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Preface

Writing in 1986, Philip Dubois remarked that “[i]t is fairly certain that no single subject has consumed as many pages in law reviews and law-related publications over the past 50 years as the subject of judicial selection” (31). In recent years, the Supreme Court’s decisions in *Republican Party of Minnesota v. White*, *Caperton v. Massey*, and *Citizens United v. FEC* have recaptured and held the interest of legal scholars and social scientists alike. Additionally, recent campaigns to reexamine the methods of judicial selection in Missouri, West Virginia, Arizona, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, and various other states have attracted the attention of the general public across the country. With that in mind, scholars at Washington University in St. Louis are initiating a collaborative data collection project in an effort to allow scholars nationwide the opportunity to study the effects of various methods of selection. We invite social scientists and legal academics alike to join us as we embark on this project.

Though few would deny the importance of the justice system in the functioning of society and on the daily lives of citizens, not enough work has gone into understanding the influence judicial selection has upon judicial systems. We believe that part of the reason that more research has not been done in this area is the fact that data regarding state judicial elections are difficult to collect. This project attempts to remedy this problem by providing a focal point for data collection and sharing.

The ability of scholars to replicate and extend research is essential to the endeavor of social science. As King (1995) aptly wrote: “Political science is a community enterprise; the community of empirical political scientists needs access to the body of data necessary to replicate existing studies to understand, evaluate, and especially build on this work.” Furthermore, where academic research informs decision-makers regarding policy decisions, as we should hope all academic work does, the importance of verifying and furthering results is magnified. Currently, there is no publicly available dataset for some of the most significant work in the area of judicial selection (e.g., Hall and Bonneau 2009).

This document outlines the variables currently being collected by the JEDI project. Herein, you can find the coding rules for the variables, the state-years for which each variable is being collected, a partial listing of studies utilizing variables similar (or identical) to the variables being collected, and a description of the sources of the information contained in the master data set.

We welcome any contributions, comments, or questions about this project. If you have any, feel free to contact us at jedi@wustl.edu.
Project Logistics

Our Purpose

To collaborate with scholars nationwide to collect data on elections to state courts of last resort from 1990 to 2010 in an effort to facilitate replication efforts and to stimulate new research in the area of state judicial selection.

Our Plan

As we collect and receive data, we will convert, clean, and add them to the data set. Throughout the process, we will regularly release the data on the project web site. Thus, the data from this project will be publicly available throughout the entire data collection project.

If You Have Data

This is a collaborative project. Aware that scholars may have collected some of these variables previously, we are soliciting data from anyone who wishes to share what they have collected. With that said, we are flexible. If your data is in a database format, we will convert it. If it is in a word processing file, we will code it. If it is on paper, we will scan it, and if it is on tape, we will find a machine to read it. In short, we will take any data you are willing to provide in any format. Additionally, if you have information on variables that we are not collecting, just send us the data and your coding rules, and we will include them in subsequent data releases.

If You Want to Help Collect Data

Contact us, and we will help you coordinate your efforts with other scholars. We welcome contributions of any scope. Whether you want to collect one or more variables for a state, about particular race(s), or about particular candidate(s), we welcome any assistance you are willing to provide. At this early stage of the project, we would particularly welcome assistance simply identifying candidates and races that have been held between 1990 and 2010. Regardless of your contribution, we will welcome your data in any form and will promptly distribute your data to scholars nationwide.
Who We Are

Andrew D. Martin  Principal Investigator
Professor of Political Science
Professor of Law
Director, Center for Empirical Research in the Law
Washington University in St. Louis

Morgan L.W. Hazelton  Project Coordinator
Ph.D. Student, Department of Political Science
Graduate Student Associate, Center for Empirical Research in the Law
Washington University in St. Louis

Michael J. Nelson  Project Coordinator
Ph.D. Student, Department of Political Science
Washington University in St. Louis

Tom Conway  Research Technologist
Assistant Web Developer, Center for Empirical Research in the Law
Washington University in St. Louis

Kevin Esterling  Associate Professor of Political Science
University of California, Riverside

Michael Potere  Research Assistant
Law Student, Northwestern University

Ariel Dobkin  Research Assistant
Undergraduate Student, Washington University in St. Louis
Research Assistant, Center for Empirical Research in the Law

Mark Dudley  Research Assistant
Ph.D. Student, Duke University Department of Political Science

Marie Millan  Research Assistant
Undergraduate Student, University of California, Riverside

Parissa Afrand  Research Assistant
Undergraduate Student, University of California, Riverside

Jamie Walter  Research Assistant
Undergraduate Student, The Ohio State University

Contributors

National Institute for Money in State Politics
# Release Notes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Version</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07-25-2010</td>
<td>2010.4</td>
<td>This release includes vote totals for a substantial number of races with some additional state and candidate information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-02-2010</td>
<td>2010.3</td>
<td>This release includes information on a number of newly identified races along with candidate quality information for most contestable races and a substantial number of new state-level variables.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04-15-2010</td>
<td>2010.2</td>
<td>This release adds a substantial amount of data provided by the National Institute for Money in State Politics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This provides a substantial increase in the information at both the candidate and race levels. However, the data is still in a preliminary form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03-29-2010</td>
<td>2010.1</td>
<td>This is the initial data release from the JEDI project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The main purpose of this release is to illustrate the data model we plan to use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The data model is subject to change as needed as the project progresses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>We are in the process of refining the coding rules for some variables; updated coding rules will be provided in a subsequent data release.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Race-Level Variables

id

States: AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

Years: 1990-2010

Description: This is a unique identifier for the race. The identifier has three parts separated by a hyphen: the two-letter state abbreviation, the four-digit year, and the two-digit race number identifier. For Texas and Oklahoma (the two states with multiple courts of last resort), TX and OK denote the civic court of last resort, and TC and OC denote the criminal court of last resort.

