relative margin in the gubernatorial election was 35.31%, again, the highest in the state.
By 1956, the relative margin increased slightly in the presidential margin, improving from 41.72% to 42.73%, while dropping in the gubernatorial election, decreasing from 35.31% to 30.85%. In the 1958 Class I United States Senate election, the relative margin debuted at 41.93%, the highest in the state.

In 1960, two different changes in the relative margin occurred—in the presidential election, it decreased a sizable amount from 42.73% to 28.51%, while in the gubernatorial election, the relative margin massively increased from 30.85% to 52.74%. While these trends are inherently at odds with each other, the change in the gubernatorial election relative margin mirrors what occurred in the North Central, Northeast, and South Central Regions of the state in the 1960 gubernatorial election, with the relative margin increasing substantially in all four regions.

The relative margin decreased slightly in the Class III United States Senate election in 1962, reducing from 31.76% twelve years prior to 24.21%. This was followed with a collapse in the relative margins of 1964. In the presidential election, the relative margin decreased massively from 28.51% to -19.23%; in the gubernatorial election, the relative margin dropped almost as much, from 52.74% to 11.05%; and in the Class I United States Senate election, a similar change was noticed, with the relative margin cratering at 7.62% from 41.93% six years prior. The drop continued into 1966 with another significant decrease in the relative margin, which, this time, dropped from 11.05% to 0.99%, barely remaining in positive territory.

In three of the four surveyed elections, ephemeral but significant bounces were recorded in the relative margins. In the 1968 presidential election, the relative margin increased
from -19.23% to 10.84%, while in 1970, the relative margin in the gubernatorial election increased 0.99% to 33.60% and the relative margin in the Class I United States Senate election increased from 7.62% to 26.04%. However, the Class III United States Senate election bucked the overall trend, with its relative margin in 1968 decreasing from 24.21% to -14.65%.

At the 1970s got underway, however, these same three elections saw the increase in their relative margins decrease substantially, while the Class III United States Senate election displayed yet another counterintuitive trend. In the 1972 presidential election, the relative margin decreased from 10.84% in 1968 to -12.92%. The relative margin in the 1974 gubernatorial election collapsed from 33.60% to -16.08%. Meanwhile, the relative margin in the 1974 Class III United States Senate election substantially improved from -14.65% to 17.49%.

A series of contradictory instances then occurred—in the 1976 presidential election, the relative margin increased a significant amount from -12.92% to -1.49%, while in the Class I United States Senate election the same year, the relative margin decreased even more substantially from 26.04% to 6.39%. In 1978, the relative margin in the gubernatorial election increased from -16.08% four years prior to 6.18%. Continuing into 1980, the relative margin once again increased in the presidential election, improving from -1.49% to 4.43%, while in the Class III United States Senate election, it decreased slightly from 17.49% to 9.69%. In 1982, the gubernatorial election relative margin increased from 6.18% to 15.72% and also made a slight improvement in the Class I United States Senate election from 6.39% to 10.19%.

As the 1980s then got underway, a noticeable pattern emerged—the relative margin in every single surveyed election decreased substantially, the first time that all four relative
margins were negative. In the 1984 presidential election, it decreased from 4.43% to -8.22%; in 1986, the gubernatorial election relative margin dropped from 15.72% to -2.19% and the Class III United States Senate election relative margin decreased much more significantly from 9.69% to -14.38%. The relative margins of both the presidential election and the Class I United States Senate election in 1988 decreased from -8.22% to -11.16% and from 10.19% to -10.55%, respectively. In 1990, the gubernatorial election relative margin decreased slightly from -2.19% to -6.37%.

In the early 1990s, all four relative margins enjoyed slight bounces, as Figure 10.4 demonstrates. The relative margin in the 1992 presidential election increased slightly from -11.16% to -9.36%, while the Class III United States Senate election showed a similarly slight improvement from -14.38% to -6.70%. In 1994, the relative margin in the gubernatorial election inched up a hardly noticeable amount, from -6.37% to -6.16%, and improved slightly in the Class I United States Senate election from -10.55% six years prior to -8.71%. The presidential election relative margin in 1996 decreased significantly from -9.36% to -18.07%. Continuing into 1998, the relative margin in the gubernatorial election eroded to -13.67% from -6.16%, but remained relatively level in the Class III United States Senate election, increasing ever-so-slightly from -6.70% to -6.58%.

By the 2000s, the negative trends mostly continued, though with a few exceptions. The 2000 presidential election relative margin decreased slightly from -18.07% to -20.05%, and the same occurred in the Class I United States Senate election, declining from -8.71% to -14.49%. The 2002 gubernatorial election proved to be one of the counterexamples, with the relative
margin actually improving a substantial amount from -13.67% to -3.90%. Advancing into 2004, the relative margin in the presidential election mostly remained the same, barely increasing from -20.05% to -19.60%, while decreasing more significantly in the Class III United States Senate election from -6.58% to -16.95%. In 2006, the improvement in the gubernatorial election relative margin was mostly erased, decreasing from -3.90% to -11.41%, while improving slightly in the Class I United States Senate election from -14.49% to -10.87%. The relative margin in the 2008 presidential election decreased from -22.85%, and in 2010, decreased slightly in the gubernatorial election, moving from -11.41% to -11.78%, while increasing a bit from -16.95% to -11.23% in the Class III United States Senate election. Finally, in 2012, the relative margin in the presidential election declined again, from -22.85% to -23.22%, and in the Class I United States Senate election from -10.87% to -20.78%.
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*Figure 10.4 Northwest Region Relative Margin of Surveyed Elections, 1950-2012*
Ultimately, though the Northwest Region started out as a Democratic stronghold in the 1950s, with relative margins of thirty percent or higher, changes in the 1960s drove the relative margin into negative territory. Though rebounds in the early 1970s and 1980s countered the overall negative trend a bit, by the 1980s, it became evident when examining Figure 10.4 that the direction of the relative margins was traveling once again into the negatives—by the mid-1980s, all relative margins were negative for the first time in the surveyed timeline. Slight improvements occurred in individual elections in the 1990s and 2000s, but the relative margins bottomed out well below zero.

