

SCOTUS Survey - March 25, 2024



Sample 2218 U.S. Adults
Conducted March 18 - 25, 2024
Margin of Error $\pm 2.4\%$

1. A proposed South Carolina election map changes district boundaries to re-assign thousands of Black voters to different districts. Some people claim these changes were made because of the voters' race, and so the map is unconstitutional. Other people claim the changes were not made because of the voters' race but because they were mostly Democrats, and so the map is constitutional. What do you think?

Asked of a random half of respondents

These changes to the districts are unconstitutional 70%
These changes to the districts are constitutional 30%

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

These changes to the districts are unconstitutional 51%
These changes to the districts are constitutional 49%

3. A proposed South Carolina election map changes district boundaries to re-assign thousands of Black voters to different districts. Some people claim the changes were not made because of the voters' race but because they were mostly Democrats, and so the map is constitutional. Other people claim these changes were made because of the voters' race, and so the map is unconstitutional. What do you think?

Asked of a random half of respondents

These changes to the districts are constitutional 35%
These changes to the districts are unconstitutional 65%

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

These changes to the districts are constitutional 54%
These changes to the districts are unconstitutional 46%

5. Funding for the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau is not appropriated by Congress but is instead taken from the Federal Reserve, which collects fees from banks. Some other federal agencies have similar funding structures that also bypass Congress. Some people think this funding structure is unconstitutional, since the Constitution specifically gives Congress the power to appropriate federal funds. Other people think this structure is constitutional. What do you think?

Asked of a random half of respondents

This funding structure is unconstitutional 60%
This funding structure is constitutional 40%

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

This funding structure is unconstitutional 51%
This funding structure is constitutional 49%

7. Funding for the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau is not appropriated by Congress but is instead taken from the Federal Reserve, which collects fees from banks. Some other federal agencies have similar funding structures that also bypass Congress. Some people think this structure is constitutional. Other people think this funding structure is unconstitutional, since the Constitution specifically gives Congress the power to appropriate federal funds. What do you think?

Asked of a random half of respondents

This funding structure is constitutional 52%
 This funding structure is unconstitutional 48%

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

This funding structure is constitutional 55%
 This funding structure is unconstitutional 45%

9. Some people think that the Food and Drug Administration's approval of the abortion drug mifepristone (also known as RU-486), which is prescribed by a physician and taken by mouth, should be revoked. Other people think that it should not be revoked. What do you think?

Asked of a random half of respondents

The Food and Drug Administration's approval of mifepristone should be revoked 34%
 The Food and Drug Administration's approval of mifepristone should NOT be revoked ... 66%

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

The Food and Drug Administration's approval of mifepristone should be revoked 45%
 The Food and Drug Administration's approval of mifepristone should NOT be revoked ... 55%

11. Some people think that the Food and Drug Administration's approval of the abortion drug mifepristone (also known as RU-486), which is prescribed by a physician and taken by mouth, should not be revoked. Other people think that it should be revoked. What do you think?

Asked of a random half of respondents

The Food and Drug Administration's approval of mifepristone should NOT be revoked ... 69%
 The Food and Drug Administration's approval of mifepristone should be revoked 31%

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

The Food and Drug Administration's approval of mifepristone should NOT be revoked ... 59%
 The Food and Drug Administration's approval of mifepristone should be revoked 41%

13. The Sackler family, the owners of Purdue Pharma, profited for many years from the sale of prescription opioids. They recently agreed to give billions of dollars to victims of the opioid epidemic in return for immunity from future lawsuits, but not all victims agreed to this deal. Some people think that the Sackler family receiving immunity from future lawsuits should not be allowed. Other people think this agreement should remain in place and the Sackler family should keep their immunity. What do you think?

Asked of a random half of respondents

The Sackler family should NOT keep their immunity from future lawsuits75%
 The Sackler family should keep their immunity from future lawsuits25%

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

The Sackler family should NOT keep their immunity from future lawsuits54%
 The Sackler family should keep their immunity from future lawsuits46%

15. The Sackler family, the owners of Purdue Pharma, profited for many years from the sale of prescription opioids. They recently agreed to give billions of dollars to victims of the opioid epidemic in return for immunity from future lawsuits, but not all victims agreed to this deal. Some people think this agreement should remain in place and the Sackler family should keep their immunity. Other people think that the Sackler family receiving immunity from future lawsuits should not be allowed. What do you think?

