Agenda Setting on the Warren Court

Timothy M. Hagle
The University of Iowa

The paper that follows is one of a series of papers I have written regarding agenda setting on the Warren Court. The papers on Warren Court agenda setting follow the pattern and topics of those I wrote on the Vinson Court's agenda setting. As each paper was completed updates and corrections sometimes changed a few of the specific numbers presented in papers that came earlier in the series. Even so, the general results for each paper did not change. The papers for the Vinson Court were eventually combined into a book titled, *Supreme Court Agenda Setting: The Vinson Court* (available on Amazon.com). The papers for the Warren Court will also be combined in a book to be titled *Supreme Court Agenda Setting: The Warren Court*. It will be available on Amazon.com in the summer of 2023. The book will use the final numbers after all the corrections and updates.

Agenda Setting on the Warren Court
Paper 12: Only a Single Lower Court as a Factor

Timothy M. Hagle
The University of Iowa

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 perhaps a few hundred more disposed of summarily. Because of this low acceptance rate 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 Warren Court (1953 to 1968 Terms) on its appellate docket. The specific question addressed in this paper is whether cases that were reviewed by only a single lower court were treated differently by the Court in terms of the review decision. The results show that although cases with the same source and origin courts had a higher acceptance rate than other cases, there were differences between state and federal courts, as well as differences between courts at both the state and federal levels.

Agenda Setting on the Warren Court
Paper 12: Only a Single Lower Court as a Factor

This is the twelfth in a series of papers examining agenda setting on the Warren Court (1953-1968 Terms). This series of papers will follow the structure and topics contained in the series of papers I wrote examining agenda setting on the Vinson Court (1946-1952 Terms). As such, certain elements of the Vinson Court papers will be repeated in the corresponding papers for the Warren Court. The papers for the Vinson Court were eventually combined in a book titled, *Supreme Court Agenda Setting: The Vinson Court 1946 to 1952 Terms*, which is available in electronic form from Amazon.com.

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 appeal (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 focused more specifically on the ideological preferences of judges (e.g., Segal and Spaeth 2002) and a book by Brenner and Whitmeyer (2009) compared 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 several thousand 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 (e.g., Hagle 1990).

In his book-length examination of Supreme Court agenda setting Perry (1991) noted that aspects of agenda setting have been of interest to judicial scholars at least since Schubert (1959). Perry also noted 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 those 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 (2022) provided an example of 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 2012), 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 Warren 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 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 2022, 90-91). 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.

Single Lower Court Review

In the sixth paper in this series I looked at whether the level of the immediate lower court was a factor in the Court's agenda setting.[3] The results indicated that the Court was more likely to accept cases coming from state supreme courts than those coming from either state courts of appeals or state trial courts (Tables 6-1 to 6-3).[4] One thought regarding this result was that cases coming from higher state courts had more "ripening" of a sort in that those cases had usually been heard by one or two lower state courts before reaching the state supreme court. Those lower courts would allow the issues to be clarified and provide additional judicial examination of them. Reaching the state supreme court would also mean a more authoritative holding regarding state law.

Of course, not all cases coming from the state supreme courts were reviewed by state intermediate appeals or trial courts. For example, cases involving attorney discipline generally start in a state supreme court and then may be appealed to the United States Supreme Court. Even so, it is certainly true that cases coming from lower state courts would have fewer opportunities for additional judicial review.

Unfortunately, that notion of ripening did not seem to work for cases coming from the federal courts. The results presented in Table 6-4 showed that the Court was nearly six times more likely to accept cases for review that came directly from a United States District Court than from a United States Court of Appeal (91.6% versus 15.4%). The analysis in the sixth paper then went on to examine whether the number of judges involved in the district court was the reason for the surprising result. (I hope this is not a spoiler but it was not; see Table 6-7.)

[3] The paper is titled, "Agenda Setting on the Warren Court, Paper 6, Court Level as a Factor."
[4] To make it easier to refer to the tables of the prior papers I will use the notation indicating the prior paper number and the table number. Thus, Table 6-1 refers to Table 1 of the sixth paper, and so on.

