



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

June 4, 2026

This release is also available online.

New Marquette Law School national survey finds 61% think Trump wins almost always or most of the time at the Supreme Court

Also:

- 57% say the Court goes out of its way to avoid a ruling Trump might refuse to obey
- Public is evenly divided on whether the Court is motivated mainly by law or by politics
- Approval of the Court rose to 46% in May, from 42% in April
- Opinion is evenly divided on enlarging the Court, but 79% favor limited terms for justices
- Two-thirds disagree with Trump's position against birthright citizenship and with his claim of a president's right to remove members of Federal Reserve
- 63% say state laws banning transgender athletes in girls' and women's teams should be upheld

MILWAUKEE — A new Marquette Law School Poll national survey finds 61% of adults think the United States Supreme Court is ruling for President Donald Trump “almost always” or “most of the time,” while 39% say the Court is ruling for him “only some of the time” or “almost never.”

Republicans and independents are less inclined to think the Court favors Trump, with 45% of Republicans and 47% of independents saying the Court rules for Trump almost always or most of the time. Small majorities say it rules for him only some of the time or almost never, a total of 55% and 53% respectively for Republicans and independents. Democrats, in contrast, are much more convinced that the Court favors Trump, with 79% saying the Court rules for Trump almost always or most of the time.

When the question is posed in terms of how challengers to Trump fare at the Court, the results are very similar, with 36% saying challengers almost always or mostly win (therefore Trump loses) and 64% saying challengers mostly lose (therefore Trump wins).

A 57% majority say the Court is going out of its way to avoid a ruling Trump might refuse to obey, while 43% say the Court is not avoiding such a ruling. On this question, the partisan divide is larger, with 67% of Republicans saying the Court is not avoiding ruling against Trump, while 80% of Democrats say it is avoiding ruling against Trump. Among independents, 60% say the Court is avoiding ruling against Trump.

The public is about evenly divided on whether the justices' decisions are motivated mainly by the law, 48%, or mainly by politics, 52%. Among Republicans, 64% say the law is the main motivation, while 67% of Democrats and 57% of independents say politics are the main motivation.

The survey was conducted May 20-26, 2026, interviewing 1,001 adults nationwide, with a margin of error of +/-3.4 percentage points.

Approval for the Supreme Court rose to 46% in May from 42% in April. This reverses a general downward trend since March 2025 when approval of the Court was 54%. Republicans are much more approving of the Court, 76%, than are independents, 39%, or Democrats, 20%.

Changes to the Supreme Court

The public is evenly divided on proposals to expand the size of the Court, with 50% in favor of adding more justices and 50% opposed. Opinion on this has varied little since the question was first asked in Marquette Law School Poll surveys in September 2019, when 42% favored enlarging the Court. In nine polls from 2021 to 2026, support for adding justices has held between 48% and 54%, the high mark coming in September 2023. Sixty-one percent of Republicans are opposed to adding to the Court, while 62% of Democrats favor expansion. There is much more support for instituting fixed terms of service for Supreme Court justices, a change that likely would require a constitutional amendment. In May, 79% favor fixed terms for justices, and 21% are opposed. Support was 71% in 2019, rising to a high of 83% in October 2024. Unlike expansion of the court, term limits for justices enjoy strong bipartisan support, with 73% of Republicans, 71% of independents, and 87% of Democrats in favor.

Cases filed against Trump critics and against Trump

Fifty-five percent say the Justice Department has filed unjustified criminal cases against Trump's political opponents, while 45% say the cases are justified. This perception is unchanged since November 2025. There is little difference in partisan perception of this issue, with 53% of Republicans, 55% of independents, and 58% of Democrats saying unjustified cases have been filed.

As for criminal cases brought against Trump in 2022-2024, 45% say those cases were unjustified and 55% say they were justified. Here, there is a large partisan split, with 77% of Republicans calling those charges unjustified, while 86% of Democrats saying they were justified. Independents are more evenly divided, with 44% calling them unjustified and 55% saying justified.

Attention to the Court

Attention to news about the Court has declined slightly since last November. In May, 24% say they heard a lot about the Court in the last month, down from 30% in November. Meanwhile, those hearing nothing at all rose to 19% from 10% in November. Attention to the Court is typically cyclical, peaking around the end of each Court term in late June each year and falling off after.

Most adults correctly say that Republican presidents have appointed a majority of the Court's nine justices, 81%, while 19% incorrectly say Democratic presidents appointed a majority of the Court. Such knowledge of the majority has increased since the first Marquette Law School Poll in September 2019, when 72% correctly noted a majority appointed by Republican presidents. Republican appointees have been a majority of the Court since the 1970-71 Court term, with the exception of 14 months in 2016-17 following the death of Justice Antonin Scalia, when the members of the Court were evenly divided in terms of the party of their appointing president.

Recent decisions and pending cases

On April 29, the Court ruled in *Louisiana v. Callais* that the Voting Rights Act of 1965 did not require Louisiana to create a second majority-minority congressional district, finding the creation of a second such district an unconstitutional racial gerrymander. Among survey respondents, 49% favor this ruling, while 51% oppose it. Among Republicans, 73% favor the ruling, 72% of Democrats oppose it, and 60% of independents oppose it.

In *Chiles v. Salazar*, on March 31, the Court ruled that a Colorado law banning "conversion therapy," as it applies to talk therapy in cases involving gender-identity issues, likely is an unconstitutional violation of the therapist's right to free speech under the First Amendment, not a permissible regulation of medical practice. The Court sent the case back to a lower court for reconsideration under a more speech-friendly standard, hinting that the Colorado law likely would be found unconstitutional. This ruling was favored by 52% and opposed by 48%. There was only a modest partisan split in opinion on this case, with 57% of Republicans favoring the ruling and 54% of Democrats opposed. Fifty-two percent of independents favored the decision.

