

**ATTORNEY ADVERTISING AND PUBLIC PERCEPTION OF THE PROFESSION:
DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSES OF SURVEY DATA ON VIEWS OF LEGAL PROFESSIONALS AND
THE IMPACT OF LEGAL SERVICES ADS ON ATTORNEY PRESTIGE AND COURT CONFIDENCE**

Drew Noble Lanier

Department of Political Science
University of Central Florida
Phillips Hall 302O
Orlando, FL 32816-1356
(407) 823-3753 (voice)
(407) 823-0051 (fax)
drew.lanier@ucf.edu

Michael Scicchitano

Department of Political Science
University of Florida
304 Anderson Hall
P.O. Box 117325
Gainesville, FL 32611
mscicc@ufl.edu

Tracy L. Johns

Research Director
Florida Survey Research Center
University of Florida
1731 NW 6th Street, Ste. A2
Gainesville, FL 32609
tjohns@ufl.edu

Prepared for presentation at the Annual Meeting of the Western Political Science Association, Las Vegas, Nevada, April 2-4, 2015. A previous version of this study was presented at the 2013 Annual Meeting of the Southern Political Science Association.

ABSTRACT

Designed to have limited institutional authority, courts are constrained by the perceived amounts of legitimacy and authority that other key actors in the political system confer upon them and their policy outputs. This study explores the often overlooked but potentially influential factor of lawyer advertising as a key impact on public opinion of the legal system. This project specifically analyzes the effects of lawyer advertising on perceived prestige of attorneys and general confidence in the court system in the state of Florida, one of the largest in the nation. Using a representative sample of Florida adults, we find that, in general, the public holds attorneys in high regard, comparable to the level of prestige that the public accords other professionals. Indeed some racial and ethnic groups (such as African-Americans) report significantly higher levels of prestige for attorneys than do other groups. Court participants, however, reported significantly less prestigious views of lawyers than did non-participants. We find that racial and ethnic differences lead to significantly divergent views by the public, underscoring the key finding in the literature that a group's treatment in the court system impact its members' views of the judiciary subsequently. However, not all racial and ethnic groups report lower confidence levels. Court participants did not report significantly different confidence levels in the court system than did non-participants. We report some age, education and income differences, suggesting that those with higher education levels and incomes manifest higher confidence levels, generally, than those with comparatively lower levels of each variable. In examining the impact of the public's viewing legal services ads, we find that court participants reported significantly lower mean percentages of those who reported an increase in their perceived prestige of lawyers and confidence in the court system. Yet, the modal response for confidence in the court system was that respondents did not change their view after viewing an ad, either lowering it or increasing it. Thus, our results demonstrate that the public's view of the institutional judiciary and lawyers as professionals is a multi-faceted one as there are many publics and there are many demographic factors that impinge on respondents' view of both opinion objects.

**ATTORNEY ADVERTISING AND PUBLIC PERCEPTION OF THE PROFESSION:
DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSES OF SURVEY DATA ON VIEWS OF LEGAL PROFESSIONALS AND
THE IMPACT OF LEGAL SERVICES ADS ON ATTORNEY PRESTIGE AND COURT CONFIDENCE**

Courts within the American federal constitutional system of government depend on the executive branch in order to enforce the courts' rulings. Designed to have limited institutional authority, courts are thus constrained by the perceived amounts of legitimacy and authority that other key actors in the political system confer upon them and their policy outputs. These political actors include not only formal governmental institutions, such as the governor or legislature, but the public as well in that the public interacts regularly with the courts and, thereby, develops views about the relative confidence and trustworthiness that they hold for the judiciary. In order for court systems in the U.S. to maintain national prestige and legitimacy, the American public must, therefore, respect the institution and its rulings. It is, accordingly, theoretically important to assess public opinion related to the courts in order to gauge the effectiveness and influence of the courts, while also considering the vast range of influences on individuals' views about the judiciary.

This study, thus, explores the often overlooked but potentially influential factor of lawyer advertising as a key impact on public opinion of the legal system. In this endeavor, this paper merges the fields of judicial politics, politics and media, and public opinion in order to best explain the interconnected relationships between individuals' demographic characteristics, lawyer advertising, and public opinion of the state court systems. While literature exists analyzing the specific aspects of lawyer advertising and their effectiveness in influencing the public's views of certain lawyers, little work has been done to study the influence such advertising has on citizens' overarching perceptions of the court system. This study, hence, offers new insights into the varying demographics factors that impact the public's view of the courts, at the state level, and whether those whose views of the courts are influenced, positively or negatively, by the lawyer advertising that has become so prevalent in today's multimedia-driven society. In a nation inundated by advertising in all forms of

communication, a systematic study of the effects such advertising may have on American society in general and our political institutions specifically is particularly timely.

This project specifically analyzes the effects of lawyer advertising on perceived prestige of attorneys and general confidence in the court system in the state of Florida, one of the largest in the nation. With the majority of the population having some access to television, and a smaller share having access to the Web, we have chosen to focus our study on these prevalent media in order to specifically identify the effects of this most prevalent form of lawyer advertising and the factors that may impact the public's view of the legal profession generally and their view of the changing level of confidence in the state court system.

THEORETIC FOUNDATION

Trust, Confidence and Legitimacy of the Judiciary

Scholarly literature has long highlighted the importance of public opinion of the court system in shaping the dynamics of the judicial system (*see e.g.*, Caldeira and Gibson 1992; Gibson, Caldeira and Spence 2003; Mishler and Sheehan 1993, 1995). At the most fundamental level, the court system relies upon positive public opinion of legal professionals and legal rulings in order to preserve its limited store of institutional authority and legitimacy because of the judiciary's direct lack of the enforcement power, whether at the state or federal level. If the public lacks respect for the courts and their rulings, the public will lack the motivation to obey the law and court decisions, undermining a key linchpin of the constitutional system of the American republic (Harris 1993; Rodney 2006). A person's general trust level for governmental institutions and his or her "felt obligation to obey the law" are important constructs undergirding one's expressed confidence level in state courts and their decisions (Hamm *et al.* 2011; 2013, 11), but *trust* may differ from *confidence* in the judiciary for certain members of the public (Dougherty, Lindquist and Bradbury 2006; Hamm *et*

al. 2011, 2013; Sun and Wu 2006).¹ In certain contexts, public opinion may influence the determination of legal rulings announced by the courts, particularly the state courts many of whose judges are popularly chosen (*e.g.*, Brace, Hall and Langer 1996, 2001; Hall 1987, 1992; Harris 1993; Mishler and Sheehan 1993, 1995; Norpoth and Segal 1994). Thus, as objects of public opinion, courts occupy a unique political place because of the important, yet fragile role that they play in the American system of governance.

Court Participation

As compared to other government institutions, the courts are most likely to interact with the public. Persons may have served as jurors; or, they may have participated in a case as a plaintiff, a defendant or as a witness. Clearly, whether a person has had some contact with the courts in the recent past may impact the person's subsequent view of the court as compared to those who have not had such recent experience (*e.g.*, Dougherty, Lindquist and Bradbury 2006; Gallagher and Wang 2011; Sun and Wu 2006; Wenzel, Bowler and Lanoue 2003). Such interaction may lead to comparatively more positive views of the courts as the courts are seen as acting in a neutral manner interpreting the law and applying it to often difficult legal questions. Other times, such participation may lead a respondent to adopt a relatively more negative view, especially if the case in which they participated did not end in a manner that the person thought best (such as when a criminal defendant is convicted of a crime or a civil plaintiff loses a case at the end of a jury trial) (*e.g.*,

¹“Trust” has been defined by one study as, “a fiduciary concept involving whether government has fulfilled its responsibility to the people to operate according to their normative expectations” (Dougherty, Lindquist and Bradbury 2006, 178). Other authors may characterize this psychological construct as perceived legitimacy (*e.g.*, Neubauer and Meinhold 2013). On the other hand, “confidence” depends “on the public’s belief that political institutions act competently in the sense that they are able to perform functions that are legally or constitutionally assigned to them” (Dougherty, Lindquist and Bradbury 2006, 178). Some studies conflate trust with confidence; others have defined “trust” as including “confidence” or “competence” as a second latent dimension of trust (Dougherty, Lindquist and Bradbury 2006; Levi and Stoker 2000).

