Is More Information Always Better?
Party Cues and Candidate Quality in U.S. Judicial Elections

Supplementary Material
(Online Appendix)

Claire S. H. Lim*
Department of Economics
Cornell University

James M. Snyder, Jr.†
Department of Government
Harvard University and NBER

Abstract

This supplementary material contains additional descriptions and statistics of our electoral data and judicial evaluation data as well as various robustness checks. It is composed of fourteen tables. The first six tables (Tables S.1 – S.6) present statistics of the electoral data: distribution of candidate-race observations, primary and general elections in the partisan system, the first and the second round races in the nonpartisan system, and retention elections. Each table presents state-by-state election statistics such as the number of candidate-race observations, the number of elections, uncontested and contested elections, the number of candidates in contested elections, and winners' vote share. Table S.7 presents the composition of the judicial evaluation data. Table S.8 presents the definition of the "qualified" status (i.e., the dichotomous *Score* variable) for each state. Table S.9 presents the data period and offices used in the computation of *Democratic Normal Vote 1* in the measurement of partisan voting. Table S.10 presents partisan differences in judicial evaluations. Tables S.11 and S.12 present robustness checks for Table 7 in the main text. Tables S.13 and S.14 present robustness checks for Table 9 in the main text.

*E-mail: clairelim@cornell.edu
†E-mail: jsnyder@gov.harvard.edu

Table S.1: Distribution of Candidate-Race Observations in the Election Data

State	Main Selection System	Number of Observations by Level and Election Period						Total	Period
		Supreme		Appellate		Trial			
		Primary	General	Primary	General	Primary	General		
AK	Appt + Ret	0	18	0	11	0	153	182	1976-2010
AL	Partisan	28	56	70	53	278	574	1059	1992-2010
AR	Non-partisan	25	14	32	7	192	46	316	1992-2010
AZ	Non-partisan	0	19	0	76	67	528	690	1990-2010
CA	Non-partisan	0	20	0	280	936	234	1470	1990-2010
CO	Appt + Ret	0	13	0	33	0	334	380	1996-2010
FL	Non-partisan	0	39	0	321	1144	262	2990	1978-2010
GA	Non-partisan	17	19	34	43	655	670	1438	1996-2010
IA	Appt + Ret	0	19	0	28	0	744	791	1990-2010
ID	Non-partisan	26	2	11	0	168	8	215	1990-2010
IL	Part + Ret	51	36	285	184	2722	2819	6097	1982-2010
IN	Partisan	0	5	0	17	669	604	1295	2002-2010
KS	Mixed	0	28	0	62	668	1196	1954	1982-2010
KY	Appt + Ret	3	21	12	50	78	433	597	1999-2010
LA	Partisan	32	7	139	13	1078	143	1412	1996-2010
MD	Non-partisan	0	12	0	35	588	251	886	1990-2008
MI	Non-partisan	0	61	50	131	309	886	1437	1992-2010
MN	Non-partisan	13	26	0	49	95	789	972	1990-2010
MO	Partisan	0	9	0	52	250	432	743	1996-2010
MS	Non-partisan	24	39	0	40	0	136	239	1986-2000
MT	Non-partisan	31	32	0	0	215	179	457	1992-2010
NC	Non-partisan	13	38	36	60	69	294	510	1994-2010
ND	Non-partisan	17	17	0	0	222	192	448	1990-2010
NE	Appt + Ret	0	24	0	18	0	175	217	1990-2010
NM	Part + Ret	7	19	24	33	170	334	587	1996-2010
NV	Non-partisan	22	29	0	0	262	200	513	1998-2010
NY	Partisan	0	0	0	0	0	1144	1144	1990-2008
OH	Non-partisan	60	54	483	380	2143	1824	4944	1990-2010
OK	Non-partisan	0	36	0	69	641	400	1146	1990-2010
OR	Non-partisan	41	10	37	15	696	193	992	1990-2010
PA	Part + Ret	16	17	56	53	1074	492	1708	1991-2011
SD	Non-partisan	0	9	0	0	24	107	140	1990-2006
TN	Partisan	0	6	0	36	0	254	296	2000-2010
TX	Partisan	94	86	668	495	3475	2713	7531	1990-2010
UT	Appt + Ret	0	10	0	26	0	229	265	1990-2010
WA	Non-partisan	154	92	103	95	504	268	1216	1970-2010
WI	Non-partisan	18	28	9	72	474	1041	1642	1988-2010
WV	Partisan	33	19	0	0	296	218	566	1992-2010
WY	Appt + Ret	0	12	0	0	0	56	68	1996-2010
Total		725	1001	2049	2837	20162	21555	49553	

Note: When a state has primary-runoffs (general-runoffs), we count them as primaries (general elections) in this table. Since primary-runoffs and general-runoffs are rare, this classification does not affect the big picture of our data in a meaningful way. There are states with variation in selection systems across different levels of courts. In the case of such variation, we indicate the main selection system for the state trial courts. "Appt + Retention" refers to states with appointment and retention systems. "Part + Ret" refers to states with partisan elections followed by retention elections. "Mixed" refers to a case of within-state, cross-district variation. The total number for Florida includes 1224 observations of unopposed candidate-races that are not classified as primary or general elections.

