Agenda Setting on the Vinson Court

Timothy M. Hagle
The University of Iowa

The paper that follows is one of a series of papers I wrote regarding agenda setting on the Vinson Court. As each paper was completed updates and corrections may have changed some of the specific numbers presented in earlier papers, but the general results did not change. The papers were eventually combined into a book titled, *Supreme Court Agenda Setting: The Vinson Court* (available on Amazon.com). The individual papers became chapters in the book and the updated numbers were used for that version.

Again, the paper that follows is the original version. Some numbers may have been updated for the version included as a chapter in the book version, but the changes were usually minor and did not affect the overall results.

Related Cases in Agenda Setting on the Vinson Court

Timothy M. Hagle
The University of Iowa

Related Cases in Agenda Setting on the Vinson Court

Abstract

Although thousands of petitions seeking review by the Supreme Court are filed each year, the justices only accept about 150 or fewer for plenary review, with maybe a few hundred more disposed of summarily. Thus, scholars have long thought that the justices must use some strategy or process to reduce their workload to manageable levels. Although the examination of agenda setting on the Supreme Court is of continuing interest to judicial scholars, previous studies have usually focused only on cert petitions, specific issues, particular terms, or sampling for their data collection. A more comprehensive examination of the cases filed before the Supreme Court will provide a clearer picture of how the justices set their agenda.

Drawing from an ongoing database project this study examines all cases filed before the Vinson Court (1946 to 1952 Terms). The specific question addressed is whether "related" cases have an increased chance of being accepted for review by the Supreme Court. The results show that related cases have a statistically significant higher chance of being granted review by the Supreme Court. This finding is shown to be quite robust when examined in relation to four additional factors.

Related Cases in Agenda Setting on the Vinson Court

The decisions on the merits of cases made by the justices of the United States Supreme Court may be the most important aspect of judicial policy making, but scholarly examination of other aspects of the judicial decision making process have contributed to our overall understanding of judicial behavior and politics. A few examples of such research includes examination of opinion writing of the Supreme Court justices (Maltzman, Spriggs, and Wahlbeck 2000), acclimation effects of new justices (Hagle 1993), the use of precedent on the Supreme Court (Segal and Spaeth 1999), and dealing with the lack of precedent in the federal courts of appeals (Klein 2002).

Of course, agenda setting and its attendant strategic considerations have also been the focus of many studies. *Marbury v. Madison* (1803) may have been the earliest and most famous example of strategic agenda setting or decision making by the Supreme Court. Despite a general view at the time that judges were not policy makers—at least not along the lines of executives and legislators (see, for example, Spaeth 1979, chapter 1)—histories of the Court have certainly recognized strategic aspects to the Court's decision making (e.g., Rodell 1955). Walter Murphy's *Elements of Judicial Strategy* (1964) is one of the earliest and most important examinations of how strategic considerations may affect judicial decision making. Other scholars have expanded and refined Murphy's arguments (e.g., Epstein and Knight 1998). A related line of research focuses more specifically on the ideological preferences of judges (e.g., Segal and Spaeth 2002)

and a recent book by Brenner and Whitmeyer (2009) compares various models of strategic judicial behavior.

One aspect of strategic judicial behavior lies in agenda setting, which means how the Supreme Court decides which cases it will take to decide on the merits. Although thousands of petitions seeking review by the Supreme Court are filed each year, the justices only accept about 150 or fewer for plenary review (i.e., full briefs submitted, oral arguments held, and opinions written), with maybe a few hundred more disposed of summarily (i.e., the Court simply affirms, reverses, or vacates in a very short per curiam opinion, sometimes as little as "Judgment affirmed."). Thus, scholars have long thought that the justices must use some strategy or process to reduce their workload to manageable levels.

In his book-length examination of Supreme Court agenda setting Perry (1991) notes that aspects of agenda setting have been of interest to judicial scholars at least since Schubert (1959). Perry also notes that a few years later Tanenhaus, Schick, Muraskin, and Rosen, (1963) formulated "cue theory" as a way of explaining how the justices were able to navigate the "sea of work that must be processed" (1991, 114). As Perry goes on to note, cue theory fell out of favor when later, more sophisticated, studies failed to replicate the initial results (1991 116). Nevertheless, although a study by Ulmer, Hintze, and Kirklosky rejected two of the three cues Tanenhaus et al., found significant, a third—the federal government as a petitioning party—was significant and the authors concluded that cue theory retained some viability (1972, 642).

