Appendix A: Experimental Models (Including Robustness Checks)

Table A.1: Predicting Perception of State Court Impartiality

	Main Model	Main Model + Consensus Treatment	Main Model + Dem Controls
Treatment: Court Ideology (Mixed Court Omitted)			
Liberal Court	.152*	.151*	.147*
	(.025)	(.025)	(.025)
Conservative Court	-.316*	-.317*	-.322*
	(.025)	(.025)	(.026)
Respondent Partisanship	-.005	-.005	-.009
(Strong Republican = 6)	(.004)	(.004)	(.006)
Court Ideology x Respondent Partisanship			
Liberal Court	-.040*	-.040*	-.039*
	(.006)	(.006)	(.006)
Conservative Court	.033*	.033*	.034*
	(.006)	(.006)	(.006)
Treatment: Court Consensus (Control Court Omitted)			
Divided	-	-.017	-.014
		(.013)	(.013)
Unanimous	-	-.005	.000
		(.013)	(.013)
Demographic Controls			
Age	-	-	-.000
			(.000)
Education	-	-	.009*
			(.004)
Female	-	-	-.017
			(.010)
Nonwhite	-	-	-.015
			(.012)
Ideology	-	-	.004
			(.005)
Constant	.577*	.585*	.580*
	(.018)	(.020)	(.029)
N	1,704	1,704	1,680

OLS Regression Estimates, Standard Errors in Parentheses. * p < .05

Table A.2: Predicting State Court Legitimacy

	Main Model	Main Model + Consensus Treatment	Main Model + Dem Controls
Treatment: Court Ideology (Mixed Court Omitted)			
Liberal Court	.086*	.086*	.086*
	(.025)	(.025)	(.024)
Conservative Court	-.139*	-.139*	-.146*
	(.025)	(.025)	(.025)
Respondent Partisanship (Strong Republican = 6)	-.005	-.005	-.005
	(.004)	(.004)	(.005)
Court Ideology x Respondent Partisanship			
Liberal Court	-.021*	-.021*	-.021*
	(.006)	(.006)	(.006)
Conservative Court	.015*	.015*	.015*
	(.006)	(.006)	(.006)
Treatment: Court Consensus (Control Court Omitted)			
Divided	-	-.003	.000
		(.012)	(.012)
Unanimous	-	-.009	-.004
		(.012)	(.012)
Demographic Controls			
Age	-	-	.001
			(.000)
Education	-	-	.027*
			(.004)
Female	-	-	-.033*
			(.010)
Nonwhite	-	-	-.034*
			(.012)
Ideology	-	-	-.001
			(.004)
Constant	.602*	.606*	.523*
	(.018)	(.019)	(.028)
N	1,704	1,704	1,680

OLS Regression Estimates, Standard Errors in Parentheses. * p < .05

Table A.3: Predicting State Court Legitimacy (Alternative Measure)

	Main Model	Main Model + Consensus Treatment	Main Model + Dem Controls
Treatment: Court Ideology (Mixed Court Omitted)			
Liberal Court	.077*	.076*	.077*
	(.026)	(.026)	(.025)
Conservative Court	-.125*	-.125*	-.132*
	(.026)	(.026)	(.025)
Respondent Partisanship (Strong Republican = 6)	-.005	-.005	-.005
	(.005)	(.005)	(.005)
Court Ideology x Respondent Partisanship			
Liberal Court	-.018*	-.018*	-.019*
	(.007)	(.007)	(.006)
Conservative Court	.014*	.014*	.014*
	(.007)	(.007)	(.006)
Treatment: Court Consensus (Control Court Omitted)			
Divided	-	-.005	-.001
		(.013)	(.013)
Unanimous	-	-.012	-.007
		(.013)	(.013)
Demographic Controls			
Age	-	-	.001*
			(.000)
Education	-	-	.030*
			(.004)
Female	-	-	-.040*
			(.010)
Nonwhite	-	-	-.035*
			(.012)
Ideology	-	-	-.002
			(.005)
Constant	.615*	.621*	.515*
	(.018)	(.020)	(.029)
N	1,704	1,704	1,680

OLS Regression Estimates, Standard Errors in Parentheses. * $p < .05$

Table A.4: Predicting Perception of State Court Impartiality using *Ideology* as Moderator

	Main Model	Main Model + Consensus Treatment	Main Model + Dem Controls
Treatment: Court Ideology (Mixed Court Omitted)			
Liberal Court	.223*	.222*	.222*
	(.028)	(.028)	(.028)
Conservative Court	-.378*	-.379*	-.383*
	(.028)	(.028)	(.028)
Respondent Ideology (Extremely Liberal = 6)	-.002	-.002	.003
	(.005)	(.005)	(.006)
Court Ideology x Respondent Ideology			
Liberal Court	-.060*	-.059*	-.060*
	(.007)	(.007)	(.007)
Conservative Court	.050*	.051*	.051*
	(.007)	(.007)	(.007)
Treatment: Court Consensus (Control Court Omitted)			
Divided	-	-.016	-.013
		(.012)	(.012)
Unanimous	-	-.010	-.004
		(.012)	(.012)
Demographic Controls			
Age	-	-	-.000
			(.000)
Education	-	-	.009*
			(.004)
Female	-	-	-.021*
			(.010)
Nonwhite	-	-	-.020
			(.012)
Partisanship	-	-	-.007
			(.004)
Constant	.567*	.577*	.583*
	(.020)	(.021)	(.029)
N	1,713	1,713	1,680

OLS Regression Estimates, Standard Errors in Parentheses. * p < .05

Table A.5: Predicting State Court Legitimacy using Respondent *Ideology* as Moderator

