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Abstract

When rendering a decision the judges at the Federal Constitutional Court (Bundesverfassungsgericht) have the opportunity to add their own views on the case to the decision. Interestingly, we observe this rather infrequently. Why do judges sometimes remain silent not expressing their unease with a decision while in other cases they do reveal their minority opinion and arguments? I pose the idea that the main incentive for judges to deviate in public is their possible influence on the decision-making process and most importantly on the legislative process. If they are in the minority the only vehicle for them to do so is writing a separate opinion. In this paper I analyze factors conducive to separate opinions in the light of the assumption that judges strive for their point of view to be implemented. I use novel data from a large-scale research project, which builds a database on decisions of the Federal Constitutional Court. This analysis is a first trial to make use of data already available and to conduct preliminary tests on crucial hypotheses.

1 Introduction

How do judges of the German Federal Constitutional Court (FCC) reach their decisions? Many observers in Germany still adhere to the idea that judicial opinions reflect a neutral process of legal reasoning. However, over the past years criticism has arisen that this presumption does not mirror the court’s reality. Research on other courts such as the Supreme Court of the United States has shown that extra-legal factors influence decisions significantly. Despite their importance for the understanding of judicial decision making such questions have not been investigated for the FCC. This is astonishing given the enormous power the court possesses. Having the authority to annul judgments, to declare void executive acts, and to nullify statutes the court influences all branches of power and along with it the entire society. This shows that the FCC is an extremely
powerful actor in the political system. Not only does it have influence on Germany. Even at an international level its actions are influential. A recent example is the European Stability Mechanism (ESM): Many members of parliament and citizens have filed complaints trying to prevent the ratification of the treaty on the ESM. As long as the judges in Karlsruhe do not render a final decision, the federal president will not sign the treaty. This means that the treaty on the ESM cannot come into effect until the judges have approved the law. Even more, in case the judges hold the treaty in the final decision unconstitutional the entire treaty on the ESM needs to be renegotiated. Both, postponing the ratification and even more a (potential) unconstitutionality of the treaty affect the process on dealing with the Euro-Crises, i.e. the European Union’s economy. Hence, it is apparent that the court’s decisions have even implications on an international level.

Over the past years, the number of cases heard at the court regarding newly introduced laws has increased. This is why the current development has been labeled as judicialization of politics (Landfried, 1994). The FCC’s tremendous power has often been criticized, and the description of the court as being a guide of politics rather than a guardian of the constitution (Guggenberger, 1998) is quite prominent in the literature. However, efforts to understand how such far ranging decisions are made are rare (amongst others: Hönnige, 2008, 2007, 2006; Kranenpohl, 2009; Sieberer, 2006; Vanberg, 2005, 2001; Schaal, 2000; Rottleuthner, 1987). Especially the processes inside the court are still a black box. Rulings of the FCC do most of the time not reveal the judges’ individual votes. Occasionally, however, judges write a separate opinion expressing their opposition to the decision. Or they add another line of arguments to the majority opinion signaling that they do not follow the logic of the majority but do agree with the final outcome. However, there is almost no research on the mechanisms of deviating opinions (an exception Shikano and Koch, 2010).

The paper wants to shed light on the judges’ incentive to deliver separate opinions and
poses the question if judges use separate opinions as a means to bring their preferences to bear. If their stand on an issue does not find its way into the majority opinion the only chance to be heard is to write a separate opinion. This paper looks particularly at a judge’s impact on the legislative process and argues that this influence is a motivation for judges to write dissents or concurrences.

The next paragraphs will further elaborate on the main incentives for the judges to write separate opinions followed by introducing the factors that are expected to play a crucial role. Subsequently, the hypotheses posed in this part are tested in section four. The final part contains a conclusion and an outlook on future research.

