MacArthur Foundation Chicagoan Opinions - Public Safety

Q1: Which of the following do you think is the most important problem in Chicago today?

				Gender					Age (Net)					Generations					Race/Ethnicity		
	Total (A)	**Male (B)**	**Female (C)**	**Transgender (D)**	**Non-binary (E)**	**18-24 (F)**	**25-34 (G)**	**35-44 (H)**	**45-54 (I)**	**55-64 (J)**	**65+ (K)**	**Gen Z (18-24) (L)**	**Millennials (25-40) (**	**Gen X (41-56) (N)**	**Baby Boomers (57-7**	**Silent Generation (7**	**White (Not Hispanic**	**People of Color (R)**	**Hispanic (S)**	**Black (Not Hispanic)**	**AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)**
Total	N=1001	N=453	N=532	N=8 **	N=14 **	N=112	N=189	N=176	N=182	N=164	N=177	N=112	N=313	N=270	N=275	N=30 *	N=605	N=396	N=175	N=137	N=52 *
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=349	N=643	N=7 **	N=8 **	N=107	N=154	N=142	N=152	N=188	N=258	N=107	N=253	N=234	N=360	N=47 *	N=679	N=322	N=91 *	N=158	N=39 *
Gun violence	57%	55%	59%	20%	30%	49%	55%	49%	52%	61% h	72% FGHIj	49%	53%	51%	68% LMN	65%	60% r	52%	52%	60%	46%
Property taxes	11%	14% C	8%	23%	29% c	4%	10%	13% f	14% fk	15% FK	7%	4%	9%	19% LMO	8%	9%	13% RT	7% T	8% T	0%	17% T
Economic inequality	6%	9% C	3%	23% C	10%	4%	6%	8% J	12% fJK	2%	5%	4%	7%	9% O	4%	1%	4%	10% Q	12% Q	9% Q	4%
Racial segregation across areas including education, housing, access to city services, etc.	5%	4%	6%	8%	0%	5%	10% IK	7% K	3%	5%	2%	5%	8% o	4%	3%	4%	4%	7%	4%	8%	9%
Lack of access to affordable housing	5%	3%	7% B	0%	0%	8% jk	7% j	6%	4%	2%	3%	8% O	8% nO	3%	2%	5%	3%	7% Q	12% Qu	6%	0%
Homelessness	4%	2%	5% b	0%	0%	10% hIK	4%	3%	2%	5% k	1%	10% mNOP	4%	2%	3%	0%	3%	5%	3%	7%	13% Qs
Police treatment of Black and Latino people	3%	2%	4%	26% BC	16% B	14% GHIJK	1%	1%	1%	2%	3%	14% MNOP	1%	1%	3%	1%	1%	6% Q	8% Q	6% Q	2%
Lack of access to social services (e.g., income assistance, job training, food pantries)	3%	3%	3%	0%	0%	2%	4% k	4% k	3%	2%	1%	2%	4%	2%	2%	0%	3%	2%	0%	2%	7% S
Pension reform	2%	2%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	4% fGH	3% h	1%	0%	0%	3% M	3% m	1%	2% r	0%	0%	0%	2%
Other (please specify):	4%	6%	3%	0%	15%	4%	3%	7%	5%	3%	5%	4%	5%	4%	3%	13% lmNO	6% r	2%	1%	2%	0%
N/A - Chicago does not have any serious problems.	1%	1%	1%	0%	0%	1%	0%	1%	1%	0%	0%	1%	1%	1%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	1%	0%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Q2: How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding the city of Chicago?

Race relations in Chicago are good right now.

				Gender					Age (Net)					Generations					Race/Ethnicity		
	Total (A)	**Male (B)**	**Female (C)**	**Transgender (D)**	**Non-binary (E)**	**18-24 (F)**	**25-34 (G)**	**35-44 (H)**	**45-54 (I)**	**55-64 (J)**	**65+ (K)**	**Gen Z (18-24) (L)**	**Millennials (25-40) (**	**Gen X (41-56) (N)**	**Baby Boomers (57-7**	**Silent Generation (7**	**White (Not Hispanic**	**People of Color (R)**	**Hispanic (S)**	**Black (Not Hispanic)**	**AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)**
Total	N=1001	N=453	N=532	N=8 **	N=14 **	N=112	N=189	N=176	N=182	N=164	N=177	N=112	N=313	N=270	N=275	N=30 *	N=605	N=396	N=175	N=137	N=52 *
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=349	N=643	N=7 **	N=8 **	N=107	N=154	N=142	N=152	N=188	N=258	N=107	N=253	N=234	N=360	N=47 *	N=679	N=322	N=91 *	N=158	N=39 *
Agree (Net)	22%	29% C	16%	16%	41%	24%	27% k	27% k	21%	18%	17%	24%	26% o	22%	18%	14%	22%	23%	19%	27%	24%
Strongly agree	4%	7% C	3%	0%	0%	6% k	5% k	5%	6% K	4%	1%	6% o	4%	7% O	2%	5%	4%	4%	3%	6%	7%
Somewhat agree	18%	23% C	14%	16%	41% c	18%	22%	23%	15%	14%	15%	18%	22% p	16%	16%	9%	18%	19%	15%	21%	17%
Disagree (Net)	78%	71%	84% B	84%	59%	76%	73%	73%	79%	82%	83% gh	76%	74%	78%	82% m	86%	78%	77%	81%	73%	76%
Somewhat disagree	43%	41%	45%	54%	32%	50%	43%	37%	43%	43%	45%	50%	40%	44%	43%	41%	42%	44%	47%	38%	54%
Strongly disagree	34%	30%	39% B	31%	26%	26%	30%	36%	36%	39% f	38% f	26%	34%	33%	39% l	45% l	36%	33%	35%	34%	22%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Compared to this time last year, race relations in Chicago have improved.

				Gender					Age (Net)					Generations					Race/Ethnicity		
	Total (A)	**Male (B)**	**Female (C)**	**Transgender (D)**	**Non-binary (E)**	**18-24 (F)**	**25-34 (G)**	**35-44 (H)**	**45-54 (I)**	**55-64 (J)**	**65+ (K)**	**Gen Z (18-24) (L)**	**Millennials (25-40) (**	**Gen X (41-56) (N)**	**Baby Boomers (57-7**	**Silent Generation (7**	**White (Not Hispanic**	**People of Color (R)**	**Hispanic (S)**	**Black (Not Hispanic)**	**AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)**
Total	N=1001	N=453	N=532	N=8 **	N=14 **	N=112	N=189	N=176	N=182	N=164	N=177	N=112	N=313	N=270	N=275	N=30 *	N=605	N=396	N=175	N=137	N=52 *
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=349	N=643	N=7 **	N=8 **	N=107	N=154	N=142	N=152	N=188	N=258	N=107	N=253	N=234	N=360	N=47 *	N=679	N=322	N=91 *	N=158	N=39 *
Agree (Net)	29%	36% C	24%	36%	0%	42% IJK	33% Ij	37% IJ	20%	21%	27%	42% NOP	34% no	24%	25%	20%	29%	29%	26%	33%	42%
Strongly agree	3%	3%	4%	0%	0%	4%	3%	5% J	5% J	1%	2%	4% O	4% O	4% O	1%	8% O	3%	3%	1%	4%	12% QrS
Somewhat agree	26%	33% C	20%	36%	0%	39% IJK	30% I	32% Ij	15%	20%	25% i	39% NOP	30% nP	20%	24% p	12%	26%	26%	25%	29%	30%
Disagree (Net)	71%	64%	76% B	64%	100%	58%	67%	63%	80% FGH	79% FgH	73% F	58%	66%	76% Lm	75% Lm	80% L	71%	71%	74%	67%	58%
Somewhat disagree	42%	38%	45% b	17%	84% BcD	36%	40%	37%	44%	46%	48% h	36%	38%	44%	47% m	42%	43% t	41%	41%	33%	40%
Strongly disagree	29%	26%	31%	46%	16%	21%	27%	27%	36% Fk	33% f	25%	21%	29%	32%	28%	38% l	28%	30%	33%	34%	17%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

There is a strong sense of community across Chicago.

				Gender					Age (Net)					Generations					Race/Ethnicity		
	Total (A)	**Male (B)**	**Female (C)**	**Transgender (D)**	**Non-binary (E)**	**18-24 (F)**	**25-34 (G)**	**35-44 (H)**	**45-54 (I)**	**55-64 (J)**	**65+ (K)**	**Gen Z (18-24) (L)**	**Millennials (25-40) (**	**Gen X (41-56) (N)**	**Baby Boomers (57-7**	**Silent Generation (7**	**White (Not Hispanic**	**People of Color (R)**	**Hispanic (S)**	**Black (Not Hispanic)**	**AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)**
Total	N=1001	N=453	N=532	N=8 **	N=14 **	N=112	N=189	N=176	N=182	N=164	N=177	N=112	N=313	N=270	N=275	N=30 *	N=605	N=396	N=175	N=137	N=52 *
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=349	N=643	N=7 **	N=8 **	N=107	N=154	N=142	N=152	N=188	N=258	N=107	N=253	N=234	N=360	N=47 *	N=679	N=322	N=91 *	N=158	N=39 *
Agree (Net)	48%	49%	47%	38%	40%	59% IjK	59% IJK	51% I	36%	45%	40%	59% NOP	55% NOP	42%	43%	36%	46%	50%	45%	48%	77% QRST
Strongly agree	10%	12%	9%	0%	0%	18% IJK	18% IJK	11% j	8%	4%	5%	18% NOp	16% NOp	7%	5%	5%	7%	15% Q	13%	17% Q	17%
Somewhat agree	37%	37%	38%	38%	40%	41% i	42% i	40%	28%	41% i	35%	41%	39%	35%	38%	31%	39%	35%	32%	31%	61% QRST
Disagree (Net)	52%	51%	53%	62%	60%	41%	41%	49%	64% FGH	55% fG	60% FG	41%	45%	58% LM	57% LM	64% LM	54% U	50% U	55% U	52% U	23%
Somewhat disagree	34%	34%	34%	31%	29%	23%	26%	33%	43% FG	39% FG	36% fg	23%	30%	40% Lm	37% L	42% l	33%	35%	42% u	32%	21%
Strongly disagree	18%	18%	19%	31%	30%	18%	15%	16%	21%	16%	24%	18%	16%	18%	21%	22%	21% rU	15% u	13%	20% U	1%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Mayor Lori Lightfoot has done a good job of investing in and supporting historically marginalized neighborhoods.

				Gender					Age (Net)					Generations					Race/Ethnicity		
	Total (A)	**Male (B)**	**Female (C)**	**Transgender (D)**	**Non-binary (E)**	**18-24 (F)**	**25-34 (G)**	**35-44 (H)**	**45-54 (I)**	**55-64 (J)**	**65+ (K)**	**Gen Z (18-24) (L)**	**Millennials (25-40) (**	**Gen X (41-56) (N)**	**Baby Boomers (57-7**	**Silent Generation (7**	**White (Not Hispanic**	**People of Color (R)**	**Hispanic (S)**	**Black (Not Hispanic)**	**AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)**
Total	N=1001	N=453	N=532	N=8 **	N=14 **	N=112	N=189	N=176	N=182	N=164	N=177	N=112	N=313	N=270	N=275	N=30 *	N=605	N=396	N=175	N=137	N=52 *
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=349	N=643	N=7 **	N=8 **	N=107	N=154	N=142	N=152	N=188	N=258	N=107	N=253	N=234	N=360	N=47 *	N=679	N=322	N=91 *	N=158	N=39 *
Agree (Net)	39%	42%	36%	14%	49%	37%	41%	43% i	31%	38%	42% i	37%	39%	39%	39%	36%	38%	39%	29%	51% QrS	42%
Strongly agree	6%	7%	5%	5%	0%	3%	7%	10% f	5%	4%	5%	3%	7% o	8% o	3%	3%	4%	8% Q	6%	13% Q	8%
Somewhat agree	33%	35%	31%	8%	49%	34%	34%	33%	26%	33%	37% i	34%	32%	31%	36%	33%	34% s	31%	24%	38% s	34%
Disagree (Net)	61%	58%	64%	86%	51%	63%	59%	57%	69% hk	62%	58%	63%	61%	61%	61%	64%	62% T	61% t	71% T	49%	58%
Somewhat disagree	30%	27%	33%	49%	18%	31%	30%	20%	37% H	30% h	33% H	31%	27%	32%	31%	42% m	29%	33%	35%	28%	36%
Strongly disagree	31%	31%	31%	38%	33%	32%	29%	37% K	33%	32%	24%	32%	34%	30%	30%	22%	33% T	28%	36% T	21%	23%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Race-related issues in Chicago are due to a few bad actors, not systemic issues.

				Gender					Age (Net)					Generations					Race/Ethnicity		
	Total (A)	**Male (B)**	**Female (C)**	**Transgender (D)**	**Non-binary (E)**	**18-24 (F)**	**25-34 (G)**	**35-44 (H)**	**45-54 (I)**	**55-64 (J)**	**65+ (K)**	**Gen Z (18-24) (L)**	**Millennials (25-40) (**	**Gen X (41-56) (N)**	**Baby Boomers (57-7**	**Silent Generation (7**	**White (Not Hispanic**	**People of Color (R)**	**Hispanic (S)**	**Black (Not Hispanic)**	**AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)**
Total	N=1001	N=453	N=532	N=8 **	N=14 **	N=112	N=189	N=176	N=182	N=164	N=177	N=112	N=313	N=270	N=275	N=30 *	N=605	N=396	N=175	N=137	N=52 *
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=349	N=643	N=7 **	N=8 **	N=107	N=154	N=142	N=152	N=188	N=258	N=107	N=253	N=234	N=360	N=47 *	N=679	N=322	N=91 *	N=158	N=39 *
Agree (Net)	37%	44% Cde	32%	0%	0%	29%	34%	38%	44% f	34%	40%	29%	34%	42% lp	40%	26%	40%	33%	31%	34%	45%
Strongly agree	14%	18% C	12%	0%	0%	7%	11%	14%	21% Fg	14%	16% f	7%	14%	16%	17% l	12%	16% t	12%	15%	9%	18%
Somewhat agree	23%	26% c	20%	0%	0%	22%	23%	23%	23%	21%	24%	22%	20%	27% p	23%	14%	24%	21%	16%	25%	27%
Disagree (Net)	63%	56%	68% B	100% b	100% b	71% i	66%	62%	56%	66%	60%	71% n	66%	58%	60%	74% n	60%	67%	69%	66%	55%
Somewhat disagree	36%	35%	37%	38%	67%	36%	38% i	39% I	25%	40% I	39% I	36%	40% n	30%	36%	55% lNO	36%	37%	42%	31%	39%
Strongly disagree	27%	21%	31% B	62% B	33%	35% K	28%	24%	31% k	25%	21%	35% o	26%	28%	24%	20%	25%	30%	27%	35% Qu	16%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Mayor Lori Lightfoot could do more to tackle inequality across Chicago neighborhoods.

				Gender					Age (Net)					Generations					Race/Ethnicity		
	Total (A)	**Male (B)**	**Female (C)**	**Transgender (D)**	**Non-binary (E)**	**18-24 (F)**	**25-34 (G)**	**35-44 (H)**	**45-54 (I)**	**55-64 (J)**	**65+ (K)**	**Gen Z (18-24) (L)**	**Millennials (25-40) (**	**Gen X (41-56) (N)**	**Baby Boomers (57-7**	**Silent Generation (7**	**White (Not Hispanic**	**People of Color (R)**	**Hispanic (S)**	**Black (Not Hispanic)**	**AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)**
Total	N=1001	N=453	N=532	N=8 **	N=14 **	N=112	N=189	N=176	N=182	N=164	N=177	N=112	N=313	N=270	N=275	N=30 *	N=605	N=396	N=175	N=137	N=52 *
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=349	N=643	N=7 **	N=8 **	N=107	N=154	N=142	N=152	N=188	N=258	N=107	N=253	N=234	N=360	N=47 *	N=679	N=322	N=91 *	N=158	N=39 *
Agree (Net)	84%	81%	87% b	100%	100%	88% k	84%	93% gIK	80%	86%	78%	88% P	87% P	84% p	82%	71%	84%	85%	91% t	80%	78%
Strongly agree	40%	37%	42%	72%	51%	48% K	48% jK	43% K	40% k	36%	29%	48% OP	46% OP	40% p	32%	23%	35%	48% Q	52% Q	44% q	37%
Somewhat agree	44%	44%	44%	28%	49%	40%	36%	50% g	39%	50% g	50% g	40%	42%	44%	50%	47%	49% RT	37%	39%	35%	41%
Disagree (Net)	16%	19% c	13%	0%	0%	12%	16% h	7%	20% H	14%	22% fH	12%	13%	16%	18%	29% LMn	16%	15%	9%	20% s	22%
Somewhat disagree	11%	13%	10%	0%	0%	11%	12% h	5%	14% H	8%	17% HJ	11%	9%	11%	13%	21% M	11%	11%	9%	16%	12%
Strongly disagree	4%	6% C	3%	0%	0%	1%	4%	3%	6% f	6% f	5%	1%	4%	5%	6% l	8% L	5%	3%	1%	4%	9% S

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Chicago law enforcement needs reform.

				Gender					Age (Net)					Generations					Race/Ethnicity		
	Total (A)	**Male (B)**	**Female (C)**	**Transgender (D)**	**Non-binary (E)**	**18-24 (F)**	**25-34 (G)**	**35-44 (H)**	**45-54 (I)**	**55-64 (J)**	**65+ (K)**	**Gen Z (18-24) (L)**	**Millennials (25-40) (**	**Gen X (41-56) (N)**	**Baby Boomers (57-7**	**Silent Generation (7**	**White (Not Hispanic**	**People of Color (R)**	**Hispanic (S)**	**Black (Not Hispanic)**	**AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)**
Total	N=1001	N=453	N=532	N=8 **	N=14 **	N=112	N=189	N=176	N=182	N=164	N=177	N=112	N=313	N=270	N=275	N=30 *	N=605	N=396	N=175	N=137	N=52 *
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=349	N=643	N=7 **	N=8 **	N=107	N=154	N=142	N=152	N=188	N=258	N=107	N=253	N=234	N=360	N=47 *	N=679	N=322	N=91 *	N=158	N=39 *
Agree (Net)	74%	71%	77% b	84%	71%	89% HIJK	81% Ij	74%	65%	70%	72%	89% MNOP	76%	71%	70%	67%	69%	82% Q	79%	88% Qsu	75%
Strongly agree	33%	29%	35%	80% Bc	51%	41% JK	39% Jk	35%	32%	25%	27%	41% Op	39% Op	32%	25%	22%	25%	45% Q	39% Q	55% QSU	31%
Somewhat agree	42%	42%	42%	4%	20%	48% i	42%	39%	33%	45% i	45% i	48%	37%	39%	46%	44%	45% rT	37%	39%	33%	44%
Disagree (Net)	26%	29% c	23%	16%	29%	11%	19%	26% F	35% FG	30% Fg	28% F	11%	24% L	29% L	30% L	33% L	31% RT	18%	21% t	12%	25% t
Somewhat disagree	16%	15%	16%	16%	29%	10%	14%	16%	22% f	14%	18%	10%	16%	18%	16%	20%	18% T	14%	17% t	8%	18%
Strongly disagree	10%	14% C	6%	0%	0%	1%	5%	10% F	13% Fg	16% FG	10% F	1%	8% l	11% L	14% Lm	14% L	13% RST	4%	4%	3%	7%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Gun violence in Chicago needs to be reduced.

				Gender					Age (Net)					Generations					Race/Ethnicity		

	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (?	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
				Gender				Age (Net)						Generations					Race/Ethnicity		
Total	N=1001	N=453	N=532	N=8 **	N=14 **	N=112	N=189	N=176	N=182	N=164	N=177	N=112	N=313	N=270	N=275	N=30 *	N=605	N=396	N=175	N=137	N=52 *
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=349	N=643	N=7 **	N=8 **	N=107	N=154	N=142	N=152	N=188	N=258	N=107	N=253	N=234	N=360	N=47 *	N=679	N=322	N=91 *	N=158	N=39 *
Agree (Net)	95%	97% c	93%	100%	100%	96%	99% Hi	90%	94%	96%	95%	96%	95%	94%	95%	99%	96% rT	93%	94%	89%	96%
Strongly agree	84%	84%	84%	83%	60%	84%	81%	78%	81%	90% gHi	91% GHI	84%	80%	82%	89% Mn	94% Mn	85%	82%	83%	82%	86%
Somewhat agree	11%	12%	9%	17%	40% bC	12% K	18% JK	12% K	13% jK	6%	4%	12%	14% O	13% O	6%	4%	11%	11%	11%	6%	11%
Disagree (Net)	5%	3%	7% b	0%	0%	4%	1%	10% G	6% g	4%	5%	4%	5%	6%	5%	1%	4%	7% q	6%	11% Q	4%
Somewhat disagree	1%	0%	1%	0%	0%	3%	0%	0%	3%	0%	1%	3% mo	0%	2%	0%	0%	0%	2% q	2%	3% Q	0%
Strongly disagree	4%	3%	5%	0%	0%	1%	1%	9% FG	4%	4%	4%	1%	5%	4%	5%	1%	3%	5%	4%	8% Q	4%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

City government is doing enough to address gun violence in the city.

	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (?	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
				Gender				Age (Net)						Generations					Race/Ethnicity		
Total	N=1001	N=453	N=532	N=8 **	N=14 **	N=112	N=189	N=176	N=182	N=164	N=177	N=112	N=313	N=270	N=275	N=30 *	N=605	N=396	N=175	N=137	N=52 *
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=349	N=643	N=7 **	N=8 **	N=107	N=154	N=142	N=152	N=188	N=258	N=107	N=253	N=234	N=360	N=47 *	N=679	N=322	N=91 *	N=158	N=39 *
Agree (Net)	16%	18%	15%	0%	22%	19% iJK	27% IJK	27% IJK	10%	10%	6%	19% OP	27% NOP	12%	8%	4%	14%	20% Q	19%	21% q	21%
Strongly agree	5%	5%	5%	0%	20%	8% jK	5% K	10% JK	4%	2%	1%	8% O	8% O	4%	1%	1%	4%	6%	7%	7%	2%
Somewhat agree	11%	13%	10%	0%	3%	12% k	21% IJK	17% IjK	6%	8%	5%	12%	19% NOP	8%	7%	3%	10%	14% q	12%	15%	19%
Disagree (Net)	84%	82%	85%	100%	78%	81%	73%	73%	90% fGH	90% fGH	94% FGH	81%	73%	88% M	92% LM	96% LM	86% Rt	80%	81%	79%	79%
Somewhat disagree	31%	28%	33%	23%	40%	32%	31%	33%	32%	28%	30%	32%	30%	34%	30%	23%	29%	35%	32%	34%	47% q
Strongly disagree	53%	54%	52%	77%	38%	49%	43%	40%	58% GH	62% GH	65% FGH	49%	43%	54% m	62% IM	73% LMN	58% RTU	45%	49%	45%	32%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Q2A: Do you think each of the following situations happening in Chicago are better, worse, or about the same compared to cities in the rest of the country?

Race relations

	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (?	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
				Gender				Age (Net)						Generations					Race/Ethnicity		
Total	N=1001	N=453	N=532	N=8 **	N=14 **	N=112	N=189	N=176	N=182	N=164	N=177	N=112	N=313	N=270	N=275	N=30 *	N=605	N=396	N=175	N=137	N=52 *
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=349	N=643	N=7 **	N=8 **	N=107	N=154	N=142	N=152	N=188	N=258	N=107	N=253	N=234	N=360	N=47 *	N=679	N=322	N=91 *	N=158	N=39 *
Better	6%	9% C	4%	0%	0%	6%	8% k	9% K	6%	4%	3%	6%	8% O	7% o	3%	7%	7%	5%	2%	5%	11% s
About the same	49%	52%	46%	59%	39%	50%	43%	43%	44%	54%	59% GHI	50%	41%	48%	58% MN	46%	50%	47%	43%	56% s	43%
Worse	45%	39%	50% B	41%	61%	44%	48%	48%	50% k	42%	38%	44%	51% O	46%	39%	47%	43%	48%	56% qT	39%	46%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Police relations with city residents

	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (?	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
				Gender				Age (Net)						Generations					Race/Ethnicity		
Total	N=1001	N=453	N=532	N=8 **	N=14 **	N=112	N=189	N=176	N=182	N=164	N=177	N=112	N=313	N=270	N=275	N=30 *	N=605	N=396	N=175	N=137	N=52 *
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=349	N=643	N=7 **	N=8 **	N=107	N=154	N=142	N=152	N=188	N=258	N=107	N=253	N=234	N=360	N=47 *	N=679	N=322	N=91 *	N=158	N=39 *
Better	7%	9% c	5%	0%	0%	5%	6%	8%	8%	8%	5%	5%	8%	8%	5%	12%	8%	6%	4%	10%	4%
About the same	52%	53%	52%	26%	16%	40%	43%	46%	59% FGh	59% FGh	59% FGH	40%	43%	59% LM	59% LM	59% lm	53%	49%	52%	50%	42%
Worse	41%	38%	43%	74%	84% Bc	55% IJK	51% IJK	46% ij	33%	33%	36%	55% NOP	50% NOP	33%	36%	29%	39%	45%	45%	39%	54%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Gun violence

	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (?	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
				Gender				Age (Net)						Generations					Race/Ethnicity		
Total	N=1001	N=453	N=532	N=8 **	N=14 **	N=112	N=189	N=176	N=182	N=164	N=177	N=112	N=313	N=270	N=275	N=30 *	N=605	N=396	N=175	N=137	N=52 *
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=349	N=643	N=7 **	N=8 **	N=107	N=154	N=142	N=152	N=188	N=258	N=107	N=253	N=234	N=360	N=47 *	N=679	N=322	N=91 *	N=158	N=39 *
Better	2%	3%	2%	0%	0%	4% k	4% jK	2%	2%	1%	0%	4% O	4% O	2% o	0%	0%	2%	2%	0%	4%	2%
About the same	17%	20%	15%	40%	10%	25% iK	18%	18%	13%	19%	13%	25% n	18%	15%	16%	13%	16%	19%	17%	20%	23%
Worse	81%	78%	83%	60%	90%	71%	77%	80%	84% F	81%	87% Fg	71%	79%	83% L	83% L	87% l	82%	79%	83%	76%	75%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Police union relations with city government (e.g., the mayor, city council, city manager)

	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (?	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
				Gender				Age (Net)						Generations					Race/Ethnicity		
Total	N=1001	N=453	N=532	N=8 **	N=14 **	N=112	N=189	N=176	N=182	N=164	N=177	N=112	N=313	N=270	N=275	N=30 *	N=605	N=396	N=175	N=137	N=52 *
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=349	N=643	N=7 **	N=8 **	N=107	N=154	N=142	N=152	N=188	N=258	N=107	N=253	N=234	N=360	N=47 *	N=679	N=322	N=91 *	N=158	N=39 *
Better	5%	7% C	3%	0%	29% bC	7% ij	10% IJK	6% i	1%	2%	3%	7% O	9% nO	3%	1%	3%	5%	5%	3%	4%	8%
About the same	48%	45%	51%	49%	49%	50%	50%	48%	43%	49%	49%	50%	48%	47%	49%	48%	48%	48%	43%	54%	53%
Worse	47%	49%	46%	51%	22%	43%	40%	46%	56% G	49%	48%	43%	44%	50%	50%	49%	47%	47%	54%	42%	39%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Carjackings

	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (?	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
				Gender				Age (Net)						Generations					Race/Ethnicity		
Total	N=1001	N=453	N=532	N=8 **	N=14 **	N=112	N=189	N=176	N=182	N=164	N=177	N=112	N=313	N=270	N=275	N=30 *	N=605	N=396	N=175	N=137	N=52 *
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=349	N=643	N=7 **	N=8 **	N=107	N=154	N=142	N=152	N=188	N=258	N=107	N=253	N=234	N=360	N=47 *	N=679	N=322	N=91 *	N=158	N=39 *
Better	3%	4%	2%	0%	0%	4%	6% jK	4%	2%	1%	1%	4% o	5% O	2%	1%	3%	3%	2%	1%	3%	2%
About the same	21%	20%	22%	49%	26%	31% IJK	28% jK	24% K	18%	16%	13%	31% nOP	25% OP	20% P	16% P	3%	19%	24%	22%	23%	34% q
Worse	76%	76%	76%	51%	74%	65%	67%	72%	80% FG	84% FGH	86% FGH	65%	70%	79% Lm	84% LM	93% LMN	78%	74%	76%	73%	64%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Other violent crimes (e.g., mugging, assault)

	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (?	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
				Gender				Age (Net)						Generations					Race/Ethnicity		
Total	N=1001	N=453	N=532	N=8 **	N=14 **	N=112	N=189	N=176	N=182	N=164	N=177	N=112	N=313	N=270	N=275	N=30 *	N=605	N=396	N=175	N=137	N=52 *
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=349	N=643	N=7 **	N=8 **	N=107	N=154	N=142	N=152	N=188	N=258	N=107	N=253	N=234	N=360	N=47 *	N=679	N=322	N=91 *	N=158	N=39 *
Better	2%	3%	1%	26% BC	16% C	7% iJK	3%	2%	2%	1%	1%	7% NO	3% O	1%	0%	3% o	3%	2%	1%	1%	2%
About the same	34%	35%	34%	46%	18%	33%	41% i	34%	26%	38% i	33%	33%	39% n	28%	35%	36%	34%	35%	32%	36%	30%
Worse	63%	62%	64%	28%	66%	59%	56%	63%	73% fGj	61%	66%	59%	58%	70% M	64%	61%	63%	63%	67%	62%	68%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Non-violent crimes (e.g., package theft, harassment, property damage)

	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (?	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
				Gender				Age (Net)						Generations					Race/Ethnicity		
Total	N=1001	N=453	N=532	N=8 **	N=14 **	N=112	N=189	N=176	N=182	N=164	N=177	N=112	N=313	N=270	N=275	N=30 *	N=605	N=396	N=175	N=137	N=52 *
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=349	N=643	N=7 **	N=8 **	N=107	N=154	N=142	N=152	N=188	N=258	N=107	N=253	N=234	N=360	N=47 *	N=679	N=322	N=91 *	N=158	N=39 *
Better	4%	6% C	2%	0%	0%	7% J	7% J	5% j	3%	1%	3%	7% O	6% O	3%	2%	2%	4%	4%	2%	5%	6%
About the same	54%	52%	57%	49%	34%	57%	51%	50%	50%	59%	61% hi	57%	48%	54%	61% M	57%	54%	54%	48%	56%	63%
Worse	42%	42%	41%	51%	66%	36%	43%	45%	47% k	40%	36%	36%	46% o	43%	37%	41%	41%	42%	50%	39%	31%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Q11: How concerned are you about the personal safety of each of the following groups of people in the Chicago area?

Police officers

	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (?	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
				Gender				Age (Net)						Generations					Race/Ethnicity		
Total	N=1001	N=453	N=532	N=8 **	N=14 **	N=112	N=189	N=176	N=182	N=164	N=177	N=112	N=313	N=270	N=275	N=30 *	N=605	N=396	N=175	N=137	N=52 *
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=349	N=643	N=7 **	N=8 **	N=107	N=154	N=142	N=152	N=188	N=258	N=107	N=253	N=234	N=360	N=47 *	N=679	N=322	N=91 *	N=158	N=39 *
Concerned (Net)	76%	72%	D 80% BD	29% **	71% **	66%	71%	73%	79% f	84% FGh	81% Fg	66%	74%	75%	82% Lm	93% LMN	81% RSU	69%	68%	75%	60%
Very concerned	41%	38%	43% d	0%	48% d	27%	38%	50% F	39% f	44% F	42% F	27%	44% L	39% l	43% L	54% Ln	43%	37%	35%	40%	27%
Somewhat concerned	36%	34%	37%	29%	23%	39% H	34%	23%	40% H	40% H	39% H	39%	31%	36%	39%	38%	38%	32%	33%	34%	33%
Not concerned (Net)	24%	28%	C 20%	71% BC	29%	34% IJK	29% jk	27% j	21%	16%	19%	34% OP	26% oP	25% P	18%	7%	19%	31% Q	32% Q	25%	40% Q
Not very concerned	18%	23%	C 14%	31%	16%	22% j	22% j	23% J	15%	12%	16%	22% p	20% p	21% op	14%	7%	14%	24% QT	28% QT	14%	35% QT
Not at all concerned	5%	4%	6%	40% BC	13%	12% hjK	6%	4%	6%	4%	3%	12% NOP	6%	4%	4%	0%	5%	7%	3%	11% Qs	5%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Residents of color (e.g., Black, Latino, Asian)

	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (?	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
				Gender				Age (Net)						Generations					Race/Ethnicity		
Total	N=1001	N=453	N=532	N=8 **	N=14 **	N=112	N=189	N=176	N=182	N=164	N=177	N=112	N=313	N=270	N=275	N=30 *	N=605	N=396	N=175	N=137	N=52 *
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=349	N=643	N=7 **	N=8 **	N=107	N=154	N=142	N=152	N=188	N=258	N=107	N=253	N=234	N=360	N=47 *	N=679	N=322	N=91 *	N=158	N=39 *
Concerned (Net)	83%	78%	87% B	100%	100%	92% Hijk	89% H	76%	81%	82%	82%	92% NO	87% N	76%	82%	90% n	80%	88% Q	87%	92% QU	77%

	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
		Gender				Age (Net)						Generations						Race/Ethnicity			
Very concerned	44%	38%	48% B	80% b	100% BC	64% GHIJK	43%	48% i	35%	40%	41%	64% MNOP	47% n	36%	41%	42%	37%	54% QU	48% u	68% QRSU	27%
Somewhat concerned	39%	40% e	39% e	20%	0%	28%	46% FH	28%	46% FH	41% fh	41% fh	28%	40%	41% I	41% I	48% L	43% RT	33%	39% T	24%	50% T
Not concerned (Net)	17%	22% C	13%	0%	0%	8%	11%	24% FG	19% f	18% f	18% f	8%	13%	24% LMp	18% L	10%	20% RT	12%	13%	8%	23% T
Not very concerned	13%	17% C	9%	0%	0%	4%	8%	19% FG	14% F	15% F	15% F	4%	9%	19% LM	15% L	8%	15% T	10%	12%	5%	22% T
Not at all concerned	4%	4%	3%	0%	0%	4%	3%	4%	5%	3%	3%	4%	4%	5%	3%	2%	5% r	2%	1%	3%	1%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Tourists

	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
		Gender				Age (Net)						Generations						Race/Ethnicity			
Total	N=1001	N=453	N=532	N=8 **	N=14 **	N=112	N=189	N=176	N=182	N=164	N=177	N=112	N=313	N=270	N=275	N=30 *	N=605	N=396	N=175	N=137	N=52 *
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=349	N=643	N=7 **	N=8 **	N=107	N=154	N=142	N=152	N=188	N=258	N=107	N=253	N=234	N=360	N=47 *	N=679	N=322	N=91 *	N=158	N=39 *
Concerned (Net)	67%	63%	71% b	55%	86%	58%	66%	56%	70% H	72% fH	79% FGHi	58%	64%	65%	75% LMN	92% LMNO	69% u	65%	59%	73% sU	50%
Very concerned	27%	27%	27%	16%	0%	18%	26%	24%	30% f	30% f	29% f	18%	25%	27%	30% I	37% L	28% S	24%	16%	38% qRS	20%
Somewhat concerned	41%	37%	44% b	40%	86% Bc	40%	41%	31%	40%	42%	50% H	40%	39%	37%	45%	55% mn	41%	41%	43%	35%	30%
Not concerned (Net)	33%	37% c	29%	45%	14%	42% jK	34% K	44% IJK	30% k	28%	21%	42% OP	36% OP	35% OP	25% P	8%	31%	35%	41% t	27%	50% qT
Not very concerned	26%	30% C	22%	45%	10%	37% gJK	24%	34% JK	27% K	20%	16%	37% OP	27% OP	29% OP	18%	8%	25%	27%	30%	21%	46% QrT
Not at all concerned	7%	7%	7%	0%	4%	5%	10% i	10% i	3%	7%	5%	5%	9% p	6%	7%	0%	6%	8%	10%	6%	4%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

City residents

	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
		Gender				Age (Net)						Generations						Race/Ethnicity			
Total	N=1001	N=453	N=532	N=8 **	N=14 **	N=112	N=189	N=176	N=182	N=164	N=177	N=112	N=313	N=270	N=275	N=30 *	N=605	N=396	N=175	N=137	N=52 *
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=349	N=643	N=7 **	N=8 **	N=107	N=154	N=142	N=152	N=188	N=258	N=107	N=253	N=234	N=360	N=47 *	N=679	N=322	N=91 *	N=158	N=39 *
Concerned (Net)	86%	80%	91% B	70%	70%	90%	85%	82%	85%	85%	90% h	90%	86%	81%	88% n	93% n	85%	87%	86%	92% qU	76%
Very concerned	43%	38%	47% B	26%	68%	49%	40%	42%	42%	43%	45%	49%	41%	41%	44%	43%	38%	51% Qu	47%	58% QU	31%
Somewhat concerned	43%	43% e	44% e	44%	3%	40%	46%	40%	43%	43%	46%	40%	45%	41%	44%	50%	47% RT	37%	39%	34%	44%
Not concerned (Net)	14%	20% C	9%	30%	30%	10%	15%	18% k	15%	15%	10%	10%	14%	19% op	12%	7%	15% t	13%	14%	8%	24% T
Not very concerned	13%	19% C	8%	30% c	30% c	9%	15%	18% K	14%	14%	8%	9%	14%	18% O	10%	7%	14% t	12%	14%	7%	23% T
Not at all concerned	1%	1%	1%	0%	0%	1%	0%	1%	0%	1%	2%	1%	0%	1%	2%	0%	1%	0%	0%	1%	1%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Suburban residents

	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
		Gender				Age (Net)						Generations						Race/Ethnicity			
Total	N=1001	N=453	N=532	N=8 **	N=14 **	N=112	N=189	N=176	N=182	N=164	N=177	N=112	N=313	N=270	N=275	N=30 *	N=605	N=396	N=175	N=137	N=52 *
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=349	N=643	N=7 **	N=8 **	N=107	N=154	N=142	N=152	N=188	N=258	N=107	N=253	N=234	N=360	N=47 *	N=679	N=322	N=91 *	N=158	N=39 *
Concerned (Net)	58%	53%	61% B	70%	82%	54%	57%	58%	61%	63%	53%	54%	59%	56%	59%	60%	58%	58%	55%	59%	55%
Very concerned	23%	22%	24%	23%	17%	19%	24%	30% k	24%	20%	20%	19%	27% o	22%	20%	29%	21%	27%	26%	30% Q	20%
Somewhat concerned	35%	31%	37%	47%	65%	35%	33%	28%	37%	43% H	34%	35%	32%	34%	39%	31%	37%	32%	29%	28%	35%
Not concerned (Net)	42%	47% C	39%	30%	18%	46%	43%	42%	39%	37%	47%	46%	41%	44%	41%	40%	42%	42%	45%	41%	45%
Not very concerned	33%	38% C	30%	13%	8%	34%	28%	38%	34%	28%	37%	34%	30%	38%	31%	38%	34%	31%	32%	31%	33%
Not at all concerned	9%	9%	9%	17%	10%	12% h	16% HI	4%	5%	9%	10%	12% p	11%	6%	10%	2%	8%	11%	13%	10%	11%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Homeless Chicagoans

	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
		Gender				Age (Net)						Generations						Race/Ethnicity			
Total	N=1001	N=453	N=532	N=8 **	N=14 **	N=112	N=189	N=176	N=182	N=164	N=177	N=112	N=313	N=270	N=275	N=30 *	N=605	N=396	N=175	N=137	N=52 *
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=349	N=643	N=7 **	N=8 **	N=107	N=154	N=142	N=152	N=188	N=258	N=107	N=253	N=234	N=360	N=47 *	N=679	N=322	N=91 *	N=158	N=39 *
Concerned (Net)	85%	79%	90% B	100%	100%	93% HJk	86%	81%	88%	83%	83%	93% No	86%	81%	84%	92%	82%	90% Q	85%	94% Qs	89%
Very concerned	44%	34%	51% B	90% B	78% b	55% hJk	46%	40%	43%	40%	43%	55% no	43%	42%	41%	48%	38%	52% QU	45%	63% QrSU	30%
Somewhat concerned	41%	45%	39%	10%	22%	38%	40%	41%	45%	43%	41%	38%	43%	39%	43%	44%	44% T	38%	40%	31%	59% rT
Not concerned (Net)	15%	21% C	10%	0%	0%	7%	14%	19% F	12%	17% F	17% f	7%	14%	19% L	16% l	8%	18% RT	10%	15% t	6%	11%
Not very concerned	13%	18% C	9%	0%	0%	4%	13% f	19% F	10%	16% F	13% F	4%	13% I	17% L	13% L	8%	16% RT	9%	13% T	5%	11%
Not at all concerned	2%	3% c	1%	0%	0%	3%	1%	1%	2%	1%	3%	3%	1%	2%	3%	0%	2%	1%	1%	1%	0%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Residents with mental or behavioral health conditions (e.g., psychiatric disorders, cognitive disabilities)

	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
		Gender				Age (Net)						Generations						Race/Ethnicity			
Total	N=1001	N=453	N=532	N=8 **	N=14 **	N=112	N=189	N=176	N=182	N=164	N=177	N=112	N=313	N=270	N=275	N=30 *	N=605	N=396	N=175	N=137	N=52 *
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=349	N=643	N=7 **	N=8 **	N=107	N=154	N=142	N=152	N=188	N=258	N=107	N=253	N=234	N=360	N=47 *	N=679	N=322	N=91 *	N=158	N=39 *
Concerned (Net)	87%	82%	90% B	100%	100%	91% h	85%	81%	92% Hj	84%	88%	91%	85%	86%	87%	92%	85%	89%	86%	92% q	83%
Very concerned	45%	37%	50% B	80% b	80% b	57% hjK	45%	42%	42%	44%	41%	57% mnO	43%	43%	42%	46%	39%	54% Qu	46%	65% QrSU	35%
Somewhat concerned	42%	45%	40%	20%	20%	34%	40%	39%	49% f	40%	47% f	34%	42%	42%	45%	46%	47% RT	35%	40% t	27%	48% t
Not concerned (Net)	13%	18% C	10%	0%	0%	9%	15%	19% fi	8%	16% i	12%	9%	15%	14%	13%	8%	15% t	11%	14%	8%	17%
Not very concerned	12%	16% C	9%	0%	0%	8%	13%	18% fi	8%	13%	11%	8%	13%	13%	12%	8%	13% T	10%	14% t	6%	17% t
Not at all concerned	1%	2%	1%	0%	0%	1%	1%	1%	0%	3%	1%	1%	1%	1%	2%	0%	1%	1%	0%	3%	0%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Q3aNEW: My trust in the police

