

Contact: Kevin Conway  
Associate Director of University Communication  
(414) 288-4745 – office  
(414) 202-9329 – mobile  
kevin.m.conway@marquette.edu

April 23, 2026

This release is also available online.

---

## **New Marquette Law School Poll national survey finds partisan divides on most Supreme Court cases, with varying views of Trump playing a large role, including within Republican opinion**

### ***Also:***

- Majority of public supports Supreme Court ruling against Trump on tariffs
- Approval of the Court slips in April, with decline among Republicans and smaller uptick among independents and Democrats
- Public favors upholding birthright citizenship under the 14th Amendment
- There is an even divide over counting absentee ballots that arrive after election day
- Attention to the Court is limited, compared to other topics, though higher for those who follow politics most of the time

MILWAUKEE – A new Marquette Law School Poll national survey finds that 66% of respondents favor the United States Supreme Court’s Feb. 20 ruling that President Donald Trump did not have authority to impose tariffs under the International Emergency Powers Act (IEEPA), while 33% oppose the decision. Partisans view the decision differently, with 61% of Republicans opposing the ruling, while 73% of independents favor the ruling, as do 92% of Democrats.

Hearing or reading more about the tariff decision reinforces partisan opinions, increasing polarization. Among Republicans who heard or read a lot about the decision, 70% were opposed to the ruling, while Republicans who heard little or nothing were more evenly divided, with 56% opposed to the decision. Among independents, those who heard more

were more in favor of the ruling, with 90% of that group in favor, whereas 69% of those who heard less favored it. For Democrats, attention to news of the decision made little difference in their support for it, with 94% in favor among those who heard a lot and 91% in favor among those who heard less.

The survey was conducted April 8-16, 2026, interviewing 982 adults nationwide, with a margin of error of +/-3.4 percentage points.

Opinion of the ruling is strongly influenced by opinion of Trump's handling of tariffs. Of those who approve of his handling of tariffs, 76% oppose the decision, while among those who disapprove of his job on tariffs, only 11% oppose the Court's decision.

Republicans as a whole are more approving of Trump's handling of tariffs, yet a very similar gap in views of the Court's decision is clear within the party. Among Republicans who approve of Trump's tariff policy, 79% oppose the Court's decision, while among Republicans who disapprove of Trump's handling of tariffs only 16% oppose the ruling. Too few independents or Democrats approve of Trump's handling of tariffs to allow a similar comparison within those groups.

The ruling against a major Trump policy did little to change the public impression that the Court is going out of its way to avoid making a ruling that Trump might refuse to obey. In April, 57% say the Court is avoiding such a ruling, unchanged from January. A majority of Republicans (67%) say the Court is not avoiding ruling against Trump, while majorities of independents (66%) and Democrats (79%) say the Court is avoiding this.

Approval of the Court dipped in April to 42%, compared to 44% in January. Approval among Republicans fell to 70% from its January level of 78%, while approval among independents ticked up to 29% from 26%. Democrats also became slightly more approving of the Court, with the level rising to 19% from 17%.

Approval of how the Supreme Court is handling its job has declined during the second Trump term. In February 2025, approval stood at 51% and in March 2025 at 54%. Since then, views of the Court have become more negative, with this April's approval the lowest since Trump returned to office. By early 2025, approval had recovered from the all-time low in Marquette Law School polling of 38% in July 2022, immediately after the Dobbs decision overturned Roe v. Wade, ending nationwide abortion rights. Approval has not approached the high-water mark of 66% it reached in September 2020. The history of approval of the Court in the Marquette Law School Poll national surveys is shown in Table 1. (All results in the tables are stated as percentages.)

**Table 1: United States Supreme Court approval**

Among adults

Poll dates	Approval		
	Net	Approve	Disapprove
4/8-16/26	-15	42	57
1/21-28/26	-12	44	56
11/5-12/25	-12	44	56
9/15-24/25	0	50	50
7/7-16/25	-2	49	51
5/5-15/25	6	53	47
3/17-27/25	8	54	46
1/27-2/6/25	2	51	49
12/2-11/24	-4	48	52
10/1-10/24	-10	45	55
7/24-8/1/24	-14	43	57
5/6-15/24	-22	39	61
3/18-28/24	-6	47	53
2/5-15/24	-20	40	60
11/2-7/23	-18	41	59
9/18-25/23	-14	43	57
7/7-12/23	-10	45	55
5/8-18/23	-18	41	59
3/13-22/23	-12	44	56
1/9-20/23	-6	47	53
11/15-22/22	-12	44	56
9/7-14/22	-20	40	60
7/5-12/22	-23	38	61
5/9-19/22	-11	44	55
3/14-24/22	9	54	45
1/10-21/22	6	52	46
11/1-10/21	8	54	46
9/7-16/21	-1	49	50
7/16-26/21	21	60	39
9/8-15/20	33	66	33

Marquette Law School Poll, national surveys, latest: Apr. 8-16, 2026

Question: Overall, how much do you approve or disapprove of the way the U.S. Supreme Court is handling its job?

