

**Table 4. Unemployment under Democratic and Republican Presidents, 1948-2009**

<i>Dependent variable: Unemployment (%) annual data</i>		
<i>Independent Variables</i>	<i>(1.)</i>	<i>(2.)</i>
Democratic President (lagged one year)	-.82** (.27)	-.21 (.19)
Lagged Unemployment	.67** (.09)	.82** (.06)
Lagged Real GNP per capita growth, 4 <sup>th</sup> qtr	–	-.13** (.02)
Lagged Real GNP per capita growth, 3 <sup>rd</sup> qtr	–	-.13** (.03)
Constant	2.26	1.63
N	62	62
Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	.58	.81
Standard Error of Estimate	.99	.65

\*\*p<.01, \*p<.05, one-tailed. Data Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics (2010).

### *Income Inequality*

The third strike against Republicans in Bartels' analysis was their poor performance in reducing income inequality between the "haves" and the "have-nots." As we have seen with respect to both general economic growth and unemployment, the growth of incomes in a year depends, in part, on the condition of the economy leading up to that year. The growth in real GNP per capita in the third and fourth quarters of the previous year are included in income inequality analysis at the five income levels in the equations estimated in Table 5. When the state of the economy in the quarters immediately preceding a year are taken into account, there are no significant differences between the parties in the growth of incomes at any income level and, therefore, no significant differences between party effects at the low and high ends on the income spectrum. In short, *once inherited economic conditions are taken into account, there is no significant evidence that the presidential parties have had distinctly different records of increasing or diminishing income disparities.*