Bay County, pictured in Figure 9.3, mostly reflects the trends found in the Northwest Region overall (Figure 10.4), gradually transitioning from a Democratic stronghold to a Republican stronghold. However, unlike the region overall, Bay County did not enjoy a significant spike in Democratic performance in the 1980s; most of the relative margins
continued to steadily decline. By the 1990s, the county had essentially completed its transformation and was fully entrenched as unfriendly territory for Democrats. Most of the other counties in the Northwest Region also followed this trajectory, including Calhoun County (Figure 9.7), Escambia County (Figure 9.16), Franklin County (Figure 9.18), Gulf County (Figure 9.22), Holmes County (Figure 9.29), Okaloosa County (Figure 9.46), Santa Rosa County (Figure 9.55), Wakulla County (Figure 9.65), Walton County (Figure 9.66), and Washington County (Figure 9.67). However, a few counties displayed noticeably different trends, with Gadsden County (Figure 9.19), Jefferson County (Figure 9.32), and Leon County (Figure 9.36) serving as the starkest examples.
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**Figure 9.36 Leon County Relative Margin of Surveyed Elections, 1950-2012**

Leon County, the most populous of the counties with countervailing trends, mostly sees stability in its relative margins over the years; in all but a select few elections, the relative margin is positive, and most years, the relative margin stays gradually changes. For example,
from the 1960s to the 1980s, the relative margin mostly stayed in the 10% to 20% range, and from the 1980s to the present, the relative margin was restricted to the 20% to 30% interval.

Northwest Region and Georgia

![Comparison of Electoral Trends in the Northwest Region and Georgia in Presidential Elections, 1952-2012](image)

For further analysis, one can consult Figure 15.4, which displays the $R^2$ values for the percentage received by Democratic presidential nominees in the East Central Region and in forty-seven other states in the country in every presidential election from 1952 to 2012. In the Northwest Region, as was the case in the North Central and the Northeastern Regions, the $R^2$ values are the highest in the south, particularly in the Deep Southern states of Georgia (Figure 4.8), Alabama (Figure 4.1), South Carolina (Figure 4.37), and North Carolina (Figure 4.30). As Figure 17.4 shows, the Northwest Region and Georgia exhibit very similar voting trends.
The South Central Region of Florida started out in the surveyed timeline with a clear tendency to vote for Democratic nominees—in the 1950 Class III United States Senate election, the 57.92% absolute margin in the region turned into a 5.32% relative margin after the statewide margin was subtracted. In 1952, in both the presidential and gubernatorial elections, the relative margin started out as 17.22% and 15.00%, respectively, comparable to the relative margin in the Northeast Region. It decreased slightly in 1956, with the presidential election relative margin declining from 17.22% to 10.90% and the gubernatorial election relative margin declining from 15.00% to 12.32%. In 1958, meanwhile, in the Class I United States Senate election, the relative margin was relatively higher than in the other recorded elections, clocking in at 27.67%.
As the 1960s started, the relative margins stayed relatively high in all elections, peaking in a few, but ultimately declining in all of them. In the 1960 presidential election, the relative margin collapsed from 10.90% to -0.25%, while in the gubernatorial election held that same year, it actually substantially increased from 12.32% to 27.50%. The Class III United States Senate election in 1962 saw a similar increase, from 5.32% to 21.72%. In 1964, all three elections taking place that year saw noticeable decreases in the relative margin, with it declining from -0.25% to -10.18% in the presidential election, from 27.50% to 4.12% in the gubernatorial election, and from 27.67% to 14.62% in the Class I United States Senate election. The decline continued into 1966, with the gubernatorial election relative margin decreasing from 4.12% to -4.27%. The presidential election relative margin recovered a bit, increasing from -10.18% in 1964 to -2.33% in 1968. However, in the 1968 Class III United States Senate election, the relative margin crashed from 21.72% six years prior to -14.24%.

The global decline mostly continued into the early 1970s, with the Class I United States Senate election relative margin decreasing from 14.62% to 11.87%, though the gubernatorial election relative margin in 1970 decreased from -4.27% to 1.62%. Advancing into 1972, the presidential election relative margin continued to bottom out, dropping to -16.11% from -2.33%. By 1974, the gubernatorial election relative margin declined from 1.62% to -18.81% while the relative margin in the Class III United States Senate election increased slightly from -14.24% to -13.15%. In the late 1970s and early 1980s, the relative margins enjoyed a brief recovery, increasing from -16.11% to 2.52% in the 1976 presidential election, though decreasing to -8.53% from 11.87%. The 1978 gubernatorial election relative margin improved to
-5.29% from -18.81% four years earlier. Continuing into 1980, the relative margin in the presidential election increased a little bit, moving from 2.52% to 4.84%, and the relative margin in the Class III United States Senate election increased more substantially from -13.15% to 1.88%. In 1982, the gubernatorial election relative margin increased from -5.29% to -3.78% as the Class I United States Senate election relative margin improved from -8.53% to 1.65%.

By the mid-1980s, however, the ephemeral bounce in the relative margins had faded, and they began decreasing once again. In 1984, the presidential election relative margin declined from 4.84% to -7.06%, and in 1986, the relative margin in the gubernatorial election decreased from -3.78% to -7.70% as the relative margin in the Class III United States Senate election shrunk from 1.88% to -4.02%. Continuing into 1988, the presidential election relative margin was reduced from -7.06% in 1984 to -9.18% that year, and the Class I United States Senate election saw a similar decline, from 1.65% to -1.41%.

In the early 1990s, most of the elections saw a small bounce in their respective relative margins; the gubernatorial election relative margin in 1990 inaugurated the trend by increasing to -4.74% from -7.70%. In 1992, the relative margin in the presidential election enjoyed a small bump from -9.18% to -5.45%, while in the Class III United States Senate election, the relative margin slipped slightly from -4.02% to -4.54%.