	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
		Gender				Age (Net)						Generations						Race/Ethnicity			
Total	N=1001	N=453	N=532	N=8 **	N=14 **	N=112	N=189	N=176	N=182	N=164	N=177	N=112	N=313	N=270	N=275	N=30 *	N=605	N=396	N=175	N=137	N=52 *
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=349	N=643	N=7 **	N=8 **	N=107	N=154	N=142	N=152	N=188	N=258	N=107	N=253	N=234	N=360	N=47 *	N=679	N=322	N=91 *	N=158	N=39 *
Do not trust at all	5%	5%	4%	66% BC	26% BC	17% GHIJK	4% k	7% JK	4%	1%	1%	17% MNOP	6% O	3%	1%	0%	2%	10% Q	10% Q	11% Qu	0%
1	5%	3%	6% b	8%	0%	4%	6% j	5% j	6% J	1%	5%	4%	6%	5%	3%	3%	3%	8% Q	2%	13% QS	13% QS
2	5%	6%	4%	0%	3%	6% K	10% IJK	6% K	2%	2%	1%	6% o	8% NOp	3%	2%	0%	2%	8% Q	10% Q	8% Q	1%
3	5%	5%	5%	0%	4%	14% hIJK	8% JK	5%	4%	2%	2%	14% mNOp	7% O	4%	2%	2%	5%	5%	5%	6%	0%
4	5%	4%	7%	0%	11%	7%	6%	5%	5%	3%	6%	7%	5%	6%	4%	4%	3%	8% Q	6%	11% Q	6%
5	9%	10%	9%	5%	0%	15% Gj	4%	13% jk	7%	7%	12% k	15%	9%	8%	9%	12%	9%	10%	11%	8%	20% q
6	13%	13%	11%	0%	49% BCd	15% K	17% K	13% K	12% k	14% K	6%	15% P	14% p	16% OP	8%	2%	11%	15%	19% qu	14%	4%
7	16%	16%	16%	0%	0%	5%	21% Fh	11%	18% F	21% Fh	16% F	5%	17% L	17% L	18% L	16% l	18% rt	12%	10%	10%	22%
8	19%	21%	17%	4%	8%	12%	12%	11%	26% FGH	26% FGH	24% fGH	12%	12%	22% IM	25% LM	33% LM	22% RT	14%	17%	10%	20%
9	8%	8%	9%	0%	0%	2%	5%	7%	8%	10% f	16% FGHi	2%	7%	8%	12% Lm	19% LMN	12% RST	3%	2%	2%	8%
Completely trust	11%	10%	11%	16%	0%	2%	6%	18% FGI	8%	14% Fg	13% F	2%	11% L	9% I	15% L	9%	13% RT	6%	8%	5%	6%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Q3bNEW: Safety level in my neighborhood

	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
		Gender				Age (Net)						Generations						Race/Ethnicity			
Total	N=1001	N=453	N=532	N=8 **	N=14 **	N=112	N=189	N=176	N=182	N=164	N=177	N=112	N=313	N=270	N=275	N=30 *	N=605	N=396	N=175	N=137	N=52 *
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=349	N=643	N=7 **	N=8 **	N=107	N=154	N=142	N=152	N=188	N=258	N=107	N=253	N=234	N=360	N=47 *	N=679	N=322	N=91 *	N=158	N=39 *
Not at all safe	1%	1%	1%	0%	0%	5% gJK	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%	5% MNO	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%	2% q	2% q	2% q	0%
1	2%	2%	2%	0%	11%	2%	0%	0%	5% gHJ	0%	2%	2%	0%	4% M	2%	0%	1%	3% Q	0%	8% QrS	0%
2	2%	1%	3%	0%	0%	1%	0%	1%	4%	2%	1%	1%	0%	3% m	1%	7% MO	1%	2%	1%	5% Q	2%
3	3%	1%	4% B	0%	0%	3%	4%	4%	2%	1%	2%	3%	4%	3%	2%	4%	1%	6% Q	6% Q	6% Q	8% Q
4	7%	6%	7%	0%	0%	11% iK	11% iJK	6%	3%	5%	4%	11% NO	10% NO	3%	4%	10% n	4%	11% Q	9% Q	15% Q	11% q
5	10%	9%	9%	38% BC	14%	10%	15% jK	12%	8%	7%	7%	10%	15% NOp	7%	8%	4%	8%	12%	13%	16% Q	6%
6	10%	11%	10%	0%	0%	8%	10%	11%	16% K	9%	7%	8%	10%	16% OP	8%	2%	12%	8%	8%	8%	9%
7	17%	16%	16%	0%	49% bcd	20%	15%	16%	14%	20%	17%	20%	15%	14%	20% p	8%	18%	15%	14%	12%	25%
8	21%	21%	21%	44%	26%	25%	19%	18%	17%	28% i	20%	25%	19%	18%	24%	21%	22% T	18%	20%	12%	12%
9	18%	21%	16%	10%	0%	9%	16%	20% f	20% f	15%	25% FJ	9%	16%	23% L	18% l	26% L	21% RT	14%	16%	9%	21%
Completely safe	11%	12%	10%	8%	0%	6%	9%	11%	10%	11%	15% f	6%	10%	9%	13%	20% Lmn	12%	9%	11%	6%	5%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Q3cNEW: How respectful police are to me

	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
		Gender				Age (Net)						Generations						Race/Ethnicity			
Total	N=1001	N=453	N=532	N=8 **	N=14 **	N=112	N=189	N=176	N=182	N=164	N=177	N=112	N=313	N=270	N=275	N=30 *	N=605	N=396	N=175	N=137	N=52 *
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=349	N=643	N=7 **	N=8 **	N=107	N=154	N=142	N=152	N=188	N=258	N=107	N=253	N=234	N=360	N=47 *	N=679	N=322	N=91 *	N=158	N=39 *

	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
				Gender				Age (Net)						Generations					Race/Ethnicity		
Not at all respectful	2%	1%	3%	23% BC	0%	8% gHIJK	2%	1%	3% i	0%	1%	8% MNOp	2%	2%	0%	0%	1%	4% Q	4% Q	6% Q	0%
1	2%	2%	1%	0%	0%	1%	2%	1%	3%	1%	1%	1%	2%	2%	1%	0%	1%	2%	1%	5% Q	0%
2	2%	2%	1%	26% BC	18% BC	4% K	3% K	3% K	1%	1%	0%	4% o	3% o	2%	0%	0%	1%	4% Q	4% Q	4% Q	0%
3	3%	3%	3%	0%	0%	7% jK	5% K	2% k	2% k	2%	0%	7% NO	4% o	2%	1%	0%	1%	5% Q	4%	9% Q	0%
4	5%	2%	7% B	17% b	10%	10% iJK	4%	11% iJK	4%	2%	1%	10% O	6% O	6% O	1%	2%	3%	9% Q	7% q	9% Q	12% Q
5	10%	8%	11%	0%	49% BCd	18% iJK	18% iJK	10% K	6%	8% k	3%	18% NOP	15% NOP	6%	6%	0%	6%	16% Q	15% Q	15% Q	18% Q
6	11%	13% c	9%	8%	4%	14% ik	16% IK	14% ik	5%	9%	7%	14% P	14% oP	9% p	8% p	0%	9%	14% Q	18% Q	13%	6%
7	14%	15%	13%	0%	0%	15%	10%	10%	15%	18%	14%	15%	11%	14%	16%	16%	14%	13%	11%	13%	22%
8	18%	20%	17%	5%	0%	10%	17%	9%	30% FGHJ	17%	22% FH	10%	13%	25% LM	20% lm	15%	19%	16%	16%	15%	19%
9	15%	15%	14%	4%	0%	7%	10%	12%	17% f	17% f	23% FGH	7%	10%	17% Lm	18% LM	34% LMNO	19% RST	8%	8%	6%	8%
Completely respectful	20%	18%	21%	16%	19%	7%	13%	26% FGI	14%	25% FGi	28% FGI	7%	20% L	15%	28% LmN	33% LmN	26% RST	10%	10%	7%	15%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Q4A: How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding local law enforcement?

Members of the Chicago Police Department are handling their job well.

	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
				Gender				Age (Net)						Generations					Race/Ethnicity		
Total	N=1001	N=453	N=532	N=8 **	N=14 **	N=112	N=189	N=176	N=182	N=164	N=177	N=112	N=313	N=270	N=275	N=30 *	N=605	N=396	N=175	N=137	N=52 *
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=349	N=643	N=7 **	N=8 **	N=107	N=154	N=142	N=152	N=188	N=258	N=107	N=253	N=234	N=360	N=47 *	N=679	N=322	N=91 *	N=158	N=39 *
Agree (Net)	62%	63%	61%	25%	49%	41%	56% f	64% F	63% F	70% FG	70% FG	41%	58% L	63% L	72% LMn	75% Lm	70% RSTU	50%	55%	45%	46%
Strongly agree	12%	15%	11%	0%	0%	4%	11%	14% F	16% F	13% f	12% f	4%	13% l	15% L	12% l	17% L	15% RsT	8%	7%	5%	19% rT
Somewhat agree	49%	48%	50%	25%	49%	37%	44%	50%	47%	57% Fg	58% FGi	37%	45%	48%	60% LMN	58% L	54% RTU	42%	48% u	40%	27%
Disagree (Net)	38%	37%	39%	75%	51%	59% gHIJK	44% JK	36%	37%	30%	30%	59% MNOP	42% Op	37% o	28%	25%	30%	50% Q	45% Q	55% Q	54% Q
Somewhat disagree	28%	28%	29%	8%	8%	40% HIJK	35% k	24%	26%	24%	23%	40% NOp	32% O	26%	22%	23%	24%	35% Q	36% Q	29%	45% Q
Strongly disagree	10%	9%	10%	66% BC	43% BC	18% JK	10%	12% j	11%	5%	7%	18% OP	10% p	11% op	6%	1%	7%	15% Q	9%	26% QRSu	9%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

I would rather the Chicago police spend less time than they currently do in my neighborhood.

	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
				Gender				Age (Net)						Generations					Race/Ethnicity		
Total	N=1001	N=453	N=532	N=8 **	N=14 **	N=112	N=189	N=176	N=182	N=164	N=177	N=112	N=313	N=270	N=275	N=30 *	N=605	N=396	N=175	N=137	N=52 *
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=349	N=643	N=7 **	N=8 **	N=107	N=154	N=142	N=152	N=188	N=258	N=107	N=253	N=234	N=360	N=47 *	N=679	N=322	N=91 *	N=158	N=39 *
Agree (Net)	28%	31%	26%	48%	13%	47% hIJK	40% IJK	32% JK	22%	13%	18%	47% mNO	34% O	26% O	15%	31% O	25%	33% Q	39% Qu	30%	20%
Strongly agree	9%	11%	8%	40% bC	13%	13% iJ	12% J	15% IJ	5%	3%	9% i	13% o	11% o	8%	6%	11%	8%	11%	13%	11%	2%
Somewhat agree	19%	20%	18%	8%	0%	34% HIJK	29% hIJK	17% k	16%	10%	9%	34% NO	23% O	18% O	8%	20% O	17%	22%	26% q	19%	18%
Disagree (Net)	72%	69%	74%	52%	87%	53%	60%	68% f	78% FG	87% FGH	82% FGH	53%	66% l	74% L	85% LMNP	69%	75% RS	67%	61%	70%	80% s
Somewhat disagree	42%	41%	43%	31%	47%	36%	40%	38%	45%	54% FGHK	38%	36% p	40% P	43% P	48% lP	18%	43%	40%	39%	34%	55% t
Strongly disagree	30%	29%	31%	20%	40%	17%	20%	30% f	34% FG	33% FG	44% FGHj	17%	25%	31% L	38% LM	51% LMN	32% s	27%	21%	36% s	25%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

If I were to have an interaction with the Chicago police in my area, I am confident that they would treat me with courtesy and respect.

	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
				Gender				Age (Net)						Generations					Race/Ethnicity		
Total	N=1001	N=453	N=532	N=8 **	N=14 **	N=112	N=189	N=176	N=182	N=164	N=177	N=112	N=313	N=270	N=275	N=30 *	N=605	N=396	N=175	N=137	N=52 *
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=349	N=643	N=7 **	N=8 **	N=107	N=154	N=142	N=152	N=188	N=258	N=107	N=253	N=234	N=360	N=47 *	N=679	N=322	N=91 *	N=158	N=39 *
Agree (Net)	75%	78% DE	74% De	25%	37%	49%	68% F	77% F	82% FG	84% FG	83% FG	49%	70% L	81% LM	85% LM	83% L	82% RST	65%	69%	60%	72%
Strongly agree	28%	27%	30%	20%	8%	14%	23%	27% F	27% F	31% F	43% FGHIJ	14%	25% l	26% l	38% LMN	53% LMNo	35% RST	18%	15%	21%	27%
Somewhat agree	47%	50% d	45%	5%	29%	36%	45%	49% f	55% FK	52% FK	40%	36%	45%	55% LmP	47% p	30%	47%	47%	54% t	39%	44%
Disagree (Net)	25%	22%	26%	75% BC	63% Bc	51% GHIJK	32% IJK	23%	18%	16%	17%	51% MNOP	30% NO	19%	15%	17%	18%	35% Q	31% Q	40% Q	28%
Somewhat disagree	19%	17%	20%	52% bc	60% BC	38% HIJK	26% IJK	16%	10%	15%	14%	38% MNOP	24% NO	12%	13%	17%	15%	25% Q	23% q	23% q	26%
Strongly disagree	6%	5%	6%	23%	3%	13% JK	6% J	7% Jk	8% JK	1%	3%	13% mOP	6% O	7% O	2%	0%	3%	10% Q	8% q	17% Qrsu	2%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

When I see a police officer in my neighborhood, I feel safer.

	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
				Gender				Age (Net)						Generations					Race/Ethnicity		
Total	N=1001	N=453	N=532	N=8 **	N=14 **	N=112	N=189	N=176	N=182	N=164	N=177	N=112	N=313	N=270	N=275	N=30 *	N=605	N=396	N=175	N=137	N=52 *
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=349	N=643	N=7 **	N=8 **	N=107	N=154	N=142	N=152	N=188	N=258	N=107	N=253	N=234	N=360	N=47 *	N=679	N=322	N=91 *	N=158	N=39 *
Agree (Net)	77%	80% D	75% D	34%	52%	51%	67% F	74% F	79% Fg	91% FGHI	90% FGHI	51%	70% L	80% Lm	90% LMN	91% LM	85% RSTU	65%	73% T	56%	64%
Strongly agree	32%	35%	29%	4%	29%	11%	25% F	34% F	32% F	38% FG	43% FG	11%	26% L	35% L	41% LM	51% LMn	39% RST	20%	22%	18%	25%
Somewhat agree	45%	45%	46%	29%	22%	40%	42%	40%	47%	53% fh	47%	40%	44%	45%	49%	39%	46%	44%	51% t	38%	39%
Disagree (Net)	23%	20%	25%	66% BC	48%	49% GHIJK	33% iJK	26% JK	21% JK	9%	10%	49% MNOP	30% nOP	20% O	10%	9%	15%	35% Q	27% Q	44% QS	36% Q
Somewhat disagree	16%	15%	17%	0%	20%	32% IJK	22% JK	20% JK	14% j	7%	8%	32% mNOP	21% O	15% O	7%	9%	12%	22% Q	18%	23% Q	32% Q
Strongly disagree	7%	5%	8%	66% BC	29% B	17% HIJK	11% JK	6%	7% k	2%	2%	17% mNOP	9% Op	5%	3%	0%	3%	13% Q	9% Q	21% QrSU	4%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

I approve of the way that the Chicago Police Department handled the summer 2020 protests.

	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
				Gender				Age (Net)						Generations					Race/Ethnicity		
Total	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=0 **
Total (Unweighted)	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=0 **
Agree (Net)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Strongly agree	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Somewhat agree	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Disagree (Net)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Somewhat disagree	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Strongly disagree	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

There is evidence of persistent racial bias in Chicago's policing practices.

	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
				Gender				Age (Net)						Generations					Race/Ethnicity		
Total	N=1001	N=453	N=532	N=8 **	N=14 **	N=112	N=189	N=176	N=182	N=164	N=177	N=112	N=313	N=270	N=275	N=30 *	N=605	N=396	N=175	N=137	N=52 *
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=349	N=643	N=7 **	N=8 **	N=107	N=154	N=142	N=152	N=188	N=258	N=107	N=253	N=234	N=360	N=47 *	N=679	N=322	N=91 *	N=158	N=39 *
Agree (Net)	65%	62%	67%	80%	100% b	75% HI	73% Hi	55%	59%	66%	65%	75% N	67%	59%	65%	64%	59%	74% Q	72% q	79% Qu	60%
Strongly agree	23%	23%	23%	80% BC	51%	40% gHJK	27% jk	27% jk	19%	16%	17%	40% mNOP	27% O	20%	16%	18%	16%	34% Qu	30% Q	43% QsU	15%
Somewhat agree	42%	39% d	44% d	0%	49% d	35%	46% H	28%	40% h	50% fH	48% fH	35%	40%	39%	48% ln	46%	43%	40%	42%	36%	45%
Disagree (Net)	35%	38% e	33%	20%	0%	25%	27%	45% FG	41% FG	34%	35%	25%	33%	41% L	35%	36%	41% RsT	26%	28%	21%	40% t
Somewhat disagree	23%	24%	22%	0%	0%	18%	20%	29%	21%	22%	24%	18%	22%	24%	22%	30%	25% rT	18%	21%	12%	29% t
Strongly disagree	12%	14%	11%	20%	0%	7%	6%	16% fG	20% FGk	12%	11%	7%	11%	16% l	13%	6%	15% Rs	8%	7%	9%	12%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Major reforms are needed within the Chicago Police Department regarding treatment of Black and Latino people.

	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
				Gender				Age (Net)						Generations					Race/Ethnicity		
Total	N=1001	N=453	N=532	N=8 **	N=14 **	N=112	N=189	N=176	N=182	N=164	N=177	N=112	N=313	N=270	N=275	N=30 *	N=605	N=396	N=175	N=137	N=52 *
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=349	N=643	N=7 **	N=8 **	N=107	N=154	N=142	N=152	N=188	N=258	N=107	N=253	N=234	N=360	N=47 *	N=679	N=322	N=91 *	N=158	N=39 *
Agree (Net)	71%	69%	72%	80%	100%	77% iK	83% hIJK	71%	65%	68%	63%	77% O	77% O	69%	64%	67%	63%	83% Q	77% Q	91% QrSU	72%
Strongly agree	31%	26%	35% B	80% BC	71% B	47% IJK	39% IJK	34% J	26%	21%	25%	47% NOP	36% O	28%	23%	24%	22%	46% Q	43% Q	55% QU	28%
Somewhat agree	40%	43% d	37%	0%	29%	30%	44% f	37%	39%	47% F	38%	30%	41%	41%	41%	43%	41%	37%	34%	36%	44%
Disagree (Net)	29%	31%	28%	20%	0%	23%	17%	29% g	35% fG	32% G	37% FG	23%	23%	31%	36% LM	33%	37% RST	17% t	23% T	9%	28% T
Somewhat disagree	18%	18%	20%	4%	0%	21% g	10%	15%	19% g	21% G	27% GH	21% m	11%	19% M	25% M	24% M	24% RT	11% T	17% T	3%	15% T
Strongly disagree	11%	13% c	8%	16%	0%	2%	7%	14% F	16% Fg	11% F	10% f	2%	12% L	12% L	12% L	10%	13% Rst	6%	6%	7%	13%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

The Chicago Police Department is doing enough to address gun violence in the city.

	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
				Gender				Age (Net)						Generations					Race/Ethnicity		
Total	N=1001	N=453	N=532	N=8 **	N=14 **	N=112	N=189	N=176	N=182	N=164	N=177	N=112	N=313	N=270	N=275	N=30 *	N=605	N=396	N=175	N=137	N=52 *
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=349	N=643	N=7 **	N=8 **	N=107	N=154	N=142	N=152	N=188	N=258	N=107	N=253	N=234	N=360	N=47 *	N=679	N=322	N=91 *	N=158	N=39 *
Agree (Net)	29%	31%	27%	33%	10%	21%	32%	33% f	27%	28%	28%	21%	32%	29%	28%	33%	29%	28%	33%	26%	21%
Strongly agree	6%	6%	6%	0%	0%	5%	5%	10% Jk	6%	3%	5%	5%	8%	5%	4%	5%	5%	6%	8%	7%	3%
Somewhat agree	23%	25%	21%	33%	10%	16%	27%	23%	21%	25%	24%	16%	24%	23%	24%	29%	24%	22%	26%	19%	18%
Disagree (Net)	71%	69%	73%	67%	90%	79% h	68%	67%	73%	72%	72%	79%	68%	71%	72%	67%	71%	72%	67%	74%	79%
Somewhat disagree	35%	29%	40% B	5%	49%	29%	40%	37%	35%	38%	31%	29%	39%	33%	36%	32%	36%	34%	29%	33%	51% s
Strongly disagree	36%	39% c	33%	62%	41%	50% GHJ	27%	30%	38%	34%	40% Gh	50% MnO	28%	38% m	36%	35%	35%	38%	38%	40%	28%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Q4B: How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding local law enforcement?

Chicago police have been effective at reducing or preventing crime in my neighborhood.

				Gender					Age (Net)					Generations					Race/Ethnicity		
	Total (A)	**Male (B)**	**Female (C)**	**Transgender (D)**	**Non-binary (E)**	**18-24 (F)**	**25-34 (G)**	**35-44 (H)**	**45-54 (I)**	**55-64 (J)**	**65+ (K)**	**Gen Z (18-24) (L)**	**Millennials (25-40) (**	**Gen X (41-56) (N)**	**Baby Boomers (57-7**	**Silent Generation (7**	**White (Not Hispanic**	**People of Color (R)**	**Hispanic (S)**	**Black (Not Hispanic)**	**AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)**
Total	N=1001	N=453	N=532	N=8 **	N=14 **	N=112	N=189	N=176	N=182	N=164	N=177	N=112	N=313	N=270	N=275	N=30 *	N=605	N=396	N=175	N=137	N=52 *
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=349	N=643	N=7 **	N=8 **	N=107	N=154	N=142	N=152	N=188	N=258	N=107	N=253	N=234	N=360	N=47 *	N=679	N=322	N=91 *	N=158	N=39 *
Agree (Net)	56%	55%	58% d	18%	29%	47%	51%	62% f	51%	61% f	61% f	47%	55%	53%	65% LmNp	51%	62% RST	47%	47%	42%	54%
Strongly agree	11%	10%	12%	13%	0%	7%	11%	15% i	7%	9%	13%	7%	12%	10%	12%	12%	12%	10%	8%	10%	9%
Somewhat agree	45%	44%	46% d	5%	29%	40%	39%	47%	44%	52% g	48%	40%	43%	43%	53% lMN	38%	50% RsT	38%	39%	32%	44%
Disagree (Net)	44%	45%	42%	82% c	71%	53% hjk	49%	38%	49%	39%	39%	53% O	45% o	47% O	35%	49% o	38%	53% Q	53% Q	58% Q	46%
Somewhat disagree	31%	34%	28%	42%	34%	33%	32%	28%	35% k	32%	26%	33%	32%	35% O	25%	37%	29%	35%	39% q	28%	38%
Strongly disagree	13%	11%	14%	40% b	36% b	20% hJ	17% J	9%	13%	6%	13% i	20% O	13%	13%	10%	12%	10%	18% Q	14%	30% QRSU	9%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

I have confidence in the Chicago Police Department to act fairly and without bias.

				Gender					Age (Net)					Generations					Race/Ethnicity		
	Total (A)	**Male (B)**	**Female (C)**	**Transgender (D)**	**Non-binary (E)**	**18-24 (F)**	**25-34 (G)**	**35-44 (H)**	**45-54 (I)**	**55-64 (J)**	**65+ (K)**	**Gen Z (18-24) (L)**	**Millennials (25-40) (**	**Gen X (41-56) (N)**	**Baby Boomers (57-7**	**Silent Generation (7**	**White (Not Hispanic**	**People of Color (R)**	**Hispanic (S)**	**Black (Not Hispanic)**	**AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)**
Total	N=1001	N=453	N=532	N=8 **	N=14 **	N=112	N=189	N=176	N=182	N=164	N=177	N=112	N=313	N=270	N=275	N=30 *	N=605	N=396	N=175	N=137	N=52 *
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=349	N=643	N=7 **	N=8 **	N=107	N=154	N=142	N=152	N=188	N=258	N=107	N=253	N=234	N=360	N=47 *	N=679	N=322	N=91 *	N=158	N=39 *
Agree (Net)	52%	56% E	50% E	20%	0%	23%	50% F	53% F	59% F	61% F	56% F	23%	49% L	59% Lm	58% Lm	69% LM	63% RST	35%	38%	28%	55% rT
Strongly agree	12%	12%	12%	20%	0%	4%	7%	19% FG	15% Fg	12% f	14% F	4%	13% l	13% l	14% L	11%	15% R	8%	8%	10%	9%
Somewhat agree	40%	44% de	37% e	0%	0%	19%	43% F	33% f	45% F	49% FH	42% F	19%	35% L	46% Lm	44% Lm	59% LM	48% RST	27% t	31% T	17%	46% rT
Disagree (Net)	48%	44%	50%	80%	100% BC	77% GHIJK	50%	47%	41%	39%	44%	77% MNOP	51% noP	41%	42%	31%	37%	65% Qu	62% Q	72% QU	45%
Somewhat disagree	32%	30%	34%	0%	40%	39% i	31%	32%	26%	31%	35%	39% n	33%	27%	33%	27%	26%	41% Q	38% q	42% Q	36%
Strongly disagree	16%	15%	16%	80% BC	60% BC	38% GHIJK	19% JK	15%	15%	8%	9%	38% MNOP	18% OP	14% p	9%	3%	11%	24% Qu	24% Q	30% QU	9%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Chicago police are often able to solve crimes that occur in the city.

				Gender					Age (Net)					Generations					Race/Ethnicity		
	Total (A)	**Male (B)**	**Female (C)**	**Transgender (D)**	**Non-binary (E)**	**18-24 (F)**	**25-34 (G)**	**35-44 (H)**	**45-54 (I)**	**55-64 (J)**	**65+ (K)**	**Gen Z (18-24) (L)**	**Millennials (25-40) (**	**Gen X (41-56) (N)**	**Baby Boomers (57-7**	**Silent Generation (7**	**White (Not Hispanic**	**People of Color (R)**	**Hispanic (S)**	**Black (Not Hispanic)**	**AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)**
Total	N=1001	N=453	N=532	N=8 **	N=14 **	N=112	N=189	N=176	N=182	N=164	N=177	N=112	N=313	N=270	N=275	N=30 *	N=605	N=396	N=175	N=137	N=52 *
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=349	N=643	N=7 **	N=8 **	N=107	N=154	N=142	N=152	N=188	N=258	N=107	N=253	N=234	N=360	N=47 *	N=679	N=322	N=91 *	N=158	N=39 *
Agree (Net)	53%	57% e	51%	39%	16%	55%	47%	53%	55%	61% gk	50%	55%	49%	59% m	53%	55%	57% RT	48%	50%	39%	65% T
Strongly agree	9%	8%	10%	8%	0%	9%	6%	15% gij	7%	8%	10%	9%	10%	9%	9%	4%	10%	8%	9%	7%	7%
Somewhat agree	44%	49% c	41%	31%	16%	47%	41%	38%	48%	53% gHK	40%	47%	39%	49% m	44%	51%	47% rT	40%	41%	32%	59% rT
Disagree (Net)	47%	43%	49%	61%	84% b	45%	53% j	47%	45%	39%	50% j	45%	51% n	41%	47%	45%	43%	52% Q	50%	61% QU	35%
Somewhat disagree	34%	33%	34%	21%	30%	29%	38%	32%	35%	29%	37%	29%	36%	32%	35%	34%	32%	36%	38%	34%	32%
Strongly disagree	13%	10%	15% b	40% B	54% BC	15%	15%	15%	10%	10%	14%	15%	16%	10%	12%	11%	11%	16% qu	11%	27% QRSU	2%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

The Chicago Police Department has the support of most city residents.

				Gender					Age (Net)					Generations					Race/Ethnicity		
	Total (A)	**Male (B)**	**Female (C)**	**Transgender (D)**	**Non-binary (E)**	**18-24 (F)**	**25-34 (G)**	**35-44 (H)**	**45-54 (I)**	**55-64 (J)**	**65+ (K)**	**Gen Z (18-24) (L)**	**Millennials (25-40) (**	**Gen X (41-56) (N)**	**Baby Boomers (57-7**	**Silent Generation (7**	**White (Not Hispanic**	**People of Color (R)**	**Hispanic (S)**	**Black (Not Hispanic)**	**AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)**
Total	N=1001	N=453	N=532	N=8 **	N=14 **	N=112	N=189	N=176	N=182	N=164	N=177	N=112	N=313	N=270	N=275	N=30 *	N=605	N=396	N=175	N=137	N=52 *
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=349	N=643	N=7 **	N=8 **	N=107	N=154	N=142	N=152	N=188	N=258	N=107	N=253	N=234	N=360	N=47 *	N=679	N=322	N=91 *	N=158	N=39 *
Agree (Net)	56%	60% cd	52%	20%	41%	38%	49%	54% F	60% F	70% FGHk	58% F	38%	48%	62% LM	65% LM	66% Lm	60% RT	49%	51%	46%	58%
Strongly agree	11%	13%	9%	4%	0%	7%	11%	14%	12%	10%	9%	7%	13%	11%	10%	5%	12%	9%	8%	13%	9%
Somewhat agree	45%	48%	43%	16%	41%	31%	38%	41%	48% F	60% FGHik	50% Fg	31%	35%	51% LM	55% LM	61% LM	49% RT	40%	43%	32%	49%
Disagree (Net)	44%	40%	48% b	80% b	59%	62% HIJK	51% J	46% J	40%	30%	42% j	62% NOP	52% NOp	38%	35%	34%	40%	51% Q	49%	54% Q	42%
Somewhat disagree	33%	31%	35%	40%	35%	36%	38% J	36% j	27%	25%	36% j	36%	40% NO	28%	30%	32%	31%	37%	35%	37%	40%
Strongly disagree	11%	9%	13%	40% Bc	24%	26% GHIJK	13% JK	10%	13% JK	5%	6%	26% MNOP	12% Op	10%	6%	2%	9%	14% q	15%	17% Qu	2%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

The Chicago Police Department has the support of most BIPOC (i.e., Black, Indigenous, and People of Color) residents.

				Gender					Age (Net)					Generations					Race/Ethnicity		
	Total (A)	**Male (B)**	**Female (C)**	**Transgender (D)**	**Non-binary (E)**	**18-24 (F)**	**25-34 (G)**	**35-44 (H)**	**45-54 (I)**	**55-64 (J)**	**65+ (K)**	**Gen Z (18-24) (L)**	**Millennials (25-40) (**	**Gen X (41-56) (N)**	**Baby Boomers (57-7**	**Silent Generation (7**	**White (Not Hispanic**	**People of Color (R)**	**Hispanic (S)**	**Black (Not Hispanic)**	**AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)**
Total	N=1001	N=453	N=532	N=8 **	N=14 **	N=112	N=189	N=176	N=182	N=164	N=177	N=112	N=313	N=270	N=275	N=30 *	N=605	N=396	N=175	N=137	N=52 *
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=349	N=643	N=7 **	N=8 **	N=107	N=154	N=142	N=152	N=188	N=258	N=107	N=253	N=234	N=360	N=47 *	N=679	N=322	N=91 *	N=158	N=39 *
Agree (Net)	33%	37% c	30%	20%	0%	25%	33%	40% FK	32%	40% FK	25%	25%	33% p	37% lP	33% p	17%	31%	35%	34%	34%	45%
Strongly agree	7%	9% c	6%	4%	0%	6%	9%	9%	6%	6%	7%	6%	9%	6%	7%	2%	6%	9%	10%	8%	4%
Somewhat agree	26%	27%	25%	16%	0%	18%	24%	31% fK	26%	34% FK	18%	18%	25%	31% lp	26%	15%	25%	27%	24%	26%	41% q
Disagree (Net)	67%	63%	70% b	80%	100%	75% HJ	67%	60%	68%	60%	75% HJ	75% n	67%	63%	67%	83% mNo	69%	65%	66%	66%	55%
Somewhat disagree	42%	42% d	41% d	0%	64% D	38%	35%	39%	44%	38%	54% FGHJ	38%	39%	40%	47%	61% LMN	43%	40%	40%	38%	44%
Strongly disagree	25%	21%	29% B	80% BC	36%	37% HiJK	32% hjk	21%	24%	22%	21%	37% NO	28% o	23%	20%	22%	26% u	24%	26%	28% u	11%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Chicago police should be brought in to handle situations regarding mental health patients and the homeless.

				Gender					Age (Net)					Generations					Race/Ethnicity		
	Total (A)	**Male (B)**	**Female (C)**	**Transgender (D)**	**Non-binary (E)**	**18-24 (F)**	**25-34 (G)**	**35-44 (H)**	**45-54 (I)**	**55-64 (J)**	**65+ (K)**	**Gen Z (18-24) (L)**	**Millennials (25-40) (**	**Gen X (41-56) (N)**	**Baby Boomers (57-7**	**Silent Generation (7**	**White (Not Hispanic**	**People of Color (R)**	**Hispanic (S)**	**Black (Not Hispanic)**	**AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)**
Total	N=1001	N=453	N=532	N=8 **	N=14 **	N=112	N=189	N=176	N=182	N=164	N=177	N=112	N=313	N=270	N=275	N=30 *	N=605	N=396	N=175	N=137	N=52 *
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=349	N=643	N=7 **	N=8 **	N=107	N=154	N=142	N=152	N=188	N=258	N=107	N=253	N=234	N=360	N=47 *	N=679	N=322	N=91 *	N=158	N=39 *
Agree (Net)	51%	51% D	51% D	0%	29%	55% i	51%	58% JK	57% JK	41%	44%	55% o	54% O	55% O	43%	44%	49%	54%	62% Qt	47%	61%
Strongly agree	14%	13%	15%	0%	0%	16% jk	13%	24% gJK	16% Jk	7%	8%	16% O	18% O	15% O	8%	11%	11%	19% Q	21% Q	23% Q	12%
Somewhat agree	37%	38%	36%	0%	29%	38%	38%	33%	41%	34%	36%	38%	35%	40%	35%	33%	38% T	35% t	41% T	25%	49% T
Disagree (Net)	49%	49%	49%	100% BC	71%	45%	49%	42%	43%	59% fHI	56% HI	45%	46%	45%	57% lMN	56%	51% S	46%	38%	53% s	39%
Somewhat disagree	31%	30%	32%	24%	20%	24%	26%	23%	26%	47% FGHI	38% fgHI	24%	25%	28%	43% LMN	36%	37% RST	21%	18%	22%	30%
Strongly disagree	18%	19%	17%	76% BC	51% bc	21%	23% J	19%	17%	12%	18%	21%	22% o	17%	14%	20%	14%	24% Qu	20%	30% QU	9%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Increased police presence is necessary for reducing gun violence in the city.

				Gender					Age (Net)					Generations					Race/Ethnicity		
	Total (A)	**Male (B)**	**Female (C)**	**Transgender (D)**	**Non-binary (E)**	**18-24 (F)**	**25-34 (G)**	**35-44 (H)**	**45-54 (I)**	**55-64 (J)**	**65+ (K)**	**Gen Z (18-24) (L)**	**Millennials (25-40) (**	**Gen X (41-56) (N)**	**Baby Boomers (57-7**	**Silent Generation (7**	**White (Not Hispanic**	**People of Color (R)**	**Hispanic (S)**	**Black (Not Hispanic)**	**AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)**
Total	N=1001	N=453	N=532	N=8 **	N=14 **	N=112	N=189	N=176	N=182	N=164	N=177	N=112	N=313	N=270	N=275	N=30 *	N=605	N=396	N=175	N=137	N=52 *
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=349	N=643	N=7 **	N=8 **	N=107	N=154	N=142	N=152	N=188	N=258	N=107	N=253	N=234	N=360	N=47 *	N=679	N=322	N=91 *	N=158	N=39 *
Agree (Net)	81%	84% cD	78% D	25%	60%	70%	68%	79%	80% g	92% FGHI	92% FGHI	70%	71%	83% LM	93% LMNp	84%	84% RT	75%	77%	69%	89% t
Strongly agree	42%	41%	43%	20%	40%	19%	37% F	37% F	42% F	51% FGH	58% FGHI	19%	38% L	41% L	54% LMN	67% LMN	46% RS	35%	30%	43% s	35%
Somewhat agree	39%	43% C	35%	5%	20%	51% GK	32%	42%	38%	40%	34%	51% MoP	34% p	42% P	39% P	17%	38% T	40% T	47% T	26%	54% T
Disagree (Net)	19%	16%	22% b	75% BC	40%	30% JK	32% iJK	21% JK	20% JK	8%	8%	30% NO	29% NO	17% O	7%	16% o	16%	25% Q	23%	31% Qu	11%
Somewhat disagree	13%	12%	15%	8%	8%	18% JK	21% JK	15% JK	14% ik	6%	7%	18% O	19% nO	12% O	6%	15% o	12%	15%	15%	17%	9%
Strongly disagree	6%	3%	7% b	66% BC	32% BC	12% JK	10% JK	6% K	7% jK	2%	1%	12% nOp	9% O	5% O	1%	1%	4%	10% Q	8% q	13% Q	2%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

There should be more funding for non-policing alternatives (e.g., social worker dispatches, neighborhood patrols, restorative justice circles).

				Gender					Age (Net)					Generations					Race/Ethnicity		
	Total (A)	**Male (B)**	**Female (C)**	**Transgender (D)**	**Non-binary (E)**	**18-24 (F)**	**25-34 (G)**	**35-44 (H)**	**45-54 (I)**	**55-64 (J)**	**65+ (K)**	**Gen Z (18-24) (L)**	**Millennials (25-40) (**	**Gen X (41-56) (N)**	**Baby Boomers (57-7**	**Silent Generation (7**	**White (Not Hispanic**	**People of Color (R)**	**Hispanic (S)**	**Black (Not Hispanic)**	**AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)**
Total	N=1001	N=453	N=532	N=8 **	N=14 **	N=112	N=189	N=176	N=182	N=164	N=177	N=112	N=313	N=270	N=275	N=30 *	N=605	N=396	N=175	N=137	N=52 *
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=349	N=643	N=7 **	N=8 **	N=107	N=154	N=142	N=152	N=188	N=258	N=107	N=253	N=234	N=360	N=47 *	N=679	N=322	N=91 *	N=158	N=39 *
Agree (Net)	73%	69%	77% B	100% e	51%	79% G	63%	75% g	72%	75% g	78% G	79% m	66%	74%	75% m	91% MNO	72%	75%	74%	80% u	61%
Strongly agree	32%	23%	38% B	80% Bc	51%	41%	28%	35%	30%	29%	31%	41% n	32%	28%	30%	40%	27%	38% Q	34%	44% Qu	24%
Somewhat agree	41%	45% e	39% e	20%	0%	38%	35%	40%	42%	46% g	47% g	38%	34%	46% M	46% M	51% m	44% r	37%	39%	36%	37%
Disagree (Net)	27%	31% C	23%	0%	49% d	21%	37% FhjK	25%	28%	25%	22%	21%	34% loP	26% P	25% P	9%	28%	25%	26%	20%	39% t
Somewhat disagree	17%	20%	15%	0%	49% Cd	14%	28% FHiJK	14%	18%	15%	13%	14%	23% OP	18% p	14%	6%	17% T	18% T	20% T	8%	35% QRT
Strongly disagree	10%	12%	8%	0%	0%	8%	9%	11%	10%	10%	9%	8%	11%	8%	11%	3%	11%	7%	6%	12%	4%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

The current level of funding for the Chicago Police Department is too high.

				Gender					Age (Net)					Generations					Race/Ethnicity		
	Total (A)	**Male (B)**	**Female (C)**	**Transgender (D)**	**Non-binary (E)**	**18-24 (F)**	**25-34 (G)**	**35-44 (H)**	**45-54 (I)**	**55-64 (J)**	**65+ (K)**	**Gen Z (18-24) (L)**	**Millennials (25-40) (**	**Gen X (41-56) (N)**	**Baby Boomers (57-7**	**Silent Generation (7**	**White (Not Hispanic**	**People of Color (R)**	**Hispanic (S)**	**Black (Not Hispanic)**	**AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)**
Total	N=1001	N=453	N=532	N=8 **	N=14 **	N=112	N=189	N=176	N=182	N=164	N=177	N=112	N=313	N=270	N=275	N=30 *	N=605	N=396	N=175	N=137	N=52 *
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=349	N=643	N=7 **	N=8 **	N=107	N=154	N=142	N=152	N=188	N=258	N=107	N=253	N=234	N=360	N=47 *	N=679	N=322	N=91 *	N=158	N=39 *
Agree (Net)	40%	43%	37%	75%	57%	67% gHIJK	54% IJK	48% iJK	34% K	26%	18%	67% MNOP	49% OP	40% OP	20%	17%	29%	56% Q	58% Q	57% Q	52% Q
Strongly agree	12%	12%	12%	75% BC	30%	27% HIJK	19% JK	13% JK	11% ik	4%	5%	27% NOP	17% NOp	9%	5%	5%	9%	18% Qu	16% Q	24% QU	4%
Somewhat agree	27%	30%	25%	0%	27%	41% IJK	34% JK	35% iJK	24% K	22% k	13%	41% OP	32% OP	31% OP	15%	12%	21%	38% Q	41% Q	34% Q	49% Q
Disagree (Net)	60%	57%	63%	25%	43%	33%	46% f	52% F	66% FGh	74% FGH	82% FGHI	33%	51% L	60% L	80% LMN	83% LMN	71% RSTU	44%	42%	43%	48%
Somewhat disagree	37%	33%	40%	5%	40%	19%	33% F	31% f	39% F	44% Fh	47% FGH	19%	34% L	36% L	47% LMN	43% L	40% RS	31%	27%	35%	36%
Strongly disagree	24%	24%	23%	20%	3%	14%	13%	21%	26% fG	30% FG	35% FGH	14%	17%	24% l	33% LMn	40% LMn	31% RSTu	13%	15%	8%	12%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Q5a: Are any of the following statements true for you?

I have had a negative experience with a member of the Chicago Police Department.