## **Pending cases**

### ***Birthright citizenship***

On April 1, the Supreme Court heard oral arguments on birthright citizenship. At issue is whether an executive order can legally declare that only children born to at least one citizen parent or to lawful permanent residents are citizens of the United States or whether the order is unconstitutional because the 14th Amendment makes all those born in the United States citizens. A majority, 69%, say the Court should rule Trump's executive order limiting birth citizenship is unconstitutional under the 14th Amendment, while 30% say the executive order should stand.

Republicans are nearly evenly divided on this case, with 54% saying the Court should uphold the executive order and 46% saying it is unconstitutional. Among independents, 77% say the Court should rule the order unconstitutional, as do 91% of Democrats.

Those who approve of Trump's handling of immigration are nevertheless somewhat divided on the question of birthright citizenship. Among those who approve of Trump's handling of immigration, 59% say the Court should sustain the executive order, but 41% say it should be found unconstitutional.

Those who disapprove of Trump's immigration policy are overwhelmingly of the view that the executive order should be ruled unconstitutional, 92%.

### ***Late-arriving absentee ballots***

On March 23, the Supreme Court heard arguments concerning a Mississippi law that allows counting of late-arriving absentee ballots so long as they were postmarked by Election Day and arrive within five days of the election. At issue is whether this state law conflicts with federal statutes that set the date of Election Day.

The public is evenly divided on this question. Fifty-three percent say the Court should uphold the state law allowing late-arriving ballots, while 47% say the law should be struck down because it is not consistent with federal law.

The sharp partisan debate over absentee voting since 2020 is apparent in views of this case. Among Republicans, 75% say the law should be struck down. A small majority (56%) of independents think the Court should uphold the state law, while 41% would have it struck down. Democrats strongly support the Mississippi law, with 81% saying the law should be upheld and 19% thinking the Court should strike down the state law as inconsistent with federal law.

The public is evenly divided on whether absentee voting by mail should be easy for everyone to do, with 52% favoring this, or instead should be limited to those physically unable to vote in person or travelling, with 48% favoring this. Opinions on this Court case are related to those views. Among those who say absentee mail voting should be easy for all, 76% think the Court should allow late-arriving ballots to be counted, while among those

who think absentee voting should be limited, 71% think the Court should strike down the law.

Views of absentee voting divide both parties in how they think the Court should rule in the Mississippi case. Among Republicans who say absentee voting should be easy, 59% would uphold the Mississippi law, while among Republicans who say absentee voting should be limited, 85% think the Court should strike it down. A similar pattern holds for Democrats. Eighty-five percent of those who favor easy absentee voting favor upholding the law, while only 59% of those who would limit absentee voting would uphold the late-arriving-ballots law.

There is a weaker relationship involving confidence in the accuracy of elections. Those who are confident in the accuracy of their state's elections in November favor upholding the late ballots law, 57%, while those not as confident in the accuracy of the election would rather see the law struck down, 56%. In this poll, 70% are very or somewhat confident in the accuracy of the upcoming elections, while 30% are not too or not at all confident.

### ***Removal of members of the Federal Reserve Board of Governors***

On January 21, the Court heard arguments concerning the president's authority to remove a member of the Federal Reserve's Board of Governors. A majority of those polled, 66%, say the Court should rule that the president cannot remove members of the Federal Reserve, while 34% say the Court should sustain the president's authority to remove members.

Sixty-three percent of Republicans say the Court should rule in favor of the president, while 67% of independents say the Court should rule that this is beyond the president's authority, as do 94% of Democrats.

Trust in Trump to make the right decisions for the country is strongly related to views of his removal of members of the Federal Reserve. Among those who completely or mostly trust Trump to make the right decisions, 71% think the Court should allow him to remove members of the Fed. Among those who mostly or completely do not trust Trump, 89% think the Court should not allow him to remove members.

There is a strong partisan effect on trust in Trump, but within the Republican party there is a clear difference in views of the case between those who trust the president's decisions and those who do not. Among Republicans who trust Trump's decisions, 72% say the Court should allow him to remove Federal Reserve Board members, while only 26% of Republicans who are less trusting of Trump's decisions think he should be allowed to remove members. Too few independents and Democrats trust Trump's judgment to allow a similar comparison in those groups.

### ***Awareness of news about the Supreme Court***

With rare exceptions, the public does not follow news about the Supreme Court as much as news about other subjects. In April, 35% had heard or read a lot about the February tariff ruling, while 52% had heard a little and 13% had heard nothing at all.