What the sixth paper did not examine was whether it made a difference if the first court to hear a case, the origin court, was also the only court to hear the case before being appealed to the US Supreme Court, making it also the source court.[5] In other words, if the first court was the only court to hear a case it would be both the origin and source court before being appealed to the Supreme Court.

The eleventh paper in the series focused on administrative action as a factor in Supreme Court agenda setting.[6] Toward the end of that paper I examined court level related to administrative action. The results presented in Tables 11-13 and 11-14 indicated that the Court was more likely to accept cases where the source and origin courts were the same. This was particularly so when federal district courts were included (Table 11-13). Table 11-14 focused only on cases coming from US Courts of Appeal and then whether they were also the origin court. Even for this comparison the Court was more likely to accept cases where the source court was also the origin court.

As a result of these prior findings, and particularly given the different results for state and federal courts, it is worth taking a more specific look at court level as a factor to get a better sense of if, and perhaps when, it makes a difference for agenda setting for the source court to also be the origin court.

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 Warren Court

[5] "ORIGIN" and "SOURCE" are the field names used in Spaeth's database (see below) for these courts and I have used them as well.
[6] The paper is titled, "Agenda Setting on the Warren Court, Paper 11, Administrative Action as a Factor."

(1953 through 1968 Terms) and provide a relatively stable period in which to examine the Court's docket.

Information on the cases was drawn from several sources including the *United States Law Week*, various reporters for the state and federal courts, LEXIS (now called NexisUNI), and other online sources. Every case filed on the Court's appellate docket during the 1953-1968 Terms is included in the dataset. This results in 15,858 cases. Unlike the examinations of the Vinson Court, not included in this number are any cases filed before the 1953 Term that were held over and received a 1953 Term or later docket number.[7] Included in this number are 308 cases that originally appeared on the Court's miscellaneous docket and were moved to the appellate docket.[8]

An additional note on the coding for this examination is worthwhile before proceeding. Coding for the source and origin courts is relatively straightforward. As noted above, the first court to hear a case, regardless of the level of that court (trial, intermediate appellate, or supreme) is designated the origin court. The court that reviews the case immediately before the case is appealed to the US Supreme Court, again regardless of level, is the source court.

For example, a federal case involving action by the Interstate Commerce Commission would usually be heard by a three-judge panel in a US District Court and then be appealed

[7] Prior to the 1971 Term held over cases 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.

[8] 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 docket (sometimes referred to as the "paid docket") and given a new docket number. The Expanded United States Supreme Court Judicial Database, Harold J. Spaeth principal investigator, lists 191 cases with a miscellaneous docket number (with an "M" in the DOCKET field, meaning they were not transferred to the appellate docket) during the 1953-1968 Terms. There are also three cases from the Miscellaneous Docket after the numbering changed. Of these 194 cases, 133 were granted some form of review (usually a short per curiam vacating or reversing), but are not included here. On the other hand, this dataset includes 107 cases initially filed on the appellate docket for which the Court granted *in forma pauperis* status to one of the parties (45 of which were granted review). (For this study I made use of 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.)

directly to the Supreme Court. That would make the District Court both the source and origin court for that case. Another example noted in the sixth paper occurs when there is administrative action by federal agencies such as the National Labor Relations Board. The losing party to the administrative action can then bring suit in a US Court of Appeals. From there the case is appealed to the Supreme Court. That makes the Court of Appeals both the source and origin court for that case.

State cases may vary a bit more in terms of why a case goes to one court rather than another, but the approach is the same in terms of identifying the source and origin courts.