Dougherty, Lindquist and Bradbury 2006; Gallagher and Wang 2011; Sun and Wu 2006; Wenzel, Bowler and Lanoue 2003).

With public opinion of the legal system playing such an important role in the institution's effectiveness and legitimacy, it is theoretically important to identify influences on public opinion related to the courts in order to better determine the sources and nature of the perceived confidence level that the public holds for the court system. It is, therefore, necessary to consider the role that legal services advertising plays in shaping popular culture and subsequent public opinion on a wide variety of topics. Within the field of judicial politics, there has been extensive analysis of the effects that lawyer advertising has on the public's opinion of attorneys, although much of the existing literature overlooks the related influence such lawyer advertising has on the public's overarching views of the court system itself (*e.g.*, Cebula 1998). With lawyers representing the most common and accessible figures in the legal system, the public's general perception of the courts is strongly influenced by the actions of lawyers, particularly those portrayed in such a public and widely available domain as legal services advertising, whether on television or via the internet (Benesh and Howell 2001; Cebula 1998; Cripe 1999; Harris 1993; Hornsby and Schimmel 1995; Sisk and Lee 2014; Smolla 2006). Lawyers are also officers of the court and, thus, stand as manifest symbols of the legal system of which they are a very visible and tangible element.

Legal Services Advertising, Media Consumption and the Image of Lawyers

Lawyer advertising has been closely scrutinized over the past several decades as the U.S. Supreme Court and state Supreme Courts have each made efforts to balance the protection of lawyers' First Amendment rights with the public interest in the validity and legitimacy of legal services advertisements (*e.g.*, Brooks 1994). Scholars have explored the legality of lawyer advertising as well as such ads' nature and effects. While the majority of scholars recognize the legality of such advertisements (Hornsby and Schimmel 1995), much of the extant literature reports sometimes

conflicting results. Some scholars assert that lawyer advertising provides needed information and a service for the public, with such advertisements increasing access to lawyers for the general public and also offering valuable information about potential opportunities or relevant court rulings to individuals who might benefit in some way from such knowledge (*e.g.*, Cebula 1998). Other scholars argue that lawyer advertising undermines the respectability and prestige of lawyers and the overall court system (Hornsby and Schimmel 1995; Salzman and Dunwoody 2005). Such scholars advocating a negative impact of lawyer advertising appear to outnumber those scholars who argue that lawyer advertising has positive effects on public opinion. While this literature is relevant to this study, as the public's perception of lawyers is related to their perception of the courts, this project contributes to a burgeoning field specifically analyzing how attorneys' advertising shapes, in part, the mass public's confidence level in the court system.

Beyond analysis of the effects of lawyer advertising, there is also a large literature that examines the influence of the public's watching television programming broadly on individuals' views of the court system. Within this area of research, scholars explore the importance of television exposure in the shaping of public opinion of the court system as well as the type of effects television has on the public's views of the courts. Some studies find that television watching impacts public opinion of the courts because television watching shapes public understanding of court system operations, as the general population has little interest in or firsthand experience with the courts (Cripe 1998; Harris 1993; Rottman, Hansen, Mott and Grimes 2003). Increased television viewing has been found to be associated with more positive levels of the public's view of the court system, with television dramas glamorizing legal professions and court operations and televised news often portraying the court system as an influential political institution (Harris 1993; *cf.* Cripe 1999; Salzman and Dunwoody 2005). However, some studies find that the public's specifically viewing televised high-profile court cases lead the mass public to grow more critical of the court system and

those involved with it, including attorneys who are many times its most public face, along with judges (*e.g.*, Salzmann and Dunwoody 2005).

Demographic Considerations: The Many Publics

Race and Ethnicity

Clearly intertwined with the public's view of the courts, including perceived levels of confidence, are several demographic factors that may condition the views of individuals derived from those individuals' direct experiences with the court system, including the police, and the experience of other members of such relevant communities. Thus, there are many publics whose views about the relative confidence of the court likely differ based on their temporal experiences with the court system and concomitant views about the fairness and equity of the judiciary. Among such factors prevalent within the American legal context are, of course, race and ethnicity (*see e.g.*, Gibson and Caldeira 1992). The most significant finding related to demographics is that African Americans tend to express significantly less confidence in the legal system, particularly related to their perception of the courts' fair treatment of people, specifically those within their community (*e.g.*, Hagan and Albonetti 1982; Henderson *et al.* 1997; Higgins, Wolfe, Mahoney and Walters 2009; Rottman *et al.* 2003; Sun and Wu 2006; Wenzel, Bowler and Lanoue 2003; Wines 2014). Sun and Wu (2006, 458) posit that racial minorities adopt differential views of the courts, as compared to non-minorities, primarily because of the "distinctive experiences that they have with the criminal justice system in general and the courts in particular."² Many such persons, the authors assert, adopt "resentful attitudes toward agencies of social control, including the criminal courts," because of their comparatively higher involvement with the criminal justice system whether as a litigant, one who has

²For example, recent Gallup data show that non-Whites express (49%) less confidence that the police will protect them from violent crime than do Whites (60%), although the gap between the two groups' mean has declined recently (http://www.gallup.com/poll/179468/nonwhites-less-likely-feel-police-protect-serve.aspx?utm_source=alert&utm_medium=email&utm_content=morelink&utm_campaign=syndication).

been incarcerated or a crime victim (Sun and Wu 2006, 458). However, there may be age-related or cohort differences in such perceptions among persons of color (Parker 2014). Thus, clearly one of the factors impinging on the views of the court system of African-Americans and other racial minorities is the perceived blatant lack of equity and fairness in the court system, thus leading to lower manifest levels of confidence in the judiciary.

Despite the widespread finding showing African Americans' comparatively low levels of confidence in the court system, many studies find that the effect of race and/or ethnicity is not uniform across all such groups. Sun and Wu (2006), in particular, find that many prior studies had aggregated several racial and ethnic groups into a "non-White" category or had simply compared the views of Whites and Blacks alone, thereby overlooking many other group-based differences in the experiences with and the confidence level in the court system broadly understood. Thus, while African-American respondents tend to be relatively quite cohesive in their negative view of the courts because of the disparities in treatment that African-Americans received there, other such groups' views are more variegated. However, Sun and Wu (2006) caution readers that a respondent's social class and income may mediate the effects of race and ethnicity on comparative levels of perceived confidence in the courts. Sun and Wu (2006, 462), further, report that Latinos showed significantly less confidence in the courts as the respondents viewed the courts more likely to treat "socially disadvantaged groups...worse than others" (*see also* Higgins, Wolfe, Mahoney and Walters 2009). Other studies, however, have found that Latinos adopt comparatively more positive views of the court system than other racial and ethnic minorities and even some White respondents (de la Garza and DeSipio 2001; Rottman *et al.* 2003; Wenzel, Bowler and Lanoue 2003; *cf.* Dougherty, Lindquist and Bradbury 2006). Those respondents of Asian background may, moreover, adopt attitudes about the court system divergent from those of other racial and ethnic minorities, although this relationship has been underexplored by current studies (Sun and Wu 2006;

Wortley 1996; Wortley, Hagan and Macmillan 1997). Thus, race and ethnicity strongly condition respondents' views of the court system and those effects differ in direction and strength across such groups.

Gender

Building on their experiential theory of court confidence, Sun and Wu (2006, 459) posit that there may be gender differences in the divergent levels of support for the judiciary among the public. Specifically, they assert that women have been subjected to “bias and discrimination” in their recent “contacts with the courts.” In particular, female respondents were, “treated less respectfully or seriously” than their male counterparts, across varying roles in the courtroom (Sun and Wu 2006, 459). Gender bias has also been widely reported for female attorneys, as compared to male attorneys, in several contexts (*see e.g.*, Sun and Wu 2006).³ Gender may also interact with race and ethnicity as well, making minority females particularly prone to report significantly lower levels of manifest confidence in the court system, although that impact may depend on whether such women had direct or indirect experience recently with the judiciary (Benesh 2006; Brooks and Jeon-Slaughter 2001; Fossati and Meeker 1997; Sun and Wu 2006; Wenzel, Bowler and Lanoue 2003).⁴ Thus, female respondents may hold relatively less positive views of the court, particularly those who have had recent experience or contact with the court system.

