Supplemental Web Appendix

Table 1: Appeals Court Database Sample Selection		
Variable	Values Selected	Description
ORIGIN	1	Federal District Court – Single Judge
SOURCE	1	Federal District Court – Single Judge
APPLFROM	1 - 5	Trial; Injunction; Summary Judgment; Guilty Plea; Dismissal
METHOD	1	Decided by 3 Judge Panel for First Time
STATE	1 - 50	U.S. District Courts for the 50 States
GENISS	1-7	Criminal; Civil Rights; First Amendment; Due Process; Privacy; Labor Relations; Economic Activity and Regulation
DIRECT1	1 or 3	Conservative; Liberal
CASETYP2	0	Cases with no Secondary Issue
TREAT	1 – 3	Affirmed; Reversed; Reversed and Remanded
DISTJUDG	$\neq$ 99999	District Judge Not Ascertained (values dropped)

Note: The origin of data observations is the Merged Court of Appeals Database (1925-2002) and is available at: http://www.cas.sc.edu/poli/juri/appctdata.htm. Using the above specification the sample captures 5,707 potential observations. To ensure proper judge coding two coding checks were performed against the Westlaw citation. The first verified the identities of the District Court judge when the state identifier of the decision and judge conflicted. The second verified the identity of the judge when the difference between the date of the decision and the judge's year of confirmation was in excess of 30 years. After making corrections for any coding errors, 27 observations were excluded for a number of reasons: originating judge was not a District Court judge (7); judge was from the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, or a U.S. territory (14); judge was a recess appointment that was not eventually confirmed or appointed before 1901 (5); or a duplicate case entry (1). After coding checks, the final sample includes 5,680 observations.

Supplemental Web Appendix

Table 2: Calculation of the District Court Position		
Court of Appeals Treatment (TREAT)	Court of Appeals Direction (DIRECT1)	District Court Direction
Affirmed (1)	Conservative (1)	Conservative (1)
Affirmed (1)	Liberal (3)	Liberal (0)
Reversed (2); Reversed and Remanded (3)	Conservative (1)	Liberal (0)
Reversed (2); Reversed and Remanded (3)	Liberal (3)	Conservative (1)

Supplemental Web Appendix

Table 3: Distribution of Sample Case Types Versus Uncontrolled Null Category Observations										
	Regime 1		Regime 2		Regime 3		Regimes 1, 2, and 3		Composite	
	Sample	Null	Sample	Null	Sample	Null	Sample	Null	Sample	Null
Criminal	24.2%	33.7%	42.0%	54.9%	44.5%	54.9%	39.0%	49.9%	39.0%	50.1%
Civil Rights	1.9%	2.7%	8.2%	9.2%	15.6%	12.9%	8.9%	8.4%	9.0%	8.3%
First Amendment	.5%	.6%	1.5%	1.4%	3.3%	4.3%	1.8%	1.7%	1.8%	1.7%
Due Process	.2%	.3%	1.0%	.9%	1.4%	.8%	.9%	.7%	.9%	.7%
Privacy	0%	0%	.1%	.2%	.4%	.4%	.2%	.2%	.2%	.2%
Labor Relations	3.1%	3.6%	4.1%	3.9%	4.4%	4.3%	4.0%	3.9%	4.0%	3.9%
Economic	70.1%	59.0%	43.0%	29.5%	30.3%	22.4%	45.2%	35.2%	45.0%	35.1%
Observations	1,169	329	2,916	803	1,529	255	5,614	1,387	5,680	1,394
Null Category %		28.1%		27.5%		16.7%		24.7%		24.5%

Table 4: Calculation of the Baseline Ideal-Point Measures				
Variable Calculation	Regime 1 1901-1942	Regime 2 1943-1976	Regime 3 1977-1994	Regime 4 1995-2006
Executive Point				
	president party median	president	president	president
Traditional Courtesy Point				
2 Senators Same Party	mean value of president party median distant senator	mean value of president distant senator	mean value of president distant senator	mean value of president distant senator
2 Senators Opposite Party	president party median	president	president	president
1 Senator Both Parties	mean value of president party median senator same party	mean value of president senator same party	mean value of president senator same party	mean value of president senator same party

Note: Ideal points are the 1st-dimension DW Nominate values for the actor or mean of two actors. DW Nominate values are not available for presidents before Eisenhower. For these early cases, the president's position is represented by the median senator of the president's party.