Regardless of how cue theory itself has developed, like these two early examinations of the Supreme Court's agenda setting, many later studies focused on how the justices deal with the large number of petitions for writs of certiorari.[1] Caldeira and Wright (1988), for example, examined organized interests in agenda setting with respect to the cert petitions filed during the Court's 1982 Term. In a recent edition of his text on the Supreme Court, Baum (2013, 88) provides an example of recent work examining litigant status (Black and Boyd 2012). Thus, although the examination of agenda setting on the Supreme Court is of continuing interest to judicial scholars previous studies have usually focused only on cert petitions (Tanenhaus et al. 1963), specific issues (Caldeira and Wright 1988; Black and Boyd 2007), particular terms (Ulmer, Hintze, and Kirklosky 1972), or sampling for their data collection (Tanenhaus et al. 1963; Perry 1991). A more comprehensive examination of the cases filed before the Supreme Court will provide a clearer picture of how the justices set their agenda. To that end, this study will examine all cases on the Vinson Court's appellate docket.[2]

[1] Cases come before the Supreme Court via two basic methods: petitions for writs of certiorari and appeals. Because this study will not distinguish between "cert" petitions and appeals, I hesitate to wade too deeply into their differences. Briefly, however, cert petitions are discretionary, which means that the justices are free to grant or deny them as they see fit. No legal meaning is attached to a denial except that the Supreme Court chose not to hear the case. Technically, the Supreme Court must hear cases that come as appeals, but the justices may avoid review by indicating that a case was not properly presented as an appeal for one reason or another. The Court may then treat the appeal papers as a petition for a writ of certiorari and grant or deny the petition. See Perry (1991, Chapter 2) for more on the difference between cert petitions and appeals. Of course, changes to the law in 1988 (Public Law No: 100-352) removed several categories of the Supreme Court's mandatory jurisdiction in appeals.

[2] Until the Court changed its numbering system for filed cases there were essentially three dockets: appellate, miscellaneous, and original. The appellate docket contained what are usually referred to as the "paid" cases, the miscellaneous docket contained the "unpaid" cases (also known as paupers, *in forma pauperis,* or *ifp* cases), and the original docket contained those cases coming to the Court via its limited original jurisdiction. Given my concern about excluding cases on appeal from prior analyses one might reasonably wonder why I do not examine all cases on the Court's three dockets. The original jurisdiction cases can be excluded because they are so few and are of a fundamentally different character. It is well

"Related" Cases

Those who follow Supreme Court decisions are familiar with the Court's frequent practice of grouping cases together for argument and the decision on the merits. Many times such cases are combined when the Court issues its decision and opinion and are commonly known by the lead cases. A well-known example of the Court combining cases is *Brown v. Board of Education* (1954). Although *Brown* is the famous lead case, three other cases were combined for the Court's decision and opinion.[3] In other instances the Court may issue separate opinions for cases that have been grouped together. Here again, *Brown* provides an example because *Bolling v. Sharpe* (1954) was also combined with the *Brown* cases but was decided with a separate opinion and citation.

The *Brown* cases constitute an example where several seemingly unrelated cases were grouped together by the Court because they dealt with a similar issue. Sometimes cases come to the Court already grouped together. An example of this occurred when the US Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit affirmed in part and reversed in part a district court decision in *International Society for Krishna Consciousness v. Lee* (1991). Both parties appealed the portion of the Court of Appeals' decision in which they lost resulting in two cases before the Supreme Court, *International Society for Krishna*

---

documented that the *ifp* cases on the Court's miscellaneous docket are treated differently, on average, than cases on the appellate docket (e.g., Perry 1991, Chapter 2; Baum 2013, 96-100). Nevertheless, the Court sometimes grants review to unpaid cases (and sometimes grants *in forma pauperis* status to cases on the appellate docket). See below for more on how these cases are treated for this study.

[3] Together with *Brown* were *Briggs v. Elliott* (1954), *Davis v. County School Board of Prince Edward County* (1954), and *Gebhart v. Belton* (1954).

