

# SCOTUS Survey - April 16, 2021



Sample 2158 U.S. Adult residents  
Conducted April 7 - 16, 2021  
Margin of Error  $\pm 2.3\%$

1. There are some religiously affiliated foster agencies that refuse to place foster children with same-sex couples. Some people think that governments can prohibit such agencies from participating in the foster care systems they operate unless the agencies allow children to be placed with same-sex couples. Other people think that doing so would violate the agencies' First Amendment rights to religious freedom. What do you think?

*Asked of a random half of respondents*

Prohibiting religious agencies from participating in the foster care system unless they allow children to be placed with same-sex couples DOES NOT VIOLATE agencies' First Amendment rights to religious freedom ..... 49%

Prohibiting religious agencies from participating in the foster care system unless they allow children to be placed with same-sex couples DOES VIOLATE agencies' First Amendment rights to religious freedom ..... 51%

2. The Supreme Court will be deciding this issue soon. Regardless of your personal views, how do you think the Supreme Court will decide?

*Asked of a random half of respondents*

Prohibiting religious agencies from participating in the foster care system unless they allow children to be placed with same-sex couples DOES NOT VIOLATE agencies' First Amendment rights to religious freedom ..... 46%

Prohibiting religious agencies from participating in the foster care system unless they allow children to be placed with same-sex couples DOES VIOLATE agencies' First Amendment rights to religious freedom ..... 54%

3. There are some religiously affiliated foster agencies that refuse to place foster children with same-sex couples. Some people think that governments cannot prohibit such agencies from participating in the foster care systems because doing so would violate the agencies' First Amendment rights to religious freedoms. Other people think that the government can prohibit such agencies from participating in the foster care systems they operate unless the agencies allow children to be placed with same-sex couples. What do you think?

*Asked of a random half of respondents*

Prohibiting religious agencies from participating in the foster care system unless they allow children to be placed with same-sex couples DOES VIOLATE agencies' First Amendment rights to religious freedom ..... 54%

Prohibiting religious agencies from participating in the foster care system unless they allow children to be placed with same-sex couples DOES NOT VIOLATE agencies' First Amendment rights to religious freedom ..... 46%

4. The Supreme Court will be deciding this issue soon. Regardless of your personal views, how do you think the Supreme Court will decide?

*Asked of a random half of respondents*

Prohibiting religious agencies from participating in the foster care system unless they allow children to be placed with same-sex couples DOES VIOLATE agencies' First Amendment rights to religious freedom ..... 54%

Prohibiting religious agencies from participating in the foster care system unless they allow children to be placed with same-sex couples DOES NOT VIOLATE agencies' First Amendment rights to religious freedom ..... 46%

5. Under the Affordable Care Act (ACA), there is a tax penalty for not buying health insurance. This is called the individual mandate. Recent legislation has set the tax penalty for not buying health insurance to \$0. Some people believe that, because the tax penalty is \$0, this means that the penalty is actually not a tax and it exceeds the federal government's power to tax and is unconstitutional. Other people believe that it does not exceed the federal government's power to tax and is constitutional. What do you think?

*Asked of a random half of respondents*

The individual mandate provision is not a tax and is UNCONSTITUTIONAL because it exceeds the federal government's power ..... 59%

The individual mandate provision is a tax and is CONSTITUTIONAL because it does not exceed the federal government's power ..... 41%

6. The Supreme Court will be deciding this issue soon. Regardless of your personal views, how do you think the Supreme Court will decide?

*Asked of a random half of respondents*

The individual mandate provision is not a tax and is UNCONSTITUTIONAL because it exceeds the federal government's power ..... 58%

The individual mandate provision is a tax and is CONSTITUTIONAL because it does not exceed the federal government's power ..... 42%

7. Under the Affordable Care Act (ACA), there is a tax penalty for not buying health insurance. This is called the individual mandate. Recent legislation has set the tax penalty for not buying health insurance to \$0. Some people believe that the penalty does not exceed the federal government's power to tax and is constitutional. Other people believe that, because the tax penalty is \$0, this means that the penalty is actually not a tax and it exceeds the federal government's power to tax and is unconstitutional. What do you think?