³Reported instances of such discrimination *may* now begin to decline as the state and federal benches are becoming more diverse by gender and by race/ethnicity and, thus, female attorneys *may* appear comparatively more frequently before judges who themselves have nontraditional backgrounds (*e.g.*, Hurwitz and Lanier 2001, 2003, 2008).

⁴Direct experience arises from the person's individual participation in some aspect of case, such as a litigant, a juror or a witness. Indirect experience indicates that a person has some non-personally derived source of information about the courts and their operation, such as that obtained from friends who were attorneys or judges, or who had served as jurors (Benesh 2006).

Education and Income

In addition, one of the most frequently reported impacts on public opinion is the respondent's level of education and corresponding income. Those sectors of the public who have comparatively higher levels of education may be better situated to understand the complexity of the judicial system and its sometimes seemingly contradictory outputs. Thus, the respondents' level of general formal training may impact their reported confidence levels in the courts (*e.g.*, Benesh 2006; Wenzel, Bowler and Lanoue 2003). Controlling for education, as well, considers a respondent's general knowledge level about the courts as political institution as well as attentiveness to salient events impacting the courts (*e.g.*, Benesh 2006; Wenzel, Bowler and Lanoue 2003). Associated with education level is one's income level, with the two concepts directly related (*see* Wenzel, Bowler and Lanoue 2003). Thus, these demographic influences must be specified, as well, in order to derive a theoretically-driven view of the public confidence in the state courts, attending to the fact that the public is multi-faceted in regards to its relationship with the judiciary.

Hypotheses

Based on review of the extant literature, we assert several hypotheses related to variations in individuals' confidence in the Florida court system and to the relationships between viewing lawyer advertisements and individuals' corresponding manifest confidence levels of the Florida court system and the perceived legitimacy of attorneys as professionals and the state courts overall. Clearly one of the dominant cleavages in American politics has been that of race and ethnicity. Given the historic inequality in the nation and the consequent disparities in the outcomes of cases involving persons who are racial and/or ethnic minorities, we expect that such persons will express less confidence in the Florida court system than individuals of all other ethnic/racial groups. However, the literature's findings are nuanced: not all such political minorities will express comparatively less

confidence than White respondents. Hispanics, particularly in Florida, may express greater confidence not only in the institutional court system, but in lawyers as professionals, too. Thus,

H_{1a}: In comparing respondents, those who are non-Hispanic racial and ethnic minorities will express less manifest confidence in the court system than will other respondents.

H_{1b}: In comparing respondents, those who are non-Hispanic racial and ethnic minorities will express less manifest confidence in lawyers as professionals than other respondents.

Correspondent with our discussion of the impact of SES, education and income, we expect that those individuals having relatively higher levels of education and income will report higher levels of confidence in the court system and for lawyers as professionals than others. Thus,

H_{2a}: In comparing respondents, those who have comparatively higher levels of income and/or education will express higher manifest levels of confidence in the court system than will other respondents.

H_{2b}: In comparing respondents, those who have comparatively higher levels of income and/or education will express higher manifest levels of confidence in lawyers as professionals than will other respondents.

One of the primary research questions that this study seeks to explore is the impact of a person's viewing a legal services advertisement (whether via television or the internet) on that person's subsequent confidence level in the court system generally or the concomitant prestige of lawyers as professionals. As indicated above, the literature finds mixed results in these contexts, suggesting perhaps a nuanced understanding of the impact of such ads on the public's view of the courts and attorneys as legal professionals. Thus,

H_{3a}: In comparing respondents, those individuals who have seen a lawyer advertisement, either via television or the internet, in the past 12 months will express lower manifest

confidence in the Florida court system than those individuals who have not seen a televised lawyer advertisement in the past 12 months.

H_{3b}: In comparing respondents, individuals who have seen a lawyer advertisement, either via television or the internet, in the past 12 months will report lower levels of perceived prestige for attorneys as legal professionals than those individuals who have not seen such an advertisement in the past 12 months.

There actually may be an interactive relationship undergirding the impact of such ads, with those who have lower levels of confidence being most impacted by legal services ads. Thus,

H_{4a}: In comparing respondents, individuals who have seen a lawyer advertisement, either via television or the internet, in the past 12 months and who have lower confidence levels will express higher manifest confidence in the Florida court system subsequently than those individuals who have not seen a televised lawyer advertisement in the past 12 months and who have high such levels initially.

H_{4b}: In comparing respondents, individuals who have seen a lawyer advertisement, either via television or the internet, in the past 12 months and who report lower perceived prestige levels for attorneys will report higher levels of perceived prestige subsequently for attorneys as legal professionals than those individuals who have not seen such an advertisement in the past 12 months and who have high such levels initially.

In addition, a respondent's recent experience or contact with the courts may condition their subsequent views of the judicial system generally and/or attorneys as professionals. Those who have served as jurors might increase their confidence levels in the courts and towards attorneys as they have some measure of control over the outcomes of the proceeding. Respondents who had served in the recent past as jurors might, as well, develop a better understanding of the judicial process, the courts and attorneys as officers of the court, thereby leading to increased manifest levels of

confidence in the courts (*e.g.*, Benesh 2006; Higgins, Wolfe, Mahoney and Walters 2009; Sun and Wu 2006; Wenzel, Bowler and Lanoue 2003). Those respondents, however, who were defendants, especially in the criminal context, may adopt more negative attitudes towards the court system and attorneys because of a comparative lack of control that they have over the proceedings and the eventual outcome (*e.g.*, Benesh 2006; Higgins, Wolfe, Mahoney and Walters 2009; Sun and Wu 2006; Wenzel, Bowler and Lanoue 2003). Also, respondents who occupied many roles in prior court contacts may adopt decreased levels of confidence for courts and attorneys subsequently after witnessing an actual trial because of their perceptions that attorneys, the judge or other court personnel were acting in an unprofessional or discriminatory manner towards witness, litigants or fellow attorneys (Sun and Wu 2006). Thus, there may be valence differences in the impact of recent prior court experience on respondents' subsequent manifest levels of confidence in the courts and their view of attorneys as professionals. We, therefore, cannot specify a directional hypothesis in this context, but do nonetheless expect some relationship between respondents' views of the courts and attorneys and their recent prior experience with the institutional judiciary. Thus,

H_{5a}: In comparing respondents, those who have recent experience with the institutional courts will adopt statistically significant different manifest confidence levels subsequently towards the judiciary than those who have not had such experience.

H_{5b}: In comparing respondents, those who have recent experience with the institutional courts will report statistically significant different levels of perceived prestige for attorneys as professionals subsequently than those who have not had such experience.

Survey Instrument and Data Gathering Process

The data for this project were gathered as part of an original dataset that the Florida Survey Research Center at the University of Florida developed in 2010. The data were collected through a statewide survey in Florida of adults over the age of 18 over the telephone with an initial wave in

April of that year and a follow-up wave in June. Participants were selected through random-digit dialing (RDD) in order to produce a random sample representative of the state's population; the surveys were administered weekday evenings and weekend afternoons. The survey sought to determine Florida residents' opinions of lawyer advertising and their subsequent views of legal professions and Florida court system, among other questions.

The adult population of Florida, from which this study's sample is drawn, is similar demographically to the national population, with the most notable exceptions being a four percent larger population of adults over 65 years old, a six percent larger population of individuals of Hispanic or Latino origin, a six percent larger population of foreign-born persons, and finally, a \$5,000 lower median household income. These differences in demographics are to be expected, given Florida's location and climate, but they do not appear to significantly affect the generalizability of this study's findings.

The survey from which this project's data is drawn was administered to 616 adults from across the state of Florida. For the purposes of this study, list-wise deletion was used to drop cases with missing data for the relevant variables included in this analysis, due to respondents' refusal or inability to answer certain questions. Comparing the original sample's characteristics and that of a reduced sample (described below, with the *N*s varying by question), we find that the reduced sample is reflective of the original underlying sample, thereby indicating that the cases excluded from this analysis' sample were dropped at random, creating no significant or meaningful changes in the demographics of the analyzed sample. The data in this project's models include information related to individuals' views on lawyers as professionals, legal services advertising, and the Florida court system, as well as descriptive information about the respondents' personal characteristics, their involvement with the court system and their media exposure, including advertising by attorneys whether done via television or the internet.