		Gender						Age (Net)										Generations						Race/Ethnicity					
	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
Total	N=1001	N=453	N=532	N=8 **	N=14 **	N=112	N=189	N=176	N=182	N=164	N=177	N=112	N=313	N=270	N=275	N=30 *	N=605	N=396	N=175	N=137	N=52 *
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=349	N=643	N=7 **	N=8 **	N=107	N=154	N=142	N=152	N=188	N=258	N=107	N=253	N=234	N=360	N=47 *	N=679	N=322	N=91 *	N=158	N=39 *
Yes	23%	27% C	20%	28%	36%	31% JK	36% IJK	28% JK	21% K	15%	11%	31% OP	31% OP	23% OP	14%	5%	14%	37% QU	35% QU	48% QrsU	9%
No	77%	73%	80% B	72%	64%	69%	64%	72%	79% G	85% FGH	89% FGHI	69%	69%	77%	86% LMN	95% LMN	86% RST	63% t	65% t	52%	91% RST

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

I have been racially profiled in at least one interaction with police officers in Chicago.

		Gender						Age (Net)										Generations						Race/Ethnicity					
	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
Total	N=1001	N=453	N=532	N=8 **	N=14 **	N=112	N=189	N=176	N=182	N=164	N=177	N=112	N=313	N=270	N=275	N=30 *	N=605	N=396	N=175	N=137	N=52 *
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=349	N=643	N=7 **	N=8 **	N=107	N=154	N=142	N=152	N=188	N=258	N=107	N=253	N=234	N=360	N=47 *	N=679	N=322	N=91 *	N=158	N=39 *
Yes	17%	21% C	14%	23%	33%	28% JK	25% JK	19% JK	21% JK	8%	5%	28% nOP	23% OP	18% OP	7%	1%	7%	33% QU	29% QU	47% QRSU	6%
No	83%	79%	86% B	77%	67%	72%	75%	81%	79%	92% FGHI	95% FGHI	72%	77%	82% I	93% LMN	99% LMN	93% RST	67% T	71% T	53%	94% RST

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

If I were to report police misconduct to the Chicago Police Department, I believe I would receive retaliation from officers for filing a complaint.

		Gender						Age (Net)										Generations						Race/Ethnicity					
	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
Total	N=1001	N=453	N=532	N=8 **	N=14 **	N=112	N=189	N=176	N=182	N=164	N=177	N=112	N=313	N=270	N=275	N=30 *	N=605	N=396	N=175	N=137	N=52 *
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=349	N=643	N=7 **	N=8 **	N=107	N=154	N=142	N=152	N=188	N=258	N=107	N=253	N=234	N=360	N=47 *	N=679	N=322	N=91 *	N=158	N=39 *
Yes	39%	39%	39%	57%	68%	57% gHJK	42% jK	42% jK	40% K	30%	28%	57% MNOP	41% Op	40% Op	29%	24%	28%	55% Q	49% Q	55% Q	55% Q
No	61%	61%	61%	43%	32%	43%	58% f	58% f	60% F	70% Fgh	72% FGHI	43%	59% L	60% L	71% LMN	76% Lmn	72% RSTU	45%	51%	45%	45%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

I have been afraid to report police misconduct to the Chicago Police Department because I believed I would receive retaliation from officers.

		Gender						Age (Net)										Generations						Race/Ethnicity					
	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
Total	N=1001	N=453	N=532	N=8 **	N=14 **	N=112	N=189	N=176	N=182	N=164	N=177	N=112	N=313	N=270	N=275	N=30 *	N=605	N=396	N=175	N=137	N=52 *
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=349	N=643	N=7 **	N=8 **	N=107	N=154	N=142	N=152	N=188	N=258	N=107	N=253	N=234	N=360	N=47 *	N=679	N=322	N=91 *	N=158	N=39 *
Yes	23%	24%	20%	75% BC	73% BC	37% hIJK	28% jK	23% K	21% k	18%	12%	37% mNOP	26% OP	21% p	16%	7%	14%	35% Q	32% Q	35% Q	28% q
No	77%	76% DE	80% DE	25%	27%	63%	72%	77% f	79% F	82% Fg	88% FGHi	63%	74% I	79% L	84% LM	93% LMn	86% RSTu	65%	68%	65%	72%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Growing up, I was taught that the police were a friend to me and my community.

		Gender						Age (Net)										Generations						Race/Ethnicity					
	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
Total	N=1001	N=453	N=532	N=8 **	N=14 **	N=112	N=189	N=176	N=182	N=164	N=177	N=112	N=313	N=270	N=275	N=30 *	N=605	N=396	N=175	N=137	N=52 *
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=349	N=643	N=7 **	N=8 **	N=107	N=154	N=142	N=152	N=188	N=258	N=107	N=253	N=234	N=360	N=47 *	N=679	N=322	N=91 *	N=158	N=39 *
Yes	84%	82% DE	87% bDE	21%	14%	61%	77% F	78% F	89% FGH	96% FGHI	95% FGHI	61%	77% L	87% LM	97% LMN	100% LMN	94% RSTU	69%	70%	66%	81%
No	16%	18% c	13%	79% BC	86% BC	39% GHIJK	23% IJK	22% IJK	11% Jk	4%	5%	39% MNOP	23% NOP	13% OP	3%	0%	6%	31% Q	30% Q	34% Q	19% Q

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

As an adult, I feel that the police are a friend to me and my community.

		Gender						Age (Net)										Generations						Race/Ethnicity					
	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
Total	N=1001	N=453	N=532	N=8 **	N=14 **	N=112	N=189	N=176	N=182	N=164	N=177	N=112	N=313	N=270	N=275	N=30 *	N=605	N=396	N=175	N=137	N=52 *
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=349	N=643	N=7 **	N=8 **	N=107	N=154	N=142	N=152	N=188	N=258	N=107	N=253	N=234	N=360	N=47 *	N=679	N=322	N=91 *	N=158	N=39 *
Yes	68%	71% DE	67% dE	25%	12%	36%	57% F	61% F	75% FGh	82% FGH	87% FGHI	36%	59% L	71% LM	85% LMN	95% LMN	82% RSTu	46%	46%	43%	67% rsT
No	32%	29%	33%	75% Bc	88% BC	64% GHIJK	43% IJK	39% iJK	25% K	18%	13%	64% MNOP	41% NOP	29% OP	15%	5%	18%	54% Qu	54% Qu	57% QU	33% q

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

I have a friend of family member who works for the Chicago Police Department.

		Gender						Age (Net)										Generations						Race/Ethnicity					
	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
Total	N=1001	N=453	N=532	N=8 **	N=14 **	N=112	N=189	N=176	N=182	N=164	N=177	N=112	N=313	N=270	N=275	N=30 *	N=605	N=396	N=175	N=137	N=52 *
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=349	N=643	N=7 **	N=8 **	N=107	N=154	N=142	N=152	N=188	N=258	N=107	N=253	N=234	N=360	N=47 *	N=679	N=322	N=91 *	N=158	N=39 *
Yes	26%	25%	27%	26%	49%	28%	28%	33% K	22%	26%	21%	28%	32% N	21%	25%	22%	24%	29% u	32% U	28% u	11%
No	74%	75%	73%	74%	51%	72%	72%	67%	78%	74%	79% H	72%	68%	79% M	75%	78%	76%	71%	68%	72%	89% rSt

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

I have felt the need to intervene or observe the interactions between a Chicago police officer and a resident.

		Gender						Age (Net)										Generations						Race/Ethnicity					
	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
Total	N=1001	N=453	N=532	N=8 **	N=14 **	N=112	N=189	N=176	N=182	N=164	N=177	N=112	N=313	N=270	N=275	N=30 *	N=605	N=396	N=175	N=137	N=52 *
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=349	N=643	N=7 **	N=8 **	N=107	N=154	N=142	N=152	N=188	N=258	N=107	N=253	N=234	N=360	N=47 *	N=679	N=322	N=91 *	N=158	N=39 *
Yes	21%	21%	19%	54% c	42%	50% GHIJK	29% IJK	23% JK	15% K	11%	6%	50% MNOP	25% nOP	18% OP	9% p	0%	12%	34% Q	30% Q	42% Q	25% q
No	79%	79%	81% d	46%	58%	50%	71% F	77% F	85% FG	89% FGH	94% FGHI	50%	75% L	82% Lm	91% LMN	100% LMNo	88% RSTu	66%	70%	58%	75%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Q12: In an effort to support essential social services that are often underfunded - such as housing, education, employment, mental health care, and youth services - there have been proposals to reduce police department budgets and redistribute those funds towards these essential social services. How much do you support or oppose such proposals?

		Gender						Age (Net)										Generations						Race/Ethnicity					
	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
Total	N=1001	N=453	N=532	N=8 **	N=14 **	N=112	N=189	N=176	N=182	N=164	N=177	N=112	N=313	N=270	N=275	N=30 *	N=605	N=396	N=175	N=137	N=52 *
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=349	N=643	N=7 **	N=8 **	N=107	N=154	N=142	N=152	N=188	N=258	N=107	N=253	N=234	N=360	N=47 *	N=679	N=322	N=91 *	N=158	N=39 *
Support (Net)	56%	54%	58%	75%	68%	84% HIJK	72% IJK	62% iJK	49% k	42%	38%	84% MNOP	66% NOP	55% OP	39%	27%	45%	74% Q	79% Q	74% Q	67% Q
Strongly support	23%	20%	24%	75% BC	49%	42% IJK	31% IJK	30% IJK	17%	14%	10%	42% NOP	31% NOP	19% op	11%	7%	17%	32% Q	31% Q	36% Q	19%
Somewhat support	34%	34%	34%	0%	20%	42% jK	42% jK	32%	32%	29%	27%	42% OP	35% p	36% p	28%	20%	28%	42% Q	48% Q	38% q	47% Q
Oppose (Net)	44%	46%	42%	25%	32%	16%	28%	38% F	51% FGh	58% FGH	62% FGHi	16%	34% L	45% LM	61% LMN	73% LMN	55% RSTU	26%	21%	26%	33%
Somewhat oppose	22%	21%	23%	10%	29%	11%	18%	19%	20%	31% FGHi	32% FGHI	11%	20%	19%	32% LMN	30% L	27% RS	15%	9%	20% s	15%
Strongly oppose	21%	24%	19%	16%	3%	5%	9%	20% Fg	31% FGh	26% FG	31% FGh	5%	14% I	26% LM	29% LM	42% LMn	28% RST	10%	12%	6%	18% t

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Q6A: Where do you think reallocated funds from the police department should go?

		Gender						Age (Net)										Generations						Race/Ethnicity					
	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
Total	N=565	N=247	N=309	N=6 **	N=10 **	N=94 *	N=137	N=108	N=90 *	N=69 *	N=67 *	N=94 *	N=207	N=148	N=108	N=8 **	N=270	N=294	N=138	N=101	N=35 *
Total (Unweighted)	N=560	N=167	N=388	N=4 **	N=6 **	N=84 *	N=119	N=90 *	N=74 *	N=91 *	N=102	N=84 *	N=180	N=124	N=159	N=13 **	N=322	N=238	N=71 *	N=117	N=25 **
Mental health care programs	64%	63%	65%	100%	56%	62%	58%	68%	68%	69%	62%	62%	63%	67%	65%	60%	65%	63%	62%	63%	66%
Homeless services and shelters	59%	57%	60%	100%	73%	70% gJk	54%	63%	62%	53%	52%	70%	58%	56%	57%	46%	53%	65% Q	65%	64% q	69%
Gun violence prevention	57%	59%	54%	46%	57%	59%	45%	57%	55%	70% G	64% G	59%	50%	59%	64% M	66%	59% S	54% s	40%	65% S	70% S
Youth services (e.g., community centers, mentorship programs, after-school programs)	52%	47%	54%	100% b	73%	62% g	46%	46%	52%	61% g	48%	62% m	46%	52%	52%	57%	50%	53%	54%	55%	39%
Affordable housing services	48%	45%	49%	100% b	44%	54% J	51% J	49% j	52% J	32%	40%	54% O	51% O	49% o	34%	52%	42%	53% q	49%	58% Q	43%
Hiring/integrating social workers into police forces to handle situations where police may not be needed	47%	53% c	43%	46%	40%	53%	42%	40%	50%	47%	56%	53%	42%	46%	51%	81% MNo	50%	44%	42%	43%	54%
Local education/schools	43%	45%	41%	69%	44%	54% iJK	55% iJK	46% jK	37% K	29%	17%	54% NOP	51% NOP	36%	27%	11%	39%	46%	50%	42%	36%
Local healthcare services	39%	38%	39%	100% BC	44%	49% IjK	50% IJK	41%	27%	31%	27%	49% nO	44% O	34%	28%	49%	33%	45% Qt	54% QT	33%	40%
Substance abuse services	39%	30%	46% B	100% Bc	56%	35%	34%	45%	36%	43%	45%	35%	38%	38%	46%	31%	40%	38%	28%	43% s	51%
People returning to their communities from jail or prison (e.g., social/family reintegration, expungement, healthcare assistance)	36%	38%	34%	69%	44%	44% ij	45% hij	28%	27%	28%	39%	44% no	41% no	28%	29%	56% n	39% s	33%	25%	42% Su	17%
Unemployment/Re-employment services	31%	32%	30%	100% BC	44%	46% IJK	35% K	34% K	22%	27%	15%	46% NOP	35% O	25%	20%	11%	26%	36% Q	33%	41% Q	30%
Other (please specify):	2%	1%	2%	0%	16% Bc	2%	0%	3%	0%	1%	3%	2%	1%	1%	2%	0%	0%	3%	3% Q	1%	3% q
Not at all sure	3%	3%	3%	0%	0%	3%	0%	1%	6% g	4%	4%	3%	1%	4%	5% m	0%	3%	3%	1%	5%	7%

* Table Base: SUPPORTS POLICE BUDGET REALLOCATION

Q6B: Which of the following should have the highest priority for reallocated funds from the police department?

				Gender					Age (Net)					Generations					Race/Ethnicity		
	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
Total	N=545	N=240	N=296	N=6 **	N=8 **	N=89 *	N=137	N=105	N=85 *	N=66 *	N=62 *	N=89 *	N=204	N=142	N=101	N=8 **	N=264	N=281	N=133	N=97 *	N=32 *
Total (Unweighted)	N=541	N=162	N=374	N=4 **	N=5 **	N=81 *	N=118	N=88 *	N=70 *	N=86 *	N=98 *	N=81 *	N=177	N=119	N=151	N=13 **	N=313	N=228	N=68 *	N=113	N=23 **
Gun violence prevention	31%	32%	30%	0%	34%	22%	23%	27%	33%	50% FGHi	44% FGh	22%	24%	36% m	44% LM	39%	34% s	28%	20%	34% s	53% rS
Hiring/integrating social workers into police forces to handle situations where police may not be needed	13%	16% c	9%	35%	27%	11%	11%	11%	18%	11%	16%	11%	10%	15%	15%	15%	17% RsT	8%	6%	7%	10%
Youth services (e.g., community centers, mentorship programs, after-school programs)	11%	10%	12%	0%	0%	10%	5%	14% g	15% g	11%	13% g	10%	10%	12%	12%	3%	11%	10%	12%	12%	0%
Mental health care programs	11%	7%	13%	0%	20%	8%	12%	10%	11%	12%	12%	8%	12%	9%	12%	25%	11%	10%	11%	10%	0%
Homeless services and shelters	10%	10%	10%	31%	0%	17% J	14% J	7%	7%	2%	8%	17% nO	11%	6%	5%	13%	8%	12%	13%	6%	22% qt
Affordable housing services	9%	6%	10%	34% b	18%	13% K	11% K	9% K	7% K	6% k	0%	13% O	10% o	7%	3%	0%	6%	11%	12%	12%	7%
Local education/schools	6%	8%	5%	0%	0%	7% K	8% K	11% iK	6% k	2%	0%	7% o	8% O	8% O	1%	0%	5%	8%	11%	6%	3%
Unemployment/Re-employment services	5%	7%	3%	0%	0%	3%	9% ik	6%	1%	3%	1%	3%	9% N	1%	3%	0%	4%	6%	5%	8%	3%
Local healthcare services	3%	3%	3%	0%	0%	3%	4%	4%	2%	0%	2%	3%	3%	4%	1%	0%	0%	5% Q	8% Q	3% q	0%
Substance abuse services	2%	1%	2%	0%	0%	4%	2%	1%	0%	2%	0%	4%	1%	1%	1%	0%	2%	1%	2%	1%	0%
People returning to their communities from jail or prison (e.g., social/family reintegration, expungement, healthcare assistance)	2%	0%	3%	0%	0%	3%	2%	0%	0%	1%	4%	3%	1%	0%	3%	6% N	2%	1%	0%	2%	1%

* Table Base: THINK POLICE BUDGET FUNDS SHOULD BE REALLOCATED TO AT LEAST ONE LISTED SERVICE

Q7: How likely do you think it is that the following situations will happen as a result of reallocating funds from the police department to underfunded social services?

Reallocating police department funds will lead to fewer officers in my neighborhood.

				Gender					Age (Net)					Generations					Race/Ethnicity		
	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
Total	N=1001	N=453	N=532	N=8 **	N=14 **	N=112	N=189	N=176	N=182	N=164	N=177	N=112	N=313	N=270	N=275	N=30 *	N=605	N=396	N=175	N=137	N=52 *
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=349	N=643	N=7 **	N=8 **	N=107	N=154	N=142	N=152	N=188	N=258	N=107	N=253	N=234	N=360	N=47 *	N=679	N=322	N=91 *	N=158	N=39 *
Likely (Net)	68%	70%	66%	92%	58%	63%	63%	60%	70%	74% gH	77% FGH	63%	63%	65%	75% lMN	89% LMNo	72% RT	61%	69% T	53%	61%
Very likely	27%	29%	24%	27%	32%	19%	19%	24%	33% fG	28%	35% FGh	19%	22%	27%	33% LM	40% LM	29% t	23%	23%	21%	24%
Somewhat likely	41%	41%	42%	65%	26%	44%	44%	36%	37%	47%	42%	44%	41%	38%	42%	49%	43% t	39%	46% t	32%	37%
Not likely (Net)	32%	30%	34%	8%	42%	37% K	37% jK	40% JK	30%	26%	23%	37% oP	37% OP	35% OP	25% p	11%	28%	39% Q	31%	47% QS	39%
Not very likely	26%	24%	28%	8%	42%	35% iJK	32% JK	35% IJK	21%	19%	18%	35% OP	32% OP	26% P	19% P	5%	22%	33% Q	30%	36% Q	37% q
Not at all likely	6%	6%	6%	0%	0%	2%	6%	5%	9% f	7%	5%	2%	5%	9% l	6%	6%	6%	5%	2%	11% S	2%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Reallocating police department funds will mean more funding for social services that can improve issues such as mental health, addiction, and homelessness.

				Gender					Age (Net)					Generations					Race/Ethnicity		
	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
Total	N=1001	N=453	N=532	N=8 **	N=14 **	N=112	N=189	N=176	N=182	N=164	N=177	N=112	N=313	N=270	N=275	N=30 *	N=605	N=396	N=175	N=137	N=52 *
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=349	N=643	N=7 **	N=8 **	N=107	N=154	N=142	N=152	N=188	N=258	N=107	N=253	N=234	N=360	N=47 *	N=679	N=322	N=91 *	N=158	N=39 *
Likely (Net)	62%	60%	64%	54%	60%	75% IJK	68% IJ	69% IJ	53%	54%	58%	75% NOP	66% o	58%	56%	55%	57%	70% Q	65%	74% Q	73%
Very likely	20%	17%	21%	54% Bc	37%	30% IJK	26% iJK	28% IJK	16%	9%	12%	30% NO	26% nO	17% O	10%	16%	16%	25% Q	23%	30% Q	16%
Somewhat likely	43%	43% d	43% d	0%	23%	45%	42%	41%	38%	45%	46%	45%	40%	41%	46%	38%	41%	45%	43%	44%	56%
Not likely (Net)	38%	40%	36%	46%	40%	25%	32%	31%	47% FGH	46% FGH	42% F	25%	34%	42% L	44% Lm	45% L	43% RT	30%	35%	26%	27%
Not very likely	28%	28%	26%	46%	40%	19%	30% h	18%	28%	35% FH	32% FH	19%	26%	26%	33% L	30%	30% t	24%	28%	21%	18%
Not at all likely	10%	12%	9%	0%	0%	6%	2%	13% G	19% FGjK	11% G	9% G	6%	7%	15% lM	10%	15%	13% RT	6%	6%	5%	10%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Reallocating police department funds will lead to an increase in crime in my neighborhood.

				Gender					Age (Net)					Generations					Race/Ethnicity		
	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
Total	N=1001	N=453	N=532	N=8 **	N=14 **	N=112	N=189	N=176	N=182	N=164	N=177	N=112	N=313	N=270	N=275	N=30 *	N=605	N=396	N=175	N=137	N=52 *
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=349	N=643	N=7 **	N=8 **	N=107	N=154	N=142	N=152	N=188	N=258	N=107	N=253	N=234	N=360	N=47 *	N=679	N=322	N=91 *	N=158	N=39 *
Likely (Net)	55%	58% E	53% E	25%	3%	46%	48%	52%	55%	63% FG	61% Fg	46%	51%	54%	63% LMn	59%	60% RST	46%	42%	44%	67% rST
Very likely	23%	28% C	20%	4%	0%	9%	13%	27% FG	32% FGi	21% f	31% FGi	9%	20% l	26% L	28% Lm	32% L	25%	20%	20%	18%	27%
Somewhat likely	32%	31%	33%	21%	3%	37% i	36% i	25%	24%	42% HIK	30%	37%	31%	28%	35%	27%	35% RSt	26%	22%	26%	41% s
Not likely (Net)	45%	42%	47%	75%	97% BC	54% JK	52% Jk	48%	45%	37%	39%	54% O	49% O	46% o	37%	41%	40%	54% Qu	58% QU	56% QU	33%
Not very likely	33%	31%	34%	34%	72% bc	38%	40% jk	33%	33%	28%	29%	38%	36% o	33%	28%	25%	29%	40% QU	49% QU	37% u	18%
Not at all likely	12%	11%	13%	40% bc	25%	16%	12%	15%	12%	9%	11%	16%	12%	14%	9%	15%	11%	14%	9%	19% Qs	14%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Reallocating police department funds will start a real dialogue about the changes needed for policing in Chicago.

				Gender					Age (Net)					Generations					Race/Ethnicity		
	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
Total	N=1001	N=453	N=532	N=8 **	N=14 **	N=112	N=189	N=176	N=182	N=164	N=177	N=112	N=313	N=270	N=275	N=30 *	N=605	N=396	N=175	N=137	N=52 *
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=349	N=643	N=7 **	N=8 **	N=107	N=154	N=142	N=152	N=188	N=258	N=107	N=253	N=234	N=360	N=47 *	N=679	N=322	N=91 *	N=158	N=39 *
Likely (Net)	58%	56%	60%	80%	77%	68% iJK	67% iJK	64% Jk	54%	44%	53%	68% Op	65% Op	57%	48%	49%	51%	68% Q	69% Q	72% Q	57%
Very likely	17%	17%	17%	49% bc	58% BC	21% Jk	22% JK	25% JK	17% J	8%	11%	21% O	23% O	17% o	10%	11%	10%	29% Q	22% Q	36% Qs	21% q
Somewhat likely	41%	39%	43%	31%	18%	47%	45%	40%	38%	36%	42%	47%	42%	40%	38%	38%	42%	40%	47%	36%	36%
Not likely (Net)	42%	44%	40%	20%	23%	32%	33%	36%	46% fg	56% FGH	47% FGh	32%	35%	43%	52% LM	51% lm	49% RST	32%	31%	28%	43%
Not very likely	26%	26%	26%	16%	23%	27% h	27% h	15%	23%	39% gHIk	29% H	27%	23%	23%	33% MN	27%	29% T	23%	25%	18%	25%
Not at all likely	16%	18%	14%	4%	0%	5%	6%	20% FG	23% FG	17% FG	18% FG	5%	12%	20% Lm	18% L	24% Lm	20% RST	9%	6%	9%	18%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Reallocating police department funds will only benefit communities of color.

				Gender					Age (Net)					Generations					Race/Ethnicity		
	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
Total	N=1001	N=453	N=532	N=8 **	N=14 **	N=112	N=189	N=176	N=182	N=164	N=177	N=112	N=313	N=270	N=275	N=30 *	N=605	N=396	N=175	N=137	N=52 *
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=349	N=643	N=7 **	N=8 **	N=107	N=154	N=142	N=152	N=188	N=258	N=107	N=253	N=234	N=360	N=47 *	N=679	N=322	N=91 *	N=158	N=39 *
Likely (Net)	40%	38%	42% de	0%	3%	29%	47% FK	41%	41%	41% f	34%	29%	45% LO	42% l	35%	46% l	40%	39%	38%	38%	53%
Very likely	8%	8%	9%	0%	0%	2%	12% F	12% F	8%	6%	7%	2%	13% LO	8%	6%	12% L	10%	6%	4%	10%	3%
Somewhat likely	31%	30%	33%	0%	3%	26%	35%	29%	33%	35%	27%	26%	32%	34%	29%	34%	30%	33%	34%	28%	51% QrT
Not likely (Net)	60%	62%	58%	100% c	97% c	71% Gi	53%	59%	59%	59%	66% G	71% Mnp	55%	58%	65% M	54%	60%	61%	62%	62%	47%
Not very likely	38%	39%	36%	69%	67%	43%	38%	32%	32%	43%	41%	43%	36%	32%	43% N	39%	38%	38%	36%	39%	38%
Not at all likely	23%	23%	22%	31%	30%	28% Gi	15%	27% gi	27% GJ	16%	25% gi	28%	19%	26%	22%	15%	22%	23%	26% u	24%	8%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Reallocating police department funds will not contribute to repairing the relationship between the police and Chicago residents.

				Gender					Age (Net)					Generations					Race/Ethnicity		
	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
Total	N=1001	N=453	N=532	N=8 **	N=14 **	N=112	N=189	N=176	N=182	N=164	N=177	N=112	N=313	N=270	N=275	N=30 *	N=605	N=396	N=175	N=137	N=52 *
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=349	N=643	N=7 **	N=8 **	N=107	N=154	N=142	N=152	N=188	N=258	N=107	N=253	N=234	N=360	N=47 *	N=679	N=322	N=91 *	N=158	N=39 *
Likely (Net)	61%	61%	61%	49%	34%	52%	58%	67% f	59%	61%	62%	52%	62%	62%	61%	61%	63% T	56%	57%	52%	60%
Very likely	24%	27%	22%	0%	0%	16%	20%	29% f	23%	25%	29% F	16%	25%	23%	28% L	22%	27% RU	19% u	22% U	20% U	3%
Somewhat likely	36%	33%	39%	49%	34%	36%	38%	39%	36%	37%	33%	36%	37%	39%	33%	38%	36%	37%	35%	31%	58% QrsT
Not likely (Net)	39%	39%	39%	51%	66%	48% h	42%	33%	41%	39%	38%	48%	38%	38%	39%	39%	37%	44%	43%	48% Q	40%
Not very likely	27%	26%	28%	24%	49%	36% Hk	36% HK	21%	26%	25%	24%	36% o	29%	25%	24%	31%	25%	31% q	35% q	29%	31%
Not at all likely	12%	14%	10%	27%	17%	12%	6%	12%	15% g	13%	14% g	12%	9%	13%	15% m	9%	12%	12%	8%	19% qs	9%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Q6: Perhaps you have heard of the campaign "Defund the Police," which refers to the movement to reduce police department budgets and redistribute those funds towards essential social services that are often underfunded, such as housing, education, employment, mental health care, and youth services. Given this understanding, how much do you support or oppose this campaign?

				Gender					Age (Net)					Generations					Race/Ethnicity		
	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
Total	N=1001	N=453	N=532	N=8 **	N=14 **	N=112	N=189	N=176	N=182	N=164	N=177	N=112	N=313	N=270	N=275	N=30 *	N=605	N=396	N=175	N=137	N=52 *
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=349	N=643	N=7 **	N=8 **	N=107	N=154	N=142	N=152	N=188	N=258	N=107	N=253	N=234	N=360	N=47 *	N=679	N=322	N=91 *	N=158	N=39 *
Support (Net)	46%	43%	49%	75%	51%	66% hIJK	53% JK	52% JK	46% K	35%	33%	66% mNOP	53% OP	45% OP	34%	26%	35%	64% Q	61% Q	70% Q	58% Q
Strongly support	16%	12%	19% B	75% BC	47% B	29% IJK	23% iJK	19% jK	13%	10%	7%	29% NOP	22% NOP	12%	9%	7%	11%	25% Qu	24% Qu	30% QU	7%
Somewhat support	30%	31%	30%	0%	4%	37% k	29%	33%	33%	25%	25%	37% op	30%	33% op	25%	19%	24%	39% Q	37% Q	40% Q	51% Q
Oppose (Net)	54%	57%	51%	25%	49%	34%	47%	48% f	54% F	65% FGH	67% FGHI	34%	47% l	55% L	66% LMN	74% LMN	65% RSTU	36%	39%	30%	42%
Somewhat oppose	21%	20%	21%	10%	49%	17%	28% ik	19%	18%	23%	18%	17%	24%	21%	19%	19%	23%	18%	16%	18%	18%

	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
		Gender				Age (Net)						Generations					Race/Ethnicity				
Strongly oppose	33%	37% c	30%	16%	0%	17%	19%	29% f	37% FG	42% FGh	50% FGHI	17%	23%	34% LM	47% LMN	55% LMN	42% RSTu	19%	23% t	12%	23%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Q9: What would reform of Chicago law enforcement look like to you?

	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
		Gender				Age (Net)						Generations					Race/Ethnicity				
Total	N=743	N=322	N=411	N=7 **	N=10 **	N=100	N=153	N=129	N=119	N=115	N=128	N=100	N=238	N=191	N=194	N=20 **	N=419	N=324	N=138	N=121	N=39 *
Total (Unweighted)	N=754	N=243	N=504	N=6 **	N=7 **	N=94 *	N=132	N=104	N=106	N=134	N=184	N=94 *	N=203	N=168	N=257	N=32 *	N=480	N=274	N=74 *	N=141	N=29 **
Sensitivity training for all officers	56%	49%	62% B	47%	82%	64% I	57% i	50%	42%	58% I	65% hI	64% N	55%	45%	65% N	50%	57%	55%	55%	52%	58%
De-escalation training for all officers	52%	51%	53%	47%	54%	54%	52%	50%	47%	59%	53%	54%	52%	49%	54%	48%	55% t	49%	51%	44%	55%
Race-focused training for all officers	51%	48%	53%	47%	82%	53%	57% hI	41%	39%	54% i	59% HI	53%	53% n	41%	55% N	64% N	52%	49%	54%	42%	41%
New policies on gun use	50%	47%	52%	68%	69%	64% IJK	59% iJ	51%	40%	38%	48%	64% NO	55% O	45%	41%	53%	49%	51%	49%	50%	69%
Introduction of social workers onto police force	50%	50%	49%	73%	96% bc	53%	49%	48%	47%	49%	56%	53%	51%	43%	54% n	51%	51%	49%	44%	49%	57%
Bias training for all officers	50%	45%	54% b	47%	54%	51%	47%	44%	39%	54% i	61% gHI	51%	47%	44%	56% n	55%	49%	50%	54%	50%	51%
Increased racial and ethnic diversity within the department	42%	39%	44%	47%	31%	50%	45%	38%	39%	39%	41%	50%	43%	38%	39%	53%	40%	44%	37%	45%	76% QRST
Stricter rules and regulations from the Chicago Police Board (the disciplinary body for Chicago police officers)	41%	33%	46% B	95% Bc	54%	46%	47%	33%	34%	43%	42%	46% n	44% n	32%	42% n	46%	37%	46% q	46%	43%	48%
Greater reliance on non-lethal weapons	40%	39%	39%	100% BC	69%	48% h	39%	32%	35%	46% h	39%	48% n	38%	34%	43%	33%	38%	41%	39%	35%	47%
More stringent recruiting requirements	36%	38%	34%	68%	42%	43%	43% i	30%	30%	31%	38%	43%	39%	30%	33%	42%	31%	42% Q	39%	45% Q	32%
Civilian oversight committee	32%	38% c	29%	47%	28%	30%	39% i	34%	26%	27%	36%	30%	39% n	27%	31%	37%	31%	35%	27%	39%	44%
Completely new leadership	28%	33% c	24%	61%	70% C	41% IK	36% IK	28% IK	18%	28%	21%	41% NOp	34% nO	23%	21%	20%	23%	35% Q	40% Q	27%	38%
Reduced funding for the police department	23%	19%	25%	68% Bc	28%	37% hIJK	28% K	22% K	21% k	18%	11%	37% mnOP	25% O	23% O	13%	12%	18%	28% Q	23%	28% q	41% Q
Consent decree (i.e., a court order that establishes an enforceable plan for reform)	19%	19%	19%	74% BC	31%	17%	25%	21%	15%	17%	17%	17%	23%	17%	17%	17%	16%	23% q	16%	26% Q	26%
Other (please specify):	4%	6% c	3%	0%	21% C	2%	5% i	6% J	8% Jk	0%	3%	2%	5% o	7% O	1%	6% o	5% T	3% t	4% t	0%	0%
Not at all sure	5%	4%	6%	0%	0%	4%	1%	6%	8% g	7% g	7% g	4%	1%	9% M	6% m	17% LMO	5%	6%	7%	6%	6%

* Table Base: AGREE CHICAGO LAW ENFORCEMENT NEEDS REFORM

Q9A: How would you rate the training of Chicago police officers on each of the following?

Racial and cultural awareness

	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
		Gender				Age (Net)						Generations					Race/Ethnicity				
Total	N=1001	N=453	N=532	N=8 **	N=14 **	N=112	N=189	N=176	N=182	N=164	N=177	N=112	N=313	N=270	N=275	N=30 *	N=605	N=396	N=175	N=137	N=52 *
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=349	N=643	N=7 **	N=8 **	N=107	N=154	N=142	N=152	N=188	N=258	N=107	N=253	N=234	N=360	N=47 *	N=679	N=322	N=91 *	N=158	N=39 *
Excellent	8%	9%	7%	0%	0%	4%	7%	9%	12% k	9%	5%	4%	7%	12% lo	6%	10%	9%	7%	5%	10%	8%
Good	21%	28% C	16%	20%	0%	5%	25% F	23% F	19% F	26% F	24% F	5%	24% L	21% L	26% L	15% l	28% RST	11%	12%	7%	19% t
Fair	26%	25%	27%	0%	3%	24%	22%	24%	23%	35% ghi	28%	24%	23%	26%	28%	47% LMNO	27%	24%	22%	24%	38%
Poor	21%	19%	23%	5%	37%	23%	23%	22%	22%	18%	21%	23%	22%	21%	21%	19%	17%	28% QU	32% QU	25% qu	8%
Terrible	8%	7%	9%	0%	30% b	15% JK	13% JK	8%	7%	4%	5%	15% NOP	12% Op	7%	4%	1%	5%	13% Q	10%	19% Qu	3%
I don't think CPD officers have been trained for this at all	8%	6%	9%	75% BC	30% B	24% GHIJK	5%	9% J	5%	2%	8% J	24% MNOP	7%	6%	6%	5%	6%	12% Q	14% Q	8%	13%
Not at all sure	7%	6%	9%	0%	0%	4%	5%	5%	11%	7%	10%	4%	6%	9%	10%	2%	8%	6%	4%	7%	11%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Bias awareness

	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
		Gender				Age (Net)						Generations					Race/Ethnicity				
Total	N=1001	N=453	N=532	N=8 **	N=14 **	N=112	N=189	N=176	N=182	N=164	N=177	N=112	N=313	N=270	N=275	N=30 *	N=605	N=396	N=175	N=137	N=52 *
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=349	N=643	N=7 **	N=8 **	N=107	N=154	N=142	N=152	N=188	N=258	N=107	N=253	N=234	N=360	N=47 *	N=679	N=322	N=91 *	N=158	N=39 *
Excellent	6%	7%	6%	0%	0%	1%	5%	8% F	13% FgJK	5%	4%	1%	6% I	12% LmO	4%	4%	7%	6%	4%	8%	8%
Good	20%	25% C	15%	20%	29%	7%	22% F	27% Fi	13%	23% Fi	23% Fi	7%	24% L	17% l	22% L	25% L	24% RsT	13%	14%	10%	16%
Fair	26%	25%	28%	0%	0%	28%	26%	20%	22%	34% HI	28%	28%	22%	24%	29%	47% LMNO	28% T	23%	26%	18%	36% t
Poor	21%	20%	21%	0%	30%	25%	21%	19%	24%	18%	18%	25%	20%	22%	19%	14%	18%	24% q	28% qu	25%	10%
Terrible	8%	7%	9%	0%	11%	7%	15% HJK	4%	10%	4%	5%	7% p	11% OP	8% p	5%	0%	5%	12% Q	8%	22% QRSU	4%
I don't think CPD officers have been trained for this at all	10%	8%	11%	80% BC	30%	25% GIJK	8%	15% IJk	5%	5%	8%	25% MNOP	11%	7%	7%	4%	9%	12% t	14% T	5%	13%
Not at all sure	9%	8%	10%	0%	0%	7%	3%	8%	13% G	9% g	14% G	7%	6%	10%	13% M	5%	9%	9%	7%	11%	13%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Sensitivity toward those of a different gender, religion, age, orientation, income, etc.