Table S.2: Competition in Partisan Elections by State – Primary Elections

State	Seats up for Election	Number of Races					Number of Candidates in Contested Elections		Winner's Vote Share in Contested Elections	
			Democrat		Republican					
		Total[a]	UnContested	Contested	Uncontested	Contested	Mean	Std Dev	Mean	Std Dev
AL	541	189	59	49	32	49	2.3	0.5	0.589	0.093
AR	52	28	9	13	3	3	2.1	0.3	0.625	0.090
AZ	49	58	28	6	22	2	2.4	0.7	0.593	0.190
IL	969	1365	309	435	368	253	3.5	2.0	0.448	0.162
IN	407	491	151	37	243	60	2.4	0.7	0.553	0.101
KS	526	562	241	31	240	50	2.3	0.8	0.544	0.110
MD	104	206	67	36	66	37	2.6	1.2	0.638	0.141
MO	177	195	86	18	69	22	2.4	0.7	0.553	0.110
MS	12	11	5	5	0	1	2.0	0.0	0.637	0.107
NC	50	16	0	12	0	4	2.1	0.3	0.623	0.088
NM	122	143	53	35	46	9	2.3	0.6	0.548	0.092
OH	1565	2154	776	191	1046	141	2.6	1.2	0.548	0.144
PA	97	188	11	84	23	70	3.2	1.5	0.496	0.132
TX	2572	3122	1163	283	1352	324	2.2	0.6	0.591	0.094
WV	193	228	111	57	50	10	2.3	0.6	0.563	0.105
Total	7436	8956	3069	1292	3560	1035	2.8	1.4	0.529	0.145

Note: For the number of candidates and winners' vote share, we report only the statistics of the elections with single winners, because statistics of the elections in multi-winner elections are not comparable to those of single-winner elections. Arkansas used partisan elections until 2000, then switched to non-partisan elections. In Arizona, counties with populations of 250,000 or greater select state trial court judges through gubernatorial appointment and retention election, and all other counties use partisan primaries and non-partisan general elections. Indiana uses partisan elections with the following exceptions: Circuit Courts and Superior Courts in Vanderburg County and Superior Court in Allen County use non-partisan elections; and, Superior Courts in Lake and St. Joseph Counties use gubernatorial appointment and retention elections. In Kansas, 14 judicial districts use partisan elections, and the other 17 districts use gubernatorial appointment and retention elections. In Missouri, Jackson, Clay, Platte, and St. Louis counties use gubernatorial appointment and retention elections for state trial court judges, and all other use partisan elections. Gubernatorial appointment with retention elections are used for appellate and supreme courts. Mississippi used partisan elections until 1992. North Carolina used partisan elections for superior courts until 1998, and for appellate and supreme courts until 2004. New York, which uses partisan elections, is omitted from the table because it uses party conventions rather than primaries to make judicial nominations. The data on primary elections in Tennessee are unavailable.

[a] The total number of races does not include the primaries of the third party.

Table S.3: Competition in Partisan Elections by State – General Elections

State	Seats up for Election	Total Number of Races	No. of Uncontested Races	No. of Contested Races	Number of Candidates in Contested Elections		Winner's Vote Share in Contested Elections	
					Mean	Std Dev	Mean	Std Dev
AL	541	533	391	142	2.0	0.0	0.552	0.066
AR	52	32	16	16	2.0	0.0	0.602	0.074
IL	969	962	562	400	2.0	0.1	0.595	0.069
IN	407	406	307	99	2.0	0.1	0.573	0.063
KS	526	522	449	73	2.0	0.0	0.563	0.056
MO	177	174	135	39	2.0	0.2	0.576	0.088
MS	12	11	8	3	2.0	0.0	0.613	0.078
NC	50	44	11	33	2.0	0.0	0.535	0.040
NM	122	118	63	55	2.0	0.2	0.557	0.045
NY	201	201	40	161	2.1	0.3	0.589	0.087
PA	97	97	37	60	2.1	0.2	0.559	0.038
TN	180	180	134	46	2.4	0.8	0.578	0.130
TX	2572	2547	1825	722	2.0	0.2	0.554	0.074
WV	193	193	153	40	2.0	0.0	0.570	0.049
Total	6099	6020	4131	1889	2.0	0.2	0.567	0.074

Note: For number of candidates and winners' vote share in contested elections, we report only the statistics of the elections in single-member districts, because statistics of the elections in multi-member districts are not comparable to those of single-member districts.