Consciousness (ISKCON) v. Lee (1991) and *Lee v. International Society for Krishna Consciousness* (1991).[4] Because of the fractured nature of the justices' opinions each case had a separate citation.

Given these and lesser known instances of the Court deciding combined cases one might reasonably ask if cases that are grouped or combined or related in some way have a better chance of being accepted for review by the Court than those that are not. The basic question is whether there is a "strength in numbers" type of factor related to the Court's agenda setting. The first step in answering this question is to define what constitutes a "related" case where such a factor might apply.

In examining the Supreme Court's caseload three basic types of related cases emerge. The first type of related case consists of those like the two *ISKCON* cases which both resulted from the same lower court decision. The same lower court decision—as indicated by having the same lower court citation—for two or more cases is perhaps the clearest indication of the cases being related. Of course, like the Court's treatment of the *ISKCON* cases, cases can be related without having the same citation. Thus, other indicators for related cases include those that may have docket numbers that are sequential or very close,[5] or those that involve one or more of the same parties. In addition, lower court opinions as well as summaries in the *United States Law Week* often indicate when another case is related. Related cases also generally have the same or

[4] These cases obviously were not decided during the Vinson Court, but they provide a good, and fairly well-known, example of this type of related cases.

[5] Supreme Court docket numbers are assigned based on the order in which cases are filed before the Court. Cases filed the same day would have sequential or very close docket numbers. Of course, related cases are not necessarily filed at the same time, so could have docket numbers that are fairly far apart. For example, the docket numbers for the two *ISKCON* cases were 91-155 and 91-339.

similar issues usually deriving from the same factual situation. Except in rare circumstances, related cases will reach the Supreme Court from the same lower court.[6]

A second basic type of related case consists of those that adhere to the basic criteria for the first type, but are filed much further apart. For example, *Perrine v. Pennroad Corporation* (1946) was a case involving bankruptcy and a railroad. The next year *Swacker v. Pennroad Corporation* (1947) was a follow up case involving attorney fees arising from the same situation as the earlier case. Despite over a year's difference in filing dates, the two cases can be considered related rather than as a return of a previous case.[7]

The third type of related case consists of those like the *Brown* cases. These cases all involved the same basic issue, and some were filed at about the same time, but they came from different states and districts and were only related because the Supreme Court chose to group them together. This type of case runs counter to the basic idea behind why related cases might be a factor in the Court's agenda setting. For such related cases the Court has apparently made its review decision before combining the cases. As such, these cases would not fit the idea being examined here that the Court might be more inclined to accept cases for review when they are related.

[6] One exception to this is when related cases come to the Supreme Court from both the state and federal courts.

[7] The notion of "returning" cases as a factor in the Court's agenda setting will be examined in a later paper.

Data

Data for this study were drawn from an ongoing database project involving all cases on the Supreme Court's appellate docket since the 1946 Term. Data are complete for the Vinson Court (1946 through 1952 Terms) and provide a relatively stable period in which to examine the Court's docket.

Information on the cases in the database was drawn from several sources including the *United States Law Week*, various reporters for the state and federal courts, LEXIS, and other online sources. Every case that received an appellate docket number during the 1946-1952 Terms is included in the database. This results in 5,905 cases. Included in this number are 156 cases originally filed before the 1946 Term (the first term of the Vinson Court). The review decision for 95 of these 156 cases was made prior to the 1946 Term and those cases are not included in the dataset for this study. At the end of the Vinson Court 121 cases eventually received a 1953 Term (the first term of the Warren Court) or later docket number.[8] The review decisions for 72 of these 121 cases were made after the 1952 Term but are included in the dataset given that those cases were initially filed during the Vinson Court. Also, included in the dataset are 67 cases that originally appeared on the Court's miscellaneous docket and were moved to the appellate docket.[9] Not included in the dataset are 64 cases that were dismissed on the

[8] Prior to the 1971 Term cases held over to the next term, before or after a review decision, were renumbered at the start of each term and there was no two-digit term indicator. For example, *Brown v. Board of Education* was initially filed during the Court's 1951 Term and given the docket number 436. It was held over to the 1952 Term with the new docket number 8, and again for the 1953 Term with the docket number 1.