By 1994, the brief increase had been worn away, as the gubernatorial election relative margin decreased from -4.74% to -7.90%, and the Class I United States Senate election relative margin was similarly reduced from -1.41% to -6.75%. This continued into 1996, when the presidential election relative margin shrank from -5.45% to -6.16%, and into 1998, when the
gubernatorial election relative margin also declined to -9.06% from -7.90% and the Class III United States Senate election relative margin decreased to -10.30% from -6.41% six years prior.

The steady decline continued into the 2000s and 2010s, though with a few short-lived increases in the process. In 2000, the presidential election relative margin saw a significant decrease from -6.16% to -15.26% and the Class I United States Senate election relative margin declined to -10.33% from -6.75%. The gubernatorial election relative margin slightly decreased in 2002 from -9.06% to -10.22%, and in 2004, the presidential election relative margin continued to bottom out, reaching -17.96% from -15.26% four years earlier. Additionally, the Class III United States Senate election relative margin declined from -6.41% to -10.30% in 2004.

Advancing into 2006, both the gubernatorial and Class I United States Senate elections saw small increases that would soon fade; in the gubernatorial election, the relative margin increased to -9.74% from -10.22% and in the Senate election, it increased more substantially to -7.47% from -10.33%. The 2008 presidential election, however, saw the global trend realized, as the relative margin decreased to -19.97% from -17.96%. In 2010, the gubernatorial election relative margin saw its short gain four years earlier all but erased, decreasing to -16.45% from -9.74%, as the Class III United States Senate election relative margin decreased only a small amount from -10.30% to -10.72%. Finally, in 2012, the presidential election relative margin reached its lowest point in the recorded timeline, clocking in at -20.91%, from -19.97% four years earlier.
Ultimately, the South Central Region began in the recorded timeline with a strong
tendency to vote for Democratic nominees in the surveyed elections. However, as was the case
in the North Central, Northeast, and Northwest regions, this tendency significantly decreased
during the 1960s and 1970s. Short recoveries in the late 1960s, early 1970s, and early 1980s did
not stem the tide, and the overall trend continued. By the mid-1980s, the pattern was baked in,
and the region voted for Democratic nominees with less and less frequency compared to the
state as a whole. By the 2000s, the South Central Region was significantly less likely than Florida
overall to vote for Democratic nominees, with each of the relative margins essentially
bottoming out.
To further understand the regional trends, one can consider the results seen in individual counties, such as Hardee County in Figure 9.24. The results in Hardee County are prototypical of the results seen in almost all of the counties in the South Central Region—DeSoto County (Figure 9.13), Glades County (Figure 9.21), Hendry County (Figure 9.25), and Okeechobee County (Figure 9.47). The same basic trend in these counties essentially mirrors the trend seen in the regional results, with a strong tendency to vote for the Democratic nominees in the 1950s and 1960s, followed by a significant decline in the 1970s and then a brief but significant bounce in the early 1980s, before retreating into solidly Republican territory by the 2000s.
Highlands County (Figure 9.27), however, presents a vastly different set of values from the other counties and the regional results. Unlike the other counties, Highlands County was never solidly Democratic; it was only marginally likely to vote for Democratic nominees in the 1950s and 1960s, and after then, it would never have a positive relative margin ever again. Despite this, however, it appears as though the graph of Highlands County is remarkably similar to the other counties, but that it was translated down. Consider Figure 9.24, which shows Hardee County: ignoring the values on the y-axis, it appears that the same basic trend lines are evident in Highlands County.
For further analysis, we can consider Figure 15.5, which shows the correlation coefficients of the Democratic presidential nominees’ performance in the South Central Region and in forty seven other states in the country. As was the case with the North Central, Northeast, and Northwest Regions, we can see that the correlation coefficients are the highest in southern states, especially in the Deep Southern states of North Carolina (Figure 5.30), Georgia (Figure 5.8), and South Carolina (Figure 5.37). As Figure 17.5 shows plainly, the trends in the percentage received by the Democratic presidential nominees over the last sixty years in the South Central Region and North Carolina are remarkably similar—though the South Central Region has been consistently less likely to vote for Democratic nominees than North Carolina, the similarity between the lines is unmistakable.
Chapter 9: Southeast Region

At the beginning of the surveyed timeline in the 1950 Class III United States Senate election, the Southeast Region was slightly more likely than the state as a whole to vote for the Democratic nominee, recording a relative margin of 1.93%. In 1952, however, the aforementioned result looked like an anomaly, as the relative margin in the presidential election was at -9.10% and was -9.71% in the gubernatorial election, both of which indicated a greater tendency to vote against Democratic nominees than the state as a whole. By 1956, both relative margins had increased slightly, with the presidential election relative margin
improving from -9.10% to -6.79%, and the gubernatorial election relative margin increasing from -9.71% to -2.71%. In the 1958 Class I United States Senate election, the relative margin started out at -10.43%.

As the 1960s began, the relative margin in the presidential and gubernatorial elections of 1960 moved in different directions, increasing in the presidential election from -6.79% to 5.32% while decreasing in the gubernatorial election from -2.71% to -10.99%. In 1962, the relative margin in the Class III United States Senate election decreased from 1.93% twelve years prior to -3.43%. In 1964, however, all three relative margins in elections taking place that year moved in the same direction; the relative margin increased from 5.32% to 9.24% in the presidential election, increased from -10.99% to -7.98% in the gubernatorial election and from -10.43% to -4.84% in the Class I United States Senate election. The trend continued into 1966 in the gubernatorial election, where the relative margin increased from -7.98% to 10.71%.

Another divergence occurred in 1968, when the presidential election relative margin declined from 9.24% to 3.46% and the Class III United States Senate election relative margin increased from -3.43% to 15.35%.

In 1970, the gubernatorial election relative margin slightly declined from 10.71% to 7.18% while, in the Class I United States Senate election, increased from -4.84% to 1.99%. The relative margin in the presidential election in 1972 also increased, moving from 3.46% to 11.28%. In 1974, both relative margins in elections taking place that year moved in concert, as the gubernatorial election relative margin continued to decline, reaching 5.66% from 7.18% four years prior and the Class III United States Senate election relative margin dipped slightly
from 15.35% to 15.26%. This trend continued into 1976, when the presidential election relative margin slipped from 11.28% to 3.88% and the Class I United States Senate election relative margin dropped to 1.25% from 1.99% six years prior. In 1978, however, the relative margin in the gubernatorial election increased substantially from 5.66% to 17.61%.