	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
		Gender				Age (Net)						Generations					Race/Ethnicity				
Total	N=1001	N=453	N=532	N=8 **	N=14 **	N=112	N=189	N=176	N=182	N=164	N=177	N=112	N=313	N=270	N=275	N=30 *	N=605	N=396	N=175	N=137	N=52 *
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=349	N=643	N=7 **	N=8 **	N=107	N=154	N=142	N=152	N=188	N=258	N=107	N=253	N=234	N=360	N=47 *	N=679	N=322	N=91 *	N=158	N=39 *
Excellent	8%	11% C	6%	0%	0%	9%	9% k	7%	12% K	7%	4%	9%	9% o	10% O	4%	8%	8%	8%	7%	9%	14%
Good	19%	22%	17%	20%	0%	3%	15% F	20% F	23% F	23% F	24% Fg	3%	17% L	22% L	25% Lm	21% L	24% RT	12%	17% t	7%	13%
Fair	27%	25%	30%	5%	3%	25%	27%	25%	21%	41% FGHIK	26%	25%	25%	25%	33% m	35%	30% rst	23%	20%	21%	33%
Poor	19%	20%	20%	0%	11%	27% i	18%	20%	16%	15%	22%	27% o	19%	17%	17%	25%	16%	25% Q	23%	29% Q	18%
Terrible	9%	8%	10%	0%	29%	6%	19% FHJK	9%	11% JK	4%	5%	6%	15% lOp	11% O	4%	4%	5%	15% Q	12% Q	21% Qu	6%
I don't think CPD officers have been trained for this at all	8%	6%	9%	75% BC	57% BC	23% GIJK	5%	13% gIJ	5%	2%	8% J	23% MNOP	8% p	6%	6%	0%	7%	11% q	15% Q	7%	6%
Not at all sure	8%	9%	8%	0%	0%	7%	7%	6%	11%	8%	11%	7%	7%	9%	11%	7%	10%	6%	6%	6%	10%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

De-escalating tense or dangerous situations

	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
		Gender				Age (Net)						Generations					Race/Ethnicity				
Total	N=1001	N=453	N=532	N=8 **	N=14 **	N=112	N=189	N=176	N=182	N=164	N=177	N=112	N=313	N=270	N=275	N=30 *	N=605	N=396	N=175	N=137	N=52 *
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=349	N=643	N=7 **	N=8 **	N=107	N=154	N=142	N=152	N=188	N=258	N=107	N=253	N=234	N=360	N=47 *	N=679	N=322	N=91 *	N=158	N=39 *
Excellent	9%	10%	9%	16%	0%	6%	10%	11%	8%	11%	8%	6%	12%	8%	9%	6%	11% R	6%	5%	7%	11%
Good	23%	25%	22%	0%	11%	9%	15%	28% FG	29% FG	29% FG	24% Fg	9%	19% I	29% Lm	27% L	33% Lm	26% RT	18%	24% T	12%	15%
Fair	27%	28%	27%	4%	0%	25%	29%	25%	21%	29%	30%	25%	26%	25%	29%	32%	28%	24%	25%	23%	22%
Poor	20%	18%	20%	5%	51% b	34% HIJK	24% k	15%	18%	18%	14%	34% mNOP	21%	17%	16%	13%	16%	25% Q	24%	25% Q	27%
Terrible	8%	7%	9%	26%	23%	8%	14% JK	8% j	12% JK	3%	4%	8% p	13% OP	9% op	4%	0%	6%	12% Q	9%	18% Q	9%
I don't think CPD officers have been trained for this at all	6%	4%	6%	48% BC	14%	12% gIJ	4%	7%	3%	3%	8% ij	12% mNp	5%	4%	6%	2%	4%	8% Q	10% Q	7%	6%
Not at all sure	7%	8%	7%	0%	0%	7%	5%	6%	9%	7%	12% g	7%	5%	8%	9%	14% m	8%	6%	3%	8%	10%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Prioritizing non-lethal actions or weapons when dealing with individuals

	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
		Gender				Age (Net)						Generations					Race/Ethnicity				
Total	N=1001	N=453	N=532	N=8 **	N=14 **	N=112	N=189	N=176	N=182	N=164	N=177	N=112	N=313	N=270	N=275	N=30 *	N=605	N=396	N=175	N=137	N=52 *
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=349	N=643	N=7 **	N=8 **	N=107	N=154	N=142	N=152	N=188	N=258	N=107	N=253	N=234	N=360	N=47 *	N=679	N=322	N=91 *	N=158	N=39 *
Excellent	9%	12% C	6%	0%	0%	4%	10%	11%	12% fk	8%	5%	4%	10%	13% lO	6%	6%	10%	8%	9%	7%	10%
Good	20%	23%	19%	0%	0%	9%	15%	21% F	23% F	24% F	27% FG	9%	18% I	22% L	25% L	36% LMn	26% RST	11%	12%	7%	17%
Fair	29%	31%	28%	0%	40%	35% I	33% I	31% i	20%	33% I	27%	35%	31%	25%	30%	36%	29%	30%	32%	25%	33%
Poor	16%	14%	19%	10%	11%	13%	21%	15%	19%	14%	14%	13%	20%	16%	14%	10%	14%	20% q	17%	26% Q	15%
Terrible	10%	9%	10%	26%	35% bc	18% hJK	13% k	9%	11%	6%	6%	18% NOP	12% O	8%	6%	4%	7%	15% Q	13% q	19% Q	7%
I don't think CPD officers have been trained for this at all	6%	4%	7%	48% BC	14%	15% GIJK	4%	8%	3%	4%	5%	15% MNOP	5%	5%	5%	1%	4%	9% Q	11% Q	7%	6%
Not at all sure	9%	7%	11%	16%	0%	5%	4%	5%	13% Gh	10% g	15% FGH	5%	4%	11% M	14% IM	7%	10%	8%	6%	9%	13%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Responding to situations involving mental or behavioral health concerns

	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
		Gender				Age (Net)						Generations					Race/Ethnicity				
Total	N=1001	N=453	N=532	N=8 **	N=14 **	N=112	N=189	N=176	N=182	N=164	N=177	N=112	N=313	N=270	N=275	N=30 *	N=605	N=396	N=175	N=137	N=52 *
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=349	N=643	N=7 **	N=8 **	N=107	N=154	N=142	N=152	N=188	N=258	N=107	N=253	N=234	N=360	N=47 *	N=679	N=322	N=91 *	N=158	N=39 *
Excellent	6%	8% c	4%	0%	0%	2%	5%	5%	11% FK	7% k	3%	2%	4%	12% LMOp	4%	2%	5%	6%	7%	5%	14% q
Good	16%	19% c	14%	16%	0%	6%	19% F	23% Fk	14%	19% F	14%	6%	22% LP	16% L	16% Lp	5%	21% RST	9%	8%	9%	13%
Fair	22%	22%	23%	5%	3%	19%	23%	21%	21%	29%	20%	19%	23%	20%	24%	31%	25% r	18%	18%	17%	22%
Poor	25%	25%	25%	0%	40%	35% Ij	32% i	24%	16%	22%	26% I	35% NO	26%	21%	22%	43% MNO	22%	31% Q	33% Q	26%	24%
Terrible	11%	9%	13% b	26%	43% Bc	18% JK	11% j	9%	19% hJK	5%	7%	18% OP	12%	13% O	7%	4%	7%	18% Q	18% Q	20% Q	11%

	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (?	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
				Gender				Age (Net)						Generations					Race/Ethnicity		
I don't think CPD officers have been trained for this at all	10%	8%	11%	48% BC	14%	13%	6%	12%	7%	7%	17% GIJ	13%	9%	8%	13% n	8%	9%	11%	11%	14%	6%
Not at all sure	9%	9%	9%	4%	0%	7%	3%	5%	13% Gh	12% G	13% Gh	7%	5%	10% m	13% M	7%	10%	7%	6%	9%	10%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Responding to situations involving family safety concerns (e.g., domestic abuse, child endangerment)

	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (?	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
				Gender				Age (Net)						Generations					Race/Ethnicity		
Total	N=1001	N=453	N=532	N=8 **	N=14 **	N=112	N=189	N=176	N=182	N=164	N=177	N=112	N=313	N=270	N=275	N=30 *	N=605	N=396	N=175	N=137	N=52 *
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=349	N=643	N=7 **	N=8 **	N=107	N=154	N=142	N=152	N=188	N=258	N=107	N=253	N=234	N=360	N=47 *	N=679	N=322	N=91 *	N=158	N=39 *
Excellent	10%	12%	9%	0%	0%	6%	10%	16%	12%	11%	5%	6%	13%	12%	8%	4%	11%	9%	6%	13%	6%
Good	29%	31%	27%	20%	0%	18%	24%	32%	31%	31%	32%	18%	26%	34%	30%	42%	36%	18%	24%	13%	21%
Fair	28%	28%	28%	31%	53%	33%	33%	26%	25%	28%	27%	33%	30%	25%	28%	27%	26%	32%	35%	26%	34%
Poor	13%	11%	16%	0%	0%	11%	18%	9%	11%	15%	14%	11%	15%	10%	14%	22%	12%	15%	12%	20%	12%
Terrible	6%	5%	7%	0%	22% b	17%	7%	3%	8%	3%	2%	17%	5%	7%	3%	0%	3%	10%	10%	13%	4%
I don't think CPD officers have been trained for this at all	6%	5%	6%	48% BC	25% bc	11% gJ	3%	9% gJ	5% j	1%	7% J	11% op	5%	6%	5%	1%	4%	9%	9%	5%	12% q
Not at all sure	7%	7%	7%	0%	0%	4%	5%	4%	7%	10%	13% FGH	4%	5%	5%	13% LMN	4%	8%	6%	3%	9%	11%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Responding to situations involving personal safety concerns (e.g., stalking, harassment, physical fights)

	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (?	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
				Gender				Age (Net)						Generations					Race/Ethnicity		
Total	N=1001	N=453	N=532	N=8 **	N=14 **	N=112	N=189	N=176	N=182	N=164	N=177	N=112	N=313	N=270	N=275	N=30 *	N=605	N=396	N=175	N=137	N=52 *
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=349	N=643	N=7 **	N=8 **	N=107	N=154	N=142	N=152	N=188	N=258	N=107	N=253	N=234	N=360	N=47 *	N=679	N=322	N=91 *	N=158	N=39 *
Excellent	11% C	14%	8%	0%	11%	10%	13% K	13% K	13% K	9%	5%	10%	14% O	12% o	7%	6%	12%	9%	7%	9%	16%
Good	27%	30%	25%	20%	0%	11%	21%	28% F	28% F	36% FG	34% FG	11%	22% l	30% L	35% LM	40% LM	33% RST	18%	18%	16%	25%
Fair	28%	28%	27%	31%	48%	35%	26%	25%	25%	31%	28%	35%	25%	27%	27%	37%	28%	27%	29%	20%	23%
Poor	15%	11%	19% B	0%	27%	22% HjK	26% HiJK	9%	15%	11%	10%	22% nOp	20% nOp	13%	11%	8%	12%	20% Q	24% Q	21% Q	10%
Terrible	6%	4%	8% b	0%	0%	8% j	5%	10% J	7%	2%	4%	8%	7%	7%	4%	1%	3%	11% Q	10% Q	16% Q	3%
I don't think CPD officers have been trained for this at all	5%	5%	4%	48% BC	14%	7% j	4%	10% IJK	3%	2%	3%	7% o	7% O	4%	2%	3%	3%	7% q	9% Q	5%	6%
Not at all sure	8%	8%	9%	0%	0%	7%	4%	5%	9%	9%	15% GH	7%	5%	7%	14% MN	4%	9%	8%	3%	12% S	17% S

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Q10: Which of the following do you think are effective policies for reducing gun violence in Chicago?

	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (?	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
				Gender				Age (Net)						Generations					Race/Ethnicity		
Total	N=950	N=438	N=497	N=8 **	N=14 **	N=108	N=187	N=159	N=171	N=157	N=169	N=108	N=297	N=255	N=260	N=30 *	N=583	N=367	N=164	N=122	N=50 *
Total (Unweighted)	N=945	N=332	N=604	N=7 **	N=8 **	N=101	N=150	N=130	N=142	N=179	N=243	N=101	N=240	N=219	N=339	N=46 *	N=646	N=299	N=86 *	N=144	N=37 *
Background checks for all gun sales	65%	65%	66%	100%	57%	67%	59%	55%	62%	76% GHI	73% GHi	67%	58%	62%	74% MN	79% Mn	66%	64%	69%	63%	65%
Higher penalties for gun-related crimes	64%	66% E	63% E	36%	12%	55%	57%	49%	65% H	76% FGHi	79% FGHI	55%	53%	61%	80% LMN	84% LMN	69% RT	56%	63%	53%	52%
Increased police presence in neighborhoods with high gun violence	58%	58%	58%	34%	29%	48%	46%	45%	64% fGH	68% FGH	74% FGH	48%	45%	60% M	72% LMN	74% LM	65% RST	47%	51%	41%	50%
Increase the police's community involvement with residents in neighborhoods with high gun violence	54%	55%	53%	29%	36%	44%	47%	44%	51%	65% FGHI	68% FGHI	44%	44%	54% m	66% LMN	76% LMN	55%	52%	51%	52%	51%
Red flag laws/Extreme risk protection orders (i.e., police can remove or block an individual's access to firearms if they believe the weapons will be used for harm)	50%	47%	53% e	34%	12%	40%	49%	41%	45%	59% FHI	61% FgHI	40%	45%	47%	58% LMN	79% LMNO	53% Rt	44%	48%	43%	48%
Neighborhood initiatives (e.g., neighborhood watch, community clubs, resident oversight communities)	48%	49%	47%	60%	49%	29%	51% F	45% f	50% F	53% F	53% F	29%	49% L	47% L	55% L	60% L	47%	49%	49%	46%	53%
Youth services and after-school programs	48%	46%	50%	47%	18%	50% g	34%	50% G	48% g	60% Gik	48% G	50%	40%	49%	54% M	39%	50%	44%	48%	41%	36%
Police follow-up after gun violence situations	46%	48%	45%	34%	22%	31%	37%	44%	45% f	58% FGHi	58% FGHI	31%	40%	44%	60% LMN	60% LMn	51% RT	39%	40%	37%	44%
Support resources for residents with mental or behavioral health conditions (e.g., counseling services, social workers, housing services)	45%	41%	47%	96% BC	67%	40%	43%	50%	48%	46%	42%	40%	47%	46%	44%	41%	43%	49%	47%	50%	37%
In-school youth programs	43%	44%	42%	29%	29%	45%	35%	43%	46%	47% g	41%	45%	38%	46%	43%	45%	42%	44%	44%	41%	42%
Buy-back of certain firearms (e.g., semi-automatic assault weapons)	33%	28%	38% B	100% BCE	34%	29%	28%	37%	29%	39%	38%	29%	32%	33%	38%	40%	35%	31%	31%	32%	35%
Other (please specify):	5%	7% C	2%	26% C	26% C	4%	4%	1%	8% H	4%	6%	4%	3%	7%	4%	9% m	4%	6%	7%	3%	0%
Not at all sure	4%	2%	5%	0%	0%	5%	3%	5%	5%	2%	2%	5%	3%	5%	2%	1%	3%	5%	4%	3%	12% Qt

* Table Base: AGREE GUN VIOLENCE NEEDS TO BE REDUCED IN CHICAGO

Q13A: Which do you think best describes the level of involvement that the Chicago Police department should have in each of the following situations?

Truancy (i.e., a student's repeated unexcused absence from school)

	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (?	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
				Gender				Age (Net)						Generations					Race/Ethnicity		
Total	N=1001	N=453	N=532	N=8 **	N=14 **	N=112	N=189	N=176	N=182	N=164	N=177	N=112	N=313	N=270	N=275	N=30 *	N=605	N=396	N=175	N=137	N=52 *
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=349	N=643	N=7 **	N=8 **	N=107	N=154	N=142	N=152	N=188	N=258	N=107	N=253	N=234	N=360	N=47 *	N=679	N=322	N=91 *	N=158	N=39 *
Sole responsibility - CPD should respond independently unless another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) is specifically requested	9%	10%	8%	0%	3%	7%	8%	11%	14% jK	6%	6%	7%	9%	12% o	7%	4%	7%	12% Qu	15% Qu	15% QU	0%
Primary responsibility - CPD should take the lead, but another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should be present	9%	9%	10%	0%	0%	11%	10%	16% IjK	5%	7%	8%	11%	11%	8%	7%	7%	10%	9%	8%	9%	13%
Shared responsibility - CPD should respond to the call alongside another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works)	26%	29% c	23%	4%	11%	20%	28%	20%	31% h	27%	26%	20%	24%	32% l	25%	23%	27%	24%	22%	22%	41% rst
Limited responsibility - another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should take the lead, but CPD should be present	21%	19%	22%	24%	49%	19%	20%	17%	21%	24%	25%	19%	19%	20%	26%	28%	22%	20%	20%	20%	19%
No responsibility - another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should respond independently unless CPD is specifically requested	26%	25%	28%	46%	14%	28%	22%	28%	24%	27%	30%	28%	27%	20%	30% N	38% N	29%	23%	21%	24%	20%
N/A - this issue should be handled without a response team(s) (e.g., between residents, involving a private organization)	8%	8%	9%	26%	23%	15% IK	11% ik	8%	5%	8%	5%	15% OP	9% p	8% p	6%	0%	6%	12% Q	15% Q	9%	7%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Medical emergency (e.g., heart attack, allergic reaction, overdose)

	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (?	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
				Gender				Age (Net)						Generations					Race/Ethnicity		
Total	N=1001	N=453	N=532	N=8 **	N=14 **	N=112	N=189	N=176	N=182	N=164	N=177	N=112	N=313	N=270	N=275	N=30 *	N=605	N=396	N=175	N=137	N=52 *
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=349	N=643	N=7 **	N=8 **	N=107	N=154	N=142	N=152	N=188	N=258	N=107	N=253	N=234	N=360	N=47 *	N=679	N=322	N=91 *	N=158	N=39 *
Sole responsibility - CPD should respond independently unless another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) is specifically requested	11%	11%	10%	0%	49% BCd	15% K	15% K	15% K	9% K	9% K	3%	15% Op	16% nOP	9%	5%	3%	7%	17% Q	16% Q	15% Q	26% Q
Primary responsibility - CPD should take the lead, but another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should be present	13%	15%	12%	4%	0%	18%	16%	12%	11%	10%	15%	18%	13%	13%	13%	11%	13%	14%	19%	13%	5%
Shared responsibility - CPD should respond to the call alongside another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works)	34%	35%	34%	24%	4%	29%	36%	31%	36%	40%	33%	29%	33%	35%	36%	43%	38% Rt	29%	30%	28%	34%
Limited responsibility - another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should take the lead, but CPD should be present	24%	21%	26%	0%	13%	24%	20%	21%	27%	24%	26%	24%	21%	25%	25%	30%	25%	21%	19%	24%	18%
No responsibility - another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should respond independently unless CPD is specifically requested	16%	15%	15%	72% BC	34%	11%	9%	19% g	16%	16%	21% fG	11%	14%	17%	19%	14%	15%	16%	15%	14%	13%

	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
N/A - this issue should be handled without a response team(s) (e.g., between residents, involving a private organization)	2%	2%	2%	0%	0%	2%	4%	2%	2%	1%	2%	2%	3%	2%	1%	0%	2%	3%	0%	6% QS	3%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Drug-related issue (e.g., intoxication, addiction, possession of an illicit substance)

	Gender					Age (Net)						Generations						Race/Ethnicity		
	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
Total	N=1001	N=453	N=532	N=8 **	N=14 **	N=112	N=189	N=176	N=182	N=164	N=177	N=112	N=313	N=270	N=275	N=30 *	N=605	N=396	N=175	N=137	N=52 *
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=349	N=643	N=7 **	N=8 **	N=107	N=154	N=142	N=152	N=188	N=258	N=107	N=253	N=234	N=360	N=47 *	N=679	N=322	N=91 *	N=158	N=39 *
Sole responsibility - CPD should respond independently unless another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) is specifically requested	21%	20%	22%	20%	11%	12%	21%	26% F	19%	21%	22% f	12%	25% L	18%	22% l	21%	22%	19%	13%	25% s	24%
Primary responsibility - CPD should take the lead, but another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should be present	28%	29%	28%	0%	0%	31% g	18%	26%	28% g	31% G	36% Gh	31% m	19%	30% M	35% M	24%	29%	26%	31%	23%	27%
Shared responsibility - CPD should respond to the call alongside another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works)	36%	36%	35%	14%	63%	36%	43% K	33%	33%	41% K	29%	36%	38%	36%	33%	41%	34%	39%	39%	36%	45%
Limited responsibility - another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should take the lead, but CPD should be present	11%	11%	11%	26%	16%	13% j	13% j	11% j	12% j	5%	11% j	13%	13%	10%	8%	15%	11% u	11%	10%	12% u	0%
No responsibility - another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should respond independently unless CPD is specifically requested	3%	3%	3%	40% BC	10%	5% K	5% jK	4% k	4% K	1%	0%	5% O	4% O	4% O	1%	0%	3%	4%	6%	3%	1%
N/A - this issue should be handled without a response team(s) (e.g., between residents, involving a private organization)	1%	1%	1%	0%	0%	2%	1%	1%	3%	0%	1%	2%	1%	2%	1%	0%	1%	2%	1%	2%	3%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Mental or behavioral health concern (e.g., suicidal tendency, unstable behavior)

	Gender					Age (Net)						Generations						Race/Ethnicity		
	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
Total	N=1001	N=453	N=532	N=8 **	N=14 **	N=112	N=189	N=176	N=182	N=164	N=177	N=112	N=313	N=270	N=275	N=30 *	N=605	N=396	N=175	N=137	N=52 *
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=349	N=643	N=7 **	N=8 **	N=107	N=154	N=142	N=152	N=188	N=258	N=107	N=253	N=234	N=360	N=47 *	N=679	N=322	N=91 *	N=158	N=39 *
Sole responsibility - CPD should respond independent	9%	9%	9%	0%	0%	4%	15% FJK	12% Jk	10% j	4%	5%	4%	14% LOP	9% op	5%	0%	7%	12% Q	12%	14% Q	9%
Primary responsibility - CPD should take the lead, but	13%	13%	14%	0%	20%	16%	11%	18% k	11%	16%	10%	16%	15%	11%	14%	11%	15%	11%	12%	9%	14%
Shared responsibility - CPD should respond to the call	42%	43%	41%	20%	15%	30%	36%	30%	52% FGH	49% FgH	49% FgH	30%	33%	49% LM	49% LM	51% LM	43%	39%	43%	34%	52%
Limited responsibility - another response team(s) (e.g	26%	26%	28%	0%	0%	35% I	24%	32% I	16%	26% i	30% I	35% N	27%	21%	28%	29%	26%	27%	24%	31%	22%
No responsibility - another response team(s) (e.g., EM	8%	6%	7%	54% BC	50% BC	8%	13% JK	6%	9%	5%	5%	8%	10% O	7%	4%	9%	7%	8%	10%	7%	1%
N/A - this issue should be handled without a response	2%	2%	1%	26% BC	16% bC	7% gJK	1%	2%	2%	0%	1%	7% MnOp	1%	2%	1%	0%	2%	3%	0%	5% Qs	3%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Domestic dispute (e.g., suspected abuse, child endangerment)

	Gender					Age (Net)						Generations						Race/Ethnicity		
	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
Total	N=1001	N=453	N=532	N=8 **	N=14 **	N=112	N=189	N=176	N=182	N=164	N=177	N=112	N=313	N=270	N=275	N=30 *	N=605	N=396	N=175	N=137	N=52 *
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=349	N=643	N=7 **	N=8 **	N=107	N=154	N=142	N=152	N=188	N=258	N=107	N=253	N=234	N=360	N=47 *	N=679	N=322	N=91 *	N=158	N=39 *
Sole responsibility - CPD should respond independently unless another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) is specifically requested	24%	24%	25%	0%	11%	26% k	26% K	31% K	26% K	21%	15%	26%	29% Op	24%	19%	14%	21%	30% Q	34% Q	30% Q	21%
Primary responsibility - CPD should take the lead, but another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should be present	35%	35%	33%	50%	65%	30%	34%	30%	31%	44% fHI	37%	30%	32%	33%	42% lm	28%	38% rT	30%	28%	22%	49% rsT
Shared responsibility - CPD should respond to the call alongside another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works)	32%	32%	33%	4%	14%	27%	31%	29%	35%	30%	40% fhj	27%	30%	35%	34%	41%	34%	30%	28%	34%	24%
Limited responsibility - another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should take the lead, but CPD should be present	6%	6%	6%	5%	0%	8%	7%	7%	6%	3%	6%	8%	7%	5%	4%	13% nO	6%	6%	6%	8%	3%
No responsibility - another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should respond independently unless CPD is specifically requested	1%	1%	0%	40% BC	10% bC	5% hJK	1%	0%	1%	0%	0%	5% mNO	1%	1%	0%	0%	1%	1%	3%	0%	0%
N/A - this issue should be handled without a response team(s) (e.g., between residents, involving a private organization)	2%	2%	1%	0%	0%	4% k	1%	2%	2%	2%	1%	4%	1%	2%	1%	4%	1%	3% q	1%	6% Q	4%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Personal safety concern (e.g., physical fight, stalking, harassment)

	Gender					Age (Net)						Generations						Race/Ethnicity		
	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
Total	N=1001	N=453	N=532	N=8 **	N=14 **	N=112	N=189	N=176	N=182	N=164	N=177	N=112	N=313	N=270	N=275	N=30 *	N=605	N=396	N=175	N=137	N=52 *
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=349	N=643	N=7 **	N=8 **	N=107	N=154	N=142	N=152	N=188	N=258	N=107	N=253	N=234	N=360	N=47 *	N=679	N=322	N=91 *	N=158	N=39 *
Sole responsibility - CPD should respond independently unless another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) is specifically requested	37%	35%	39%	20%	40%	30%	34%	38%	35%	41%	44% f	30%	37%	33%	45% LN	37%	36%	40%	43%	35%	40%
Primary responsibility - CPD should take the lead, but another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should be present	31%	34%	30%	34%	16%	24%	33%	30%	33%	38% f	29%	24%	32%	33%	31%	36%	36% RST	24%	21%	23%	32%
Shared responsibility - CPD should respond to the call alongside another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works)	23%	23%	23%	5%	31%	35% gIJk	22%	23%	23%	16%	24%	35% MOp	21%	25%	20%	18%	23%	24%	29%	22%	16%
Limited responsibility - another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should take the lead, but CPD should be present	5%	5%	5%	17%	10%	6%	8% k	5%	5%	4%	3%	6%	7% o	4%	3%	7%	3%	8% Q	4%	11% Q	8%
No responsibility - another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should respond independently unless CPD is specifically requested	1%	0%	2% b	23% BC	3%	3%	0%	3% k	2%	1%	0%	3%	1%	2%	1%	0%	1%	3% q	2%	4% Q	2%
N/A - this issue should be handled without a response team(s) (e.g., between residents, involving a private organization)	1%	2%	1%	0%	0%	2%	3%	1%	2%	0%	0%	2% o	2%	2% o	0%	1%	1%	2%	0%	4% q	3%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Wellness check (i.e., requested in-person visit to verify a resident's personal well-being)

	Gender					Age (Net)						Generations						Race/Ethnicity		
	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
Total	N=1001	N=453	N=532	N=8 **	N=14 **	N=112	N=189	N=176	N=182	N=164	N=177	N=112	N=313	N=270	N=275	N=30 *	N=605	N=396	N=175	N=137	N=52 *
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=349	N=643	N=7 **	N=8 **	N=107	N=154	N=142	N=152	N=188	N=258	N=107	N=253	N=234	N=360	N=47 *	N=679	N=322	N=91 *	N=158	N=39 *
Sole responsibility - CPD should respond independently unless another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) is specifically requested	15%	15%	15%	0%	0%	9%	22% FJK	17%	15%	11%	12%	9%	22% LNO	12%	11%	13%	15%	15%	16%	17%	14%
Primary responsibility - CPD should take the lead, but another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should be present	18%	19%	16%	0%	40%	17%	19%	22%	13%	18%	17%	17%	18%	18%	17%	18%	18%	17%	19%	12%	19%
Shared responsibility - CPD should respond to the call alongside another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works)	37%	38%	35%	20%	26%	29%	36%	39%	40% k	44% FK	29%	29%	37% p	40% P	37% p	22%	37%	36%	39%	35%	37%
Limited responsibility - another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should take the lead, but CPD should be present	19%	18%	20%	5%	0%	25% G	11%	17%	21% g	18%	22% G	25% M	13%	20% m	21% m	23%	18%	20%	15%	22%	22%
No responsibility - another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should respond independently unless CPD is specifically requested	10%	8%	11%	66% BC	34% b	16% H	10%	4%	8%	8%	18% gHIJ	16% mN	8%	7%	13% n	20% MN	11%	9%	9%	10%	3%

	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
		Gender				Age (Net)						Generations					Race/Ethnicity				
Total	N=1001	N=453	N=532	N=8 **	N=14 **	N=112	N=189	N=176	N=182	N=164	N=177	N=112	N=313	N=270	N=275	N=30 *	N=605	N=396	N=175	N=137	N=52 *
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=349	N=643	N=7 **	N=8 **	N=107	N=154	N=142	N=152	N=188	N=258	N=107	N=253	N=234	N=360	N=47 *	N=679	N=322	N=91 *	N=158	N=39 *
Sole responsibility - CPD should respond independently unless another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) is specifically requested	44%	41%	47%	8%	40%	38%	44%	39%	47%	44%	50%	38%	43%	43%	47%	57% I	45%	42%	42%	46%	32%
Primary responsibility - CPD should take the lead, but another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should be present	27%	28%	26%	16%	14%	19%	26%	24%	27%	30% f	33% F	19%	25%	28%	32% L	24%	31% RT	21%	25%	17%	18%
Shared responsibility - CPD should respond to the call alongside another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works)	21%	24%	19%	4%	20%	26% k	21%	28% jK	19%	18%	15%	26% o	22%	23%	16%	17%	17%	27% Q	27% q	22%	43% QrT
Limited responsibility - another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should take the lead, but CPD should be present	6%	4%	7%	31% BC	16%	13% iJK	6% K	6% K	5% K	4% k	1%	13% NOP	7% O	5%	2%	0%	5%	6%	4%	8%	4%
No responsibility - another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should respond independently unless CPD is specifically requested	1%	0%	1%	23% BC	0%	2%	0%	1%	0%	1%	1%	2% n	0%	0%	1%	2% n	0%	1%	2%	0%	0%
N/A - this issue should be handled without a response team(s) (e.g., between residents, involving a private organization)	2%	3% C	1%	17% C	10% C	2%	3% k	2%	1%	2%	0%	2%	3%	2%	1%	0%	1%	3%	0%	7% QS	3%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Neighborhood concern (e.g., noise complaints, disorderly conduct)

	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
		Gender				Age (Net)						Generations					Race/Ethnicity				
Total	N=1001	N=453	N=532	N=8 **	N=14 **	N=112	N=189	N=176	N=182	N=164	N=177	N=112	N=313	N=270	N=275	N=30 *	N=605	N=396	N=175	N=137	N=52 *
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=349	N=643	N=7 **	N=8 **	N=107	N=154	N=142	N=152	N=188	N=258	N=107	N=253	N=234	N=360	N=47 *	N=679	N=322	N=91 *	N=158	N=39 *
Sole responsibility - CPD should respond independently unless another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) is specifically requested	34%	30%	38% B	8%	11%	33%	33%	35%	32%	34%	34%	33%	34%	33%	33%	44%	34%	33%	43% T	26%	29%
Primary responsibility - CPD should take the lead, but another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should be present	28%	29%	26%	16%	29%	24%	23%	29%	25%	28%	35% fGi	24%	25%	27%	34% m	22%	29% s	25%	18%	30%	33%
Shared responsibility - CPD should respond to the call alongside another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works)	24%	28% c	22%	0%	27%	24%	30% k	22%	25%	26%	19%	24%	26%	25%	22%	22%	24%	26%	28%	22%	30%
Limited responsibility - another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should take the lead, but CPD should be present	9%	9%	10%	27%	10%	11%	9%	8%	13%	7%	9%	11%	9%	10%	8%	10%	9%	10%	9%	15% q	5%
No responsibility - another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should respond independently unless CPD is specifically requested	3%	2%	3%	49% BC	22% BC	6% iK	4%	4%	1%	2%	1%	6% No	5% No	1%	2%	2%	3%	3%	2%	3%	0%
N/A - this issue should be handled without a response team(s) (e.g., between residents, involving a private organization)	2%	3%	1%	0%	0%	2%	2%	1%	4% k	3%	1%	2%	1%	4% o	1%	0%	2%	2%	0%	5% Qs	5% s

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Homelessness (e.g., tent locations, panhandling)

	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
		Gender				Age (Net)						Generations					Race/Ethnicity				
Total	N=1001	N=453	N=532	N=8 **	N=14 **	N=112	N=189	N=176	N=182	N=164	N=177	N=112	N=313	N=270	N=275	N=30 *	N=605	N=396	N=175	N=137	N=52 *
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=349	N=643	N=7 **	N=8 **	N=107	N=154	N=142	N=152	N=188	N=258	N=107	N=253	N=234	N=360	N=47 *	N=679	N=322	N=91 *	N=158	N=39 *
Sole responsibility - CPD should respond independently unless another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) is specifically requested	10%	11%	9%	0%	0%	8%	15% K	12% K	10% k	8%	4%	8%	14% O	10% o	5%	6%	8%	12% q	10%	18% Q	7%
Primary responsibility - CPD should take the lead, but another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should be present	12%	10%	14%	0%	0%	12%	10%	17%	9%	13%	10%	12% p	14% P	10%	12% p	2%	12%	12%	12%	13%	7%
Shared responsibility - CPD should respond to the call alongside another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works)	38%	40%	37%	4%	11%	32%	30%	36%	45% G	41%	41%	32%	33%	41%	41%	51% lM	40% T	35%	36%	28%	58% qRsT
Limited responsibility - another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should take the lead, but CPD should be present	24%	23%	26%	16%	4%	25%	25%	16%	22%	26% h	33% Hi	25%	19%	25%	28% m	35% M	26%	22%	22%	24%	17%
No responsibility - another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should respond independently unless CPD is specifically requested	12%	11%	11%	46% BC	70% BC	14%	16%	15%	9%	9%	10%	14%	16% o	10%	10%	6%	10%	15%	20% Qt	9%	7%
N/A - this issue should be handled without a response team(s) (e.g., between residents, involving a private organization)	4%	5%	3%	34% BC	16%	9% jK	4%	4%	4%	3%	2%	9% Op	4%	4%	3%	0%	3%	5%	0%	9% QS	4%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Q13B: Which group(s) should be involved in responding to each of the following situations?

Truancy (i.e., a student's repeated unexcused absence from school)

	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
		Gender				Age (Net)						Generations					Race/Ethnicity				
Total	N=912	N=408	N=489	N=8 **	N=14 **	N=104	N=174	N=156	N=157	N=154	N=167	N=104	N=284	N=238	N=257	N=29 **	N=565	N=347	N=149	N=116	N=52 *
Total (Unweighted)	N=924	N=320	N=596	N=7 **	N=7 **	N=100	N=143	N=126	N=134	N=176	N=245	N=100	N=231	N=209	N=339	N=45 *	N=642	N=282	N=77 *	N=135	N=39 *
Non-police first responder (e.g., Chicago Fire Department, EMS)	9%	12% C	6%	0%	30% C	7%	18% fHJK	7%	12% jK	4%	4%	7%	12% OP	12% OP	4%	0%	7%	12% Q	12%	13% Q	4%
Social services (e.g., mental health professional, social worker)	61%	57%	65% b	74%	35%	53%	53%	60%	60%	66% g	73% FGHI	53%	56%	58%	73% LMN	64%	64% tu	57%	64%	54%	44%
Branch(es) of local government (e.g., Department of Public Works, Department of Parks and Recreation)	14%	15%	13%	0%	0%	19% K	14% K	11%	19% K	14% K	6%	19% Op	13%	18% Op	9%	6%	12%	16%	11%	15%	33% QRSt
Private organization(s) (e.g., insurance company, neighborhood watch, homeowner's association)	10%	13% C	8%	0%	0%	10%	19% iJK	11% k	8%	6%	5%	10%	17% NOp	8%	5%	5%	8%	13% q	9%	19% Qs	12%
Residents	12%	11%	13%	0%	19%	12%	10%	17%	11%	11%	11%	12%	13%	12%	10%	21% o	10%	15% q	16%	13%	20%
None of these	11%	12%	11%	26%	16%	12%	8%	8%	12%	13%	15%	12%	7%	14% M	13% m	13%	13%	9%	10%	10%	6%

* Table Base: THINKS CPD SHOULD NOT HAVE SOLE RESPONSIBILITY FOR THIS SITUATION

Medical emergency (e.g., heart attack, allergic reaction, overdose)

	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
		Gender				Age (Net)						Generations					Race/Ethnicity				
Total	N=892	N=404	N=480	N=8 **	N=7 **	N=96 *	N=160	N=148	N=166	N=150	N=173	N=96 *	N=262	N=246	N=260	N=29 **	N=565	N=328	N=146	N=116	N=38 *
Total (Unweighted)	N=912	N=318	N=587	N=7 **	N=6 **	N=96 *	N=133	N=124	N=135	N=174	N=250	N=96 *	N=221	N=207	N=342	N=46 *	N=637	N=275	N=76 *	N=138	N=30 *
Non-police first responder (e.g., Chicago Fire Department, EMS)	81%	77%	84% b	100%	100%	71%	77%	75%	86% Fh	81%	90% FGHJ	71%	76%	83% I	86% LM	94% LMn	83% TU	77%	82%	71%	64%
Social services (e.g., mental health professional, social worker)	14%	16%	13%	27%	0%	23% iJK	22% iJK	19% jK	11% k	9%	5%	23% nOP	22% NOP	12% o	6%	4%	12%	18% q	13%	17%	43% QRST
Branch(es) of local government (e.g., Department of Public Works, Department of Parks and Recreation)	8%	13% C	3%	0%	0%	16% HIJK	20% HIJK	5% k	5%	3%	1%	16% NOP	14% NOp	5% o	1%	3%	7%	10%	10%	11%	2%
Private organization(s) (e.g., insurance company, neighborhood watch, homeowner's association)	5%	6%	4%	0%	0%	6% K	9% JK	8% jK	4%	2%	1%	6% o	8% Op	5% o	2%	0%	3%	8% Q	5%	11% Q	12% q
Residents	5%	5%	4%	0%	0%	0%	5%	6% f	6% f	4%	4%	0%	6% I	7% I	3%	0%	4%	6%	5%	8% q	5%

None of these	3%	4%	3%	0%	0%	2%	1%	5% i	1%	8% Glk	3%	2%	3%	1%	7% N	0%	3%	4%	0%	5%	18% QRST

* Table Base: THINKS CPD SHOULD NOT HAVE SOLE RESPONSIBILITY FOR THIS SITUATION

Drug-related issue (e.g., intoxication, addiction, possession of an illicit substance)

				Gender					Age (Net)					Generations					Race/Ethnicity		
	Total (A)	**Male (B)**	**Female (C)**	**Transgender (D)**	**Non-binary (E)**	**18-24 (F)**	**25-34 (G)**	**35-44 (H)**	**45-54 (I)**	**55-64 (J)**	**65+ (K)**	**Gen Z (18-24) (L)**	**Millennials (25-40) (**	**Gen X (41-56) (N)**	**Baby Boomers (57-7**	**Silent Generation (7**	**White (Not Hispanic**	**People of Color (R)**	**Hispanic (S)**	**Black (Not Hispanic)**	**AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)**
Total	N=794	N=364	N=417	N=7 **	N=13 **	N=99 *	N=150	N=131	N=147	N=129	N=138	N=99 *	N=236	N=222	N=214	N=24 **	N=473	N=321	N=151	N=103	N=40 *
Total (Unweighted)	N=797	N=274	N=516	N=5 **	N=7 **	N=95 *	N=124	N=109	N=120	N=149	N=200	N=95 *	N=200	N=184	N=283	N=35 *	N=544	N=253	N=76 *	N=120	N=29 **
Non-police first responder (e.g., Chicago Fire Department, EMS)	43%	41%	44%	90% b	34%	55% HJ	43%	36%	43%	38%	43%	55% mP	39%	42%	43% p	26%	43% Tu	41% t	53% TU	29%	22%
Social services (e.g., mental health professional, social worker)	49%	45%	53%	90%	38%	59% Gk	39%	51%	50%	54% g	44%	59%	46%	48%	48%	53%	50%	48%	41%	49%	62%
Branch(es) of local government (e.g., Department of Public Works, Department of Parks and Recreation)	12%	17% C	8%	0%	0%	12%	20% iJK	15% k	9%	8%	7%	12%	19% NOp	9%	8%	3%	12%	13%	14%	12%	10%
Private organization(s) (e.g., insurance company, neighborhood watch, homeowner's association)	8%	8%	7%	0%	36% bC	11% k	12% jK	12% K	5%	5%	4%	11% O	12% O	7%	4%	3%	6%	11% Qs	3%	16% QS	20% QS
Residents	5%	6%	4%	0%	0%	4%	6% k	8% jK	7% K	2%	2%	4%	7% O	7% o	2%	0%	3%	8% Q	4%	8% Q	26% QRST
None of these	15%	14%	15%	10%	22%	4%	15% f	14% f	12%	20% F	21% F	4%	14% l	14% l	20% L	23% L	16%	13%	12%	20%	5%

* Table Base: THINKS CPD SHOULD NOT HAVE SOLE RESPONSIBILITY FOR THIS SITUATION

Mental or behavioral health concern (e.g., suicidal tendency, unstable behavior)

				Gender					Age (Net)					Generations					Race/Ethnicity		
	Total (A)	**Male (B)**	**Female (C)**	**Transgender (D)**	**Non-binary (E)**	**18-24 (F)**	**25-34 (G)**	**35-44 (H)**	**45-54 (I)**	**55-64 (J)**	**65+ (K)**	**Gen Z (18-24) (L)**	**Millennials (25-40) (**	**Gen X (41-56) (N)**	**Baby Boomers (57-7**	**Silent Generation (7**	**White (Not Hispanic**	**People of Color (R)**	**Hispanic (S)**	**Black (Not Hispanic)**	**AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)**
Total	N=914	N=413	N=487	N=8 **	N=14 **	N=107	N=162	N=155	N=164	N=157	N=168	N=107	N=269	N=245	N=263	N=30 *	N=565	N=349	N=154	N=118	N=47 *
Total (Unweighted)	N=929	N=323	N=597	N=7 **	N=8 **	N=100	N=137	N=127	N=136	N=180	N=249	N=100	N=226	N=210	N=346	N=47 *	N=645	N=284	N=80 *	N=137	N=37 *
Non-police first responder (e.g., Chicago Fire Department, EMS)	31%	30%	33%	36%	16%	38% k	37% k	28%	33%	29%	26%	38% o	33%	33%	27%	24%	32% t	30%	36% t	22%	24%
Social services (e.g., mental health professional, social worker)	78%	76%	81% e	100% e	49%	71%	80%	69%	82% h	79%	85% FH	71%	78%	75%	85% LmN	83%	84% RSTu	70%	69%	68%	69%
Branch(es) of local government (e.g., Department of Public Works, Department of Parks and Recreation)	9%	13% C	6%	0%	22%	20% IJK	14% JK	11% JK	8%	4%	4%	20% NOP	13% O	8% O	3%	5%	8%	12%	11%	10%	17%
Private organization(s) (e.g., insurance company, neighborhood watch, homeowner's association)	9%	11% C	6%	23%	40% BC	11% IK	16% IJK	14% IjK	2%	6%	3%	11% OP	13% OP	9% Op	3%	0%	5%	14% Q	11% q	12% Q	21% Q
Residents	7%	7%	6%	0%	20%	6%	12% K	6%	6%	6%	3%	6%	9% O	7% o	3%	8%	4%	11% Q	8%	13% Q	18% Q
None of these	3%	3%	2%	0%	0%	2%	1%	4%	1%	5%	2%	2%	1%	4%	3%	1%	1%	4% Q	4%	6% Q	5%

* Table Base: THINKS CPD SHOULD NOT HAVE SOLE RESPONSIBILITY FOR THIS SITUATION

Domestic dispute (e.g., suspected abuse, child endangerment)

				Gender					Age (Net)					Generations					Race/Ethnicity		
	Total (A)	**Male (B)**	**Female (C)**	**Transgender (D)**	**Non-binary (E)**	**18-24 (F)**	**25-34 (G)**	**35-44 (H)**	**45-54 (I)**	**55-64 (J)**	**65+ (K)**	**Gen Z (18-24) (L)**	**Millennials (25-40) (**	**Gen X (41-56) (N)**	**Baby Boomers (57-7**	**Silent Generation (7**	**White (Not Hispanic**	**People of Color (R)**	**Hispanic (S)**	**Black (Not Hispanic)**	**AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)**
Total	N=759	N=346	N=398	N=8 **	N=13 **	N=83 *	N=141	N=120	N=135	N=129	N=151	N=83 *	N=221	N=206	N=222	N=26 **	N=480	N=279	N=116	N=95 *	N=41 *
Total (Unweighted)	N=784	N=271	N=504	N=7 **	N=7 **	N=78 *	N=122	N=106	N=111	N=149	N=218	N=78 *	N=194	N=176	N=295	N=41 *	N=553	N=231	N=66 *	N=107	N=31 *
Non-police first responder (e.g., Chicago Fire Department, EMS)	24%	23%	24%	59% bc	17%	33% ijK	25%	29%	19%	20%	19%	33% op	24%	24%	20%	15%	24%	24%	26%	21%	28%
Social services (e.g., mental health professional, social worker)	59%	54%	63% b	100% b	64%	61%	57%	55%	56%	57%	68% hij	61%	58%	54%	63%	76% mN	62% T	54%	55%	45%	65%
Branch(es) of local government (e.g., Department of Public Works, Department of Parks and Recreation)	11%	13%	10%	0%	0%	31% HIJK	19% IJK	15% JK	8% jk	2%	2%	31% MNOP	17% nOP	9% Op	3%	0%	8%	18% Q	18% Q	13%	32% Qt
Private organization(s) (e.g., insurance company, neighborhood watch, homeowner's association)	7%	9%	6%	26% c	20%	17% IJK	10% k	9% k	4%	5%	3%	17% nO	9% O	7%	3%	5%	5%	11% Q	9%	14% Q	4%
Residents	7%	9% C	5%	0%	33% C	2%	8%	8%	11% f	7%	5%	2%	9% o	10% lO	4%	8%	4%	12% Q	11% q	14% Q	8%
None of these	20%	22%	20%	0%	0%	8%	14%	21% f	25% F	28% FG	22% F	8%	17%	22% L	27% Lmp	12%	22%	17%	18%	21%	7%

* Table Base: THINKS CPD SHOULD NOT HAVE SOLE RESPONSIBILITY FOR THIS SITUATION

Personal safety concern (e.g., physical fight, stalking, harassment)