Supplemental Web Appendix

Table 5: Calculation of the Selection Point Measure				
Initial Position / Veto Point	Regime 1 1901-1942	Regime 2 1943-1976	Regime 3 1977-1994	Regime 4 1995-2006
Executive Position	president party median	*constraint found*	president	*constraint found*
Senatorial Courtesy				
2 Senators Same Party	*constraint not found*	mean value of president distant senator	mean value of president distant senator	mean value of president distant senator
2 Senators Opposite Party	*constraint not found*	mean value of president distant senator	*constraint not found*	mean value of president distant senator
1 Senator Both Parties	*constraint not found*	mean value of president senator same party	*constraint not found*	mean value of president senator opposite party
Committee Consideration Judiciary Chairman	*constraint not found*	mean value of president chairman	*constraint not found*	mean value of president chairman
Floor Stage Opposite Party	*constraint not found*	*constraint not found*	*constraint not found*	*constraint not found*

Note: Ideal points are the 1st dimension DW Nominate values for the actor or mean of two actors. If more than one stage of the process shows constraint (i.e., senatorial courtesy, committee consideration, or the floor) then an absolute distance gridlock interval was calculated for each stage. The judge's ideal point then represents the above calculation for the veto point with the greatest gridlock interval. DW Nominate values are not available for presidents before Eisenhower. For these early cases, the president's position is represented by the median senator of the president's party.

Table 6: Calculation of the Confirmation Point Measure

Initial Position / Veto Point	Regime 1 1901-1942	Regime 2 1943-1976	Regime 3 1977-1994	Regime 4 1995-2006
Executive Position	*constraint found*	*constraint found*	*constraint found*	*constraint found*
Senatorial Courtesy				
2 Senators Same Party	mean value of president distant senator	*constraint not found*	*constraint not found*	*constraint not found*
2 Senators Opposite Party	mean value of president distant senator	*constraint not found*	*constraint not found*	mean value of president distant senator
1 Senator Both Parties	mean value of president senator same party	*constraint not found*	*constraint not found*	*constraint not found*
Committee Consideration Judiciary Chairman	*constraint not found*	mean value of president chairman	mean value of president chairman	mean value of president chairman
Floor Stage Opposite Party	*constraint not found*	*constraint not found*	*constraint not found*	mean value of president opposite party median

Note: Ideal points are the 1st-dimension DW Nominate values for the actor or mean of two actors. If more than one stage of the process shows constraint (i.e., senatorial courtesy, committee consideration, or the floor) then an absolute distance gridlock interval was calculated for each stage. The judge's ideal point represents the above calculation for the veto point with the greatest gridlock interval. DW Nominate values are not available for presidents before Eisenhower. For these early cases, the president's position is represented by the median senator of the president's party.