Results

I begin by noting that of the 15,706 cases in the dataset where the Court made a review decision it accepted 3,100 of them for review. That resulted in an overall acceptance rate of 19.7%.[9]

Table 1 shows the comparison of those cases when the source court was also the origin court with those cases when the source court was not the origin court. Combining state and federal cases and regardless of level there were 2,844 cases when the source court was also the origin court (which I will refer to as SO cases from here on). This is 18.1% of all the cases, so a not insignificant amount. The Court granted review to 1,203 of these cases (42.3%). In comparison, of the 12,862 cases when the source and origin courts were not the same (non-SO cases) the Court granted review to 1,897 (14.7%). Using a two-tailed difference of means test this difference is significant at the $p < .001$ level.

TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE

[9] This number is fewer than the 15,858 noted previously because it does not include 152 cases where the Court did not make a review decision on the substance of the case. One hundred and forth-eight were due to requests for dismissal by the petitioner before the review decision and the remaining four were due to other rule dismissals.

That the Court was more likely to grant review where only one court below had reviewed the cases seems to run counter to the notion that review by more than one lower court provides additional ripening, at least in this form. Even so, and as prior results suggest, we must drill down a bit to get a clearer picture of what was occurring for these types of cases. To that end, Table 2 shows the comparison between state SO cases with all cases when the two courts are different.

TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE

There were 289 SO cases from state courts. The Supreme Court granted review to 54 of these cases (18.7%). There were 3,976 state non-SO cases and the Court granted review to 616 of them (15.5%).[10] Although these percentages are much closer, and the difference does not reach statistical significance, this finding is still contrary to the notion that more courts reviewing a case as it works its way up the judicial ladder would increase the likelihood of acceptance by the Court. We know from the sixth paper in the series, however, that there was a difference in the acceptance rates for cases coming from state supreme courts versus lower state courts (Tables 6-1 and 6-2). Thus, the next step is to break out these state cases based on court level.

TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE

Table 3 shows the comparison of state supreme court SO cases with all state non-SO cases. There were 194 SO cases from state supreme courts of which the Court granted review to 39 (20.1%). There were 3,157 non-SO state supreme court cases of which the Court granted review to 524 (16.6%). Once again, the Court was more accepting of cases with fewer lower court examinations, though not to a statistically significant degree. It seems likely that the Court

[10] For the corresponding examinations of the Vinson Court the second row in all the tables used the non-SO figures from the second row of Table 1. It seems, however, that it would be better to separate the non-SO cases into those from state and federal courts as appropriate given prior findings suggesting that the Court treats cases from state and federal courts differently.

viewe state supreme decisions as more authoritative than those from lower state courts, so the next step is to examine SO cases from lower state courts.

TABLE 4 ABOUT HERE

Given that the acceptance rate for state supreme court SO cases was higher than for all such state non-SO cases, it should be no surprise that the acceptance rate for lower state court SO cases was even lower. This is shown in Table 4 where we see that although the number of cases was much smaller than those from state supreme courts at 95, the Court only accepted 15 of them (15.8%). There were still a fair number of state lower court non-SO cases at 819, but the Court only accepted 92 of them (11.2%). Once again, this difference is not statistically significant.

One might reasonably wonder why the acceptance rate for lower state court SO cases would be so much lower than SO cases coming from the state supreme courts. Again, part of the reason likely has to do with the Court's view of the greater authority of the state high courts. It may also turn in large part on the types of cases coming from each court level. In particular, a large portion of the cases coming from a lower state courts involved criminal issues. The results presented in the eighth and ninth papers in the series showed that the acceptance rates for certain types of cases involving criminal issues parties tended to be lower.[11] With those results in mind, it is worth comparing state SO cases while excluding those with criminal issues.

TABLE 5 ABOUT HERE

Table 5 shows the comparison of state SO cases of all levels with all state non-SO cases. After excluding the state SO cases with criminal issues there were 241 remaining state SO cases of which the Court granted review to 42 (17.4%). There were 2,879 state non-SO cases of which the Court granted review to 468 (16.3%). It is interesting that the acceptance rate for the non-

[11] The eighth paper is titled, "Agenda Setting on the Warren Court, Paper 8, Law Enforcement Parties as a Factor." The ninth paper is titled, "Agenda Setting on the Warren Court, Paper 9, Criminal Defendants as a Factor."

criminal cases was actually lower than when criminal cases were included. We usually think that the bulk of cases with criminal defendants, particularly those coming from lower state courts, were likely thought to be frivolous by the Court and denied review accordingly. That may still be true, but apparently the Court did not find much of interest in the state SO cases either.