Asked of a random half of respondents

The Sackler family should keep their immunity from future lawsuits28%
 The Sackler family should NOT keep their immunity from future lawsuits72%

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

The Sackler family should keep their immunity from future lawsuits48%
 The Sackler family should NOT keep their immunity from future lawsuits52%

17. There are public officials who sometimes use private social media accounts to conduct or announce government business. Some people think that public officials are allowed to block people from such accounts. Other people think that the First Amendment prohibits public officials from blocking people from such accounts. What do you think?

Asked of a random half of respondents

Public officials are allowed to block people from private social media accounts used to conduct government business40%
 Public officials are NOT allowed to block people from private social media accounts used to conduct government business60%

18. The Supreme Court recently decided this issue. Regardless of your personal views, how do you think the Supreme Court decided?

Asked of a random half of respondents

Public officials are allowed to block people from private social media accounts used to conduct government business47%
 Public officials are NOT allowed to block people from private social media accounts used to conduct government business53%

19. There are public officials who sometimes use private social media accounts to conduct or announce government business. Some people think that the First Amendment prohibits public officials from blocking people from such accounts. Other people think that public officials are allowed to block people from such accounts. What do you think?

Asked of a random half of respondents

Public officials are NOT allowed to block people from private social media accounts used to conduct government business 64%

Public officials are allowed to block people from private social media accounts used to conduct government business 36%

20. The Supreme Court recently decided this issue. Regardless of your personal views, how do you think the Supreme Court decided?

Asked of a random half of respondents

Public officials are NOT allowed to block people from private social media accounts used to conduct government business 57%

Public officials are allowed to block people from private social media accounts used to conduct government business 43%

21. Courts usually defer to how administrative agencies interpret laws in situations where the law is unclear. Some people think that courts should not defer to administrative agencies when laws are unclear because that gives these agencies too much power. Others think that administrative agencies employ experts, and so courts should defer to them in these situations. What do you think?

Asked of a random half of respondents

Courts should NOT defer to administrative agencies when laws are unclear 51%

Courts should defer to administrative agencies when laws are unclear 49%

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

Courts should NOT defer to administrative agencies when laws are unclear 53%

Courts should defer to administrative agencies when laws are unclear 47%

23. Courts usually defer to how administrative agencies interpret laws in situations where the law is unclear. Some think that administrative agencies employ experts, and so courts should defer to administrative agencies when laws are unclear. Other people think that courts should not defer to administrative agencies in these cases because that gives these agencies too much power. What do you think?

Asked of a random half of respondents

Courts should defer to administrative agencies when laws are unclear 53%

Courts should NOT defer to administrative agencies when laws are unclear 47%

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

Courts should defer to administrative agencies when laws are unclear 47%

Courts should NOT defer to administrative agencies when laws are unclear 53%

25. Idaho law criminalizes most abortions. However, federal law requires that hospitals receiving federal funds must provide abortions in medical emergencies. Some people think that Idaho law supercedes federal law, and so Idaho hospitals are not allowed to provide abortions to women in medical emergencies. Other people think that federal law supercedes Idaho law, and so Idaho hospitals that receive federal funds must provide abortions. What do you think?

Asked of a random half of respondents

Idaho hospitals are not allowed to provide abortions in medical emergencies 21%
 Idaho hospitals must provide abortions in medical emergencies 79%

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

Idaho hospitals are not allowed to provide abortions in medical emergencies 35%
 Idaho hospitals must provide abortions in medical emergencies 65%

27. Idaho law criminalizes most abortions. However, federal law requires that hospitals receiving federal funds must provide abortions in medical emergencies. Some people think that federal law supercedes Idaho law, and so Idaho hospitals that receive federal funds must provide abortions to women in medical emergencies. Other people think that Idaho law supercedes federal law, and so Idaho hospitals are not allowed to provide abortions. What do you think?