Table 7: Weighted Logit Estimates of the Likelihood of a Conservative Vote U.S. District Court Judges Appointed in Regime 1 – 1901 to 1942					
	Null Configuration Model 1	Executive Point Model 2	Traditional Courtesy Model 3	Selection Point Model 4	Confirmation Point Model 5
Ideal Point		.06 (.21)	.10 (.20)	*N/A*	-.08 (.23)
Years of Service (natural log)	.18 * (.08)	.18 * (.08)	.18 * (.08)		.18 * (.08)
Jury Instructions	2.60 ** (1.00)	2.60 ** (1.00)	2.61 ** (1.00)		2.60 ** (1.00)
Sentencing	1.51 (1.04)	1.51 (1.04)	1.51 (1.05)		1.50 (1.04)
Defective Indictment	2.40 * (1.04)	2.40 * (1.04)	2.39 * (1.04)		2.41 * (1.04)
Search and Seizure	1.37 (.79)	1.37 (.79)	1.37 (.79)		1.37 (.79)
Other Inadmissible	2.43 ** (.82)	2.44 ** (.82)	2.44 ** (.82)		2.44 ** (.82)
Due Process	-1.25 (.64)	-1.25 (.65)	-1.24 (.65)		-1.26 * (.64)
Executive Order	-.42 (.51)	-.42 (.51)	-.42 (.51)		-.42 (.51)
State Policy or Law	-.41 * (.19)	-.40 * (.19)	-.40 * (.19)		-.41 * (.19)
Weight of Evidence	-.43 ** (.15)	-.43 ** (.15)	-.43 ** (.15)		-.43 ** (.15)
Pre-trial Procedure	-.07 (.53)	-.07 (.53)	-.07 (.54)		-.07 (.53)
Trial Procedure	-.65 *** (.18)	-.65 *** (.18)	-.66 *** (.18)		-.65 *** (.18)
Post-trial Procedure	-.34 (.41)	-.33 (.41)	-.33 (.42)		-.33 (.41)
Attorney Fees	-.39 (1.28)	-.39 (1.28)	-.39 (1.27)		-.37 (1.29)
Judge's Discretion	-.20 (.31)	-.19 (.31)	-.19 (.31)		-.21 (.31)
Alternative Dispute Resolution	-.30 (.75)	-.28 (.75)	-.28 (.75)		-.31 (.75)
Injunction	-.81 * (.42)	-.82 * (.42)	-.83 * (.42)		-.80 (.42)
Summary Judgment	-.43 (.58)	-.43 (.58)	-.43 (.57)		-.44 (.58)
Federal Vesiture	-.28 (.56)	-.29 (.56)	-.28 (.56)		-.28 (.56)

Other Civil Issue	-.95 *	-.95 *	-.95 *	-.96 *
	(.42)	(.42)	(.42)	(.42)
Substantial Evidence	-1.42 *	-1.43 *	-1.43 *	-1.42 *
	(.57)	(.57)	(.57)	(.57)
Agency Discretion	-.64	-.65	-.65	-.64
	(1.16)	(1.15)	(1.15)	(1.15)
Appropriate General Standing	-.36	-.35	-.36	-.36
	(.37)	(.37)	(.36)	(.37)
Constant Value	.40	.39	.39	.41
	(.23)	(.23)	(.23)	(.23)
N	1169	1169	1169	1169
Wald $\sim \chi^2$	76.90 ***	76.93 ***	76.79 ***	77.89 ***
Log-Likelihood	-672.19	-672.15	-672.04	-672.12
Correct Predictions	784	785	787	780
PRE	8.33	8.57	9.05	7.38
LR Test (Null)		.09	.31	.14
LR Test (Exec)			.22	.05
LR Test (Trad)				*-.17*

Note: Source of data is the original and updated U.S. Courts of Appeals Database. The sample includes at least one case outcome for 239 judges or 64.1% of the 373 judges appointed during the regime. The mean and maximum numbers of observations per judge are 4.9 and 34. Estimation is weighted by the recommended circuit/year values. Robust standard errors are in parentheses. * $\rho<.05$, ** $\rho<.01$, *** $\rho<.001$, two-tailed tests.

