

Supplement D. Questionnaire data

D.1 My main difficulties in reading the US Supreme Court decisions at the start of the course were:

- S2 Decisions too long and to understand the judicial language
 - S3 vocabulaire nouveau et concepts juridiques différents de ceux français
 - S4 Understanding the language that was used, as some decisions were held through the XIXth century and understanding the judicial decision that was held because of the first issue.
 - S5 Prioritizing information among the amount of them.
difficult to keep track of main information
 - S6 The length: it was hard to follow everything the Court was implying. I understood some parts but definitely not all of it
 - S7 The main difficulty was the language used, mostly old English with terms and syntax we don't necessarily use anymore
 - S8 identifying moves and steps
 - S9 moves and steps
 - S10 Les décisions sont particulièrement longues et les phrases sont également articulées de manière complexe.
 - S11 Specific/Legal English vocabulary
 - S12 technical vocabulary, syntax
 - S13 The English used was too difficult (old English).
The structure was not clear.
 - S14 the legal terms
 - S15 The long sentences and the use of specific terms and legal expressions by the US judges. The way they write.
 - S16 The vocabulary I wasn't familiar dealing with
 - S18 The syntax, vocabulary and legal arguments are hard to understand for someone who never studied legal English.
 - S19 at the beginning, understanding some specific terms.
I also think that sometimes some opinion do not have a very clear structure (for example the introduction is very long, there are many digressions,..)
 - S20 understanding legal expressions of an old and formal English
 - S21 The level of the English language, especially in the most old decisions
 - S23 A lot of specific words & long sentences
 - S24 The language used and the terms, also the several legal concepts
-

D.2. How would you define the term "moves"? Feel free to explain in your own words.

- S1 moves would be the structure of the text, how it goes on, kind of like a wave reaching the shore and passing through different phases.
- S2 Groups of words, like an expression
- S3 Ce sont les différentes étapes que l'auteur va suivre pour élaborer un texte.
- S4 Moves would be the general name given to legal paragraphs of a legal text, such as "jurisprudence".
- S5 a move is an argumentative or descriptive part of a document that can be identified by its position, composition, construction or the presence of certain words or bundles in a corpus.
- S6 A part of a text; what a paragraph is about and how it's structured with the other paragraphs. It also deals with the purpose of that paragraph.
- S7 I would define moves as the different "steps" taken by the author of an opinion in order to get to the result wanted, however it is broader than "steps" because moves are the general stages (introduction, development, conclusion), when steps are each paragraph.
- S8 It is like a "tool" that structures the document: it permits to identify what the arguments are.
- S9 parts of the reasoning of a person
- S10 Les moves constituent la structure et l'enchaînement logique d'un texte.
- S11 The way that a text is divided, the entire process that permits to reach a conclusion and a clear argumentation. Moves are the different categories to support, explain and detail the arguments.
- S12 they are excerpts of phrase or little phrase that the author uses to change argument, to give an example or to introduce and conclude a text, opinion.
- S13 I would say that the moves represent the logic the court followed in its reasoning.
- S14 the main ideas of an opinion

- S15 Moves are different paragraphs of a speech or in a written document that structure the whole document, from the beginning until the end. It's designate the structure and the organization of the ideas said orally or by written.
- S16 for me it is the general idea in a part of an opinion that helps to understand it better. The way the opinion is constructed is define by the moves.
- S18 A move is a part of a text that explains one of the points leading to the final opinion.
- S19 The moves are the arguments and the use of them made by the justice : the topics and ideas he expresses in his opinion and how he places them in the text : how they are positioned and related in the text
- S20 In my opinion, moves means how the judge articulated his arguments and why he decided to address first one point and then another one. It's also related to the logical structure of the judge reasoning and it helps to understand the juridical and logical basis of its decision.
- S21 The directions that the argument takes in explaining itself
- S23 I would say it refers to the steps, the reasoning of the writer (justice in our cases)
- S24 I would define the term to talk about the logical steps used to write the opinion
-

D.3 Which of the following moves did your group find in the majority of the judicial opinions you read? (Examples from Kalamkar et al., 2022: 4422)