	Main Model	Main Model + Consensus Treatment	Main Model + Dem Controls
Treatment: Court Ideology (Mixed Court Omitted)			
Liberal Court	.126*	.126*	.126*
	(.028)	(.028)	(.028)
Conservative Court	-.138*	-.139*	-.144*
	(.028)	(.028)	(.028)
Respondent Ideology (Extremely Liberal = 6)	-.001	-.001	.003
	(.005)	(.005)	(.006)
Court Ideology x Respondent Ideology			
Liberal Court	-.032*	-.032*	-.032*
	(.007)	(.007)	(.007)
Conservative Court	.015*	.015*	.014*
	(.007)	(.007)	(.007)
Treatment: Court Consensus (Control Court Omitted)			
Divided	-	-.004	.001
		(.012)	(.012)
Unanimous	-	-.011	-.005
		(.012)	(.012)
Demographic Controls			
Age	-	-	.001
			(.000)
Education	-	-	.027*
			(.004)
Female	-	-	-.034*
			(.010)
Nonwhite	-	-	-.037*
			(.012)
Partisanship	-	-	-.006
			(.004)
Constant	.590*	.596*	.512*
	(.020)	(.021)	(.029)
N	1,713	1,713	1,680

OLS Regression Estimates, Standard Errors in Parentheses. * $p < .05$

Appendix B: Descriptive Statistics, Summarized

Table B.1: Frequency Table for Treatment Conditions in the Experimental Analysis

	Unanimous Court	Divided Court	Control Court
Liberal Court	188	189	185
Conservative Court	181	208	185
Mixed Court	193	188	196

Table B.2: Descriptive Statistics for Variables in the Experimental Analysis

Variable	Coding	Range	Mean/ Proportion	s.d.	N
Party Identification	0 = Strong Democrat 1 = Democrat 2 = Weak Democrat 3 = Pure Independent 4 = Weak Republican 5 = Republican 6 = Strong Republican	0->6	.20 .21 .15 .13 .09 .13 .08	N/A	1,704
Court Impartiality	0 = Least Impartial 1 = Most Impartial	0->1	.50	.24	1,713
Court Legitimacy	0 = Least legitimate 1= Most legitimate	0->1	.56	.21	1,713
Female	0 = Male 1 = Female	0, 1	.49 .51	N/A	1,695
Age	18-79	18->79	36.65	12.36	1,711
Nonwhite	0 = White 1 = Nonwhite	0, 1	.76 .24	N/A	1,709
Education	0 = < than high school diploma 1 = Highs school diploma 2 = Some College 3 = Associate's degree 4 = Bachelor's degree 5 = Postgraduate education	0->5	.01 .09 .26 .12 .36 .16	N/A	1,711
Ideology	0 = extremely liberal 7 = extremely conservative	0->7	3.45	1.67	1,713

Table B.3: Descriptive Statistics for Variables in the Observational Analysis

Variable	Coding	Range	Mean/ Proportion	s.d.	N
Perception of Court Impartiality	0 = Least impartial 1 = Most impartial	0->1	.37	.20	994
Judicial Knowledge	0 = Least knowledgeable 1 = Most knowledgeable	0->1	.43	.23	999
Party Identification	-2 = Democrat -1 = Leans Democrat 0 = Independent 1 = Leans Republican 2 = Republican	-2->2	.36 .14 .15 .10 .24	N/A	999
Experience	0 = No experience 1 = Low stakes, high control 2 = high stakes, low control	0, 2	.65 .07 .28	N/A	999
Differential Media Exposure	0 = all news comes from traditional news outlets 1 = all news comes from sensationalist news outlets	0->1	0.44	.18	999
Court Conservatism	-1.05 = most liberal state court .87 = most conservative state court	-1.05->.87	-.09	.48	50
Judicial Integrity	0 = least "accountable" state court system 1 = most "accountable" state court system	0->1	0.60	.22	50
Violent Crime Rate	0=98.2 violent crimes per 100,000 residents 1=761.1 violent crimes per 100,000 residents	0->1	.46	.27	50
Judicial Elections	0 = appointment mechanism or merit selection 1= nonpartisan election or partisan election	0, 1	.56 .44	N/A	50
Unanimity	Proportion decisions unanimous	.29->.99	.79	.16	50
Female	0 = Male 1 = Female	0, 1	.48 .52	N/A	999
Age	0=18 1=73	0->1	.39	.24	977
Nonwhite	0 = White 1 = Nonwhite	0, 1	.72 .26	N/A	999
Education	0 = Less than high school diploma .33 = High School Diploma .66 = Some College, No Degree 1 = Four-year college degree+	0, 1	.13 .36 .23 .27	N/A	999

Appendix C: Experimental Vignettes

[Randomization occurred based on ideology. People who selected **Extremely liberal**, **Liberal**, **Slightly liberal** in question P7 and **Liberal** in question P8 were grouped together while people who selected **Slightly conservative**, **Conservative**, **Extremely Conservative** in question P7 and **Conservative** in question P8 were grouped together.]

P9. The United States Supreme Court will conclude its most recent term in June of this year. The U.S. Supreme Court issues decisions that affect the entire nation. Many state supreme courts also issue rulings on important cases affecting the lives of their residents. The following newspaper article describes decisions made by one such state supreme court. Please read the story carefully. You will be asked to give your thoughts and opinions on the court you read about.

State High Court Issues Four Unanimous Landmark Decisions
Conservatives Pleased with Outcomes
May 2, 2016
Author: Mike Johnson

The state supreme court wrapped up its term this past Friday, ruling on four important issues affecting the state and its residents. Observers have said that the court's slate of decisions stand out for both the conservatism of the outcomes and the unanimity of the court.

The four central cases dealt with police search warrant requirements, police officer use of deadly force, protection of employee pensions, and regulations on the natural gas industry.

- The court unanimously decided (7-0) that police could obtain cell phone billing and call records without first obtaining a warrant through a judge.
- They (7-0) overturned a jury's guilty verdict against a local police officer for the fatal shooting of a man, because of the officer's claim that he was threatened.
- The supreme court (7-0) also upheld a law passed by the state legislature that made massive cuts to state employee's pensions. And they unanimously (7-0) struck down restrictions on the natural gas industry under the state constitution's clause to "not significantly impair or impede" businesses essential for the state's power source.

These decisions were expected by many court watchers, given the overall conservative bent of the high court. The court in recent years has also regularly passed down unanimous rulings, indicating the overall high level of consensus of the court.