doe

States: AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

Years: 1990-2010

Description: The date of the general election in MM-DD-YYYY format

year

States: AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

Years: 1990-2010

Description: The year of the general election in YYYY format

seat

States: AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

Years: 1990-2010

Description: Text. The name of the seat filled by the election.
**winner**

*States:* AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

*Years:* 1990-2010

*Description:* The name of the winning candidate in a partisan or nonpartisan race. The name of the candidate in a retention race.

*Source:* The names of the winning candidates in many races were provided by the National Institute for Money in State Politics

**seatprev**

*States:* AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

*Years:* 1990-2010

*Description:* Text. The Race id of any previous elections to fill this seat.

**postwhite**

*States:* AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

*Years:* 1990-2010

*Description:* Binary. Takes a value of 1 if the election occurred after June 27, 2002 (the date of the Supreme Court’s decision in *Republican Party of Minnesota v. White*).

**contested**

*States:* AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

*Years:* 1990-2010

*Description:* Binary variable. Takes a value of 1 if there are at least two candidates in the general election. Since no retention election can be contested, all retention elections take a value of NA.
**openseat**

*States:* AL, AR, GA, ID, IL, KY, LA, MI, MN, MS, MT, NC, ND, NM, NV, OH, OR, PA, TN (1990-1994), TX, WA, WI, WV

*Years:* 1990-2010

*Description:* Binary. Takes a value of 1 if the election is for an open seat. Since no retention election can be for an open seat, all retention elections take a value of NA.

*Sources:* A list of open races from 1990-2006 was provided by Chris W. Bonneau. Additional races were identified by the National Institute for Money in State Politics.

**electedinc**

*States:* AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

*Years:* 1990-2010

*Description:* Binary. Takes a value of 1 if the election involves an incumbent who has previously won election.

**incumbelect**

*States:* AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

*Years:* 1990-2010

*Description:* Binary. Takes a value of 1 if the incumbent has previously won election to the court.

**appointinc**

*States:* AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

*Years:* 1990-2010

*Description:* Binary. Takes a value of 1 if the election involves an incumbent who was initially appointed and has never won election.
**ico**

*States:* AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

*Years:* 1990-2010

*Description:* Factor. Describes the candidate’s position in a race. The variable takes a value of O (the letter) if the race is an open race, I if the candidate is an incumbent, C if the candidate is challenging an incumbent, IC if the race involves an incumbent challenger running against a current incumbent, and IO if the race involves an incumbent running for an open seat.

*Sources:* This coding scheme was identified by the National Institute for Money in State Politics

**district**

*States:* AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

*Years:* 1990-2010

*Description:* Binary. Takes a value of 1 if the seat represents a district and not the entire state.

**multimember**

*States:* AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

*Years:* 1990-2010

*Description:* Binary. Takes a value of 1 if the election is for a multimember district.

**newsccand**

*States:* AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

*Years:* 1990-2010

*Description:* Binary. Takes a value of 1 if the election is for an open seat or an incumbent initially appointed and is facing his or her first election.
**ctcontrol**

We will not begin collecting this variable until Summer 2010. Coding rules to follow.

*States:* AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

*Years:* 1990-2010

*Description:* Binary. Takes a value of 1 if control of the court is at stake.

**expdiff**

*States:* AL, AR, GA, ID, IL, KY, LA, MI, MN, MS, MT, NC, ND, NM, NV, OH, OR, PA, TN (1990-1994), TX, WA, WI, WV

*Years:* 1990-2010

*Description:* Factor. Takes a value of 2 if winner has prior judicial experience, but the loser does not, takes a value of 1 if both (or neither) have prior judicial experience, and takes a value of 0 if the winner does not have prior judicial experience and the loser does.

**majoff**

*States:* AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

*Years:* 1990-2010

*Description:* Factor. Identifies “the presidential, gubernatorial, or U.S. senatorial contest attracting the most voters in each election” (Hall and Bonneau 2009: 23). The variable takes a value of 1 if the presidential race received the most votes, a value of 2 if the gubernatorial race attracted the most votes, a value of 3 if the senatorial race received the most votes, and a value of 0 if some other race attracted the most votes or if none of the aforementioned races were on the ballot.

**majoffvote**

*States:* AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

*Years:* 1990-2010

*Description:* Continuous. The number of votes cast in “the presidential, gubernatorial, or U.S. senatorial contest attracting the most voters in each election” (Hall and Bonneau 2009: 23).
vote
States: AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

Years: 1990-2010

Description: Continuous. Total votes cast for all candidates this Supreme Court race.

winvote
States: AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

Years: 1990-2010

Description: Continuous. Total votes for winner of seat.

losevote
States: AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

Years: 1990-2010

Description: Continuous. Total votes for losers of seat.

incumbvote
States: AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

Years: 1990-2010

Description: Continuous. Number of votes received by the incumbent. For retention elections, this number is, by definition, the number of “Yes” votes.

winlosepctdiff
States: AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

Years: 1990-2010
Description: Continuous. The difference in percentage of vote received of the winner and losers.