In order to most validly assess the role television and televised lawyer advertising play in shaping individuals' views of the court system, the dependent variables of interest in this project are a variable depicting individuals' manifest level of confidence in the Florida court system and their perceived prestige level for attorneys. A variable reflecting whether a subject's regard for the Florida court system was higher, the same, or lower after viewing a lawyer television advertisement was added as well as a question inquiring about the respondent's change in the perceived level of integrity of attorneys.

ANALYSIS

Professional Prestige

We have drawn a series of tables to address the several hypotheses that we have asserted above. Table 1 reports the perceived level of prestige that respondents ascribed to various professions. The cell entries represent the percentage of respondents who indicated that they believe that the corresponding profession possesses "considerable" or "very great" levels of prestige. The "Total" column reports the findings for all respondents. As indicated, the mean percentage for lawyers (58.73) was statistically significantly different from that for bankers (45.09) and realtors (25.76) but also from that for medical doctors (88.63). When the mean prestige ratings for non-lawyer occupations were aggregated, the result (53.60) is not statistically significantly different than the result for attorneys alone. Thus, Floridians view the corresponding level of prestige for attorneys second only to medical doctors, suggesting that respondents accord comparatively high levels of regard even for attorneys.

However, as indicated above, there may be variations in the mean prestige level reported by some elements of the public as compared to other persons. In particular, we hypothesized above that those respondents who had recent experience with a court may report different levels of

confidence in courts or attorneys as professionals for varying reasons. Table 1 also reports these findings for court participants. The comparison group is for non-participants such that the mean prestige rating for lawyers (50.84 percent) among participants is significantly different from that for respondents who did not have such recent experience. This figure represents a decline in the aggregate manifest prestige rating for lawyers as compared to the overall rating assigned by all respondents (58.73 percent), however. Yet, it is greater than that for non-lawyers (45.95 percent). Thus, our first hypothesis about the mean prestige rating for attorneys as professionals is supported, suggesting that court experience conditions the public's view of attorneys.⁵

Similarly, we hypothesized that there may be significant differences among varying racial and ethnic groups in how they view the prestige of attorneys, as lawyers are officers of the courts. Table 1 reports these results for several different racial and ethnic groups. Focusing on the mean ratings reported by respondents for lawyers, we find that White respondents' ratings (53.92 percent) differed significantly from non-White subjects. Surprisingly, African-Americans' ratings for attorneys were comparatively higher (81.13 percent) and differed significantly from those of other subjects. In general, the ratings assigned by African-American respondents were significantly higher for each profession than for other subjects, except for medical doctors (92.02 percent). Hispanic subjects, on the other hand, assigned comparatively similar ratings to the professions listed as did other respondents, suggesting that their views of attorneys as professionals may be more similar to the generalized public than the views of other racial and ethnic groups, such as African-Americans; the one exception in this context is that Hispanic respondents assigned comparatively lower ratings for bankers (35.77 percent) than did other subjects. In much the same way, Asian respondents were quite similar to non-Asians in their relative views of the prestige of several professions including

⁵We below explore the question about whether court participants accord the institutional courts, as opposed to attorneys, different levels of confidence than those respondents who do not have such recent contact.

attorneys, with bankers (10.51 percent), realtors (0.0 percent) and non-lawyers generally (38.03 percent) being the exceptions. Florida is also home to several American Indian tribes whose views about professional prestige differ but not significantly from those of other groups, likely because of the small number of respondents included in our sample. Collectively, non-White respondents reported significantly different mean prestige ratings for bankers (52.95 percent), lawyers (74.01 percent), realtors (35.74 percent) and non-lawyers generally (60.44 percent). Thus, Table 1 reports results that suggest that there is a clear conditioning effect of race and ethnicity on the views of respondents about the prestige of professions, including most importantly that for attorneys.

Confidence in the Court System

Table 2 reports our findings about the respondents' comparative confidence level in the Florida court system, broadly understood. The values reported in the Table indicate the mean percentage of respondents who rated the courts' confidence among the highest three values, based on an original five-point scale. As we noted above, there are several demographic and other factors that may impact such reported levels. Overall, we find that the respondents' mean confidence level was 73.70, the reference level for the remainder of the analyses listed in the Table. This initial figure suggest that the respondents hold the state courts in relative high esteem, especially given how diverse the state is generally. The Table also reports that court participants' mean rating was 66.59, lower but not statistically significantly so from the overall result. Thus, court experience does not impact the respondents' manifest level of confidence in the institutional judiciary, unlike the reported result for such participants with regard to the level of prestige that they accorded to attorneys as professionals (*see* Table 1 and accompanying discussion above). Respondents were, also, asked if they had hired a lawyer in the last five years. Among those subjects who had done so, their mean confidence level in the court (69.63 percent) similarly did not differ significantly from the overall result. Even those respondents who had seen, read, or heard a legal services ad did not differ

significantly in their manifest confidence level for the courts from that for all respondents. Again, these results underline the distinction that respondents seemingly make between the courts as political institutions and lawyers as professionals and officers of that court system.

Just as we reported in Table 1, and as hypothesized, we tested the mean confidence levels for varying subsamples. Table 2 reports these differences among key elements of the public. First, race and ethnicity appear to play a key role in impacting respondents' views of the confidence in the court system. Notably, African-Americans reported statistically significantly lower ratings (47.22 percent) than did respondents overall, as did Hispanics (71.83 percent) and non-White respondents collectively (55.31 percent). However, Asian respondents reported a higher manifest level of confidence in the court system (94.25 percent) with White respondents reporting a mean confidence rating of 77.75 percent, higher than the overall score but not statistically significantly so. The results for African-Americans and Hispanics may reflect the historical experience that members of those communities have had with the courts, particularly in the criminal context, as noted above. We had hypothesized that African-Americans would accordingly report lower confidence levels, which is supported by the results. Yet, we also had hypothesized that Hispanics would report comparatively higher levels; that hypothesis is undercut by the reported findings in Table 2. These results, however, may be conditioned by other demographic factors, such as income, education and age, to which we now turn.

Table 2 lists the findings for several theoretically important subsamples. As the literature review suggests, several existing studies point to the impact of demographic factors on the public's views of the courts. As we noted above, those respondents with comparatively higher levels of formal education may rate the courts' confidence as opposed to those with lesser such education levels. We find that those with less than a high school education, or its equivalent, reported a mean confidence rating of 53.22, significantly lower than the overall figure (73.70 percent). Similarly,

those respondents having a college degree gave the judiciary relatively higher confidence levels (83.49 percent) than all respondents generally. Thus, our results bear out that education may lead to respondents to report higher confidence levels for the courts as they may then be better equipped to understand the complex and seemingly contradictory operation of the institutional courts.

Education has been long linked to income level and we find that those with lower income levels report relatively lower confidence levels than those of higher incomes: those respondents who reported annual incomes of less than \$20,000 rated the mean confidence level of the courts at 50.92, while those subjects with incomes at \$50,000 and above indicated significantly higher confidence levels (\$50,000-\$69,000 = 87.85; \$70,000 or more = 83.50).

We, moreover, find that the youngest cohort (those age 18-24) in our sample reported significantly lower levels of confidence in the courts (56.95 percent) than respondents overall. However, respondents in other age cohorts reported confidence levels that did not significantly depart from the overall mean. The fact that the youngest cohort holds lower comparative levels of confidence in the judiciary comports with other findings about the political beliefs and behavior of younger persons, suggesting that such persons may have undergone divergent socializing events as compared to those for older subjects (*e.g.*, Dalton 2009). Gender, however, did not produce significant differences in the mean confidence level reported by male and female subjects. Thus, there are several factors conditioning the public's view of the relative confidence level in the court system. These results support our view that the public is multifaceted in its relationship with the courts and that theoretically-grounded analyses must bear these significant differences in mind when specifying relationships among key variables.