				Gender					Age (Net)					Generations					Race/Ethnicity		
	Total (A)	**Male (B)**	**Female (C)**	**Transgender (D)**	**Non-binary (E)**	**18-24 (F)**	**25-34 (G)**	**35-44 (H)**	**45-54 (I)**	**55-64 (J)**	**65+ (K)**	**Gen Z (18-24) (L)**	**Millennials (25-40) (**	**Gen X (41-56) (N)**	**Baby Boomers (57-7**	**Silent Generation (7**	**White (Not Hispanic**	**People of Color (R)**	**Hispanic (S)**	**Black (Not Hispanic)**	**AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)**
Total	N=628	N=295	N=323	N=7 **	N=8 **	N=79 *	N=125	N=109	N=119	N=96 *	N=100	N=79 *	N=197	N=181	N=152	N=19 **	N=388	N=239	N=100	N=88 *	N=31 *
Total (Unweighted)	N=630	N=217	N=407	N=5 **	N=6 **	N=75 *	N=105	N=89 *	N=97 *	N=113	N=151	N=75 *	N=167	N=149	N=210	N=29 **	N=435	N=195	N=58 *	N=89 *	N=26 **
Non-police first responder (e.g., Chicago Fire Department, EMS)	27%	25%	28%	67%	31%	38% K	30% k	25%	26%	26%	18%	38% oP	26% p	28% p	23%	9%	26%	28%	33%	20%	41%
Social services (e.g., mental health professional, social worker)	29%	28%	29%	57%	17%	28%	32%	29%	23%	22%	37% iJ	28%	30%	26%	29%	36%	27%	31%	29%	33%	32%
Branch(es) of local government (e.g., Department of Public Works, Department of Parks and Recreation)	15%	19% C	12%	0%	37%	30% HIJK	25% HiJK	11%	12%	11%	7%	30% NO	21% NO	10%	8%	13%	12%	21% Q	23% q	15%	28% q
Private organization(s) (e.g., insurance company, neighborhood watch, homeowner's association)	12%	8%	14% b	61% BC	59% BC	16% K	16% iK	22% IJK	6%	8%	5%	16% OP	20% NOP	9%	5%	0%	9%	18% Q	18% q	19% Q	13%
Residents	13%	17% C	9%	0%	33%	5%	19% FJK	23% FJK	14%	6%	8%	5%	20% LOp	16% lO	5%	4%	8%	21% Q	26% Q	18% Q	23% q
None of these	32%	33%	31%	0%	6%	14%	28% f	23%	39% Fh	40% FH	43% FgH	14%	25%	35% L	44% LM	43% Lm	38% RST	22%	22%	21%	21%

* Table Base: THINKS CPD SHOULD NOT HAVE SOLE RESPONSIBILITY FOR THIS SITUATION

Wellness check (i.e., requested in-person visit to verify a resident's personal well-being)

				Gender					Age (Net)					Generations					Race/Ethnicity		
	Total (A)	**Male (B)**	**Female (C)**	**Transgender (D)**	**Non-binary (E)**	**18-24 (F)**	**25-34 (G)**	**35-44 (H)**	**45-54 (I)**	**55-64 (J)**	**65+ (K)**	**Gen Z (18-24) (L)**	**Millennials (25-40) (**	**Gen X (41-56) (N)**	**Baby Boomers (57-7**	**Silent Generation (7**	**White (Not Hispanic**	**People of Color (R)**	**Hispanic (S)**	**Black (Not Hispanic)**	**AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)**
Total	N=853	N=387	N=450	N=8 **	N=14 **	N=102	N=148	N=145	N=155	N=146	N=156	N=102	N=244	N=237	N=244	N=26 **	N=517	N=336	N=147	N=114	N=45 *
Total (Unweighted)	N=871	N=303	N=559	N=7 **	N=8 **	N=100	N=125	N=120	N=129	N=167	N=230	N=100	N=206	N=202	N=322	N=41 *	N=597	N=274	N=78 *	N=132	N=33 *
Non-police first responder (e.g., Chicago Fire Department, EMS)	36%	37%	35%	31%	16%	34%	38%	34%	39%	38%	33%	34%	36%	40%	34%	31%	36% u	35%	39% u	36%	18%
Social services (e.g., mental health professional, social worker)	60%	54%	66% B	96% b	49%	59%	66%	53%	57%	57%	69% HiJ	59%	61%	56%	63%	78% lmN	62% t	58%	59%	51%	63%
Branch(es) of local government (e.g., Department of Public Works, Department of Parks and Recreation)	9%	12% C	6%	0%	32% C	18% IJK	15% IJK	13% iJK	5%	3%	3%	18% NOP	13% Op	7%	4%	2%	7%	12% Q	6%	17% Qs	6%
Private organization(s) (e.g., insurance company, neighborhood watch, homeowner's association)	12%	13%	9%	27%	20%	15%	15%	12%	8%	11%	10%	15%	14%	9%	11%	8%	8%	16% Q	17% Q	15% q	23% Q
Residents	14%	16%	12%	23%	20%	13%	15%	16%	13%	13%	13%	13%	17%	12%	14%	8%	12%	16%	16%	18%	22%
None of these	5%	6%	4%	0%	0%	2%	4%	5%	6%	6%	4%	2%	4%	7%	5%	0%	6% r	3%	1%	4%	5%

* Table Base: THINKS CPD SHOULD NOT HAVE SOLE RESPONSIBILITY FOR THIS SITUATION

Suspicious behavior (e.g., trespassing, loitering, unfamiliar vehicles)

				Gender					Age (Net)					Generations					Race/Ethnicity		
	Total (A)	**Male (B)**	**Female (C)**	**Transgender (D)**	**Non-binary (E)**	**18-24 (F)**	**25-34 (G)**	**35-44 (H)**	**45-54 (I)**	**55-64 (J)**	**65+ (K)**	**Gen Z (18-24) (L)**	**Millennials (25-40) (**	**Gen X (41-56) (N)**	**Baby Boomers (57-7**	**Silent Generation (7**	**White (Not Hispanic**	**People of Color (R)**	**Hispanic (S)**	**Black (Not Hispanic)**	**AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)**
Total	N=561	N=269	N=281	N=8 **	N=8 **	N=70 *	N=106	N=107	N=96 *	N=92 *	N=90 *	N=70 *	N=177	N=154	N=146	N=13 **	N=332	N=228	N=101	N=74 *	N=35 *
Total (Unweighted)	N=565	N=203	N=354	N=6 **	N=6 **	N=70 *	N=94 *	N=80 *	N=79 *	N=103	N=139	N=70 *	N=150	N=128	N=195	N=22 **	N=377	N=188	N=56 *	N=85 *	N=28 **
Non-police first responder (e.g., Chicago Fire Department, EMS)	21%	23%	19%	11%	20%	16%	28% k	22%	25%	16%	15%	16%	25%	23%	16%	13%	18%	25% q	27%	28%	19%
Social services (e.g., mental health professional, social worker)	14%	16%	13%	19%	17%	7%	18%	16%	16%	11%	14%	7%	17%	17%	13%	4%	15%	14%	9%	18%	24%
Branch(es) of local government (e.g., Department of Public Works, Department of Parks and Recreation)	18%	19%	17%	0%	33%	31% iJK	21% j	19%	16%	9%	13%	31% NO	21% O	15%	10%	23%	15%	22%	27% q	19%	17%
Private organization(s) (e.g., insurance company, neighborhood watch, homeowner's association)	17%	13%	20% b	58% Bc	30%	35% HIJK	21%	14%	10%	12%	16%	35% MNOP	18%	10%	16%	6%	15%	20%	16%	21%	11%
Residents	13%	12%	13%	53% BC	26%	21% Hi	18% h	6%	9%	11%	16% h	21% n	14%	9%	11%	30% mNO	11%	16%	19%	13%	8%
None of these	39%	40%	39%	17%	0%	21%	26%	42% Fg	44% Fg	48% FG	48% FG	21%	32%	43% L	50% LM	38%	44% Rst	32%	29%	31%	41%

* Table Base: THINKS CPD SHOULD NOT HAVE SOLE RESPONSIBILITY FOR THIS SITUATION

Neighborhood concern (e.g., noise complaints, disorderly conduct)

				Gender					Age (Net)					Generations					Race/Ethnicity		
	Total (A)	**Male (B)**	**Female (C)**	**Transgender (D)**	**Non-binary (E)**	**18-24 (F)**	**25-34 (G)**	**35-44 (H)**	**45-54 (I)**	**55-64 (J)**	**65+ (K)**	**Gen Z (18-24) (L)**	**Millennials (25-40) (**	**Gen X (41-56) (N)**	**Baby Boomers (57-7**	**Silent Generation (7**	**White (Not Hispanic**	**People of Color (R)**	**Hispanic (S)**	**Black (Not Hispanic)**	**AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)**
Total	N=664	N=319	N=329	N=8 **	N=13 **	N=75 *	N=127	N=114	N=124	N=108	N=116	N=75 *	N=207	N=182	N=183	N=17 **	N=400	N=264	N=100	N=101	N=37 *
Total (Unweighted)	N=667	N=239	N=419	N=6 **	N=7 **	N=75 *	N=108	N=92 *	N=101	N=125	N=166	N=75 *	N=175	N=156	N=234	N=27 **	N=451	N=216	N=55 *	N=109	N=27 **
Non-police first responder (e.g., Chicago Fire Department, EMS)	19%	19%	19%	0%	0%	14%	24%	21%	22%	14%	14%	14%	21% o	24% O	13%	10%	19%	18%	23%	17%	9%

Social services (e.g., mental health professional, social worker)	21%	27%	C	15%		0%		33%		19%		30%	I	19%		15%		22%		19%		19%		25%		16%		21%		20%		19%		24%		26%		18%		31%	
Branch(es) of local government (e.g., Department of Public Works, Department of Parks and Recreation)	18%	22%	C	13%		58%	C	54%	C	35%	HIJK	29%	HIJK	10%		20%	K	14%	K	5%		35%	mNOp	21%	O	20%	O	7%		15%		16%		22%		16%		24%	q	26%	
Private organization(s) (e.g., insurance company, neighborhood watch, homeowner's association)	27%	22%		31%	b	64%	b	31%		43%	IJK	33%	JK	32%	JK	25%		15%		16%		43%	NOP	33%	Op	25%	o	16%		14%		24%		31%		25%		35%	q	36%	
Residents	21%	22%		20%		53%		17%		29%	jk	23%		26%		20%		15%		16%		29%	O	25%	o	19%		15%		27%		22%		19%		19%		18%		24%	
None of these	26%	26%		26%		17%		0%		7%		14%		16%		30%	FGh	37%	FGH	44%	FGHi	7%		16%		24%	L	45%	LMN	28%	L	29%	r	21%		18%		24%		21%	

* Table Base: THINKS CPD SHOULD NOT HAVE SOLE RESPONSIBILITY FOR THIS SITUATION

Homelessness (e.g., tent locations, panhandling)

				Gender									Age (Net)												Generations										Race/Ethnicity					
	Total (A)	**Male (B)**	**Female (C)**	**Transgender (D)**		**Non-binary (E)**		**18-24 (F)**		**25-34 (G)**		**35-44 (H)**		**45-54 (I)**		**55-64 (J)**		**65+ (K)**		**Gen Z (18-24) (L)**		**Millennials (25-40) (**		**Gen X (41-56) (N)**		**Baby Boomers (57-7**		**Silent Generation (?**		**White (Not Hispanic**		**People of Color (R)**		**Hispanic (S)**		**Black (Not Hispanic)**		**AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)**	
Total	N=904	N=405	N=484	N=8	**	N=14	**	N=104		N=161		N=154		N=164		N=151		N=170		N=104		N=270		N=242		N=260		N=28	**	N=557		N=347		N=158		N=113		N=48	*
Total (Unweighted)	N=906	N=312	N=585	N=7	**	N=8	**	N=96	*	N=130		N=123		N=136		N=176		N=245		N=96	*	N=218		N=207		N=341		N=44	*	N=629		N=277		N=82	*	N=132		N=34	*
Non-police first responder (e.g., Chicago Fire Department, EMS)	16%	17%	15%	27%		29%		17%	K	27%	IJK	22%	JK	14%	k	11%		7%		17%	o	25%	OP	17%	O	8%		6%		16%		17%		17%		16%		10%	
Social services (e.g., mental health professional, social worker)	68%	69%	69%	61%		10%		59%		56%		58%		78%	FGH	74%	FGH	79%	FGH	59%		58%		72%	IM	78%	LM	76%	lm	72%	RS	61%		57%		65%		65%	
Branch(es) of local government (e.g., Department of Public Works, Department of Parks and Recreation)	20%	20%	21%	8%		25%		34%	IJK	24%	J	23%	j	17%		12%		15%		34%	mNO	21%	o	20%	o	13%		20%		16%		27%	Q	28%	Q	22%		31%	q
Private organization(s) (e.g., insurance company, neighborhood watch, homeowner's association)	14%	18%	11%	0%		15%		22%	IK	19%	iK	17%	K	10%		15%	K	5%		22%	nOp	19%	O	12%		8%		8%		13%		16%		12%		16%		25%	
Residents	8%	12%	5%	0%		11%		7%		9%	k	12%	K	8%		9%	k	3%		7%		11%	O	8%		5%		4%		7%		9%		8%		9%		11%	
None of these	8%	9%	6%	26%	c	35%	bC	12%	g	4%		8%		6%		9%		9%		12%	mP	5%		6%		10%	mp	0%		9%		6%		7%		4%		5%	

* Table Base: THINKS CPD SHOULD NOT HAVE SOLE RESPONSIBILITY FOR THIS SITUATION

MacArthur Foundation Chicagoan Opinions - Public Safety

Q1: Which of the following do you think is the most important problem in Chicago today?

		Gender					Age (Net)						Generations						Race/Ethnicity				
	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
Total	1,001	453	532	8 **	14 **	112	189	176	182	164	177	112	313	270	275	30 *	605	396	175	137	52 *
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	349	643	7 **	8 **	107	154	142	152	188	258	107	253	234	360	47 *	679	322	91 *	158	39 *
Gun violence	567	250	313	2	4	55	103	87	94	101	127	55	167	137	188	20	363	205	91	82	24
Property taxes	109	62	41	2	4	5	20	23	25	24	13	5	28	51	23	3	80	29	14	1	9
Economic inequality	62	43	18	2	1	4	11	14	21	3	9	4	22	25	11	0	23	39	22	12	2
Racial segregation across areas including education, housing, access to city services, etc.	52	19	34	1	0	5	18	13	5	8	3	5	24	12	9	1	24	28	8	11	5
Lack of access to affordable housing	49	11	38	0	0	9	13	11	7	4	5	9	24	8	7	2	20	29	20	8	0
Homelessness	40	11	29	0	0	12	8	6	5	8	2	12	13	7	9	0	18	22	5	9	7
Police treatment of Black and Latino people	30	8	20	2	2	16	2	1	2	3	6	16	3	3	8	0	5	25	13	8	1
Lack of access to social services (e.g., income assistance, job training, food pantries)	26	11	15	0	0	2	8	6	6	4	1	2	14	6	5	0	19	8	0	3	3
Pension reform	15	10	6	0	0	0	0	0	8	5	2	0	0	8	7	0	14	1	0	0	1
Other (please specify):	44	26	17	0	2	4	5	13	9	5	10	4	16	11	9	4	35	9	2	3	0
N/A - Chicago does not have any serious problems.	6	2	3	0	0	1	1	2	2	0	0	1	3	2	0	0	4	2	1	1	0

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Q2: How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding the city of Chicago?

Race relations in Chicago are good right now.

		Gender					Age (Net)						Generations						Race/Ethnicity				
	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
Total	1,001	453	532	8 **	14 **	112	189	176	182	164	177	112	313	270	275	30 *	605	396	175	137	52 *
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	349	643	7 **	8 **	107	154	142	152	188	258	107	253	234	360	47 *	679	322	91 *	158	39 *
Agree (Net)	224	132	86	1	6	27	51	48	39	30	30	27	82	61	49	4	132	91	33	37	12
Strongly agree	43	30	14	0	0	7	9	8	11	6	2	7	12	18	5	1	26	18	6	9	3
Somewhat agree	180	102	72	1	6	20	42	40	28	23	27	20	70	42	44	3	107	74	27	29	9
Disagree (Net)	777	322	447	7	8	85	138	128	143	135	148	85	231	209	226	26	473	305	142	100	40
Somewhat disagree	432	186	240	5	5	56	82	65	78	70	81	56	126	120	118	12	257	175	82	53	28
Strongly disagree	345	136	207	3	4	29	57	63	65	64	67	29	105	89	108	14	216	129	60	47	11

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Compared to this time last year, race relations in Chicago have improved.

		Gender					Age (Net)						Generations						Race/Ethnicity				
	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
Total	1,001	453	532	8 **	14 **	112	189	176	182	164	177	112	313	270	275	30 *	605	396	175	137	52 *
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	349	643	7 **	8 **	107	154	142	152	188	258	107	253	234	360	47 *	679	322	91 *	158	39 *
Agree (Net)	293	165	126	3	0	48	63	64	36	35	47	48	105	66	68	6	177	116	45	45	22
Strongly agree	32	14	19	0	0	4	6	9	9	1	3	4	12	12	2	2	19	13	2	5	6
Somewhat agree	261	152	107	3	0	43	56	55	27	34	44	43	93	54	66	4	158	103	44	39	16
Disagree (Net)	708	288	407	5	14	65	127	111	146	130	130	65	208	204	207	24	428	280	129	92	30
Somewhat disagree	421	172	240	1	12	41	76	64	80	75	85	41	119	119	130	13	261	160	72	46	21
Strongly disagree	287	117	166	4	2	24	51	47	65	55	45	24	89	85	77	11	168	119	58	47	9

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

There is a strong sense of community across Chicago.

		Gender					Age (Net)						Generations						Race/Ethnicity				
	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
Total	1,001	453	532	8 **	14 **	112	189	176	182	164	177	112	313	270	275	30 *	605	396	175	137	52 *
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	349	643	7 **	8 **	107	154	142	152	188	258	107	253	234	360	47 *	679	322	91 *	158	39 *
Agree (Net)	478	221	252	3	6	66	112	89	65	74	71	66	171	113	117	11	280	198	79	66	40
Strongly agree	103	55	48	0	0	20	34	19	14	7	10	20	49	19	13	2	44	59	23	24	9
Somewhat agree	375	166	203	3	6	46	79	70	52	67	62	46	122	94	104	9	235	140	56	42	32
Disagree (Net)	523	233	281	5	8	46	77	86	117	90	106	46	142	157	158	19	325	198	96	71	12
Somewhat disagree	339	153	180	3	4	26	48	59	78	65	64	26	93	107	101	13	199	140	73	43	11
Strongly disagree	183	80	101	3	4	21	29	28	39	26	42	21	49	50	57	7	126	58	23	28	1

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Mayor Lori Lightfoot has done a good job of investing in and supporting historically marginalized neighborhoods.

		Gender					Age (Net)						Generations						Race/Ethnicity				
	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
Total	1,001	453	532	8 **	14 **	112	189	176	182	164	177	112	313	270	275	30 *	605	396	175	137	52 *
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	349	643	7 **	8 **	107	154	142	152	188	258	107	253	234	360	47 *	679	322	91 *	158	39 *
Agree (Net)	387	189	191	1	7	41	77	75	56	62	75	41	122	104	108	11	232	155	51	70	22
Strongly agree	58	30	28	0	0	3	13	17	9	7	9	3	23	21	9	1	25	33	10	17	4
Somewhat agree	329	160	163	1	7	38	65	58	47	54	66	38	99	83	99	10	207	122	41	52	18
Disagree (Net)	614	264	342	7	7	71	112	100	127	102	102	71	191	166	167	19	373	241	123	67	30
Somewhat disagree	303	123	175	4	3	35	57	35	67	50	59	35	84	85	86	13	173	130	61	39	19
Strongly disagree	311	141	167	3	5	36	55	66	60	52	43	36	107	80	81	7	200	111	63	29	12

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Race-related issues in Chicago are due to a few bad actors, not systemic issues.

		Gender					Age (Net)						Generations						Race/Ethnicity				
	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
Total	1,001	453	532	8 **	14 **	112	189	176	182	164	177	112	313	270	275	30 *	605	396	175	137	52 *
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	349	643	7 **	8 **	107	154	142	152	188	258	107	253	234	360	47 *	679	322	91 *	158	39 *
Agree (Net)	372	202	170	0	0	33	65	66	80	56	72	33	107	115	110	8	241	131	54	47	24
Strongly agree	144	82	62	0	0	8	21	25	38	22	29	8	44	42	46	4	94	49	26	12	9
Somewhat agree	229	120	109	0	0	25	44	41	42	34	43	25	63	73	64	4	147	82	28	35	14
Disagree (Net)	629	252	362	8	14	80	124	110	102	108	106	80	206	155	165	22	364	265	121	90	28
Somewhat disagree	361	157	194	3	9	41	72	68	45	66	69	41	125	80	99	16	215	146	73	43	20
Strongly disagree	268	95	168	5	5	39	52	41	57	41	37	39	82	76	65	6	149	119	47	47	8

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Mayor Lori Lightfoot could do more to tackle inequality across Chicago neighborhoods.

		Gender					Age (Net)						Generations						Race/Ethnicity				
	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
Total	1,001	453	532	8 **	14 **	112	189	176	182	164	177	112	313	270	275	30 *	605	396	175	137	52 *
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	349	643	7 **	8 **	107	154	142	152	188	258	107	253	234	360	47 *	679	322	91 *	158	39 *
Agree (Net)	845	367	463	8	14	99	159	163	145	141	139	99	274	227	224	21	508	338	159	109	41
Strongly agree	402	170	226	6	7	54	90	75	73	59	51	54	144	109	88	7	213	190	91	61	19
Somewhat agree	443	198	237	2	7	45	69	88	72	82	88	45	130	118	136	14	295	148	68	48	21
Disagree (Net)	156	86	70	0	0	13	30	13	37	24	39	13	40	43	51	9	97	58	16	28	11
Somewhat disagree	112	57	55	0	0	13	22	8	26	14	29	13	28	30	34	6	66	45	15	22	6
Strongly disagree	44	29	15	0	0	1	8	5	11	10	9	1	11	13	16	2	31	13	1	6	5

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Chicago law enforcement needs reform.

		Gender					Age (Net)						Generations						Race/Ethnicity				
	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
Total	1,001	453	532	8 **	14 **	112	189	176	182	164	177	112	313	270	275	30 *	605	396	175	137	52 *
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	349	643	7 **	8 **	107	154	142	152	188	258	107	253	234	360	47 *	679	322	91 *	158	39 *
Agree (Net)	743	322	411	7	10	100	153	129	119	115	128	100	238	191	194	20	419	324	138	121	39
Strongly agree	327	133	188	7	7	46	73	61	59	40	48	46	121	85	68	7	149	178	69	76	16
Somewhat agree	416	190	223	0	3	54	80	68	60	74	80	54	117	106	126	13	270	146	69	45	23
Disagree (Net)	258	131	121	1	4	13	36	46	63	49	50	13	75	79	81	10	186	72	37	16	13
Somewhat disagree	162	69	87	1	4	12	27	28	40	23	32	12	51	49	44	6	107	55	30	11	9
Strongly disagree	96	62	34	0	0	1	10	18	23	27	17	1	24	30	37	4	80	17	8	5	4

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Gun violence in Chicago needs to be reduced.

		Gender						Age (Net)						Generations					Race/Ethnicity				
	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
Total	1,001	453	532	8 **	14 **	112	189	176	182	164	177	112	313	270	275	30 *	605	396	175	137	52 *
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	349	643	7 **	8 **	107	154	142	152	188	258	107	253	234	360	47 *	679	322	91 *	158	39 *
Agree (Net)	950	438	497	8	14	108	187	159	171	157	169	108	297	255	260	30	583	367	164	122	50
Strongly agree	840	382	448	7	8	95	153	137	147	147	161	95	252	221	244	28	515	325	144	113	45
Somewhat agree	110	55	49	1	6	13	34	21	24	10	8	13	45	34	16	1	68	42	20	9	6
Disagree (Net)	51	16	35	0	0	4	2	17	12	7	9	4	16	15	15	0	22	29	10	15	2
Somewhat disagree	10	2	8	0	0	3	0	0	5	1	1	3	1	5	1	0	2	8	3	5	0
Strongly disagree	41	14	28	0	0	1	2	17	7	7	8	1	16	10	14	0	20	21	7	11	2

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

City government is doing enough to address gun violence in the city.

		Gender						Age (Net)						Generations					Race/Ethnicity				
	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
Total	1,001	453	532	8 **	14 **	112	189	176	182	164	177	112	313	270	275	30 *	605	396	175	137	52 *
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	349	643	7 **	8 **	107	154	142	152	188	258	107	253	234	360	47 *	679	322	91 *	158	39 *
Agree (Net)	163	81	79	0	3	22	50	47	18	16	10	22	85	32	23	1	83	80	33	29	11
Strongly agree	48	22	24	0	3	9	10	18	7	3	2	9	25	10	4	0	25	24	12	9	1
Somewhat agree	114	59	55	0	0	13	40	29	11	13	8	13	60	22	19	1	58	57	22	20	10
Disagree (Net)	838	373	454	8	11	91	139	129	164	148	167	91	228	238	252	29	523	316	142	108	41
Somewhat disagree	310	126	178	2	6	36	58	58	58	47	53	36	93	93	81	7	173	137	56	46	25
Strongly disagree	528	247	275	6	5	55	81	70	106	101	114	55	135	145	171	22	350	178	85	61	17

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Q2A: Do you think each of the following situations happening in Chicago are better, worse, or about the same compared to cities in the rest of the country?

Race relations

		Gender						Age (Net)						Generations					Race/Ethnicity				
	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
Total	1,001	453	532	8 **	14 **	112	189	176	182	164	177	112	313	270	275	30 *	605	396	175	137	52 *
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	349	643	7 **	8 **	107	154	142	152	188	258	107	253	234	360	47 *	679	322	91 *	158	39 *
Better	61	40	20	0	0	7	16	15	11	7	5	7	26	19	7	2	42	19	3	7	6
About the same	486	234	247	5	6	56	82	76	80	88	105	56	128	128	161	14	300	186	75	77	23
Worse	454	179	265	3	9	50	92	84	92	69	68	50	160	123	107	14	263	192	97	53	24

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Police relations with city residents

		Gender						Age (Net)						Generations					Race/Ethnicity				
	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
Total	1,001	453	532	8 **	14 **	112	189	176	182	164	177	112	313	270	275	30 *	605	396	175	137	52 *
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	349	643	7 **	8 **	107	154	142	152	188	258	107	253	234	360	47 *	679	322	91 *	158	39 *
Better	69	42	27	0	0	6	12	15	15	13	8	6	24	21	15	3	47	22	6	14	2
About the same	517	240	275	2	2	45	81	81	108	97	105	45	133	159	161	18	322	195	90	69	22
Worse	415	172	230	6	12	61	97	80	59	54	64	61	156	90	99	9	237	178	79	54	28

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Gun violence

		Gender						Age (Net)						Generations					Race/Ethnicity				
	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
Total	1,001	453	532	8 **	14 **	112	189	176	182	164	177	112	313	270	275	30 *	605	396	175	137	52 *
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	349	643	7 **	8 **	107	154	142	152	188	258	107	253	234	360	47 *	679	322	91 *	158	39 *
Better	22	12	10	0	0	4	8	4	4	1	1	4	12	5	1	0	13	8	1	6	1
About the same	173	89	80	3	1	29	35	31	24	31	23	29	55	40	45	4	97	76	30	27	12
Worse	806	352	442	5	13	80	147	140	154	132	154	80	247	225	229	26	495	311	144	104	39

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Police union relations with city government (e.g., the mayor, city council, city manager)

		Gender						Age (Net)						Generations					Race/Ethnicity				
	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
Total	1,001	453	532	8 **	14 **	112	189	176	182	164	177	112	313	270	275	30 *	605	396	175	137	52 *
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	349	643	7 **	8 **	107	154	142	152	188	258	107	253	234	360	47 *	679	322	91 *	158	39 *
Better	48	30	14	0	4	8	20	10	2	3	5	8	27	9	4	1	27	21	5	5	4
About the same	481	202	274	4	7	56	94	85	78	80	86	56	150	126	134	14	292	189	75	74	27
Worse	472	221	244	4	3	48	75	80	102	81	86	48	136	136	137	15	286	186	94	57	20

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Carjackings

		Gender						Age (Net)						Generations					Race/Ethnicity				
	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
Total	1,001	453	532	8 **	14 **	112	189	176	182	164	177	112	313	270	275	30 *	605	396	175	137	52 *
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	349	643	7 **	8 **	107	154	142	152	188	258	107	253	234	360	47 *	679	322	91 *	158	39 *
Better	28	18	10	0	0	4	11	7	4	1	2	4	16	5	2	1	20	8	3	5	1
About the same	211	89	119	4	4	35	52	43	32	26	23	35	79	53	43	1	116	96	39	32	18
Worse	762	347	404	4	10	73	126	126	146	137	152	73	218	212	230	28	469	292	133	101	33

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Other violent crimes (e.g., mugging, assault)

		Gender						Age (Net)						Generations					Race/Ethnicity				
	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
Total	1,001	453	532	8 **	14 **	112	189	176	182	164	177	112	313	270	275	30 *	605	396	175	137	52 *
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	349	643	7 **	8 **	107	154	142	152	188	258	107	253	234	360	47 *	679	322	91 *	158	39 *
Better	24	15	7	2	2	8	6	4	3	1	1	8	10	4	1	1	18	6	1	2	1
About the same	344	157	183	4	3	38	78	60	47	62	59	38	122	77	97	11	204	140	56	50	16
Worse	633	282	342	2	9	67	105	111	132	101	117	67	182	189	177	18	384	250	117	85	35

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Non-violent crimes (e.g., package theft, harassment, property damage)

		Gender						Age (Net)						Generations					Race/Ethnicity				
	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
Total	1,001	453	532	8 **	14 **	112	189	176	182	164	177	112	313	270	275	30 *	605	396	175	137	52 *
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	349	643	7 **	8 **	107	154	142	152	188	258	107	253	234	360	47 *	679	322	91 *	158	39 *
Better	41	28	13	0	0	8	12	9	6	2	4	8	19	9	5	1	26	15	4	7	3
About the same	543	237	303	4	5	64	96	87	91	96	109	64	149	146	167	17	329	214	83	76	33
Worse	417	189	217	4	9	41	81	79	85	66	64	41	145	115	103	12	250	167	87	54	16

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Q11: How concerned are you about the personal safety of each of the following groups of people in the Chicago area?

Police officers

		Gender						Age (Net)						Generations					Race/Ethnicity				
	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
Total	1,001	453	532	8 **	14 **	112	189	176	182	164	177	112	313	270	275	30 *	605	396	175	137	52 *
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	349	643	7 **	8 **	107	154	142	152	188	258	107	253	234	360	47 *	679	322	91 *	158	39 *
Concerned (Net)	764	329	426	2	10	74	135	128	144	138	144	74	233	204	225	28	490	274	120	103	31
Very concerned	406	173	229	0	7	30	72	87	72	72	74	30	137	105	118	16	258	148	61	55	14
Somewhat concerned	357	155	198	2	3	44	64	41	73	66	70	44	97	98	107	12	232	126	58	47	17
Not concerned (Net)	237	125	106	6	4	38	54	48	38	26	33	38	80	67	50	2	115	122	55	34	21
Not very concerned	183	105	75	3	2	25	42	40	28	20	28	25	61	56	38	2	88	95	50	19	18
Not at all concerned	54	20	31	3	2	13	12	7	10	7	5	13	19	11	12	0	27	27	5	16	3

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Residents of color (e.g., Black, Latino, Asian)

		Gender						Age (Net)						Generations					Race/Ethnicity				
	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
Total	1,001	453	532	8 **	14 **	112	189	176	182	164	177	112	313	270	275	30 *	605	396	175	137	52 *
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	349	643	7 **	8 **	107	154	142	152	188	258	107	253	234	360	47 *	679	322	91 *	158	39 *

Concerned (Net)	834	355	464	8	14	104	169	134	148	134	145	104	271	206	226	27	487	347	152	127	40
Very concerned	441	173	255	7	14	72	81	84	65	66	73	72	146	97	114	13	225	215	83	93	14
Somewhat concerned	394	182	210	2	0	32	88	50	84	68	72	32	125	110	112	15	262	132	69	33	26
Not concerned (Net)	167	99	68	0	0	9	21	42	34	30	32	9	42	64	49	3	118	49	22	10	12
Not very concerned	129	79	50	0	0	4	15	34	25	25	26	4	30	52	41	3	88	41	21	7	11
Not at all concerned	38	20	18	0	0	4	6	8	8	5	6	4	12	12	8	1	30	7	2	4	1

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Tourists

			Gender						Age (Net)						Generations					Race/Ethnicity			
	Total (A)	**Male (B)**	**Female (C)**	**Transgender (D)**	**Non-binary (E)**	**18-24 (F)**	**25-34 (G)**	**35-44 (H)**	**45-54 (I)**	**55-64 (J)**	**65+ (K)**	**Gen Z (18-24) (L)**	**Millennials (25-40) (**	**Gen X (41-56) (N)**	**Baby Boomers (57-7**	**Silent Generation (7**	**White (Not Hispanic**	**People of Color (R)**	**Hispanic (S)**	**Black (Not Hispanic)**	**AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)**
Total	1,001	453	532	8	14	112	189	176	182	164	177	112	313	270	275	30	605	396	175	137	52
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	349	643	7	8	107	154	142	152	188	258	107	253	234	360	47	679	322	91	158	39
Concerned (Net)	675	287	378	5	12	66	126	97	127	119	141	66	200	175	207	28	418	257	104	100	26
Very concerned	266	121	144	1	0	20	48	42	55	49	52	20	79	74	82	11	170	96	28	52	11
Somewhat concerned	409	166	234	3	12	45	78	55	72	70	89	45	121	101	125	17	248	161	76	48	15
Not concerned (Net)	326	166	155	4	2	47	64	78	55	45	37	47	113	95	68	2	187	139	71	37	26
Not very concerned	256	134	118	4	1	41	45	60	49	33	28	41	86	78	49	2	149	108	53	29	24
Not at all concerned	69	32	36	0	1	6	18	18	6	12	9	6	27	17	19	0	38	31	18	9	2

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

City residents

			Gender						Age (Net)						Generations					Race/Ethnicity			
	Total (A)	**Male (B)**	**Female (C)**	**Transgender (D)**	**Non-binary (E)**	**18-24 (F)**	**25-34 (G)**	**35-44 (H)**	**45-54 (I)**	**55-64 (J)**	**65+ (K)**	**Gen Z (18-24) (L)**	**Millennials (25-40) (**	**Gen X (41-56) (N)**	**Baby Boomers (57-7**	**Silent Generation (7**	**White (Not Hispanic**	**People of Color (R)**	**Hispanic (S)**	**Black (Not Hispanic)**	**AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)**
Total	1,001	453	532	8	14	112	189	176	182	164	177	112	313	270	275	30	605	396	175	137	52
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	349	643	7	8	107	154	142	152	188	258	107	253	234	360	47	679	322	91	158	39
Concerned (Net)	861	364	486	6	10	101	162	143	155	140	160	101	270	220	242	28	515	345	151	126	39
Very concerned	429	171	251	2	10	55	75	73	77	70	79	55	129	110	121	13	229	200	83	79	16
Somewhat concerned	432	194	234	4	0	45	86	70	79	70	81	45	141	110	121	15	287	145	68	46	23
Not concerned (Net)	140	89	47	3	4	12	28	32	27	24	17	12	43	50	33	2	90	51	24	11	13
Not very concerned	132	85	43	3	4	10	28	31	26	22	14	10	43	48	28	2	83	49	24	10	12
Not at all concerned	9	5	4	0	0	1	0	1	1	2	3	1	0	2	5	0	7	2	0	1	1

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Suburban residents

			Gender						Age (Net)						Generations					Race/Ethnicity			
	Total (A)	**Male (B)**	**Female (C)**	**Transgender (D)**	**Non-binary (E)**	**18-24 (F)**	**25-34 (G)**	**35-44 (H)**	**45-54 (I)**	**55-64 (J)**	**65+ (K)**	**Gen Z (18-24) (L)**	**Millennials (25-40) (**	**Gen X (41-56) (N)**	**Baby Boomers (57-7**	**Silent Generation (7**	**White (Not Hispanic**	**People of Color (R)**	**Hispanic (S)**	**Black (Not Hispanic)**	**AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)**
Total	1,001	453	532	8	14	112	189	176	182	164	177	112	313	270	275	30	605	396	175	137	52
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	349	643	7	8	107	154	142	152	188	258	107	253	234	360	47	679	322	91	158	39
Concerned (Net)	578	239	326	6	11	61	108	102	111	103	94	61	185	152	162	18	348	230	96	80	29
Very concerned	230	99	128	2	2	22	45	52	43	33	35	22	86	60	54	9	125	105	45	42	10
Somewhat concerned	348	140	198	4	9	39	62	49	68	70	60	39	99	92	108	9	223	125	51	39	18
Not concerned (Net)	423	214	206	3	3	52	82	74	71	61	83	52	128	118	113	12	257	166	78	57	23
Not very concerned	331	173	158	1	1	38	52	67	62	46	66	38	93	102	86	11	208	123	56	42	17
Not at all concerned	91	41	49	1	1	13	30	7	9	14	18	13	35	16	27	1	49	43	22	14	6

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Homeless Chicagoans

			Gender						Age (Net)						Generations					Race/Ethnicity			
	Total (A)	**Male (B)**	**Female (C)**	**Transgender (D)**	**Non-binary (E)**	**18-24 (F)**	**25-34 (G)**	**35-44 (H)**	**45-54 (I)**	**55-64 (J)**	**65+ (K)**	**Gen Z (18-24) (L)**	**Millennials (25-40) (**	**Gen X (41-56) (N)**	**Baby Boomers (57-7**	**Silent Generation (7**	**White (Not Hispanic**	**People of Color (R)**	**Hispanic (S)**	**Black (Not Hispanic)**	**AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)**
Total	1,001	453	532	8	14	112	189	176	182	164	177	112	313	270	275	30	605	396	175	137	52
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	349	643	7	8	107	154	142	152	188	258	107	253	234	360	47	679	322	91	158	39
Concerned (Net)	853	360	478	8	14	105	163	142	160	136	148	105	269	220	230	28	496	357	149	129	46
Very concerned	438	155	271	8	11	62	87	70	78	65	76	62	135	113	113	15	231	207	78	86	15
Somewhat concerned	415	205	207	1	3	43	76	72	81	71	72	43	135	107	117	13	265	150	71	43	31
Not concerned (Net)	148	94	55	0	0	7	26	34	23	28	30	7	44	50	45	2	109	39	26	8	6
Not very concerned	130	80	49	0	0	5	24	33	19	26	24	5	41	46	36	2	94	36	23	6	6
Not at all concerned	19	13	5	0	0	3	2	1	4	2	6	3	3	5	8	0	15	4	2	1	0

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Residents with mental or behavioral health conditions (e.g., psychiatric disorders, cognitive disabilities)

			Gender						Age (Net)						Generations					Race/Ethnicity			
	Total (A)	**Male (B)**	**Female (C)**	**Transgender (D)**	**Non-binary (E)**	**18-24 (F)**	**25-34 (G)**	**35-44 (H)**	**45-54 (I)**	**55-64 (J)**	**65+ (K)**	**Gen Z (18-24) (L)**	**Millennials (25-40) (**	**Gen X (41-56) (N)**	**Baby Boomers (57-7**	**Silent Generation (7**	**White (Not Hispanic**	**People of Color (R)**	**Hispanic (S)**	**Black (Not Hispanic)**	**AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)**
Total	1,001	453	532	8	14	112	189	176	182	164	177	112	313	270	275	30	605	396	175	137	52
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	349	643	7	8	107	154	142	152	188	258	107	253	234	360	47	679	322	91	158	39
Concerned (Net)	867	371	481	8	14	103	161	142	167	138	156	103	267	231	238	28	516	351	150	126	43
Very concerned	447	168	268	7	11	64	85	74	77	72	73	64	136	117	116	14	234	213	81	88	18
Somewhat concerned	420	203	213	2	3	38	76	68	90	65	83	38	131	115	122	14	282	138	70	37	25
Not concerned (Net)	134	82	52	0	0	10	28	33	15	26	21	10	46	39	37	3	89	45	24	11	9
Not very concerned	121	75	46	0	0	9	25	31	15	21	20	9	42	35	32	3	80	41	24	8	9
Not at all concerned	13	8	5	0	0	1	3	2	1	5	2	1	4	3	5	0	9	4	0	4	0

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Q3aNEW: My trust in the police

			Gender						Age (Net)						Generations					Race/Ethnicity			
	Total (A)	**Male (B)**	**Female (C)**	**Transgender (D)**	**Non-binary (E)**	**18-24 (F)**	**25-34 (G)**	**35-44 (H)**	**45-54 (I)**	**55-64 (J)**	**65+ (K)**	**Gen Z (18-24) (L)**	**Millennials (25-40) (**	**Gen X (41-56) (N)**	**Baby Boomers (57-7**	**Silent Generation (7**	**White (Not Hispanic**	**People of Color (R)**	**Hispanic (S)**	**Black (Not Hispanic)**	**AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)**
Total	1,001	453	532	8	14	112	189	176	182	164	177	112	313	270	275	30	605	396	175	137	52
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	349	643	7	8	107	154	142	152	188	258	107	253	234	360	47	679	322	91	158	39
Do not trust at all	49	21	22	6	4	20	8	12	7	1	1	20	19	8	3	0	10	39	17	15	0
1	47	14	33	1	0	5	11	10	11	2	8	5	19	13	9	1	17	30	4	18	7
2	46	25	21	0	0	7	20	10	4	4	2	7	26	8	5	0	14	32	17	11	0
3	52	22	29	0	1	16	14	9	6	3	4	16	20	10	6	1	31	21	8	9	0
4	51	16	35	0	2	7	12	8	10	4	10	7	15	15	12	1	19	32	10	16	3
5	94	44	49	0	0	17	8	23	13	12	21	17	27	22	24	3	53	41	19	11	10
6	127	61	59	0	7	17	33	23	21	23	10	17	42	44	23	1	67	61	34	19	2
7	157	70	87	0	0	6	39	19	32	34	28	6	52	45	49	5	108	49	18	14	11
8	187	97	90	0	1	14	23	19	48	42	42	14	36	59	68	10	133	55	29	13	11
9	85	37	47	0	0	3	10	13	15	16	29	3	20	21	34	6	73	12	4	3	4
Completely trust	106	45	60	1	0	2	12	31	14	23	23	2	35	25	41	3	81	24	14	7	3

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Q3bNEW: Safety level in my neighborhood

			Gender						Age (Net)						Generations					Race/Ethnicity			
	Total (A)	**Male (B)**	**Female (C)**	**Transgender (D)**	**Non-binary (E)**	**18-24 (F)**	**25-34 (G)**	**35-44 (H)**	**45-54 (I)**	**55-64 (J)**	**65+ (K)**	**Gen Z (18-24) (L)**	**Millennials (25-40) (**	**Gen X (41-56) (N)**	**Baby Boomers (57-7**	**Silent Generation (7**	**White (Not Hispanic**	**People of Color (R)**	**Hispanic (S)**	**Black (Not Hispanic)**	**AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)**
Total	1,001	453	532	8	14	112	189	176	182	164	177	112	313	270	275	30	605	396	175	137	52
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	349	643	7	8	107	154	142	152	188	258	107	253	234	360	47	679	322	91	158	39
Not at all safe	10	2	7	0	0	6	1	2	1	0	0	6	2	2	0	0	2	8	4	3	0
1	17	7	10	0	2	2	1	0	10	1	4	2	1	10	5	0	4	13	0	11	0
2	17	3	14	0	0	1	1	2	7	4	2	1	1	9	4	2	8	9	1	7	1
3	27	4	23	0	0	3	7	7	4	2	3	3	11	7	5	1	4	23	10	8	4
4	65	27	39	0	0	13	22	11	6	8	7	13	31	8	11	3	22	44	16	20	6
5	98	43	51	3	2	11	28	20	15	12	12	11	46	18	21	1	50	48	23	22	3
6	104	52	53	0	0	9	19	19	29	15	13	9	31	42	21	1	73	31	14	11	5
7	166	73	86	0	7	22	28	28	25	33	30	22	48	38	56	2	106	60	25	17	13
8	208	93	111	4	4	28	36	32	32	46	35	28	61	48	66	6	136	73	35	16	6
9	182	94	87	1	0	10	31	34	36	25	45	10	51	63	50	8	128	54	29	13	11
Completely safe	106	54	52	1	0	7	16	19	19	18	26	7	30	26	37	6	72	34	19	8	3

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Q3cNEW: How respectful police are to me

			Gender						Age (Net)						Generations					Race/Ethnicity			
	Total (A)	**Male (B)**	**Female (C)**	**Transgender (D)**	**Non-binary (E)**	**18-24 (F)**	**25-34 (G)**	**35-44 (H)**	**45-54 (I)**	**55-64 (J)**	**65+ (K)**	**Gen Z (18-24) (L)**	**Millennials (25-40) (**	**Gen X (41-56) (N)**	**Baby Boomers (57-7**	**Silent Generation (7**	**White (Not Hispanic**	**People of Color (R)**	**Hispanic (S)**	**Black (Not Hispanic)**	**AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)**
Total	1,001	453	532	8	14	112	189	176	182	164	177	112	313	270	275	30	605	396	175	137	52

Total (Unweighted)	1,001	349	643	7 **	8 **	107	154	142	152	188	258	107	253	234	360	47 *	679	322	91 *	158	39 *
Not at all respectful	21	5	14	2	0	9	4	2	5	0	1	9	5	6	1	0	5	16	7	8	0
1	15	10	5	0	0	1	4	2	5	1	2	1	6	5	3	0	6	9	2	7	0
2	19	10	6	2	3	4	5	6	3	1	0	4	9	4	1	0	4	15	7	5	0
3	29	13	16	0	0	8	10	4	4	3	0	8	14	4	3	0	9	20	7	12	0
4	51	11	39	1	1	12	8	19	6	4	2	12	19	16	4	1	16	35	13	12	6
5	101	38	56	0	7	20	34	17	11	13	5	20	47	17	16	0	38	63	26	20	10
6	107	60	46	1	1	16	29	25	10	15	12	16	45	24	22	0	52	55	31	18	3
7	136	68	68	0	0	17	19	17	28	30	25	17	33	38	43	5	85	51	20	18	11
8	180	90	90	0	0	11	32	16	54	28	39	11	41	68	55	5	117	63	28	20	10
9	146	69	77	0	0	8	18	21	31	28	41	8	32	46	50	10	116	31	15	9	4
Completely respectful	196	80	114	1	3	8	25	46	26	41	50	8	61	41	76	10	158	38	18	9	8

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Q4A: How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding local law enforcement?