Table S.4: Competition in Non-Partisan Elections by State – First Round

State	Total Number of Races	No. of Uncontested Races	No. of Contested Races	No. of Candidates in Contested Elections		Top Vote-getter's Vote Share in Contested Elections	
				Mean	Std Dev	Mean	Std Dev
AR	109	41	68	2.3	0.7	0.569	0.089
CA	377	52	325	2.8	1.3	0.584	0.132
FL	1689	1505	184	3.2	0.9	0.453	0.116
GA	804	660	144	2.6	1.2	0.589	0.117
ID	182	164	18	2.3	0.5	0.581	0.074
IN	29	24	5	2.8	0.8	0.526	0.110
KY	361	232	129	2.4	0.9	0.557	0.099
LA	812	568	244	2.8	1.1	0.550	0.115
MI	504	349	155	3.3	1.7	0.527	0.135
MN	741	639	102	2.9	2.8	0.581	0.119
MS	111	58	53	2.4	0.8	0.568	0.096
MT	154	128	26	2.9	1.3	0.523	0.124
NC	172	101	71	2.7	1.2	0.544	0.127
ND	168	146	22	2.7	1.2	0.561	0.143
NV	181	88	93	3.3	1.5	0.538	0.142
OK	571	348	223	2.5	0.9	0.571	0.102
OR	703	602	101	2.9	1.3	0.545	0.125
SD	83	59	24	2.4	0.8	0.560	0.130
WA	493	296	197	2.6	1.0	0.565	0.110
WI	1036	802	234	2.7	1.2	0.580	0.125
Total	9280	6862	2418	2.8	1.3	0.560	0.122

Note 1: For the number of candidates and winners' vote share in contested elections, we report only the statistics of the elections in single-member districts, because statistics of the elections in multi-member districts are not comparable to those of single-member districts.
Note 2: In Indiana, non-partisan election is used only in Vanderburgh and Allen County. All the non-partisan elections in Indiana in this table were held in general elections.

Table S.5: Competition in Non-Partisan Elections by State – Second Round

State	Total Number of Races	No. of Uncontested Races	No. of Contested Races	No. of Candidates in Contested Elections		Winner's Vote Share in Contested Elections	
				Mean	Std Dev	Mean	Std Dev
AR	9		9	2.0	0.0	0.564	0.039
AZ	56	47	9	2.8	1.6	0.554	0.100
CA	105		105	2.0	0.0	0.563	0.052
FL	125		125	2.0	0.0	0.558	0.045
GA	36		36	2.0	0.2	0.577	0.065
ID	5		5	2.0	0.0	0.552	0.026
KY	23		23	2.0	0.0	0.581	0.062
LA	75		75	2.0	0.0	0.569	0.093
MD	119	112	7	2.0	0.0	0.615	0.052
MI	70		70	2.0	0.0	0.548	0.040
MN	20		20	2.0	0.0	0.584	0.068
MS	4		4	2.0	0.0	0.563	0.068
MT	47		47	2.0	0.0	0.586	0.069
NC	22		22	2.0	0.0	0.554	0.037
ND	40		40	2.0	0.0	0.592	0.068
NV	57		57	2.0	0.0	0.573	0.054
OH	1564	908	656	2.1	0.3	0.592	0.081
OK	57		57	2.0	0.0	0.558	0.043
OR	28		28	2.0	0.0	0.559	0.044
SD	7		7	2.0	0.0	0.559	0.043
WA	54		54	2.0	0.0	0.563	0.045
WI	96		96	2.0	0.0	0.579	0.060
Total	2619	1067	1552	2.0	0.2	0.578	0.070

Note 1: For number of candidates and winners' vote share in contested elections, we report only the statistics of the elections in single-member districts, because statistics of the elections in multi-member districts are not comparable to those of single-member districts.

Note 2: Arizona has partisan primaries and non-partisan general elections in counties with population smaller than 250,000. The nonpartisan elections in Arizona in this table were all held in general elections after partisan primaries.

Note 3: The nonpartisan elections in Ohio and in Maryland in this table were all held in general elections after partisan primaries.

Table S.6: Vote Share in Retention Elections by State

State	No. of Elections	Shares of "Yes" Votes						
		Mean	Std Dev	Min	10th Percen -tile	Median	90th Percen- tile	Max
AK	182	0.662	0.055	0.519	0.601	0.660	0.730	0.841
AZ	549	0.721	0.060	0.537	0.632	0.726	0.802	0.831
CA	300	0.695	0.061	0.519	0.611	0.707	0.763	0.801
CO	380	0.709	0.058	0.378	0.635	0.721	0.770	0.822
FL	360	0.698	0.051	0.531	0.631	0.706	0.761	0.810
IA	791	0.746	0.054	0.376	0.683	0.756	0.800	0.852
IL	1677	0.766	0.053	0.511	0.705	0.775	0.825	0.885
IN	33	0.696	0.037	0.595	0.649	0.702	0.732	0.780
KS	691	0.754	0.063	0.509	0.673	0.757	0.837	0.905
MD	47	0.845	0.040	0.746	0.779	0.861	0.883	0.899
MO	279	0.683	0.043	0.554	0.627	0.685	0.739	0.780
MT	108	0.813	0.057	0.591	0.730	0.832	0.877	0.916
NE	217	0.720	0.057	0.326	0.665	0.730	0.775	0.825
NM	207	0.741	0.062	0.505	0.655	0.750	0.809	0.861
OK	105	0.643	0.043	0.557	0.575	0.656	0.689	0.720
PA	195	0.744	0.080	0.355	0.628	0.755	0.825	0.865
SD	9	0.830	0.011	0.812	0.812	0.829	0.846	0.846
TN	42	0.746	0.024	0.683	0.710	0.755	0.771	0.776
UT	265	0.795	0.052	0.460	0.745	0.798	0.853	0.886
WY	68	0.779	0.045	0.493	0.743	0.785	0.820	0.847
Total	6505	0.739	0.067	0.326	0.646	0.747	0.817	0.916