*Asked of a random half of respondents*

The individual mandate provision is a tax and is CONSTITUTIONAL because it does not exceed the federal government's power ..... 48%

The individual mandate provision is not a tax and is UNCONSTITUTIONAL because it exceeds the federal government's power ..... 52%

8. The Supreme Court will be deciding this issue soon. Regardless of your personal views, how do you think the Supreme Court will decide?

*Asked of a random half of respondents*

The individual mandate provision is a tax and is CONSTITUTIONAL because it does not exceed the federal government's power ..... 53%

The individual mandate provision is not a tax and is UNCONSTITUTIONAL because it exceeds the federal government's power ..... 47%

9. Under the Affordable Care Act (ACA), there is a tax penalty for not buying health insurance. This is called the individual mandate. Some people think that if the individual mandate is unconstitutional then the entirety of the ACA must also be unconstitutional. Other people disagree and think that if the individual mandate is unconstitutional, that should not affect the rest of the law. What do you think?

*Asked of a random half of respondents*

If the individual mandate is unconstitutional, then the ENTIRE LAW SHOULD BE STRUCK DOWN ..... 47%

If the individual mandate is unconstitutional, that should NOT AFFECT THE REST OF THE LAW ..... 53%

10. The Supreme Court will be deciding this issue soon. Regardless of your personal views, how do you think the Supreme Court will decide?

*Asked of a random half of respondents*

If the individual mandate is unconstitutional, then the ENTIRE LAW SHOULD BE STRUCK DOWN ..... 41%

If the individual mandate is unconstitutional, that should NOT AFFECT THE REST OF THE LAW ..... 59%

11. Under the Affordable Care Act (ACA), there is a tax penalty for not buying health insurance. This is called the individual mandate. Some people think that if the individual mandate is unconstitutional, that should not affect the rest of the law. Other people disagree and think that if the individual mandate is unconstitutional then the entirety of the ACA must also be unconstitutional. What do you think?

*Asked of a random half of respondents*

If the individual mandate is unconstitutional, that should NOT AFFECT THE REST OF THE LAW ..... 53%

If the individual mandate is unconstitutional, then the ENTIRE LAW SHOULD BE STRUCK DOWN ..... 47%

12. The Supreme Court will be deciding this issue soon. Regardless of your personal views, how do you think the Supreme Court will decide?

*Asked of a random half of respondents*

If the individual mandate is unconstitutional, that should NOT AFFECT THE REST OF THE LAW ..... 60%

If the individual mandate is unconstitutional, then the ENTIRE LAW SHOULD BE STRUCK DOWN ..... 40%

13. In Arizona, if a voter arrives at a polling place and is not listed on the voter roll for that precinct, the voter may still cast a provisional ballot. After election day, Arizona election officials review all provisional ballots to determine the voter's identity and address. If officials determine that the voter voted outside of their precinct, the ballot is discarded in its entirety, even if the voter was eligible to vote in most of the races on the ballot. Some people believe that discarding entire ballots in this manner is unlawful. Other people believe that it is lawful. What do you think?

*Asked of a random half of respondents*

Discarding entire ballots from voters who voted outside of their precinct IS UNLAWFUL . 55%

Discarding entire ballots from voters who voted outside of their precinct IS LAWFUL ..... 45%

14. The Supreme Court will be deciding this issue soon. Regardless of your personal views, how do you think the Supreme Court will decide?

*Asked of a random half of respondents*

Discarding entire ballots from voters who voted outside of their precinct IS UNLAWFUL . 48%

Discarding entire ballots from voters who voted outside of their precinct IS LAWFUL ..... 52%

15. In Arizona, if a voter arrives at a polling place and is not listed on the voter roll for that precinct, the voter may still cast a provisional ballot. After election day, Arizona election officials review all provisional ballots to determine the voter's identity and address. If officials determine that the voter voted outside of their precinct, the ballot is discarded in its entirety, even if the voter was eligible to vote in most of the races on the ballot. Some people believe that discarding entire ballots in this manner is lawful. Other people believe that it is unlawful. What do you think?