Having examined how the Court treats SO cases coming from the state courts we can now turn to an examination of SO cases coming from the federal courts.

TABLE 6 ABOUT HERE

Table 6 shows the comparison between SO cases coming from the federal courts and all non-SO cases. There were 2,555 federal SO cases and the Court granted review to 1,149 of them (45.0%). There were 8,886 federal non-SO cases and the Court granted review to 1,281 of them (14.4%). This acceptance rate for federal SO cases was well over three times the rate for all federal non-SO cases and the difference reaches a high level of statistical significance. We know from prior examinations, Table 11-11 in particular, that the Court's acceptance rate for cases coming from the US District Courts was significantly higher than the rate for cases coming from the US Courts of Appeals. Thus, as with the state SO cases, we must drill down to better understand this different treatment.

TABLE 7 ABOUT HERE

Table 7 shows the comparison of SO cases coming from US Courts of Appeals and all non-SO cases. There were only 1,197 SO cases from the Courts of Appeals and the Supreme Court granted review to 275 of them (23.0%). As in Table 6, the comparison here is with all federal non-SO cases. These same numbers will also be used in the remaining tables. The acceptance rate for the SO cases was sufficiently higher than the acceptance rate for the non-SO cases to reach statistical significance. The acceptance rate for SO cases from the Courts of

Appeals was consistent with the acceptance rate for SO cases from the Courts of Appeals that involved administrative action shown in Table 11-14.[12]

TABLE 8 ABOUT HERE

Having examined the acceptance rate for SO cases coming from the US Courts of Appeals the next step is to examine those SO cases from lower federal courts. I use the phrase "lower federal courts" here because this includes both the US District Courts as well as the US Court of Claims which also functions as a trial court. In Table 8 we see that there were 1,358 cases that came from lower federal courts and the Court granted review to 874 of them (64.4%). Again, given the findings from prior papers, and in particular the results presented in Tables 6-5 and 6-7, it is no surprise that the cases from the lower federal courts had such a high acceptance rate. Again, however, it is worth drilling down a bit more. Given that SO cases from the Court of Claims were included in Table 8 it makes sense to examine those cases separately from those SO cases coming from US District Courts.

TABLE 9 ABOUT HERE

Beginning with the SO cases from the District Courts, Table 9 shows the comparison of those cases with all federal non-SO cases. There were 908 SO cases from the District Courts and the Court granted review to 833 of them (91.7%). In Table 6-5 the comparison focused on SO cases from District Courts versus cases from the Courts of Appeals and Court of Claims. Here, the focus is on SO versus non-SO cases but restricting the Court of Appeals cases here to non-SO cases actually resulted in a lower acceptance rate.

Table 6-7 looked at the comparison of cases coming from single-judge and three-judge US District Courts. Both types of courts had very high acceptance rates (85.9% and 95.4%,

[12] The comparison in Table 11-14 was with a much narrower set of non-SO cases (only those involving federal administrative action), but the difference there still reached statistical significance.

respectively), but the difference between them still reached statistical significance. In the next two tables these rates are compared to the set of all federal non-SO cases.

TABLE 10 ABOUT HERE

Table 10 shows the comparison of SO cases coming from three-judge US District Courts with all federal non-SO cases. There were 545 of these cases and the Court granted review to 520 of them (95.4%). As expected, this difference was very large and highly significant.

TABLE 11 ABOUT HERE

Table 11 shows the comparison of SO cases coming from single-judge US District Courts with all federal non-SO cases. There were 363 of these cases and the Court granted review to 313 of them (86.2%). Despite the smaller number of these cases the difference was still highly significant.