[9] Through the Vinson and Warren Courts, cases originating on the miscellaneous docket (sometimes referred to as the "pauper's docket") that were granted review were usually moved to the appellate

motion of the petitioner prior to the review decision, 18 cases that were dismissed by a Supreme Court rule (e.g., late filing, failure to pay fees), and one case where no review decision could be found.[10] This results in a dataset of 5,727 cases.

Results

TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE

Table 1 shows the number of related and unrelated cases that were accepted and denied review by the Court. The row total shows there were 1,125 related cases of the 5,727 in the dataset (19.6%). Of the related cases, 354 were accepted for review by the Court for 31.5%. In contrast, only 815 of the 4602 unrelated cases were accepted for review (17.7%). As the table indicates, this difference is statistically significant at $p < .001$ using a difference of means test.

Regardless of whether there is an actual "strength in numbers" factor, this result demonstrates that related cases have a distinctly higher acceptance rate than nonrelated cases. Given this result, it is worthwhile to dig a bit deeper into the data to see if the result is related to or consistent with on other factors shown to be related to the Court's agenda setting. More specifically, I will now examine four additional factors: cases filed

---

docket (sometimes referred to as the "paid docket") and given a new docket number. The United States Supreme Court Judicial Database, Harold J. Spaeth principal investigator, lists 26 cases with a miscellaneous docket number (with an "M" in the DOCKET field, meaning they were not transferred to the appellate docket) during the 1946-1952 Terms. Of these, 17 were granted review (with eight of those disposed of in a short per curiam), but are not included here. On the other hand, this dataset includes 19 cases initially filed on the appellate docket for which the Court granted *in forma pauperis* status to one of the parties (only one of which was granted review). (This is an older version of the Supreme Court Database before it was moved online, which, as of this writing, can be viewed at http://scdb.wustl.edu.)

[10] Without going into great detail, it appears that the case in question was withdrawn shortly after filing and refiled a month later with a new docket number. The latter case, *Deena Products Co. v. National Labor Relations Board* (1952) is included in the database and was denied review.

on certiorari versus appeal, cases coming from federal versus state courts, whether there was disagreement among the judges in the courts below, and whether there were reversals in the lower courts as the case made its way to the Supreme Court. I will not go into great detail regarding the reasons for selecting these four factors at this point except to say that in various ways they have been considered as factors relating to whether the Court accepts a case for review. In addition, and to avoid repetition below, each has or will be considered in separate papers examining agenda setting on the Vinson Court.

Certiorari versus Appeal

TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE

Table 2 separates the data into those cases coming to the Court on a petition for a writ of certiorari versus those on appeal. Overall, and not surprisingly, we see far more cases filed as petitions for writs of certiorari. There were 5,146 certiorari cases but only 575 on appeal. In addition, and also not surprisingly, a much higher percentage of cases on appeal were accepted for review, 57.4% (330 of 575) versus only 16.2% (834 of 5146) for certiorari cases.

In looking specifically at the certiorari cases we see that although the overall acceptance rate is much lower than for cases on appeal, there is still a statistically significant difference between those cases that were related and those that were not. Just over a quarter of related certiorari cases (25.6%) were granted review, whereas only 14.0% of unrelated certiorari cases were granted review.

In contrast to the certiorari cases, those on appeal start with a much higher acceptance rate. Nevertheless, we again see that related cases have a statistically significant higher acceptance rate than unrelated cases. Of the 145 related cases on appeal 101 (69.7%) were granted review. Although over half of the unrelated appeal cases were also granted review (53.3%), that percentage is significantly lower than the percentage for related appeal cases.

Thus, regardless of whether a case came to the Court on a petition for a writ of certiorari or as an appeal, related cases had a statistically significant higher chance of being granted review than unrelated cases.[11]

Cases from Federal versus State Courts

TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE

The next factor to examine is whether the case came from a federal or state court. From Table 3 we can see that 4101 of the cases in the dataset came from lower federal courts, while only 1,622 came from lower state courts.[12] We also see that the overall acceptance rate was higher for cases from federal courts (21.9%) than those from state courts (16.6%).