Members of the Chicago Police Department are handling their job well.

		Gender					Age (Net)						Generations					Race/Ethnicity				
	Total (A)	**Male (B)**	**Female (C)**	**Transgender (D)**	**Non-binary (E)**	**18-24 (F)**	**25-34 (G)**	**35-44 (H)**	**45-54 (I)**	**55-64 (J)**	**65+ (K)**	**Gen Z (18-24) (L)**	**Millennials (25-40) (**	**Gen X (41-56) (N)**	**Baby Boomers (57-7**	**Silent Generation (?**	**White (Not Hispanic**	**People of Color (R)**	**Hispanic (S)**	**Black (Not Hispanic)**	**AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)**
Total	1,001	453	532	8 **	14 **	112	189	176	182	164	177	112	313	270	275	30 *	605	396	175	137	52 *
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	349	643	7 **	8 **	107	154	142	152	188	258	107	253	234	360	47 *	679	322	91 *	158	39 *
Agree (Net)	619	286	325	2	7	47	106	112	115	115	125	47	182	170	197	23	421	198	97	62	24
Strongly agree	124	67	57	0	0	5	21	24	29	22	22	5	40	41	32	5	93	31	12	7	10
Somewhat agree	495	219	268	2	7	42	84	88	85	93	103	42	142	129	165	18	328	167	84	55	14
Disagree (Net)	382	168	208	6	7	66	84	64	68	49	53	66	131	100	78	7	184	198	78	75	28
Somewhat disagree	281	128	154	1	1	45	66	42	47	40	41	45	99	70	61	7	144	138	63	39	24
Strongly disagree	101	40	54	6	6	21	18	22	20	9	12	21	32	30	17	0	40	61	15	36	5

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

I would rather the Chicago police spend less time than they currently do in my neighborhood.

		Gender					Age (Net)						Generations					Race/Ethnicity				
	Total (A)	**Male (B)**	**Female (C)**	**Transgender (D)**	**Non-binary (E)**	**18-24 (F)**	**25-34 (G)**	**35-44 (H)**	**45-54 (I)**	**55-64 (J)**	**65+ (K)**	**Gen Z (18-24) (L)**	**Millennials (25-40) (**	**Gen X (41-56) (N)**	**Baby Boomers (57-7**	**Silent Generation (?**	**White (Not Hispanic**	**People of Color (R)**	**Hispanic (S)**	**Black (Not Hispanic)**	**AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)**
Total	1,001	453	532	8 **	14 **	112	189	176	182	164	177	112	313	270	275	30 *	605	396	175	137	52 *
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	349	643	7 **	8 **	107	154	142	152	188	258	107	253	234	360	47 *	679	322	91 *	158	39 *
Agree (Net)	280	139	137	4	2	53	77	57	39	22	32	53	108	70	40	9	150	130	69	42	10
Strongly agree	93	49	41	3	2	15	22	26	10	5	16	15	35	22	17	3	49	44	23	15	1
Somewhat agree	187	90	97	1	0	38	55	30	30	17	17	38	72	47	23	6	100	86	46	26	9
Disagree (Net)	721	315	395	4	12	60	113	119	143	142	145	60	205	200	235	21	455	266	106	95	42
Somewhat disagree	419	185	228	3	7	40	75	66	82	88	68	40	127	116	131	5	260	159	69	47	29
Strongly disagree	302	130	167	2	6	20	38	53	61	54	77	20	79	85	104	16	195	107	37	49	13

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

If I were to have an interaction with the Chicago police in my area, I am confident that they would treat me with courtesy and respect.

		Gender					Age (Net)						Generations					Race/Ethnicity				
	Total (A)	**Male (B)**	**Female (C)**	**Transgender (D)**	**Non-binary (E)**	**18-24 (F)**	**25-34 (G)**	**35-44 (H)**	**45-54 (I)**	**55-64 (J)**	**65+ (K)**	**Gen Z (18-24) (L)**	**Millennials (25-40) (**	**Gen X (41-56) (N)**	**Baby Boomers (57-7**	**Silent Generation (?**	**White (Not Hispanic**	**People of Color (R)**	**Hispanic (S)**	**Black (Not Hispanic)**	**AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)**
Total	1,001	453	532	8 **	14 **	112	189	176	182	164	177	112	313	270	275	30 *	605	396	175	137	52 *
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	349	643	7 **	8 **	107	154	142	152	188	258	107	253	234	360	47 *	679	322	91 *	158	39 *
Agree (Net)	752	352	395	2	5	55	128	135	150	138	147	55	219	219	234	25	496	256	120	82	37
Strongly agree	283	124	158	2	1	15	43	48	49	51	77	15	78	69	104	16	214	69	26	28	14
Somewhat agree	469	228	237	0	4	40	85	86	101	86	71	40	141	150	130	9	282	187	95	54	23
Disagree (Net)	249	102	138	6	9	57	61	41	33	27	30	57	94	51	41	5	109	140	55	55	15
Somewhat disagree	189	77	104	4	8	42	49	29	18	25	25	42	74	32	35	5	90	99	41	31	14
Strongly disagree	60	24	33	2	0	15	12	12	14	1	5	15	20	19	6	0	19	41	14	24	1

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

When I see a police officer in my neighborhood, I feel safer.

		Gender					Age (Net)						Generations					Race/Ethnicity				
	Total (A)	**Male (B)**	**Female (C)**	**Transgender (D)**	**Non-binary (E)**	**18-24 (F)**	**25-34 (G)**	**35-44 (H)**	**45-54 (I)**	**55-64 (J)**	**65+ (K)**	**Gen Z (18-24) (L)**	**Millennials (25-40) (**	**Gen X (41-56) (N)**	**Baby Boomers (57-7**	**Silent Generation (?**	**White (Not Hispanic**	**People of Color (R)**	**Hispanic (S)**	**Black (Not Hispanic)**	**AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)**
Total	1,001	453	532	8 **	14 **	112	189	176	182	164	177	112	313	270	275	30 *	605	396	175	137	52 *
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	349	643	7 **	8 **	107	154	142	152	188	258	107	253	234	360	47 *	679	322	91 *	158	39 *
Agree (Net)	769	361	402	3	7	57	127	130	145	149	160	57	220	216	248	27	513	256	128	77	33
Strongly agree	317	157	155	0	4	13	47	60	59	63	75	13	82	94	113	15	237	80	38	25	13
Somewhat agree	452	204	246	2	3	45	80	71	86	87	84	45	138	122	135	12	276	176	89	52	20
Disagree (Net)	232	92	131	6	7	55	62	45	37	15	18	55	93	54	27	3	92	140	47	60	19
Somewhat disagree	162	70	89	0	3	36	41	35	25	11	14	36	64	40	19	3	74	88	32	31	17
Strongly disagree	70	22	42	6	4	19	20	10	13	4	4	19	29	14	8	0	18	52	15	29	2

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

I approve of the way that the Chicago Police Department handled the summer 2020 protests.

		Gender					Age (Net)						Generations					Race/Ethnicity				
	Total (A)	**Male (B)**	**Female (C)**	**Transgender (D)**	**Non-binary (E)**	**18-24 (F)**	**25-34 (G)**	**35-44 (H)**	**45-54 (I)**	**55-64 (J)**	**65+ (K)**	**Gen Z (18-24) (L)**	**Millennials (25-40) (**	**Gen X (41-56) (N)**	**Baby Boomers (57-7**	**Silent Generation (?**	**White (Not Hispanic**	**People of Color (R)**	**Hispanic (S)**	**Black (Not Hispanic)**	**AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)**
Total	0 **	0 **	0 **	0 **	0 **	0 **	0 **	0 **	0 **	0 **	0 **	0 **	0 **	0 **	0 **	0 **	0 **	0 **	0 **	0 **	0 **
Total (Unweighted)	0 **	0 **	0 **	0 **	0 **	0 **	0 **	0 **	0 **	0 **	0 **	0 **	0 **	0 **	0 **	0 **	0 **	0 **	0 **	0 **	0 **
Agree (Net)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Strongly agree	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Somewhat agree	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Disagree (Net)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Somewhat disagree	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Strongly disagree	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

There is evidence of persistent racial bias in Chicago's policing practices.

		Gender					Age (Net)						Generations					Race/Ethnicity				
	Total (A)	**Male (B)**	**Female (C)**	**Transgender (D)**	**Non-binary (E)**	**18-24 (F)**	**25-34 (G)**	**35-44 (H)**	**45-54 (I)**	**55-64 (J)**	**65+ (K)**	**Gen Z (18-24) (L)**	**Millennials (25-40) (**	**Gen X (41-56) (N)**	**Baby Boomers (57-7**	**Silent Generation (?**	**White (Not Hispanic**	**People of Color (R)**	**Hispanic (S)**	**Black (Not Hispanic)**	**AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)**
Total	1,001	453	532	8 **	14 **	112	189	176	182	164	177	112	313	270	275	30 *	605	396	175	137	52 *
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	349	643	7 **	8 **	107	154	142	152	188	258	107	253	234	360	47 *	679	322	91 *	158	39 *
Agree (Net)	651	280	357	7	14	84	139	96	108	108	115	84	209	161	177	19	359	292	126	108	31
Strongly agree	234	105	123	7	7	45	51	47	35	26	30	45	84	55	44	5	100	134	53	59	8
Somewhat agree	417	175	234	0	7	39	88	49	73	82	85	39	125	105	133	14	259	157	73	49	23
Disagree (Net)	350	173	175	2	0	28	50	79	74	56	62	28	104	109	98	11	246	104	49	29	21
Somewhat disagree	227	109	118	0	0	20	39	51	38	36	43	20	70	66	61	9	154	73	36	17	15
Strongly disagree	124	65	58	2	0	8	12	29	36	20	20	8	34	44	36	2	92	32	13	12	6

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Major reforms are needed within the Chicago Police Department regarding treatment of Black and Latino people.

		Gender					Age (Net)						Generations					Race/Ethnicity				
	Total (A)	**Male (B)**	**Female (C)**	**Transgender (D)**	**Non-binary (E)**	**18-24 (F)**	**25-34 (G)**	**35-44 (H)**	**45-54 (I)**	**55-64 (J)**	**65+ (K)**	**Gen Z (18-24) (L)**	**Millennials (25-40) (**	**Gen X (41-56) (N)**	**Baby Boomers (57-7**	**Silent Generation (?**	**White (Not Hispanic**	**People of Color (R)**	**Hispanic (S)**	**Black (Not Hispanic)**	**AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)**
Total	1,001	453	532	8 **	14 **	112	189	176	182	164	177	112	313	270	275	30 *	605	396	175	137	52 *
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	349	643	7 **	8 **	107	154	142	152	188	258	107	253	234	360	47 *	679	322	91 *	158	39 *
Agree (Net)	710	314	383	7	14	87	157	125	118	111	112	87	242	186	175	20	382	328	135	124	38
Strongly agree	313	120	184	7	10	53	74	60	47	34	45	53	113	77	63	7	133	181	75	75	15
Somewhat agree	397	194	199	0	4	34	83	65	72	77	67	34	129	110	112	13	250	147	60	49	23
Disagree (Net)	291	140	149	2	0	26	32	50	64	53	66	26	71	84	100	10	223	68	39	13	14
Somewhat disagree	185	80	105	0	0	23	19	25	35	35	48	23	34	53	68	7	142	42	30	4	8
Strongly disagree	106	60	45	1	0	3	13	25	29	19	18	3	37	31	32	3	80	25	10	9	7

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

The Chicago Police Department is doing enough to address gun violence in the city.

		Gender					Age (Net)						Generations					Race/Ethnicity				
	Total (A)	**Male (B)**	**Female (C)**	**Transgender (D)**	**Non-binary (E)**	**18-24 (F)**	**25-34 (G)**	**35-44 (H)**	**45-54 (I)**	**55-64 (J)**	**65+ (K)**	**Gen Z (18-24) (L)**	**Millennials (25-40) (**	**Gen X (41-56) (N)**	**Baby Boomers (57-7**	**Silent Generation (?**	**White (Not Hispanic**	**People of Color (R)**	**Hispanic (S)**	**Black (Not Hispanic)**	**AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)**
Total	1,001	453	532	8 **	14 **	112	189	176	182	164	177	112	313	270	275	30 *	605	396	175	137	52 *
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	349	643	7 **	8 **	107	154	142	152	188	258	107	253	234	360	47 *	679	322	91 *	158	39 *
Agree (Net)	288	142	144	3	1	24	61	59	49	46	50	24	101	78	76	10	176	112	58	36	11
Strongly agree	57	26	31	0	0	6	9	18	11	5	8	6	24	15	11	1	32	25	13	10	1
Somewhat agree	231	115	113	3	1	18	52	41	38	41	42	18	77	63	65	9	144	87	45	26	9
Disagree (Net)	713	312	389	6	13	89	129	117	133	118	127	89	213	192	199	20	429	284	116	101	41
Somewhat disagree	354	133	215	0	7	32	77	65	63	62	56	32	124	90	99	10	220	135	50	46	26
Strongly disagree	358	179	174	5	6	57	52	52	70	56	72	57	89	102	100	11	210	149	66	55	15

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Q4B: How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding local law enforcement?

Chicago police have been effective at reducing or preventing crime in my neighborhood.

		Gender						Age (Net)						Generations							Race/Ethnicity				
	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)		Non-binary (E)		18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7		White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)	
Total	1,001	453	532	8	**	14	**	112	189	176	182	164	177	112	313	270	275	30	*	605	396	175	137	52	*
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	349	643	7	**	8	**	107	154	142	152	188	258	107	253	234	360	47	*	679	322	91	* 158	39	*
Agree (Net)	562	248	310	2		4		53	96	110	94	100	109	53	173	142	179	15		374	187	82	58	28	
Strongly agree	109	46	62	1		0		8	22	27	14	15	24	8	39	27	32	4		71	38	14	14	5	
Somewhat agree	453	202	247	0		4		45	74	83	80	85	85	45	134	115	147	12		303	150	68	44	23	
Disagree (Net)	439	206	223	7		10		60	94	66	88	64	69	60	141	128	96	15		231	209	93	79	24	
Somewhat disagree	310	156	151	4		5		37	61	49	65	53	46	37	100	93	69	11		173	137	69	39	20	
Strongly disagree	129	50	72	3		5		23	33	16	24	11	23	23	40	34	28	4		58	71	24	40	5	

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

I have confidence in the Chicago Police Department to act fairly and without bias.

		Gender						Age (Net)						Generations							Race/Ethnicity				
	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)		Non-binary (E)		18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7		White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)	
Total	1,001	453	532	8	**	14	**	112	189	176	182	164	177	112	313	270	275	30	*	605	396	175	137	52	*
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	349	643	7	**	8	**	107	154	142	152	188	258	107	253	234	360	47	*	679	322	91	* 158	39	*
Agree (Net)	520	252	266	2		0		26	94	92	108	100	99	26	153	160	160	21		381	139	67	38	29	
Strongly agree	123	55	66	2		0		5	13	34	27	20	25	5	42	35	38	3		90	33	13	14	5	
Somewhat agree	397	198	200	0		0		21	81	58	82	80	75	21	111	125	122	18		291	106	54	24	24	
Disagree (Net)	481	201	266	7		14		86	95	83	74	64	78	86	160	110	115	9		224	257	108	99	23	
Somewhat disagree	319	134	180	0		6		44	59	57	47	51	62	44	104	72	90	8		158	161	66	58	19	
Strongly disagree	162	67	86	7		8		43	37	26	27	13	16	43	56	38	25	1		66	96	42	41	5	

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Chicago police are often able to solve crimes that occur in the city.

		Gender						Age (Net)						Generations							Race/Ethnicity				
	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)		Non-binary (E)		18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7		White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)	
Total	1,001	453	532	8	**	14	**	112	189	176	182	164	177	112	313	270	275	30	*	605	396	175	137	52	*
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	349	643	7	**	8	**	107	154	142	152	188	258	107	253	234	360	47	*	679	322	91	* 158	39	*
Agree (Net)	535	261	272	3		2		62	90	94	101	100	88	62	153	158	145	16		345	190	88	54	34	
Strongly agree	92	38	54	1		0		10	12	27	13	13	17	10	32	25	24	1		59	33	16	10	4	
Somewhat agree	443	223	218	3		2		52	78	67	88	87	71	52	121	133	121	15		286	157	72	44	30	
Disagree (Net)	466	193	261	5		12		50	100	82	81	64	89	50	160	112	130	14		260	206	87	83	18	
Somewhat disagree	336	150	183	2		4		33	71	56	63	48	65	33	111	86	96	10		194	142	67	47	17	
Strongly disagree	130	43	78	3		8		17	28	26	18	16	24	17	49	26	34	3		66	64	20	37	1	

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

The Chicago Police Department has the support of most city residents.

		Gender						Age (Net)						Generations							Race/Ethnicity				
	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)		Non-binary (E)		18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7		White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)	
Total	1,001	453	532	8	**	14	**	112	189	176	182	164	177	112	313	270	275	30	*	605	396	175	137	52	*
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	349	643	7	**	8	**	107	154	142	152	188	258	107	253	234	360	47	*	679	322	91	* 158	39	*
Agree (Net)	558	274	278	2		6		43	93	95	109	115	104	43	151	167	178	20		364	194	88	63	30	
Strongly agree	107	57	49	0		0		8	21	24	21	16	15	8	40	29	27	1		70	37	14	18	5	
Somewhat agree	451	217	229	1		6		34	71	71	88	98	88	34	111	137	150	18		294	158	75	44	25	
Disagree (Net)	443	180	255	7		8		70	97	80	73	49	74	70	162	103	97	10		241	202	86	75	22	
Somewhat disagree	331	140	186	3		5		40	73	63	50	41	64	40	124	76	81	10		186	145	61	51	21	
Strongly disagree	112	40	68	3		3		30	24	17	23	8	10	30	38	27	16	1		55	56	26	23	1	

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

The Chicago Police Department has the support of most BIPOC (i.e., Black, Indigenous, and People of Color) residents.

		Gender						Age (Net)						Generations							Race/Ethnicity				
	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)		Non-binary (E)		18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7		White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)	
Total	1,001	453	532	8	**	14	**	112	189	176	182	164	177	112	313	270	275	30	*	605	396	175	137	52	*
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	349	643	7	**	8	**	107	154	142	152	188	258	107	253	234	360	47	*	679	322	91	* 158	39	*
Agree (Net)	329	167	160	2		0		28	62	71	58	66	44	28	104	100	91	5		189	140	59	47	23	
Strongly agree	73	43	30	0		0		7	17	16	12	9	12	7	27	17	20	1		38	34	17	11	2	
Somewhat agree	256	124	131	1		0		21	45	55	47	56	32	21	77	83	71	5		150	106	42	36	21	
Disagree (Net)	672	287	372	7		14		85	128	105	124	98	133	85	209	170	184	25		416	256	116	90	29	
Somewhat disagree	417	190	219	0		9		42	67	68	80	63	96	42	121	108	128	18		257	160	71	52	23	
Strongly disagree	255	96	153	7		5		42	61	36	43	35	37	42	88	62	56	7		159	96	45	38	6	

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Chicago police should be brought in to handle situations regarding mental health patients and the homeless.

		Gender						Age (Net)						Generations							Race/Ethnicity				
	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)		Non-binary (E)		18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7		White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)	
Total	1,001	453	532	8	**	14	**	112	189	176	182	164	177	112	313	270	275	30	*	605	396	175	137	52	*
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	349	643	7	**	8	**	107	154	142	152	188	258	107	253	234	360	47	*	679	322	91	* 158	39	*
Agree (Net)	509	232	273	0		4		62	96	101	104	68	78	62	168	149	118	13		294	215	108	65	32	
Strongly agree	142	61	81	0		0		18	25	43	29	12	15	18	58	41	22	3		67	76	37	31	6	
Somewhat agree	367	171	192	0		4		43	71	59	75	56	63	43	110	108	96	10		228	140	71	34	25	
Disagree (Net)	492	221	259	8		10		51	93	74	78	96	99	51	145	121	157	17		311	181	67	72	20	
Somewhat disagree	309	136	169	2		3		27	50	41	47	76	68	27	77	75	119	11		225	84	31	31	16	
Strongly disagree	183	85	91	6		7		24	43	34	30	20	32	24	68	46	38	6		86	96	35	42	5	

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Increased police presence is necessary for reducing gun violence in the city.

		Gender						Age (Net)						Generations							Race/Ethnicity				
	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)		Non-binary (E)		18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7		White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)	
Total	1,001	453	532	8	**	14	**	112	189	176	182	164	177	112	313	270	275	30	*	605	396	175	137	52	*
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	349	643	7	**	8	**	107	154	142	152	188	258	107	253	234	360	47	*	679	322	91	* 158	39	*
Agree (Net)	806	382	415	2		8		79	130	138	145	150	164	79	223	224	255	25		510	296	134	95	46	
Strongly agree	420	186	228	2		6		22	70	64	77	84	103	22	117	111	149	20		281	139	52	59	18	
Somewhat agree	386	197	187	0		3		57	60	74	68	66	61	57	105	112	106	5		228	158	82	36	28	
Disagree (Net)	195	71	117	6		6		34	60	38	37	14	13	34	91	46	20	5		96	100	41	42	6	
Somewhat disagree	134	55	79	1		1		20	40	26	25	11	12	20	61	32	16	4		74	60	26	24	5	
Strongly disagree	61	16	39	6		5		13	19	11	12	3	2	13	30	14	3	0		22	39	15	18	1	

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

There should be more funding for non-policing alternatives (e.g., social worker dispatches, neighborhood patrols, restorative justice circles).

		Gender						Age (Net)						Generations							Race/Ethnicity				
	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)		Non-binary (E)		18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7		White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)	
Total	1,001	453	532	8	**	14	**	112	189	176	182	164	177	112	313	270	275	30	*	605	396	175	137	52	*
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	349	643	7	**	8	**	107	154	142	152	188	258	107	253	234	360	47	*	679	322	91	* 158	39	*
Agree (Net)	731	311	412	8		7		88	119	132	131	124	138	88	208	199	208	27		434	297	129	109	32	
Strongly agree	316	106	204	7		7		46	53	62	54	47	55	46	101	76	82	12		165	151	60	60	13	
Somewhat agree	415	205	208	2		0		43	66	70	77	76	83	43	108	124	126	15		269	146	69	50	19	
Disagree (Net)	270	143	120	0		7		24	71	44	51	41	40	24	105	71	67	3		171	99	46	28	20	
Somewhat disagree	174	89	78	0		7		15	54	24	33	24	23	15	72	48	37	2		104	70	36	11	18	
Strongly disagree	96	54	42	0		0		9	17	19	18	16	16	9	33	23	30	1		67	29	10	17	2	

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

The current level of funding for the Chicago Police Department is too high.

		Gender						Age (Net)						Generations							Race/Ethnicity				
	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)		Non-binary (E)		18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7		White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)	
Total	1,001	453	532	8	**	14	**	112	189	176	182	164	177	112	313	270	275	30	*	605	396	175	137	52	*
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	349	643	7	**	8	**	107	154	142	152	188	258	107	253	234	360	47	*	679	322	91	* 158	39	*
Agree (Net)	398	194	196	6		8		76	101	84	62	42	32	76	154	109	55	5		177	222	101	79	27	
Strongly agree	124	56	63	6		4		30	36	23	19	7	9	30	55	25	14	1		52	73	29	32	2	
Somewhat agree	274	138	133	0		4		46	65	62	43	35	23	46	100	84	41	4		125	149	72	46	25	
Disagree (Net)	603	260	337	2		6		37	88	91	120	122	145	37	159	162	220	25		428	174	74	59	25	
Somewhat disagree	366	150	212	0		6		21	63	55	71	72	84	21	106	96	129	13		241	124	47	47	19	

Strongly disagree	237	110	125	2	0	16	25	36	48	50	62	16	53	65	91	12	187	50	27	11	6

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Q5a: Are any of the following statements true for you?

I have had a negative experience with a member of the Chicago Police Department.

		Gender						Age (Net)					Generations					Race/Ethnicity				
	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
Total	1,001	453	532	8 **	14 **	112	189	176	182	164	177	112	313	270	275	30 *	605	396	175	137	52 *
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	349	643	7 **	8 **	107	154	142	152	188	258	107	253	234	360	47 *	679	322	91 *	158	39 *
Yes	234	122	105	2	5	34	68	49	39	25	19	34	98	62	38	2	87	147	61	66	5
No	767	331	427	6	9	78	121	127	143	139	159	78	216	208	237	29	518	249	114	71	47

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

I have been racially profiled in at least one interaction with police officers in Chicago.

		Gender						Age (Net)					Generations					Race/Ethnicity				
	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
Total	1,001	453	532	8 **	14 **	112	189	176	182	164	177	112	313	270	275	30 *	605	396	175	137	52 *
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	349	643	7 **	8 **	107	154	142	152	188	258	107	253	234	360	47 *	679	322	91 *	158	39 *
Yes	173	94	72	2	5	32	48	34	38	12	9	32	73	49	20	0	43	131	51	64	3
No	828	359	460	6	9	81	141	142	144	152	169	81	241	221	255	30	563	265	124	73	49

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

If I were to report police misconduct to the Chicago Police Department, I believe I would receive retaliation from officers for filing a complaint.

		Gender						Age (Net)					Generations					Race/Ethnicity				
	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
Total	1,001	453	532	8 **	14 **	112	189	176	182	164	177	112	313	270	275	30 *	605	396	175	137	52 *
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	349	643	7 **	8 **	107	154	142	152	188	258	107	253	234	360	47 *	679	322	91 *	158	39 *
Yes	389	175	205	5	10	64	79	74	73	50	49	64	129	109	80	7	172	217	85	76	29
No	612	279	327	4	5	48	110	102	109	114	128	48	185	161	195	23	433	179	90	61	23

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

I have been afraid to report police misconduct to the Chicago Police Department because I believed I would receive retaliation from officers.

		Gender						Age (Net)					Generations					Race/Ethnicity				
	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
Total	1,001	453	532	8 **	14 **	112	189	176	182	164	177	112	313	270	275	30 *	605	396	175	137	52 *
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	349	643	7 **	8 **	107	154	142	152	188	258	107	253	234	360	47 *	679	322	91 *	158	39 *
Yes	226	108	107	6	10	42	53	40	39	29	22	42	81	58	43	2	87	138	56	47	15
No	775	345	426	2	4	70	136	135	143	135	155	70	233	212	232	28	518	258	119	90	37

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Growing up, I was taught that the police were a friend to me and my community.

		Gender						Age (Net)					Generations					Race/Ethnicity				
	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
Total	1,001	453	532	8 **	14 **	112	189	176	182	164	177	112	313	270	275	30 *	605	396	175	137	52 *
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	349	643	7 **	8 **	107	154	142	152	188	258	107	253	234	360	47 *	679	322	91 *	158	39 *
Yes	841	373	466	2	2	69	146	137	162	158	169	69	242	235	266	30	567	274	123	90	42
No	160	80	67	7	12	44	43	38	20	6	8	44	72	35	9	0	38	122	52	47	10

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

As an adult, I feel that the police are a friend to me and my community.

		Gender						Age (Net)					Generations					Race/Ethnicity				
	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
Total	1,001	453	532	8 **	14 **	112	189	176	182	164	177	112	313	270	275	30 *	605	396	175	137	52 *
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	349	643	7 **	8 **	107	154	142	152	188	258	107	253	234	360	47 *	679	322	91 *	158	39 *
Yes	680	321	357	2	2	40	108	108	136	134	155	40	183	193	235	29	499	181	80	58	35
No	321	132	176	6	12	73	82	68	46	30	23	73	130	77	40	1	106	215	95	79	17

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

I have a friend of family member who works for the Chicago Police Department.

		Gender						Age (Net)					Generations					Race/Ethnicity				
	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
Total	1,001	453	532	8 **	14 **	112	189	176	182	164	177	112	313	270	275	30 *	605	396	175	137	52 *
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	349	643	7 **	8 **	107	154	142	152	188	258	107	253	234	360	47 *	679	322	91 *	158	39 *
Yes	264	115	142	2	7	32	53	57	41	43	37	32	99	58	68	6	147	117	56	38	5
No	737	339	390	6	7	81	136	118	141	121	140	81	214	212	207	24	458	279	118	99	47

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

I have felt the need to intervene or observe the interactions between a Chicago police officer and a resident.

		Gender						Age (Net)					Generations					Race/Ethnicity				
	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
Total	1,001	453	532	8 **	14 **	112	189	176	182	164	177	112	313	270	275	30 *	605	396	175	137	52 *
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	349	643	7 **	8 **	107	154	142	152	188	258	107	253	234	360	47 *	679	322	91 *	158	39 *
Yes	209	97	104	5	6	56	55	40	28	18	11	56	80	47	25	0	73	135	52	58	13
No	792	356	429	4	8	57	134	136	154	146	166	57	233	223	250	30	532	261	123	80	39

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Q12: In an effort to support essential social services that are often underfunded - such as housing, education, employment, mental health care, and youth services - there have been proposals to reduce police department budgets and redistribute those funds towards these essential social services. How much do you support or oppose such proposals?

		Gender						Age (Net)					Generations					Race/Ethnicity				
	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
Total	1,001	453	532	8 **	14 **	112	189	176	182	164	177	112	313	270	275	30 *	605	396	175	137	52 *
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	349	643	7 **	8 **	107	154	142	152	188	258	107	253	234	360	47 *	679	322	91 *	158	39 *
Support (Net)	565	247	309	6	10	94	137	108	90	69	67	94	207	148	108	8	270	294	138	101	35
Strongly support	229	92	130	6	7	47	58	53	31	22	18	47	97	51	32	2	100	128	55	49	10
Somewhat support	336	155	179	0	3	47	79	55	59	47	48	47	110	97	76	6	170	166	83	52	25
Oppose (Net)	436	206	224	2	4	18	53	67	92	95	111	18	106	123	167	22	335	101	37	36	17
Somewhat oppose	224	97	123	1	4	12	35	33	36	52	56	12	63	52	88	9	163	61	16	27	8
Strongly oppose	212	109	101	1	0	6	18	34	56	43	55	6	43	71	79	13	172	40	20	9	9

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Q6A: Where do you think reallocated funds from the police department should go?

		Gender						Age (Net)					Generations					Race/Ethnicity				
	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
Total	565	247	309	6 **	10 **	94 *	137	108	90 *	69 *	67 *	94 *	207	148	108	8 **	270	294	138	101	35 *
Total (Unweighted)	560	167	388	4 **	6 **	84 *	119	90 *	74 *	91 *	102	84 *	180	124	159	13 **	322	238	71 *	117	25 **
Mental health care programs	363	156	201	6	5	58	80	74	61	48	42	58	131	99	71	5	177	187	86	63	23
Homeless services and shelters	334	141	185	6	7	66	74	68	56	37	34	66	121	82	62	4	142	192	90	65	24
Gun violence prevention	320	146	168	3	5	55	62	61	50	48	43	55	103	87	69	5	161	159	54	66	25
Youth services (e.g., community centers, mentorship programs, after-school programs)	291	116	166	6	7	58	62	49	47	43	32	58	95	77	56	5	135	157	75	56	14
Affordable housing services	269	111	152	6	4	51	69	53	46	22	27	51	105	72	37	4	114	155	68	59	15
Hiring/Integrating social workers into police forces to handle situations where police may not be needed	266	132	131	3	4	50	58	44	45	32	37	50	86	68	55	7	135	130	59	43	19
Local education/schools	240	111	126	4	4	51	75	49	33	20	11	51	106	53	29	1	104	136	69	42	13
Local healthcare services	222	94	121	6	4	46	68	44	24	21	18	46	91	50	30	4	89	133	74	33	14
Substance abuse services	220	73	141	6	5	33	47	49	32	30	30	33	78	57	50	3	109	112	38	44	18
People returning to their communities from jail or prison (e.g., social/family reintegration, expungement, healthcare assistance)	203	94	104	4	4	41	61	31	24	19	26	41	84	41	31	5	104	98	34	42	6
Unemployment/Re-employment services	176	78	92	6	4	43	47	37	20	19	10	43	73	37	21	1	69	107	45	41	10
Other (please specify):	9	2	6	0	2	2	0	4	0	1	2	2	2	2	2	0	0	8	4	1	1
Not at all sure	15	7	8	0	0	3	0	1	5	3	3	3	1	5	5	0	7	8	1	5	2

* Table Base: SUPPORTS POLICE BUDGET REALLOCATION

Q6B: Which of the following should have the highest priority for reallocated funds from the police department?

		Gender					Age (Net)							Generations					Race/Ethnicity				
	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
Total	545	240	296	6 **	8 **	89 *	137	105	85 *	66 *	62 *	89 *	204	142	101	8 **	264	281	133	97 *	32 *
Total (Unweighted)	541	162	374	4 **	5 **	81 *	118	88 *	70 *	86 *	98 *	81 *	177	119	151	13 **	313	228	68 *	113	23 **
Gun violence prevention	169	77	89	0	3	20	31	29	28	34	27	20	50	51	44	3	89	80	26	33	17
Hiring/integrating social workers into police forces to handle situations where police may not be needed	68	39	27	2	2	10	15	11	16	7	10	10	21	22	15	1	45	23	9	7	3
Youth services (e.g., community centers, mentorship programs, after-school programs)	59	24	34	0	0	9	6	15	13	8	8	9	19	17	12	0	29	29	17	11	0
Mental health care programs	58	18	39	0	2	7	16	10	9	8	7	7	24	13	12	2	30	27	14	10	0
Homeless services and shelters	53	23	28	2	0	15	19	7	6	1	5	15	23	9	5	1	20	33	17	6	7
Affordable housing services	46	14	30	2	1	12	15	10	6	4	0	12	21	10	3	0	16	30	16	11	2
Local education/schools	35	19	16	0	0	6	11	11	5	1	0	6	17	11	1	0	12	23	14	6	1
Unemployment/Re-employment services	25	16	10	0	0	3	12	7	1	2	1	3	18	2	3	0	10	16	7	7	1
Local healthcare services	15	7	8	0	0	2	5	4	2	0	1	2	5	6	1	0	1	14	11	3	0
Substance abuse services	8	2	6	0	0	3	3	1	0	1	0	3	3	1	1	0	5	3	2	1	0
People returning to their communities from jail or prison (e.g., social/family reintegration, expungement, healthcare assistance)	8	1	7	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	3	2	3	0	3	0	6	3	0	2	0

* Table Base: THINK POLICE BUDGET FUNDS SHOULD BE REALLOCATED TO AT LEAST ONE LISTED SERVICE

Q7: How likely do you think it is that the following situations will happen as a result of reallocating funds from the police department to underfunded social services?

Reallocating police department funds will lead to fewer officers in my neighborhood.

		Gender					Age (Net)							Generations					Race/Ethnicity				
	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
Total	1,001	453	532	8 **	14 **	112	189	176	182	164	177	112	313	270	275	30 *	605	396	175	137	52 *
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	349	643	7 **	8 **	107	154	142	152	188	258	107	253	234	360	47 *	679	322	91 *	158	39 *
Likely (Net)	680	319	349	8	8	71	119	105	128	122	137	71	199	176	207	27	437	243	120	73	32
Very likely	267	133	127	2	4	22	35	42	60	45	63	22	69	74	90	12	177	90	40	28	12
Somewhat likely	413	186	222	5	4	49	83	63	67	76	74	49	130	103	117	15	260	153	80	44	19
Not likely (Net)	321	135	183	1	6	42	71	71	55	42	41	42	114	94	68	3	169	152	55	64	20
Not very likely	263	109	150	1	6	39	60	62	38	31	31	39	100	70	52	2	132	131	52	50	19
Not at all likely	58	25	33	0	0	2	11	9	16	11	9	2	14	24	16	2	37	22	3	15	1

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Reallocating police department funds will mean more funding for social services that can improve issues such as mental health, addiction, and homelessness.

		Gender					Age (Net)							Generations					Race/Ethnicity				
	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
Total	1,001	453	532	8 **	14 **	112	189	176	182	164	177	112	313	270	275	30 *	605	396	175	137	52 *
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	349	643	7 **	8 **	107	154	142	152	188	258	107	253	234	360	47 *	679	322	91 *	158	39 *
Likely (Net)	622	272	342	5	8	84	129	121	97	88	103	84	208	158	155	16	345	277	114	101	38
Very likely	196	79	113	5	5	33	49	49	28	15	22	33	83	47	28	5	97	99	40	41	9
Somewhat likely	426	193	229	0	3	51	80	71	69	73	81	51	125	111	127	12	248	178	75	60	29
Not likely (Net)	379	182	190	4	6	28	61	55	85	76	74	28	105	112	120	14	260	119	60	36	14
Not very likely	276	129	140	4	6	21	57	31	50	58	58	21	82	71	92	9	181	95	49	29	9
Not at all likely	103	53	50	0	0	7	4	24	35	18	16	7	23	41	28	4	78	25	11	7	5

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Reallocating police department funds will lead to an increase in crime in my neighborhood.

		Gender					Age (Net)							Generations					Race/Ethnicity				
	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
Total	1,001	453	532	8 **	14 **	112	189	176	182	164	177	112	313	270	275	30 *	605	396	175	137	52 *
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	349	643	7 **	8 **	107	154	142	152	188	258	107	253	234	360	47 *	679	322	91 *	158	39 *
Likely (Net)	548	265	281	2	0	52	92	91	101	103	108	52	160	145	172	18	365	183	73	60	35
Very likely	230	125	104	0	0	11	24	48	57	34	55	11	63	70	77	10	151	78	34	25	14
Somewhat likely	318	140	176	2	0	42	68	43	43	69	53	42	97	75	96	8	213	105	39	35	21
Not likely (Net)	453	189	252	6	14	60	98	84	82	61	69	60	153	125	103	12	240	213	102	77	17
Not very likely	331	139	182	3	10	43	75	58	59	45	51	43	114	89	78	8	173	157	85	51	10
Not at all likely	123	49	69	3	4	18	23	26	22	15	19	18	39	37	25	5	67	56	16	26	7

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Reallocating police department funds will start a real dialogue about the changes needed for policing in Chicago.

		Gender					Age (Net)							Generations					Race/Ethnicity				
	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
Total	1,001	453	532	8 **	14 **	112	189	176	182	164	177	112	313	270	275	30 *	605	396	175	137	52 *
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	349	643	7 **	8 **	107	154	142	152	188	258	107	253	234	360	47 *	679	322	91 *	158	39 *
Likely (Net)	582	252	320	7	11	77	126	113	99	72	94	77	203	154	133	15	312	270	120	99	30
Very likely	173	75	89	4	8	24	42	43	31	13	20	24	72	45	28	3	59	113	39	49	11
Somewhat likely	409	177	231	3	3	53	85	70	68	59	75	53	131	109	105	11	252	157	82	50	19
Not likely (Net)	419	202	213	2	3	36	63	63	83	92	83	36	110	117	142	15	294	126	55	38	22
Not very likely	264	119	140	1	3	30	51	27	42	63	51	30	71	63	92	8	173	91	44	25	13
Not at all likely	155	83	73	0	0	6	12	35	41	29	32	6	39	54	50	7	121	35	11	13	9

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Reallocating police department funds will only benefit communities of color.