TABLE 12 ABOUT HERE

Finally, Table 12 examines the comparison between SO cases from the Court of Claims and all non-SO cases. There were 450 SO cases from the Court of Claims and the Court granted review to only 41 of them (9.1%). This acceptance rate was well below the rate for all federal non-SO cases and reaches a traditional level of statistical significance.

Discussion

As we have seen in previous papers in this series, the results for this examination were more nuanced than a single factor might indicate. The notion that the justices of the Supreme Court prefer to let issues ripen in the lower courts may have some validity, but the results presented in this paper do not seem to indicate that a factor in such ripening is simply whether more than one lower court ruled on the case before it was appealed to the Court.

As shown in Table 1, in looking at all the cases when there was only one lower court, meaning when the source and origin courts were the same, the Warren Court was almost three times as likely to accept cases for review when there was only one lower court compared with those with two or more lower courts. This result was certainly contrary to the notion of a case being more ripe if more courts had heard it. Not surprisingly, however, a closer examination of the cases when the source and origin courts were the same—the SO cases—found that the Court's acceptance of these cases was more nuanced.

In particular, there was a distinct difference in the acceptance rates for SO cases from state and federal courts (Tables 2 and 6, respectively). Despite the difference in the acceptance rates for state and federal SO cases, more distinctions appeared when drilling down even further. Not surprisingly, the Court was more accepting of SO cases from state supreme courts (Table 3) than from lower state courts (Table 4). Interestingly, there was not a large number of state criminal cases and when they were excluded from the examination the acceptance rate for the remaining cases actually decreased (Table 5). We would normally expect criminal cases to have a lower acceptance rate on the assumption that more of them were frivolous or at least longshots. For the Warren Court, however, these state criminal cases actually had a higher acceptance rate (12 of 48 cases for 25%).

Although SO cases from the federal courts had a much higher acceptance rate than SO cases from the state courts, there were also differences based on the type of federal court involved. One might reasonably guess that the Court would be more accepting of cases from the Courts of Appeals than the District Courts, but this was shown to not be the case. It was not surprising that the acceptance rate for SO cases from the Courts of Appeals (Table 7) was higher than the rate for SO cases from the state supreme courts (Table 3), but that rate was much lower

than the acceptance rate for SO cases from all lower federal courts (Table 8) and in particular from the District Courts (Table 9).

Indications of the unusually high acceptance rate for SO cases coming from the federal District Courts were shown in the sixth and eleventh papers in the series. In the sixth paper, which examined the level of the source court as a factor, compared single- and three-judge federal district courts and found the rate for three-judge district courts was nearly 10 points higher (Table 6-7). Nevertheless, both types of court had exceptionally high acceptance rates and in this paper, Tables 10 and 11 compared those rates with the rate for non-SO cases and found the differences to be highly significant. It was not just a matter of the Court's willingness to hear cases from federal trial courts, however, as Table 12 examined the acceptance rate for SO cases coming from the Court of Claims and found the acceptance rate to be well below the rate for the non-SO cases to a statistically significant degree.

Vinson Court Comparison

One difference to note immediately is that the comparison group for many of the examinations was different for the Vinson and Warren Courts. For the Vinson Court all the examinations used as the comparison group all non-SO cases. For the Warren Court examinations I used a more specific comparison group. More specifically, for the state cases the comparison group was all state non-SO cases. For the federal cases is was all federal non-SO cases. I made this change because the results in prior cases showed differences in how the Warren Court treated state versus federal cases, so it seemed more appropriate to separate state and federal cases for the comparison groups as well. That said, it appears that the different comparison group made a difference in the significance level of only one or two instances.

For the initial examination of all SO cases with all non-SO cases, both Courts significantly favored the SO cases. For the Vinson Court the acceptance rate for SO cases was double that for non-SO cases, but for the Warren Court the difference was almost triple.