*Asked of a random half of respondents*

Discarding entire ballots from voters who voted outside of their precinct IS LAWFUL ..... 53%  
Discarding entire ballots from voters who voted outside of their precinct IS UNLAWFUL . 47%

16. The Supreme Court will be deciding this issue soon. Regardless of your personal views, how do you think the Supreme Court will decide?

*Asked of a random half of respondents*

Discarding entire ballots from voters who voted outside of their precinct IS LAWFUL ..... 55%  
Discarding entire ballots from voters who voted outside of their precinct IS UNLAWFUL . 45%

17. Arizona offers in-person voting at a precinct or vote center either on election day or during an early-vote period. Many voters – particularly racial minorities – who vote early rely on another person to collect and drop off voted ballots. However, the Arizona legislature made it illegal to collect and deliver another person's ballot. Some people think that voters should be able to rely on another person or third party to collect and drop off ballots. Other people think that states can forbid this. What do you think?

*Asked of a random half of respondents*

Voters SHOULD BE ABLE to rely on another person or third party to collect and drop off ballots ..... 52%  
STATES CAN FORBID voters from relying on another person or third party to collect and drop off ballots ..... 48%

18. The Supreme Court will be deciding this issue soon. Regardless of your personal views, how do you think the Supreme Court will decide?

*Asked of a random half of respondents*

Voters SHOULD BE ABLE to rely on another person or third party to collect and drop off ballots ..... 45%  
STATES CAN FORBID voters from relying on another person or third party to collect and drop off ballots ..... 55%

19. Arizona offers in-person voting at a precinct or vote center either on election day or during an early-vote period. Many voters – particularly racial minorities – who vote early rely on another person to collect and drop off voted ballots. However, the Arizona legislature made it illegal to collect and deliver another person's ballot. Some people think that states can forbid voters from relying on another person or third party to collect and drop off ballots. Other people think that voters should be able to rely on another person or third party to collect and drop off ballots. What do you think?

*Asked of a random half of respondents*

STATES CAN FORBID voters from relying on another person or third party to collect and drop off ballots ..... 52%  
Voters SHOULD BE ABLE to rely on another person or third party to collect and drop off ballots ..... 48%

20. The Supreme Court will be deciding this issue soon. Regardless of your personal views, how do you think the Supreme Court will decide?

*Asked of a random half of respondents*

STATES CAN FORBID voters from relying on another person or third party to collect and drop off ballots .....57%  
 Voters SHOULD BE ABLE to rely on another person or third party to collect and drop off ballots .....43%

21. To detect possible fraud, the attorney general of California requires private nonprofit organizations to report the names and addresses of their major donors to the state, which keeps this information confidential. Some people think that this violates nonprofit organizations' First Amendment rights to free association because it might deter people from financially supporting them. Other people do not think that this violates nonprofit organizations' First Amendment rights to free association. What do you think?

*Asked of a random half of respondents*

Requiring nonprofit organizations to report information to the state about their major donors VIOLATES their First Amendment rights .....41%  
 Requiring nonprofit organizations to report information to the state about their major donors DOES NOT VIOLATE their First Amendment rights .....59%

22. The Supreme Court will be deciding this issue soon. Regardless of your personal views, how do you think the Supreme Court will decide?

*Asked of a random half of respondents*

Requiring nonprofit organizations to report information to the state about their major donors VIOLATES their First Amendment rights .....51%  
 Requiring nonprofit organizations to report information to the state about their major donors DOES NOT VIOLATE their First Amendment rights .....49%

23. To detect possible fraud, the attorney general of California requires private nonprofit organizations to report the names and addresses of their major donors to the state, which keeps this information confidential. Some people do not think that this violates nonprofit organizations' First Amendment rights to free association. Other people think that this violates nonprofit organizations' First Amendment rights to free association because it might deter people from financially supporting them. What do you think?

