

**Web Appendixes for “Explaining Processes of Institutional Opinion Leadership”
*Journal of Politics***

Appendix A: Study Design and Measurement

Experimental Design

Issue Manipulation: “Next I’d like to ask you your opinion on *federal laws requiring affirmative action programs for women and minorities provided there are no rigid quotas*” [or] “*federal laws making it a punishable offense to burn the American flag.*”

Institutional Endorsement Manipulation: “As you may know, *the Supreme Court* [or] *Congress now favors federal laws requiring affirmative action programs for women and minorities*” [or] “*opposes federal laws making it a punishable offense to burn the American flag.*” A control group received no institutional endorsement.

Argument Manipulation: For the groups receiving an institutional endorsement: “*The Supreme Court / Congress favors such laws because it thinks these laws are needed in order to balance out the effects of past discrimination against women and minorities*” [or] “*opposes such laws because it thinks these laws violate the right to freedom of expression.*” For the group receiving no institutional endorsement: “*One argument is that such laws are needed in order to balance out the effects of past discrimination against women and minorities*” [or] “*One argument is that such laws violate the right to freedom of expression.*” A control group received no argument.

Measurement

Issue Opinion: “How about you? Do you favor or oppose *federal laws requiring affirmative action* [or] *federal laws making it a punishable offense to burn the American flag?*” “Would you say you strongly favor/oppose or only somewhat favor/oppose these laws?” Responses were based on a four-point scale and were recoded so that “4” indicates an institution-consistent and

argument-consistent response, and “1” indicates an institution-inconsistent and argument-inconsistent opinion.

Thought Listing Item: “As you were thinking about whether *federal laws should require affirmative action programs for women and minorities provided there are no rigid quotas* [or] *federal laws should make it a punishable offense to burn the American flag*, what kind of thoughts occurred to you?” See the text for measures created out of this item.

Political Sophistication: The objective knowledge items included whether respondents knew: (1) which party had the most members in the House of Representatives, (2) the proportion of the House and Senate needed to override a veto, (3) which party is more conservative, (4) who determines if a law is constitutional, and (5) which political office was held by Al Gore. The subjective item asked respondents, “How well informed would you say that you are when it comes to this issue?” There were four possible responses, ranging from “extremely well informed” to “not at all informed.” See the text for how we created a dichotomous measure of sophistication.

Appendix B: Analysis of Variance – The Impact of Congress and the Supreme Court on Mass Opinion

	SUPREME COURT				CONGRESS			
	Sum of Squares	df	F	p	Sum of Squares	df	F	p
MAIN EFFECTS								
Institutional Endorsement	7.82	1	8.11	0.00	0.42	1	0.47	0.49
Issue	48.86	1	50.66	0.00	69.80	1	77.41	0.00
Argument	5.32	1	5.52	0.02	11.61	1	12.87	0.00
Political Sophistication	2.30	1	2.39	0.12	0.31	1	0.34	0.56
Issue-Relevant Thought	19.67	1	20.40	0.00	15.73	1	17.44	0.00
2-WAY INTERACTIONS								
Inst. Endorsement*Issue	2.14	1	2.21	0.14	0.03	1	0.03	0.86
Inst. Endorsement*Argument	3.36	1	3.49	0.06	0.00	1	0.00	0.98
Inst. Endorsement*Sophistication	0.32	1	0.34	0.56	4.03	1	4.47	0.03
Inst. Endorsement*Issue-Relevant Thought	1.16	1	1.20	0.27	3.62	1	4.01	0.05
Issue*Argument	2.58	1	2.68	0.10	0.97	1	1.08	0.30
Issue*Sophistication	4.01	1	4.16	0.04	0.06	1	0.07	0.79
Issue*Issue-Relevant Thought	1.78	1	1.84	0.18	1.17	1	1.30	0.25
Argument*Sophistication	0.16	1	0.17	0.68	0.10	1	0.11	0.74
Argument*Issue-Relevant Thought	0.61	1	0.63	0.43	0.15	1	0.17	0.68
Sophistication*Issue-Relevant Thought	4.47	1	4.63	0.03	0.51	1	0.56	0.45
COVARIATES								
Education	11.54	1	11.97	0.00	4.68	1	5.19	0.02
Age	7.25	1	7.52	0.01	7.10	1	7.87	0.01
Sex	2.80	1	2.91	0.09	4.25	1	4.71	0.03
Race	7.89	1	8.18	0.00	9.71	1	10.77	0.00
Income	0.06	1	0.06	0.80	2.69	1	2.98	0.08
Republican	3.59	1	3.73	0.05	2.22	1	2.47	0.12
Democrat	0.42	1	0.44	0.51	6.51	1	7.22	0.01
Model	157.75	22	7.44	0.00	188.63	22	9.51	0.00
			N=490				N=508	