	Null Configuration Model 1	Executive Point Model 2	Traditional Courtesy Model 3	Selection Point Model 4	Confirmation Point Model 5
Table 8: Weighted Logit Estimates of the Likelihood of a Conservative Vote U.S. District Court Judges Appointed in Regime 2 – 1943 to 1976					
Ideal Point		.47 *** (.15)	.64 *** (.16)	1.18 *** (.29)	1.14 *** (.29)
Years of Service (natural log)	-.19 ** (.07)	-.21 ** (.07)	-.20 ** (.07)	-.21 ** (.07)	-.20 ** (.07)
Jury Instructions	3.48 *** (1.01)	3.49 *** (1.01)	3.49 *** (1.01)	3.48 *** (1.01)	3.49 *** (1.01)
Sentencing	2.41 * (1.01)	2.41 * (1.00)	2.41 * (1.00)	2.41 * (1.01)	2.41 * (1.00)
Defective Indictment	.74 (.43)	.75 (.44)	.77 (.44)	.78 (.44)	.76 (.44)
Search and Seizure	2.32 ** (.85)	2.32 ** (.85)	2.32 ** (.85)	2.31 ** (.86)	2.30 ** (.85)
Other Inadmissible	1.69 *** (.48)	1.69 *** (.49)	1.69 *** (.49)	1.70 *** (.49)	1.68 *** (.49)
Due Process	.71 (.42)	.67 (.42)	.70 (.41)	.70 (.42)	.65 (.42)
Executive Order	-.56 (.50)	-.59 (.50)	-.60 (.49)	-.55 (.50)	-.61 (.50)
State Policy or Law	-.53 *** (.16)	-.53 *** (.16)	-.54 *** (.16)	-.52 *** (.16)	-.54 *** (.16)
Weight of Evidence	-.96 *** (.12)	-.96 *** (.12)	-.96 *** (.12)	-.96 *** (.12)	-.95 *** (.12)
Pre-trial Procedure	.83 (.47)	.81 (.46)	.80 (.47)	.81 (.47)	.81 (.47)
Trial Procedure	-.65 *** (.17)	-.64 *** (.17)	-.63 *** (.17)	-.63 *** (.17)	-.63 *** (.17)
Post-trial Procedure	-.58 (.37)	-.60 (.37)	-.63 (.37)	-.61 (.36)	-.60 (.36)
Attorney Fees	-.85 * (.37)	-.85 * (.38)	-.84 * (.38)	-.82 * (.38)	-.86 * (.38)
Judge's Discretion	-.51 * (.23)	-.51 * (.23)	-.51 * (.23)	-.52 * (.23)	-.51 * (.23)
Alternative Dispute Resolution	.06 (.45)	.04 (.45)	.04 (.45)	.05 (.45)	.04 (.44)
Injunction	-1.27 *** (.27)	-1.27 *** (.27)	-1.23 *** (.27)	-1.26 *** (.27)	-1.28 *** (.27)
Summary Judgment	.55 * (.25)	.55 * (.25)	.55 * (.25)	.55 * (.25)	.53 * (.25)
Federal Vestiture	-.01 (.45)	-.08 (.44)	-.10 (.44)	-.03 (.45)	-.07 (.45)

Other Civil Issue	-.66 **	-.71 **	-.72 ***	-.72 ***	-.73 ***
	(.22)	(.22)	(.22)	(.22)	(.22)
Substantial Evidence	-.26	-.26	-.31	-.28	-.27
	(.50)	(.50)	(.49)	(.49)	(.49)
Agency Discretion	-.90	-.93	-.92	-.90	-.96
	(.52)	(.53)	(.52)	(.53)	(.53)
Appropriate General Standing	.42	.43	.45	.39	.42
	(.43)	(.42)	(.42)	(.43)	(.42)
Constant Value	1.91 ***	1.96 ***	1.96 ***	1.95 ***	1.90 ***
	(.17)	(.17)	(.17)	(.17)	(.17)
N	2916	2916	2916	2916	2916
Wald ~ χ^2	227.34 ***	230.79 ***	232.31 ***	236.00 ***	234.87 ***
Log-Likelihood	-1,236.11	-1,229.95	-1,226.84	-1,226.04	-1,227.15
Correct Predictions	2,322	2,323	2,331	2,331	2,326
PRE	7.33	7.49	8.73	8.73	7.96
LR Test (Null)		12.31 ***	18.54 ***	20.14 ***	17.93 ***
LR Test (Exec)			6.23 *	7.83 **	5.61 *
LR Test (Trad)				1.60	*-.61*

Note: Source of data is the original and updated U.S. Courts of Appeals Database. The sample includes at least one case outcome for 594 judges or 88.8% of the 669 judges appointed during the regime. The mean and maximum numbers of observations per judge are 4.9 and 29. Estimation is weighted by the recommended circuit/year values. Robust standard errors are in parentheses. * $\rho<.05$, ** $\rho<.01$, *** $\rho<.001$, two-tailed tests.