2 Main Incentives

Why would a judge take the effort of adding something to the ruling that legally does not have any effect? The workload of the judges being extremely high they could spare this time consuming effort. The examination at hand builds on the common assumption in political science that judges are policy seeking and as such rational actors (amongst many others Dahl, 1957; Baum, 1988; Hönnige, 2006). They have values, ideas, and preferences about how a society should be or about what is right and wrong, and they want to bring those to bear. This ideological basis determines the judges’ actions. When ruling they want to ensure that their ideas are introduced to the public most efficiently. Thus, the driving force for the judges’ decisions is the possibility to influence the legislature. To what extent is this possible? The constitution empowers the court to declare statutes void, and a ruling has to argue why that is. If a statute has been nullified a new legislative process starts. The rationale presented in the decision specifies principles for the legislature as to what to do and what to avoid in a future bill. Over time the court has established a habit to give detailed guidelines for what to take into consideration when drafting a statute. Recently, after having it repealed before, they also overruled the

\footnote{About 6000 petitions per year enter the court}
revised federal electoral law and decreed how many excess mandates the law is allowed to permit in order to be constitutional (filenumber: AZ 2 BvE 9/11). Those directives are their means to impinge on a revised law. However, this applies directly only to judges in the majority. They are able to formulate their ideas, which then the legislature is obliged to implement. Judges who disagree with the majority opinion cannot establish their ideas with the same automatism as the majority. The motivation of the minority judges to introduce their opinion and their preferences to the legislative arena, however, continues. A separate opinion provides a way of presenting those arguments that did not find their way into the majority opinion. This holds especially true for concurring opinions. When the court publishes dissents and concurrences subsequent to the main ruling it is ensured that the points made are heard. Even more, if the ruling is delivered orally, a separate opinion is read or summarized in the rendition. Thus, publishing a separate opinion introduces thoughts and arguments differing from the majority to the legislators and the public. Given that legal arguments are never unambiguous it is, despite the binding majority opinion, still possible that the logic the minority statement elucidates has an impact on a new or revised statute (Hogg and Bushell, 1997). And indeed, we find cases, in which the separate opinion has later turned into being the leading opinion at the court and in jurisprudence. As a result the arguments became parts of subsequent statutes (for examples see Schlaich and Korioth, 2007, Rn. 94). Other jurisprudential literature also finds that ”minority opinions (...) have left an imprint on societal discussions” (Kau, 2007)².

Together with the endeavor to influence the decision-making process of other actors goes the effort to maintain trust in the court. It has no means to execute its rulings and thus relies heavily on the citizens’ belief in its work. From its beginning the FCC as enjoyed a high degree of trust. In surveys, it is always among the top two institutions with regard to trustworthiness (Schlink, 2007). If actors do not comply with the ruling

²Translation by the author
it weakens their reputation not that of the court. An example of this is how the media react to the courts decisions. One of the main newscasts, the "Tagesthemen", comments on the electoral law decision mentioned above. It calls the FCC a "repair and assembly shop for atrocious political actions" (Tagesthemen from July 25, 2012). We find similar statements in the press. The Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung uses the metaphor that the FCC has to live with the fact that "its diligently prepared decisions and guidelines are doused with bad tasting legislative sauce." (Müller, 2012) 3. This good reputation endures only as long as the legitimacy of the court is higher than that of the other actors. As soon as people get the impression that judges are partisan or do not decide thoroughly, the influence of the court will decrease (Caldeira and Gibson, 1992; Caldeira, 1986). Hence, writing separate opinions should be directed also towards sustaining the high reputation of the court.

How can we test if those consideration indeed have an impact on observing separate opinions?

3 Key Factors

3.1 Success

Assuming that judges want to influence the policy process, success is a crucial factor to include in the analysis. The effectiveness of an attempt to impact a new procedure increases if in the aftermath of the court’s ruling a further action follows. This happens only if the plaintiff is successful: If a lower court is overruled it has to make a new judgment; if an administrative act is held unconstitutional the administrative agency has to change it; if a law was repealed the legislator has to revise it or to enact a new one.

3Both translations by the author
This new action motivates judges to write a separate opinion, which leads to the first hypothesis.

Hypothesis 1: The probability of observing a separate opinion is higher if the plaintiff is successful.

The variable success is operationalized as follows: The information on success is connected to what the petitioner wants to attain. Therefore, it is collected at the case-level. Success can have the values “no success” (kein Erfolg), “partial success” (Erfolg in Teilen), “full success” (Erfolg im Ganzen), and “other” (Sonstiges). As explained above, we make a distinction between cases and decisions. This requires aggregating information when conducting analyses at the decision-level. In order to build a variable for success on the decision-level, “success” and “partial success” are treated equally. This operationalization is driven by the consideration that even in case a petitioner is only partially successful a new process follows. Accordingly, “no success” and “other” both count as lack of success.

