



Apr 9th, 10:00 AM - 11:00 AM

Supreme Court Responsiveness: An Analysis of Individual Justice Voting Behavior and the Role of Public Opinion

Michael Browning
Illinois Wesleyan University

Greg Shaw, Faculty Advisor
Illinois Wesleyan University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.iwu.edu/jwprc>



Part of the [Political Science Commons](#)

Browning, Michael and Shaw, Faculty Advisor, Greg, "Supreme Court Responsiveness: An Analysis of Individual Justice Voting Behavior and the Role of Public Opinion" (2011). *John Wesley Powell Student Research Conference*. 2.

<https://digitalcommons.iwu.edu/jwprc/2011/oralpres2/2>

This Event is protected by copyright and/or related rights. It has been brought to you by Digital Commons @ IWU with permission from the rights-holder(s). You are free to use this material in any way that is permitted by the copyright and related rights legislation that applies to your use. For other uses you need to obtain permission from the rights-holder(s) directly, unless additional rights are indicated by a Creative Commons license in the record and/ or on the work itself. This material has been accepted for inclusion by faculty at Illinois Wesleyan University. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@iwu.edu.

©Copyright is owned by the author of this document.

Oral Presentation O2.2

**SUPREME COURT RESPONSIVENESS: AN ANALYSIS OF INDIVIDUAL
JUSTICE VOTING BEHAVIOR AND THE ROLE OF PUBLIC OPINION**

Michael Browning and Greg Shaw*
Political Science Department, Illinois Wesleyan University

Despite leading the unelected branch of the federal government, research shows that the Supreme Court regularly decides in line with the public's mood. This study aims to explain why the Supreme Court responds to public mood by analyzing the liberalism of individual justices compared to the liberalism of the general public from 1953 to 2005. Three theories suggesting why the Court may respond to public opinion are discussed, including replacement, political adjustment, and the attitude change hypotheses. An argument for using Court reversals to determine the ideology of the Court is presented and implemented. The Court is analyzed as an institutional actor among the other branches of government, and individual justices are examined as actors within the larger framework of the Court. Public reaction to the Court is also studied as an examination of the Court's role in society.