N	Move	Move description
a) 10	Preamble	“This covers the metadata related to the legal judgment document. A typical judgment would start with the court name, the details of parties, lawyers and judges’ names, headnote (summary).”
b) 23	Facts	“This corresponds to the facts of the case. It refers to the chronology of events that led to filing the case and how it evolved. Depositions and proceedings of the current court, and summary of lower court proceedings.”
c) 9	Ruling by lower court	“Cases are not directly filed in the higher courts but are appealed from lower courts. Consequently, the documents contain judgments given by the lower courts based on the present appeal. The lower court’s verdict, analysis, and the ratio behind the judgment by the lower court is annotated with this label.”
d) 17	Issues	“Some judgments mention the key points on which the verdict needs to be delivered. Such Legal Questions Framed by the Court are issues.”
e) 21	Argument by petitioner	“Arguments by petitioners’ lawyers. Precedent cases argued by petitioner lawyers fall under this category, but when the court discusses them later, then they belong to either the relied / not relied upon category.”
f) 21	Argument by respondent	“Arguments by respondents’ lawyers. Precedent cases argued by respondent lawyers fall under this, but when the court discusses them later, they belong to either the relied / not relied category.”
g) 16	Analysis	“These are views of the court. This includes courts’ discussion on the evidence, facts presented, prior cases, and statutes. Discussions on how the law is applicable or not applicable to the current case. Observations (nonbinding) from the court.”
h) 13	Statute	“This includes texts in which the court discusses established laws, that can come from a mixture of sources: Acts , Sections, Articles, Rules, Order, notices, notifications, and Quotations directly from the bare act.”
i) 19	Precedent relied	“Texts in which the court discusses prior case documents, discussions and decisions which were relied upon by the court for final decisions.”
j) 7	Precedent not relied	“Texts in which the court discusses prior case documents, discussions and decisions which were not relied upon by the court for final decisions. It could be due to the fact that the situation, in that case, is not relevant to the current case.”
k) 12	Ratio of the decision	“This includes the main reason given for the application of any legal principle to the legal issue. It is the result of the analysis by the court. It typically appears right before the final decision.”
l) 21	Ruling by present court	“Final decision + conclusion + order of the Court following from the natural/logical outcome of the rationale.”

D.4 Please describe how you agreed on the names of the moves when you discussed the judicial opinions with your group.

-
- S1 We chose the name that best reflected the content of the paragraph or of the part of the opinion.
- S3 nous ne donnions pas de noms précis aux moves and steps, mais nous faisons seulement des résumés de chacun d'entre eux.
- S4 The names of the moves came rather naturally as we never deeply analyzed decisions in terms of moves, but rather in terms of law. Thus, we named moves following general nominations, such as "jurisprudence", or "statutes".
- S5 we rarely gave a name to the move itself, we explained the move as a "point of interest" in the texte. But if we were to give them names it would have been to describe the goal or the aim of the argument : citing context, providing argument, citing doctrine etc...
- S6 If someone did not agree with a name, this person was trying to show what the meaning of the moves were by quoting some parts of it.
- S7 We never had to discuss the names, firstly because we divided the work, secondly because we looked at the ppt from M1 to find the accurate names.
- S8 no problem
- S9 I listened to my classmate
- S10 Nous avons déterminé les moves à mesure que nous avons avancé dans le semestre mais la majorité était déjà déterminée au début comme les faits, la décision, les arguments, la problématique, qui sont des éléments essentiels dans une décision de justice, même française.
- S11 Comparing our personal work (most of the time we totally agreed). When not, finding a bundle, a word that supported the argument.
- S12 We took the power point of the class of last year.
- S13 The structure of the opinions are quite similar, so some of the moves appear frequently. There is always an introduction, the arguments of the parties, some case references and then the conclusion.
- S14 I took the general idea of the move
- S15 We used documents in the past courses about that, the correction of the professor concerning the qualification of the moves.
- S16 It was very instinctive, we tried to be as precise as possible
- S17 we have some words, with describe a part (a move) and we use the same in order to be sure that we are agree. and to be sure at the end, we discussed that together.
- S18 By making general categories of what you can find in a judicial opinion.
- S19 we tried to identify the main concept express in every paragraph/ argument
- S20 We try to identify the main idea or concept express in every paragraph/argument
- S21 We talked about the division of the paragraphs and we tried to summarise each paragraph
- S23 no agreement , just what we saw in class last year
- S24 We divided the parahrappes between us
-

D.5 Please describe how you identified moves when you worked on the judicial opinions alone.

- S1 I tried to identify the justice's way of thinking and logic, usually divided into paragraphs. It is usually the same structure (overview of the case, law or precedent applicable, application to the fact of the case), although some justices have a tendency to talk for pages and pages without getting to the point and therefore losing the logical structure.
- S3 en fonction de la syntaxe, mais aussi de l'organisation des différents paragraphes de la décision.
- S4 I first identified the general meaning of the paragraph I was reading, and then tried to integrate it to the whole structure of the opinion.
- S5 I intensified moves often as paragraphs that were using a particular syntax or vocabulary. the position of the move in the text is also a strong indicator.
- S6 I was mainly trying to find keywords or bundles that were specific to a type of move (ex: dates, words relating to the parties or institutions) for facts and procedure // verbs for argumentative parts)
- S7 I firstly read the whole opinion taking notes to understand the opinion and the general idea. I then read a second time and took time to understand each paragraph, the idea explained in it and if it differed from the other paragraphs. Lastly I try to come up with a name for the paragraph(s).
- S8 by reading the opinion
- S9 reading and trying to understand the intention of the justice
- S10 En surlignant au fur et à mesure de la lecture.
- S11 Read the opinion entirely. Then part by part analyzing the words.