The top portion of Table 3 considers those cases coming from lower federal courts. Of these federal cases, 922 were related and 3,179 were unrelated. As shown in the

[11] The total of certiorari and appeal cases is 5,721. All six of the remaining cases came to the Court on certificate. Three of the five granted review were related cases and the one denied review was unrelated.
[12] These numbers sum to 5,723. Three of the remaining four cases came from the Supreme Court of the Philippines during the 1946 Term. The final case came directly to the Supreme Court from the Motor Carrier Claims Commission. None of these four were related, nor were they granted review.

table, the acceptance rate for related cases was 30.8% while that of unrelated cases was a much lower 19.4%. The bottom portion of the table shows there to have been 203 related cases and 1,419 unrelated cases coming from state courts. As with the federal cases, the acceptance rate for related cases (34.5%) is much higher than that for unrelated cases (14.0%). For both federal and state cases the difference is statistically significant.

Disagreement (or not) Among Lower Court Judges

TABLE 4 ABOUT HERE

The next factor to consider is whether there was any disagreement among the judges in the lower courts. For purposes of this study, such disagreement includes any judges who dissented or dissented in part, but not those who only concurred or concurred in the judgment of the lower courts. From the numbers in Table 4 we see there were 905 of the cases (15.8%) in this dataset where there was disagreement among the judges in the lower courts and 4,822 cases (84.2%) in which there was no disagreement.

The top portion of Table 4 contains the numbers for cases with disagreement. Among these cases there were 231 that were related (25.5%) and 674 (74.5%) that were not. As the last column shows, the acceptance rate for related cases was 53.2% while that for unrelated cases was a much lower 32.5%. The bottom portion of Table 4 shows the breakdown for those cases without lower court disagreement. Here, there were 894 related cases (18.5%) and 3,928 unrelated cases (81.5%). Although the acceptance rates

for both related and unrelated cases were much lower than for the corresponding cases with disagreement, the 25.8% acceptance rate for related cases was still much higher than the 15.2% for unrelated cases. Once again, the difference was statistically significant for cases with and without disagreement among the judges in the courts below.

Reversals in the Lower Courts

The final factor to consider is whether there was a reversal among the lower courts as a case made its way to the Supreme Court. The notion of a reversal is fairly clear, but there are two points worth noting regarding this factor. The first is that many lower court cases involve decisions that affirm in part and reverse in part. The key to this factor is whether the part reversed is the part appealed to the Supreme Court. If so, it counts as a reversal for this factor; if not, it does not. The second point to make is that certain types of cases do not allow for reversals to occur. In other words, for a reversal to even be possible the case must have been before at least two lower courts before reaching the Supreme Court. There are, however, certain types of cases that are only heard by one lower court before being filed before the Supreme Court. An example among state courts concerns attorney discipline cases which typically begin in the state's highest court. An example among federal courts concerns cases heard by a three judge panel in the federal district courts.

TABLE 5 ABOUT HERE

From Table 5 we see that 4,443 cases without a reversal were appealed to the Supreme Court (77.6%) whereas a much lower 1,284 cases (22.4%) did not have a lower court reversal.

The top portion of Table 5 shows the results for the cases without a lower court reversal. The vast majority of these cases were unrelated; 3,652 versus only 791 related cases. Of the related cases, 264 of them (33.4%) were granted review. In contrast, the acceptance rate was less than half that for the unrelated cases at only 16.4%. The bottom portion of the table contains the data for the cases with a lower court reversal. Of these 1,284 cases, 334 were related (26.0%) and 950 unrelated (74.0%). Like the cases without a reversal, related cases had a higher acceptance rate than the unrelated cases (26.9% versus 22.8%), but the difference is smaller than for any other factor and is the only one examined here that is not statistically significant.

Discussion

As noted at the outset of this paper, there is a continuing interest in discovering factors that affect Supreme Court agenda setting. The purpose of this study is to take an initial, primarily empirical look at a factor that might have such an influence. Although the examination of the extent to which various nonlegal factors influence the justices is based on long-standing behavorialist theories of judicial decision making, whether cases are related or other factors examined here will, at some point, require additional theoretical justification. Nevertheless, it is reasonable to ask, at an initial level, whether

there even seems to be a connection between Court behavior and a particular factor. For the notion of related cases, this study answers the question in the affirmative.