Regulation of Professional Ads

Table 3 shows the mean percentage of respondents supporting the regulations of ads by various professionals. Clearly, those members of the public who support the regulation of

professional ads dovetails with the public's aggregate view of the prestige of each of those professions (*see* Table 1 and accompanying analysis). The Total column represents the mean percentage of respondents who supported the regulation of ads by the various indicated professions. The reference category is ads by attorneys. Nearly three-quarters (70.72 percent) of persons surveyed believed that ads by lawyers should be regulated; in fact, it is the highest mean reported among the indicated professions. Comparatively, the accord or regard that the public has for various professions should relate directly to the extent to which the public supports state regulation of ads by such professionals. Table 3 bears this view out: while Table 2 reports that medical doctors enjoyed the highest level of perceived prestige by the respondents (88.63 percent), Table 3 shows that the same sample demonstrated a statistically significantly smaller mean percentage of respondents who shared the view that physicians' ads should be regulated (58.35 percent), as compared to the finding for attorneys' ads.⁶ The mean percentages of the public who supported such regulation for ads by bankers (60.10 percent), realtors (58.47 percent), and accountants (46.02 percent) all achieved statistically significant differences from that for lawyers. Thus, overall, the public holds attorneys in comparatively high esteem but tempers that repute with the belief that legal services ads should be state regulated. Perhaps these duality reflects the complex view that the public holds for attorneys: lawyers are professionals but also officers of the court and, thus, bear some duty to the public in their commercial advertisements.⁷

Table 3 also reports the findings for key subsamples. As with Tables 1 and 2, we calculate the mean percentage of respondents in theoretically-compelling subgroups who support the

⁶Table 3 also shows that the mean percentage of the public who support state regulation of ads by accountants (46.02) was significantly lower than the corresponding figure for medical doctors, but the association between the two findings seems to be generally supported by the results reported in both tables.

⁷In fact, the case law dealing with state regulation of attorneys' ads is complex and often contradictory (*see e.g.*, Brooks 1994; Hornsby and Schimmel 1995; *Florida Bar v. Went-for-It, Inc.* 1995; Mitchell 1982; Smoller 2006).

regulation of professional ads, with emphasis on ads by attorneys. First, court participants demonstrated a statistically higher mean percentage of support for the regulation of lawyers' ads (74.91 percent) than did non-participants. In fact, participants supported the regulation of legal services ads more frequently than they did for other professions, perhaps because of their recent exposure to the legal system. Again, this finding may underlie a certain public skepticism of attorneys or it may indicate that the respondents hold attorneys to higher standards than other professions because of their status of officers of the court; the findings for non-lawyer professions did not achieve statistical significance, with the exception of that for realtors (51.78 percent).

Second, consistent with the findings reported above, we find that there are clear divisions in the public's view of professional regulations surrounding racial and ethnic groups. White respondents supported ad regulation by attorneys (67.24 percent) at a statistically significantly different level than did other respondents. African-Americans, on the other hand, reflected a mean support level of 77.27 for such ads, clearly higher than the level for White respondents, but one not statistically significant from non-African-American respondents. Interestingly, the findings for African-Americans were significant for all other listed professions. This result may reflect, in part, the comparatively high regard that members of that racial community reported when asked about the level of prestige that attorneys occupy in their view (*see* Table 1). The findings for other racial and ethnic groups show that the views of Hispanics did not significantly differ from those of other racial and ethnic groups, somewhat distinct from the findings of the literature showing that Hispanics possess greater regard for courts than persons in other racial groups. Substantively, the mean percentage of Hispanics who supported regulation of various professionals did not differ appreciably in terms of the reported magnitude of the respective means from those of White respondents. Asian respondents reported the second highest mean percentage supporting the regulation of lawyers' ads (86.24 percent), but that finding (and the others for Asians) did not

achieve statistical significance. Native Americans reported the highest such level (100 percent), but the subsample size was quite small; and that figure is not statistically significant. Collectively, non-White respondents supported regulation of attorneys' ad at a statistically higher rate (77.96) than did other members of the public. This finding implies that racial and ethnic minorities may see attorneys as professionally prestigious (*see* Table 1), but because of lawyers' key role in the justice system, they should be regulated at a comparatively higher level than other professionals.

Effects of Ad Viewing on Public Confidence in the Courts and Lawyer Prestige

One of the key theoretical questions that this study seeks to explore is whether those persons who view legal services ads change their manifest levels of confidence in the courts and/or the perceived level of integrity of lawyers. Table 4 reports our findings on various questions in these regards. First, respondents were asked if their confidence in the Florida court system was lower, the same or higher following their viewing an ad (either on TV or via the internet). The Table shows that the modal response for both types of ad viewers (TV ad=58.7 percent; internet ad = 53.0 percent) was that their relative confidence level did not change subsequently. About one-quarter of each group (TV ad = 24.9 percent; internet ad = 25.4 percent) perceived that they were less confident in the judiciary following the ad viewing, while between about 10 and 13 percent (TV ad = 9.7 percent; 12.7 percent internet ad) stated that they were actually *more* confident in the operation of the state judiciary following their seeing the ad.

We also asked respondents about their perceived level of lawyers' integrity after viewing attorney ads. Specifically, we inquired if they believed that attorneys' integrity had *increased* subsequently. Table 4 reports that the modal response was "strongly disagree" (TV ad = 43.5 percent; internet ad = 50.7 percent). However, this result does not suggest that attorneys' comparative integrity level had actually *declined*. Respondents may assign the same level of integrity

to attorneys regardless of their viewing legal services ads.⁸ We similarly asked respondents about their subsequent confidence level in the Florida court system after they viewed legal services ads. Table 3 shows that the modal response was, once again, “strongly disagree” for TV ad viewers (43.9 percent); but for internet ad viewers, the modal response was “somewhat disagree” (31.2 percent). Again, the implication of these findings is somewhat unclear as the valence of the question may not imply a decline in the public’s confidence level in the court system after viewing legal services ads. About 14 percent of TV ad viewers (5.1 percent “somewhat agree” and 9.1 percent “strongly agree”) and about 21 percent of internet ad viewers (2.1 percent “somewhat agree” and 19.1 percent “strongly agree”) believed that their confidence in the court system increased following their viewing such ads. Thus, the impact of the mass public’s viewing attorneys’ ads is not monotonic.

Not only does the impact vary in magnitude across the question type but also the respondents who viewed attorney ads on the internet appear to report comparatively more positive or higher ratings for their confidence in the court system and for the change in their view of lawyers and their confidence in the court system. Again, Table 4 reports these findings. Internet ad viewers reported higher confidence levels in the court system following seeing that ad 12.7 percent of the time. Similarly, more than 23 percent of the respondents who had viewed an internet ad observed an increase in the perceived integrity of lawyers afterwards, while only slightly more than 16 percent of TV ad viewers did so. Similar trends are seen for the differential percentages among the respondents who agreed with the proposition that their viewing such ads led to an increased level of confidence in the court system generally. Not only does it thus appear that there are some structural differences underlying the impact of the public’s viewing legal services ads, but it also seems that overall the level of confidence that the mass public holds for the court system does not substantially

⁸In fact, respondents’ modal response was “same” to the question about what their subsequent level of confidence in the court system was after they viewed a legal services ad. Thus, these results may suggest no overall change in the corresponding levels of attorney integrity.

decline as a result of their viewing of legal services ads; in fact, such viewing may actually burnish their view of the courts and, for some of the mass publics, it may lead to increased perceived levels of prestige of lawyers (*see* Cebula 1998).

Increased Court System Confidence and Integrity of Lawyers and Ad Viewing

As noted above, the public is multi-faceted in its response to changes in the perceived level of confidence in the judiciary and the change in the perceived integrity level of lawyers. This dynamism is particularly relevant for the many varying groups who come into contact with the courts and lawyers as professionals, as such groups may hold divergent beliefs about the role and performance of the institutional judiciary, as the literature suggests. Accordingly, Table 4 reports the percentage of respondents in several subsamples who reported an increase in their perceived integrity level of lawyers following the respondents' viewing some legal services ad. The Table also lists the results for those persons who indicated that their manifest confidence in the court system in general had increased, or at least not declined, in similar contexts. First, the mean percentage of court participants who reported an increase in the perceived integrity of lawyers (TV ad = 10.75 percent; internet ad = 7.44 percent) was statistically significantly different than the mean for non-participants, confirming one of the key findings of existing studies linking recent court contact with manifest levels of court support. Hispanics have been found to be generally more supportive of the institutional courts than other racial and ethnic minorities. Here we find the mean percentage of Hispanic respondents who had viewed an internet attorney ad (57.75 percent), but not one on TV, was statistically significantly different than for non-Hispanics. This finding suggests that Hispanics may be more similar in their views of attorneys, who once again are officers of the court, to those of Whites than to other racial and ethnic minorities. The findings for non-Whites (38.95 percent) imply that this idea may be empirically supported.