Note: Arizona, California, Florida, Oklahoma, and Tennessee use gubernatorial appointment and retention election for state appellate courts and supreme courts. In Montana, incumbent judges who are unopposed in the first round run for retention elections at the time of general elections. South Dakota uses gubernatorial appointment and retention election only for the state supreme court.

Table S.7: Composition of Judicial Evaluation Data

State	Type	Name of Evaluating Body	Period	Number
AK	State	Alaska Judicial Council	1996-2010	152
AL	Bar	Birmingham Bar Association	2004-2010	118
AZ	State	Arizona Commiss. on Judicial Performance Review	2000-2010	384
CA	Bar	Los Angeles County Bar Association	1994-2010	314
CA	Bar	Orange County Bar Association	1998-2010	65
CA	Bar	San Diego County Bar Association	1994-2010	98
CA	Bar	San Francisco County Bar Association	1996-2010	21
CO	State	Colorado Commiss. on Judicial Performance	1996-2010	781
FL	Bar	Dade County Bar Association	2001-2010	487
IL	Bar	Illinois State Bar Association	1990-2010	3501
IL	Bar	Chicago area Bar Associations (several)	1990-2010	2619
IA	Bar	Iowa State Bar Association	1990-2010	803
KS	State	Kansas Commission on Judicial Performance	2008-2010	127
KY	Bar	Louisville Bar Association	2003-2010	98
MI	Bar	Detroit Metropolitan Bar Association	1992-2010	354
MN	Bar	State Bar Association (with 2 county Bar Assoc)	1990-2010	190
MO	Bar	Missouri Bar Association	1996-2006	293
NE	Bar	Nebraska State Bar Association	2002-2010	694
NM	State	New Mexico Judicial Perform. Eval. Commiss.	2002-2010	194
NV	News	Las Vegas Review Journal	2000-2011	408
NY	Bar	New York City Bar Association	1997-2010	322
OH	Bar	Cleveland area Bar Associations (several)	1992-2010	769
OH	Bar	Columbus Bar Association	1993-2010	628
OR	Bar	Oregon State Bar Association	1990-2010	913
PA	Bar	Philadelphia Bar Association	1991-2011	768
PA	Bar	Allegheny County Bar Association	2001-2009	167
TX	Bar	Houston Bar Association	1992-2010	1959
TX	Bar	Dallas Bar Association	1993-2011	1550
UT	State	Utah Judicial Council	1998-2010	223
WA	Bar	Seattle-King County Bar Association	1990-2012	425
WY	Bar	Wyoming State Bar Association	1998-2010	87

Table S.8: Definition of the "Qualified" Status ($Score = 1$)

State	Definition of Score = 1
IL	overall evaluation from more than 50% of the bar associations is "highly qualified" or "highly recommended" or "well qualified" or "qualified" or "recommended" or "retain" or "qualified/ highly-qualified" rather than "not qualified" or "not recommended" or "do not retain" or "did not participate"
TX	percent who say "well qualified" or "qualified" rather than "not qualified" exceeds 50%
OH	overall evaluation is "highly recommended" or "excellent" or "acceptable" or "adequate" rather than "non recommended" or "did not participate"; for Toledo: percent who say "highly qualified" or "qualified" rather than "not qualified" exceeds 50%
CA	overall evaluation is "exceptionally well qualified" or "well qualified" or "highly qualified" or "qualified" or "adequate" rather than "not qualified" or "not recommended" or "lacking qualifications" or "refused to participate"
MN	percent who prefer candidate is more than 25% (so, a race is only included when at least one candidate was preferred by under 25% of respondents)
OR	percent who prefer candidate is more than 25% (so, a race is only included when at least one candidate was preferred by under 25% of respondents)
WA	overall evaluation is "exceptionally well qualified" or "well qualified" or "highly qualified" "qualified" or "adequate" rather than "non qualified" or "not recommended" or "lacking qualifications" or "refused to participate"
WI	percent who say "highly qualified" or "qualified" rather than "not qualified" exceeds 65%
AZ	percent who say "meets standard" rather than "does not meet standard" exceeds 60%
CO	overall evaluation is "retain"
IA	percent who favor retention exceeds 60%
KS	percent who favor retention, either "strongly" or somewhat," exceeds 70%
MO	percent who favor retention exceeds 60%
NE	percent who favor retention exceeds 60%
NM	overall evaluation is "retain"
UT	percent who say "excellent" or "more than adequate" or "adequate" rather than "inadequate" exceeds 75%
WY	percent who favor retention exceeds 65%