Supplemental Web Appendix

Table 9:	Weighted Logit Estimates of the Likelihood of a Conservative Vote U.S. District Court Judges Appointed in Regime 3 – 1977 to 1994				
	Null Configuration Model 1	Executive Point Model 2	Traditional Courtesy Model 3	Selection Point Model 4	Confirmation Point Model 5
Ideal Point		.37 * (.15)	.47 ** (.18)	.37 * (.16)	.40 * (.19)
Years of Service (natural log)	.00 (.11)	.02 (.11)	.02 (.11)	.02 (.11)	.01 (.11)
Jury Instructions	1.86 (1.02)	1.88 (1.02)	1.88 (1.02)	1.88 (1.02)	1.88 (1.02)
Sentencing	2.12 *** (.48)	2.07 *** (.48)	2.07 *** (.48)	2.07 *** (.48)	2.08 *** (.48)
Defective Indictment	-.12 (.45)	-.13 (.45)	-.14 (.44)	-.13 (.46)	-.12 (.45)
Search and Seizure	1.49 * (.72)	1.46 * (.72)	1.45 * (.72)	1.47 * (.72)	1.48 * (.72)
Other Inadmissible	2.34 ** (.81)	2.33 ** (.80)	2.34 ** (.80)	2.34 ** (.80)	2.35 ** (.80)
Due Process	-.12 (.29)	-.10 (.30)	-.10 (.30)	-.10 (.29)	-.09 (.30)
Executive Order	-.98 * (.47)	-.96 * (.46)	-.93 * (.45)	-.95 * (.46)	-.96 * (.45)
State Policy or Law	-.01 (.20)	-.01 (.20)	-.01 (.20)	-.01 (.20)	-.01 (.20)
Weight of Evidence	-.52 ** (.19)	-.54 ** (.19)	-.54 ** (.19)	-.54 ** (.19)	-.55 ** (.19)
Pre-trial Procedure	.66 (.45)	.62 (.45)	.62 (.44)	.63 (.45)	.62 (.45)
Trial Procedure	-.98 *** (.29)	-1.02 *** (.28)	-1.02 *** (.28)	-1.01 *** (.28)	-1.00 *** (.28)
Post-trial Procedure	-.22 (.42)	-.20 (.43)	-.20 (.43)	-.19 (.43)	-.19 (.42)
Attorney Fees	-.39 (.46)	-.37 (.48)	-.39 (.47)	-.38 (.47)	-.36 (.47)
Judge's Discretion	-.30 (.25)	-.31 (.25)	-.32 (.25)	-.31 (.25)	-.31 (.25)
Alternative Dispute Resolution	-1.23 (.63)	-1.27 * (.62)	-1.29 * (.62)	-1.27 * (.62)	-1.25 * (.62)
Injunction	-1.13 *** (.30)	-1.16 *** (.30)	-1.16 *** (.30)	-1.16 *** (.30)	-1.15 *** (.30)
Summary Judgment	.13 (.20)	.11 (.20)	.11 (.20)	.12 (.20)	.13 (.20)
Federal Vestiture	-.87 * (.44)	-.87 * (.44)	-.87 (.44)	-.87 (.44)	-.86 (.44)

Supplemental Web Appendix

Other Civil Issue	.09	.08	.09	.08	.11
	(.29)	(.30)	(.30)	(.30)	(.29)
Substantial	-.70	-.60	-.58	-.59	-.66
Evidence	(.68)	(.69)	(.69)	(.68)	(.68)
Agency Discretion	-1.58 *	-1.65 *	-1.63 **	-1.65 **	-1.65 **
	(.70)	(.77)	(.66)	(.67)	(.67)
Appropriate	-1.10 **	-1.07 **	-1.07 **	-1.08 **	-1.09 **
General Standing	(.39)	(.40)	(.40)	(.40)	(.40)
Constant Value	1.42 ***	1.39 ***	1.39 ***	1.39 ***	1.43 ***
	(.27)	(.27)	(.27)	(.27)	(.27)
N	1529	1529	1529	1529	1529
Wald ~ χ^2	128.48 ***	134.02 ***	135.07 ***	133.70 ***	134.14 ***
Log-Likelihood	-607.16	-603.84	-603.39	-604.29	-604.45
Correct Predictions	1,245	1,247	1,250	1,249	1,246
PRE	5.65	6.31	7.31	6.97	5.98
LR Test (Null)		6.65 **	7.55 **	5.75 *	5.43 *
LR Test (Exec)			.90	-.90	-1.22
LR Test (Trad)				-.1.80	-2.12