Most of the relative margins slipped in the early 1980s, though they recovered soon thereafter. In the 1980 presidential election, the relative margin dropped from 3.88% to -0.10%, and in the Class III United States Senate election that same year, decreased more significantly from 15.26% to -1.51%. In 1982, the pattern mostly continued, with the gubernatorial election relative margin dropping from 17.61% to 3.13%, but the Class I United States Senate election relative margin increased from 1.25% to 7.71%. As it turned out, these would be the lowest relative margins experienced by each of these respective elections, and the relative margins would mostly increase after the early 1980s.

In the 1984 presidential election, the relative margin shot up from -0.10% to 10.48%. This continued into 1986, when the gubernatorial election relative margin increased from 3.13% to 6.96% and the Class III United States Senate election relative margin saw a similar increase from -1.51% to 4.93%. The upward trend of the 1980s closed out in 1988, when the presidential election relative margin slightly increased from 10.48% to 11.92%, and the Class I United States Senate election relative margin remained mostly level, only slightly dropping from 7.71% to 7.39%.

The 1990s would mostly see the same positive trend as the mid-to-late 1980s saw, with the gubernatorial election relative margin in 1990 bouncing from 6.96% four years prior to
9.05%. In 1992, however, a small slip occurred in the presidential election relative margin, as it decreased from 11.92% to 11.53%, but this was partly countered by the fact that the Class III United States Senate election relative margin shot up from 4.93% to 16.23%. Both the gubernatorial and Class I United States Senate election relative margins increased in 1994, moving from 9.05% to 14.52% and from 7.39% to 16.53%, respectively. In 1996, the presidential election relative margin more than recovered from its earlier drop, increasing significantly from 11.53% to 17.12%. The positive trend continued into 1998, when the gubernatorial election relative margin increased from 14.52% to 18.79% and the Class III United States Senate election relative margin shot up to 22.84% from 16.23% six years prior.

By the 2000s, the relative margins for three of the elections mostly stabilized. In the presidential elections, the relative margin increased from 17.12% in 1996 to 19.23% in 2000. It would hover around the twenty percent mark for the rest of the recorded presidential elections, increasing slightly to 20.92% in 2004, dropping slightly to 18.20% in 2008, and then increasing again to 20.74% in 2012. In the gubernatorial elections, meanwhile, it decreased slightly from 18.79% in 1998 to 17.32% in 2002, increasing to 21.74% in 2006, and then dropping to 18.37% in 2010, all while remaining around the twenty percent mark. In the Class I United States Senate election, meanwhile, the relative margin was a little lower, hovering around the fifteen percent mark—it decreased from 16.53% in 1994 to 14.81% in 2000, remained essentially unchanged in 2006 at 14.79%, and then increased slightly to 16.01% in 2012. Finally, the Class III United States Senate election remained the countervailing trend—the
relative margin dropped from 22.84% in 1998 to 15.23% in 2004 and then to 13.52% in 2010. However, the overall trend of the four elections remained intact.
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**Figure 10.6 Southeast Region Relative Margin of Surveyed Elections, 1950-2012**

Ultimately, there are a number of patterns and trends evident in the relative margins and voting behaviors of Southeast Florida, many of which are difficult to decipher in Figure 10.6. All of the relative margins have a pattern that is positive in nature, though a number of gyrations, particularly in the Class III United States Senate election, make this difficult to see. Starting in the 1950s, three out of the four elections showed that the Southeast Region was less likely to vote for Democratic nominees than the state as a whole. Starting in the 1960s, all four elections started to move in a positive direction, though with different levels of intensity, eventually peaking in the 1970s before bottoming out in the late 1970s and early 1980s. From there, save for a few ephemeral dips, the relative margins of all four elections continued to steadily increase. By 2000, with the exception of the Class III United States Senate election, all
of the relative margins started to hover between fifteen and twenty percent, avoiding significant increases or decreases, at the end of the surveyed timeline.

In the Southeast Region, the county-level results are perhaps the most interesting and divergent of any other region in Florida. Here, the county-level results can be sorted into essentially two groups that behave similarly. Group 1 includes Broward County (Figure 9.6), Palm Beach County (Figure 9.50), and St. Lucie County (Figure 9.59); Group 2 includes Indian River County (Figure 9.30) and Martin County (Figure 9.42).
In Broward County (Figure 9.6, seen above), there has been a consistent trend towards voting for Democratic nominees, though it has possibly started to plateau and level out in the 2000s. This roughly tracks with the regional trends, but, unlike the region as a whole, the Southeast Region did not experience a significant drop in Democratic performance in the 1980s.

![Palm Beach County graph](image)

*Figure 9.50 Palm Beach County Relative Margin of Surveyed Elections, 1950-2012*

Palm Beach County (Figure 9.50) essentially tracks the same trends as Broward County, but when Broward County plateaued in the 2000s, Palm Beach County’s tendency to vote for Democratic nominees started to noticeably decrease. Though it remains significantly more likely to vote for Democratic nominees than not, that tendency is slowly decreasing.

Finally, St. Lucie County (Figure 9.59) shows the same basic trend as Broward and Palm Beach, but the consistent increase has only taken place since the 1980s.
In the second group, however, which includes Martin County (Figure 9.42, seen above) and Indian River County (Figure 9.30), there has been a relatively consistent trend towards voting against Democratic nominees. Consider that most of the recorded elections started out with positive relative margins in the 1950s before Martin County collapsed to a Republican stronghold by the 1980s. Though there was a significant increase in the 1990s and early 2000s, by the late 2000s and the start of the 2010s, that increase had been all but erased.

