DESCRIPTION: You are invited to participate in a research study conducted by researchers at Stanford University, Harvard University, and The University of Texas on decisions to be made by the Supreme Court. You will be asked to complete a series of survey questions.

TIME INVOLVEMENT: Your participation will take approximately 20 minutes.

RISKS AND BENEFITS: There are no foreseeable risks associated with this study. Study data will be stored securely, in compliance with Stanford University standards, minimizing the risk of confidentiality breach. There are no benefits which may reasonably be expected to result from this study. We cannot and do not guarantee or promise that you will receive any benefits from this study.

PAYMENTS: You will receive compensation for your participation based on your agreement with YouGov.

PARTICIPANT’S RIGHTS: If you have read this form and have decided to participate in this project, please understand your **participation is voluntary** and you have the **right to withdraw your consent or discontinue participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. The alternative is not to participate.** You have the right to refuse to answer particular questions. The results of this research study may be presented at scientific or professional meetings or published in scientific journals. Your individual privacy will be maintained in all published and written data resulting from the study.

In accordance with scientific norms, the data from this study may be used or shared with other researchers for future research (after removing personally identifying information) without additional consent from you.

CONTACT INFORMATION:

***Questions***: If you have any questions, concerns or complaints about this research, its procedures, risks and benefits, contact the Protocol Director, Neil Malhotra, at neilm@stanford.edu or 408-772-7969.

***Independent Contact***: If you are not satisfied with how this study is being conducted, or if you have any concerns, complaints, or general questions about the research or your rights as a participant, please contact the Stanford Institutional Review Board (IRB) to speak to someone independent of the research team at 650-723-2480 or toll free at 1-866-680-2906, or email at irbnonmed@stanford.edu. You can also write to the Stanford IRB, Stanford University, 1705 El Camino Real, Palo Alto, CA 94306.

Please save or print a copy of this page for your records.

If you agree to participate in this research, please continue on with the survey.

INTRO SCREEN

We would now like to ask about your views on some of the types of issues that the U.S. Supreme Court is often asked to decide. For each of the following situations, please tell us what you personally believe and also how you think the Supreme Court would decide if it were asked to rule on the case.

***[Note to programmer: For all case questions, randomize (50-50) whether respondents are presented Version A or Version B; for the response options, present them in the order that they are presented in the question stem. The text “Case #X” is just for organizational purposes and should not appear to respondents.]***

**Case 1: Alexander v. South Carolina State Conference of the NAACP**

A proposed South Carolina election map changes district boundaries to re-assign thousands of Black voters to different districts.

VERSION A

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.

VERSION B

Some people claim the voters were not moved because of their race but because they were mostly Democrats, and so the map is constitutional. Other people claim the voters were moved because of their race, and so the map is unconstitutional.

What do you think?

1 These changes to the districts are constitutional

2 These changes to the districts are unconstitutional

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

1 These changes to the districts are constitutional

2 These changes to the districts are unconstitutional

**Case 2: Consumer Financial Protection Bureau v. Community Financial Services**

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.

VERSION A

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.

VERSION B

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?

1 This funding structure is unconstitutional

2 This funding structure is constitutional

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

1 This funding structure is unconstitutional

2 This funding structure is constitutional

**Case 3: Food and Drug Administration v. Alliance for Hippocratic Medicine**

VERSION A

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.

VERSION B

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?

1 The Food and Drug Administration’s approval of mifepristone should be revoked

2 The Food and Drug Administration’s approval of mifepristone should NOT be revoked

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

1 The Food and Drug Administration’s approval of mifepristone should be revoked

2 The Food and Drug Administration’s approval of mifepristone should NOT be revoked

**Case 4: Harrington v. Purdue Pharma**

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.

VERSION A

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.

VERSION B

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?

1 The Sackler family should keep their immunity from future lawsuits

2 The Sackler family should NOT keep their immunity from future lawsuits

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

1 The Sackler family should keep their immunity from future lawsuits

2 The Sackler family should NOT keep their immunity from future lawsuits

**Case 5: Lindke v. Freed/O'Connor-Ratcliff v. Garnier**

There are public officials who sometimes use private social media accounts to conduct or announce government business.

VERSION A

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.

VERSION B

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?

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

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

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

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

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

**Case 6: Loper Bright Enterprises v. Raimondo/Relentless, Inc. v. Department of Commerce**

Courts usually defer to how administrative agencies interpret laws in situations where the law is unclear.

VERSION A:

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.

VERSION B:

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?

1 Courts should defer to administrative agencies when laws are unclear

2 Courts should NOT defer to administrative agencies when laws are unclear

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

1 Courts should defer to administrative agencies when laws are unclear

2 Courts should NOT defer to administrative agencies when laws are unclear

**Case 7: Moyle v. United States**

Idaho law criminalizes most abortions. However, federal law requires that hospitals receiving federal funds must provide abortions in medical emergencies.

VERSION A:

Some people think that Idaho law trumps federal law, and so Idaho hospitals are not allowed to provide abortions to women in medical emergencies. Other people think that federal law trumps Idaho law, and so Idaho hospitals that receive federal funds must provide abortions.