Table S.9: Data Period and Offices Used in *Democratic Normal Vote 1*

State	Year	Office
AR	2006, 2008, 2010	Attorney General, Commissioner of Lands, Governor, Lt. Governor, Secretary of State, State Treasurer, State Senate, State Representative, U.S. President, U.S. Senate, U.S. House of Representatives
AZ	2002, 2004, 2006, 2008, 2010	Attorney General, Corporation Commissioner, Governor, Secretary of State, State Mine Inspector, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, State Treasurer, State Senate, State Representative, U.S. President, U.S. Senate, U.S. House of Representatives
CA	2004, 2006, 2008, 2010	Attorney General, Governor, Lt. Governor, Secretary of State, State Controller, State Insurance Commissioner, State Treasurer, U.S. President, U.S. Senate
IL	2002, 2006 2008, 2010	Attorney General, Governor, Secretary of State, State Comptroller, State Treasurer, U.S. President, U.S. Senate
NC	1998, 2000, 2002, 2004, 2006, 2008, 2010	Attorney General, Governor, Lt. Governor, Secretary of State, State Commissioner of Agriculture, State Commissioner of Insurance, State Auditor, State Commissioner of Labor, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, State Treasurer, State Representative, U.S. President, U.S. Senate, State Senate, U.S. House of Representatives
OH	1992, 1996, 1998, 2000, 2002, 2006, 2008, 2010	Attorney General, Governor, Secretary of State, State Auditor, State Treasurer, State Senate, State Representative, U.S. President, U.S. Senate, U.S. House of Representatives
PA	2002, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2008, 2009, 2010	Attorney General, Governor, Secretary of State, State Auditor, State Treasurer, U.S. President, U.S. Senate
TX	1996, 1998, 2000	Attorney General, Governor, Lt. Governor, Secretary of State, State Comptroller, State Commissioner of Agriculture, State Lands Commissioner, State Board of Education, State Railroad Commissioner, State Treasurer, State Senate, State Representative, U.S. President, U.S. Senate, U.S. House of Representatives
WA	2004, 2006, 2008, 2010	Attorney General, Governor, Lt. Governor, Secretary of State, State Auditor, State Insurance Commissioner, State Commissioner of Public Lands, State Treasurer, U.S. President, U.S. Senate

Note: *Democratic Normal Vote 1* is defined in equation (1) on page 10 in the main text.

Table S.10: Partisan Differences in Judicial Evaluations

State	Evaluating Body	Average Score[a]			
		Democrat	Republican	Difference	*p*-value
AZ	Arizona Commiss. on Judicial Performance Review	1.00	0.98	0.02	0.19
		(110)	(190)		
CO	Colorado Commiss. on Judicial Performance	0.99	0.99	0.00	0.77
		(474)	(184)		
IL	Average Across All Associations	0.75	0.81	-0.07	0.00
		(2604)	(1439)		
IA	Iowa State Bar Association	1.00	1.00	0.01	0.45
		(116)	(400)		
KS	Kansas Commission on Judicial Performance	0.96	0.95	0.01	0.75
		(55)	(40)		
MO	Missouri Bar Association	0.96	0.99	-0.03	0.13
		(191)	(101)		
NE	Nebraska State Bar Association	0.97	0.99	-0.03	0.08
		(162)	(177)		
NM	New Mexico Judicial Performance Eval. Commiss.	0.98	1.00	-0.02	0.41
		(104)	(35)		
NY	New York City Bar Association	0.94	0.54	0.41	0.00
		(68)	(56)		
OH	Average Across All Associations	0.76	0.86	-0.10	0.00
		(603)	(492)		
TX	Average Across All Associations	0.72	0.81	-0.09	0.00
		(621)	(769)		
WY	Wyoming State Bar Association	0.94	0.92	0.02	0.75
		(48)	(24)		

[a] *Score* is 1 if a candidate has "qualified" status, and 0 if a candidate has "unqualified" status. This *Score* variable is described and discussed in Sections 2.2 and 3.1 in the main text and in Table S.8 in this supplementary material.