Finally, there are a few counties whose trends do not fit neatly into any group and do not relate to any of the other county-level trends.
In Miami-Dade County (Figure 9.43), for instance, though the county’s relative margin in any election has not been negative since the 1960s, there have been massive gyrations. With the exception of the Class III United States Senate election, which recorded the largest and most inexplicable gyrations, the relative margin was mostly decreasing from the 1970s until the 2000s, when it started to rebound in every recorded election.
Monroe County (Figure 9.44) also displays a trend unlike any other. Its relative margin consistently decreased from the 1950s onward, reaching a low point in the mid-1980s. By the 1990s, it had mostly recovered, but briefly decreased in the late 1990s; as the 2000s rolled around, it appeared as though the relative margin had started to roughly stabilize, though it continued to slightly decrease.

Figure 17.6 Comparison of Electoral Trends in the Southeast Region and Illinois in Presidential Elections, 1952-2012
In Figure 15.6, the correlation coefficients of the relationship between the percentage received by Democratic presidential nominees in the Southeast Region and forty seven other states in the country have been mapped out, and the results are demonstrative—the Southeast Region has virtually nothing in common with the southern states of the country, instead clocking in the highest correlation coefficients in solidly Democratic states like Illinois (Figure 6.10), Maryland (Figure 6.17), California (Figure 6.4), New Jersey (Figure 6.27), and Delaware (Figure 6.7).

As Figure 17.6 shows, the voting trends in presidential elections in the Southeast Region and Illinois closely resemble each other—though the results have not been quite the same since the mid-1960s, the same basic trends and values are evident in both areas.
Chapter 10: Southwest Region

At the beginning of the surveyed timeline, in the 1950 Class III United States Senate election, there was a relative strong tendency to vote for Democratic nominees—the relative margin was 15.73%, the third-highest in the state. However, in 1952, both relative margins were significantly lower. In the presidential election, the relative margin was actually negative, clocking in at -4.98%, while in the gubernatorial election, it was barely positive, registering at 3.62%. By 1956, a divergence had developed, as the relative margin in the presidential election decreased from -4.98% to -9.76% while it slightly increased in the gubernatorial election from 3.62% to 4.77%. In the first surveyed election for the Class I United States Senate seat, the relative margin was similar, at 2.23%.

By the 1960s, a global decline started to occur, with the presidential election relative margin cratering at -24.29% in 1960 from -9.76%. In the gubernatorial election held the same year, the relative margin declined from 4.77% to -0.64%. Advancing into 1962, the relative
margin in the Class III United States Senate election declined significantly from 15.73% to -6.82%. In 1964, though the relative margin in the presidential election improved from -24.29% to -9.35%, the relative margins in the gubernatorial election and the Class I United States Senate election both declined, reducing from -0.64% to -9.50% and from 2.23% to -8.45%, respectively. The gubernatorial election relative margin continued its decline into 1966, dropping from -9.50% to -16.86%. In 1968, both the presidential election and Class III United States Senate election relative margins dropped, from -9.35% to -12.67% and from -6.82% to -8.50%.

As the 1970s got underway, most of the relative margins continued to plummet, with one notable exception: the gubernatorial election, which increased until the mid-1970s. In 1970, the relative margin in the gubernatorial election increased from -16.86% to -8.07%, and then increased slightly in 1974, reaching -7.15%. Every other election saw a significant decline in its relative margin—in the 1970 Class I United States Senate election, for instance, the relative margin dropped slightly from -8.45% to -9.78%. In 1972, the presidential election relative margin dropped from -12.67% to -14.34%, and in 1974, the Class III United States Senate election relative margin collapsed to -23.07% from -8.50% just six years earlier. The presidential and Class I United States Senate election relative margins declined in 1976, from -14.34% to -18.76% and from -9.78% to -20.91%, respectively. By 1978, the gubernatorial election relative margin stopped its steady increase and instead cratered, dropping from -7.15% to -24.87%. The decline continued into the early 1980s, with the presidential election relative margin dropping from -18.76% to -20.34% and the Class III United States Senate election
relative margin inching downward, from -23.07% to -24.03% in 1980. In 1982, the gubernatorial election relative margin and the Class I United States Senate relative margin both reached their lowest recorded points, respectively at -33.37% and -32.20%.

At the 1980s continued, most of the relative margins saw noticeable gains that mostly lasted until the early 1990s, at which point they started dropping once again. In 1984, the presidential election relative margin slightly recovered from -20.34% to -18.04%. By 1986, the gubernatorial election relative margin saw a significant gain from -33.37% to -16.00% while the Class III United States Senate election relative margin dropped slightly from -24.03% to -25.24%. In 1988, the relative margin in the presidential election continued to inch up, advancing to -15.51% from -18.04%. The Class I United States Senate election relative margin, meanwhile, saw a dramatic improvement, moving from -32.20% to -19.19% that same year. The gubernatorial election relative margin in 1990 saw a significant drop from -16.00% to -23.67%, which, as it would turn out, was an ephemeral drop that was quickly erased. In 1992, the presidential election relative margin saw a modest increase from -18.04% to -15.51%, and the Class III United States Senate election relative margin saw a relatively larger increase from -25.24% to -16.57%. The gubernatorial election relative margin saw its previous decline all but erased, moving from -23.67% to -15.33% in 1994 as the Class I United States Senate election relative margin also increased from -19.19% to -14.78%.

As the 1990s continued, all of the relative margins would bottom out until 2000—in 1996, the presidential election relative margin decreased from -11.72% to -17.41%. In 1998, the gubernatorial election relative margin dropped from -15.33% to -20.40%, and the Class III
United States Senate election relative margin declined to -24.40% from -16.57%. By 2000, the decline in the presidential election relative margin reached a low point of -20.05% from -17.41% four years earlier, as the Class I United States Senate election relative margin reached its own low point of -28.03% from -14.78% six years earlier. In 2002, the gubernatorial election relative margin also bottomed out at -23.65% from -20.40%.