VERSION B:

Some people think that federal law trumps Idaho law, and so Idaho hospitals that receive federal funds must provide abortions to women in medical emergencies. Other people think that Idaho law trumps federal law, and so Idaho hospitals are not allowed to provide abortions.

What do you think?

1 Idaho hospitals are not allowed to provide abortions in medical emergencies

2 Idaho hospitals must provide abortions in medical emergencies

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

1 Idaho hospitals are not allowed to provide abortions in medical emergencies

2 Idaho hospitals must provide abortions in medical emergencies

**Case 8: Murthy v. Missouri**

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.

VERSION A:

Some people think that this violates users’ First Amendment right to free speech. Other people think that it does not.

VERSION B:

Some people think that this does not violate users’ First Amendment right to free speech. Other people think it does.

What do you think?

1 Federal officials urging private social media companies to block, delete, or remove users violates users’ First Amendment rights

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

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

1 Federal officials urging private social media companies to block, delete, or remove users violates users’ First Amendment rights

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

**Case 9: National Rifle Association of America v. Vullo**

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).

VERSION A:

Some people think that the state regulator’s behavior violates the NRA’s First Amendment rights. Other people say it does not.

VERSION B:

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?

1 The state regulator’s behavior DOES NOT violate the NRA’s First Amendment Rights

2 The state regulator’s behavior violates the NRA’s First Amendment Rights

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

1 The state regulator’s behavior DOES NOT violate the NRA’s First Amendment Rights

2 The state regulator’s behavior violates the NRA’s First Amendment Rights

**Case 10: NetChoice v. Paxton/Moody v. NetChoice**

Social media companies often remove content from their websites for various reasons.

VERSION A:

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.

VERSION B:

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?

1 States should be allowed to prevent social media companies from censoring speech

2 States cannot prevent social media companies from censoring speech

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

1 States should be allowed to prevent social media companies from censoring speech

2 States cannot prevent social media companies from censoring speech

**Case 11: Securities and Exchange Commission v. Jarkesy**

Some federal agencies bring actions in administrative proceedings with their own judges rather than in regular federal courts.

VERSION A:

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.

VERSION B:

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?

1 Federal agencies bringing actions in administrative proceedings rather than in federal courts is constitutional

2 Federal agencies bringing actions in administrative proceedings rather than in federal courts is NOT constitutional

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

1 Federal agencies bringing actions in administrative proceedings rather than in federal courts is constitutional

2 Federal agencies bringing actions in administrative proceedings rather than in federal courts is NOT constitutional

**Case 12: Trump v. Anderson**

VERSION A:

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.

VERSION B:

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?

1 President Donald Trump is NOT eligible to run for president in 2024

2 President Donald Trump is eligible to run for president in 2024

The Supreme Court recently decided this issue. Regardless of your personal views, what is your best guess at how the Supreme Court decided?

1 President Donald Trump is NOT eligible to run for president in 2024

2 President Donald Trump is eligible to run for president in 2024

**Case 13: Trump v. United States**

VERSION A:

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.

VERSION B:

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?

1 Former presidents are immune from criminal prosecution for actions they took while president

2 Former presidents are NOT immune from criminal prosecution for actions they took while president

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

1 Former presidents are immune from criminal prosecution for actions they took while president

2 Former presidents are NOT immune from criminal prosecution for actions they took while president

**Case 14: United States v. Rahimi**

VERSION A:

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.

VERSION B:

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?

1 Barring domestic abusers from possessing firearms violates their Second Amendment rights

2 Barring domestic abusers from possessing firearms DOES NOT violate their Second Amendment rights

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

1 Barring domestic abusers from possessing firearms violates their Second Amendment rights

2 Barring domestic abusers from possessing firearms DOES NOT violate their Second Amendment rights

**Case 15: Vidal v. Elster**

Federal law forbids trademarks that include individual names, including politicians’ names.

VERSION A:

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.

VERSION B:

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?

1 Forbidding trademarks that include individual names, including politicians’ names, does violate the First Amendment

2 Forbidding trademarks that include individual names, including politicians’ names, does NOT violate the First Amendment

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

1 Forbidding trademarks that include individual names, including politicians’ names, does violate the First Amendment

2 Forbidding trademarks that include individual names, including politicians’ names, does NOT violate the First Amendment

**Case 16: Grants Pass v. Johnson**

A local law bans homeless people from camping outside even when local shelters are full.

VERSION A:

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.

VERSION B:

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?

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

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

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

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

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

**Case 17: Fischer v. United States**

Federal law makes it a crime to obstruct, influence, or impede an official proceeding.

VERSION A

Some people think this does not includes the activities that took place at the U.S. Capitol Building on January 6, 2021. Other people think that it does.

VERSION B

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?