State High Court Issues Four Unanimous Landmark Decisions
Liberals Pleased with Outcomes
May 2, 2016
Author: Mike Johnson

The state supreme court wrapped up its term this past Friday, ruling on four important issues affecting the state and its residents. Observers have said that the court's slate of decisions stand out for both the liberalism of the outcomes and the unanimity of the court.

The four central cases dealt with police search warrant requirements, police officer use of deadly force, protection of employee pensions, and regulations on the natural gas industry.

- The court unanimously decided (7-0) that police could not obtain cell phone billing and call records without first obtaining a warrant through a judge.
- They (7-0) upheld a jury's guilty verdict against a local police officer for the fatal shooting of a man, in spite of the police officer's claim that he was threatened.
- The supreme court (7-0) also struck down a law passed by the state legislature that made massive cuts to state employee's pensions.
- And they unanimously (7-0) upheld restrictions on the natural gas industry under the state constitution's clause protecting the "health and well-being" of its citizens.

These decisions were expected by many court watchers, given the overall liberal bent of the high court. The court in recent years has also regularly passed down unanimous rulings, indicating the overall high level of consensus of the court.

State High Court Issues Four Unanimous Landmark Decisions
**Conservatives Pleased with Two of the Outcomes; Liberals Pleased with Two of the
Outcomes**
May 2, 2016
Author: Mike Johnson

The state supreme court wrapped up its term this past Friday, ruling on four important issues affecting the state and its residents. Observers have said that the court's slate of decisions stand out for the moderate balance of the outcomes – with liberal verdicts on two cases and conservative verdicts on the other two – as well as the unanimity of the court.

The four central cases dealt with police search warrant requirements, police officer use of deadly force, protection of employee pensions, and regulations on the natural gas industry.

- The court unanimously decided (7-0) that police could not obtain cell phone billing and call records without first obtaining a warrant through a judge.
- However, they (7-0) overturned a jury's guilty verdict against a local police officer for the fatal shooting of a man, because of the officer's claim that he was threatened.
- The supreme court (7-0) also upheld a law passed by the state legislature that made massive cuts to state employee's pensions.
- But they unanimously (7-0) upheld restrictions on the natural gas industry under the state constitution's clause protecting the "health and well-being" of its citizens.

These decisions were expected by many court watchers, given the overall moderate bent of the high court. The court in recent years has also regularly passed down unanimous rulings, indicating the overall high level of consensus of the court.

E4.

State High Court Issues Four Split Landmark Decisions
Conservatives Pleased with Outcomes
May 2, 2016
Author: Mike Johnson

The state supreme court wrapped up its term this past Friday, ruling on four important issues affecting the state and its residents. Observers have said that the court's slate of decisions stand out for both the conservatism of the outcomes and the divisiveness of the court.

The four central cases dealt with police search warrant requirements, police officer use of deadly force, protection of employee pensions, and regulations on the natural gas industry.

- The divided court decided (4-3) that police could obtain cell phone billing and call records without first obtaining a warrant through a judge.
- They (4-3) overturned a jury's guilty verdict against a local police officer for the fatal shooting of a man, because of the officer's claim that he was threatened.
- The supreme court (4-3) also upheld a law passed by the state legislature that made massive cuts to state employee's pensions.
- And they split 4-3 in striking down restrictions on the natural gas industry under the state constitution's clause to "not significantly impair or impede" businesses essential for the state's power source.

These decisions were expected by many court watchers, given the overall conservative bent of the high court. The court in recent years has also regularly passed down bitterly divided rulings, indicating the overall low level of consensus of the court.

Liberal, Divided Court
E5.
State High Court Issues Four Split Landmark Decisions
Liberals Pleased with Outcomes
May 2, 2016
Author: Mike Johnson

The state supreme court wrapped up its term this past Friday, ruling on four important issues affecting the state and its residents. Observers have said that the court's slate of decisions stand out for both the liberalism of the outcomes and the divisiveness of the court.

The four central cases dealt with police search warrant requirements, police officer use of deadly force, protection of employee pensions, and regulations on the natural gas industry.
- The divided court decided (4-3) that police could not obtain cell phone billing and call records without first obtaining a warrant through a judge.
- They (4-3) upheld a jury's guilty verdict against a local police officer for the fatal shooting of a man, in spite of the police officer's claim that he was threatened.
- The supreme court (4-3) also struck down a law passed by the state legislature that made massive cuts to state employee's pensions.
- And they split 4-3 in upholding restrictions on the natural gas industry under the state constitution's clause protecting the "health and well-being" of its citizens.

These decisions were expected by many court watchers, given the overall liberal bent of the high court. The court in recent years has also regularly passed down bitterly divided rulings, indicating the overall low level of consensus of the court.

Mixed, Divided Court
E6.

State High Court Issues Four Split Landmark Decisions
Conservatives Pleased with Two of the Outcomes; Liberals Pleased with Two of the Outcomes
May 2, 2016
Author: Mike Johnson

The state supreme court wrapped up its term this past Friday, ruling on four important issues affecting the state and its residents. Observers have said that the court's slate of decisions stand out for the moderate balance of the outcomes – with liberal verdicts on two cases and conservative verdicts on the other two – as well as the divisiveness of the court.

The four central cases dealt with police search warrant requirements, police officer use of deadly force, protection of employee pensions, and regulations on the natural gas industry.

- The divided court decided (4-3) that police could not obtain cell phone billing and call records without first obtaining a warrant through a judge.
- However, they (4-3) overturned a jury's guilty verdict against a local police officer for the fatal shooting of a man, because of the officer's claim that he was threatened.
- The supreme court (4-3) also upheld a law passed by the state legislature that made massive cuts to state employee's pensions.
- But they split 4-3 in upholding restrictions on the natural gas industry under the state constitution's clause protecting the "health and well-being" of its citizens.

These decisions were expected by many court watchers, given the overall moderate bent of the high court. The court in recent years has also regularly passed down bitterly divided rulings, indicating the overall low level of consensus of the court.