As noted in the existing literature, aggregate education level may impact a respondent's view of the court system, including lawyers as professionals. Table 4 shows that those with higher levels of education (over that of a high school education or its equivalent) demonstrate significantly lower mean percentages of respondents who reported an increased level of perceived prestige for attorneys following their viewing an attorney ad. The mean percentages for college graduates (TV ad = 7.37 percent; internet ad = 3.59 percent) and professional and graduate school graduates (internet ad only = 32.97) significantly diverged from that for high school graduates. While the literature seems to suggest that those persons with higher reported levels of education would better understand the complexity and the seemingly contradictory operation of the courts, our results suggest that those respondents with comparative higher levels of education actually do not increase their perceived prestige level of attorneys as readily as other persons. Perhaps such persons have more fixed attitudes about attorneys as legal professionals than others and, thus, they are more immune from short-term forces such as viewing attorney services ads.

We find a similar pattern when examining income level: those with higher incomes demonstrated significantly lower mean percentages of persons who increased their perceived prestige for lawyers after viewing a legal services ad. Those with incomes less than \$20,000 (TV ad = 53.68 percent; internet ad = 23.00 percent) seem to be more likely to bolster their view of attorneys subsequently than those with incomes between \$35,000 and \$49,999 (TV ad = 19.61 percent; internet ad = 19.83 percent) or those with incomes equal to or greater than \$70,000 (TV ad = 6.40 percent; internet ad = 19.19 percent). Age, however, demonstrated no significant differences in the reported means here. Thus, our study confirms that race and ethnicity, education level and income bear upon the public's view of attorneys as professionals, which is a key finding as attorneys are often the most public face of the judiciary, other than individual judges; yet lawyers as well are held up as objects of scorn in some contexts.

Table 4 also indicates the mean percentages of respondents who reported that they observed an increase in their confidence level in the court system following their viewing a legal services ad. The Table shows that court participants reported significantly lower means of persons who increased their confidence level in the court system (TV ad = 10.05 percent; internet ad = 5.65 percent), a finding similar to that for the same group and their increased level of perceived integrity of lawyers. Once again, it is interesting to note the difference in magnitude of the mean percentages of respondents who reported a higher confidence level in the state judiciary following viewing a legal services ad. Hispanics who had viewed an internet-based attorney ad reported significantly higher mean percentages than for other respondents. This result supports the finding in some of the existing studies that Hispanics adopt a more positive attitude toward the court system as compared to other racial and ethnic minorities. None of the other racial and ethnic groups reported significantly different mean percentages here. We found similar results when we calculated the mean percentages of respondents who perceived an improvement, or at least no decline, in their view of the court system after viewing a legal services ad.

Education has been indicated to affect a person's view of the courts. Our results show that college graduates reported significantly lower mean percentages than respondents who differing levels of education (TV ad = 5.33 percent; 5.57 percent). This result suggests that those who are college educated hold views that are more resistant to change based on their viewing a legal services ad. It is interesting, however, to note that those who are professional and/or graduate school degree holders reported similar mean percentages to those of college graduates (TV ad = 6.51 percent; internet ad = 0.00 percent), but those arising from the most highly educated group were not significantly different from those for other respondents.

Age cohort also demonstrated significant differences but only for those persons 35 to 54 (TV ad= 11.57 percent; internet ad = 23.75 percent) and those 65 and older (TV ad = 9.46 percent;

internet ad = 20.03 percent). However, both groups' means were significantly different for only those respondents who viewed an internet ad. Perhaps the groups are in some way structurally different if they are more likely to view an internet ad as opposed to one broadcast on TV. This result suggests additional analysis to determine the underlying difference. One of these differences may, in fact, be income differentials: our results show that respondents with higher income levels show significant differences but the impact differs in its direction. Those respondents with incomes between \$35,000 and \$49,999 reported significantly higher mean percentages (TV ad = 17.43 percent; internet ad = 25.31 percent) than other groups. However, those respondents reporting incomes at \$70,000 or greater reported significantly lower mean percentages (TV ad = 5.43 percent; internet ad = 8.21 percent). Again, these differences may be correlated with underlying differences in education level as income and education have long been shown to be directly associated.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

We began with the question about what effect the public's viewing of legal services ads might have on their respective views of the institutional courts and their view of lawyers as professionals. The literature was mixed in its findings about how different members of the public view attorneys as legal professionals and the courts as governmental institutions. We find that in general the public holds attorneys in high regard, comparable to the level of prestige that the public accords other professionals; this result is surprising given the popular view of lawyers, held by some, that attorneys are unprincipled, single-minded seekers of profit at any cost. Indeed some racial and ethnic groups (such as African-Americans) report significantly higher levels of prestige for attorneys than do other groups. Similarly, we find that large proportions of the public, cutting across racial/ethnic lines, income and educational groups, support the regulation of lawyer ads. Court participants, however, reported significantly less prestigious views of lawyers than did non-participants. This finding points out an interesting duality: the public in general holds lawyers in

comparatively high esteem but yet wants their ads regulated, much as they do for other professionals, too.

When we examine the comparative confidence levels that the many publics have for the state judiciary, we find that racial and ethnic differences lead to significantly divergent views by the public: these findings underscore the key finding in the literature that a group's treatment in the court system impact its members' views of the judiciary subsequently. However, not all racial and ethnic groups report lower confidence levels. Hispanics and those of Asian descent reported significantly higher mean confidence levels in the institutional judiciary. These findings support the conclusion of some existing studies that race and ethnicity in particular must be disaggregated to better understand how the many aspects of the public might view the courts and their subsequent views after seeing a legal services ad. Unlike the question about the perceived level of attorney prestige, court participants did not report significantly different confidence levels in the court system than did non-participants, implying that respondents hold attorneys and the judiciary in different aspects. However, we did find that there were some age, education and income differences, suggesting that those with higher education levels and incomes manifest higher confidence levels, generally, than those with comparatively lower levels of each variable.

In examining the impact of the public's viewing legal services ads, we find that court participants reported significantly lower mean percentages of those who witnessed an increase in their perceived prestige of lawyers and confidence in the court system. There were also many consistent differences for Hispanics and those of comparatively higher educational and/or income levels. However, the question specifically asked about increases in the respondents' respective views of lawyers and the courts. Indeed, the modal response for confidence in the court system was that respondents did not change their view after viewing an ad, either lowering it or increasing it. For the change in the perceived level of prestige of lawyers, the modal response was "strongly disagree," but

that result, once again, does not portend that the public perceives attorneys in a more negative light after viewing a legal services ad. It simply suggests that their views did not increase as a result.

Thus, our results demonstrate that the public's view of the institutional judiciary and lawyers as professionals is a multi-faceted one as there are many publics and there are many demographic factors that impinge on respondents' view of both opinion objects. Clearly, there are several cross-cutting relationships that deserve further inquiry, such as the impact of race and ethnicity on those with comparatively higher education and income levels. Hence, there is much more work to be done to develop a theoretically-compelling and empirically-driven view of the comparative view that the public holds for lawyers as professionals, their confidence level in the institutional courts and the impact, if any, of the public viewing ads touting the services of attorneys.