- S12 I numbered the paragraphs, then I read the paragraphs one by one and explain what the Justice is saying in it. Then I try to understand the structure of the opinion by making a plan(I., II., III.)
- S13 I read the full opinion once and then I tried to give a title to each paragraph in order to understand the main arguments.
- S15 With the different separate paragraphs and with words with logical connectors.
- S16 I tried to see if there were many paragraphs and described the main idea in each
- S17 I read the opinion. I identified the moves through the paragraph. In general, a paragraph show one or several ideas.
- S18 By highlighting the text while reading it and identifying what the author talks about and wants to stress.
- S19 I tend to identify an introduction and the main paragraphs and a conclusion.
what I did was also trying to identify the main question developed in the opinion, even if sometimes they were not explicit.
- S20 I try to identify an introduction and then the development of the argumentation through linkers such as "firstly, in addition, secondly, however, moreover, etc"
- S21 I printed the opinion so while reading it I could underline the text and divide it into different paragraphs
- S23 reading briefly then making an idea of what's it about
- S24 First of all I read all the opinion, then I underlined the most important concepts and in this way I subdivided the text
-

D.6 The main difficulties with reading opinions and identifying the moves were:

- S1 Some can be very long and some of the Justices don't write with a real legal structure, rather give their opinion with examples to justify but without making the effort of dividing their viewpoint into arguments or questions.
- S3 parfois certains moves ans steps pouvaient se confondre
- S4 The main difficulties were, for me, to get the legal idea behind the language, and moves might have helped me, but giving a general idea, not quite helping me analyze in deep.
- S5 the length and the number of the documents and opinion can be discouraging.
- S6 Sometimes American opinions can be quite unstructured making it difficult to find specific moves. Sometimes the justices were jumping from one point to other or were using different types of moves in a single paragraph (argument, exemple, facts and so on)
- S7 The main difficulties were the language and syntax used which can be harder to understand in older opinions. It can also be a bit long sometimes which makes it hard to focus the entire opinion.
- S8 opinions were a bit long
- S9 didn't really felt relevant sometimes
- S10 Le vocabulaire, et la distinction entre les parties du texte, notamment en comprenant l'emplacement des citations.
- S11 When the text was not that clear and the paragraphs were alike, it was difficult to clearly understand where an argument started and ended. Also when there were no much argument and that the opinion was one big argument with several examples.
- S12 The syntax and the technical vocabulary. And the fact that some opinions were very long.
- S13 It is very long.
- S14 long opinion
- S15 To differentiate the moves between them, to identify when a move end and when an other one beginn. Feeling that all the paragraphs (in particular in the middle of the opinion) are in the same move.
- S16 Sometimes it is difficult when the opinion is long, the specific vocabulary also and the description of the facts can be a bit shorter so it is more complicated to contextualise
- S17 It is not a difficulties, but it took a lot of time. I don't have the impression to read the opinion faster.
- S18 Hard vocabulary, lot of reference to jurisprudence and the american law mechanisms while I didn't know about it.
- S19 the fact that sometimes there were many digressions made by the justice , which affected the ability of comprehending the general argument expressed.
- S20 to understand where an argument ends and where it starts the following one
- S21 When there were too long paragraphs
- S23 Very long and complex
- S24 to understand the legal concept expressed by the author
-

Table 3. The main advantages of having identified the moves of the judicial opinion were:

I understood the overall structure of argumentation better	15
I understood specific arguments better	12
I started to read the opinions faster	3
I understood legal vocabulary better	2
I remembered the contents more after the move analysis	4
I understood American legal reasoning better	6

D.6a Comments from those intending to use moves in future

- S4 I do not believe to need move analysis in the future, as, for the moment, I don't see the interest of integrating it in my future work. That idea might change, if moves become a notion more concrete and applicable in my everyday-future-work.
- S8 No because I don't think I am going to work with this type of document in the future. And I think I am able to do it so I don't have to exercise it everyday
- S9 no because I intend to work in French law and decisions are clearer
- S12 I am not willing to work in that environment (traduction)
- S17 I don't see the purpose of this. Concerning opinions, there are some similitudes, but sometimes not.
- S18 I don't think I will need it.
-