State High Court Issues Four Landmark Decisions
Conservatives Pleased with Outcomes
May 2, 2016
Author: Mike Johnson

The state supreme court wrapped up its term this past Friday, ruling on four important issues affecting the state and its residents. Observers have said that the court's slate of decisions stand out for the conservatism of the outcomes.

The four central cases dealt with police search warrant requirements, police officer use of deadly force, protection of employee pensions, and regulations on the natural gas industry.

- The court decided that police could obtain cell phone billing and call records without first obtaining a warrant through a judge.
- They overturned a jury's guilty verdict against a local police officer for the fatal shooting of a man, because of the officer's claim that he was threatened.
- The supreme court also upheld a law passed by the state legislature that made massive cuts to state employee's pensions.
- And they struck down restrictions on the natural gas industry under the state constitution's clause to "not significantly impair or impede" businesses essential for the state's power source.

These decisions were expected by many court watchers, given the overall conservative bent of the high court.

State High Court Issues Four Landmark Decisions
Liberals Pleased with Outcomes
May 2, 2016
Author: Mike Johnson

The state supreme court wrapped up its term this past Friday, ruling on four important issues affecting the state and its residents. Observers have said that the court's slate of decisions stand out for the liberalism of the outcomes.

The four central cases dealt with police search warrant requirements, police officer use of deadly force, protection of employee pensions, and regulations on the natural gas industry.

- The court decided that police could not obtain cell phone billing and call records without first obtaining a warrant through a judge.
- They upheld a jury's guilty verdict against a local police officer for the fatal shooting of a man, in spite of the police officer's claim that he was threatened.
- The supreme court also struck down a law passed by the state legislature that made massive cuts to state employee's pensions.
- And they upheld restrictions on the natural gas industry under the state constitution's clause protecting the "health and well-being" of its citizens.

These decisions were expected by many court watchers, given the overall liberal bent of the high court.

Mixed, Control Court
E9.
State High Court Issues Four Landmark Decisions
Conservatives Pleased with Two of the Outcomes; Liberals Pleased with Two of the Outcomes
May 2, 2016
Author: Mike Johnson

The state supreme court wrapped up its term this past Friday, ruling on four important issues affecting the state and its residents. Observers have said that the court's slate of decisions stand out for the moderate balance of the outcomes – with liberal verdicts on two cases and conservative verdicts on the other two.

The four central cases dealt with police search warrant requirements, police officer use of deadly force, protection of employee pensions, and regulations on the natural gas industry.

- The court decided that police could not obtain cell phone billing and call records without first obtaining a warrant through a judge.
- However, they overturned a jury's guilty verdict against a local police officer for the fatal shooting of a man, because of the officer's claim that he was threatened.
- The supreme court also upheld a law passed by the state legislature that made massive cuts to state employee's pensions.
- But they upheld restrictions on the natural gas industry under the state constitution's clause protecting the "health and well-being" of its citizens.

These decisions were expected by many court watchers, given the overall moderate bent of the high court.

Appendix D: Experimental Survey Question Wording

Below is the exact question wording, response options given, along with Qualtrics' *original* coding for the entire survey administered by Amazon.com's Mechanical Turk platform.

Introduction Block

I1. I invite you to share your thoughts about government. This survey should take about 8-10 minutes to complete. You will be paid for completing this survey. There are no other direct benefits to you. I do not know of any personal risk or discomfort you will have from being in this study, and your answers will remain confidential. Your results are also anonymous. I will not be asking for your name. By completing the survey below, you are indicating that you agree to take part in this research. You may discontinue your participation at any time. If you elect to not complete the survey, you will not be paid. In most cases, you may avoid particular questions if you are uncomfortable answering them. If you have any questions about participating in this survey, please contact _____. You may also use this contact if you are interested in knowing more about the results of this survey.

The University of Colorado - Boulder Institutional Review Board has reviewed and approved this study. If you have questions regarding your rights as a participant, any concerns regarding this project, or any dissatisfaction with any aspect of this study, you may confidentially contact the Institutional Review Board (IRB). You can reach the IRB by phone at 303-735-3702 or by e-mail at irbadmin@colorado.edu.

I2. Do you agree to participate in this survey?

>Yes (1)
>No (2)

Pre-test Questions Block

P1. Do you happen to know or can you name any of the three branches of state government?

>Yes (1)
>No (2)

If Do you happen to know or can you name any of the three branches of state government? **Yes** is **Selected**

P2. Would you mind naming any of them (the three branches of state government?) Please list as many as you can?

> First Branch [Text Box] (1)
>
> Second Branch [Text Box] (2)
>
> Third Branch [Text Box] (3)

P3. Generally speaking, do you usually think of yourself as a Democrat, a Republican, an Independent, or what?

> Democrat (1)
>
> Republican (2)
>
> Independent (3)
>
> Other party [Text Box] (4)

If Generally speaking, do you usually think of yourself as a Democrat, a Republican, an Independent, or what? **Democrat** is **Selected**

P4. Would you call yourself a strong Democrat or a not very strong Democrat?

> Strong Democrat (1)
>
> Not very strong Democrat (2)

If Generally speaking, do you usually think of yourself as a Democrat, a Republican, an Independent, or what? **Republican** is **Selected**

P5. Would you call yourself a strong Republican or a not very strong Republican?

> Strong Republican (1)
>
> Not very strong Republican (2)

If Generally speaking, do you usually think of yourself as a Democrat, a Republican, an Independent, or what? **Independent** is **Selected**

Or Generally speaking, do you usually think of yourself as a Democrat, a Republican, an Independent, or what? **Other party** is **Selected**

P6. Would you call yourself a strong Republican or a not very strong Republican?