*Asked of a random half of respondents*

Requiring nonprofit organizations to report information to the state about their major donors DOES NOT VIOLATE their First Amendment rights .....61%  
 Requiring nonprofit organizations to report information to the state about their major donors VIOLATES their First Amendment rights .....39%

24. The Supreme Court will be deciding this issue soon. Regardless of your personal views, how do you think the Supreme Court will decide?

*Asked of a random half of respondents*

Requiring nonprofit organizations to report information to the state about their major donors DOES NOT VIOLATE their First Amendment rights .....55%  
 Requiring nonprofit organizations to report information to the state about their major donors VIOLATES their First Amendment rights .....45%

25. Some people think that public school officials can punish students for things they say or write off campus, including on social media, without violating students' First Amendment rights to free speech. Other people think that such punishments violate students' First Amendment rights to free speech. What do you think?

*Asked of a random half of respondents*

Public school officials CAN punish students for things they say or write off campus ..... 31%  
Public school officials CANNOT punish students for things they say or write off campus . 69%

26. The Supreme Court will be deciding this issue soon. Regardless of your personal views, how do you think the Supreme Court will decide?

*Asked of a random half of respondents*

Public school officials CAN punish students for things they say or write off campus ..... 34%  
Public school officials CANNOT punish students for things they say or write off campus . 66%

27. Some people think that public school officials punishing students for things they say or write off campus, including on social media, violates students' First Amendment rights to free speech. Other people think that such punishments do not violate students' First Amendment rights to free speech. What do you think?

*Asked of a random half of respondents*

Public school officials CANNOT punish students for things they say or write off campus . 72%  
Public school officials CAN punish students for things they say or write off campus ..... 28%

28. The Supreme Court will be deciding this issue soon. Regardless of your personal views, how do you think the Supreme Court will decide?

*Asked of a random half of respondents*

Public school officials CANNOT punish students for things they say or write off campus . 68%  
Public school officials CAN punish students for things they say or write off campus ..... 32%

29. There are states that reserve the ability to sentence juvenile criminal defendants to life sentences without the possibility of any parole. Some people think that such juvenile defendants must be found to be incorrigible – or impossible of being reformed – before being sentenced to life without parole. Other people think that juveniles can be sentenced to life sentences without parole without states having to make such a determination. What do you think?

*Asked of a random half of respondents*

Juvenile defendants MUST BE FOUND to be incorrigible before being sentenced to a life sentence without parole ..... 71%  
Juvenile defendants NEED NOT BE FOUND to be incorrigible before being sentenced to a life sentence without parole ..... 29%

30. The Supreme Court will be deciding this issue soon. Regardless of your personal views, how do you think the Supreme Court will decide?

*Asked of a random half of respondents*

Juvenile defendants MUST BE FOUND to be incorrigible before being sentenced to a life sentence without parole ..... 66%  
Juvenile defendants NEED NOT BE FOUND to be incorrigible before being sentenced to a life sentence without parole ..... 34%

31. Some people think that such juvenile defendants need not be found to be incorrigible – or impossible of being reformed – before being sentenced to life without parole. Other people think that juveniles cannot be sentenced to life sentences without parole without states having to make such a determination. What do you think?

*Asked of a random half of respondents*

Juvenile defendants NEED NOT BE FOUND to be incorrigible before being sentenced to a life sentence without parole ..... 30%

Juvenile defendants MUST BE FOUND to be incorrigible before being sentenced to a life sentence without parole ..... 70%

32. The Supreme Court will be deciding this issue soon. Regardless of your personal views, how do you think the Supreme Court will decide?

*Asked of a random half of respondents*

Juvenile defendants NEED NOT BE FOUND to be incorrigible before being sentenced to a life sentence without parole ..... 35%

Juvenile defendants MUST BE FOUND to be incorrigible before being sentenced to a life sentence without parole ..... 65%

33. Law enforcement officers have access to several government databases to use for investigations and other law enforcement activities. Some people believe that using government databases for uses not explicitly authorized should be punished, even if the user had lawful access to the database. Others believe that using government databases for other uses not explicitly authorized should not be punished, so long as the user had lawful access to the database. What do you think?