		Gender					Age (Net)							Generations					Race/Ethnicity				
	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
Total	1,001	453	532	8 **	14 **	112	189	176	182	164	177	112	313	270	275	30 *	605	396	175	137	52 *
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	349	643	7 **	8 **	107	154	142	152	188	258	107	253	234	360	47 *	679	322	91 *	158	39 *
Likely (Net)	396	173	223	0	0	32	89	73	74	68	61	32	141	113	96	14	242	155	67	51	28
Very likely	83	36	47	0	0	2	23	22	14	9	13	2	40	21	16	4	59	24	7	14	1
Somewhat likely	313	137	176	0	0	30	66	51	60	58	48	30	101	92	80	10	183	130	60	38	26
Not likely (Net)	605	281	309	8	14	80	100	103	108	96	117	80	172	157	179	16	363	241	108	86	24
Not very likely	379	175	192	6	9	49	73	56	59	70	73	49	113	87	119	12	229	150	63	53	20
Not at all likely	226	106	117	3	4	32	28	47	49	26	44	32	59	70	60	5	134	92	45	33	4

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Reallocating police department funds will not contribute to repairing the relationship between the police and Chicago residents.

		Gender					Age (Net)							Generations					Race/Ethnicity				
	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
Total	1,001	453	532	8 **	14 **	112	189	176	182	164	177	112	313	270	275	30 *	605	396	175	137	52 *
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	349	643	7 **	8 **	107	154	142	152	188	258	107	253	234	360	47 *	679	322	91 *	158	39 *
Likely (Net)	606	275	327	4	5	58	110	118	108	101	110	58	193	168	168	18	383	223	100	71	31
Very likely	241	123	118	0	0	17	39	50	43	41	51	17	77	63	77	7	164	77	39	28	1
Somewhat likely	365	152	210	4	5	41	72	68	65	60	59	41	116	105	91	12	218	147	61	43	30
Not likely (Net)	395	179	205	4	9	54	79	58	74	63	67	54	120	102	107	12	222	173	75	66	21
Not very likely	274	116	150	2	7	40	67	36	47	42	42	40	92	68	65	9	150	124	61	40	16
Not at all likely	121	63	55	2	2	14	12	21	27	22	25	14	28	34	42	3	73	48	14	26	4

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Q6: Perhaps you have heard of the campaign "Defund the Police," which refers to the movement to reduce police department budgets and redistribute those funds towards essential social services that are often underfunded, such as housing, education, employment, mental health care, and youth services. Given this understanding, how much do you support or oppose this campaign?

		Gender					Age (Net)							Generations					Race/Ethnicity				
	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
Total	1,001	453	532	8 **	14 **	112	189	176	182	164	177	112	313	270	275	30 *	605	396	175	137	52 *
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	349	643	7 **	8 **	107	154	142	152	188	258	107	253	234	360	47 *	679	322	91 *	158	39 *
Support (Net)	463	194	263	6	7	74	99	92	83	57	58	74	165	121	95	8	211	252	106	96	30
Strongly support	162	55	101	6	7	33	44	33	23	16	12	33	70	32	25	2	64	99	41	41	4
Somewhat support	301	139	162	0	1	41	55	58	60	41	45	41	95	90	69	6	148	154	65	55	27
Oppose (Net)	538	260	270	2	7	38	90	84	99	107	120	38	148	149	181	22	394	144	68	41	22

Somewhat oppose	208	91	109	1	7	19	54	33	32	38	32	19	74	57	52	6	139	69	28	24	10
Strongly oppose	330	168	160	1	0	19	36	51	67	69	88	19	73	92	128	17	255	74	40	16	12

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Q9: What would reform of Chicago law enforcement look like to you?

	Gender					Age (Net)						Generations					Race/Ethnicity				
	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
Total	743	322	411	7 **	10 **	100	153	129	119	115	128	100	238	191	194	20 **	419	324	138	121	39 *
Total (Unweighted)	754	243	504	6 **	7 **	94 *	132	104	106	134	184	94 *	203	168	257	32 *	480	274	74 *	141	29 **
Sensitivity training for all officers	416	157	253	3	8	64	88	65	50	67	82	64	131	85	126	10	239	177	76	63	23
De-escalation training for all officers	388	165	220	3	5	54	79	65	56	68	67	54	125	94	105	10	230	158	70	54	21
Race-focused training for all officers	376	154	216	3	8	52	87	53	47	61	75	52	125	78	107	13	218	158	75	51	16
New policies on gun use	373	153	215	5	7	64	90	66	48	43	61	64	132	87	80	11	206	167	68	60	27
Introduction of social workers onto police force	372	162	203	5	10	53	74	62	55	56	71	53	123	82	105	10	215	158	60	59	22
Bias training for all officers	368	145	220	3	5	51	73	57	47	62	78	51	113	85	108	11	205	163	74	60	20
Increased racial and ethnic diversity within the department	311	126	182	3	3	50	68	49	46	45	53	50	102	72	76	11	168	144	51	55	29
Stricter rules and regulations from the Chicago Police Board (the disciplinary body for Chicago police officers)	302	107	189	7	5	46	71	42	41	49	53	46	104	61	82	9	154	148	63	52	19
Greater reliance on non-lethal weapons	294	125	162	7	7	48	60	41	42	53	50	48	91	65	83	7	161	133	54	42	18
More stringent recruiting requirements	267	123	140	5	4	43	66	39	35	35	49	43	94	58	64	8	131	136	53	55	13
Civilian oversight committee	241	121	118	3	3	30	60	44	31	31	46	30	93	52	59	7	130	112	37	47	17
Completely new leadership	211	105	99	4	7	41	55	36	22	32	26	41	81	45	41	4	97	114	54	32	15
Reduced funding for the police department	168	61	103	5	3	37	43	28	25	21	14	37	59	44	26	2	77	92	31	34	16
Consent decree (i.e., a court order that establishes an enforceable plan for reform)	143	60	78	5	3	17	39	27	18	20	22	17	56	33	33	3	68	75	22	31	10
Other (please specify):	30	19	11	0	2	2	7	8	9	0	3	2	12	12	2	1	20	10	5	0	0
Not at all sure	39	14	25	0	0	4	2	7	9	8	8	4	3	16	12	4	19	20	10	7	2

* Table Base: AGREE CHICAGO LAW ENFORCEMENT NEEDS REFORM

Q9A: How would you rate the training of Chicago police officers on each of the following?

Racial and cultural awareness

	Gender					Age (Net)						Generations					Race/Ethnicity				
	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
Total	1,001	453	532	8 **	14 **	112	189	176	182	164	177	112	313	270	275	30 *	605	396	175	137	52 *
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	349	643	7 **	8 **	107	154	142	152	188	258	107	253	234	360	47 *	679	322	91 *	158	39 *
Excellent	78	39	39	0	0	5	13	15	21	14	9	5	23	31	16	3	52	26	9	13	4
Good	211	126	84	2	0	5	47	40	35	43	42	5	76	56	71	5	167	45	21	9	10
Fair	259	113	145	0	0	27	42	41	43	57	49	27	71	70	77	14	164	94	39	33	20
Poor	213	87	122	0	5	26	44	38	40	29	37	26	69	56	56	6	104	109	57	34	4
Terrible	85	33	49	0	4	17	24	15	14	6	9	17	37	18	12	0	33	52	17	26	2
I don't think CPD officers have been trained for this at all	80	27	47	6	4	27	10	17	9	3	14	27	20	16	15	2	33	47	25	12	7
Not at all sure	74	29	46	0	0	5	9	10	21	12	18	5	18	23	28	1	51	23	7	9	6

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Bias awareness

	Gender					Age (Net)						Generations					Race/Ethnicity				
	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
Total	1,001	453	532	8 **	14 **	112	189	176	182	164	177	112	313	270	275	30 *	605	396	175	137	52 *
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	349	643	7 **	8 **	107	154	142	152	188	258	107	253	234	360	47 *	679	322	91 *	158	39 *
Excellent	63	32	32	0	0	1	9	15	23	8	7	1	19	31	12	1	41	22	7	11	4
Good	200	113	81	2	4	8	41	47	25	38	41	8	75	47	62	7	147	53	24	14	9
Fair	260	111	149	0	0	31	49	35	40	56	49	31	69	66	80	14	168	92	45	24	19
Poor	207	91	113	0	4	28	40	33	44	30	32	28	63	60	52	4	111	97	48	35	5
Terrible	79	33	46	0	2	8	29	7	18	7	9	8	35	21	14	0	29	49	14	30	2
I don't think CPD officers have been trained for this at all	100	37	57	7	4	28	15	25	9	9	14	28	34	18	19	1	52	48	25	7	7
Not at all sure	92	37	55	0	0	8	5	14	24	16	25	8	18	27	37	2	57	34	12	15	7

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Sensitivity toward those of a different gender, religion, age, orientation, income, etc.

	Gender					Age (Net)						Generations					Race/Ethnicity				
	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
Total	1,001	453	532	8 **	14 **	112	189	176	182	164	177	112	313	270	275	30 *	605	396	175	137	52 *
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	349	643	7 **	8 **	107	154	142	152	188	258	107	253	234	360	47 *	679	322	91 *	158	39 *
Excellent	81	50	31	0	0	10	18	12	22	11	7	10	28	28	12	3	48	33	12	12	7
Good	191	100	89	2	0	4	28	36	42	38	43	4	54	59	68	6	145	47	29	10	7
Fair	275	113	162	0	0	28	50	44	38	68	46	28	78	68	91	10	183	91	35	29	17
Poor	193	89	104	0	2	30	34	35	30	25	38	30	60	47	48	7	95	98	41	39	9
Terrible	94	36	54	0	4	7	36	15	21	6	8	7	47	28	10	1	33	60	22	29	3
I don't think CPD officers have been trained for this at all	84	26	49	6	8	26	9	22	9	3	14	26	26	16	17	0	41	43	26	9	3
Not at all sure	83	39	44	0	0	8	13	10	20	13	20	8	21	23	29	2	60	23	10	8	5

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

De-escalating tense or dangerous situations

	Gender					Age (Net)						Generations					Race/Ethnicity				
	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
Total	1,001	453	532	8 **	14 **	112	189	176	182	164	177	112	313	270	275	30 *	605	396	175	137	52 *
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	349	643	7 **	8 **	107	154	142	152	188	258	107	253	234	360	47 *	679	322	91 *	158	39 *
Excellent	92	45	46	1	0	7	18	20	15	18	15	7	37	22	25	2	69	24	8	9	6
Good	230	114	116	0	2	10	28	49	53	48	42	10	60	77	73	10	158	72	43	17	8
Fair	267	125	142	0	0	28	56	44	39	48	52	28	81	68	80	10	171	96	44	31	12
Poor	197	82	108	0	7	38	45	27	32	30	25	38	66	47	43	4	99	99	41	35	14
Terrible	84	33	49	2	3	9	27	15	22	5	7	9	39	24	12	0	35	49	16	24	5
I don't think CPD officers have been trained for this at all	55	18	33	4	2	14	7	12	5	4	14	14	14	10	17	1	23	33	17	10	3
Not at all sure	75	36	39	0	0	8	9	10	16	11	21	8	16	22	25	4	51	23	5	11	5

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Prioritizing non-lethal actions or weapons when dealing with individuals

	Gender					Age (Net)						Generations					Race/Ethnicity				
	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
Total	1,001	453	532	8 **	14 **	112	189	176	182	164	177	112	313	270	275	30 *	605	396	175	137	52 *
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	349	643	7 **	8 **	107	154	142	152	188	258	107	253	234	360	47 *	679	322	91 *	158	39 *
Excellent	88	55	33	0	0	5	19	19	22	14	10	5	30	35	17	2	58	30	15	9	5
Good	204	104	100	0	0	10	28	37	41	40	48	10	56	58	69	11	160	44	22	9	9
Fair	295	141	149	0	6	39	63	55	36	54	49	39	96	67	82	11	176	119	56	34	17
Poor	164	64	100	1	2	15	41	26	34	24	24	15	63	44	39	3	85	79	29	36	8
Terrible	100	41	54	2	5	20	24	16	20	10	10	20	39	23	17	1	40	59	23	26	3
I don't think CPD officers have been trained for this at all	60	18	39	4	2	17	8	15	5	6	10	17	16	13	14	0	26	35	20	10	3
Not at all sure	90	31	58	1	0	6	7	9	24	17	27	6	14	30	38	2	60	30	10	13	7

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Responding to situations involving mental or behavioral health concerns

	Gender					Age (Net)						Generations					Race/Ethnicity				
	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
Total	1,001	453	532	8 **	14 **	112	189	176	182	164	177	112	313	270	275	30 *	605	396	175	137	52 *
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	349	643	7 **	8 **	107	154	142	152	188	258	107	253	234	360	47 *	679	322	91 *	158	39 *
Excellent	57	35	23	0	0	2	10	9	20	12	5	2	13	31	10	1	32	25	12	7	7
Good	163	88	74	1	0	7	36	40	26	30	24	7	67	43	45	2	129	35	14	12	7
Fair	224	99	125	0	0	22	44	36	39	47	36	22	72	54	67	9	152	72	31	24	12

Poor	252	113	135	0	6	39	60	42	29	36	47	39	82	56	61	13	131	121	58	35	13	
Terrible	113	39	69	2	6	20	22	17	34	8	13	20	37	36	19	1	44	70	31	27	6	
I don't think CPD officers have been trained for this at all	102	38	59	4	2	14	11	22	12	12	30	14	27	21	37	2	57	44	19	19	3	
Not at all sure	89	41	47	0	0	8	6	10	23	19	23	8	15	28	36	2	60	29	10	13	5	

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Responding to situations involving family safety concerns (e.g., domestic abuse, child endangerment)

		Gender							Age (Net)				Generations						Race/Ethnicity			
	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (?	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
Total	1,001	453	532	8 **	14 **	112	189	176	182	164	177	112	313	270	275	30 *	605	396	175	137	52 *	
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	349	643	7 **	8 **	107	154	142	152	188	258	107	253	234	360	47 *	679	322	91 *	158	39 *	
Excellent	102	56	46	0	0	7	20	28	21	18	8	7	42	32	21	1	68	34	11	18	3	
Good	290	143	145	2	0	21	45	57	57	52	58	21	81	93	82	13	217	72	42	18	11	
Fair	285	127	151	3	7	37	62	46	46	46	47	37	95	68	77	8	157	128	62	36	18	
Poor	133	49	83	0	0	12	34	16	20	24	25	12	46	28	40	7	72	61	22	27	6	
Terrible	62	21	38	0	3	19	14	5	15	5	4	19	17	19	7	0	21	42	17	18	2	
I don't think CPD officers have been trained for this at all	57	23	29	4	4	12	6	16	10	2	12	12	16	16	12	0	21	35	16	7	6	
Not at all sure	73	34	39	0	0	4	9	8	12	16	23	4	16	15	37	1	49	24	5	12	6	

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Responding to situations involving personal safety concerns (e.g., stalking, harassment, physical fights)

		Gender							Age (Net)				Generations						Race/Ethnicity			
	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (?	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
Total	1,001	453	532	8 **	14 **	112	189	176	182	164	177	112	313	270	275	30 *	605	396	175	137	52 *	
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	349	643	7 **	8 **	107	154	142	152	188	258	107	253	234	360	47 *	679	322	91 *	158	39 *	
Excellent	107	63	44	0	2	11	25	23	23	16	9	11	43	33	18	2	73	34	12	12	8	
Good	272	136	134	2	0	13	39	50	51	58	61	13	69	81	96	12	200	72	32	22	13	
Fair	278	128	143	3	7	39	50	44	46	50	49	39	79	74	75	11	170	108	51	27	12	
Poor	154	52	100	0	4	24	49	16	28	18	18	24	63	34	31	2	74	80	42	29	5	
Terrible	61	19	42	0	0	10	10	17	12	4	8	10	22	18	10	0	16	45	18	22	2	
I don't think CPD officers have been trained for this at all	47	21	22	4	2	8	8	17	5	3	6	8	22	10	6	1	20	27	15	7	3	
Not at all sure	82	34	48	0	0	8	7	10	16	15	26	8	15	19	39	1	52	31	5	16	9	

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Q10: Which of the following do you think are effective policies for reducing gun violence in Chicago?

		Gender							Age (Net)				Generations						Race/Ethnicity			
	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (?	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
Total	950	438	497	8 **	14 **	108	187	159	171	157	169	108	297	255	260	30 *	583	367	164	122	50 *	
Total (Unweighted)	945	332	604	7 **	8 **	101	150	130	142	179	243	101	240	219	339	46 *	646	299	86 *	144	37 *	
Background checks for all gun sales	619	283	326	8	8	73	111	88	106	119	124	73	172	158	193	23	384	235	114	77	33	
Higher penalties for gun-related crimes	607	290	314	3	2	59	106	78	110	120	134	59	158	157	207	25	400	206	103	64	26	
Increased police presence in neighborhoods with high gun violence	550	255	290	3	4	52	86	71	110	106	125	52	135	154	188	22	377	174	84	50	25	
Increase the police's community involvement with residents in neighborhoods with high gun violence	510	239	264	2	5	47	88	70	87	102	115	47	130	138	172	22	320	190	84	63	25	
Red flag laws/Extreme risk protection orders (i.e., police can remove or block an individual's access to firearms if they believe the weapons will be used for harm)	472	204	265	3	2	43	92	64	77	92	103	43	135	119	151	23	311	161	78	52	24	
Neighborhood initiatives (e.g., neighborhood watch, community clubs, resident oversight communities)	456	214	234	5	7	31	95	71	86	83	89	31	146	119	142	18	276	180	80	56	27	
Youth services and after-school programs	452	203	247	4	3	54	63	79	81	94	81	54	120	125	141	12	290	162	78	50	18	
Police follow-up after gun violence situations	437	211	221	3	3	34	69	69	76	91	98	34	119	111	155	18	295	143	65	46	22	
Support resources for residents with mental or behavioral health conditions (e.g., counseling services, social workers, housing services)	427	179	236	8	9	43	80	79	82	72	71	43	139	118	115	12	248	178	78	61	19	
In-school youth programs	405	192	207	2	4	48	66	68	79	74	69	48	114	116	113	13	245	160	72	50	21	
Buy-back of certain firearms (e.g., semi-automatic assault weapons)	318	122	189	8	5	31	53	59	50	62	63	31	94	83	98	12	205	113	51	38	18	
Other (please specify):	43	30	11	2	4	4	8	2	14	6	10	4	8	17	11	3	22	21	11	4	0	
Not at all sure	35	10	24	0	0	6	6	8	8	2	4	6	10	12	6	0	17	18	6	4	6	

* Table Base: AGREE GUN VIOLENCE NEEDS TO BE REDUCED IN CHICAGO

Q13A: Which do you think best describes the level of involvement that the Chicago Police department should have in each of the following situations?

Truancy (i.e., a student's repeated unexcused absence from school)

		Gender							Age (Net)				Generations						Race/Ethnicity			
	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (?	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
Total	1,001	453	532	8 **	14 **	112	189	176	182	164	177	112	313	270	275	30 *	605	396	175	137	52 *	
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	349	643	7 **	8 **	107	154	142	152	188	258	107	253	234	360	47 *	679	322	91 *	158	39 *	
Sole responsibility - CPD should respond independently unless another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) is specifically requested	89	45	44	0	0	8	15	19	25	10	11	8	29	33	18	1	40	49	25	21	0	
Primary responsibility - CPD should take the lead, but another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should be present	93	39	54	0	0	12	19	28	9	12	13	12	36	23	21	2	59	34	14	13	7	
Shared responsibility - CPD should respond to the call alongside another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works)	258	134	124	0	2	23	52	36	57	44	46	23	75	85	68	7	163	95	38	31	21	
Limited responsibility - another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should take the lead, but CPD should be present	213	88	117	2	7	21	38	30	38	40	45	21	59	53	71	8	133	80	35	27	10	
No responsibility - another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should respond independently unless CPD is specifically requested	265	113	148	4	2	32	43	48	45	45	53	32	86	54	82	11	175	90	36	33	10	
N/A - this issue should be handled without a response team(s) (e.g., between residents, involving a private organization)	82	35	46	2	3	17	22	14	8	14	8	17	28	22	16	0	35	47	26	13	4	

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Medical emergency (e.g., heart attack, allergic reaction, overdose)

		Gender							Age (Net)				Generations						Race/Ethnicity			
	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (?	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
Total	1,001	453	532	8 **	14 **	112	189	176	182	164	177	112	313	270	275	30 *	605	396	175	137	52 *	
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	349	643	7 **	8 **	107	154	142	152	188	258	107	253	234	360	47 *	679	322	91 *	158	39 *	
Sole responsibility - CPD should respond independently unless another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) is specifically requested	109	50	52	0	7	17	29	27	17	14	5	17	51	25	15	1	40	68	29	21	14	
Primary responsibility - CPD should take the lead, but another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should be present	135	68	66	0	0	20	30	22	20	16	27	20	41	34	36	3	80	55	33	17	3	
Shared responsibility - CPD should respond to the call alongside another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works)	345	160	183	2	1	33	68	54	65	66	59	33	104	95	100	13	230	114	53	39	18	
Limited responsibility - another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should take the lead, but CPD should be present	237	97	139	0	2	27	38	36	48	40	47	27	64	67	69	9	152	84	33	33	9	
No responsibility - another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should respond independently unless CPD is specifically requested	156	69	82	6	5	13	17	33	30	27	37	13	43	45	51	4	92	64	27	20	7	

N/A - this issue should be handled without a response team(s) (e.g., between residents, involving a private organization)	20	10	10	0	0	3	7	3	3	1	3	3	9	4	4	0	10	10	0	8	2

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Drug-related issue (e.g., intoxication, addiction, possession of an illicit substance)

		Gender						Age (Net)						Generations						Race/Ethnicity			
	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
Total	1,001	453	532	8 **	14 **	112	189	176	182	164	177	112	313	270	275	30 *	605	396	175	137	52 *
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	349	643	7 **	8 **	107	154	142	152	188	258	107	253	234	360	47 *	679	322	91 *	158	39 *
Sole responsibility - CPD should respond independently unless another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) is specifically requested	207	89	116	2	2	13	39	45	35	35	40	13	77	49	61	6	132	75	24	34	12
Primary responsibility - CPD should take the lead, but another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should be present	281	131	151	0	0	35	33	46	52	51	64	35	61	82	96	7	178	104	54	31	14
Shared responsibility - CPD should respond to the call alongside another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works)	358	163	187	1	9	41	81	57	60	68	51	41	118	97	90	12	205	153	68	49	24
Limited responsibility - another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should take the lead, but CPD should be present	110	50	58	2	2	15	24	20	23	8	20	15	41	27	23	4	67	43	17	17	0
No responsibility - another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should respond independently unless CPD is specifically requested	32	15	13	3	1	5	10	6	8	2	1	5	14	11	2	0	18	15	10	4	0
N/A - this issue should be handled without a response team(s) (e.g., between residents, involving a private organization)	13	5	7	0	0	3	1	1	5	1	1	3	2	6	2	0	6	7	2	2	2

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Mental or behavioral health concern (e.g., suicidal tendency, unstable behavior)

		Gender						Age (Net)						Generations						Race/Ethnicity			
	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
Total	1,001	453	532	8 **	14 **	112	189	176	182	164	177	112	313	270	275	30 *	605	396	175	137	52 *
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	349	643	7 **	8 **	107	154	142	152	188	258	107	253	234	360	47 *	679	322	91 *	158	39 *
Sole responsibility - CPD should respond independently unless another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) is specifically requested	87	41	46	0	0	5	28	20	18	7	9	5	44	25	12	0	40	47	21	19	5
Primary responsibility - CPD should take the lead, but another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should be present	134	59	72	0	3	18	20	32	20	26	18	18	46	29	37	3	91	43	21	13	7
Shared responsibility - CPD should respond to the call alongside another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works)	418	196	220	2	2	34	69	53	95	81	86	34	102	134	133	15	262	156	74	47	27
Limited responsibility - another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should take the lead, but CPD should be present	265	117	147	0	0	39	46	55	29	42	53	39	83	57	77	9	159	106	42	42	11
No responsibility - another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should respond independently unless CPD is specifically requested	76	29	39	5	7	9	25	11	16	8	9	9	33	20	12	3	44	32	17	9	1
N/A - this issue should be handled without a response team(s) (e.g., between residents, involving a private organization)	21	11	8	2	2	8	2	4	4	1	2	8	4	6	2	0	10	11	0	7	2

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Domestic dispute (e.g., suspected abuse, child endangerment)

		Gender						Age (Net)						Generations						Race/Ethnicity			
	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
Total	1,001	453	532	8 **	14 **	112	189	176	182	164	177	112	313	270	275	30 *	605	396	175	137	52 *
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	349	643	7 **	8 **	107	154	142	152	188	258	107	253	234	360	47 *	679	322	91 *	158	39 *
Sole responsibility - CPD should respond independently unless another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) is specifically requested	242	108	135	0	2	29	49	55	48	35	27	29	92	64	53	4	125	117	59	42	11
Primary responsibility - CPD should take the lead, but another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should be present	347	159	178	4	9	34	65	53	56	73	67	34	99	90	115	8	228	119	49	31	25
Shared responsibility - CPD should respond to the call alongside another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works)	325	146	178	0	2	31	59	51	64	49	71	31	94	95	93	12	206	119	50	46	12
Limited responsibility - another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should take the lead, but CPD should be present	58	25	32	0	0	9	12	12	10	4	11	9	22	13	10	4	34	24	10	11	2
No responsibility - another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should respond independently unless CPD is specifically requested	10	5	2	3	1	5	2	0	2	0	1	5	2	2	1	0	6	5	4	0	0
N/A - this issue should be handled without a response team(s) (e.g., between residents, involving a private organization)	19	11	8	0	0	5	3	4	3	3	2	5	4	6	4	1	7	12	2	8	2

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Personal safety concern (e.g., physical fight, stalking, harassment)

		Gender						Age (Net)						Generations						Race/Ethnicity			
	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
Total	1,001	453	532	8 **	14 **	112	189	176	182	164	177	112	313	270	275	30 *	605	396	175	137	52 *
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	349	643	7 **	8 **	107	154	142	152	188	258	107	253	234	360	47 *	679	322	91 *	158	39 *
Sole responsibility - CPD should respond independently unless another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) is specifically requested	373	158	209	2	6	34	65	67	64	68	77	34	117	89	123	11	217	157	75	49	21
Primary responsibility - CPD should take the lead, but another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should be present	315	155	158	3	2	28	62	52	60	63	52	28	100	90	86	11	219	97	38	32	16
Shared responsibility - CPD should respond to the call alongside another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works)	232	106	123	0	4	39	42	41	42	26	42	39	64	68	55	5	138	94	51	31	8
Limited responsibility - another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should take the lead, but CPD should be present	51	23	27	1	1	6	15	9	9	6	5	6	22	12	9	2	20	31	8	15	4
No responsibility - another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should respond independently unless CPD is specifically requested	15	2	11	2	0	3	0	5	4	2	1	3	4	5	2	0	4	10	3	5	1
N/A - this issue should be handled without a response team(s) (e.g., between residents, involving a private organization)	15	10	5	0	0	3	5	1	4	0	1	3	6	6	1	0	7	7	0	5	2

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Wellness check (i.e., requested in-person visit to verify a resident's personal well-being)

		Gender						Age (Net)						Generations						Race/Ethnicity			
	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
Total	1,001	453	532	8 **	14 **	112	189	176	182	164	177	112	313	270	275	30 *	605	396	175	137	52 *
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	349	643	7 **	8 **	107	154	142	152	188	258	107	253	234	360	47 *	679	322	91 *	158	39 *
Sole responsibility - CPD should respond independently unless another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) is specifically requested	148	66	82	0	0	11	41	30	27	18	21	11	69	33	31	4	88	60	28	23	7

Primary responsibility - CPD should take the lead, but another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should be present	175	86	86	0	6	19	36	38	23	30	30	19	57	48	47	5	108	67	34	17	10
Shared responsibility - CPD should respond to the call alongside another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works)	366	172	188	2	4	32	69	68	73	73	52	32	117	108	102	7	223	143	69	48	19
Limited responsibility - another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should take the lead, but CPD should be present	187	81	105	0	0	28	21	30	39	29	39	28	40	54	57	7	109	78	27	30	12
No responsibility - another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should respond independently unless CPD is specifically requested	103	38	60	6	5	18	18	6	15	13	32	18	24	19	36	6	67	37	16	14	2
N/A - this issue should be handled without a response team(s) (e.g., between residents, involving a private organization)	21	10	11	1	0	5	4	3	5	2	3	5	5	7	3	1	10	11	2	5	2

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Suspicious behavior (e.g., trespassing, loitering, unfamiliar vehicles)

		Gender						Age (Net)					Generations						Race/Ethnicity			
	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
Total	1,001	453	532	8 **	14 **	112	189	176	182	164	177	112	313	270	275	30 *	605	396	175	137	52 *
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	349	643	7 **	8 **	107	154	142	152	188	258	107	253	234	360	47 *	679	322	91 *	158	39 *
Sole responsibility - CPD should respond independently unless another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) is specifically requested	440	184	252	1	6	43	84	68	86	72	88	43	136	116	129	17	273	168	74	63	17
Primary responsibility - CPD should take the lead, but another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should be present	270	127	140	1	2	21	49	42	49	50	59	21	78	75	89	7	186	84	44	24	9
Shared responsibility - CPD should respond to the call alongside another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works)	209	107	99	0	3	29	39	50	35	30	26	29	70	61	44	5	104	105	47	30	23
Limited responsibility - another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should take the lead, but CPD should be present	56	18	35	3	2	15	11	11	10	7	2	15	21	14	7	0	32	24	7	11	2
No responsibility - another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should respond independently unless CPD is specifically requested	7	2	3	2	0	3	0	1	0	1	2	3	1	0	3	1	3	4	3	0	0
N/A - this issue should be handled without a response team(s) (e.g., between residents, involving a private organization)	19	15	3	1	1	3	6	3	3	4	1	3	8	4	4	0	8	11	0	9	2

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Neighborhood concern (e.g., noise complaints, disorderly conduct)

		Gender						Age (Net)					Generations						Race/Ethnicity			
	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
Total	1,001	453	532	8	14 **	112	189	176	182	164	177	112	313	270	275	30 *	605	396	175	137	52 *
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	349	643	7 **	8 **	107	154	142	152	188	258	107	253	234	360	47 *	679	322	91 *	158	39 *
Sole responsibility - CPD should respond independently unless another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) is specifically requested	337	134	203	1	2	37	62	62	58	57	61	37	106	88	92	13	205	132	75	36	15
Primary responsibility - CPD should take the lead, but another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should be present	277	134	138	1	4	27	43	51	46	46	63	27	78	73	92	7	176	100	32	41	17
Shared responsibility - CPD should respond to the call alongside another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works)	245	127	115	0	4	27	56	39	45	43	34	27	83	68	61	7	143	102	49	30	15
Limited responsibility - another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should take the lead, but CPD should be present	94	40	53	2	1	12	16	14	24	11	17	12	29	27	23	3	54	41	15	20	2
No responsibility - another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should respond independently unless CPD is specifically requested	28	7	16	4	3	7	8	6	2	3	2	7	14	2	4	1	17	11	4	4	0
N/A - this issue should be handled without a response team(s) (e.g., between residents, involving a private organization)	20	12	8	0	0	3	3	3	6	4	1	3	3	11	3	0	10	10	0	7	2

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Homelessness (e.g., tent locations, panhandling)

		Gender						Age (Net)					Generations						Race/Ethnicity			
	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
Total	1,001	453	532	8 **	14 **	112	189	176	182	164	177	112	313	270	275	30 *	605	396	175	137	52 *
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	349	643	7 **	8 **	107	154	142	152	188	258	107	253	234	360	47 *	679	322	91 *	158	39 *
Sole responsibility - CPD should respond independently unless another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) is specifically requested	97	48	48	0	0	9	29	22	18	13	7	9	43	28	15	2	48	49	17	24	4
Primary responsibility - CPD should take the lead, but another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should be present	119	45	75	0	0	14	19	30	17	22	18	14	44	27	34	1	74	46	22	17	4
Shared responsibility - CPD should respond to the call alongside another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works)	377	180	197	0	2	36	57	63	82	67	72	36	102	111	113	15	240	137	63	38	30
Limited responsibility - another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should take the lead, but CPD should be present	245	106	137	1	1	28	48	27	41	43	58	28	61	67	78	11	159	86	38	32	9
No responsibility - another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should respond independently unless CPD is specifically requested	123	51	61	4	10	16	30	27	17	15	18	16	50	27	28	2	63	59	34	13	4
N/A - this issue should be handled without a response team(s) (e.g., between residents, involving a private organization)	40	23	15	3	2	10	7	7	8	5	3	10	13	9	8	0	21	19	1	13	2

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Q13B: Which group(s) should be involved in responding to each of the following situations?

Truancy (i.e., a student's repeated unexcused absence from school)

		Gender						Age (Net)					Generations						Race/Ethnicity			
	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
Total	912	408	489	8 **	14 **	104	174	156	157	154	167	104	284	238	257	29 **	565	347	149	116	52 *
Total (Unweighted)	924	320	596	7 **	7 **	100	143	126	134	176	245	100	231	209	339	45 *	642	282	77 *	135	39 *
Non-police first responder (e.g., Chicago Fire Department, EMS)	81	49	28	0	4	7	32	10	18	7	7	7	35	28	11	0	39	42	18	16	2
Social services (e.g., mental health professional, social worker)	559	234	316	6	5	56	93	94	94	101	122	56	160	137	188	18	362	197	95	62	23
Branch(es) of local government (e.g., Department of Public Works, Department of Parks and Recreation)	124	62	61	0	0	19	25	18	30	22	10	19	38	42	23	2	70	54	17	18	17
Private organization(s) (e.g., insurance company, neighborhood watch, homeowner's association)	92	55	37	0	0	11	33	18	13	9	9	11	48	19	13	1	47	45	13	22	6
Residents	109	44	64	0	3	13	17	26	18	17	18	13	38	28	25	6	57	52	23	15	11
None of these	104	50	52	2	2	13	14	12	19	20	26	13	19	34	34	4	71	33	15	11	3

* Table Base: THINKS CPD SHOULD NOT HAVE SOLE RESPONSIBILITY FOR THIS SITUATION

Medical emergency (e.g., heart attack, allergic reaction, overdose)

		Gender						Age (Net)					Generations						Race/Ethnicity			
	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)

	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
		Gender				Age (Net)						Generations					Race/Ethnicity				
Total	892	404	480	8 **	7 **	96 *	160	148	166	150	173	96 *	262	246	260	29 **	565	328	146	116	38 *
Total (Unweighted)	912	318	587	7 **	6 **	96 *	133	124	135	174	250	96 *	221	207	342	46 *	637	275	76 *	138	30 *
Non-police first responder (e.g., Chicago Fire Department, EMS)	723	313	402	8	7	68	123	112	143	121	155	68	198	204	225	28	470	253	120	83	25
Social services (e.g., mental health professional, social worker)	126	64	60	2	0	22	35	28	19	14	9	22	57	30	17	1	68	59	18	20	16
Branch(es) of local government (e.g., Department of Public Works, Department of Parks and Recreation)	70	53	16	0	0	16	32	8	8	4	2	16	38	12	4	1	38	32	15	13	1
Private organization(s) (e.g., insurance company, neighborhood watch, homeowner's association)	44	23	21	0	0	6	14	11	7	3	2	6	21	13	4	0	19	25	7	13	4
Residents	41	21	19	0	0	0	8	10	10	5	7	0	15	16	9	0	22	19	8	9	2
None of these	30	18	13	0	0	2	2	7	1	12	6	2	8	3	18	0	18	12	0	5	7

* Table Base: THINKS CPD SHOULD NOT HAVE SOLE RESPONSIBILITY FOR THIS SITUATION

Drug-related issue (e.g., intoxication, addiction, possession of an illicit substance)

	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
		Gender				Age (Net)						Generations					Race/Ethnicity				
Total	794	364	417	7 **	13 **	99 *	150	131	147	129	138	99 *	236	222	214	24 **	473	321	151	103	40 *
Total (Unweighted)	797	274	516	5 **	7 **	95 *	124	109	120	149	200	95 *	200	184	283	35 *	544	253	76 *	120	29 **
Non-police first responder (e.g., Chicago Fire Department, EMS)	338	150	182	6	4	54	64	47	64	49	59	54	93	93	92	6	205	132	80	30	9
Social services (e.g., mental health professional, social worker)	389	164	220	6	5	58	59	67	74	70	61	58	109	107	103	13	236	153	62	50	24
Branch(es) of local government (e.g., Department of Public Works, Department of Parks and Recreation)	95	63	32	0	0	12	30	20	13	10	9	12	45	21	16	1	55	40	21	12	4
Private organization(s) (e.g., insurance company, neighborhood watch, homeowner's association)	63	28	31	0	4	10	18	15	8	6	5	10	29	15	8	1	27	37	4	17	8
Residents	40	23	17	0	0	4	9	11	11	3	2	4	16	15	4	0	14	25	6	9	10
None of these	117	52	62	1	3	4	22	19	18	26	28	4	33	31	42	5	76	41	18	21	2

* Table Base: THINKS CPD SHOULD NOT HAVE SOLE RESPONSIBILITY FOR THIS SITUATION

Mental or behavioral health concern (e.g., suicidal tendency, unstable behavior)

	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
		Gender				Age (Net)						Generations					Race/Ethnicity				
Total	914	413	487	8 **	14 **	107	162	155	164	157	168	107	269	245	263	30 *	565	349	154	118	47 *
Total (Unweighted)	929	323	597	7 **	8 **	100	137	127	136	180	249	100	226	210	346	47 *	645	284	80 *	137	37 *
Non-police first responder (e.g., Chicago Fire Department, EMS)	287	122	162	3	2	41	60	43	54	45	44	41	89	80	70	7	181	106	55	26	11
Social services (e.g., mental health professional, social worker)	716	314	394	8	7	77	129	107	134	125	143	77	209	183	223	25	472	243	105	80	33
Branch(es) of local government (e.g., Department of Public Works, Department of Parks and Recreation)	86	52	31	0	3	21	22	17	13	6	6	21	35	20	8	1	46	41	17	12	8
Private organization(s) (e.g., insurance company, neighborhood watch, homeowner's association)	78	44	28	2	6	12	26	22	3	10	6	12	36	21	9	0	31	47	18	14	10
Residents	60	30	27	0	3	6	20	10	10	9	5	6	25	17	8	3	23	37	12	15	9
None of these	23	14	9	0	0	2	2	6	2	8	3	2	4	10	7	0	8	15	6	7	2

* Table Base: THINKS CPD SHOULD NOT HAVE SOLE RESPONSIBILITY FOR THIS SITUATION

Domestic dispute (e.g., suspected abuse, child endangerment)

	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
		Gender				Age (Net)						Generations					Race/Ethnicity				
Total	759	346	398	8 **	13 **	83 *	141	120	135	129	151	83 *	221	206	222	26 **	480	279	116	95 *	41 *
Total (Unweighted)	784	271	504	7 **	7 **	78 *	122	106	111	149	218	78 *	194	176	295	41 *	553	231	66 *	107	31 *
Non-police first responder (e.g., Chicago Fire Department, EMS)	179	78	97	5	2	28	35	35	26	26	29	28	53	49	45	4	113	66	31	20	11
Social services (e.g., mental health professional, social worker)	449	188	250	8	8	51	80	66	76	73	103	51	128	111	139	20	298	151	63	43	27
Branch(es) of local government (e.g., Department of Public Works, Department of Parks and Recreation)	87	46	40	0	0	26	27	18	10	2	3	26	38	18	6	0	37	50	21	12	13
Private organization(s) (e.g., insurance company, neighborhood watch, homeowner's association)	56	30	23	2	3	14	14	11	5	7	5	14	20	14	6	1	24	32	10	13	2
Residents	54	31	18	0	4	2	12	10	15	8	7	2	20	21	8	2	19	34	12	14	3
None of these	152	74	78	0	0	7	19	25	33	36	33	7	38	45	60	3	105	47	21	20	3

* Table Base: THINKS CPD SHOULD NOT HAVE SOLE RESPONSIBILITY FOR THIS SITUATION

Personal safety concern (e.g., physical fight, stalking, harassment)

	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
		Gender				Age (Net)						Generations					Race/Ethnicity				
Total	628	295	323	7 **	8 **	79 *	125	109	119	96 *	100	79 *	197	181	152	19 **	388	239	100	88 *	31 *
Total (Unweighted)	630	217	407	5 **	6 **	75 *	105	89 *	97 *	113	151	75 *	167	149	210	29 **	435	195	58 *	89 *	26 **
Non-police first responder (e.g., Chicago Fire Department, EMS)	168	75	90	5	3	30	38	27	31	25	18	30	51	50	35	2	101	67	33	18	13
Social services (e.g., mental health professional, social worker)	179	82	93	4	1	22	40	32	27	21	37	22	59	47	44	7	105	74	29	29	10
Branch(es) of local government (e.g., Department of Public Works, Department of Parks and Recreation)	97	56	38	0	3	24	31	12	14	10	7	24	41	17	12	2	47	50	23	13	9
Private organization(s) (e.g., insurance company, neighborhood watch, homeowner's association)	77	24	46	4	5	13	20	24	8	8	5	13	39	17	8	0	34	43	18	17	4
Residents	82	50	29	0	3	4	24	25	16	6	8	4	40	30	8	1	33	49	26	16	7
None of these	200	98	101	0	1	11	35	25	47	38	44	11	50	64	67	8	147	52	22	18	7

* Table Base: THINKS CPD SHOULD NOT HAVE SOLE RESPONSIBILITY FOR THIS SITUATION

Wellness check (i.e., requested in-person visit to verify a resident's personal well-being)

	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
		Gender				Age (Net)						Generations					Race/Ethnicity				
Total	853	387	450	8 **	14 **	102	148	145	155	146	156	102	244	237	244	26 **	517	336	147	114	45 *
Total (Unweighted)	871	303	559	7 **	8 **	100	125	120	129	167	230	100	206	202	322	41 *	597	274	78 *	132	33 *
Non-police first responder (e.g., Chicago Fire Department, EMS)	306	145	159	3	2	34	56	49	60	55	51	34	87	94	83	8	188	118	57	41	8
Social services (e.g., mental health professional, social worker)	515	209	298	8	7	60	97	77	89	83	108	60	148	133	153	20	319	196	86	58	28
Branch(es) of local government (e.g., Department of Public Works, Department of Parks and Recreation)	77	45	28	0	4	18	22	19	8	5	5	18	32	17	9	0	35	42	9	20	3
Private organization(s) (e.g., insurance company, neighborhood watch, homeowner's association)	98	51	42	2	3	15	22	17	12	16	16	15	34	20	27	2	43	55	25	17	10
Residents	119	61	53	2	3	13	23	23	21	19	21	13	40	29	34	2	64	55	24	21	10
None of these	41	24	17	0	0	2	6	7	10	9	6	2	11	16	11	0	32	9	2	4	2

* Table Base: THINKS CPD SHOULD NOT HAVE SOLE RESPONSIBILITY FOR THIS SITUATION

Suspicious behavior (e.g., trespassing, loitering, unfamiliar vehicles)

	Total (A)	Male (B)	Female (C)	Transgender (D)	Non-binary (E)	18-24 (F)	25-34 (G)	35-44 (H)	45-54 (I)	55-64 (J)	65+ (K)	Gen Z (18-24) (L)	Millennials (25-40) (	Gen X (41-56) (N)	Baby Boomers (57-7	Silent Generation (7	White (Not Hispanic	People of Color (R)	Hispanic (S)	Black (Not Hispanic)	AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)
		Gender				Age (Net)						Generations					Race/Ethnicity				
Total	561	269	281	8 **	8 **	70 *	106	107	96 *	92 *	90 *	70 *	177	154	146	13 **	332	228	101	74 *	35 *
Total (Unweighted)	565	203	354	6 **	6 **	70 *	94 *	80 *	79 *	103	139	70 *	150	128	195	22 **	377	188	56 *	85 *	28 **
Non-police first responder (e.g., Chicago Fire Department, EMS)	116	63	53	1	2	11	30	24	24	15	13	11	44	36	23	2	58	58	28	20	7
Social services (e.g., mental health professional, social worker)	81	43	37	1	1	5	19	17	16	11	13	5	30	26	19	0	49	32	9	13	9
Branch(es) of local government (e.g., Department of Public Works, Department of Parks and Recreation)	100	50	47	0	3	22	22	20	16	9	12	22	38	23	15	3	50	50	27	14	6
Private organization(s) (e.g., insurance company, neighborhood watch, homeowner's association)	97	34	58	4	3	24	22	15	9	11	14	24	32	16	23	1	51	46	17	16	4

Residents	73	33	36	4	2	14	19	7	8	10	14	14	25	13	17	4	37	36	20	10	3
None of these	218	108	108	1	0	15	27	45	43	44	43	15	57	67	74	5	145	72	29	23	15

* Table Base: THINKS CPD SHOULD NOT HAVE SOLE RESPONSIBILITY FOR THIS SITUATION

Neighborhood concern (e.g., noise complaints, disorderly conduct)

		Gender						Age (Net)						Generations					Race/Ethnicity			
	Total (A)	**Male (B)**	**Female (C)**	**Transgender (D)**	**Non-binary (E)**	**18-24 (F)**	**25-34 (G)**	**35-44 (H)**	**45-54 (I)**	**55-64 (J)**	**65+ (K)**	**Gen Z (18-24) (L)**	**Millennials (25-40) (**	**Gen X (41-56) (N)**	**Baby Boomers (57-7**	**Silent Generation (?**	**White (Not Hispanic**	**People of Color (R)**	**Hispanic (S)**	**Black (Not Hispanic)**	**AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)**
Total	664	319	329	8 **	13 **	75 *	127	114	124	108	116	75 *	207	182	183	17 **	400	264	100	101	37 *
Total (Unweighted)	667	239	419	6 **	7 **	75 *	108	92 *	101	125	166	75 *	175	156	234	27 **	451	216	55 *	109	27 **
Non-police first responder (e.g., Chicago Fire Department, EMS)	124	61	63	0	0	11	31	23	27	15	17	11	44	44	24	2	77	47	23	17	3
Social services (e.g., mental health professional, social worker)	139	87	48	0	4	14	38	22	19	23	22	14	53	29	39	3	76	63	26	18	11
Branch(es) of local government (e.g., Department of Public Works, Department of Parks and Recreation)	122	72	43	4	7	26	37	11	25	15	6	26	43	36	13	3	63	59	16	25	10
Private organization(s) (e.g., insurance company, neighborhood watch, homeowner's association)	177	70	102	5	4	32	42	37	30	16	19	32	68	46	29	2	95	82	25	35	13
Residents	139	71	64	4	2	21	29	30	24	16	19	21	52	34	27	4	89	50	19	18	9
None of these	170	84	84	1	0	5	18	19	37	40	51	5	34	44	82	5	115	55	18	25	8

* Table Base: THINKS CPD SHOULD NOT HAVE SOLE RESPONSIBILITY FOR THIS SITUATION

Homelessness (e.g., tent locations, panhandling)

		Gender						Age (Net)						Generations					Race/Ethnicity			
	Total (A)	**Male (B)**	**Female (C)**	**Transgender (D)**	**Non-binary (E)**	**18-24 (F)**	**25-34 (G)**	**35-44 (H)**	**45-54 (I)**	**55-64 (J)**	**65+ (K)**	**Gen Z (18-24) (L)**	**Millennials (25-40) (**	**Gen X (41-56) (N)**	**Baby Boomers (57-7**	**Silent Generation (?**	**White (Not Hispanic**	**People of Color (R)**	**Hispanic (S)**	**Black (Not Hispanic)**	**AAPI (Not Hispanic) (U)**
Total	904	405	484	8 **	14 **	104 *	161	154	164	151	170	104 *	270	242	260	28 **	557	347	158	113	48 *
Total (Unweighted)	906	312	585	7 **	8 **	96 *	130	123	136	176	245	96 *	218	207	341	44 *	629	277	82 *	132	34 *
Non-police first responder (e.g., Chicago Fire Department, EMS)	148	69	73	2	4	17	44	35	24	17	12	17	67	41	21	2	90	58	28	19	5
Social services (e.g., mental health professional, social worker)	615	279	332	5	1	61	90	89	128	112	135	61	156	174	202	22	404	211	90	73	32
Branch(es) of local government (e.g., Department of Public Works, Department of Parks and Recreation)	182	80	101	1	4	36	39	35	29	18	26	36	57	49	34	6	88	94	44	25	15
Private organization(s) (e.g., insurance company, neighborhood watch, homeowner's association)	128	74	53	0	2	23	31	26	16	22	9	23	51	30	21	2	72	56	19	18	12
Residents	71	48	23	0	2	7	14	18	13	13	6	7	30	20	13	1	40	31	12	11	6
None of these	69	37	27	2	5	12	6	12	10	13	15	12	14	16	27	0	49	21	11	4	2

* Table Base: THINKS CPD SHOULD NOT HAVE SOLE RESPONSIBILITY FOR THIS SITUATION

MacArthur Foundation Chicagoan Opinions - Public Safety

Q1: Which of the following do you think is the most important problem in Chicago today?