Closer to the Republican Party (1)

Closer to Democratic Party (2)

Neither (3)

P7. Thinking about politics these days, how would you describe your own political viewpoint?
[**Force Response**]

Extremely liberal (1)

Liberal (2)

Slightly liberal (6)

Moderate; middle of the road (3)

Slightly conservative (7)

Conservative (4)

Extremely Conservative (5)

If Thinking about politics these days, how would you describe your own political viewpoint?
Moderate; middle of the road is **Selected**

P8. If you had to choose, would you consider yourself more liberal or conservative? [**Force Response**]

Liberal (1)

Conservative (2)

[Respondents were then presented with a vignette; see Appendix C for the exact question wording.]

Post-test Questions Block

Q1. Would you consider the decisions of that state supreme court to be mostly liberal, mostly conservative or half liberal, half conservative?

Mostly liberal (1)

Mostly conservative (2)

About half liberal, half conservative (3)

Q2. Based on what you just read, were the rulings of the state supreme court more favorable to the police or individuals?

    The rulings were more favorable to the police than to individuals (1)

    The rulings were more favorable to individuals than to the police (2)

    One ruling was more favorable to the police than individuals, while another ruling was more favorable to individuals than the police (3)

Q3. Based on the decisions you just read about, which of the following statements is most accurate?

    The decisions were unanimous: 7-0 (1)

    The decisions were divided: 4-3 (2)

    The votes of the justices were not presented in the article (3)

Q4. Most people have a favorite Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. For some people that is Earl Warren. For others, it is John Marshall, Roger Taney, or even John Jay. Regardless of if you actually have a favorite Chief Justice, please select John Jay for this question.

    Earl Warren (1)

    Roger B. Taney (2)

    John Marshall (3)

    John Jay (4)

Dependent Variable Questions Block

DV1. Based on the news story you just read, please answer the following questions:

To what extent do you feel that the state supreme court…

DV1_1. Was fair and impartial when issuing its rulings.

DV1_2. Considered the opinions of people who share your viewpoint on those issues.

DV1_3. Strictly followed the law when making its decisions.

    Not At All (1)

    Small Extent (2)

    Moderate Extent (3)

Great Extent (4)

DV2. Again, please consider the state supreme court you just read about in answering the following questions:

DV2_1. We ought to have stronger means of controlling the actions of that state supreme court.

DV2_2. That state supreme court ought to be made less independent.

DV2_3. Judges on state supreme courts who consistently make decisions like that court should be removed from their position as judge.

DV2_4. We cannot trust those state supreme court judges to decide court cases in a way that is in the best interests of the people.

DV2_5. It might be better to do away with that state supreme court altogether.

DV2_6. That state supreme court gets too mixed up in politics.

DV2_7. The right of that state supreme court to decide certain types of controversial issues should be reduced.

Strongly Agree (1)
Agree (2)
Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)
Disagree (4)
Strongly Disagree (5)

DV3. For just a few more questions, please consider the court rulings you just read about:

That state supreme court is legislating from the bench rather than interpreting the law.
Strongly Agree (2)
Agree (3)
Neither Agree Nor Disagree (7)
Disagree (5)
Strongly Disagree (6)

DV4. In your opinion, to what extent do you think the judges' rulings were influenced by their personal political views?

      Great Extent (1)

      Moderate Extent (2)

      Small Extent (3)

      Not at All (4)

DV5. Which of the following statements come closer to your belief about that court?

      That court was fair and objective in their rulings. (1)

      That court was politically motivated in their rulings. (2)

DV6. How well do you think that state supreme court does its main job in government? It does...

      A great job (1)

      A pretty good job (2)

      A not very good job (3)

      A poor job (4)

DV7. To what extent do agree with the decisions that court made?

      I agree with all of the decisions. (1)

      I agree with most of the decisions. (2)

      I agree with about half of the decisions. (3)

      I agree with few of the decisions. (4)

      I agree with none of the decisions. (5)

State and Attention to Politics Questions Block

Q5. What state do you currently live in?

      [Dropdown Menu]

Q6. Can you recall ever reading, listening to, or watching a news story either in print, on t.v., or online about decisions from your state supreme (highest) court, that is, the [Q5. Respondent State] Supreme Court?

      Yes (1)

No (2)

Q7. How often do you hear about decisions from your state supreme (highest) court, that is, the [Q5. Respondent State] Supreme Court?

Often (1)

Sometimes (2)

Seldom (3)

Never (4)

Q8. How well do you feel that you understand the purpose and role of the court system in [Q5. Respondent State]?

Very poorly (1)

Somewhat poorly (2)

Somewhat well (3)

Very well (4)

Q9. Does the constitution in [Q5. Respondent State] protect judges from the threat of being removed from office if the judge makes a ruling that the governor or the legislature disagrees with?

Yes (1)

No (2)

Don't Know (3)

Q10. Do you happen to know how judges for [Q5. Respondent State]'s supreme (highest) court are selected?

They are elected by the people in either nonpartisan or partisan elections. (1)

They are appointed by the governor or state legislature. (2)

They are initially appointed but must stand in retention elections (where the people vote either "yes" or "no") to stay in office. (3)

Don't know (4)

Demographic Questions Block

D1. In what year were you born?

[Dropdown Menu]

D2. Are you male or female?

Male (1)

Female (2)

D3. What is the highest level of education you have completed?

Did not graduate from high school (1)

High school graduate (2)

Some college, but no degree (yet) (3)

2-year college degree (4)

4-year college degree (5)

Postgraduate degree (MA, MBA, MD, JD, PhD, etc.) (6)

D4. What racial or ethnic group best describes you? [Respondents can choose more than one option]

White (1)

Black or African-American (2)

Hispanic or Latino (3)

Asian or Asian-American (4)

Native American (5)

Middle Eastern (6)

Mixed Race (7)

Other (8) [Text Box]

D5. People like all different kinds of ice cream flavors. The most popular flavors in the United States are: cookies and cream, vanilla, cookie dough, and mint chocolate chip. Regardless of your actual favorite ice cream flavor, please select cookie dough for this question.

Cookies and cream (1)

Vanilla (2)

Cookie dough (3)

Mint chocolate chip (4)

Appendix E: Experimental Survey Coding Procedures

Dependent Variable: Court Impartiality

DV1_1, DV1_2, DV1_3, DV3, DV4, DV5

Although not always on the same scale, all components of this dependent variable were rescaled to range from 0 to 1 with 0 indicating the lowest level of perceived court impartiality and 1 indicating the highest level of perceived court impartiality. Then, the average of the six components was taken.