\textbf{losepct}

\textit{States}: AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

\textit{Years}: 1990-2010

Description: Continuous. The percentage of votes received by the losing candidates.

\textbf{margin}

\textit{States}: AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

\textit{Years}: 1990-2010

Description: Continuous \([0,1]\). Percentage margin of victory for the winner.

\textbf{POTUSWin}

\textit{States}: AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

\textit{Years}: 1990-2010

Description: The name of the candidate attracting the most votes in the US Presidential race on the general election ballot in the jurisdiction of the supreme court race. This variable takes a value of NA if there was no presidential race on the general election ballot.

\textbf{POTUSWinVotes}

\textit{States}: AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

\textit{Years}: 1990-2010

Description: The number of votes received by the candidate attracting the most votes in the US Presidential race on the general election ballot in the jurisdiction of the supreme court race. This variable takes a value of NA if there was no presidential race on the general election ballot.
**POTUSVotesCast**

*States:* AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

*Years:* 1990-2010

*Description:* The total number of votes cast for all candidates (including write-in candidates) in the US Presidential race on the general election ballot in the jurisdiction of the supreme court race. This variable takes a value of NA if there was no presidential race on the general election ballot.

**GovWin**

*States:* AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

*Years:* 1990-2010

*Description:* The name of the candidate attracting the most votes in the gubernatorial race on the general election ballot. This variable takes a value of NA if there was no gubernatorial race on the general election ballot in the jurisdiction of the supreme court race.

**GovWinVotes**

*States:* AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

*Years:* 1990-2010

*Description:* The number of votes received by the candidate attracting the most votes in the gubernatorial race on the general election ballot in the jurisdiction of the supreme court race. This variable takes a value of NA if there was no gubernatorial race on the general election ballot.

**GovVotesCast**

*States:* AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

*Years:* 1990-2010

*Description:* The total number of votes cast for all candidates (including write-in candidates)
in the gubernatorial race on the general election ballot in the jurisdiction of the supreme court race. This variable takes a value of NA if there was no gubernatorial race on the general election ballot.

**SenWin**

*States:* AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

*Years:* 1990-2010

*Description:* The name of the candidate attracting the most votes in the US senatorial race on the general election ballot. This variable takes a value of NA if there was no senatorial race on the general election ballot. This variable will be the same for all candidates and all races within a state for a given year.

**SenWinVotes**

*States:* AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

*Years:* 1990-2010

*Description:* The number of votes received by the candidate attracting the most votes in the US senatorial race on the general election ballot in the jurisdiction of the supreme court race. This variable takes a value of NA if there was no senatorial race on the general election ballot.

**SenVotesCast**

*States:* AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

*Years:* 1990-2010

*Description:* The total number of votes cast for all candidates (including write-in candidates) in the US senatorial race on the general election ballot in the jurisdiction of the supreme court race. This variable takes a value of NA if there was no senatorial race on the general election ballot.

**previncpct**

We will not begin collecting this variable until Summer 2010. Coding rules to follow.

*States:* AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO,
prevvtpct

We will begin releasing this variable in late July. Coding rules to follow.

States: AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

Years: 1990-2010

Description: Continuous [0,1]. Vote percentage won by incumbent in previous election.

totalspend

We will begin releasing this variable in late July. Coding rules to follow.

States: AL, AR, GA, ID, IL, KY, LA, MI, MN, MS, MT, NC, ND, NM, NV, OH, OR, PA, TN

Years: 1990-2010

Description: Continuous [0,1]. Vote percentage of winning Supreme Court candidate in previous election cycle for each seat.

prevwin

We will begin releasing this variable in late July. Coding rules to follow.

States: AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

Years: 1990-2010

Description: Continuous. The total number of votes received by the winning candidate in most recent judicial election in that jurisdiction.

prevlose

We will begin releasing this variable in late July. Coding rules to follow.

States: AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

Years: 1990-2010

Description: Continuous. The total number of votes received by losing candidates in the most recent judicial election in that jurisdiction.
(1990-1994), TX, WA, WI, WV

Years: 1990-2010

Description: Continuous. The total amount of campaign spending in the election by all candidates.

**totalspend90**

We will begin releasing this variable in late July. Coding rules to follow.
*States: AL, AR, GA, ID, IL, KY, LA, MI, MN, MS, MT, NC, ND, NM, NV, OH, OR, PA, TN (1990-1994), TX, WA, WI, WV*

Years: 1990-2010

Description: Continuous. The total amount of campaign spending in the election by all candidates in 1990 dollars.

**totalfund**

We will begin releasing this variable in late July. Coding rules to follow.
*States: AL, AR, GA, ID, IL, KY, LA, MI, MN, MS, MT, NC, ND, NM, NV, OH, OR, PA, TN (1990-1994), TX, WA, WI, WV*

Years: 1990-2010

Description: Continuous. The total amount of campaign fundraising in the election by all candidates.