Note: Source of data is the original and updated U.S. Courts of Appeals Database. The sample includes at least one case outcome for 555 judges or 77.0% of the 721 judges appointed during the regime. The mean and maximum numbers of observations per judge are 2.8 and 14. Estimation is weighted by the recommended circuit/year values. Robust standard errors are in parentheses. * $\rho<.05$, ** $\rho<.01$, *** $\rho<.001$, two-tailed tests.

Table 10: Weighted Logit Estimates of the Likelihood of a Conservative Vote
U.S. District Court Judges Appointed in Regimes 1, 2, 3, and 4 – 1901 to 2000

	Null Configuration Model 1	Executive Point Model 2	Traditional Courtesy Model 3	Selection Point Model 4	Confirmation Point Model 5	Traditional Cycle Model 6	Selection Cycle Model 7	Confirmation Cycle Model 8
Ideal Point		.25 ** (.09)	.34 *** (.10)	.33 ** (.12)	.40 ** (.13)	.43 *** (.10)	.56 *** (.13)	.56 *** (.13)
Years of Service (natural log)	-.10 * (.05)	-.10 * (.05)	-.10 * (.05)	-.10 * (.05)	-.10 * (.05)	-.10 * (.05)	-.10 * (.05)	-.10 * (.05)
Jury Instructions	2.80 *** (.62)	2.81 *** (.62)	2.81 *** (.62)	2.80 *** (.62)	2.81 *** (.62)	2.81 *** (.62)	2.80 *** (.62)	2.80 *** (.62)
Sentencing	2.21 *** (.39)	2.19 *** (.39)	2.19 *** (.39)	2.18 *** (.39)	2.20 *** (.39)	2.16 *** (.39)	2.16 *** (.39)	2.16 *** (.39)
Defective Indictment	.73 * (.29)	.73 * (.29)	.73 * (.29)	.73 * (.29)	.74 * (.29)	.74 * (.29)	.74 * (.29)	.74 * (.29)
Search and Seizure	1.98 *** (.46)	1.98 *** (.46)	1.97 *** (.46)	1.97 *** (.46)	1.97 *** (.46)	1.96 *** (.46)	1.96 *** (.46)	1.96 *** (.46)
Other Inadmissible	2.03 *** (.38)	2.03 *** (.38)	2.03 *** (.38)	2.03 *** (.38)	2.03 *** (.38)	2.02 *** (.38)	2.03 *** (.38)	2.02 *** (.38)
Due Process	.03 (.21)	.02 (.21)	.03 (.21)	.03 (.21)	.04 (.21)	.02 (.21)	.03 (.21)	.02 (.21)
Executive Order	-.71 ** (.27)	-.70 ** (.27)	-.69 ** (.27)	-.69 * (.27)	-.70 ** (.27)	-.70 ** (.27)	-.69 * (.27)	-.69 ** (.27)
State Policy or Law	-.34 *** (.10)	-.34 *** (.10)	-.34 *** (.10)	-.34 *** (.10)	-.34 *** (.10)	-.35 *** (.10)	-.34 *** (.10)	-.35 *** (.10)
Weight of Evidence	-.73 *** (.08)	-.73 *** (.08)	-.73 *** (.08)	-.73 *** (.08)	-.74 *** (.08)	-.74 *** (.08)	-.74 *** (.08)	-.74 *** (.08)
Pre-trial Procedure	.66 * (.27)	.64 * (.27)	.64 * (.27)	.65 * (.27)	.64 * (.27)	.63 * (.27)	.63 * (.27)	.63 * (.27)
Trial Procedure	-.80 *** (.11)	-.80 *** (.11)	-.80 *** (.11)	-.80 *** (.11)	-.80 *** (.11)	-.80 *** (.11)	-.80 *** (.11)	-.80 *** (.11)
Post-trial Procedure	-.40 (.23)	-.40 (.23)	-.41 (.23)	-.40 (.23)	-.40 (.23)	-.41 (.23)	-.41 (.23)	-.40 (.23)
Attorney Fees	-.64 * (.27)	-.63 * (.27)	-.63 * (.27)	-.62 * (.27)	-.63 * (.27)	-.62 * (.28)	-.62 * (.28)	-.63 * (.28)