REFERENCES

- Benesh, Sara C. 2006. "Understanding Public Confidence in American Courts." *Journal of Politics* 68(3): 697-707.
- Benesh, Sara C., and Susan E. Howell. 2001. "Confidence in the Courts: A Comparison of Users and Non-Users." *Behavioral Sciences and the Law* 19: 199-214.
- Brace, Paul, Melinda Gann Hall, and Laura Langer. 1996. "Judicial Choice and the Politics of Abortion: Institutions, Context, and the Autonomy of Courts." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, San Francisco, Ca.
- Brace, Paul, Melinda Gann Hall, and Laura Langer. 2001. "Placing State Supreme Courts in State Politics." *State Politics and Policy Quarterly* 1(1): 81-108.
- Brooks, Mylene. 1994. "Lawyer Advertising: Is There Really A Problem?" *Loyola of Los Angeles Law Review* 15: 1-32.
- Brooks, R., and J. Jeon-Slaughter. 2001. "Race, Income, and Perceptions of the U.S. Court System." *Behavioral Sciences and the Law* 19: 249-64.
- Caldeira, Gregory A., and James L. Gibson. 1992. "The Etiology of Public Support for the Supreme Court." *American Journal of Political Science* 36(3): 635-64.
- Cebula, Richard J. 1998. "Does Lawyer Advertising Adversely Influence the Image of Lawyers in the United States? An Alternative Perspective and New Empirical Evidence." *Journal of Legal Studies* 27: 503-16.
- Cripe, Kelly L. 1999. "Empowering the Audience: Television's Role in the Diminishing Respect for the American Judicial System." *UCLA Entertainment Law Review* 251: 235-82.
- Dalton, Russell J. 2009. *The Good Citizen: How a Younger Generation is Reshaping American Politics*. Rev. ed. Washington, DC: CQ Press.
- de la Garza, R.O., and Louis DeSipio. 2001. "A Satisfied Clientele Seeking More Diverse Services: Latinos and the Courts." *Behavioral Sciences and the Law* 19(2): 237-248.
- Doughtery, George W., Stefanie A. Lindquist, and Mark D. Bradbury. 2006. "Evaluating Performance in State Judicial Institutions: Trust and Confidence in the Georgia Judiciary." *State & Local Government Review* 38(3): 176-90.
- Florida Bar v. Went For It Inc.* 1995. 516 U.S. 618.
- Fossati, T., and J. Meeker. 1997. "Evaluations of Institutional Legitimacy and Court System Fairness: A Study of Gender Differences." *Journal of Criminal Justice* 25: 141-54.
- Gibson, James L., Gregory A. Caldeira, and Lester Kenyatta Spence. 2003. "Measuring Attitudes Toward the United States Supreme Court." *American Journal of Political Science* 47(2): 354-67.

- Hagan, J., and C. Albonetti. 1982. "Race, Class, and the Perceptions of Criminal Justice in America." *American Journal of Sociology* 88: 329-55.
- Hall, Melinda Gann. 1987. "Constituent Influence in State Supreme Courts: Conceptual Notes and a Case Study." *Journal of Politics* 49(4): 1117-24.
- Hall, Melinda Gann. 1992. "Electoral Politics and Strategic Voting in State Supreme Courts." *Journal of Politics* 54(2): 427-46.
- Hamm, Joseph A., Lisa M. PytlikZillig, Mitchel N. Herian, Brian H. Bornstein, Alan J. Tomkins, and Lesa Hoffman. 2013. "Deconstructing Public Confidence in State Courts." *Journal of Trust Research* 3(1): 11-31.
- Hamm, Joseph A., Lisa M. PytlikZillig, Alan J. Tomkins, Mitchel N. Herian, Brian H. Bornstein, and Elizabeth M. Neely. 2011. "Exploring the Separable Components of Institutional Confidence." *Behavioral Sciences and the Law* 29: 95-115.
- Harris, David A. 1993. "The Appearance of Justice: Court TV, Conventional Television, and Public Understanding of the Criminal Justice System." *Arizona Law Review* 35: 785-828.
- Henderson, M., F. Cullen, L. Cao., S. Browning, and, R. Kopache. 1997. "Impact of Race on Perceptions of Criminal Justice." *Journal of Criminal Justice* 25: 477-62.
- Higgins, George E., Scott E. Wolfe, Margaret Mahoney, and Nelseta M. Walters. 2009. "Race, Ethnicity, and Experience: Modeling the Public's Perceptions of Justice, Satisfaction, and Attitude Toward the Courts." *Journal of Ethnicity in Criminal Justice* 7(4): 293-310.
- Hornsby, William E., Jr., and Kurt Schimmel. 1995. "Regulating Lawyer Advertising: Public Images and the Irresistible Aristotelian Impulse." *Georgetown Journal of Legal Ethics* 9: 325-58.
- Hurwitz, Mark S., and Drew Noble Lanier. 2001. "Women and Minorities on State and Federal Appellate Benches, 1985 and 1999." *Judicature* 85(September-October):84-92.
- Hurwitz, Mark S., and Drew Noble Lanier. 2003. "Explaining Judicial Diversity: The Differential Ability of Women and Minorities to Attain Seats on State Supreme and Appellate Courts." *State Politics and Policy Quarterly* 3(4): 329-52.
- Hurwitz, Mark S., and Drew Noble Lanier. 2008. "Diversity in the State and Federal Appellate Courts: Change and Continuity Across 20 Years." *The Justice System Journal* 29(1): 47-70.
- Levi, Margaret, and Laura Stoker. 2000. "Political Trust and Trustworthiness." *American Review of Political Science* 3:475-507.
- Mishler, William and Reginald S. Sheehan. 1993. "The Supreme Court as a Countermajoritarian Institution? The Impact of Public Opinion on Supreme Court Decisions." *American Political Science Review* 87(1): 87-101.

- Mishler, William and Reginald S. Sheehan. 1996. "Public Opinion, the Attitudinal Model and Supreme Court Decision Making: A Micro-Analytic Perspective." *Journal of Politics* 58: 169-200.
- Mitchell, Chester N. 1982. "Impact, Regulation and Efficacy of Lawyer Advertising." *Osgoode Hall Law Journal* 20: 119-137.
- Neubauer, David W., and Stephen S. Meinhold. 2013. *Judicial Process: Law, Courts, and Politics in the United States*. 6th ed. Belmont, CA: Thompson Wadsworth.
- Norpoth, Helmut, and Jeffrey A. Segal. 1994. "Popular Influence on Supreme Court Decisions: Comment." *American Political Science Review* 88(3): 711-16.
- Parker, Kim. 2014. "Within the Black Community, Young and Old Differ on Police Searches, Discrimination." Pew Research Center <http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2014/08/27/within-the-black-community-young-and-old-differ-on-police-searches-discrimination/> (last viewed 12/22/2014).
- Rottman, D., R. Hansen, N. Mott, and L. Grimes. 2003. *Perceptions of the Courts in Your Community: The Influence of Experience, Race, and Ethnicity. Final Report*. Williamsburg, VA: National Center for State Courts.
- Salzmann, Victoria S. and Philip T. Dunwoody. 2005. "Prime Time Lies: Do Portrayals of Lawyers Influence How People Think About the Legal Profession." *SMU Law Review* 58: 411-64.
- Smolla, Rodney A. 2006. "Lawyer Advertising and the Dignity of the Profession." *Arkansas Law Review* 59: 437-470.
- Sun, Ivan Y., and Yuning Wu. 2006. "Citizens' Perceptions of the Courts: The Impact of Race, Gender, and Recent Experience." *Journal of Criminal Justice* 34: 457-67.
- Wenzel, James P., Shaun Bowler, and David J. Lanoue. 2003. "The Sources of Public Confidence in State Courts: Experience and Institutions." *American Politics Research* 31(2): 191-211.
- Wines, Michael. 2014. "After Ferguson Announcement, a Racial Divide Remains Over View of Justice." *The New York Times* (Nov. 25, A1).
- Wortley, S. 1996. "Justice for All? Race and Perceptions of Bias in the Ontario Criminal Justice System: A Toronto Survey." *Canadian Journal of Criminology* 38: 439-67.
- Wortley, S., J. Hagan, and R. Macmillan. 1997. "Just Des(s)erts? The Racial Polarization of Perceptions of Criminal Injustice." *Law and Society Review* 31: 637-76.

**TABLE 1. MEAN RATINGS OF THE PRESTIGE OF PROFESSIONS
AS ASSESSED BY FLORIDA RESIDENTS (2010)**

	Total	Court Participants	White Rs	African American Rs	Hispanic Rs	Asian Rs	Native American Rs	Non-White Rs
Accountants' Prestige	54.94	48.40*	53.47	64.80*	58.98	41.61	0.0	60.64
Medical Doctors' Prestige	88.63*	80.26*	87.82	92.02	92.50	100	100	92.45
Bankers' Prestige	45.09*	33.55*	42.26*	60.85*	35.77*	10.51*	0.0	52.95*
Lawyers' Prestige	58.73	50.84*	53.92*	81.13*	62.79	66.49	100	74.01*
Realtors' Prestige	25.76*	21.59	21.47*	44.54*	21.14	0.0*	65.86	35.74*
Non- Lawyers' Prestige	53.60	45.95*	51.25*	65.55*	52.09	38.03*	53.12	60.44*

Explanatory Notes: Cell entries are the mean percentage of respondents who rated the profession's prestige as having "considerable" or "very great" levels of prestige. An * represents a statistically significant difference from the relevant reference group as compared to the reported mean for the corresponding profession, at the .05 level or better ($p < .05$, two-tailed test). For example, in the Total Column, the mean prestige rating for lawyers (58.73) by all respondents is significantly different than the mean rating for bankers by all respondents (45.09); thus, the mean prestige rating for lawyers is the reference category for this column. For the remaining columns, an * represents a statistically significant difference from the corresponding overall mean for each of the indicated groups at the .05 level or better ($p < .05$, two-tailed test). For example, in the Court Participants column, the mean prestige rating assigned by court participants for lawyers (50.84) is significantly different from the corresponding mean prestige rating assigned by non-participants for lawyers.