On May 14, the Court issued a stay of a lower federal court decision that would have prevented abortion providers from prescribing mifepristone, a medication that induces abortions, by telemedicine and shipping it to patients in states that ban most abortions. The Court returned the case to lower courts for further proceedings. Among survey respondents, 57% say the Court should allow shipments of the drug to continue, while 43%

said it should have allowed the ban on shipments to remain in place. Among Republicans, 69% say the Court should uphold the lower court decision, while 64% of independents and 79% of Democrats say the Court should allow shipments of the drug.

On April 1, the Court heard a case 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. Sixty-eight percent say the Court should rule for “birthright citizenship” under the 14th Amendment, while 32% say the president can limit citizenship by executive order. Limits on citizenship are supported by 57% of Republicans but opposed by 71% of independents and 91% of Democrats.

The Supreme Court heard arguments in the fall in a case asking whether state laws that prohibit transgender girls and women from participating on girls’ and women’s sports teams violate the Constitution’s equal protection clause. Sixty-three percent say the state laws should be found constitutional, while 37% say these laws violate the equal protection clause. Republicans are strongly in favor of upholding the state laws, 81%, while independents and Democrats are closely divided, with 53% of independents and 49% of Democrats favoring the state laws.

The Supreme Court heard arguments in a case challenging a state law that allows absentee ballots to be counted that are postmarked by election day but arrive up to five days after the election. A 56% majority say state law should be upheld and late-arriving ballots counted, while 44% say the law should be struck down. There is a gulf between the parties, with 81% of Democrats saying the law should allow late-arriving ballots to be counted, while a majority of Republicans, 68%, say the law should be struck down. Among independents, 54% would uphold the law and 46% would strike it down.

Trump v. Cook asks whether Trump, as president, can remove a member of the Federal Reserve Board of Governors. Among poll respondents, 66% say the president may not remove members of the Federal Reserve, while 34% say he has that authority. Ninety-two percent of Democrats and 68% of independents say the president cannot remove Federal Reserve members, but 60% of Republicans say the Court should rule that he does have that authority.

Trump v. Slaughter, a case involving removal of members of independent federal agencies, was argued Dec. 8, 2025. By federal statute, individuals appointed to serve on independent, multimember regulatory agencies, such as the Federal Trade Commission, can be removed only for “inefficiency, neglect of duty, or malfeasance in office.” This case asks whether such congressional requirements for removal infringe on the president’s executive power under the Constitution. Seventy-three percent of respondents say that statutes can set requirements for removal, while 27% say the president has the power to remove appointees to independent agencies. In this case, a majority of each partisan group says statutes can set requirements for removal, with 54% of Republicans, 72% of independents, and 93% of Democrats holding this view.

On Dec. 9, 2025, the Supreme Court heard arguments challenging a federal law limiting the amount of money that political parties can spend in coordination with a candidate for office. The challengers argue that the limits violate First Amendment free speech rights. Supporters argue that the law appropriately ensures that contributors cannot use donations to parties to evade limits on contributions directly to candidates. Among survey respondents, 74% say the law is an appropriate regulation of contributions, while 26% say it is a violation of First Amendment speech rights. There is little partisan polarization on this case, with 74% of Republicans, 64% of independents, and 78% of Democrats saying the law is appropriate.

About the Marquette Law School Poll

The survey was conducted May 20-26, 2026, interviewing 1,001 adults nationwide, with a margin of error of +/-3.4 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 national political issues) were [released on June 3](#). 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 includes the following (the names of the cases were not included in the survey):

Louisiana v. Callais

In April, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that the Voting Rights Act of 1965 does not require states to create congressional districts where nonwhite voters are in the majority, and that Louisiana's having done so to protect the ability of Blacks to elect candidates of their choice was a violation of the equal protection clause of the 14th Amendment and an unconstitutional racial gerrymander. How much do you favor or oppose this decision?

Chiles v. Salazar

A Colorado law restricts mental health therapists from trying to change the gender identity or sexual orientation of clients under age 18, often called "conversion therapy." On March 31, the Supreme Court ruled that the law, as it applies to talk therapy, likely is an unconstitutional violation of the therapist's right to free speech under the First Amendment, and not a permissible regulation of medical practice. The Court sent the case back to a lower court for reconsideration under a more speech friendly standard, hinting that the Colorado law likely would be found unconstitutional. How much do you favor or oppose this decision?

Danco Laboratories v. Louisiana

A lower federal court decision would prevent abortion providers from prescribing mifepristone, a medication that induces abortions, by telemedicine and shipping it to patients in states that ban most abortions. Should the U.S. Supreme Court uphold this decision or overturn it?

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?

Little v. Hecox and West Virginia v. B.P.J.

The Supreme Court heard arguments in a case asking whether state laws that prohibit transgender girls and women from participating on girls' and women's sports teams violate the Constitution's equal protection clause. 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?

Trump v. Slaughter

By federal statute, individuals appointed to serve on independent, multi-member regulatory agencies, like the Federal Trade Commission, can be removed only for "inefficiency, neglect of duty, or malfeasance in office." The Supreme Court has heard arguments in a case asking whether such Congressional requirements for removal infringe on the president's executive power. How do you think the Supreme Court should rule?

National Republican Senatorial Committee v. Federal Election Commission

In December, the Supreme Court heard arguments challenging a federal law limiting the amount of money that political parties can spend in coordination with a candidate for office. The challengers argue that the limits violate First Amendment free speech rights. Supporters argue that the law appropriately ensures that contributors cannot use donations to parties to evade limits on contributions directly to candidates.

#

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