Judge's Discretion	-.27 *	-.27	-.27	-.27	-.27	-.28	-.28	-.28
	(.15)	(.15)	(.15)	(.15)	(.15)	(.15)	(.15)	(.15)
Alternative Dispute Resolution	-.36	-.36	-.36	-.36	-.35	-.38	-.38	-.38
	(.32)	(.33)	(.33)	(.33)	(.32)	(.33)	(.32)	(.32)
Injunction	-1.10 ***	-1.12 ***	-1.11 ***	-1.12 ***	-1.12 ***	-1.10 ***	-1.12 ***	-1.12 ***
	(.18)	(.18)	(.18)	(.18)	(.18)	(.18)	(.18)	(.18)
Summary Judgment	.42 ***	.42 **	.41 **	.41 **	.42 ***	.41 **	.40 **	.40 **
	(.13)	(.13)	(.13)	(.13)	(.13)	(.13)	(.13)	(.13)
Federal Vestiture	-.31	-.33	-.33	-.32	-.31	-.34	-.32	-.32
	(.27)	(.27)	(.27)	(.27)	(.27)	(.27)	(.27)	(.27)
Other Civil Issue	-.39 *	-.40 **	-.40 **	-.39 *	-.39 *	-.41 **	-.42 **	-.42 **
	(.16)	(.16)	(.16)	(.16)	(.16)	(.16)	(.16)	(.16)
Substantial Evidence	-.65 *	-.65 *	-.66 *	-.65 *	-.65 *	-.65 *	-.63	-.63
	(.32)	(.33)	(.32)	(.32)	(.32)	(.32)	(.32)	(.33)
Agency Discretion	-.77 *	-.78 *	-.77 *	-.77 *	-.80 *	-.78 *	-.78 *	-.81 *
	(.37)	(.38)	(.38)	(.38)	(.38)	(.38)	(.38)	(.38)
Appropriate General Standing	-.59 **	-.59 **	-.59 **	-.59 **	-.59 **	-.58 **	-.59 **	-.58 **
	(.22)	(.22)	(.22)	(.22)	(.22)	(.22)	(.22)	(.22)
Constant Value	1.51 ***	1.52 ***	1.52 ***	1.50 ***	1.51 ***	1.53 ***	1.51 ***	1.50 ***
	(.12)	(.12)	(.12)	(.12)	(.12)	(.12)	(.12)	(.12)
N	5680	5680	5680	5680	5680	5680	5680	5680
Wald ~ χ^2	382.63 ***	387.94 ***	389.80 ***	389.12 ***	392.49 ***	392.64 ***	395.07 ***	397.10 ***
Log-Likelihood	-2,584.51	-2,580.08	-2,577.79	-2,579.90	-2,578.92	-2,574.82	-2,573.96	-2,573.79
Correct Predictions	4,364	4,359	4,364	4,363	4,360	4,372	4,372	4,379
PRE	4.15	3.79	4.15	4.08	3.86	4.74	4.74	5.25
LR Test (Null)		8.88 **	13.44 ***	9.22 **	11.19 ***	19.39 ***	21.10 ***	21.47 ***
LR Test (Exec)			4.08 *	.35	2.31	10.51 **	12.22 ***	12.59 ***
LR Test (Trad)				-4.22	-2.25	5.95 *	7.66 **	8.03 **

Note: Source of data is the original and updated U.S. Courts of Appeals Database. The sample includes at least one case outcome for 1,437 judges or 72.7% of the 1,976 judges appointed from 1901 to 2001 (a year before the end of the sample of decisions). The mean and maximum numbers of observations per judge are 4.0 and 34. Estimation is weighted by the recommended circuit/year values. Robust standard errors are in parentheses. * $\rho<.05$, ** $\rho<.01$, *** $\rho<.001$, two-tailed tests.