The Campaign Trails of Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump: The Data Graphic

This data graphic, which uses the data gathered in FiveThirtyEight’s December 2016 article titled *The Last 10 Weeks of 2016 Campaign Stops in One Handy Gif*, demonstrates a similar point to that of the 538 article, but we feel that yet another reason as to why Hillary lost the 2016 presidential election can be extracted from this data graphic. In that article, the relative lack of frequency with which Hillary went campaigning in the last 10 weeks of the 2016 campaign (71 stops for Hillary, and 106 stops for Trump) is highlighted as one reason among many as to why she lost. While the 538 article focuses mainly on how many stops each candidate took, for this data graphic, the focus is squarely on *where* each campaign did (or didn’t) campaign, and how that may have affected the outcome of the election.

As seen above, we used the geom\_path function (a part of the ggplot2 package’s function list) in R to show the paths that the campaigns of each candidate took in the last ten weeks of the 2016 election, and one key (and very noticeable) difference between the two is the complete lack of campaign stops in Wisconsin by Clinton’s campaign, who at the time believed it to be an easily won state for the Democrats based on polls; on the other hand, Trump made three stops in different parts of the state in the last ten weeks alone. Additionally, while we see Clinton making stops in solidly blue states like California and New York, and multiple stops in most swing states with the exception of the aforementioned Wisconsin, we see Trump making almost twice as many stops in the same swing states that Clinton went to personally in states like Ohio, Pennsylvania, Florida, and Iowa.