*Asked of a random half of respondents*

Using government databases for uses not explicitly authorized SHOULD BE PUNISHED 70%

Using government databases for uses not explicitly authorized SHOULD NOT BE PUNISHED ..... 30%

34. The Supreme Court will be deciding this issue soon. Regardless of your personal views, how do you think the Supreme Court will decide?

*Asked of a random half of respondents*

Using government databases for uses not explicitly authorized SHOULD BE PUNISHED 66%

Using government databases for uses not explicitly authorized SHOULD NOT BE PUNISHED ..... 34%

35. Law enforcement officers have access to several government databases to use for investigations and other law enforcement activities. Some people believe that using government databases for uses not explicitly authorized should not be punished, so long as the user had lawful access to the database. Others believe that using government databases for uses not explicitly authorized should be punished, even if the user had lawful access to the database. What do you think?

*Asked of a random half of respondents*

Using government databases for uses not explicitly authorized SHOULD NOT BE PUNISHED ..... 34%

Using government databases for uses not explicitly authorized SHOULD BE PUNISHED 66%



36. The Supreme Court will be deciding this issue soon. Regardless of your personal views, how do you think the Supreme Court will decide?

*Asked of a random half of respondents*

Using government databases for uses not explicitly authorized SHOULD NOT BE PUNISHED ..... 40%  
 Using government databases for uses not explicitly authorized SHOULD BE PUNISHED .. 60%

37. The National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) strictly limits colleges and universities from providing paid compensation to college athletes. Some people think the NCAA's strict limits on paid compensation for college athletes in this manner is an unlawful form of coordination against athletes. Others disagree and think that the NCAA should be able to strictly limit colleges and universities from providing paid compensation to college athletes. What do you think?

*Asked of a random half of respondents*

The NCAA SHOULD NOT BE ABLE TO strictly limit paid compensation to college athletes. .... 50%  
 The NCAA SHOULD BE ABLE TO strictly limit paid compensation to college athletes. .. 50%

38. The Supreme Court will be deciding this issue soon. Regardless of your personal views, how do you think the Supreme Court will decide?

*Asked of a random half of respondents*

The NCAA SHOULD NOT BE ABLE TO strictly limit paid compensation to college athletes. .... 51%  
 The NCAA SHOULD BE ABLE TO strictly limit paid compensation to college athletes. .. 49%

39. The National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) strictly limits colleges and universities from providing paid compensation to college athletes. Some people think that the NCAA should be able to strictly limit colleges and universities from providing paid compensation to college athletes. Other people disagree and think the NCAA's strict limits on paid compensation for college athletes is an unlawful form of coordination against athletes. What do you think?

*Asked of a random half of respondents*

The NCAA SHOULD BE ABLE TO strictly limit paid compensation to college athletes. .. 50%  
 The NCAA SHOULD NOT BE ABLE TO strictly limit paid compensation to college athletes. .... 50%

40. The Supreme Court will be deciding this issue soon. Regardless of your personal views, how do you think the Supreme Court will decide?

*Asked of a random half of respondents*

The NCAA SHOULD BE ABLE TO strictly limit paid compensation to college athletes. .. 55%  
 The NCAA SHOULD NOT BE ABLE TO strictly limit paid compensation to college athletes. .... 45%



41. Many states have prohibited large in-person gatherings due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Some people think that states cannot prohibit in-person religious gatherings because of the First Amendment right to free exercise of religion. Other people think that states can prohibit in-person religious gatherings. What do you think?

*Asked of a random half of respondents*

States CANNOT prohibit in-person religious gatherings because of the First Amendment right to free exercise of religion .....53%

States CAN prohibit in-person religious gatherings despite the First Amendment right to free exercise of religion .....47%

42. The Supreme Court will be deciding this issue soon. Regardless of your personal views, how do you think the Supreme Court will decide?

