

Reworked HW4

\*Data entry on Economist 5 Feb 2024 Data.

\*SC Ideology vs PartyID.

\*uses raw numbers\*.

data list free / Ideology PartyID count.

begin data.

1 1 75

1 2 49

1 3 88

2 1 145

2 2 164

2 3 176

3 1 277

3 2 186

3 3 144

4 1 81

4 2 153

4 3 55

end data.

variable labels Ideology "SC Ideology".

value labels Ideology 1 'liberal' 2 'moderate' 3 'conservative' 4 'not sure'.

variable labels PartyID "PartyID".

value labels PartyID 1 'Dem' 2 'Ind' 3 'Rep'.

weight by count.

crosstabs tables = Ideology by PartyID

/cells = column count

/statistics = phi tau chisq.

**SC Ideology \* PartyID Crosstabulation**

		PartyID			Total	
		Dem	Ind	Rep		
SC Ideology	liberal	Count	75	49	88	212
		% within PartyID	13.0%	8.9%	19.0%	13.3%
	moderate	Count	145	164	176	485
		% within PartyID	25.1%	29.7%	38.0%	30.4%
	conservative	Count	277	186	144	607
		% within PartyID	47.9%	33.7%	31.1%	38.1%
	not sure	Count	81	153	55	289
		% within PartyID	14.0%	27.7%	11.9%	18.1%
Total		Count	578	552	463	1593
		% within PartyID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

### Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	100.487 <sup>a</sup>	6	<.001
Likelihood Ratio	97.309	6	<.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	18.224	1	<.001
N of Valid Cases	1593		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 61.62.

### Symmetric Measures

		Value	Asymptotic Standard Error <sup>a</sup>	Approximate T <sup>b</sup>	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.251			<.001
	Cramer's V	.178			<.001
Ordinal by Ordinal	Kendall's tau-c	-.095	.022	-4.358	<.001
N of Valid Cases		1593			

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

It is perhaps tempting to see the dependent variable as ordinal. Note, however, that the DV is not ordinal due to the presence of the 'not sure' category. Therefore, the proper summary measures should be: Cramer's V = .178;  $p < .001$ .

While the relationship is statistically significant, it is not particularly strong. According to the table in Data Lab 6 this relationship is weak or minimally acceptable. This is surprising given the apparent recent politicization of the court. And it is weaker than the other relationships involving partisanship and immigration.

Eliminating the 'Not sure' responses, table becomes 3X3 square  
 $Taub = -.143$ ;  $p < .001$ .

Recoding the 'not sure' along with the 'moderate'  
 $Taub = -.129$ ;  $p < .001$ .

As always, it is essential, however, to look at the actual table to see what is going on. While the modal response among Democrats is that the SC is conservative, among Republicans the modal response is that the SC is moderate. And looking across the rows we see only a modest relationship. This suggests that while the court is seen as political, the Court is not perceived solely in partisan terms.