In the mid-2000s, a slight bounce occurred in most of the relative margins. The presidential election relative margin increased from -20.05% to -17.31% in 2004, and the Class III United States Senate election relative margin improved a bit from -24.40% to -22.47%. In 2006, the relative margin in the gubernatorial election nominally increased to -22.94% from, four years earlier, -23.65%, and the relative margin in the Class I United States Senate election improved more significantly, from -28.03% to -17.49%. In 2008, the presidential election relative margin peaked at -16.12%, a slight increase from -17.31% four years prior. By 2010, both the gubernatorial and Class III United States Senate election relative margins enjoyed ever-so-slight bounces, with the gubernatorial relative margin improving from -22.94% to -22.49%, and the Senate relative margin increasing from -22.47% to -19.67%. In 2012, the trend appeared to be moving in a different direction, as the presidential election relative margin dropped from -16.12% to -21.07% and the Class I United States Senate election relative margin declined to -23.48% from -17.49%.
Ultimately, at the beginning of the surveyed timeline, three of the four relative margins started out in positive territory, and, after 1960, that would be the only time in the surveyed elections that any of them would be positive. Most of the relative margins in most elections decreased through the 1960s and 1970s, bottoming out in the early 1980s, and recovered briefly in the early 1990s before declining once again until the mid-2000s, when a brief bounce occurred.
Figure 9.11 Collier County Relative Margin of Surveyed Elections, 1950-2012

The Southwest Region’s voting trends can be further understood by examining the county-level results, even though there are only three counties in this region, which is the smallest division in the state. Collier County (Figure 9.11, pictured above) and Lee County (Figure 9.35) mostly show the same trends as seen in the region as a whole, as Figure 10.7 shows. Collier County starts out as a relative Democratic stronghold before collapsing into a Republican stronghold by the 1970s, after which point no relative margin is ever positive. Save for a few bounces and dips, the relative margins stay in essentially the same change.
Charlotte County (Figure 9.8) seemingly vastly different trend lines, but this is perhaps masked by the fact that there are a number of wild gyrations in the relative margins in the county. Ultimately, the same basic patterns can be plainly seen, but they are exaggerated and more Democratic-friendly. Note that the lowest value of the relative margin in Charlotte County is approximately -30%, which is closer to the lowest relative margin of the region as a whole, while the lowest value of the relative margin in Collier County approaches -50%. Additionally, the relative margin in Charlotte County is regularly higher than the region as a whole, coming close to reaching a positive value in 1992 in the presidential election, which was not the case for the region.
Looking at the big picture, the voting trends in the Southwest Region can be compared to forty seven other states in the country; as was the case for the previous regions, the correlation coefficients of the Democratic presidential nominees’ performance in the Southwest Region and forty seven other states in the country were mapped out and are visible in Figure 15.7. The Southwest Region’s $R^2$ values are unusual—they are spread out in a way that no other region’s values are, and the highest $R^2$ value is only 0.7888, which, of the top $R^2$ values of each region, is the smallest. Regardless, it is important to note that the correlation coefficients in the southern states are relatively weak compared to the other surveyed regions, and that the largest correlation coefficients can be found in the Mid-Atlantic region, the Midwest, and the Southwest; to that effect, the largest correlation coefficients can be found in Virginia (Figure 7.43), North Carolina (Figure 7.30), Arizona (Figure 7.2), and Delaware (Figure 7.7).
Consider Figure 17.7, which shows the voting trends of the Southwest Region and Virginia compared to each other. Though the Southwest Region is consistently less likely to support Democratic presidential nominees, the same basic trend lines can be seen, with increases and decreases occurring largely to the same degree in the same years.
In 1950, at the beginning of the surveyed timeline, in the Class III United States Senate election, the Tampa Bay Region was significantly less likely than the state as a whole to vote for the Democratic nominee—in Tampa Bay, the absolute margin in the election was 25.43%, which, compared to the statewide margin of 52.60%, put the relative margin at -27.17%. In 1952, in both the presidential and gubernatorial elections, the region remained firmly to the right of the state overall, recording a relative margin of -11.38% in the presidential election and a relative margin of -15.45% in the gubernatorial election. The 1956 presidential election saw a modest increase in the relative margin, which moved from -11.38% to -11.14%, as the gubernatorial election the same year saw a more modest increase, from -15.45% to -6.30%.
When the Class I United States Senate election occurred in 1958, a similar relative margin debuted at -7.86%. By 1960, both the presidential and gubernatorial elections saw slight declines in their relative margins, with the presidential election relative margin declining to -11.75% from -11.14%, and the gubernatorial election relative margin decreasing from -6.30% to -11.22%.

As the 1960s continued, the relative margins started to peak—in 1962, the Class III United States Senate election relative margin increased astronomically from -27.17% to -7.84%. In 1964, the relative margin in the presidential election grew from -11.75% into positive territory at 2.24% while the relative margin in the gubernatorial election increased from -11.22% to 0.74%. The Class I United States Senate election saw a smaller increase, but an increase nevertheless, boosting the relative margin from -7.86% to -3.18%. The gubernatorial election relative margin continued to increase in 1966, inching up to 1.54% from 0.74%. In 1968, a divergence occurred, with the presidential election relative margin shrinking to -7.13% from 2.24% as the Class III United States Senate election relative margin grew to 1.96% from -7.84% six years prior.

By 1970, the brief increase in the relative margins started to mostly recede; the gubernatorial election relative margin dropped to -4.51% from 1.54% and the relative margin for the Class I United States Senate election declined to -8.49% from -3.18%. Over the next twenty years, a series of gyrations would occur in the relative margins of each elections, with trends that were often diametrically opposed to each other. Advancing into 1972, the relative margin in the presidential election increased to -1.74% from -7.13%. By 1974, as the
gubernatorial election relative margin significantly grew from -4.51% to 5.73%, the Class III United States Senate election relative margin plummeted from 1.96% to -19.75%. Then, in 1976, both relative margins moved in concert with each other; the presidential election relative margin dropped slightly to -5.67% from -1.74% and the Class I United States Senate election relative margin also dropped, from -8.49% to -3.01%. In 1978, the relative margin in the gubernatorial election plummeted to -18.18% from 5.73% just four years before.