D.6b Comments from those intending to use moves in future

- S1 We actually as law students use it everyday and tend to structure very thought using the syllogism method. I think that at this point it's something we don't think about anymore.
- S3 permet de structurer l'organisation et permet une meilleure compréhension d'un texte.
- S5 maybe not as treated in the class, but I'll definitely use the analytic approach in the future.
- S6 I think it is useful to read American opinions is a clearer and faster way so I think I will still work like that in the future. However it can not be the only thing : it's also important to have informations on the impact and core principles of the case.
- S11 If I am working in the future with opinions, no matter the country and language.
- S15 In translation exercise. To better understand some documents. To write and make reports in futur jobs. Using moves in the structure of the document that I will have to write.
- S20 to analyse argumentations of the italian or french Supreme Court (or even of a first instance tribunal) for my mémoire but also in my future job as a lawyer
- S23 to read faster and more efficiently
-

D.7 Suggestions for improving this course (specifically the move analysis approach)

- S1 We had a lot of content and I think what was most difficult was to jump from cases to cases so quickly with having an American constitutional law course beforehand. I feel like I directly dived it into very specific and technical content and therefore spent more time trying to understand the legal and constitutional background rather than being able to go into the depth of the opinions. I have the impression of having learned superficially without getting the opportunity to really understand and create logical links. Same goes for the move analysis, I felt like because we were spending so much time trying to get what the opinion was saying that we brushed over the move analysis, and in the same way stayed very superficial.
- S4 I would suggest designating a rotation of groups at the very beginning of the semester and to assign to each group an opinion to analyse in deep and to identify moves and bundles. Working, every week, on the opinions, not knowing if we would pass before the class or not, was rather exhausting and I lost interest for the class. This system did not really allow me to focus through class and oral presentations as I already knew everything regarding the case.
I would also suggest truly analyzing American Private law. For example, for a semester, focusing on Commercial Law and analyzing opinions, debates and affairs related to this legal field. That way, the class may be entirely related to the objective and the goal of the Master.
Regarding the move analysis approach, I would suggest a debate, each week, after students are done presenting their opinion, regarding both identification and nomination of moves. That way, identifying moves may become a concrete subject and be less theoretical.
- S5 explaining the legal concept at hand in the decision we are about to analyse. it can be difficult to understand a concept with a decision as a first entry to the notion.

- S6 Unfortunately, the fact that we focus on moves and steps kind of prevent us from understanding the real impact of a case or the principles that it establishes (since the Court's reasoning is often quite indirect when it comes to setting down principles).
It would be maybe better to have one or two groups working on opinions and another one present the tests or principles set in the opinion, maybe how the opinion was used afterwards.
Another solution is to reduce the number of opinion to enable all groups to also work on that part.
- S7 Maybe not having so much opinions to read to focus on the moves and steps of one opinion and presenting it to the class and discuss in class with the other group of how we understood each paragraphs and ideas of said opinion.
- S8 expectation are high, and select randomly the group who present the opinion was stressful. Even if I knew how to do the macrostructure, it was a very long work because opinions were long.
- S9 maybe have some clearer examples of what we are supposed to identify, that was a bit confusing this year.
- S10 Le focus sur la Cour Suprême est un peu fort. Peut-être une possibilité d'étendre à l'étude de d'autres instances et concepts juridiques.
- S11 Correction of the moves in class and overall discussion.
- S12 Start with very short opinion to not loose the student.
- S13 For some cases, the work load was a little bit too much, especially with two or three opinions of 20 pages or more.
Maybe in these cases, only one opinion would be fine.
Maybe more debate because presentations can get monotones.
- S15 To identify the move in class all together and to discuss why a paragraph can be qualified as such. To analyze more in class how to distinguish the moves between them and when it's difficult to separate them, to see why exactly, and how to deal with this.
- S16 To focus more on the decision and to try to analyse better the opinion in the US legal context.
- S1 Less Supreme Court cases (or at least not only), more explanation about the mechanisms of american law (due process clause, habeas corpus...), explanations about the specificity of the American legal reasoning. We can easily get lost as some opinions are about specific topics that we've never heard of before and are not explained clearly in class.
- S19 I Believe it would be more interesting to analyse more actual cases and topics.
For example, referring to the freedom of speech, it would be more interesting to analyse the case of some famous politics (or of Julian Assange, if there will be a process in the US).
I would be more keen to deal with current topics and cases.
- S20 maybe it will be helpful an "introduction" class (the first lesson for exemple) to explain what is the move analysis of an opinion, how it works and how it can be used to understand specific arguments better
- S23 Not giving so much opinions and dissents because it takes a really long time to do it all in one week even if it's divided in groups
- S24 I think that reading short opinions is easier than long ones (three opinions with 30 pages) and this allows you to syudy better and understand better the case. Otherwise, It should be better to do it progressively (from short ones to long ones).
-