3.2 Senates

Figure 1 displays the percentage of decisions comprising a separate opinion. A look at the curves shows that the amount of separate opinions varies in both senates considerably from year to year. While there are periods in which both senates have a very low number of separate opinions and are almost equal, in the majority of the years displayed the relative number of decisions with separate opinions is higher in the second senate. Over a time span of twenty-five years, the first senate had a higher share of separate opinions in six years only. This gives reason to investigate the effect of the senates.

The senate that decides on a case is expected to affect the occurrence of separate opinions. This is due to the different types of topics they are responsible for. While the first senate is mainly concerned with questions of basic rights (Artt. 1 to 19 GG) such as equality, freedom of opinion, or freedom of assembly, the second senate deals with
constitutional provisions that determine the organization of the state. These different types of topics influence the judges’ behavior towards separate opinions. The influence on the legislative process is higher in the second than in the first senate. Assuming that judges are keen to influence the legislature, the second senate offers a broader range of possibilities and a more sustainable impact. Cases that are concerned with competencies of the legislature are decided in the second senate. It rules if an issue is in the realm of the federal legislature, of the Länder, or if a federal law has to be approved by the Länder. An example of the types of questions the second senate deals with illustrates this in more detail. One type of legislative power is “Concurrent legislative power” Art. 72 I GG. It means that in specific issue areas “the Länder shall have power to legislate so long as and to the extent that the Federation has not exercised its legislative power by enacting a law”. Art. 74 I GG specifies the areas this kind of power applies to. One example is “prevention and abuse of economic power” (No. 16), another one “admission to institutions of higher education and requirements for graduation in such institutions”
(No. 33). If, for example, a case comes to the court in which a *Land* complains that it already has a law on the abuse of economic power but the Federation nevertheless enacted one the court has to answer two questions. First, is the law under investigation really concerned with the topic of abuse of economic power? Second, did the statute come into effect by the correct procedure? To find the answer to these questions the court has to subsume if, first, the issue the law is regulating is indeed a matter of economic power or about its abuse. Given that such rather unspecific terms allow space for interpretation the judges can define for the future what economic power or its abuse means. Second, the judges decide on the future of this particular and potential other law. If they rule that the federal legislator was not allowed to pass this law due to not possessing the legislative power they will declare it void. Even more, they can give guidelines under which conditions and under which procedure it will be constitutional. These rulings then provide a framework for the subsequent legislative processes. In addition, the decision determines legislative competencies for prospective statutes. Therefore, the impact of the decision is not restricted to a single case but can radiate and shape future laws. In case the judges do not declare the statute void holding that the federal legislator was entitled to pass the law they curtail the power of the complaining *Land*. This example underlines the judges’ influence. Deciding which legislative body has to be part of the process to what extent and the examination and interpretation of the substantial issues encompasses all critical aspects of a statute. Therefore, with its decisions the senate impinges highly on legislative processes. This is assumed to be a main driving force for the judges. One may argue that this holds true for the majority. However, as stated above, for a judge in the minority, the best means to be heard and to bring his influence to bear is a separate opinion. Once he has introduced the responsible actors to his ideas these arguments can find their way into the following process.

In addition, the legitimacy question is less likely to come up in the second than in the first senate. Topics like the specific power of a legislative body are rather abstract
and highly complex. While in cases dealing with freedom of opinion or other civil liberties the public has a better understanding of the topic and can connect to it; in rather “technical” questions people are less likely to develop strong opinions or attitudes towards the problem. Thus, judges dealing with more abstract issue, i.e. those in the second senate, have to be less cautious when exchanging arguments in public. Whereas legal experts understand the arguments and logic behind the rationales the public will have only little insight into the ramifications of such a decision. Similarly, interpreting to what extent deviating from the majority opinion is a sign of fragmentation of the court is a difficult task. From this it follows that judges of the second senate face less pressure with regard to legitimacy concerns. They can formulate opinions that contradict the majority opinion without fearing to lower the trust in the court or to appear as a splitter.