Table S.11: Effect of Relative Score on Election Outcomes
Robustness Checks with Alternative Cutoffs for the *Score* Variable

State	Cutoff Multiplier[a]	Dependent Variable: Win Percentage Mean	Win Percentage Coef (1)	Win Percentage Std Error (2)	Win Percentage # Obs (3)	Vote Percentage Mean	Vote Percentage Coef (4)	Vote Percentage Std Error (5)	Vote Percentage # Obs (6)
Partisan General Elections									
Texas	0.8	37.0	10.0	(6.7)	243	46.0	2.7***	(1.0)	243
Texas	0.9	37.0	6.8	(5.4)	243	46.0	2.1***	(0.8)	243
Texas	1.0	37.0	5.2	(4.4)	243	46.0	2.1***	(0.7)	243
Texas	1.1	37.0	4.0	(4.1)	243	46.0	2.0***	(0.6)	243
Texas	1.2	37.0	4.3	(3.8)	243	46.0	2.0***	(0.6)	243
Partisan Primary Elections									
Texas	0.8	49.2	25.1***	(8.6)	122	50.3	12.4***	(2.7)	122
Texas	0.9	49.2	30.0***	(7.0)	122	50.3	11.4***	(2.2)	122
Texas	1.0	49.2	24.4***	(6.0)	122	50.3	10.5***	(1.8)	122
Texas	1.1	49.2	20.5***	(5.6)	122	50.3	9.2***	(1.7)	122
Texas	1.2	49.2	21.0***	(5.3)	122	50.3	9.3***	(1.6)	122
Non-Partisan Elections									
Minnesota	0.8	46.3	46.6***	(7.6)	54	49.5	11.0***	(1.4)	49
Minnesota	0.9	46.3	47.0***	(6.6)	54	49.5	10.9***	(1.2)	49
Minnesota	1.0	46.3	47.4***	(5.7)	54	49.5	10.8***	(1.1)	49
Minnesota	1.1	46.3	44.7***	(5.4)	54	49.5	10.0***	(1.0)	49
Minnesota	1.2	46.3	44.9***	(5.1)	54	49.5	9.9***	(1.0)	49
Oregon	0.8	44.7	24.3*	(14.3)	47	48.8	6.8**	(2.7)	47
Oregon	0.9	44.7	24.3*	(14.3)	47	48.8	6.8**	(2.7)	47
Oregon	1.0	44.7	29.7**	(12.4)	47	48.8	7.2***	(2.3)	47
Oregon	1.1	44.7	32.1***	(11.4)	47	48.8	6.7***	(2.2)	47
Oregon	1.2	44.7	34.6***	(10.1)	47	48.8	6.9***	(2.0)	47
Wisconsin	0.8	48.6	24.9	(15.4)	37	50.9	10.6***	(4.1)	37
Wisconsin	0.9	48.6	35.0**	(13.9)	37	50.9	11.4***	(3.8)	37
Wisconsin	1.0	48.6	34.1***	(11.3)	37	50.9	11.8***	(3.0)	37
Wisconsin	1.1	50.0	34.3***	(12.5)	26	51.2	10.4***	(3.9)	26
Wisconsin	1.2	50.0	50.6***	(20.2)	18	53.0	15.0***	(5.1)	18

Note: Columns (1)-(6) show the estimated coefficient on the variable Relative Score, as well as the standard error (in parentheses) and the number of observations, for two different election outcomes – win percentage (Columns (1)-(3)) and vote percentage (Columns (4)-(6)). *** p<0.01; ** p<0.05; * p<0.1

[a] The cutoff multiplier means the alternative cutoff as a proportion of the baseline cutoff for coding "qualified" status (*Score*=1). For example, if the cutoff multiplier is 0.8, the cutoff between *Score*=1 and *Score*=0 for the given row is 80% of the baseline cutoff presented in Table S.8.

Table S.11 (cont'd): Effect of Relative Score on Election Outcomes
Robustness Checks with Alterantive Cutoffs for the *Score* Variable