**totalfund90**

We will begin releasing this variable in late July. Coding rules to follow.
*States: AL, AR, GA, ID, IL, KY, LA, MI, MN, MS, MT, NC, ND, NM, NV, OH, OR, PA, TN (1990-1994), TX, WA, WI, WV*

Years: 1990-2010

Description: Continuous. The total amount of campaign fundraising in the election by all candidates in 1990 dollars.

**pcspend**

We will begin releasing this variable in late July. Coding rules to follow.
*States: AL, AR, GA, ID, IL, KY, LA, MI, MN, MS, MT, NC, ND, NM, NV, OH, OR, PA, TN*
Description: Continuous. The total amount of campaign spending in the election by all candidates divided by voting age population (measured in 1000s).

**pcspend90**

*We will begin releasing this variable in late July. Coding rules to follow.*

*States: AL, AR, GA, ID, IL, KY, LA, MI, MN, MS, MT, NC, ND, NM, NV, OH, OR, PA, TN (1990-1994), TX, WA, WI, WV*

*Years: 1990-2010*

Description: Continuous. The natural log of the total amount of campaign spending in the election by all candidates in 1990 dollars divided by voting age population (measured in 1000s).

**spenddiff**

*We will begin releasing this variable in late July. Coding rules to follow.*

*States: AL, AR, GA, ID, IL, KY, LA, MI, MN, MS, MT, NC, ND, NM, NV, OH, OR, PA, TN (1990-1994), TX, WA, WI, WV*

*Years: 1990-2010*

Description: Continuous. The difference between the log of the incumbents spending and the log of the challengers spending.

**ideodist**

*States: AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY*

*Years: 1990-2010*

Description: Continuous. The absolute value of the difference between each justice’s ideology score, measured using Brace, Langer, and Hall’s (2000), PAJID scores, and citizen ideology at the time of each election, as measured by Berry et al. (1998) citizen ideology scores.

Source: Where possible, the candidate’s PAJID score comes from Laura Langer’s natural courts database.
Candidate-Level Variables

id

States: AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

Years: 1990-2010

Description: This is a unique identifier for the race. The identifier has four parts separated by a hyphen: the two-letter state abbreviation, the four-digit year, the two-digit race number identifier, and the two-digit candidate identifier. For Texas and Oklahoma (the two states with multiple courts of last resort), TX and OK denote the civic court of last resort, and TC and OC denote the criminal court of last resort.

cid

States: AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

Years: 1990-2010

Description: Text. The Race id of previous races in which this individual has been a candidate.

fullname

States: AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

Years: 1990-2010

Description: Text. The candidate’s full name in LastName Suffix, FirstName MiddleInitial form.

Source: For many races, the National Institute for Money in State Politics identified the candidates.

win

States: AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

Years: 1990-2010

Description: Binary. Takes a value of 1 if the candidate won the election.

Sources: For many races, the winning candidate was identified by the National Institute for Money in State Politics
status

*States:* AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

*Years:* 1990-2010

*Description:* Factor. Describes the candidate’s final electoral status. Takes a value of W if the candidate won a partisan or nonpartisan election, a value of L if the candidate lost a partisan or nonpartisan election in the general election, PL if the candidate lost a general or nonpartisan election in the primary. If the election is a retention election, the variable takes a value of WR if the candidate was retained and a value of LR if the candidate was not retained. The variable takes a value of WITHDREW if the candidate withdrew from the race.

*Sources:* The coding scheme for this variable was identified by the National Institute for Money in State Politics

incumb

*States:* AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

*Years:* 1990-2010

*Description:* Binary. Takes a value of 1 if the candidate is an incumbent.

ico

*States:* AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

*Years:* 1990-2010

*Description:* Factor. Describes the candidate’s position in a race. The variable takes a value of O (the letter) if the race is an open race, I if the candidate is an incumbent, C if the candidate is challenging an incumbent, IC if the race involves an incumbent challenger running against a current incumbent, and IO if the race involves an incumbent running for an open seat.

*Sources:* This coding scheme was identified by the National Institute for Money in State Politics

female

*States:* AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

*Years:* 1990-2010
Description: Binary. Takes a value of 1 if the candidate is female.

Sources: For many races, this information was identified by the National Institute for Money in State Politics. In other cases, it was obtained by examining candidate biographies, newspaper articles, and court websites.

**minority**

States: AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

Years: 1990-2010

Description: Binary. Takes a value of 1 if the candidate is a racial minority.

Sources: For many races, this information was identified by the National Institute for Money in State Politics. In other cases, it was obtained by examining candidate biographies, newspaper articles, the American Bar Association’s Directory of Minority Judges, and court websites.

**appointed**

States: AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

Years: 1990-2010

Description: Binary. Takes a value of 1 if the incumbent in the race was initially appointed.

**pid**

States: AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

Years: 1990-2010

Description: Factor. Takes a value of 0 if the candidate is a Republican, a value of 1 if the candidate is a Democrat, and a value of 2 if the candidate is from a third-party, and a value of 3 if the candidate has no party affiliation. This variable classifies the candidate’s political party, not the political party that appears on the ballot.

Sources: For many races, this information was identified by the National Institute for Money in State Politics

**spend**

We will begin releasing this variable in late July. Coding rules to follow.

States: AL, AR, GA, ID, IL, KY, LA, MI, MN, MS, MT, NC, ND, NM, NV, OH, OR, PA, TN
(1990-1994), TX, WA, WI, WV

Years: 1990-2010

Description: Continuous. Total amount of campaign spending.

