Divided Senate Delegation Indicator of Realignment

In a research note written in 2005 and subsequently rejected by three leading political science journals as too speculative and not adequately statistically anchored, we sought to update Brunell and Grofman's 1998 research note in the *APSR* on divided Senate delegation by showing that we were right in predicting that, in the Senate election years taking place immediately after our original data analyses, the number of states with divided Senate delegations would continue to decline.[1] It did: from 19 states in 1996 to 18 in 1998, way down to 13 in 2000 and remaining at that level until the most recent election in 2006. However, at the end of our 2005 paper we also say: "Unlike Brunell and Grofman (1998), though, we are not prepared to predict further decreases in the number of divided Senate delegations."

Brunell and Grofman (1998) use the number of divided Senate delegations as a (leading) indicator of realignment. In our 2005 unpublished paper we wrote: "If we were to take 1952 as a baseline for how far the number of divided Senate delegations might be expected to drop in the modern era, it may well be 2004 (or at date close to it) which will prove the high point of Republican dominance—at least as judged by the reduction in the number of divided Senate delegations." In fact, in 2006, the number of divided delegations increased by two states to 15 total. This is the first time since 1974 that the number of divided Senate delegations has gone up by more than just a single state.

In our 2005 paper we further argued that, with more data points to examine, the suggestion in Brunell and Grofman (1998) that 1980 was a realignment year looks even more plausible. We also think 2006 is more than just a blip, i.e., that it reflects more than an idiosyncratic confluence of unrepeatable factors such as a botched and unnecessary war, corruption scandals, and a president in his second term who is perceived as having surrounded himself with incompetents and yes-men.

David Mayhew's (2002) seminal work notwithstanding—and we agree with just about everything he said about flaws in existing realignment theory—there are cycles in American politics, and 2006 may well be an inflection point signaling a change in the direction of the recent pro-Republican partisan tides.

Tom Brunell
University of Texas at Dallas
Bernard Grofman
University of California, Irvine

Note

1. Those interested in obtaining a copy of Brunell and Grofman's 2005 paper are invited to email the authors at tbrunell@utdallas.edu or bgrofman@uci.edu.

References

Brunell, Thomas L., and Bernard Grofman. 1998. "Explaining Divided U.S. Senate Delegations, 1788–1996: A Realignment Approach." *American Political Science Review* 92 (2): 391–9.

Mayhew, David R. 2002. *Electoral Realignments: A Critique of an American Genre*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Corrections to "The Political Science 400"

Emails received by the authors since the publication of "The Political Science 400: A 20-Year Update" (Masuoka, Grofman, and Feld 2007) called attention to mistakes in the citation counts of a number of scholars. Corrections to the citation counts are posted in an EXCEL file at www.socsci.uci.edu/~bgrofman/. Once we have entered all corrections, an erratum will appear in a later issue of *PS*. Please address any corrections to that article to BGrofman@uci.edu.

Natalie Masuoka
University of California, Irvine
Bernard Grofman
University of California, Irvine
Scott L. Feld
Purdue University

Reference

Masuoka, Natalie, Bernard Grofman, and Scott L. Feld. 2007. "The Political Science 400: A 20-Year Update." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 40 (January): 133–45.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096507210674 Published online by Cambridge University Press