

# 2016 LATINO ELECTION ANALYSIS

---

November 9, 2016

# SPONSOR ORGANIZATIONS


**AMERICA'S  
VOICE**



**NCLR**  
NATIONAL COUNCIL OF LA RAZA

# 2016 Election Eve Poll

5,600 Latino voters  
National Sample and  
12 state oversamples  
November 4-7  
National +/- 1.8%  
Florida +/- 3.5%  
Other states +/- 4.9%



# Latino election eve methodology

4

- National sample N=5,600 (MoE +/-1.8%)
- 11 state samples N=400 (MoE +/-4.9%), and Florida N=800 (MoE +/-3.5%)
- English or Spanish at respondent discretion
- Interviews conducted on landline, cell, and on-line
- Respondents are extreme-high-propensity voters screened on vote history, or newly registered, and queried self-report of intention to vote (or having voted).
- Randomly drawn from representative statewide sample, and then weighted to match census demographics

# National exit polls questions

5

- Which precincts did they select?
- How many were in Latino neighborhoods?
- How many Spanish interviews did they conduct?
- Did they match Latino sample to known census demographics?

# REAL ELECTION DATA



# Opinions on the Exit Poll

7

## FiveThirtyEight

Politics

Sports

Science & Health

Economics

Culture



NATE SILVER 1:01 AM

The [national exit poll](#) shows [Trump making bigger gains](#) among black and Hispanic voters than among whites. But I'd urge at least a little caution. I know that exit polls aren't supposed to be used for projecting results, but they did an awfully bad job tonight, initially showing what had looked like a near-landslide margin for Clinton. Furthermore, as [compared with pre-election polls](#), Trump clearly overperformed the most in whiter states. So on second thought, maybe that's a lot of caution and not just a little.



Evaluation of Edison/Mitofsky Election System 2004  
prepared by Edison Media Research and Mitofsky International  
for the National Election Pool (NEP)  
embargoed for release at 10AM ET January 19, 2005

These demographic groups have two things in common: each group represents 8% or less of the total number of voters, and each group tends to be concentrated geographically and thus would be more affected by any “clustering effects” in the precincts selected for the National Exit Poll sample. A National Sample of 250 precincts can do a good job estimating all of the broad characteristics of the electorate, but it is not designed to yield very reliable estimates of the characteristics of small, geographically clustered demographic groups. These groups have much larger design effects and thus larger sampling errors.

A detailed look at the distribution of plurality Hispanic precincts in the National Exit Poll Sample demonstrates how this clustering effect can influence the estimate of Hispanic voting in the National Exit Poll. Out of the 250 precincts in the national sample, 11 were plurality Hispanic precincts representing about 4% of the sample.

Comparing the regional breakout of the Hispanic vote, one can see the “clustering effect” that these two majority Cuban precincts have on the estimate of the Hispanic vote in the South in the National Exit Poll versus the Cross Survey Results. Since the National Exit Poll sample has only five plurality Hispanic precincts in the South, the number of Cuban precincts can make a difference in the estimate of the Hispanic vote in the region. If we want to improve the National Exit Poll estimate for Hispanic vote (or Asian vote, Jewish vote or Mormon vote etc.) we would either need to drastically increase the number of precincts in the National Sample or oversample the number of Hispanic precincts.




# Latino polling across 2016

9

Poll	Percent Trump
Univision/Washington Post	19%
NBC/Telemundo oversample	17%
NALEO/Telemundo	14%
FIU/New Latino Voice	13%
Gross statistical model	18%

# Texas Latino Vote 2016


10



County	% Latino	HRC Vote	DJT Vote
Starr	96%	79%	19%
Jim Hogg	94%	77%	20%
Maverick	94%	77%	21%
Webb	94%	74%	23%
Zavala	93%	78%	20%
Brooks	92%	75%	24%

# Texas Latino Turnout 2016


11



County	% Latino	2012 Turnout	2016 Turnout	Increase
Starr	96%	45%	47%	<b>+2</b>
Jim Hogg	94%	44%	54%	<b>+10</b>
Maverick	94%	38%	44%	<b>+6</b>
Hidalgo	86%	46%	49%	<b>+3</b>
Cameron	89%	48%	53%	<b>+5</b>
Brooks	92%	46%	46%	<b>+6</b>