Aside from the different comparison group used for the state cases, there were substantial differences between the two Courts. During the Vinson Court there were a very large number of criminal cases that were only heard by the state lower courts. This resulted in the state lower court SO cases having an acceptance rate of only 4.2%. In contrast, during the Warren Court the acceptance rate for these cases was 15.8% (Table 4). That rate was below the rates shown in Tables 2, 3, and 5, but still a few points higher than the non-SO cases from the lower state courts.

For the federal cases, and despite the different comparison groups, for both Courts the examinations proved to be statistically significant for all but the final one in Table 12. The comparison in Table 12 was with cases coming from the Court of Claims. The acceptance rate for Court of Claims cases was 20.5% for the Vinson Court, but only 9.1% for the Warren Court. The acceptance rate for the Vinson Court was only 3.5% above the comparison group. The rate for the Warren Court was over five points lower than the comparison group and was statistically significant.

Conclusion

An initial suggestion that SO cases might not be seen as sufficiently ripe by the Court, or put differently, that cases that have been reviewed by more than one lower court are more ripe for review proved to not be the case. In fact, in nearly every comparison the SO cases had higher acceptance rates than non-SO cases. Nevertheless, to the extent SO cases are related in some way to the notion of ripening that factor appears to be influenced by the type of court (state or

federal), the court level (supreme or lower at the state level) and the subject matter of the case (criminal or not, federal administrative action in three-judge federal courts). Thus, although SO cases may be worthy of examination, the fact that the source and origin courts were the same may be a proxy for other factors that were also, if not more, important for the Warren Court.

References

Baum, Lawrence. 2022. *The Supreme Court*, 14th 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.

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

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

Hagle, Timothy M. 1990. "So Many Cases, So Little Time: Judges as Decision Makers." In *American Politics in the Heartland*, ed. Douglas Madsen, Arthur H. Miller, and James A. Stimson. Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall/Hunt.

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

Hagle, Timothy M. 2022. "Agenda Setting on the Warren Court Paper 6: Court Level as a Factor." Typescript.

Hagle, Timothy M. 2022. "Agenda Setting on the Warren Court, Paper 8: Law Enforcement Parties as a Factor." Typescript.

Hagle, Timothy M. 2022. "Agenda Setting on the Warren Court, Paper 9: Criminal Defendants as a Factor."

Hagle, Timothy M. 2022. "Agenda Setting on the Warren Court Paper 11: Administrative Parties as a Factor."

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

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.

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.

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 Cases With Source and Origin Courts the Same Compared With Cases With Different Source and Origin Courts on the Warren Court's Appellate Docket

	Accepted	Denied	Row Total	Acceptance Rate (%)
SO Cases	1,203	1,641	2,844	42.3%*
Non-SO Cases	1,897	10,965	12,862	14.7%
Column Total	3,100	12,606	15,706	19.7%

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

Table 2

Acceptance Rates for State Cases With Source and Origin Courts the Same Compared With Cases With Different Source and Origin Courts on the Warren Court's Appellate Docket

	Accepted	Denied	Row Total	Acceptance Rate (%)
State SO Cases	54	235	289	18.7%
Non-SO Cases	616	3,360	3,976	15.5%
Column Total	670	3,595	4,265	15.7%

Table 3

Acceptance Rates for State Supreme Court Cases With Source and Origin Courts the Same Compared With Cases With Different Source and Origin Courts on the Warren Court's Appellate Docket

	Accepted	Denied	Row Total	Acceptance Rate (%)
State Supreme Court SO Cases	39	155	194	20.1%
Non-SO Cases	524	2,633	3,157	16.6%
Column Total	563	2,788	3,351	16.8%

Table 4

Acceptance Rates for State Lower Court Cases With Source and Origin Courts the Same Compared With Cases With Different Source and Origin Courts on the Warren Court's Appellate Docket

	Accepted	Denied	Row Total	Acceptance Rate (%)
State Lower Court SO Cases	15	80	95	15.8%
Non-SO Cases	92	727	819	11.2%
Column Total	107	807	914	11.7%