State	Cutoff Multiplier	Dependent Variable: Win Percentage Mean	Win Percentage Coef (1)	Win Percentage Std Error (2)	Win Percentage # Obs (3)	Vote Percentage Mean	Vote Percentage Coef (4)	Vote Percentage Std Error (5)	Vote Percentage # Obs (6)
Retention Elections									
Arizona	0.8	100.0	0.0	(0.0)	332	72.5	15.1**	(6.0)	331
Arizona	0.9	100.0	0.0	(0.0)	332	72.5	15.1**	(6.0)	331
Arizona	1.0	100.0	0.0	(0.0)	332	72.5	14.8***	(3.4)	331
Arizona	1.1	100.0	0.0	(0.0)	332	72.5	13.3***	(2.9)	331
Arizona	1.2	100.0	0.0	(0.0)	332	72.5	13.3***	(2.9)	331
Iowa	0.8	99.9	-0.1	(2.1)	741	74.8	8.7***	(2.9)	741
Iowa	0.9	99.9	-0.1	(1.6)	741	74.8	5.2**	(2.3)	741
Iowa	1.0	99.9	14.3***	(1.3)	741	74.8	9.7***	(1.9)	741
Iowa	1.1	99.9	5.3***	(0.8)	741	74.8	5.8***	(1.2)	741
Iowa	1.2	99.9	2.8***	(0.6)	741	74.8	3.6***	(0.9)	741
Kansas[b]	0.9	100.0	0.0	(0.0)	111	71.7	3.6	(4.0)	111
Kansas	1.0	100.0	0.0	(0.0)	111	71.7	0.6	(2.9)	111
Kansas	1.1	100.0	0.0	(0.0)	111	71.7	0.1	(2.0)	111
Kansas	1.2	100.0	0.0	(0.0)	111	71.7	-0.5	(1.4)	111
Missouri	0.8	100.0	0.0	(0.0)	291	68.1	10.5***	(3.0)	290
Missouri	0.9	100.0	0.0	(0.0)	291	68.1	7.5***	(1.9)	290
Missouri	1.0	100.0	0.0	(0.0)	291	68.1	6.3***	(1.4)	290
Missouri	1.1	100.0	0.0	(0.0)	291	68.1	4.3***	(1.0)	290
Missouri	1.2	100.0	0.0	(0.0)	291	68.1	2.4***	(0.7)	290
Nebraska	0.8	99.5	-0.5	(3.4)	222	72.1	7.8***	(2.4)	222
Nebraska	0.9	99.5	-0.5	(2.8)	222	72.1	9.0***	(1.9)	222
Nebraska	1.0	99.5	10.0***	(2.1)	222	72.1	9.6***	(1.4)	222
Nebraska	1.1	99.5	6.7***	(1.7)	222	72.1	9.0***	(1.2)	222
Nebraska	1.2	99.5	4.8***	(1.5)	222	72.1	7.6***	(1.0)	222
Utah[b]	1.0	99.0	28.6***	(3.3)	200	80.3	15.0***	(1.8)	200
Utah	1.1	99.0	10.5***	(2.3)	200	80.3	7.5***	(1.2)	200
Utah	1.2	99.0	3.0**	(1.5)	200	80.3	2.8***	(0.8)	200
Wyoming[b]	0.9	100.0	0.0	(0.0)	71	77.8	5.5	(4.3)	71
Wyoming	1.0	100.0	0.0	(0.0)	71	77.8	11.3***	(1.8)	71
Wyoming	1.1	100.0	0.0	(0.0)	71	77.8	6.4***	(1.3)	71
Wyoming	1.2	100.0	0.0	(0.0)	71	77.8	5.3***	(1.2)	71

[b] In Kansas, Utah, and Wyoming, cutoff multipliers smaller than the values shown in this table yield no candidates with *Score*=0.

Table S.12: Effect of Relative Score on Election Outcomes
Robustness Checks with Ratings as Continuous Variables
(The Effect of a One Standard Deviation Difference in Ratings as Continous Variables)

State	Dependent Variable					
	Win Percentage			Vote Percentage		
	Coef	Std Error	# Obs	Coef	Std Error	# Obs
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Partisan General Elections						
Illinois	11.6	(38.1)	126	-1.0	(6.2)	126
Texas	3.9	(2.8)	244	1.9***	(0.4)	244
Partisan Primary Elections						
Illinois	55.5**	(20.9)	94	11.2**	(4.6)	93
Texas	24.0***	(4.8)	122	9.7***	(1.5)	122
Non-Partisan Elections						
Minnesota	40.9***	(4.5)	54	9.0***	(0.9)	49
Oregon	24.8***	(9.7)	47	4.0**	(1.9)	47
Wisconsin	22.2***	(7.7)	37	7.7***	(1.8)	37
Retention Elections						
Arizona	0.0	(0.0)	332	2.1***	(0.2)	331
Colorado	0.7	(0.5)	456	1.3***	(0.3)	456
Illinois	29.6***	(3.3)	572	15.9***	(1.2)	572
Iowa	0.6***	(0.1)	741	0.8***	(0.2)	741
Kansas	0.0	(0.0)	111	0.4	(0.4)	111
Missouri	0.0	(0.0)	243	0.3***	(0.1)	242
Nebraska	0.9 *	(0.5)	222	2.2***	(0.3)	222
New Mexico	16.6**	(6.0)	14	5.0***	(0.9)	14
Utah	2.7***	(0.7)	200	1.7***	(0.3)	200
Wyoming	0.0	(0.0)	71	2.1***	(0.6)	71

Note: The judicial evaluation data used in this table are described in Table S.8. This table uses only the states where the raw evaluations are continuous variables. The coefficients show the response in win and vote percentages to a one standard deviation difference in the evaluation between the two candidates in contested elections. For retention elections, for which there is no contested election, the coefficients show the response in win and vote percentages to a one standard deviation change in the evaluation of the incumbent candidate. Columns (1)-(6) show the estimated coefficients, the standard error (in parentheses), and the number of observations. *** p<0.01; ** p<0.05; * p<0.1

Table S.13: Party and Criminal Sentencing

Dependent Variable: log (sentence length (months) + 1)