*Asked of a random half of respondents*

States CANNOT prohibit in-person religious gatherings because of the First Amendment right to free exercise of religion .....65%

States CAN prohibit in-person religious gatherings despite the First Amendment right to free exercise of religion .....35%

43. Many states have prohibited large in-person gatherings due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Some people think that states can prohibit in-person religious gatherings. Other people think that states cannot prohibit in-person religious gatherings because of the First Amendment right to free exercise of religion. What do you think?

*Asked of a random half of respondents*

States CAN prohibit in-person religious gatherings despite the First Amendment right to free exercise of religion .....46%

States CANNOT prohibit in-person religious gatherings because of the First Amendment right to free exercise of religion .....54%

44. The Supreme Court will be deciding this issue soon. Regardless of your personal views, how do you think the Supreme Court will decide?

*Asked of a random half of respondents*

States CAN prohibit in-person religious gatherings despite the First Amendment right to free exercise of religion .....39%

States CANNOT prohibit in-person religious gatherings because of the First Amendment right to free exercise of religion .....61%

45. California law requires that employers allow union representatives to enter a company's private property to meet with employees and solicit support for labor organizing. Some people believe that this is akin to the government taking companies' private property without compensation. Other people argue that the law is acceptable, and is not the government taking companies' private property without compensation. What do you think?

*Asked of a random half of respondents*

States CANNOT require that employers allow union representatives to enter a company's private property .....50%

States CAN require that employers allow union representatives to enter a company's private property .....50%

46. The Supreme Court will be deciding this issue soon. Regardless of your personal views, how do you think the Supreme Court will decide?

*Asked of a random half of respondents*

States CANNOT require that employers allow union representatives to enter a company's private property ..... 56%

States CAN require that employers allow union representatives to enter a company's private property ..... 44%

47. California law requires that employers allow union representatives to enter a company's private property to meet with employees and solicit support for labor organizing. Some people believe that this law is acceptable. Other people argue that this is akin to the government taking companies' private property without compensation. What do you think?

*Asked of a random half of respondents*

States CAN require that employers allow union representatives to enter a company's private property ..... 47%

States CANNOT require that employers allow union representatives to enter a company's private property ..... 53%

48. The Supreme Court will be deciding this issue soon. Regardless of your personal views, how do you think the Supreme Court will decide?

*Asked of a random half of respondents*

States CAN require that employers allow union representatives to enter a company's private property ..... 46%

States CANNOT require that employers allow union representatives to enter a company's private property ..... 54%

49. Some federal government agencies – such as the Federal Housing Finance Agency – are headed by a single director who may be removed from office by the president only for a specific cause rather than for any reason the president wishes. Some people think that this leadership structure is unconstitutional because it infringes on the president's authority over the executive branch, including such federal agencies. Other people disagree and think that this leadership structure is not unconstitutional because it does not infringe on the president's authority over the executive branch. What do you think?

*Asked of a random half of respondents*

Limiting the president to only firing agency heads for a specific reason INFRINGES on the president's authority ..... 48%

Limiting the president to only firing agency heads for a specific reason DOES NOT INFRINGE on the president's authority ..... 52%

50. The Supreme Court will be deciding this issue soon. Regardless of your personal views, how do you think the Supreme Court will decide?

*Asked of a random half of respondents*

Limiting the president to only firing agency heads for a specific reason INFRINGES on the president's authority ..... 48%

Limiting the president to only firing agency heads for a specific reason DOES NOT INFRINGE on the president's authority ..... 52%

51. Some federal government agencies – such as the Federal Housing Finance Agency – are headed by a single director who may be removed from office by the president only for a specific cause rather than for any reason the president wishes. Some people think that this leadership structure is not unconstitutional because it does not infringe on the president's authority over the executive branch. Other people disagree and think that this leadership structure is unconstitutional because it infringes on the president's authority over the executive branch, including such federal agencies. What do you think?

