

---

## Contents

---

<b>Summary</b>	<b>v</b>
<b>Acknowledgments</b>	<b>vii</b>
<b>Table of Contents</b>	<b>ix</b>
<b>List of Figures</b>	<b>xiii</b>
<b>List of Tables</b>	<b>xv</b>
<b>1 Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Courts as Political Actors . . . . .	2
1.2 Studying Separate Opinions . . . . .	4
1.3 The Necessity of New Approaches . . . . .	5
1.3.1 Theories of Judicial Decision-Making . . . . .	5
1.3.2 Deficiencies of the Theories . . . . .	10
1.4 A Novel Study . . . . .	15
1.5 Innovations . . . . .	16
<b>2 The Constitutional Court Database</b>	<b>19</b>
2.1 Premises and Conceptual Development . . . . .	19
2.1.1 Conceptualization . . . . .	21
2.1.2 Purpose . . . . .	21

2.1.3	What Data and Where to Find it . . . . .	23
2.1.4	Structural Demands . . . . .	26
2.1.5	Technical Realization . . . . .	30
2.1.6	Collection Process . . . . .	31
2.2	From a Decision to Variables . . . . .	34
2.2.1	Actors . . . . .	35
2.2.2	Subject . . . . .	36
2.2.3	Legal Concepts . . . . .	37
2.2.4	Essential Content . . . . .	38
2.2.5	Key Facts . . . . .	39
2.3	Variables in the Database . . . . .	40
2.3.1	Case Level . . . . .	41
2.3.2	Proceeding Level . . . . .	47
2.3.3	Concluding Remarks . . . . .	54
<b>3</b>	<b>Separate Opinions</b> . . . . .	<b>57</b>
3.1	Separate Opinions in an International Perspective . . . . .	60
3.2	Separate Opinions in Germany . . . . .	61
3.3	Existing Research . . . . .	64
<b>4</b>	<b>Theory</b> . . . . .	<b>71</b>
4.1	Individual Costs and Benefits of Separate Opinions . . . . .	71
4.2	A New Approach . . . . .	73
4.2.1	Norm of Consensus . . . . .	74
4.2.2	Utilities of Norm Adherence . . . . .	75
4.2.3	Norm-Identification . . . . .	77
4.2.4	Level of Disagreement . . . . .	82
4.3	The Identification-Disagreement Model . . . . .	84
4.4	Hypotheses . . . . .	87
<b>5</b>	<b>Empirics</b> . . . . .	<b>93</b>
5.1	Data Set and Case Selection . . . . .	93
5.2	Operationalization . . . . .	98
5.2.1	Dependent Variable: A Judge's Vote . . . . .	99
5.2.2	Explanatory Variables . . . . .	99
5.2.3	Control Variables . . . . .	106
5.2.4	Descriptive Statistics . . . . .	110
5.3	Methods and Estimation Strategy . . . . .	114

---

5.4	Results . . . . .	117
5.4.1	Hypothesis 1: Potential for Disagreement . . . . .	120
5.4.2	Hypothesis 2: Norm-Identification . . . . .	122
5.4.3	Hypothesis 3: Differences between Professions in Contro- versial and Uncontroversial Cases . . . . .	124
5.4.4	Hypotheses 4a & 4b: Types of Separate Opinions . . . . .	126
5.4.5	Hypothesis 5: Time and Norm-Identification . . . . .	128
<b>6</b>	<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>131</b>
6.1	Scientific Contributions . . . . .	132
6.1.1	Building a Database . . . . .	132
6.1.2	A New Theoretical Framework . . . . .	133
6.1.3	Separate Opinions at the FCC . . . . .	134
6.2	Implications for Further Research . . . . .	135
6.3	Outlook on Future Research . . . . .	136
	<b>Bibliography</b>	<b>139</b>
	<b>Appendices</b>	<b>153</b>
	<b>A Separate Opinions</b>	<b>153</b>
	<b>B Empirics</b>	<b>157</b>
B.1	Correlations . . . . .	157
B.2	Effect of Controversy at Mean of <i>Paragraphs</i> . . . . .	159
B.3	Proportions of Vote Types . . . . .	159
B.4	Proportional Odds Assumption . . . . .	160
B.5	Robustness Checks . . . . .	160
B.6	Variable Names . . . . .	160