The presidential and Class III United States Senate election relative margins both settled at around the same place in 1980, though they underwent vastly different changes to do so; the presidential election relative margin marginally increased from -5.67% to -0.46%, while the Senate election relative margin grew much more, from -19.75% to -2.92%. In 1982, the gubernatorial election relative margin grew by a solid amount, from -18.18% to -4.68%, while the Class I United States Senate election relative margin slightly declined from -3.01% to -4.89%. The presidential election relative margin slipped in 1984, dipping down to -2.92% from -0.46%.

A brief peak in the relative margins occurred in the late 1980s and early 1990s, with both the gubernatorial and Class III United States Senate election relative margins increased in 1986, though by different amounts; the gubernatorial relative margin increased from -4.68% to -3.11% and the Senate relative margin grew to 3.87% from -2.92%. In 1988, it was the same story—the presidential election relative margin and the Class I United States Senate election relative margins both grew, but differently. The presidential relative margin inched up to 0.66% from -2.92% while the Senate relative margin shot up to 5.54% from -4.89% six years prior. In
1990, then, the gubernatorial election relative margin increased to 6.59% from -3.11%, making 1986-1990 the first time that all four relative margins were in positive territory together.

By 1992, however, the bounce had faded; the presidential election relative margin slipped to -1.29% from 0.66%, and the Class III United States Senate election relative margin decreased more substantially from 3.87% to -6.38%. Around this time, three out of the four relative margins started to stabilize, with the Class III United States Senate election as the exception. For example, the gubernatorial election hovered in slightly negative territory from this point on, clocking in at -2.39% in 1994, -2.94% in 1998, -3.41% in 2002, -3.55% in 2006, and -1.52% in 2010. Following a brief dip in 1994 to -5.73% from 5.54%, the Class I United States Senate election relative margin hovered around zero, increasing to -0.59% in 2000, -0.32% in 2006, and 0.77% in 2012. This was true, too, for the presidential election relative margin, which slightly declined from -1.29% in 1992 to -1.33% in 1996, and continued a small decline to -2.09% in 2000 and -2.71% in 2004 before increasing to -1.50% in 2008 and then dipping to -2.23% in 2012. The Class III United States Senate election, meanwhile, enjoyed a less predictable pattern, dropping to -10.39% in 1998 from -6.38% in 1992, and then increasing to 3.07% in 2004 before decreasing to -0.27% in 2010.
To conclude, the Tampa Bay Region started out much less likely to vote for Democratic nominees. As the timeline advanced, however, its tendency to do so increased, peaking in the 1960s before declining in the late 1960s and early 1970s. Afterward, two of the elections—the gubernatorial election and the Class III United States Senate election—displayed massive gyrations, as Figure 10.8 demonstrates, and the other two elections—the presidential election and the Class I United States Senate election—often displayed trends that were exact opposites of each other. The region remained less likely to vote for Democratic nominees up until the mid-to-late 1980s, when all of the relative margins were in positive territory for the first time. Though this bounce faded in the 1990s, by the 2000s, it had changed course once again, and all four relative margins were between negative five percent and five percent.

When looking at the county-level results in the Tampa Bay Region, just as was the case in the Southeast Region, they can be broken down into several different groups. Group 1 includes Manatee County (Figure 9.40), Pinellas County (Figure 9.52) and Sarasota County
(Figure 9.56) and Group 2 includes Citrus County (Figure 9.9), Hernando County (Figure 9.26), and Polk County (Figure 9.53).

Group 1 can perhaps best be represented by Pinellas County (Figure 9.52, seen above), which shows that Pinellas was, at the beginning a Republican stronghold; however, as time passed, the relative margin saw consistent, albeit unsteady, increases until it plateaued as a nominally Democratic county by the 2000s. This trend can be seen in Manatee County (Figure 9.40) and Sarasota County (Figure 9.56), though not as dramatically, as both of those counties are, as of now, nominally Republican.
Group 2 is perhaps best represented by Citrus County (Figure 9.9, seen above), which displays a trend that was last seen in counties in the North Central, Northeast, and Northwest Regions; it is marked by a significant likelihood at the beginning of the surveyed timeline to vote for Democratic candidates followed by a decline as the 1970s and 1980s got underway and then followed by a collapse into solidly Republican territory by the 2000s. Though the trend lines are neither as clear nor strong in Hernando County (Figure 9.26) and Polk County (Figure 9.53), they are still present.
Figure 15.8 maps out the correlation coefficients of the percentage received by Democratic presidential nominees in the Tampa Bay Region and forty seven other states in the country to provide yet another method of illustrating how the Tampa Bay Region’s voting trends can be understood. As the figure shows, the Tampa Bay Region has little in common electorally with most of the states in the South, but has a great deal in common with the Mid-Atlantic states, the Midwestern states, and the Southwestern states. The highest correlation coefficients, unsurprisingly, were found in Virginia (Figure 8.43), Delaware (Figure 8.7), and Maryland (Figure 8.17).

Figure 17.8, shown above, shows the percentage received by Democratic presidential nominees in the Tampa Bay Region and Virginia from 1952 to the present. As can be plainly seen, the two areas display a high degree of similarity in terms of how they have voted through the years, with the two lines essentially becoming one during certain years; a strong correlation truly exists.
Chapter 12: Conclusion and Summaries

Over the last sixty years, voting behavior in Florida has changed dramatically. Regions that once were Democratic bastions turned into Republican strongholds. Republican strongholds turned into swing regions frequently visited by presidential, gubernatorial, and Senate candidates. The landscape of Florida elections today is vastly different than the landscape sixty years ago, and the impact of this is clear to see. While considerably less inclined to vote for Democratic candidates than other states in the South, especially those in the Deep South, Florida still had a strong and seemingly unyielding tendency to vote for Democrats. As the 1960s and 1970s got underway, however, this began to change. Florida became more accommodating to Republicans at the federal and state levels, and Republicans got closer and closer to cracking the regions that had previously been inhospitable to them. By the 1980s and 1990s, Republicans began to solidify their hold on Florida, but strange transformations began happening—Florida became the prototypical swing state.