**spend90**

We will begin releasing this variable in late July. Coding rules to follow.

States: AL, AR, GA, ID, IL, KY, LA, MI, MN, MS, MT, NC, ND, NM, NV, OH, OR, PA, TN (1990-1994), TX, WA, WI, WV

Years: 1990-2010

Description: Continuous. Total amount of campaign spending in 1990 U.S. dollars.

**fundr**

States: AL, AR, GA, ID, IL, KY, LA, MI, MN, MS, MT, NC, ND, NM, NV, OH, OR, PA, TN (1990-1994), TX, WA, WI, WV

Years: 1990-2010

Description: Continuous. Total amount of campaign fundraising.

**fundr90**

We will begin releasing this variable in late July. Coding rules to follow.

States: AL, AR, GA, ID, IL, KY, LA, MI, MN, MS, MT, NC, ND, NM, NV, OH, OR, PA, TN (1990-1994), TX, WA, WI, WV

Years: 1990-2010

Description: Continuous. Total amount of campaign fundraising in 1990 U.S. dollars.

**votes**

States: AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

Years: 1990-2010
Description: Continuous. Total number of votes received by the candidate in the general election.

**totalvotes**

*States:* AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

*Years:* 1990-2010

Description: Continuous. Total number of votes received by any candidate in this race in the general election.

**percent**

*States:* AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

*Years:* 1990-2010

Description: Continuous [0,1]. The percentage of votes cast in the race received by the candidate.

**POTUSWin**

*States:* AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

*Years:* 1990-2010

Description: The name of the candidate attracting the most votes in the US Presidential race on the general election ballot in the jurisdiction of the supreme court race. This variable takes a value of NA if there was no presidential race on the general election ballot.

**POTUSWinVotes**

*States:* AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

*Years:* 1990-2010

Description: The number of votes received by the candidate attracting the most votes in the
US Presidential race on the general election ballot in the jurisdiction of the supreme court race. This variable takes a value of NA if there was no presidential race on the general election ballot.

**POTUSVotesCast**

*States:* AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

*Years:* 1990-2010

*Description:* The total number of votes cast for all candidates (including write-in candidates) in the US Presidential race on the general election ballot in the jurisdiction of the supreme court race. This variable takes a value of NA if there was no presidential race on the general election ballot.

**GovWin**

*States:* AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

*Years:* 1990-2010

*Description:* The name of the candidate attracting the most votes in the gubernatorial race on the general election ballot. This variable takes a value of NA if there was no gubernatorial race on the general election ballot in the jurisdiction of the supreme court race.

**GovWinVotes**

*States:* AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

*Years:* 1990-2010

*Description:* The number of votes received by the candidate attracting the most votes in the gubernatorial race on the general election ballot in the jurisdiction of the supreme court race. This variable takes a value of NA if there was no gubernatorial race on the general election ballot.
GovVotesCast

*States:* AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

*Years:* 1990-2010

*Description:* The total number of votes cast for all candidates (including write-in candidates) in the gubernatorial race on the general election ballot in the jurisdiction of the supreme court race. This variable takes a value of NA if there was no gubernatorial race on the general election ballot.

SenWin

*States:* AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

*Years:* 1990-2010

*Description:* The name of the candidate attracting the most votes in the US senatorial race on the general election ballot. This variable takes a value of NA if there was no senatorial race on the general election ballot. This variable will be the same for all candidates and all races within a state for a given year.

SenWinVotes

*States:* AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

*Years:* 1990-2010

*Description:* The number of votes received by the candidate attracting the most votes in the US senatorial race on the general election ballot in the jurisdiction of the supreme court race. This variable takes a value of NA if there was no senatorial race on the general election ballot.

SenVotesCast

*States:* AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

*Years:* 1990-2010

*Description:* The total number of votes cast for all candidates (including write-in candidates)
in the US senatorial race on the general election ballot in the jurisdiction of the supreme court race. This variable takes a value of NA if there was no senatorial race on the general election ballot.

**qualc**

*States:* AL, AR, GA, ID, IL, KY, LA, MI, MN, MS, MT, NC, ND, NM, NV, OH, OR, PA, TN (1990-1994), TX, WA, WI, WV

*Years:* 1990-2010

*Description:* Binary. Takes a value of 1 if the candidate currently holds, or has ever held, a judgeship. Additionally, the variable takes a value of NC if we are not currently collecting this variable for a particular race at this time; currently, we are only collecting this information for contestable elections.

**tcexp**

*States:* AL, AR, GA, ID, IL, KY, LA, MI, MN, MS, MT, NC, ND, NM, NV, OH, OR, PA, TN (1990-1994), TX, WA, WI, WV

*Years:* 1990-2010

*Description:* Binary. Takes a value of 1 if the candidate is a current or former trial court judge. Additionally, the variable takes a value of NC if we are not currently collecting this variable for a particular race at this time; currently, we are only collecting this information for contestable elections.