The results in Table 1 demonstrated a statistically significant increase in the chance a case would be granted review by the Court if it was related to another case on the Court's docket. Once it was established that there seems to be something to the notion of related cases being a factor in the Court's agenda setting it was worthwhile to consider this finding relative to some other factors that also seem to be related the Court's decision to review a case. The general purpose for doing so is to gauge, if even at a basic level, the robustness of the initial finding.

Examining the results for related cases in the context of four additional factors demonstrated the robustness of the initial finding. Whether the case came to the Supreme Court via a petition for a writ of certiorari or on an appeal, from a federal or state court, or regardless of whether there was disagreement among the lower court judges, there was a statistically significant increase in the acceptance rate for cases that were related. There was also a significant increase in the acceptance rate for related cases when there was not a reversal in the courts below. Among the factors examined, the only time there was not a statistically significant increase in the acceptance rate for related cases over unrelated ones was if there was a reversal in the lower courts as a case made its way to the Supreme Court. This suggests, at least for these two-variable comparisons, the robustness of the initial finding.

These results strongly suggest the value of pursuing the notion of related cases further. On one level this means further consideration of why related cases have higher

acceptance rates. Is it really just a strength-in-numbers factor or something else? On another level, further studies should examine additional factors and do so in both bivariate and multivariate contexts. Although it is encouraging to find another factor that is related to Supreme Court agenda setting, there is, as always, more work to be done.

References

Baum, Lawrence. 2013. *The Supreme Court*, 11th Edition. Washington, DC: CQ Press.

Black, Ryan C., and Christina L. Boyd. 2012. "U.S. Supreme Court Agenda Setting and the Role of Litigant Status." *Journal of Law, Economics & Organization*, (June 2012): 286-312.

Brenner, Saul, and Joseph M. Whitmeyer. 2009. *Strategy on the United States Supreme Court*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Briggs v. Elliott, 347 US 483 (1954).

Brown v. Board of Education, 347 US 483 (1954).

Bolling v. Sharpe, 347 US 497 (1954).

Caldeira, Gregory A., and John R. Wright. 1988. "Organized Interests and Agenda Setting in the U.S. Supreme Court." *American Political Science Review*, 82:1109-1127.

Davis v. County School Board of Prince Edward County, 347 US 483 (1954).

Deena Products Co. v. National Labor Relations Board, 344 US 827 (1952).

Epstein, Lee, and Jack Knight. 1998. *The Choices Justices Make*. Washington, DC: CQ Press.

Gebhart v. Belton, 347 US 483 (1954).

Hagle, Timothy M. 1993. "'Freshman Effects' for Supreme Court Justices." *American Journal of Political Science*, 37:1142-1157.

International Society for Krishna Consciousness v. Lee, 925 F2d 576 (1991).

International Society for Krishna Consciousness v. Lee, 505 US 672 (1992).

Klein, David E. 2002. *Making Law in the United States Courts of Appeals*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Lee v. International Society for Krishna Consciousness, 505 US 830 (1992).

Maltzman, Forrest, James F. Spriggs II, and Paul J. Wahlbeck. 2000. *Crafting Law on the Supreme Court: The Collegial Game*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Marbury v. Madison, 5 US 137 (1803).

Murphy, Walter F. 1964. *Elements of Judicial Strategy*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Perrine v. Pennroad Corporation, 47 A2d 479 (1946).

Perry, H.W., Jr. 1991. *Deciding to Decide: Agenda Setting in the United States Supreme Court*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Rodell, Fred. 1955. *Nine Men: A Political History of the Supreme Court of the United States from 1790 to 1955*. New York: Random House.

Schubert, Glendon. 1959. "The Certiorari Game." In *Quantitative Analysis of Judicial Behavior*, ed. Glendon Schubert New York: Free Press.

Segal, Jeffrey A., and Harold J. Spaeth. 1999. *Majority Rule or Minority Will: Adherence to Precedent on the U.S. Supreme Court*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Segal, Jeffrey A., and Harold J. Spaeth. 2002. *The Supreme Court and the Attitudinal Model Revisited*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Spaeth, Harold J. 1979. *Supreme Court Policy Making*. San Francisco: W.H. Freeman.

Spaeth, Harold J. 1998. *Expanded United States Supreme Court Judicial Database, 1946-1968 Terms*. [Computer file]. 4th ICPSR version. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State

University, Dept. of Political Science [producer]. Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 1999.