Asked of a random half of respondents

Idaho hospitals must provide abortions in medical emergencies 86%
 Idaho hospitals are not allowed to provide abortions in medical emergencies 14%

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

Idaho hospitals must provide abortions in medical emergencies 68%
 Idaho hospitals are not allowed to provide abortions in medical emergencies 32%

29. Recently federal officials urged private social media companies such as Facebook and Twitter to block, delete, or remove users expressing disinformation or disfavored views on controversial topics, including COVID-19 and election fraud. Some people think that this violates users' First Amendment right to free speech. Other people think that it does not. What do you think?

Asked of a random half of respondents

Federal officials urging private social media companies to block, delete, or remove users violates users' First Amendment rights 62%
 Federal officials urging private social media companies to block, delete, or remove users does NOT violate users' First Amendment rights 38%

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

Federal officials urging private social media companies to block, delete, or remove users violates users' First Amendment rights 60%
 Federal officials urging private social media companies to block, delete, or remove users does NOT violate users' First Amendment rights 40%

31. Recently federal officials urged private social media companies such as Facebook and Twitter to block, delete, or remove users expressing disinformation or disfavored views on controversial topics, including COVID-19 and election fraud. Some people think that this does not violate users' First Amendment right to free speech. Other people think it does. What do you think?

Asked of a random half of respondents

Federal officials urging private social media companies to block, delete, or remove users does NOT violate users' First Amendment rights 37%

Federal officials urging private social media companies to block, delete, or remove users violates users' First Amendment rights 63%

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

Federal officials urging private social media companies to block, delete, or remove users does NOT violate users' First Amendment rights 38%

Federal officials urging private social media companies to block, delete, or remove users violates users' First Amendment rights 62%

33. Following a school shooting, a state regulator told financial services companies that they should consider refusing to provide services to the National Rifle Association (NRA). Some people think that the state regulator's behavior violates the NRA's First Amendment rights. Other people say it does not. What do you think?

Asked of a random half of respondents

The state regulator's behavior violates the NRA's First Amendment Rights 56%

The state regulator's behavior DOES NOT violate the NRA's First Amendment Rights ... 44%

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

The state regulator's behavior violates the NRA's First Amendment Rights 64%

The state regulator's behavior DOES NOT violate the NRA's First Amendment Rights ... 36%

35. Following a school shooting, a state regulator told financial services companies that they should consider refusing to provide services to the National Rifle Association (NRA). Some people think that the state regulator's behavior does not violate the NRA's First Amendment rights. Other people say it does. What do you think?

Asked of a random half of respondents

The state regulator's behavior DOES NOT violate the NRA's First Amendment Rights ... 49%

The state regulator's behavior violates the NRA's First Amendment Rights 51%

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

The state regulator's behavior DOES NOT violate the NRA's First Amendment Rights ... 41%

The state regulator's behavior violates the NRA's First Amendment Rights 59%

37. Social media companies often remove content from their websites for various reasons. Some people think that states should be allowed to prevent social media companies from censoring speech based on the viewpoint of the user. Other people think that states cannot do that because it violates social media companies' First Amendment rights. What do you think?

Asked of a random half of respondents

States should be allowed to prevent social media companies from censoring speech 41%
 States cannot prevent social media companies from censoring speech 59%

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

States should be allowed to prevent social media companies from censoring speech 46%
 States cannot prevent social media companies from censoring speech 54%

39. Social media companies often remove content from their websites for various reasons. Some people think that states cannot prevent social media companies from censoring speech based on the viewpoint of the user because it violates social media companies' First Amendment rights. Other people think that states should be allowed to do that. What do you think?

Asked of a random half of respondents

States cannot prevent social media companies from censoring speech 60%
 States should be allowed to prevent social media companies from censoring speech 40%

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

States cannot prevent social media companies from censoring speech 57%
 States should be allowed to prevent social media companies from censoring speech 43%

41. Some federal agencies bring actions in administrative proceedings with their own judges rather than in regular federal courts. Some people think this is unconstitutional because these proceedings do not have jury trials the way federal courts do. Other people think that such proceedings are constitutional. What do you think?