Also in April, 26% said they had read or heard a lot about the Court in just the last month, while 61% heard a little and 13% heard nothing at all.

Attention to news about the Court rises around the end of the Court's term in June when many major decisions are handed down. In combined Marquette Law School Poll national surveys conducted in July 2024 and 2025, shortly after the end of the Court's term, 33% said they had heard a lot about the Court, while in polls conducted in other months 23% had heard a lot.

A larger influence on awareness of news about the Court is general attention to politics and public affairs. Among those who say they follow what's going on in politics most of the time, 54% said they had heard a lot about the tariff decision, while among those who follow politics less often, only 19% had heard a lot about that decision. Similarly, of those who follow politics most of the time, 47% say they've heard a lot about the Court in just the last month, while among those less attentive to politics, only 9% have heard a lot.

Those most attentive to political news also get a boost in awareness of the Court in July, compared to other months. In the combined July polls of 2024 and 2025, among those who follow politics most of the time, 56% heard a lot about the Court, while in other months 41% of this group heard a lot. There is also a gap among the less attentive to political news but at a far lower level of awareness of news about the Court. Among those less attentive to politics, 15% had heard a lot about the Court in the July polls and just 9% had heard a lot in polls at other times in the year.

In April, attention to news about the Court was among the lowest levels across the eight topics covered. Attention to news about the war with Iran topped the charts, with 76% of those polled hearing a lot, and this was in the top three most attended-to topics in polling through 2025 and 2026. Less than half as many people heard a lot about the tariff ruling, 35%, and only 26% said they had heard or read a lot about the Supreme Court in the last month. The only topic that received less attention was two jury verdicts holding YouTube and Meta liable for harm to young users of their apps. The full attention ranking is shown in Table 2.

**Table 2: Attention to topics in the news**

Among adults

Topic	Read or heard		
	A lot	A little	Nothing at all
The U.S. war with Iran	76	21	3
Iran limiting oil shipments through the Strait of Hormuz	60	27	13
The NASA mission that sent four people around the moon	56	34	10
The partial shutdown of the Department of Homeland Security due to failure to pass a funding bill	49	38	13
The rescue of two airmen whose plane was shot down over Iran	45	34	21
The U.S. Supreme Court decision in February that blocked President Trump's tariffs	35	52	13
Heard about the Supreme Court in last month	26	61	13
Two jury verdicts holding Meta (Facebook) and YouTube liable for harm to young users of their social media apps	18	53	29

Marquette Law School Poll, national survey Apr. 8-16, 2026

Question: Here are some recent topics in the news. How much have you heard or read about each of these?

While high levels of attention to the Court are limited, a substantial majority of the public hears at least a little about the Court, and a bit more in July following the end of the term. High awareness of decisions appears to reinforce partisan predispositions, leading to somewhat greater party polarization on decisions that receive greater attention.

### About the Marquette Law School Poll

The survey was conducted April 8-16, 2026, interviewing 982 adults nationwide, with a margin of error of +/-3.4 percentage points. For registered voters, the sample size is 870, with a margin of error of +/-3.6. For likely voters, the sample size is 576, with a margin of error of +/-4.4 percentage points.

Interviews were conducted using the SSRS Opinion Panel, a national probability sample with interviews conducted online. Certain other data from this survey (focusing on those about national political issues) were previously released on April 23. The detailed methodology statement, survey instrument, topline results, and crosstabs for this release are available on the [Marquette Law Poll website](#).

Wording of questions about recent and pending Supreme Court decisions: These items do not attempt to exactly frame the particular issues in specific cases but rather address the topic in more general terms.

The wording of questions about recent cases include:

*Learning Resources, Inc. v. Trump*

As you may have heard, on February 20, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that President Trump did not have the authority to impose tariffs under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (IEEPA). Do you favor or oppose this decision?

*Trump v. Barbara*

The Supreme Court heard arguments on April 1 asking whether an executive order can legally declare that only children born to at least one citizen parent or to lawful permanent residents are citizens of the United States or whether the order is unconstitutional because the 14th Amendment makes all those born in the United States citizens. How do you think the Supreme Court should rule?

*Watson v. Republican National Committee*

The Supreme Court heard arguments in a case asking whether to uphold a state law that allows absentee ballots to be counted that are postmarked by election day, but that arrive up to five days after the election, or whether this state law conflicts with the federal law setting the date of elections. Should the Supreme Court uphold the state law to count late-arriving ballots, or should it strike down the state law because it is not consistent with federal law?

*Trump v. Cook*

The Supreme Court has heard arguments in a case asking whether President Trump can remove a member of the Federal Reserve Board of Governors. A lower court ruling prevented the removal, which the Supreme Court is now considering. How do you think the Supreme Court should rule?

# # #

For more Marquette news, visit [Marquette Today](#)