**TABLE 2. MEAN RATINGS OF CONFIDENCE IN THE FLORIDA COURT SYSTEM
AS ASSESSED BY FLORIDA RESIDENTS (2010)**

Subsample	Mean Confidence Rating	Subsample	Mean Confidence Rating
Age		Education	
18-24	56.95*	8th Grade or less/Some High School	53.22*
25-34	74.80	High School/GED	79.21
35-54	75.95	Tech./Vocational/Some College	66.02
55-64	78.84	College Graduate	83.49*
65+	74.16	Graduate/Professional School	84.65
Gender		Income	
Male	68.47	Under \$20,000	50.92*
Female	78.08	\$20,000-\$34,999	67.20
		\$35,000-\$49,999	67.22
		\$50,000-\$69,999	87.85*
		\$70,000 or more	83.50*
Race		Court Participants	66.59
White	77.75	Hired a Lawyer in Last 5 Years	69.63
African-American	47.22*	Saw, Heard or Read Lawyer Ad	
Hispanic	71.83*	in Past 12 Months	73.25
Asian	94.25*	in Past Month	61.27
Native American	24.68	in Past Week	72.72
Other	65.29	in Past Day	75.87
Non-White	55.31*		
OVERALL	73.70		

Explanatory Notes: Respondents were initially asked to rate their confidence in the Florida Court system across a five-point scale with the lowest value representing “no confidence” and the highest value representing “complete confidence.” These original values were collapsed into a dichotomous variable with the lowest two values taking on the value of zero and the highest three values taking on the value of one. Cell entries are, thus, the mean percentage of respondents who rated their confidence in the Florida Court system among the higher values. An * represents a statistically significant difference for the relevant subsample mean as compared to the overall mean, at the .05 level or better ($p < .05$, two-tailed test). For example, the mean court confidence level for respondents age 18 to 24 (56.95) is significantly different from the corresponding mean for all respondents (73.70).

**TABLE 3. MEAN PERCENTAGE OF FLORIDA RESIDENTS SUPPORTING
THE REGULATION OF ADS BY PROFESSIONALS (2010)**

	Total	Court Participants	White Rs	African American Rs	Hispanic Rs	Asian Rs	Native American Rs	Non-White Rs
Accountants' Ads	46.02*	45.78	43.60*	58.29*	47.90	65.78	100	59.55*
Medical Doctors' Ads	58.35*	60.92	57.59	69.62*	53.97	41.39	100	65.25
Bankers' Ads	60.10*	60.92	57.24	70.49*	60.40	41.39	100	64.28
Lawyers' Ads	70.72	74.91*	67.24*	77.27	67.96	86.24	100	77.96*
Realtors' Ads	58.47*	51.78*	56.94	71.59*	50.33	65.70	75.32	47.49
Non- Lawyers' Ads	55.72*	54.85	53.84	67.49*	53.15	53.56	93.83*	59.14

Explanatory Notes: Cell entries are the mean percentage of respondents who believed that ads by the indicated professionals should be regulated. An * represents a statistically significant difference from the relevant reference group as compared to the reported mean for the corresponding profession, at the .05 level or better ($p < .05$, two-tailed test). For example, in the Total Column, the mean percentage of all respondents supporting the regulation of ads by lawyers (70.72) is significantly different than the mean percentage of all respondents supporting such regulation of medical doctors (58.35); thus, the mean percentage supporting ad regulation for lawyers is the reference category for this column. For the remaining columns, an * represents a statistically significant difference from the corresponding overall mean for each of the indicated groups at the .05 level or better ($p < .05$, two-tailed test). For example, in the Court Participants column, the mean percentage of court participants supporting ad regulation by lawyers (74.91) is significantly different from the corresponding mean percentage of non-participants supporting such regulation.

**TABLE 4. FLORIDA RESPONDENTS' VIEWS ON THE CHANGE IN CONFIDENCE LEVEL
IN THE FLORIDA COURT SYSTEM OR PRESTIGE OF LAWYERS AFTER VIEWING LAWYER ADS (2010)**

Subsample/Question	Percentage of Respondents		Subsample/Question	Percentage of Respondents	
	TV Ad	Internet Ad		TV Ad	Internet Ad
Confidence in Court System After Viewing Ad	TV Ad	Internet Ad	Increased Perceived Integrity of Lawyers After Viewing Ad	TV Ad	Internet Ad
Lower	24.9	25.4	Court Participants	10.75*	7.44*
Same	58.7	53.0	Hispanics	21.50	57.75*
Higher	9.7	12.7	Whites	12.57	27.46
Don't Know/Refused	6.8	8.9	Non-Whites	38.95*	33.44
Increased Perceived Integrity of Lawyers After Viewing Ad	TV Ad	Internet Ad	High School Grad./GED	20.05	58.13
Strongly Disagree	43.5	30.7	College Grad.	7.37*	3.59*
Somewhat Disagree	19.6	28.3	Prof./Grad. School	11.78	32.97*
Neither Agree/Disagree	17.5	14.0	Income < \$20,000	53.68	23.00
Somewhat Agree	8.8	9.1	Income \$35,000-\$49,999	19.61*	19.83
Strongly Agree	8.0	17.6	Income >\$70,000	6.40*	19.19
Don't Know/Refused	2.5	0.3	Age 18-24	17.56	14.34
			Age 35-54	10.41	20.96
			Age 65+	7.36	40.06
Increased Confidence in Court System After Viewing Ad	TV Ad	Internet Ad	Increased Perceived Confidence of Florida Courts After Viewing Ad	TV Ad	Internet Ad
Strongly Disagree	43.9	28.0	Court Participants	10.05*	5.65*
Somewhat Disagree	22.9	31.2	Hispanics	25.09	57.75*
Neither Agree/Disagree	17.1	18.1	Whites	13.81	24.48
Somewhat Agree	5.1	2.1	Non-Whites	20.58	17.30
Strongly Agree	9.1	19.1	High School Grad./GED	15.38	37.15
NA/Don't Know/Refused	2.0	1.4	College Grad.	5.33*	5.57*
			Prof./Grad. School	6.51	0.00
			Income < \$20,000	39.29	68.96
			Income \$35,000-\$49,999	17.43*	25.31*
			Income >\$70,000	5.43*	8.21*
			Age 18-24	5.22	0.00
			Age 35-54	11.57	23.75*
			Age 65+	9.46	20.03*

	Subsample/Question	Percentage of Respondents	
	Respondents Who Perceived Improvement, or No Decline, in Court System After Viewing Ad	TV Ad	Internet Ad
	Court Participants	67.64*	67.84
	Hispanics	92.71*	100.00*
	Whites	74.12	72.67
	Non-Whites	73.13	70.58
	High School Grad./GED	70.97	73.80
	College Grad.	74.12	93.02
	Prof./Grad. School	71.44	80.91
	Income < \$20,000	88.44	39.54
	Income \$35,000-\$49,999	70.46*	49.20
	Income >\$70,000	76.19	63.62
	Age 18-24	71.39	89.41
	Age 35-54	70.07	65.06*
	Age 65+	63.94	43.19*

Explanatory Notes: An * represents a statistically significant difference from the mean for the base category for each of the indicated groups at the .05 level or better ($p < .05$, two-tailed test). For example, in the section of the table listing the results for those respondents who perceived an increase in the integrity of lawyers after viewing one type of ad, the mean prestige rating assigned by court participants (10.75) is significantly different from the corresponding mean rating assigned by non-participants. The other referent categories are: Hispanic-Non-Hispanic; Whites-Non-Whites; High School Graduates/GED holders vs. all other educational levels; Income < \$20,000 vs. all other income levels; and, Age 18-24 vs. all other age categor