Asked of a random half of respondents

Federal agencies bringing actions in administrative proceedings rather than in federal courts is NOT constitutional 70%
 Federal agencies bringing actions in administrative proceedings rather than in federal courts is constitutional 30%

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

Federal agencies bringing actions in administrative proceedings rather than in federal courts is NOT constitutional 59%
 Federal agencies bringing actions in administrative proceedings rather than in federal courts is constitutional 41%

43. Some federal agencies bring actions in administrative proceedings with their own judges rather than in regular federal courts. Some people think that such proceedings are constitutional. Other people think this is unconstitutional because these proceedings do not have jury trials the way federal courts do. What do you think?

Asked of a random half of respondents

Federal agencies bringing actions in administrative proceedings rather than in federal courts is constitutional	34%
Federal agencies bringing actions in administrative proceedings rather than in federal courts is NOT constitutional	66%

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

Federal agencies bringing actions in administrative proceedings rather than in federal courts is constitutional	46%
Federal agencies bringing actions in administrative proceedings rather than in federal courts is NOT constitutional	54%

45. Some people think that Donald Trump is not eligible to run for president in 2024 because the 14th Amendment's ban on insurrectionists holding public office includes his conduct on January 6, 2021. Others disagree and think he is eligible to run. What do you think?

Asked of a random half of respondents

President Donald Trump is NOT eligible to run for president in 2024	46%
President Donald Trump is eligible to run for president in 2024	54%

46. The Supreme Court recently decided this issue. Regardless of your personal views, how do you think the Supreme Court decided?

Asked of a random half of respondents

President Donald Trump is NOT eligible to run for president in 2024	24%
President Donald Trump is eligible to run for president in 2024	76%

47. Some people think that President Donald Trump is eligible to run for president in 2024. Others think that he is not eligible to run because the 14th Amendment's ban on insurrectionists holding public office includes his conduct on January 6, 2021. What do you think?

Asked of a random half of respondents

President Donald Trump is eligible to run for president in 2024	53%
President Donald Trump is NOT eligible to run for president in 2024	47%

48. The Supreme Court recently decided this issue. Regardless of your personal views, how do you think the Supreme Court decided?

Asked of a random half of respondents

President Donald Trump is eligible to run for president in 2024	76%
President Donald Trump is NOT eligible to run for president in 2024	24%

49. Some people think that former presidents are immune from criminal prosecution for actions they took while president. Other people think that former presidents are not immune from criminal prosecution for actions they took while president and so can be criminally prosecuted for such actions. What do you think?

Asked of a random half of respondents

Former presidents are immune from criminal prosecution for actions they took while president	27%
Former presidents are NOT immune from criminal prosecution for actions they took while president	73%

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

Former presidents are immune from criminal prosecution for actions they took while president	40%
Former presidents are NOT immune from criminal prosecution for actions they took while president	60%

51. Some people think that former presidents are not immune from criminal prosecution for actions they took while president and so can be criminally prosecuted for such actions. Other people think that former presidents are immune from criminal prosecution for actions they took while president. What do you think?

Asked of a random half of respondents

Former presidents are NOT immune from criminal prosecution for actions they took while president	74%
Former presidents are immune from criminal prosecution for actions they took while president	26%

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

Former presidents are NOT immune from criminal prosecution for actions they took while president	63%
Former presidents are immune from criminal prosecution for actions they took while president	37%

53. Some people think that barring domestic abusers from possessing firearms violates their Second Amendment right to keep and bear arms. Other people think that this does not violate their Second Amendment rights. What do you think?

Asked of a random half of respondents

Barring domestic abusers from possessing firearms violates their Second Amendment rights	26%
Barring domestic abusers from possessing firearms DOES NOT violate their Second Amendment rights	74%

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

Barring domestic abusers from possessing firearms violates their Second Amendment rights	39%
Barring domestic abusers from possessing firearms DOES NOT violate their Second Amendment rights	61%

55. Some people think that barring domestic abusers from possessing firearms does not violate their Second Amendment right to keep and bear arms. Other people think that this does violate their Second Amendment rights. What do you think?