Dependent Variable: Court Legitimacy

DV2_1, DV2_2, DV2_3, DV2_3, DV2_4, DV2_5, DV2_6, DV2_7

All of these questions were on the same scale. Each component was rescaled to range from 0 to 1 with 0 indicating the respondent affords the court the lowest level of legitimacy and 1 indicating the respondent affords the court with the highest level of legitimacy. Then, the average of the seven components was taken.

A Note about the Measures of Legitimacy

Gibson, Caldeira, and Spence (2003) has produced a well-respected list of questions that capture overall loyalty to a particular court. Their current wording references the U.S. Supreme Court. These questions have been slightly adapted to remind respondents that they are reacting to the state supreme court they just read about, not their own state supreme court. We have also reworded some questions to remove the double-barreled portions. Below we justify these changes.

	Original Wording (Gibson 2011)	Rewording
1	If the U.S. Supreme Court started making a lot of decisions that most people disagree with, it might be better to do away with the Supreme Court altogether.	It might be better to do away with that state supreme court altogether.
2	The right of the Supreme Court to decide certain types of controversial issues should be reduced.	The right of that state supreme court to decide certain types of controversial issues should be reduced.

3	The U.S. Supreme Court gets too mixed up in politics.	That state supreme court gets too mixed up in politics.
4	Judges on the U.S. Supreme Court who consistently make decisions at odds with what a majority of the people want should be removed from their position as judge.	Judges on state supreme courts who consistently make decisions like that court should be removed from their position as judge.
5	The U.S. Supreme Court ought to be made less independent so that it listens a lot more to what the people want.	That state supreme court ought to be made less independent.
6	It is inevitable that the U.S. Supreme Court gets mixed up in politics; therefore, we ought to have stronger means of controlling the actions of the U.S. Supreme Court.	We ought to have stronger means of controlling the actions of that state supreme court.
7	Supreme Court justices are just like any other politicians; we cannot trust them to decide court cases in a way that is in the best interests of our country.	We cannot trust those judges to decide court cases in a way that is in the best interests of the people.

For questions 2 and 3, we simply changed the referent from "the Supreme Court" or "the U.S. Supreme Court" to "that state supreme court." The other five questions had some additional changes designed to better capture the concept of diffuse support.

For question 1, we eliminated the dependent clause of the conditional statement for two reasons. First, the condition adds unnecessary heterogeneity in the meaning of respondent answers. Some people might respond that they strongly disagree with that statement simply because abolishing the Supreme Court is an extreme proposal. Other people might respond that they strongly disagree with abolishing the Supreme Court when it makes decisions that "most people" disagree with, perhaps because they view themselves as holding one or more minority viewpoints. Therefore, it would not be in their best interest to have the Supreme Court abolished because its decisions would be relatively consistent with their views.

On the one hand, people could be agreeing or disagreeing with that statement based on deeply rooted support for the Court. On the other hand, they could be agreeing or disagreeing with that statement based on whether or not the respondent believes the Court will be making decisions

that he or she personally agrees with, which is a separate concept in the literature – specific support – or support tied to the immediate satisfaction with the policy outputs of the Court.

Second, the added condition might create additional confusion for respondents. Respondents were presented with either a liberal, conservative, or balanced court. "If that state supreme court started making a lot of decisions that most people disagree with" might already imply that the hypothetical court in the news story is *not* making decisions that a lot of people already disagree with. That might be true if the respondent believes a liberal court is in a liberal state. But what if the respondent believes that the liberal court could be *their* state supreme court and they live in Alabama, for example? Respondents might not know exactly how to answer and frustrated respondents are more likely to satisfice than provide accurate responses. Clauses like the one above create unnecessary confusion and have been eliminated.

A similar problem (as question 1) presents itself in question 4. Question 4 originally reads, "Judges on the U.S. Supreme Court who consistently make decisions at odds with what a majority of the people want should be removed from their position as judge." To avoid response heterogeneity about what majority they are thinking of, if they consider themselves in the majority, or what state they presume this court comes from, we simply ask: "Judges on state supreme courts who consistently make decisions like that court should be removed from their position as judge." Same goes with question 5.

Question 6 contains two clauses and respondents could agree with one clause but not the other. "It is inevitable that the U.S. Supreme Court gets mixed up in politics" is most certainly a true statement. But, *loyalty* to the Court comes in in the next phrase: "therefore, we ought to have stronger means of controlling the actions of the U.S. Supreme Court." We removed the qualifying clause and the "therefore" to more simply tap into a respondent's loyalty to that state supreme court. A similar problem exists with question 7. We omitted the qualifying clause and changed "our country" to "that state." The scale, as amended, holds together incredibly well with a Cronbach's alpha $\alpha = .89$.

Table F.1: Manipulation and Reading Checks

Manipulation Checks	Full Sample	Attentive Sample
Ideology Manipulation Check		
Liberal	64.59	66.35
Conservative	70.38	70.53
Mixed	74.70	77.11
Ideology Manipulation Check Passed	69.94	71.38
Decision Content Manipulation Check		
Pro-Police Decisions	76.31	78.64
Anti-Police Decisions	76.33	77.26
Mixed Police Decisions	66.43	68.44
Decision Content Manipulation Check Passed	72.91	74.71
Judicial Consensus Manipulation Check		
Unanimous	91.98	93.96
Divided	95.04	96.34
Control	89.18	91.87
Judicial Consensus Manipulation Check Passed	91.94	93.89
All Manipulation Checks Passed	53.53	55.77
Reading Check Questions		
Favorite Chief Justice (John Jay)	94.98	
Favorite Ice Cream Flavor (Cookie Dough)	98.66	
Answered Both Correctly	94.63	

Percent of respondents who either correctly identified the type of court they read about or correctly answered the reading check question in the columns.