# Florida Latino Vote 2016

12



Precinct	% Latino	% HRC	% Obama	Increase
MD402	96%	57%	32%	<b>+25</b>
MD423	95%	59%	36%	<b>+23</b>
MD419	91%	49%	28%	<b>+21</b>
MD409	97%	58%	42%	<b>+16</b>
MD342	96%	60%	47%	<b>+13</b>
MD338	96%	55%	41%	<b>+13</b>


# Florida Latino Turnout 2016



Precinct	% Latino	2012 Turnout	2016 Turnout	Increase
MD309	97%	60%	66%	<b>+6</b>
MD342	96%	60%	69%	<b>+9</b>
MD410	97%	59%	65%	<b>+6</b>
MD322	95%	64%	70%	<b>+6</b>
MD416	95%	64%	71%	<b>+7</b>
MD388	95%	55%	74%	<b>+16</b>

# Florida Latino Vote 2016


14



Precinct	% Latino	% HRC	% DJT
KISS210	78%	80%	17%
KISS200	69%	78%	18%
KISS314	69%	69%	26%
KISS411	71%	80%	18%

# Florida Latino Turnout 2016


15



Precinct	% Latino	2012 Turnout	2016 Turnout	Increase
KISS210	78%	64%	70%	+6
KISS200	69%	62%	68%	+6
KISS314	69%	56%	64%	+8
KISS411	71%	60%	68%	+8

# New Mexico Latino Vote 2016

16




Precinct	% Latino	HRC Vote	DJT Vote
D.A. 80	99%	85%	9%
D. A. 87	96%	84%	9%
D. A. 13	99%	87%	7%
Val. 24	94%	72%	16%
S.F. 79	87%	66%	24%
S. M. 17	91%	69%	11%



# New Mexico Latino Turnout 2016


17



Precinct	% Latino	2012 Turnout	2016 Turnout	Increase
D.A. 93	86%	49%	59%	<b>+10</b>
D. A. 97	96%	42%	50%	<b>+8</b>
D. A. 13	99%	40%	49%	<b>+9</b>
Val. 24	94%	40%	47%	<b>+7</b>
S.F. 79	87%	56%	63%	<b>+7</b>
S. M. 17	91%	38%	42%	<b>+4</b>

# Wisconsin Latino Vote 2016

18




Precinct	% Latino	HRC Vote	DJT Vote
D12W232	78%	87%	9%
D12W233	77%	88%	9%
D12W231	75%	85%	13%
D12W236	74%	83%	12%
D12W321	72%	90%	8%
D12W237	74%	88%	8%

# ELECTION EVE POLL



# Latino Vote 2016




# Inside the numbers...

21


- Latino Men distinct from non-Latinos: 71% Clinton
- Latinas: 86% Clinton
- National Cuban vote: 50% Clinton, 48% Trump
- Millennials: Clinton 80%, Trump 14%

# 78% of Latino voters made their decision months ago


22



# Community Solidarity the Plurality Reason for Latino Turnout




# Importance of Immigration to Vote






# Support for Obama's DACA Order

25




# Attitude toward Lawsuit Against DAPA



# Perceptions of Candidates and Parties

27

■ Truly cares ■ Did not care too much ■ Hostile



# Candidate and Party Reputations...

28

- Significant change from Republicans in 2012
  - ▣ Romney: Truly cares 14%; Doesn't care 56%; Hostile 18%
  - ▣ Trump: Truly cares 13%; Doesn't care 29%; Hostile 55%
  
- Democrats wildly more popular than Republicans
  - ▣ 57% think Dems care, 5% see them as hostile
  - ▣ 29% think GOP cares, 30% see them as hostile

# Wrapping it up

29

- Polling data & real election results confirm Latino turnout was up and GOP support was down
  - ▣ The lowest vote ever for presidential candidate
- Latinos critical in election of Cortez-Masto and Bennet and defeat of Arpaio
- We will continue to update and gather real election data to validate the findings

FOLLOW OUR WORK AT  
LATINODECISIONS.COM,  
ON FACEBOOK AND TWITTER  
@LATINODECISIONS