**tcname**

*States:* AL, AR, GA, ID, IL, KY, LA, MI, MN, MS, MT, NC, ND, NM, NV, OH, OR, PA, TN (1990-1994), TX, WA, WI, WV

*Years:* 1990-2010

*Description:* Text. The name(s) of the trial court(s) upon which the candidate has previously served. If the candidate has no previous experience of this sort, the variable takes a value of NA. Additionally, the variable takes a value of NC if we are not currently collecting this variable for a particular race at this time; currently, we are only collecting this information for contestable elections.

**iacexp**

*States:* AL, AR, GA, ID, IL, KY, LA, MI, MN, MS, MT, NC, ND, NM, NV, OH, OR, PA, TN (1990-1994), TX, WA, WI, WV
Years: 1990-2010

Description: Binary. Takes a value of 1 if the candidate is a current or former intermediate appellate court judge. Additionally, the variable takes a value of NC if we are not currently collecting this variable for a particular race at this time; currently, we are only collecting this information for contestable elections.

iacname

States: AL, AR, GA, ID, IL, KY, LA, MI, MN, MS, MT, NC, ND, NM, NV, OH, OR, PA, TN (1990-1994), TX, WA, WI, WV

Years: 1990-2010

Description: Text. The name(s) of the trial court(s) upon which the candidate has previously served. If the candidate has no previous experience of this sort, the variable takes a value of NA. Additionally, the variable takes a value of NC if we are not currently collecting this variable for a particular race at this time; currently, we are only collecting this information for contestable elections.

defsc

States: AL, AR, GA, ID, IL, KY, LA, MI, MN, MS, MT, NC, ND, NM, NV, OH, OR, PA, TN (1990-1994), TX, WA, WI, WV

Years: 1990-2010

Description: Binary. Takes a value of 1 if the candidate is a defeated supreme court justice. Additionally, the variable takes a value of NC if we are not currently collecting this variable for a particular race at this time; currently, we are only collecting this information for contestable elections.

otheroffice

States: AL, AR, GA, ID, IL, KY, LA, MI, MN, MS, MT, NC, ND, NM, NV, OH, OR, PA, TN (1990-1994), TX, WA, WI, WV

Years: 1990-2010

Description: Text. The name(s) of the trial court(s) upon which the candidate has previously served. If the candidate has no previous electoral experience, the variable takes a value of NA. Additionally, the variable takes a value of NC if we are not currently collecting this variable for a particular race at this time; currently, we are only collecting this information for contestable elections.
elections.

campoff

States: AL, AR, GA, ID, IL, KY, LA, MI, MN, MS, MT, NC, ND, NM, NV, OH, OR, PA, TN (1990-1994), TX, WA, WI, WV

Years: 1990-2010

Description: Text. Description of office(s) campaigned for; put the year of the campaign in parentheses where available. Additionally, the variable takes a value of NC if we are not currently collecting this variable for a particular race at this time; currently, we are only collecting this information for contestable elections.

totalwithoutnc

States: AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

Years: 1990-2010

Description: The total amount of contributions raised by the candidate minus any noncontributions.

Sources: This information was provided by the National Institute for Money in State Politics on March 31, 2010.

agriculture

States: AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

Years: 1990-2010

Description: The total amount of contributions raised by the candidate from the agricultural sector as coded by the National Institute for Money in State Politics.

Sources: This information was provided by the National Institute for Money in State Politics on March 31, 2010.

construction

States: AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

Years: 1990-2010
**Description:** The total amount of contributions raised by the candidate from the construction sector as coded by the National Institute for Money in State Politics.

**Sources:** This information was provided by the National Institute for Money in State Politics on March 31, 2010.

### comelect

**States:** AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

**Description:** The total amount of contributions raised by the candidate from the communications and electronics sector as coded by the National Institute for Money in State Politics.

**Sources:** This information was provided by the National Institute for Money in State Politics on March 31, 2010.

### defense

**States:** AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

**Years:** 1990-2010

**Description:** The total amount of contributions raised by the candidate from the defense sector as coded by the National Institute for Money in State Politics.

**Sources:** This information was provided by the National Institute for Money in State Politics on March 31, 2010.

### energynr

**States:** AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

**Years:** 1990-2010

**Description:** The total amount of contributions raised by the candidate from the energy and natural resources sector as coded by the National Institute for Money in State Politics.

**Sources:** This information was provided by the National Institute for Money in State Politics on March 31, 2010.

### fireinsre

**States:** AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY
Years: 1990-2010

Description: The total amount of contributions raised by the candidate from the fire, insurance, and real estate sector as coded by the National Institute for Money in State Politics.

Sources: This information was provided by the National Institute for Money in State Politics on March 31, 2010.

genbus
States: AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

Years: 1990-2010

Description: The total amount of contributions raised by the candidate from the general business sector as coded by the National Institute for Money in State Politics.

Sources: This information was provided by the National Institute for Money in State Politics on March 31, 2010.

health
States: AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

Years: 1990-2010

Description: The total amount of contributions raised by the candidate from the health sector as coded by the National Institute for Money in State Politics.

Sources: This information was provided by the National Institute for Money in State Politics on March 31, 2010.

retireecivserv
States: AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

Years: 1990-2010

Description: The total amount of contributions raised by the candidate from the other retiree and civil servant sector as coded by the National Institute for Money in State Politics.

Sources: This information was provided by the National Institute for Money in State Politics on March 31, 2010.
ideospint

States: AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

Years: 1990-2010

Description: The total amount of contributions raised by the candidate from the other retiree and civil servant sector as coded by the National Institute for Money in State Politics.