By contrast, members of the first senate face different problems. As mentioned above, the first senate is responsible for basic rights, mainly civil liberties. Quite often, those cases are highly controversial, e.g. a crucifix in the classroom (BVerfGE 93, 1) or abortion (BVerfGE 39, 1 and 88, 203). Thus, the attention of the public is often very high. However, the final impact of one particular decision is lower. Alike their colleagues in the second senate, they have to examine whether a law was passed correctly as well. But since they mainly rule on the substantial matter, their impact in the long run is lower. They do not determine legislative powers for the future. As a result, the second senate is expected to be more active in delivering separate opinions. Therefore the next hypothesis is as follows.

Hypothesis 2: The probability of observing a separate opinion is higher in the second than in the first senate.
3.3 Oral Argument

Oral arguments serve as a further explanatory factor. A ruling for which an oral argument was held should affect the occurrence of separate opinions positively. Technically, the hearings are mandatory for every decision but in some procedures the participants can agree to forego them. This is the case for constitutional complaints and concrete judicial reviews, which the vast majority of cases consists of. Thus, we do not find them often. Only in rarely occurring procedures they are compulsory. The following argument builds on the assumption that judges are constraint by their considerations with regards to legitimacy of the court. The citizens’ trust in the court is shaken if they have the impression that the judges are repeatedly split over a topic. Some judges ruling in one way while others have a contradictory opinion does not convey a signal of delivering a persuasive and “right” decision. Also, the impression of deciding partisan is detrimental to the reputation of the court. The public expects the judges to be as neutral as possible. However, if an oral argument has taken place, differing standpoints are already in the public. Since the court decides to schedule a hearing only in difficult cases it receives high public attention then. Quite often the media reports on it introducing a broader public to the issue. Afterwards, it explains the arguments exchanged and who has which standpoint. In doing so it becomes visible that there are several ways of solving the respective constitutional problem. Moreover, it also demonstrates that there are different approaches to interpreting the basic law. To put it in other words, citizens are already familiar with different points of view. They have better access to possible interpretations of the constitution and to pros and cons of particular arguments. This makes it visible for them that there is no clear and unambiguous answer to the legal question. Hence, they have a better understanding of the judges’ situation. They can see that there are different ways to approach a problem and that it is hard to come to a “right” decision. Knowing that the public has more information on the case and has learned that there are various ways of reading the constitution means for the judges that they have fewer
concerns with regards to the trust in the court. The fear of losing legitimacy when expressing arguments and thoughts different from that of the majority therefore plays a less important role. From these thoughts one can derive the following hypothesis.

**Hypothesis 3:** The probability of observing separate opinions is higher if an oral argument was held.

The variable Oral argument is coded 1 if the head of the decision mentions one, e.g. “Decision of the second senate from December 20, 2007 based on the oral argument from May 24, 2007…” (BVerfGE 119, 331).

### 3.4 Statements

Experts, interest groups, parties, the federal government, and other actors have – depending on the procedure – the possibility to give statements and assess the actual or legal situation. They present the judges with a wide array of arguments, considerations, and points of view. Thus, in addition to their own thoughts the judges hear manifold standpoints. This will increase the variety of positions within the senate. The variable statement (stellungnahme) is, again, a binary variable. It is coded as 1 if an actor other than the plaintiff himself expresses his stands on the cases. The fourth hypothesis is therefore:

**Hypothesis 4:** The probability of observing a separate opinion is higher if third parties made a statement.

### 3.5 Chamber

A factor to control for is the introduction of chambers in 1993. To handle the horrendous amount of cases the court in 1993 established chambers, i.e. three judge committees consisting of the members of the senate. Every judge is sitting in a chamber; one judge has to serve in two. Due to a higher division of work the workload for the judges has at least slightly decreased since 1993 which could positively affect the probability of a
separate opinion. For future research it should be noted, however, that the amount of incoming cases has risen in the past years. Nevertheless, in order to control for this change in the institutional setup I include a dummy variable for the years before 1993 (coded 0) and from then on (coded 1).