Swacker v. Pennroad Corporation, 57 A2d 63 (1947).

Tanenhaus, Joseph, Marvin Schick, Matthew Muraskin, and Daniel Rosen. 1963. "The Supreme Court's Certiorari Jurisdiction: Cue Theory." In *Judicial Decision Making*, ed. Glendon Schubert. New York: Free Press.

Ulmer, S. Sidney, William Hintze, and Louise Kirklosky. 1972. "The Decision to Grant or Deny Certiorari: Further Consideration of Cue Theory." *Law and Society*, 6:637-643.

Wonnacott, Thomas H., and Ronald J. Wonnacott. 1972. *Introductory Statistics for Business and Economics*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Table 1

Acceptance Rates for Related and Unrelated Cases on the Vinson Court's Appellate Docket

	Accepted	Denied	Row Total	Acceptance Rate (%)
Related	354	771	1125	31.5%*
Unrelated	815	3787	4602	17.7%
Column Total	1169	4558	5727	20.4%

* $p < .001$, 1-tail difference of means test (see Wonnacott and Wonnacott 1972, 178).

Table 2

Acceptance Rates for Related and Unrelated Cases on the Vinson Court's Appellate Docket—Certiorari versus Appeal

A. Cases on Certiorari

	Accepted	Denied	Row Total	Acceptance Rate (%)
Related	250	727	977	25.6%*
Unrelated	584	3585	4169	14.0%
Column Total	834	4312	5146	16.2%

* $p < .001$, 1-tail difference of means test (see Wonnacott and Wonnacott 1972, 178).

B. Cases on Appeal

	Accepted	Denied	Row Total	Acceptance Rate (%)
Related	101	44	145	69.7%*
Unrelated	229	201	430	53.3%
Column Total	330	245	575	57.4%

* $p < .001$, 1-tail difference of means test (see Wonnacott and Wonnacott 1972, 178).

Table 3

Acceptance Rates for Related and Unrelated Cases on the Vinson Court's Appellate Docket—Federal versus State Cases

A. Cases from Federal Courts

	Accepted	Denied	Row Total	Acceptance Rate (%)
Related	284	638	922	30.8%*
Unrelated	616	2563	3179	19.4%
Column Total	900	3201	4101	21.9%

* $p < .001$, 1-tail difference of means test (see Wonnacott and Wonnacott 1972, 178).

B. Cases from State Courts

	Accepted	Denied	Row Total	Acceptance Rate (%)
Related	70	133	203	34.5%*
Unrelated	199	1220	1419	14.0%
Column Total	269	1353	1622	16.6%

* $p < .001$, 1-tail difference of means test (see Wonnacott and Wonnacott 1972, 178).

Table 4

Acceptance Rates for Related and Unrelated Cases on the Vinson Court's Appellate Docket— Disagreement Among Judges in the Lower Courts

A. Disagreement Among Lower Court Judges

	Accepted	Denied	Row Total	Acceptance Rate (%)
Related	123	108	231	53.2%*
Unrelated	219	455	674	32.5%
Column Total	342	563	905	37.8%

* $p < .001$, 1-tail difference of means test (see Wonnacott and Wonnacott 1972, 178).

B. No Disagreement Among Lower Court Judges

	Accepted	Denied	Row Total	Acceptance Rate (%)
Related	231	663	894	25.8%*
Unrelated	596	3332	3928	15.2%
Column Total	827	3995	4822	17.2%

* $p < .001$, 1-tail difference of means test (see Wonnacott and Wonnacott 1972, 178).

Table 5

Acceptance Rates for Related and Unrelated Cases on the Vinson Court's Appellate Docket— Reversals in the Lower Courts

A. No Reversals in the Lower Courts

	Accepted	Denied	Row Total	Acceptance Rate (%)
Related	264	527	791	33.4%*
Unrelated	598	3054	3652	16.4%
Column Total	862	3581	4443	19.4%

* $p < .001$, 1-tail difference of means test (see Wonnacott and Wonnacott 1972, 178).

B. Reversals in the Lower Courts

	Accepted	Denied	Row Total	Acceptance Rate (%)
Related	90	244	334	26.9%
Unrelated	217	733	950	22.8%
Column Total	307	977	1284	23.9%