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

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

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

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

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

~~[PERCEPTIONS QUESTIONS]~~

~~[NEXT SCREEN]~~

~~In the past six months, how frequently would you say you have heard political leaders from the [pipe in respondent's party] Party mention the Supreme Court?~~

~~- Always~~

~~- Often~~

~~- Sometimes~~

~~- Rarely~~

~~- Never~~

~~In your view, how important is it for political leaders of the [pipe in respondent's party] Party to talk about the kinds of justices they would like to see appointed to the Supreme Court?~~

~~- Extremely Important~~

~~- Very Important~~

~~- Moderately Important~~

~~- Slightly Important~~

~~- Not Important~~

~~[If likely voter] How important will the Supreme Court be in your decision for whom to vote for in November 2024?~~

~~- Extremely Important~~

~~- Very Important~~

~~- Moderately Important~~

~~- Slightly Important~~

~~- Not Important~~

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

Very important

Moderately important

Slightly important

Not important

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

Very important

Moderately important

Slightly important

Not important

~~[OTHER QUESTIONS]~~

~~Can you name any case ever heard by the U.S. Supreme Court?~~

~~- Yes~~

~~- No~~

~~If [Yes], please list [open response field, to 10 choices]~~

~~Please list as many Supreme Court cases as you can in the boxes below, up to 10:~~

~~In your own words what would you say is the reputation of the Supreme Court? [open ended text box]~~

How important are the following in how you feel about a Supreme Court justice? [GRID]

- Having good professional and educational qualifications

- Extremely Important

- Very Important

- Moderately Important

- Slightly Important

- Not Important

- Being likely to decide cases in a way that you agree with

- Extremely Important

- Very Important

- Moderately Important

- Slightly Important

- Not Important

- Being likely to interpret the law appropriately

- Extremely Important

- Very Important

- Moderately Important

- Slightly Important

- Not Important

Sharing my political ideology

- Extremely Important

- Very Important

- Moderately Important

- Slightly Important

- Not Important

How much do you agree with the following statement:

“It is important for leaders of the [pipe in respondent's party] Party to criticize the Supreme Court’’

1 Strongly Agree

2 Somewhat Agree

3 Neither Agree nor Disagree

5 Somewhat Disagree

6 Strongly Disagree

[OTHER QUESTIONS]

[NEXT SCREEN]

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?

1 5-4

2 6-3

3 7-2

4 8-1

5 9-0

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?

1 Set number of years

2 Life term

3 Neither

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?

1 U.S. Congress

2 U.S. Supreme Court

3 The President

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?

1 Elected to the bench

2 Appointed to the bench

3 Neither

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

1 Sonia Sotomayor

2 Samuel Alito

3 Elena Kagan

4 John Roberts

5 Neil Gorsuch

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

1 Sonia Sotomayor

2 Ketanji Brown Jackson

3 John Roberts

4 Brett Kavanaugh

5 Amy Coney Barrett

[NEXT SCREEN]

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?

1 9 out of 9

2 8 out of 9

3 7 out of 9

4 6 out of 9

5 5 out of 9

6 4 out of 9

7 3 out of 9

8 2 out of 9

9 1 out of 9

10 0 out of 9

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

1 A great deal

2 A lot

3 A moderate amount

4 A little

5 Not at all

[NEXT SCREEN]

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

1 Strongly approve

2 Somewhat approve

3 Neither approve nor disapprove

4 Somewhat disapprove

5 Strongly disapprove

[NEXT SCREEN]

Do you agree or disagree with the following statement?

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.

1 Strongly agree

2 Somewhat agree

3 Neither agree nor disagree

4 Somewhat disagree

5 Strongly disagree

[NEXT SCREEN]

Do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

The U.S. Supreme Court has become too independent and should be reined in.

1 Strongly Agree

2 Somewhat Agree

3 Neither Agree nor Disagree

4 Somewhat Disagree

5 Strongly Disagree

[NEXT SCREEN]

Do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

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.

1 Strongly Agree

2 Somewhat Agree

3 Neither Agree nor Disagree

4 Somewhat Disagree

5 Strongly Disagree

Do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

The U.S. Supreme Court gets too mixed up in politics.

1 Strongly Agree

2 Somewhat Agree

3 Neither Agree nor Disagree

4 Somewhat Disagree

5 Strongly Disagree

[NEXT SCREEN]

Do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

The U.S. Supreme Court can usually be trusted to make decisions that are right for the country as a whole.

1 Strongly Agree

2 Somewhat Agree

3 Neither Agree nor Disagree

4 Somewhat Disagree

5 Strongly Disagree

[NEXT SCREEN]

Where would you place YOURSELF on the following scale? [SLIDER; 0-100]

EXTREMELY LIBERAL EXTREMELY CONSERVATIVE

Where would you place THE CURRENT U.S. SUPREME COURT on the following scale? [SLIDER; 0-100]

EXTREMELY LIBERAL EXTREMELY CONSERVATIVE

[NEXT SCREEN]

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?

1 Strongly Agree

2 Somewhat Agree

3 Neither Agree nor Disagree

4 Somewhat Disagree

5 Strongly Disagree

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?

1 Strongly Agree

2 Somewhat Agree

3 Neither Agree nor Disagree

4 Somewhat Disagree

5 Strongly Disagree