4 Data and Analysis

To test the hypotheses formulated above a first and preliminary output from a major data collecting project is used. So far, large-N studies on the FCC have not been possible due to a lack of data. At the moment, however, a large scale project collects data on decisions of the court and sets up a database. Students – up to twelve at the same time – code every senate-decision from 1972 to 2010. In addition, automated text analysis will be used to systematically extract relevant information for social sciences and legal studies as well as – in the long run – for the public. For now, we leave aside chamber decisions because they do not pose new legal questions and are therefore less informative. The chambers were introduced in 1993 in order to reduce the workload. They decide only on cases the prevailing legal question of which the court has already ruled (§93c I, S.1 BVerfGG).

In order to receive a maximum of precision in the data, we differentiate between decision and case. Decisions are the overarching unit, and cases are subunits of decisions. The rationale behind it is as follows: In many procedures, the court merges petitions of different petitioners that comprise the same topic. But they deliver one final decision. However, there are still minor differences between the claims. An evident example for those differences is the situation in which one petitioner can be successful while others are not. In order to account for these differences we make a distinction between those units.
The final data set will contain approximately 2000 decisions. At this point, data from 1986 to 2010 is available, which includes 937 decisions. In a second step, we link the court data to the dataset about German legislature (GESTA/DIP), which will enable us to track a law’s path through the political institutions. Also, we will connect our data with individual data on the judges as well as with information on the economic and social environment. In doing so we hope to get a deeper understanding of the court’s work, its political and societal influence and interdependencies between political institutions.

So far the vast majority of the information gathered is still raw data and needs to be prepared for reliable analyses. However, this paper works for the first time with a part of this novel data that is already usable.

Due to the binary nature of the dependent variable, logistic regression is used to analyze the effects of the respective variables. According to the theory elaborated on above, I assume separate opinions to be a function of senate, success, statements, and oral arguments. Given a change in the procedural rules I control for the existence of chambers. In order to examine the actual effects of each factor in a more intuitive way than looking at raw coefficients from the logistic regression, the results are interpreted through predicted probabilities and their first differences. Those quantities of interests are derived through simulation. For each independent variable 1000 simulations were run, setting the respective variable first to 1 and then to 0. Figure 2 displays first differences between those two scenarios for each independent variable.

In general, we see that the probability of observing separate opinions is low, which is not surprising due to the low total number of separate opinions. All directions of the effects are as expected. Success, oral argument, statements, and chamber all have a positive sign. The first senate ruling on a case has a negative effect.

Contrary to the expectations is the result of the success variable. While the theory
Figure 2: Differences in Expected Values by Variable

Note: Obtained through simulation. FD = first differences between the expected values of the respective variable. SD = standard deviation of first differences. Confidence level = 90%
suggests that due to the ability to influence further decision-processes judges are more prone to write separate opinions the actual effect is of very little strength, yet in the presumed, i.e. positive direction. The differences between successful decisions – from the plaintiff’s point of view – and bad success are almost non-existent.

The type of senate – first or second – has the strongest effect. The predicted probability of observing a separate opinion differs significantly between the two panels of judges. Looking at Figure 2 it becomes clear that the senate variable shows the strongest effects. While in the first senate the probability of observing a separate opinion lies around 4%, the probability is considerably higher in the second senate. There, the probability of a decision with a dissent or a concurrence is approximately 11%. This is in accordance with the thoughts laid down above: The second senate with its high influence on actual and future legislative processes, its complex issues, and less ethically relevant questions is more likely to deliver separate opinions than the first senate.

The data also bolster Hypothesis 3. Oral arguments have a positive effect on the occurrence of separate opinions. Thus, one can observe considerable differences in the probabilities in cases with oral arguments in comparison to those without. As to the theory, judges are eager to maintain the court’s legitimacy. If several arguments are already in the public they have to worry less about arguments that could be perceived as partisan or randomly made up. Therefore, the strong effect of this variable supports the theory.

Figure 2 further demonstrates that the existence of statements has a positive influence on finding decisions that contain a separate opinion. Although the probability of observing dissents and concurrences is higher in the presence than in the absence of an oral argument the overlapping confidence intervals do not allow for claiming that there is a substantial difference between cases with and without statements. Thus, in contrast to the expectations the data do not prove that it matters much whether judges are confronted with arguments from third actors, i.e. those who are not parties in the
case. Although those parties introduce manifold points of view that judges can pick up on and which was why those statements were thought to have an impact on the judges’ behavior, the statistics do not support this.