Note: Attentive sample in column two refers to the sample who answered both reading check questions correctly (i.e. 94.63% of the total sample).

Appendix G: Annenberg Survey Question Wording and Coding Procedures

The Annenberg Judicial Independence Survey was conducted from August 3, 2006, through August 16, 2006, and has a grand total of 1002 respondents. Three of these respondents were automatically excluded because they live in the District of Columbia, so the effective maximum sample size is 999.

Dependent Variable

Variable: **Perception of Court Impartiality**

Annenberg Variable Names: q3b, q5b, q5c, q5d, q8, q12

Recoded Variable Names: *judges_ethical_rc*, *court_politics_rc*, *court_wealthy_rc*, *court_legislating_rc*, *judge_political_rc*, *court_fair_rc*

Dependent Variable Name: *impartial_court*

Coding Procedure

We recoded all of the component variables to range from 0 to 1. Zero indicates the respondent believes that state courts are the *least* impartial (i.e. biased). One indicates the respondent has the perception that state courts are the *most* impartial. "Somewhat" answers fell in between 0 and 1. We then took the mean of the six variables for each respondent in the sample.

Below contains the exact question wording of each of the component variables. For each question, respondents that answered with either "Don't Know" or refused to answer the question were recoded as missing.

q3b: judges_ethical_rc

Question q3b asked people the following: "Now thinking about the ethical practices of judges in [state respondent lives in], in your opinion are the ethical practices of judges in [state respondent lives in] very good, somewhat good, somewhat bad, or very bad?"

q5b: court_politics_rc

Question q5b asked people the following: Turning to the court system in [state respondent lives in]. Please tell me if you strongly agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree or strongly disagree with the following statement: The courts get too mixed up in politics.

q5c: court_wealthy_rc

Question q5c asked people the following: Turning to the court system in [state respondent lives in]. Please tell me if you strongly agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree or strongly disagree with the following statement: The courts do not favor the wealthy or those with political influence.

q5d: court_legislating_rc

Question q5d asked people the following: Turning to the court system in [state respondent lives in]. Please tell me if you strongly agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree or strongly disagree with the following statement: The courts are legislating from the bench rather than interpreting the law.

q8: judge_political_rc

Question q8 asked people the following: In your opinion, to what extent do you think a judge's ruling is influence by his or her personal political views—to a great extent, moderate extent, small extent, or not at all?

q12: court_fair_rc

Question q12 asked people the following: Which of the following statements come closer to your beliefs about the courts in [state respondent lives in]?

    The courts are fair and objective in their rulings.

    The courts are sometimes politically motivated in their rulings.

Independent Variables

Key Moderating Variable: Judicial Knowledge

Variable: **Judicial Knowledge**

Annenberg Variable Names: q19, q24, q25, [q26, q27_1, q27_2, q27_3], q28, q29

Recoded Variable Names: *know_elect*, *know_purpose*, *know_protect*, *know_jb*, *know_cj*, *know_reasons*

Independent Variable Name: *know*

Coding Procedure

We recoded all of the component variables to range from 0 to 1 with 0 indicating the respondent either did not know the answer to the question, answered incorrectly, or refused to answer the question, and with 1 indicating only that the respondent knew the correct answer to the question, for the objective indicators of judicial knowledge. For the one subjective indicator (q24), 0 indicates the respondent either knows the courts very poorly, did not know or refused to answer the question. One indicates the respondent believes he or she knows the purpose and function of the court system "Very Well." We then took the mean of the six variables to construct a measure of judicial knowledge.

q19: know_elect

Question q19 asked respondents: "To the best of your knowledge are judges in your state ELECTED by the people or APPOINTED by the Governor or an independent committee?" This question is problematic for two reasons. For one thing, not all judges in each state are selected using the same process. The question does not *refer* to a particular kind of judge (ones that sit on the court of last resort versus local judges). We code respondents in those particular states (the states that select their judges using both election and appointment mechanisms) as having a correct answer so long as they did not answer with "Don't Know" or refused to answer the question. Secondly, judges in states that utilize a form of merit selection are initially appointed but eventually stand in retention elections. Respondents that live in states that use merit selection were coded as being correct only if they responded that judges in that state are *appointed*. We code these respondents in this way, because in all states that utilize merit selection, the judges are *initially* appointed by either the

governor, a committee or some combination of both. Judges are never actually selected by the people in these states – they can only be removed by the people.

q24: know_purpose

Question q24 was a subjective assessment of the respondent's knowledge of state courts: "How well do YOU feel that you understand the purpose and role of the court system – very well, somewhat well, somewhat poorly or very poorly?" This question was recoded to range from 0 (very poorly) to 1 (very well).

q25: know_protect

Question q25 asked respondents the following: "Does the constitution in [state respondent lives in] protect judges from the threat of being removed from office if the judge makes a ruling that the governor or the legislature disagree with?" Respondents who answered *yes* were coded as having a correct answer (1). Respondents who answered with either *no*, *don't know*, or refused to answer the question were coded as not being correct (0).

q26, q27_1, q27_2, q27_3: know_jb

Question q26 asked respondents if they could name any of the three branches of government: "Do you happen to know any of the three branches of government?" Respondents who answered yes were prompted to list those branches: "Would you mind naming any of them?" Respondents were coded as having more knowledge about the judicial branch if they could name that branch of government.

q28: know_cj

Question q28 asked respondents if they could name the Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court: "Do you happen to know who the current Supreme Court Chief Justice is?" Respondents that could name John Roberts as the Chief Justice were coded as being correct while all other responses were coded as not knowing.

q29: know_reasons

Question q29 asked respondents: To the best of your knowledge, do Supreme Court justices usually give written reasons behind their rulings or do they NOT usually give written reasons?