Sources: This information was provided by the National Institute for Money in State Politics on March 31, 2010.

lawyerlobby

States: AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

Years: 1990-2010

Description: The total amount of contributions raised by the candidate from the lawyers and lobbyists sector as coded by the National Institute for Money in State Politics.

Sources: This information was provided by the National Institute for Money in State Politics on March 31, 2010.

labor

States: AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

Years: 1990-2010

Description: The total amount of contributions raised by the candidate from the labor sector as coded by the National Institute for Money in State Politics.

Sources: This information was provided by the National Institute for Money in State Politics on March 31, 2010.

transport

States: AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

Years: 1990-2010

Description: The total amount of contributions raised by the candidate from the transportation sector as coded by the National Institute for Money in State Politics.
Sources: This information was provided by the National Institute for Money in State Politics on March 31, 2010.

**uncoded**

*States:* AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

*Years:* 1990-2010

*Description:* The total amount of contributions whose sector was not identified by the National Institute for Money in State Politics.

Sources: This information was provided by the National Institute for Money in State Politics on March 31, 2010.

**partycontrib**

*States:* AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

*Years:* 1990-2010

*Description:* The total amount of contributions raised by the candidate from sources related to the candidate’s party as coded by the National Institute for Money in State Politics.

Sources: This information was provided by the National Institute for Money in State Politics on March 31, 2010.

**smallcontrib**

*States:* AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

*Years:* 1990-2010

*Description:* The total amount of small contributions raised by the candidate as coded by the National Institute for Money in State Politics.

Sources: This information was provided by the National Institute for Money in State Politics on March 31, 2010.

**candcontrib**

*States:* AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY
Years: 1990-2010

Description: The total amount of candidate contributions made by the candidate as coded by the National Institute for Money in State Politics.

Sources: This information was provided by the National Institute for Money in State Politics on March 31, 2010.

**noncontrib**

States: AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

Years: 1990-2010

Description: The total amount of non-contributions received by the candidate as coded by the National Institute for Money in State Politics.

Sources: This information was provided by the National Institute for Money in State Politics on March 31, 2010.

**pubsub**

States: AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

Years: 1990-2010

Description: The total amount of public subsidy received by the candidate from the construction sector as coded by the National Institute for Money in State Politics.

Sources: This information was provided by the National Institute for Money in State Politics on March 31, 2010.

**instate**

States: AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

Years: 1990-2010

Description: The total amount of in-state contributions raised by the candidate as coded by the National Institute for Money in State Politics.

Sources: This information was provided by the National Institute for Money in State Politics on March 31, 2010.
**outstate**

*States:* AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

*Years:* 1990-2010

*Description:* The total amount of in-state contributions raised by the candidate as coded by the National Institute for Money in State Politics.

*Sources:* This information was provided by the National Institute for Money in State Politics on March 31, 2010.

**unkstate**

*States:* AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

*Years:* 1990-2010

*Description:* The total amount of contributions raised by the candidate for which the National Institute for Money in State Politics was unable to identify a state.

*Sources:* This information was provided by the National Institute for Money in State Politics on March 31, 2010.

**notes**

*States:* AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

*Years:* 1990-2010

*Description:* Text. Coding notes for the candidate.

**State-Level Variables**

**id**

*States:* AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

*Years:* 1990-2010

*Description:* This is a unique identifier for the state-year. The identifier has two parts separated by a hyphen: the two-letter state abbreviation and the four-digit year. For Texas and Oklahoma (the two states with multiple courts of last resort), TX and OK denote the civic court of last resort, and...
TC and OC denote the criminal court of last resort.

**state**
*States:* AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

*Years:* 1990-2010

*Description:* Text. The name of the state.

**year**
*States:* AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

*Years:* 1990-2010

*Description:* The four-digit year.

**oddyear**
*States:* AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

*Years:* 1990-2010

*Description:* Binary. Takes a value of 1 if the year is odd-numbered.

**potusyr**
*States:* AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

*Years:* 1990-2010

*Description:* Binary. Takes a value of 1 if the election is held during a presidential election year.

**partisan**
*States:* AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY
Years: 1990-2010

Description: Binary. Takes a value of 1 if the state holds partisan judicial elections to select and retain supreme court judges.

retention

States: AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

Years: 1990-2010

Description: Binary. Takes a value of 1 if the state holds retention judicial elections to retain supreme court judges.

nonpartisan

States: AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

Years: 1990-2010

Description: Binary. Takes a value of 1 if the state holds nonpartisan judicial elections to select and retain supreme court judges.

numavails

States: AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

Years: 1990-2010

Description: Ordinal. Number of available court of last resort seats in the state that year.

numsts

States: AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

Years: 1990-2010

Description: Ordinal. Number of seats on the court of last resort.
**noiac**

*States:* AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

*Years:* 1990-2010

*Description:* Binary. Takes a value of 1 if the state has no intermediate appellate court.

**term**

*States:* AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

*Years:* 1990-2010

*Description:* Continuous. Length of term measured in years.

*Source:* For 1990-2005, the data come from Lindquist’s State Politics and the Judiciary data set.