Asked of a random half of respondents

Barring domestic abusers from possessing firearms DOES NOT violate their Second Amendment rights	74%
Barring domestic abusers from possessing firearms violates their Second Amendment rights	26%

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

Barring domestic abusers from possessing firearms DOES NOT violate their Second Amendment rights	61%
Barring domestic abusers from possessing firearms violates their Second Amendment rights	39%

57. Federal law forbids trademarks that include individual names, including politicians' names. Some people think that this violates people's First Amendment right to free speech. Other people think this does not violate people's First Amendment rights. What do you think?

Asked of a random half of respondents

Forbidding trademarks that include individual names, including politicians' names, does violate the First Amendment	44%
Forbidding trademarks that include individual names, including politicians' names, does NOT violate the First Amendment	56%

58. 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

Forbidding trademarks that include individual names, including politicians' names, does violate the First Amendment	44%
Forbidding trademarks that include individual names, including politicians' names, does NOT violate the First Amendment	56%

59. Federal law forbids trademarks that include individual names, including politicians' names. Some people think this does not violate people's First Amendment right to free speech. Other people think that this violates people's First Amendment rights. What do you think?

Asked of a random half of respondents

Forbidding trademarks that include individual names, including politicians' names, does NOT violate the First Amendment	57%
Forbidding trademarks that include individual names, including politicians' names, does violate the First Amendment	43%

60. 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

Forbidding trademarks that include individual names, including politicians' names, does NOT violate the First Amendment	58%
Forbidding trademarks that include individual names, including politicians' names, does violate the First Amendment	42%

61. A local law bans homeless people from camping outside even when local shelters are full. Some people believe that the law violates the Constitution's prohibition against cruel and unusual punishment because these people have nowhere else to go. Other people think this does not violate the Constitution's prohibition against cruel and unusual punishment. What do you think?

Asked of a random half of respondents

Banning homeless people from camping outside even when local shelters are full violates the Constitution	61%
Banning homeless people from camping outside even when local shelters are full DOES NOT violate the Constitution	39%

62. 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

Banning homeless people from camping outside even when local shelters are full violates the Constitution	45%
Banning homeless people from camping outside even when local shelters are full DOES NOT violate the Constitution	55%

63. A local law bans homeless people from camping outside even when local shelters are full. Some people think that the law does not violate the Constitution's prohibition against cruel and unusual punishment. Other people believe that this does violate the Constitution's prohibition against cruel and unusual punishment because these people have nowhere else to go. What do you think?

Asked of a random half of respondents

Banning homeless people from camping outside even when local shelters are full DOES NOT violate the Constitution	45%
Banning homeless people from camping outside even when local shelters are full violates the Constitution	55%

64. 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

Banning homeless people from camping outside even when local shelters are full DOES NOT violate the Constitution 58%

Banning homeless people from camping outside even when local shelters are full violates the Constitution 42%

65. Federal law makes it a crime to obstruct, influence, or impede an official proceeding. Some people think this does not include the activities that took place at the U.S. Capitol Building on January 6, 2021. Other people think that it does. What do you think?

Asked of a random half of respondents

The events at the U.S. Capitol Building on January 6, 2021 were NOT criminal 31%

The events at the U.S. Capitol Building on January 6, 2021 were criminal 69%

66. 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 events at the U.S. Capitol Building on January 6, 2021 were NOT criminal 35%

The events at the U.S. Capitol Building on January 6, 2021 were criminal 65%

67. Federal law makes it a crime to obstruct, influence, or impede an official proceeding. Some people think this includes the activities that took place at the U.S. Capitol Building on January 6, 2021. Other people think that it does not. What do you think?

Asked of a random half of respondents

The events at the U.S. Capitol Building on January 6, 2021 were criminal 72%

The events at the U.S. Capitol Building on January 6, 2021 were NOT criminal 28%

68. 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 events at the U.S. Capitol Building on January 6, 2021 were criminal 67%

The events at the U.S. Capitol Building on January 6, 2021 were NOT criminal 33%

69. How important is the president's ability to nominate people to fill Supreme Court vacancies in deciding how you will vote for president in November 2024?