Though it had voted for then-Vice President George Bush in a landslide in his 1988 presidential run, it was hotly contested in the 1992 presidential election, and Bush only narrowly won its electoral votes. In 1996, for the first time in twenty years, Florida voted for the Democratic nominee for President, Bill Clinton. Florida’s competitiveness in 2000 was previously mentioned and goes without saying, and the competitiveness continued into 2004, 2008, and 2012. At the same time, however, Republicans held tightly onto their control of the state government in Tallahassee. The last time that a Democrat won a gubernatorial election in Florida was in 1994, two years before Bill Clinton would inevitably win the state’s electoral
votes. Though close elections in 2010 and 2014 almost resulted in Democratic Governors, Republicans still held tightly to the Governor’s Mansion, and achieved massive majorities in the state legislature.

How, then, can we understand the changes that have taken place? Surely, they seem almost contradictory—as Democrats have been more competitive in presidential elections in Florida, Republicans have continued their dominance over state government. In a way, this represents an inverse of the patterns experienced just decades ago, when the state became a relatively reliable vote for Republican presidential nominees, but still preferred its Democratic Governors.

Part of understanding the trends comes from putting them into context. For all of the changes that have taken place, Florida is by no means a Republican stronghold in the South. This flies in the face of Republican strongholds in almost every other southern state, perhaps suggesting that Florida, in the aggregate, does not behave like a prototypically southern state. Indeed, states like Alabama and Mississippi better represent the change that southern states have gone through. Instead, Florida appears to have followed the model of states like North Carolina and Virginia, which are also increasingly competitive for Democrats at the federal level. Even then, the comparison is imperfect—up until very recently, Democrats dominated state-level elections in North Carolina, while Virginia’s state-level elections, up until 2013, appeared to only have one dominating characteristic, wherein the party of the President of the United States at any given time would lose Virginia’s gubernatorial election.
Florida, therefore, appears to stand alone: subject to the winds of change that swept across the South, but immune to the transformation that other southern states have gone through. How was this possible? While that is a relatively subjective question, this inquiry attempts to answer it, albeit indirectly. Consider Figures 11.17 through 11.32, Figures 12.18 through 12.34, Figures 13.11 through 13.20, and Figures 14.11 through 14.20, which show the relative margin by region in, respectively, the presidential elections, gubernatorial elections, Class I United States Senate elections, and the Class III United States Senate elections over the last sixty years. Consider Figure 11.17, which shows that, in the 1952 presidential election, the East Central Region was the least likely to vote for Democratic nominees, and the Northwest Region was the most likely. The Southeast Region, Southwest Region, and the Tampa Bay Region were nominally less likely to vote for Democratic nominees, and the North Central Region, the Northeast Region, and the South Central Region were at least nominally more likely to vote for Democratic nominees. Contrast this with Figure 11.32, which shows the relative margin by region in the 2012 presidential election and has the situation almost (but not exactly) reversed entirely—the Northwest Region, previously the most likely to vote for Democratic nominees, is now the least likely. The East Central Region, previously the least likely to vote for Democratic nominees, is now one of two regions in the state to at least nominally favor Democratic nominees, as is the Southeast Region. While the counties and regions did not exactly reverse their voting tendencies, they have come close to doing so. Ultimately, this mostly represents the story of Florida. The regions most likely to initially support Democrats were the most “Southern” regions, as demonstrated by the fact that the regions in question—
the North Central, Northeast, Northwest, and South Central Regions—had very high correlation coefficients when the percentage received by Democratic presidential nominees was compared to those of states in the South, particularly those in the Deep South. The regions least likely to initially support Democrats were the least “Southern” regions, which is demonstrated by an opposite fact as was described above; their correlation coefficients were the highest in states either in the North or at least in the Upper South, such as Delaware, Maryland, North Carolina, and Virginia. The least populous, mostly rural counties and regions, which were previously likely to support Democrats by astronomically large margins—consider that in the 1952 gubernatorial election, the Northwest Region voted for the Democratic nominee with 92.49% of the vote—now vote for Republicans by solid margins that are not quite as large—in 2010, the Northwest Region voted for the Republican nominee with 54.24% of the vote, so in fifty eight years, that represented a 46.73% swing towards the Republican and a 51.18% swing against the Democrat. The more populous, urban counties and regions, which were previously likely to support Republicans by solid margins that were especially impressive considering the statewide margins, now are tossup regions alternatively won by Republicans and Democrats.

However, the data analysis performed in this work does not even begin to cover what can be done with the generated data—Tables 1.1 through 8.47, for instance, were analyzed only in passing and only briefly, but they lead to interesting research questions. Why do some regions of Florida vote so similarly to different states in the country? For example, what is it about Delaware’s voting patterns that are so similar to those of the East Central Region, as Figures 1.7 and 17.1 show, and what demographic and cultural factors can explain the
similarity? The Southwest Region displays remarkably similar voting patterns to Arizona, as Figure 7.2 shows—what can explain this?

Though these are interesting questions that surely have compelling and complicated answers, they are well beyond the scope of this inquiry. This inquiry merely focused—and, given the length of this inquiry, merely is perhaps an understatement—on a description of what the electoral and voting trends were, not why they happened the way that they did, or what could have caused them. It suffices to say that there is a treasure trove of demographic, economic, social, cultural, and political data that has been collected by the United States Census Bureau that would go a long way in at least suggesting what could possibly explain the voting trends. Though this inquiry initially made attempts to explore this further, it was limited by the fact that the Census Bureau’s questions and answer options have been radically transformed over the past sixty years, especially with racial data, and any researcher using its data would have to make some difficult and subjective determinations—for example, “Hispanic” was not available as an option until the 1980s. How did Hispanic Americans identify themselves in earlier years when this was not an option? If Hispanic population growth can help explain some voting trends—as it surely can in Miami-Dade, Orange, and Osceola Counties, at a minimum—then piercing the veil of vagueness in the data is absolutely imperative.

Therefore, the author welcomes future researchers to continue the lines of inquiry initially addressed in this work. The figures in the appendix have been provided so that all of the data analyzed in this work is completely transparent, both in terms of how it was gathered and in terms of how it was manipulated and used. Future researchers are not only welcomed, but
encouraged to build on this data and to make additional—and even contradictory!—conclusions.
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