

Tables and Figures

Tables

Table 2-1	Selection Systems and Terms of Office for State Supreme Courts, 2013	37
Table 2-2	Electoral Competition for Incumbents in State Supreme Courts, 2000–2010	51
Table 2-3	Features of State Supreme Court Elections, Pre- <i>White</i> and Post- <i>White</i>	58
Table 3-1	Televised Campaign Advertising by State in Supreme Court Elections, 2002–2008	91
Table 4-1	Variable Means, Overall and by Election Type, in Campaign-Based Models of Incumbent Vote Shares	109
Table 4-2	Televised Campaign Advertising and the Electoral Performance of State Supreme Court Incumbents, 2002–2008	111
Table 4-3	Televised Campaign Advertising and the Electoral Performance of State Supreme Court Incumbents, 2002–2008, with Interaction Terms for All Ad Types	112
Table 4-4	Televised Campaign Advertising as Net Effects and the Electoral Performance of State Supreme Court Incumbents, 2002–2008	119

Table 4-5	Televised Campaign Advertising and the Electoral Performance of State Supreme Court Incumbents, 2002–2008, with Robustness Checks for Third-Party Challengers and Hybrid Election Systems (Michigan and Ohio)	122
Table 5-1	Variable Means, Overall and by Election Type, in Campaign-Based Models of Ballot Roll-Off	146
Table 5-2	Televised Campaign Advertising and Ballot Roll-Off in State Supreme Court Elections, 2002–2008, with Controls for Presidential Election Years	148
Table 5-3	Televised Campaign Advertising and Ballot Roll-Off in State Supreme Court Elections, 2002–2008, with Controls for the Salience of Top-Ballot Races and Election Year	149
Table 5-4	Televised Campaign Advertising and Ballot Roll-Off in State Supreme Court Elections, 2002–2008, with Interaction Terms for All Ad Types	150
Table 5-5	Televised Campaign Advertising and Ballot Roll-Off in State Supreme Court Elections, 2002–2008, in Nonpartisan Elections Only	156
Table 5-6	Televised Campaign Advertising and Ballot Roll-Off in State Supreme Court Elections, 2002–2008, with Robustness Checks for Third-Party Challengers and Hybrid Election Systems (Michigan and Ohio)	159

Figures

Figure 2-1	Trends in Selecting State Supreme Court Justices, 1960–2010	41
Figure 2-2	Contestation and Defeat Rates in State Supreme Court Elections, 1980–2010	46
Figure 2-3	Average Vote for Incumbents in State Supreme Court Elections, 1980–2010	49
Figure 2-4	The Electoral Insecurity of State Supreme Court Justices by State, 2000–2010	53
Figure 2-5	Ballot Roll-Off in State Supreme Court Elections, 1980–2010	55

Figure 2-6	Average Spending (in 2008 Dollars) by Candidates in Contested State Supreme Court Elections, 1996–2008	60
Figure 3-1	Televised Campaign Advertising by Seat and Election Cycle in State Supreme Court Elections, 2002–2008	74
Figure 3-2	Televised Campaign Advertising by Seat and Incumbency in State Supreme Court Elections, 2002–2008	76
Figure 3-3	The Tone of Televised Campaign Airings by Election Cycle and Incumbency Status in State Supreme Court Elections, 2002–2008	78
Figure 3-4	Shares of Traits, Values, and Issues Appeals in Televised Campaign Advertising by Tone in State Supreme Court Elections, 2002–2008	83
Figure 3-5	Total Televised Campaign Airings by Sponsor and Tone in State Supreme Court Elections, 2002–2008	85
Figure 3-6	Total Televised Campaign Airings by Sponsor and Appeals in State Supreme Court Elections, 2002–2008	88
Figure 3-7	The Total Cost of Airtime Purchased by Interest Groups in State Supreme Court Elections, 2002–2008	90
Figure 4-1	Predicted Vote Shares of State Supreme Court Incumbents in Nonpartisan Elections at Various Levels of Televised Attack Airings, Professionalization, and Campaign Spending	116