Extremely important 30%

Very important 28%

Moderately important 24%

Slightly important 8%

Not important 10%

70. How important is the president's ability to nominate people to fill Supreme Court vacancies in deciding how you will vote for Congress in November 2024?

Extremely important	25%
Very important	28%
Moderately important	25%
Slightly important	9%
Not important	13%

71. How important are the following in how you feel about a Supreme Court justice?

	Extremely important	Very important	Moderately important	Slightly important	Not important
Having good professional and educational qualifications	54%	29%	12%	3%	1%
Being likely to decide cases in a way that you agree with	17%	29%	32%	10%	12%
Being likely to interpret the law appropriately	65%	22%	10%	2%	2%
Sharing my political ideology	14%	22%	35%	13%	16%

72. How much do you agree with the following statement: "It is important for leaders of the [Democratic/Republican] Party to criticize the Supreme Court"

Asked of Democrats, Republicans, and leaners

Strongly agree	18%
Somewhat agree	21%
Neither agree nor disagree	40%
Somewhat disagree	9%
Strongly disagree	12%

73. 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?

5-4	26%
6-3	44%
7-2	20%
8-1	5%
9-0	6%

74. 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	23%
Life term	66%
Neither	10%

75. 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	12%
U.S. Supreme Court	75%
The President	13%

76. 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	75%
Neither	11%

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

Sonia Sotomayor	10%
Samuel Alito	7%
Elena Kagan	4%
John Roberts	72%
Neil Gorsuch	8%

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

Sonia Sotomayor	8%
Ketanji Brown Jackson	56%
John Roberts	7%
Brett Kavanaugh	12%
Amy Coney Barrett	17%

79. 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	2%
7 out of 9	6%
6 out of 9	38%
5 out of 9	25%
4 out of 9	14%
3 out of 9	7%
2 out of 9	2%
1 out of 9	1%
0 out of 9	1%

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

A great deal	25%
A lot	28%
A moderate amount	30%
A little	11%
Not at all	6%

81. How much do you approve of the performance of the Supreme Court?

Strongly approve	9%
Somewhat approve	27%
Neither approve nor disapprove	31%
Somewhat disapprove	16%
Strongly disapprove	18%

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

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
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	12%	22%	33%	16%	18%
The U.S. Supreme Court has become too independent and should be reined in	11%	22%	34%	17%	17%
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	8%	15%	26%	18%	32%
The U.S. Supreme Court gets too mixed up in politics	26%	32%	27%	10%	5%
The U.S. Supreme Court can usually be trusted to make decisions that are right for the country as a whole	12%	33%	26%	18%	11%

83. 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	11%
Somewhat agree	18%
Neither agree nor disagree	27%
Somewhat disagree	15%
Strongly disagree	29%

84. 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	32%
Somewhat agree	27%
Neither agree nor disagree	24%
Somewhat disagree	8%
Strongly disagree	9%

85. 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	38%
Some of the time	30%
Only now and then	17%
Hardly at all	12%
Don't know	3%

86. In the election for President, did you vote for Joe Biden or Donald Trump?

Joe Biden	32%
Donald Trump	29%
Jo Jorgensen	1%
Howie Hawkins	0%
Other	1%
Did not vote for President	38%

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

Democrat	31%
Republican	28%
Independent	28%
Other	4%
Not sure	8%

88. Are you...?

Male	49%
Female	51%

89. Respondent age by category

Under 30	21%
30-44	25%
45-64	33%
65+	21%

90. What racial or ethnic group best describes you?

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

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

HS or less	38%
Some college	28%
College grad	21%
Postgrad	12%

92. What is your marital status?

Married	38%
Separated	2%
Divorced	12%
Widowed	6%
Never married	36%
Domestic / civil partnership	6%

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

Yes	21%
No	79%

94. In which census region do you live?

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

95. How would you describe the place where you live?

City	31%
Suburb	37%
Town	13%
Rural area	18%
Other	1%

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

Under \$50K	46%
\$50-100K	25%
\$100K or more	18%
Prefer not to say	12%