Table 5

Acceptance Rates for State Non-Criminal Cases With Source and Origin Courts the Same Compared With Cases With Different Source and Origin Courts on the Warren Court's Appellate Docket

	Accepted	Denied	Row Total	Acceptance Rate (%)
State Non-Criminal SO Cases	42	199	241	17.4%
Non-SO Cases	468	2,411	2,879	16.3%
Column Total	510	2,610	3,120	16.3%

Table 6

Acceptance Rates for Federal Cases With Source and Origin Courts the Same Compared With Cases With Different Source and Origin Courts on the Warren Court's Appellate Docket

	Accepted	Denied	Row Total	Acceptance Rate (%)
Federal SO Cases	1,149	1,406	2,555	45.0%*
Non-SO Cases	1,281	7,605	8,886	14.4%
Column Total	2,430	9,011	11,441	21.2%

* $p < .001$, two-tail difference of means test.

Table 7

Acceptance Rates for Federal Courts of Appeals Cases With Source and Origin Courts the Same Compared With Cases With Different Source and Origin Courts on the Warren Court's Appellate Docket

	Accepted	Denied	Row Total	Acceptance Rate (%)
Federal Court of Appeals SO Cases	275	922	1,197	23.0%*
Non-SO Cases	1,281	7,605	8,886	14.4%
Column Total	1,556	8,527	10,083	15.4%

* $p < .001$, two-tail difference of means test.

Table 8

Acceptance Rates for Federal Lower Court Cases With Source and Origin Courts the Same Compared With Cases With Different Source and Origin Courts on the Warren Court's Appellate Docket

	Accepted	Denied	Row Total	Acceptance Rate (%)
Federal Lower Court SO Cases	874	484	1,358	64.4%*
Non-SO Cases	1,281	7,605	8,886	14.4%
Column Total	2,155	8,089	10,244	21.0%

* $p < .001$, two-tail difference of means test.

Table 9

Acceptance Rates for Federal District Court Cases With Source and Origin Courts the Same Compared With Cases With Different Source and Origin Courts on the Warren Court's Appellate Docket

	Accepted	Denied	Row Total	Acceptance Rate (%)
Federal District Court SO Cases	833	75	908	91.7%*
Non-SO Cases	1,281	7,605	8,886	14.4%
Column Total	2,114	7,680	9,794	21.6%

* $p < .001$, two-tail difference of means test.

Table 10

Acceptance Rates for Federal Three-Judge District Court Cases With Source and Origin Courts the Same Compared With Cases With Different Source and Origin Courts on the Warren Court's Appellate Docket

	Accepted	Denied	Row Total	Acceptance Rate (%)
Federal Three-Judge District Court SO Cases	520	25	545	95.4%*
Non-SO Cases	1,281	7,605	8,886	14.4%
Column Total	1,801	7,630	9,431	19.1%

* $p < .001$, two-tail difference of means test.

Table 11

Acceptance Rates for Federal Single-Judge District Court Cases With Source and Origin Courts the Same Compared With Cases With Different Source and Origin Courts on the Warren Court's Appellate Docket

	Accepted	Denied	Row Total	Acceptance Rate (%)
Federal Single-Judge District Court SO Cases	313	50	363	86.2%*
Non-SO Cases	1,281	7,605	8,886	14.4%
Column Total	1,594	7,655	9,249	17,2%

* $p < .001$, two-tail difference of means test.

Table 12

Acceptance Rates for Federal Court of Claims Cases With Source and Origin Courts the Same Compared With Cases With Different Source and Origin Courts on the Warren Court's Appellate Docket

	Accepted	Denied	Row Total	Acceptance Rate (%)
Federal Court of Claims SO Cases	41	409	450	9.1%*
Non-SO Cases	1,281	7,605	8,886	14.4%
Column Total	1,322	8,014	9,336	14.1%