*Asked of a random half of respondents*

Limiting the president to only firing agency heads for a specific reason DOES NOT INFRINGE on the president's authority ..... 57%

Limiting the president to only firing agency heads for a specific reason INFRINGES on the president's authority ..... 43%

52. The Supreme Court will be deciding this issue soon. Regardless of your personal views, how do you think the Supreme Court will decide?

*Asked of a random half of respondents*

Limiting the president to only firing agency heads for a specific reason DOES NOT INFRINGE on the president's authority ..... 59%

Limiting the president to only firing agency heads for a specific reason INFRINGES on the president's authority ..... 41%

53. Police officers sometimes pursue people who flee in cars and who refuse to pull over. Some people think that a police officer should be able to enter someone's home without a warrant if they are in pursuit of them when that person enters their home. Other people think that it is unconstitutional for police to enter someone's home without a warrant except when there is a genuine emergency. What do you think?

*Asked of a random half of respondents*

Police SHOULD be able to enter someone's house without a warrant if they are in pursuit of them when that person enters their home ..... 45%

Police SHOULD NOT be able to enter someone's house without a warrant if they are in pursuit of them when that person enters their home ..... 55%

54. The Supreme Court will be deciding this issue soon. Regardless of your personal views, how do you think the Supreme Court will decide?

*Asked of a random half of respondents*

Police SHOULD be able to enter someone's house without a warrant if they are in pursuit of them when that person enters their home ..... 51%

Police SHOULD NOT be able to enter someone's house without a warrant if they are in pursuit of them when that person enters their home ..... 49%

55. Police officers sometimes pursue people who flee in cars and who refuse to pull over. Some people think that it is unconstitutional for police to enter someone's home without a warrant except when there is a genuine emergency. Other people think that a police officer should be able to enter someone's home without a warrant if they are in pursuit of them when that person enters their home. What do you think?

*Asked of a random half of respondents*

Police SHOULD NOT be able to enter someone's house without a warrant if they are in pursuit of them when that person enters their home ..... 50%

Police SHOULD be able to enter someone's house without a warrant if they are in pursuit of them when that person enters their home ..... 50%

56. The Supreme Court will be deciding this issue soon. Regardless of your personal views, how do you think the Supreme Court will decide?

*Asked of a random half of respondents*

Police SHOULD NOT be able to enter someone's house without a warrant if they are in pursuit of them when that person enters their home ..... 50%

Police SHOULD be able to enter someone's house without a warrant if they are in pursuit of them when that person enters their home ..... 50%

57. The Supreme Court has nine members. For the issues that we asked you about earlier, what do you think the breakdown in the votes on the Court would typically be?

9-0 ..... 7%

8-1 ..... 7%

7-2 ..... 18%

6-3 ..... 34%

5-4 ..... 34%

58. Some judges in the U.S. are elected; others are appointed to the bench. Do you happen to know if the Justices of the U.S. Supreme Court are elected or appointed to the bench?

Elected to the bench ..... 14%

Appointed to the bench ..... 72%

Neither ..... 14%

59. Some judges in the U.S. serve for a set number of years; others serve a life term. Do you happen to know whether the Justices of the U.S. Supreme Court serve for a set number of years or whether they serve a life term?

Set number of years ..... 18%

Life term ..... 70%

Neither ..... 12%

60. Do you happen to know who has the last say when there is a conflict over the meaning of the U.S. Constitution—the U.S. Supreme Court, the U.S. Congress, or the President?

U.S. Congress ..... 16%

U.S. Supreme Court ..... 71%

The President ..... 12%

61. Please select the name of the current Chief Justice of the United States from the choices below:

Stephen Breyer ..... 9%

Samuel Alito ..... 9%

Elena Kagan ..... 8%

John Roberts ..... 65%

Neil Gorsuch ..... 10%

62. Please select the name of the Justice who most recently joined the U.S. Supreme Court from the choices below:

Sonia Sotomayor .....	8%
Neil Gorsuch .....	7%
John Roberts .....	7%
Brett Kavanaugh .....	12%
Amy Coney Barrett .....	66%

63. Supreme Court justices are appointed by the President of the United States. How many of the current nine justices do you think were appointed by Republican presidents?