Variable: **Party Identification**
Annenberg Variable Names: d2, d3
Recoded Variable Name: *partyid*

Coding Procedure

This variable was constructed using two variables: d2 and d3. Question d2 reads "In politics today, do you consider yourself a Republican, Democrat or Independent? Answer choices were: *Republican*, *Democrat*, *Independent*, two volunteered answers (*No Preference* and *Other*) as well as *Don't Know* and *Refused*. All respondents who did not answer either *Republican* or *Democrat* for question d2 were asked question d3, which reads: As of today, do you lean more to the Republican Party or more to the Democratic Party? Answer choices were *Republican*, *Democrat*, one volunteered response (*Other*) and both *Don't Know* and *Refused*. Strength of partisan identification was not asked of self-identified Democrats or Republicans in this survey.

All respondents who do not respond as either identifying with or leaning toward one of the two major political parties are coded as Independent. Although Independents are a heterogeneous group, and research suggests that such heterogeneity may affect the conclusions we draw about the levels of political engagement of Independents (Miller and Wattenberg 1983), these distinctions are not worth excluding the respondents from the statistical analysis of this chapter.
Demographics

Variable: **Sex**
Annenberg Variable Name: d1
Recoded Variable Name: *female*

Variable: **Age**

Annenberg Variable Name: d4

Recoded Variable Name: *age*

Variable: **Race/Ethnicity**

Annenberg Variable Name: d6, d7_1, d7_2, d7_3, d7othe

Recoded Variable Name: *racethn*

Coding Procedure

Question d6 asks respondents if they are of Latino or Hispanic origin. The exact question wording follows: "Are you yourself of Latino or Hispanic origin or descent, such as Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, or some other Latin American background?" Question d7_1, d7_2, d7_3, and d7othe allow respondents to select multiple races that they identify with. The question asked is: "What is your race? Are you white, black or African American, Asian, American Indian or Alaska Native, or Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander? You may select more than one race." Respondents were coded as *white* if and only if the respondent selected *white* as their primary race (d7_1), did not answer yes to being of Latino or Hispanic descent (so they could have either refused to answer the question or answered "Don't Know" to being of Latino or Hispanic origin but did answer with "white" as their primary race) and did not select a secondary or tertiary race. Respondents who answered d7_1 with black or African American are coded as black or African American if and only if they did not respond with "yes" to d6 and did not select a secondary or tertiary race. All respondents who answered "yes" to d6 are coded as Hispanic regardless of their answer to the race question. Finally, respondents who are of Asian, American Indian, Alaskan Native, Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander or are of a mixed racial category are coded as "Other." Respondents who answered both d6 and d7_1 with either *Don't Know* or *Refused* were coded as missing.

Variable: **Education Category**

Annenberg Variable Name: d21

Recoded Variable Name: *educ_cat*

The first includes "Grade 8 or Lower" and "Some High School, No Diploma"

The second education category includes "High School Diploma or Equivalent" and "Technical or Vocational School"

The third education category includes "Some College, No Degree" and "Associate's or Two-Year College Degree"

The final education category includes "Four-year College Degree," "Graduate or Professional School," and "Graduate or Professional Degree"

Rescaled from 0 to 1.

Key Control Variables

Variable: **Experience with Courts**

Annenberg Variable Name: d12, d14

Recoded Variable Name: *low_stakes*, *high_stakes*

Benesh (2006) finds that experience with courts shapes people's perceptions with them and that perception is different depending on the experience on has with the state judicial system. People who serve on juries generally express higher levels of confidence in the state courts than people who have no experience with the court system at all. This is because their stake in the outcome is low, but they have high control over that outcome (*Low Stakes, High Control Experience*). However, people who are either a plaintiff or a defendant generally express lower levels of confidence in the state court system, because the stakes of winning the case are high and the respondent has little control over the outcome (*High Stakes, Low Control Experience*).

People who answered in the affirmative to this question (d12) were coded has having a low stakes, high control experience: "Have you served on a jury in the past five years?" People who answered in the affirmative to this question (d14) were coded as having a high stakes, low control experience: "Besides jury duty, have you or an immediate family member gone to court or been part of a court process in the past five years?" All other respondents were coded as not having experience with the state court system in any meaningful capacity.

Variable: **Differential Media Exposure**

Annenberg Variable Name: q35a, q35b, q35d, q35e

Recoded Variable Name: *sensational_exposure*

Johnston and Bartels (2010) found that people exposed to more sensationalist news, relative to more traditional news sources, believed state courts were less legitimate compared to people consumed more traditional media. Each question asked the number of days each week the respondent watched national network news (q35a), cable news (q35b), read a daily newspaper (q35d) and listened to talk radio shows (q35e). Both cable news and radio talk shows were considered sensationalist media consumption while national network news and newspapers were considered traditional media consumption. Using the following formula, we constructed a differential media exposure variable ranging from -14 to 14 with positive numbers indicating more exposure to sensationalist media, relative to traditional media and negative numbers indicating the opposite: [network news + newspaper] – [cable news + radio talk shows].

Variable: **Violent Crime Rate from 2005**
Variable Name: *violent_crime*

The violent crime rate was taken from the FBI Uniform Crime Reporting Program from the year 2005 and is the rate per 100,000 inhabitants. See: https://www2.fbi.gov/ucr/05cius/data/table_05.html for the data. The original variable ranges from 98.2 to 761.1. It has been recoded to range from 0 to 1.

Variable: **Judicial Integrity from State Integrity Investigation in 2012**
Variable Name: *jud_integrity*

This is the State Integrity Investigation's numerical grade for the integrity of each state's judicial branch (with *lower* scores indicating more corruption in the judiciary in the state).

Variable: **Proportion of Unanimous Decisions**
Variable Name: *unan_five*

This variable is an average from 2001-2005 of the proportion of the state supreme court's decisions that were unanimous.

Appendix References

Benesh, Sara C. 2006. "Understanding Public Confidence in American Courts." *Journal of Politics* 68(3): 697–707.

Johnston, Christopher D., and Brandon L. Bartels. 2010. "Sensationalism and Sobriety: Differential Media Exposure and Attitudes Toward American Courts." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 74(2): 260–80.

Miller, Arthur H., and Martin P. Wattenberg. 1983. "Measuring Party Identification: Independent or No Partisan Preference?" *American Journal of Political Science* 27(1): 106–21.