Finally, a change in the procedural rules, namely the introduction of chambers in order to decrease the workload, does not show any effect. The probability of a decision delivered with one or more separate opinions stays more or less the same. Thus, a decrease in workload caused by establishing more panels of judges does not have any impact. It needs to be emphasized, though, that this variable is not meant to measure accurately the effect of workload on separate opinions but only to control for the change in the rules.

5 Conclusion and Outlook

Based on the first output of the future database I have conducted a preliminary examination of possible factors that can explain separate opinions. The results partially support the assumptions of the theory. Whereas the direction of the effects is as expected, the results regarding the strengths are mixed. The probability of observing a separate opinion differs between the senates. Also, the chance of observing a separate opinion after an oral argument is higher than without one. The other variables in the model have only minor effects.

This analysis is, however, highly constrained by the small amount of data already available. Looking at the results proves that more data and more analyses are needed in order to understand substantially under which conditions we can observe separate opinions. In the following I will give a brief outlook on which such factors can be.

First, data from 1972 to 1985 that will be added soon can give a more precise picture of the situation. A further and highly important variable that is expected to explain separate opinions is workload (e.g. Smyth, 2005; Brace and Hall, 1990; Atkins and Green, 1976). So far, we only have data on the total number of cases coming in for
each senate per year. I did not use this measure in the analysis at hand because it does not mirror the true amount of work a judge faces. In terms of preparing the first draft of the decision the cases are not equally distributed among the judges. Depending on how many cases of a judge’s issue area enter the court, the workload differs significantly. A rapporteur spends considerably more work on the case than the other judges. Once there are data on the number of cases in which a judge serves as rapporteur we have a reliable measure for workload.

It also remains to be investigated how the decisions of the FCC are actually implemented. So far, we do not have data that monitor a statute’s way from the legislature to the court and back. Once the process of gathering these data is finished, we will be able to examine those questions. If my (so far only weakly supported) idea that judges are more likely to publicly deviate from the majority opinion subsequent to a success of the petitioner is true, this effect should be strong if a legislative process follows. Infiltrating the legislative process is more fundamental than influencing an administrative act. Even more, the question if the arguments posed in a separate opinion find their way into revised laws can be investigated with the future data.

Moreover, I assume the specific content of the decisions to play a crucial role for the judges’ motivation to write a separate opinion (e.g. Brace and Hall, 1990; Gerber and Park, 1997). So far, we can only differentiate roughly between basic rights in the first senate and polity issues in the second senate. But more precise classifications of issue areas should shed light on the conditions under which separate opinions arise. This also applies to the complexity of a decision. Finally, putting emphasis on the individual level will explain separate opinions to a higher degree. Attributes that have proven to have influence in studies on other courts are e.g. personal background of the judges (e.g. Smyth, 2005; Ulmer, 1970), time in office (e.g. Lanier, 2011; Hurwitz and Stefko, 2004), or the role and personality of the chief justice (e.g. Haynie, 1992; Danelski, 1960). However, we have to be careful with applying research approaches from other countries,
e.g. the United States to the FCC. Due to different institutional rules and procedures, incentives to publicly deviate from the majority opinion can considerably differ. Many intriguing questions lie ahead waiting to be answered. Once the database database will provide a wider array of variables on different levels I can include more factors in my analysis and will be able to develop more precise measures for the variables used in this paper. But this first trial conducted here proves that continuing in this direction is a worthwhile effort.
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## Appendix

Regression Table from the Logistic Regression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Confidence Interval (95%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Success</td>
<td>0.134</td>
<td>-0.374; 0.643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Senate</td>
<td>-0.990</td>
<td>-1.521; -0.482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Argument</td>
<td>0.811</td>
<td>0.269; 1.338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>0.629</td>
<td>-0.037; 1.391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamber</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td>-0.442; 0.665</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| N                    | 937      |
| Mc Fadden’s $R^2$     | 0.061    |