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## General Research Question:

How can network graphing and information visualization techniques improve the understanding of the work of the United States Supreme Court?


## Visualizing the Harvard Law Review Supreme Court Statistics

## -




Ideological Landscape of the Justices (1994-2003)


Voting frequencies represented as the edge weight between nodes and presented visually as a graph. Scalia and Thomas vote most frequently together and are joined least frequently by Stevens. O'connor, and to a lesser extent Kennedy, are the judges most likely to join the liberal members of the Court. (Rendered with Pajek using a stochastic, spring force algorithm.)

Frequency of Voting Blocks in 5-4 Cases
(1994-2003 Supreme Court Terms)


ALL OTHER GROUPINGS OF 5 (34 different groupings)
(Highest repetition - 3 times)


Total 5 to 4 Cases $=175$
Source: Statistics harvested from the Harvard Law Review

## Thresholding (Voting Together > 50\%) Reveals Ideological Cliques



Thresholding (Voting Together > 49\%) Reveals Ideological Cliques



## Base Map/Overlay Pedagological Visualizations of the Work of the United States Supreme Court

- Create visualizations of the work of the United States Supreme Court to be used for teaching.
- Create a topical Base Map to serve as a common reference point on which to layer additional information.


## Base Map Creation

- Technique 1- Use the co-occurrence of West topics (keynumbers) to render the topical adjacencies of American caselaw.



## Problem:

- There are three types of West top level topics:
- Procedural (green)
- Factual (red)
- Doctrinal (blue)
- The three types can co-occur in a wide variety of cases.
- For instance, procedural topics may co-occur with just about any factual or substantive topic.



## Technique 2

－Use the＂Topics By Specialty＂ assignments in West＇s Analysis of American Law to create a topic map．
－Problem：Some topics are still assigned to too many top level substantive categories．
－This creates more unmanageable spaghetti．
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## Remedy

- Remove the most tenuous, multiple, subject assignments that pull everything to the center:





## Research Goal

Spatial navigation / visualization of bibliographic data in which the underlying structural organization of the domain is conveyed to the user.


The End