Independent Variable: Share of Democratic Judges

	Baseline							
Offense	TX				AL, IL, IN, KS, LA, NM, OH			
Category	Coefficient	Std Error	N	R^2	Coefficient	Std Error	N	R^2
Violent	0.190	0.148	27550	0.52	-0.184	0.167	34873	0.63
Property	0.362**	0.164	40430	0.45	0.087	0.146	59162	0.42
Drug	-0.076	0.231	53194	0.50	-0.101	0.128	110136	0.32
Other	-0.169	0.153	23629	0.48	-0.265**	0.129	44156	0.39
	Small Districts							
Offense	TX				AL, IL, IN, KS, LA, NM, OH			
Category	Coefficient	Std Error	N	R^2	Coefficient	Std Error	N	R^2
Violent	0.124	0.692	2278	0.48	-0.041	0.521	4748	0.65
Property	-0.908*	0.493	3280	0.43	0.260	0.532	8953	0.44
Drug	1.062	0.839	3454	0.43	0.139	0.499	10635	0.33
Other	0.077	0.604	1991	0.44	-0.439	0.287	4435	0.43
	No Demographic Controls							
Offense	TX				AL, IL, IN, KS, LA, NM, OH			
Category	Coefficient	Std Error	N	R^2	Coefficient	Std Error	N	R^2
Violent	-0.565**	0.273	27550	0.51	-0.102	0.108	34873	0.63
Property	-0.561	0.382	40430	0.44	0.180*	0.109	59162	0.42
Drug	-0.694*	0.409	53194	0.49	-0.084	0.139	110136	0.32
Other	-0.895**	0.393	23629	0.45	-0.031	0.148	44156	0.38

Note 1: In each panel the coefficient estimates are from four separate regressions, one for each offense category. *** p<0.01; ** p<0.05; * p<0.1. Control variables are: demographic composition of the population (race, gender, ethnicity, age), income, and crime rates.

Note 2: For violent crimes the median sentence length is 36 months, the 25th percentile is 6 and the 75th percentile is 84. Consider the effect in the "baseline" case in this table for the states other than TX. The point estimate on Share of Democratic Judges is -0.184. Consider a change in the composition of a typical court from zero Democrats to all Democrats. This would reduce the median sentence length from 36 months to about 31 months (more precisely: exp(3.61092 - .184) = 30.78 months). On the one hand, this is a non-trivial reduction of 5 months. On the other hand, it is a relatively small faction – only about 6% – of the interquartile range.

Note 3: Some of the other points in this table, such as those in the bottom panel for TX with no demographic controls, imply relatively large changes in sentence due to changes in judges' partisan affiliations. Even for TX, however, the overall patterns are mixed. In the baseline specifications the two largest coefficients are positive, implying that Democratic judges are harsher than Republican judges, as is the only coefficient that is statistically significant. In the middle panel three of the four coefficients are positive. Thus, if voters are fairly sophisticated and take local conditions into account when predicting sentencing behavior, they would not conclude that Republican judges in TX, or in the other states in the analysis, are clearly harsher across the board than Democratic judges.

Table S.14: Party and Criminal Sentencing
Serious Crimes (All Violent Crimes, All Types of Burglaries, and Drug Trafficking Crimes)

	Baseline							
	TX				AL, IL, IN, KS, LA, NM, OH			
Depndent Variable	Coefficient	Std Error	N	R^2	Coefficient	Std Error	N	R^2
Relative Harshness	-0.026**	0.012	80956	0.38	-0.034	0.025	77247	0.36
Log(Sentence + 1)	-0.102	0.167	86189	0.50	-0.054	0.143	84726	0.45
Sentence	-12.103*	6.909	86189	0.45	-5.696	5.576	84726	0.67
	Small Districts							
	TX				AL, IL, IN, KS, LA, NM, OH			
Depndent Variable	Coefficient	Std Error	N	R^2	Coefficient	Std Error	N	R^2
Relative Harshness	0.065	0.042	6029	0.41	-0.094	0.075	5996	0.40
Log(Sentence + 1)	0.397	0.445	6565	0.45	-0.213	0.497	7619	0.58
Sentence	55.349**	23.556	6565	0.61	-8.526	10.948	7619	0.73
	No Demographic Controls							
	TX				AL, IL, IN, KS, LA, NM, OH			
Depndent Variable	Coefficient	Std Error	N	R^2	Coefficient	Std Error	N	R^2
Relative Harshness	-0.051**	0.020	80956	0.38	-0.025*	0.014	77247	0.36
Log(Sentence + 1)	-0.718**	0.316	86189	0.49	0.037	0.094	84726	0.45
Sentence	-21.382***	6.534	86189	0.45	-7.067*	4.230	84726	0.67

Note: In this table, we pool all "serious" crimes, defining serious crimes as those offense categories with an average sentence length of more than 30 months. This includes all violent crimes, all types of burglaries, and drug trafficking crimes. In all cases the period studied is 1992-2006. In each panel the coefficient estimates are from three separate regressions, one for each dependent variable. *** p<0.01; ** p<0.05; * p<0.1. Control variables are: demographic composition of the population (race, gender, ethnicity, age), income, and crime rates.