9 out of 9 .....	4%
8 out of 9 .....	3%
7 out of 9 .....	7%
6 out of 9 .....	32%
5 out of 9 .....	27%
4 out of 9 .....	13%
3 out of 9 .....	5%
2 out of 9 .....	4%
1 out of 9 .....	2%
0 out of 9 .....	2%

64. How much do you think the political party of the appointing president affects how Supreme Court justices decide cases?

A great deal .....	26%
A lot .....	24%
A moderate amount .....	31%
A little .....	11%
Not at all .....	9%

65. Do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
If the U.S. Supreme Court started making a lot of decisions that most people disagree with, it might be better to do away with the Supreme Court altogether.	7%	14%	28%	24%	27%
The U.S. Supreme Court can usually be trusted to make decisions that are right for the country as a whole.	10%	32%	37%	15%	6%
The U.S. Supreme Court gets too mixed up in politics.	17%	31%	34%	14%	4%

*continued on the next page ...*

*continued from previous page*

Judges on the U.S. Supreme Court who consistently make decisions at odds with what a majority of the people want should be removed from their position as judge.	11%	20%	34%	21%	14%
The U.S. Supreme Court has become too independent and should be reined in.	9%	15%	36%	24%	16%

66. The U.S. Supreme Court has nine members. Some people believe that Congress should expand the size of the Supreme Court, allowing the current president to appoint one or more new Justices. Do you agree or disagree that the size of the Supreme Court should be increased?

Strongly Agree	12%
Agree	20%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	27%
Disagree	16%
Strongly Disagree	26%

67. U.S. Supreme Court Justices currently serve life terms. Some people think that, instead, Supreme Court Justices should be limited to 18-year terms. Do you agree or disagree that there should be such term limits for Supreme Court Justices?

Strongly Agree	23%
Agree	28%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	29%
Disagree	11%
Strongly Disagree	9%

68. Some people seem to follow what's going on in government and public affairs most of the time, whether there's an election going on or not. Others aren't that interested. Would you say you follow what's going on in government and public affairs ...

Most of the time	44%
Some of the time	27%
Only now and then	15%
Hardly at all	8%
Don't know	6%

69. In general, how would you describe your own political viewpoint?

Liberal	28%
Moderate	30%
Conservative	31%
Not sure	11%

## 70. Are you registered to vote?

Registered .....	71%
Not registered .....	29%

## 71. Who did you vote for in the election for President in 2020?

Joe Biden .....	31%
Donald Trump .....	28%
Jo Jorgensen .....	1%
Howie Hawkins .....	0%
Other .....	0%
Did not vote for President .....	40%

## 72. Generally speaking, do you think of yourself as a ...?

Democrat .....	34%
Republican .....	26%
Independent .....	29%
Other .....	3%
Not sure .....	9%

## 73. Are you...?

Male .....	48%
Female .....	52%

## 74. Respondent age by category

Under 30 .....	20%
30-44 .....	25%
45-64 .....	34%
65+ .....	21%

## 75. What racial or ethnic group best describes you?

White .....	63%
Black .....	12%
Hispanic .....	16%
Other .....	9%

## 76. What is the highest level of education you have completed?

HS or less .....	39%
Some college .....	28%
College grad .....	21%
Postgrad .....	12%



## 77. What is your marital status?

Married	46%
Separated	3%
Divorced	11%
Widowed	6%
Never married	29%
Domestic / civil partnership	5%

## 78. Are you the parent or guardian of any children under the age of 18?

Yes	22%
No	78%

## 79. Calculated from respondent's state of residence

Northeast	17%
Midwest	21%
South	38%
West	24%

## 80. How would you describe the place where you live?

City	31%
Suburb	35%
Town	13%
Rural area	20%
Other	1%

## 81. Thinking back over the last year, what was your family's annual income?

Under \$50K	43%
\$50-100K	25%
\$100K or more	19%
Prefer not to say	12%