**ctprof**

*States:* AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

*Years:* 1990-2010

*Description:* Brace and Hall (2001) measure of state supreme court professionalism (a factor analysis of the “number of clerks available to assist the Chief Justice and all other justices in their routine tasks, the amount of remuneration received by the justices (standardized against average employee earnings of other justice system employees), the number of justices relative to population, and overall docket size”).

**stringency**

*States:* AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

*Years:* 1990-2010

**regulation**

*States:* AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

*Years:* 1990-2010

*Description:* Continuous. Witko (2005) index of state disclosure requirements.

---

**regulation**

*States:* AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

*Years:* 1990-2010


---

**regulation**

*States:* AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

*Years:* 1990-2010


---

**chcomp**

*States:* AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

*Years:* 1990-2010

*Description:* Continuous. Base salary for the chief justice, in dollars.

*Source:* *The Book of the States* and the National Center for State Courts’s Survey of Judicial Salaries.

---

**astcomp**

*States:* AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY
Years: 1990-2010

Description: Continuous. Base salary for associate justices, in dollars.

Source: The Book of the States and the National Center for State Courts’s Survey of Judicial Salaries.

govparty
States: AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

Years: 1990-2010

Description: Factor. Takes a value of 0 if Governor is a Republican, a value of 1 if the governor is a Democrat, and a value of .5 if the there was split control of the governor’s office during that year. Years in which a governor switched parties or was replaced by a governor of the other major party may receive fractional scores.

Source: For 1990-2005, the data come from Lindquist’s State Politics and the Judiciary data set.

uhparty
States: AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

Years: 1990-2010

Description: Factor. Takes a value of 0 if the upper house is controlled by Republicans, a value of 1 if it is controlled by Democrats, a value of .5 if there is split control. If one party had more than 50%, the case received its score on the basis of percent of legislators who were of the two different parties.

Source: For 1990-2005, the data come from Lindquist’s State Politics and the Judiciary data set.

lhparty
States: AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

Years: 1990-2010

Description: Factor. Takes a value of 0 if the upper house is controlled by Republicans, a value of 1 if it is controlled by Democrats, a value of .5 if there is split control. If one party had more than 50%, the case received its score on the basis of percent of legislators who were of the two different parties.
For 1990-2005, the data come from Lindquist’s State Politics and the Judiciary data set.

**unifiedgov**

*States:* AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

*Years:* 1990-2010

*Description:* Binary. Takes a value of 1 if the legislative and executive branches of state government are unified and a value of 0 if there is divided government.

*Source:* For 1990-2005, the data come from Lindquist’s State Politics and the Judiciary data set.

**preswinparty**

*States:* AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

*Years:* 1990-2010

*Description:* Binary. Takes a value of 0 if the most recent presidential winner is a Democrat or a value of 1 if the winning candidate is a Republican.

**senwinparty**

*States:* AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

*Years:* 1990-2010

*Description:* Factor. Takes a value of 0 if the most recent senatorial winner is a Democrat, a value of 1 if the winning candidate is a Republican, and a value of two 2 if he or she is from a third party.

**govwinparty**

*States:* AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

*Years:* 1990-2010

*Description:* Factor. Takes a value of 0 if the most recent gubernatorial winner is a Democrat, a value of 1 if the winning candidate is a Republican, and a value of two 2 if he or she is from a third party.
lawyers

*States:* AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

*Years:* 1990-2010

*Description:* Continuous. The number of lawyers in each state at the time of election.

*Source:* Statistical Reports provided by the market research department of the American Bar Association

edlevel

*States:* AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

*Years:* 1990-2010

*Description:* Continuous [0,1]. The percentage of the state population 25 years of age or older with a high school diploma.

*Sources:* U.S. Census Bureau

tort

*States:* AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

*Years:* 1990-2010

*Description:* Continuous. Proportion of the court docket (1995) involving tort cases

*Source:* State Supreme Court Database.

murder

*States:* AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

*Years:* 1990-2010

*Description:* The number of murders and non-negligent manslaughters per 100,000 inhabitants.

*Source:* The Federal Bureau of Investigation’s *Uniform Crime Reports.*
vap

States: AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

Years: 1990-2010

Description: Voting age population of the state/district according to the data on McDonald’s website (http://elections.gmu.edu).

vep

States: AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

Years: 1990-2010

Description: Voting eligible population of the state/district according to the data on McDonald’s website (http://elections.gmu.edu).

berrycitid

States: AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

Years: 1990-2010

Description: Continuous. Berry et al. (1998) citizen ideology score.

Source: For 1990-2004, the data come from Lindquist’s State Politics and the Judiciary data set which, in turn, is taken from Richard Fording’s website.

distlevcomp

States: AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

Years: 1990-2010

Description: Continuous. The measure of district-level competition calculated in Holbrook and Van Dunk (1993).

Source: For 1995-2004, the data come from Lindquist’s State Politics and the Judiciary data set. For other years, the variable is calculated using the methodology outlined in Ranney, Austin. 1965. Parties in State Politics. In Herbert Jacobs and Kenneth N. Vines, eds. Politics in the American

foldranney

*States:* AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

*Years:* 1990-2010

*Description:* Continuous. The folded Ranney index calculated in Holbrook and Van Dunk (1993).


ranney

*States:* AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY

*Years:* 1990-2010

*Description:* Continuous. The Ranney index

References


tion.” *PS: Political Science and Politics* 28:444-452.