			City vs. Suburb				Chicago Area Type			
	Total (A)	**City (B)**		**Suburbs (C)**		**City of Chicago (D)**		**Cook County Suburb**		**Non-Cook County Suburb (F)**	
Total	N=1001	N=332		N=669		N=332		N=262		N=406	
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=299		N=702		N=299		N=296		N=406	
Gun violence	57%	48%		61%	B	48%		57%	d	64%	D
Property taxes	11%	14%		9%		14%	e	8%		10%	
Economic inequality	6%	10%	C	4%		10%	EF	3%		5%	
Racial segregation across areas including education, housing, access to city services, etc.	5%	8%	C	4%		8%	F	6%	F	2%	
Lack of access to affordable housing	5%	7%	c	4%		7%	f	5%		3%	
Homelessness	4%	3%		5%		3%		5%		4%	
Police treatment of Black and Latino people	3%	4%		3%		4%	F	5%	F	1%	
Lack of access to social services (e.g., income assistance, job training, food pantries)	3%	3%		3%		3%		2%		3%	
Pension reform	2%	0%		2%	b	0%		3%	D	2%	d
Other (please specify):	4%	3%		5%		3%		4%		6%	
N/A - Chicago does not have any serious problems.	1%	0%		1%		0%		1%		0%	

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Q2: How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding the city of Chicago?

Race relations in Chicago are good right now.

			City vs. Suburb		Chicago Area Type		
	Total (A)	**City (B)**	**Suburbs (C)**	**City of Chicago (D)**	**Cook County Suburb**	**Non-Cook County Suburb (F)**	
Total	N=1001	N=332	N=669	N=332	N=262	N=406	
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=299	N=702	N=299	N=296	N=406	
Agree (Net)	22%	23%	22%	23%	25%	20%	
Strongly agree	4%	4%	5%	4%	5%	4%	
Somewhat agree	18%	19%	18%	19%	20%	16%	
Disagree (Net)	78%	77%	78%	77%	75%	80%	
Somewhat disagree	43%	45%	42%	45%	37%	45%	e
Strongly disagree	34%	32%	36%	32%	38%	34%	

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Compared to this time last year, race relations in Chicago have improved.

			City vs. Suburb		Chicago Area Type		
	Total (A)	**City (B)**	**Suburbs (C)**	**City of Chicago (D)**	**Cook County Suburb**	**Non-Cook County Suburb (F)**	
Total	N=1001	N=332	N=669	N=332	N=262	N=406	
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=299	N=702	N=299	N=296	N=406	
Agree (Net)	29%	29%	29%	29%	30%	29%	
Strongly agree	3%	3%	3%	3%	4%	3%	
Somewhat agree	26%	26%	26%	26%	25%	26%	
Disagree (Net)	71%	71%	71%	71%	70%	71%	
Somewhat disagree	42%	41%	42%	41%	36%	47%	E
Strongly disagree	29%	29%	28%	29%	34%	F	24%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

There is a strong sense of community across Chicago.

			City vs. Suburb		Chicago Area Type		
	Total (A)	**City (B)**	**Suburbs (C)**	**City of Chicago (D)**	**Cook County Suburb**	**Non-Cook County Suburb (F)**	
Total	N=1001	N=332	N=669	N=332	N=262	N=406	
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=299	N=702	N=299	N=296	N=406	
Agree (Net)	48%	51%	46%	51%	47%	46%	
Strongly agree	10%	12%	9%	12%	10%	9%	
Somewhat agree	37%	39%	37%	39%	37%	37%	
Disagree (Net)	52%	49%	54%	49%	53%	54%	
Somewhat disagree	34%	33%	35%	33%	32%	36%	
Strongly disagree	18%	17%	19%	17%	21%	18%	

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Mayor Lori Lightfoot has done a good job of investing in and supporting historically marginalized neighborhoods.

			City vs. Suburb		Chicago Area Type		
	Total (A)	**City (B)**	**Suburbs (C)**	**City of Chicago (D)**	**Cook County Suburb**	**Non-Cook County Suburb (F)**	
Total	N=1001	N=332	N=669	N=332	N=262	N=406	
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=299	N=702	N=299	N=296	N=406	
Agree (Net)	39%	39%	39%	39%	37%	40%	
Strongly agree	6%	6%	6%	6%	7%	5%	
Somewhat agree	33%	33%	33%	33%	31%	35%	
Disagree (Net)	61%	61%	61%	61%	63%	60%	
Somewhat disagree	30%	32%	29%	32%	29%	29%	
Strongly disagree	31%	29%	32%	29%	34%	31%	

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Race-related issues in Chicago are due to a few bad actors, not systemic issues.

			City vs. Suburb		Chicago Area Type		
	Total (A)	**City (B)**	**Suburbs (C)**	**City of Chicago (D)**	**Cook County Suburb**	**Non-Cook County Suburb (F)**	
Total	N=1001	N=332	N=669	N=332	N=262	N=406	
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=299	N=702	N=299	N=296	N=406	
Agree (Net)	37%	35%	38%	35%	38%	38%	
Strongly agree	14%	14%	14%	14%	16%	13%	
Somewhat agree	23%	21%	24%	21%	21%	25%	
Disagree (Net)	63%	65%	62%	65%	62%	62%	
Somewhat disagree	36%	36%	36%	36%	32%	39%	
Strongly disagree	27%	28%	26%	28%	30%	f	23%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

MacArthur Foundation Chicagoan Opinions - Public Safety

Q1: Which of the following do you think is the most important problem in Chicago today?

		City vs. Suburb			Chicago Area Type	
	Total (A)	**City (B)**	**Suburbs (C)**	**City of Chicago (D)**	**Cook County Suburb**	**Non-Cook County Suburb (F)**
Total	1,001	332	669	332	262	406
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	299	702	299	296	406
Gun violence	567	158	409	158	150	259
Property taxes	109	46	63	46	22	41
Economic inequality	62	34	28	34	7	21
Racial segregation across areas including education, housing, access to city services, etc.	52	27	25	27	16	9
Lack of access to affordable housing	49	24	25	24	12	13
Homelessness	40	9	31	9	14	17
Police treatment of Black and Latino people	30	13	17	13	14	3
Lack of access to social services (e.g., income assistance, job training, food pantries)	26	10	17	10	7	10
Pension reform	15	0	15	0	8	8
Other (please specify):	44	11	33	11	10	23
N/A - Chicago does not have any serious problems.	6	1	5	1	4	2

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Q2: How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding the city of Chicago?

Race relations in Chicago are good right now.

		City vs. Suburb			Chicago Area Type	
	Total (A)	**City (B)**	**Suburbs (C)**	**City of Chicago (D)**	**Cook County Suburb**	**Non-Cook County Suburb (F)**
Total	1,001	332	669	332	262	406
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	299	702	299	296	406
Agree (Net)	224	76	148	76	65	83
Strongly agree	43	13	30	13	12	18
Somewhat agree	180	63	118	63	52	65
Disagree (Net)	777	257	521	257	198	323
Somewhat disagree	432	149	283	149	98	185
Strongly disagree	345	107	238	107	99	139

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Compared to this time last year, race relations in Chicago have improved.

		City vs. Suburb			Chicago Area Type	
	Total (A)	**City (B)**	**Suburbs (C)**	**City of Chicago (D)**	**Cook County Suburb**	**Non-Cook County Suburb (F)**
Total	1,001	332	669	332	262	406
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	299	702	299	296	406
Agree (Net)	293	97	196	97	77	118
Strongly agree	32	9	23	9	11	12
Somewhat agree	261	88	173	88	66	106
Disagree (Net)	708	235	473	235	185	288
Somewhat disagree	421	137	284	137	95	189
Strongly disagree	287	98	189	98	90	99

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

There is a strong sense of community across Chicago.

		City vs. Suburb			Chicago Area Type	
	Total (A)	**City (B)**	**Suburbs (C)**	**City of Chicago (D)**	**Cook County Suburb**	**Non-Cook County Suburb (F)**
Total	1,001	332	669	332	262	406
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	299	702	299	296	406
Agree (Net)	478	169	309	169	123	187
Strongly agree	103	41	62	41	26	36
Somewhat agree	375	128	247	128	96	151
Disagree (Net)	523	164	359	164	140	219
Somewhat disagree	339	109	231	109	85	146
Strongly disagree	183	55	128	55	55	74

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Mayor Lori Lightfoot has done a good job of investing in and supporting historically marginalized neighborhoods.

		City vs. Suburb			Chicago Area Type	
	Total (A)	**City (B)**	**Suburbs (C)**	**City of Chicago (D)**	**Cook County Suburb**	**Non-Cook County Suburb (F)**
Total	1,001	332	669	332	262	406
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	299	702	299	296	406
Agree (Net)	387	128	259	128	98	161
Strongly agree	58	20	38	20	18	20
Somewhat agree	329	108	221	108	80	140
Disagree (Net)	614	204	410	204	165	246
Somewhat disagree	303	108	195	108	76	120
Strongly disagree	311	97	215	97	89	126

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Race-related issues in Chicago are due to a few bad actors, not systemic issues.

		City vs. Suburb			Chicago Area Type	
	Total (A)	**City (B)**	**Suburbs (C)**	**City of Chicago (D)**	**Cook County Suburb**	**Non-Cook County Suburb (F)**
Total	1,001	332	669	332	262	406
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	299	702	299	296	406
Agree (Net)	372	117	255	117	99	156
Strongly agree	144	48	96	48	43	53
Somewhat agree	229	70	159	70	56	103
Disagree (Net)	629	215	414	215	163	251
Somewhat disagree	361	120	241	120	84	157
Strongly disagree	268	94	173	94	80	94

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Mayor Lori Lightfoot could do more to tackle inequality across Chicago neighborhoods.

		City vs. Suburb			Chicago Area Type	
	Total (A)	**City (B)**	**Suburbs (C)**	**City of Chicago (D)**	**Cook County Suburb**	**Non-Cook County Suburb (F)**
Total	1,001	332	669	332	262	406
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	299	702	299	296	406
Agree (Net)	845	290	556	290	212	344
Strongly agree	402	161	241	161	111	130
Somewhat agree	443	128	315	128	101	214
Disagree (Net)	156	43	113	43	51	62
Somewhat disagree	112	38	73	38	38	35
Strongly disagree	44	4	40	4	13	27

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Chicago law enforcement needs reform.

		City vs. Suburb			Chicago Area Type	
	Total (A)	**City (B)**	**Suburbs (C)**	**City of Chicago (D)**	**Cook County Suburb**	**Non-Cook County Suburb (F)**
Total	1,001	332	669	332	262	406
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	299	702	299	296	406
Agree (Net)	743	256	487	256	196	291
Strongly agree	327	134	193	134	92	101
Somewhat agree	416	122	294	122	104	190
Disagree (Net)	258	76	182	76	66	115
Somewhat disagree	162	44	117	44	42	75
Strongly disagree	96	32	64	32	24	40

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Gun violence in Chicago needs to be reduced.

		City vs. Suburb			Chicago Area Type	
	Total (A)	**City (B)**	**Suburbs (C)**	**City of Chicago (D)**	**Cook County Suburb**	**Non-Cook County Suburb (F)**
Total	1,001	332	669	332	262	406
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	299	702	299	296	406
Agree (Net)	950	311	639	311	250	389
Strongly agree	840	274	565	274	224	341
Somewhat agree	110	36	74	36	26	48
Disagree (Net)	51	22	29	22	12	18
Somewhat disagree	10	8	2	8	1	1
Strongly disagree	41	14	27	14	11	17

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

City government is doing enough to address gun violence in the city.

		City vs. Suburb			Chicago Area Type	
	Total (A)	**City (B)**	**Suburbs (C)**	**City of Chicago (D)**	**Cook County Suburb**	**Non-Cook County Suburb (F)**
Total	1,001	332	669	332	262	406
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	299	702	299	296	406
Agree (Net)	163	75	88	75	36	52
Strongly agree	48	28	20	28	10	10
Somewhat agree	114	46	68	46	26	42
Disagree (Net)	838	258	581	258	226	355
Somewhat disagree	310	92	217	92	66	152
Strongly disagree	528	165	363	165	160	203

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Q2A: Do you think each of the following situations happening in Chicago are better, worse, or about the same compared to cities in the rest of the country?

Race relations

		City vs. Suburb			Chicago Area Type	
	Total (A)	**City (B)**	**Suburbs (C)**	**City of Chicago (D)**	**Cook County Suburb**	**Non-Cook County Suburb (F)**
Total	1,001	332	669	332	262	406
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	299	702	299	296	406
Better	61	23	38	23	14	23
About the same	486	150	336	150	129	208
Worse	454	160	295	160	119	175

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Police relations with city residents

		City vs. Suburb			Chicago Area Type	
	Total (A)	**City (B)**	**Suburbs (C)**	**City of Chicago (D)**	**Cook County Suburb**	**Non-Cook County Suburb (F)**
Total	1,001	332	669	332	262	406
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	299	702	299	296	406
Better	69	15	54	15	7	47
About the same	517	165	352	165	147	205
Worse	415	153	263	153	108	154

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Gun violence

		City vs. Suburb			Chicago Area Type	
	Total (A)	**City (B)**	**Suburbs (C)**	**City of Chicago (D)**	**Cook County Suburb**	**Non-Cook County Suburb (F)**
Total	1,001	332	669	332	262	406
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	299	702	299	296	406
Better	22	4	18	4	4	14
About the same	173	52	120	52	42	78
Worse	806	276	531	276	216	314

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Police union relations with city government (e.g., the mayor, city council, city manager)

		City vs. Suburb			Chicago Area Type	
	Total (A)	**City (B)**	**Suburbs (C)**	**City of Chicago (D)**	**Cook County Suburb**	**Non-Cook County Suburb (F)**
Total	1,001	332	669	332	262	406
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	299	702	299	296	406

Better	48	15	34	15	8	26
About the same	481	134	346	134	131	215
Worse	472	184	289	184	123	166

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Carjackings

		City vs. Suburb		Chicago Area Type		
	Total (A)	**City (B)**	**Suburbs (C)**	**City of Chicago (D)**	**Cook County Suburb**	**Non-Cook County Suburb (F)**
Total	1,001	332	669	332	262	406
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	299	702	299	296	406
Better	28	15	13	15	4	9
About the same	211	64	147	64	49	98
Worse	762	253	509	253	209	300

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Other violent crimes (e.g., mugging, assault)

		City vs. Suburb		Chicago Area Type		
	Total (A)	**City (B)**	**Suburbs (C)**	**City of Chicago (D)**	**Cook County Suburb**	**Non-Cook County Suburb (F)**
Total	1,001	332	669	332	262	406
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	299	702	299	296	406
Better	24	8	16	8	8	8
About the same	344	109	235	109	79	156
Worse	633	215	418	215	175	243

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Non-violent crimes (e.g., package theft, harassment, property damage)

		City vs. Suburb		Chicago Area Type		
	Total (A)	**City (B)**	**Suburbs (C)**	**City of Chicago (D)**	**Cook County Suburb**	**Non-Cook County Suburb (F)**
Total	1,001	332	669	332	262	406
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	299	702	299	296	406
Better	41	9	32	9	16	16
About the same	543	172	371	172	136	236
Worse	417	151	265	151	111	155

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Q11: How concerned are you about the personal safety of each of the following groups of people in the Chicago area?

Police officers

		City vs. Suburb		Chicago Area Type		
	Total (A)	**City (B)**	**Suburbs (C)**	**City of Chicago (D)**	**Cook County Suburb**	**Non-Cook County Suburb (F)**
Total	1,001	332	669	332	262	406
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	299	702	299	296	406
Concerned (Net)	764	245	519	245	217	301
Very concerned	406	140	266	140	98	168
Somewhat concerned	357	105	252	105	119	133
Not concerned (Net)	237	87	150	87	45	105
Not very concerned	183	63	120	63	33	87
Not at all concerned	54	24	30	24	12	19

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Residents of color (e.g., Black, Latino, Asian)

		City vs. Suburb		Chicago Area Type		
	Total (A)	**City (B)**	**Suburbs (C)**	**City of Chicago (D)**	**Cook County Suburb**	**Non-Cook County Suburb (F)**
Total	1,001	332	669	332	262	406
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	299	702	299	296	406
Concerned (Net)	834	280	554	280	230	324
Very concerned	441	161	279	161	122	157
Somewhat concerned	394	119	275	119	107	167
Not concerned (Net)	167	52	115	52	33	82
Not very concerned	129	38	91	38	25	66
Not at all concerned	38	14	24	14	7	16

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Tourists

		City vs. Suburb		Chicago Area Type		
	Total (A)	**City (B)**	**Suburbs (C)**	**City of Chicago (D)**	**Cook County Suburb**	**Non-Cook County Suburb (F)**
Total	1,001	332	669	332	262	406
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	299	702	299	296	406
Concerned (Net)	675	212	464	212	192	271
Very concerned	266	78	189	78	80	108
Somewhat concerned	409	134	275	134	112	163
Not concerned (Net)	326	121	205	121	70	135
Not very concerned	256	93	163	93	58	105
Not at all concerned	69	27	42	27	12	30

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

City residents

		City vs. Suburb		Chicago Area Type		
	Total (A)	**City (B)**	**Suburbs (C)**	**City of Chicago (D)**	**Cook County Suburb**	**Non-Cook County Suburb (F)**
Total	1,001	332	669	332	262	406
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	299	702	299	296	406
Concerned (Net)	861	293	567	293	234	334
Very concerned	429	162	267	162	119	148
Somewhat concerned	432	132	300	132	115	185
Not concerned (Net)	140	39	101	39	28	73
Not very concerned	132	37	94	37	27	68
Not at all concerned	9	2	7	2	2	5

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Suburban residents

		City vs. Suburb		Chicago Area Type		
	Total (A)	**City (B)**	**Suburbs (C)**	**City of Chicago (D)**	**Cook County Suburb**	**Non-Cook County Suburb (F)**
Total	1,001	332	669	332	262	406
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	299	702	299	296	406
Concerned (Net)	578	141	437	141	180	257
Very concerned	230	55	175	55	75	101
Somewhat concerned	348	87	261	87	105	156
Not concerned (Net)	423	191	232	191	82	149
Not very concerned	331	131	200	131	74	126
Not at all concerned	91	59	32	59	9	23

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Homeless Chicagoans

		City vs. Suburb		Chicago Area Type		
	Total (A)	**City (B)**	**Suburbs (C)**	**City of Chicago (D)**	**Cook County Suburb**	**Non-Cook County Suburb (F)**
Total	1,001	332	669	332	262	406
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	299	702	299	296	406
Concerned (Net)	853	283	570	283	234	336
Very concerned	438	153	285	153	141	143
Somewhat concerned	415	130	285	130	92	193
Not concerned (Net)	148	49	99	49	29	70
Not very concerned	130	42	88	42	25	63
Not at all concerned	19	8	11	8	3	8

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Residents with mental or behavioral health conditions (e.g., psychiatric disorders, cognitive disabilities)

		City vs. Suburb		Chicago Area Type		
	Total (A)	**City (B)**	**Suburbs (C)**	**City of Chicago (D)**	**Cook County Suburb**	**Non-Cook County Suburb (F)**
Total	1,001	332	669	332	262	406
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	299	702	299	296	406
Concerned (Net)	867	287	580	287	233	347
Very concerned	447	155	292	155	140	151
Somewhat concerned	420	132	289	132	93	196
Not concerned (Net)	134	46	88	46	29	59
Not very concerned	121	41	79	41	23	56
Not at all concerned	13	4	9	4	6	3

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Q3aNEW: My trust in the police

		City vs. Suburb		Chicago Area Type		
	Total (A)	**City (B)**	**Suburbs (C)**	**City of Chicago (D)**	**Cook County Suburb**	**Non-Cook County Suburb (F)**
Total	1,001	332	669	332	262	406
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	299	702	299	296	406
Do not trust at all	49	29	20	29	10	9
1	47	20	27	20	10	16
2	46	18	28	18	9	19
3	52	16	36	16	19	16
4	51	20	32	20	16	15
5	94	30	63	30	25	39
6	127	48	80	48	35	45
7	157	62	95	62	33	62
8	187	48	139	48	44	95
9	85	16	69	16	25	44
Completely trust	106	25	80	25	35	45

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Q3bNEW: Safety level in my neighborhood

		City vs. Suburb		Chicago Area Type		
	Total (A)	**City (B)**	**Suburbs (C)**	**City of Chicago (D)**	**Cook County Suburb**	**Non-Cook County Suburb (F)**
Total	1,001	332	669	332	262	406
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	299	702	299	296	406
Not at all safe	10	5	5	5	0	5
1	17	14	3	14	1	3
2	17	12	5	12	3	2
3	27	16	11	16	4	7
4	65	34	32	34	17	15
5	98	43	54	43	25	29
6	104	48	56	48	26	30
7	166	69	97	69	49	48
8	208	50	158	50	65	93
9	182	20	162	20	44	118
Completely safe	106	21	84	21	27	57

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Q3cNEW: How respectful police are to me

		City vs. Suburb		Chicago Area Type		
	Total (A)	**City (B)**	**Suburbs (C)**	**City of Chicago (D)**	**Cook County Suburb**	**Non-Cook County Suburb (F)**
Total	1,001	332	669	332	262	406
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	299	702	299	296	406
Not at all respectful	21	11	10	11	4	6
1	15	8	7	8	4	3
2	19	5	14	5	10	4
3	29	21	8	21	2	6
4	51	21	30	21	17	13
5	101	36	65	36	22	43

6	107	43	64	43	27	36
7	136	49	86	49	35	52
8	180	57	124	57	48	75
9	146	25	122	25	42	80
Completely respectful	196	57	139	57	52	88

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Q4A: How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding local law enforcement?

Members of the Chicago Police Department are handling their job well.

		City vs. Suburb			Chicago Area Type	
	Total (A)	**City (B)**	**Suburbs (C)**	**City of Chicago (D)**	**Cook County Suburb**	**Non-Cook County Suburb (F)**
Total	1,001	332	669	332	262	406
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	299	702	299	296	406
Agree (Net)	619	188	431	188	163	268
Strongly agree	124	40	84	40	29	54
Somewhat agree	495	148	347	148	133	214
Disagree (Net)	382	144	238	144	100	138
Somewhat disagree	281	97	185	97	75	110
Strongly disagree	101	48	53	48	25	29

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

I would rather the Chicago police spend less time than they currently do in my neighborhood.

		City vs. Suburb			Chicago Area Type	
	Total (A)	**City (B)**	**Suburbs (C)**	**City of Chicago (D)**	**Cook County Suburb**	**Non-Cook County Suburb (F)**
Total	1,001	332	669	332	262	406
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	299	702	299	296	406
Agree (Net)	280	82	198	82	72	126
Strongly agree	93	31	62	31	23	40
Somewhat agree	187	51	135	51	49	86
Disagree (Net)	721	250	471	250	190	281
Somewhat disagree	419	134	285	134	110	175
Strongly disagree	302	116	186	116	81	106

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

If I were to have an interaction with the Chicago police in my area, I am confident that they would treat me with courtesy and respect.

		City vs. Suburb			Chicago Area Type	
	Total (A)	**City (B)**	**Suburbs (C)**	**City of Chicago (D)**	**Cook County Suburb**	**Non-Cook County Suburb (F)**
Total	1,001	332	669	332	262	406
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	299	702	299	296	406
Agree (Net)	752	238	515	238	200	315
Strongly agree	283	85	198	85	75	123
Somewhat agree	469	152	317	152	125	192
Disagree (Net)	249	95	154	95	62	91
Somewhat disagree	189	71	118	71	43	74
Strongly disagree	60	24	36	24	19	17

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

When I see a police officer in my neighborhood, I feel safer.

		City vs. Suburb			Chicago Area Type	
	Total (A)	**City (B)**	**Suburbs (C)**	**City of Chicago (D)**	**Cook County Suburb**	**Non-Cook County Suburb (F)**
Total	1,001	332	669	332	262	406
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	299	702	299	296	406
Agree (Net)	769	238	531	238	204	327
Strongly agree	317	90	227	90	88	138
Somewhat agree	452	148	304	148	116	189
Disagree (Net)	232	95	137	95	58	79
Somewhat disagree	162	61	101	61	40	61
Strongly disagree	70	34	37	34	18	19

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

I approve of the way that the Chicago Police Department handled the summer 2020 protests.

			City vs. Suburb				Chicago Area Type			
	Total (A)		**City (B)**		**Suburbs (C)**		**City of Chicago (D)**		**Cook County Suburb**		**Non-Cook County Suburb (F)**	
Total	0	**	0	**	0	**	0	**	0	**	0	**
Total (Unweighted)	0	**	0	**	0	**	0	**	0	**	0	**
Agree (Net)	0		0		0		0		0		0	
Strongly agree	0		0		0		0		0		0	
Somewhat agree	0		0		0		0		0		0	
Disagree (Net)	0		0		0		0		0		0	
Somewhat disagree	0		0		0		0		0		0	
Strongly disagree	0		0		0		0		0		0	

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

There is evidence of persistent racial bias in Chicago's policing practices.

		City vs. Suburb			Chicago Area Type	
	Total (A)	**City (B)**	**Suburbs (C)**	**City of Chicago (D)**	**Cook County Suburb**	**Non-Cook County Suburb (F)**
Total	1,001	332	669	332	262	406
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	299	702	299	296	406
Agree (Net)	651	242	409	242	174	235
Strongly agree	234	103	131	103	70	61
Somewhat agree	417	139	278	139	104	174
Disagree (Net)	350	91	260	91	88	172
Somewhat disagree	227	61	166	61	51	114
Strongly disagree	124	30	94	30	37	57

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Major reforms are needed within the Chicago Police Department regarding treatment of Black and Latino people.

		City vs. Suburb			Chicago Area Type	
	Total (A)	**City (B)**	**Suburbs (C)**	**City of Chicago (D)**	**Cook County Suburb**	**Non-Cook County Suburb (F)**

Total	1,001	332	669	332	262	406
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	299	702	299	296	406
Agree (Net)	710	256	455	256	183	271
Strongly agree	313	131	182	131	92	91
Somewhat agree	397	125	272	125	92	181
Disagree (Net)	291	77	214	77	79	135
Somewhat disagree	185	46	139	46	51	87
Strongly disagree	106	30	75	30	27	48

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

The Chicago Police Department is doing enough to address gun violence in the city.

		City vs. Suburb			Chicago Area Type	
	Total (A)	**City (B)**	**Suburbs (C)**	**City of Chicago (D)**	**Cook County Suburb**	**Non-Cook County Suburb (F)**
Total	1,001	332	669	332	262	406
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	299	702	299	296	406
Agree (Net)	288	107	181	107	57	124
Strongly agree	57	30	27	30	12	15
Somewhat agree	231	77	154	77	44	110
Disagree (Net)	713	225	488	225	206	282
Somewhat disagree	354	115	240	115	90	150
Strongly disagree	358	111	248	111	116	132

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Q4B: How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding local law enforcement?

Chicago police have been effective at reducing or preventing crime in my neighborhood.

		City vs. Suburb			Chicago Area Type	
	Total (A)	**City (B)**	**Suburbs (C)**	**City of Chicago (D)**	**Cook County Suburb**	**Non-Cook County Suburb (F)**
Total	1,001	332	669	332	262	406
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	299	702	299	296	406
Agree (Net)	562	183	379	183	141	238
Strongly agree	109	46	63	46	22	41
Somewhat agree	453	137	316	137	119	197
Disagree (Net)	439	150	290	150	121	169
Somewhat disagree	310	100	211	100	86	125
Strongly disagree	129	50	79	50	35	44

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

I have confidence in the Chicago Police Department to act fairly and without bias.

		City vs. Suburb			Chicago Area Type	
	Total (A)	**City (B)**	**Suburbs (C)**	**City of Chicago (D)**	**Cook County Suburb**	**Non-Cook County Suburb (F)**
Total	1,001	332	669	332	262	406
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	299	702	299	296	406
Agree (Net)	520	147	373	147	137	236
Strongly agree	123	38	85	38	32	53
Somewhat agree	397	109	288	109	105	182
Disagree (Net)	481	185	296	185	125	171
Somewhat disagree	319	111	208	111	83	125
Strongly disagree	162	74	88	74	42	46

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Chicago police are often able to solve crimes that occur in the city.

		City vs. Suburb			Chicago Area Type	
	Total (A)	**City (B)**	**Suburbs (C)**	**City of Chicago (D)**	**Cook County Suburb**	**Non-Cook County Suburb (F)**
Total	1,001	332	669	332	262	406
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	299	702	299	296	406
Agree (Net)	535	162	372	162	143	230
Strongly agree	92	37	55	37	19	36
Somewhat agree	443	126	317	126	123	194
Disagree (Net)	466	170	296	170	119	177
Somewhat disagree	336	113	224	113	88	136
Strongly disagree	130	57	73	57	31	41

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

The Chicago Police Department has the support of most city residents.

		City vs. Suburb			Chicago Area Type	
	Total (A)	**City (B)**	**Suburbs (C)**	**City of Chicago (D)**	**Cook County Suburb**	**Non-Cook County Suburb (F)**
Total	1,001	332	669	332	262	406
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	299	702	299	296	406
Agree (Net)	558	174	384	174	143	241
Strongly agree	107	37	70	37	34	36
Somewhat agree	451	136	315	136	110	205
Disagree (Net)	443	159	284	159	119	165
Somewhat disagree	331	114	218	114	92	125
Strongly disagree	112	45	67	45	27	40

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

The Chicago Police Department has the support of most BIPOC (i.e., Black, Indigenous, and People of Color) residents.

		City vs. Suburb			Chicago Area Type	
	Total (A)	**City (B)**	**Suburbs (C)**	**City of Chicago (D)**	**Cook County Suburb**	**Non-Cook County Suburb (F)**
Total	1,001	332	669	332	262	406
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	299	702	299	296	406
Agree (Net)	329	107	222	107	83	139
Strongly agree	73	25	48	25	17	31
Somewhat agree	256	82	174	82	66	108
Disagree (Net)	672	225	447	225	179	268
Somewhat disagree	417	144	273	144	100	172
Strongly disagree	255	81	174	81	79	95

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Chicago police should be brought in to handle situations regarding mental health patients and the homeless.

		City vs. Suburb		Chicago Area Type	
	Total (A)	**City (B)**	**Suburbs (C)**	**City of Chicago (D)**	**Cook County Suburb**	**Non-Cook County Suburb (F)**
Total	1,001	332	669	332	262	406
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	299	702	299	296	406
Agree (Net)	509	174	335	174	126	209
Strongly agree	142	52	90	52	43	47
Somewhat agree	367	122	245	122	84	162
Disagree (Net)	492	158	334	158	136	197
Somewhat disagree	309	95	214	95	84	130
Strongly disagree	183	63	119	63	52	68

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Increased police presence is necessary for reducing gun violence in the city.

		City vs. Suburb		Chicago Area Type	
	Total (A)	**City (B)**	**Suburbs (C)**	**City of Chicago (D)**	**Cook County Suburb**	**Non-Cook County Suburb (F)**
Total	1,001	332	669	332	262	406
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	299	702	299	296	406
Agree (Net)	806	262	544	262	206	338
Strongly agree	420	147	273	147	108	165
Somewhat agree	386	115	271	115	98	173
Disagree (Net)	195	70	125	70	56	68
Somewhat disagree	134	47	87	47	38	49
Strongly disagree	61	23	38	23	19	19

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

There should be more funding for non-policing alternatives (e.g., social worker dispatches, neighborhood patrols, restorative justice circles).

		City vs. Suburb		Chicago Area Type	
	Total (A)	**City (B)**	**Suburbs (C)**	**City of Chicago (D)**	**Cook County Suburb**	**Non-Cook County Suburb (F)**
Total	1,001	332	669	332	262	406
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	299	702	299	296	406
Agree (Net)	731	240	491	240	199	292
Strongly agree	316	116	200	116	94	105
Somewhat agree	415	124	291	124	105	186
Disagree (Net)	270	92	178	92	63	115
Somewhat disagree	174	60	115	60	36	78
Strongly disagree	96	33	63	33	27	36

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

The current level of funding for the Chicago Police Department is too high.

		City vs. Suburb		Chicago Area Type	
	Total (A)	**City (B)**	**Suburbs (C)**	**City of Chicago (D)**	**Cook County Suburb**	**Non-Cook County Suburb (F)**
Total	1,001	332	669	332	262	406
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	299	702	299	296	406
Agree (Net)	398	152	246	152	96	150
Strongly agree	124	66	58	66	29	29
Somewhat agree	274	86	188	86	67	121
Disagree (Net)	603	180	423	180	167	256
Somewhat disagree	366	113	253	113	103	150
Strongly disagree	237	67	170	67	64	106

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Q5a: Are any of the following statements true for you?

I have had a negative experience with a member of the Chicago Police Department.

		City vs. Suburb		Chicago Area Type	
	Total (A)	**City (B)**	**Suburbs (C)**	**City of Chicago (D)**	**Cook County Suburb**	**Non-Cook County Suburb (F)**
Total	1,001	332	669	332	262	406
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	299	702	299	296	406
Yes	234	113	121	113	53	68
No	767	219	548	219	209	339

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

I have been racially profiled in at least one interaction with police officers in Chicago.

		City vs. Suburb		Chicago Area Type	
	Total (A)	**City (B)**	**Suburbs (C)**	**City of Chicago (D)**	**Cook County Suburb**	**Non-Cook County Suburb (F)**
Total	1,001	332	669	332	262	406
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	299	702	299	296	406
Yes	173	95	79	95	45	34
No	828	238	590	238	217	373

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

If I were to report police misconduct to the Chicago Police Department, I believe I would receive retaliation from officers for filing a complaint.

		City vs. Suburb		Chicago Area Type	
	Total (A)	**City (B)**	**Suburbs (C)**	**City of Chicago (D)**	**Cook County Suburb**	**Non-Cook County Suburb (F)**
Total	1,001	332	669	332	262	406
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	299	702	299	296	406
Yes	389	152	237	152	100	137
No	612	180	432	180	162	270

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

I have been afraid to report police misconduct to the Chicago Police Department because I believed I would receive retaliation from officers.

		City vs. Suburb		Chicago Area Type	
	Total (A)	**City (B)**	**Suburbs (C)**	**City of Chicago (D)**	**Cook County Suburb**	**Non-Cook County Suburb (F)**
Total	1,001	332	669	332	262	406
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	299	702	299	296	406
Yes	226	101	124	101	52	72
No	775	231	544	231	210	335

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Growing up, I was taught that the police were a friend to me and my community.

		City vs. Suburb		Chicago Area Type		
	Total (A)	**City (B)**	**Suburbs (C)**	**City of Chicago (D)**	**Cook County Suburb**	**Non-Cook County Suburb (F)**
Total	1,001	332	669	332	262	406
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	299	702	299	296	406
Yes	841	254	587	254	228	359
No	160	78	82	78	34	48

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

As an adult, I feel that the police are a friend to me and my community.

		City vs. Suburb		Chicago Area Type		
	Total (A)	**City (B)**	**Suburbs (C)**	**City of Chicago (D)**	**Cook County Suburb**	**Non-Cook County Suburb (F)**
Total	1,001	332	669	332	262	406
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	299	702	299	296	406
Yes	680	195	485	195	188	297
No	321	137	184	137	74	109

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

I have a friend of family member who works for the Chicago Police Department.

		City vs. Suburb		Chicago Area Type		
	Total (A)	**City (B)**	**Suburbs (C)**	**City of Chicago (D)**	**Cook County Suburb**	**Non-Cook County Suburb (F)**
Total	1,001	332	669	332	262	406
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	299	702	299	296	406
Yes	264	108	156	108	65	91
No	737	225	512	225	197	316

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

I have felt the need to intervene or observe the interactions between a Chicago police officer and a resident.

		City vs. Suburb		Chicago Area Type		
	Total (A)	**City (B)**	**Suburbs (C)**	**City of Chicago (D)**	**Cook County Suburb**	**Non-Cook County Suburb (F)**
Total	1,001	332	669	332	262	406
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	299	702	299	296	406
Yes	209	87	121	87	45	76
No	792	245	547	245	217	330

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Q12: In an effort to support essential social services that are often underfunded - such as housing, education, employment, mental health care, and youth services - there have been proposals to reduce police department budgets and redistribute those funds towards these essential social services. How much do you support or oppose such proposals?

		City vs. Suburb		Chicago Area Type		
	Total (A)	**City (B)**	**Suburbs (C)**	**City of Chicago (D)**	**Cook County Suburb**	**Non-Cook County Suburb (F)**
Total	1,001	332	669	332	262	406
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	299	702	299	296	406
Support (Net)	565	204	361	204	137	224
Strongly support	229	88	141	88	64	77
Somewhat support	336	116	220	116	73	147
Oppose (Net)	436	129	307	129	125	183
Somewhat oppose	224	76	148	76	59	89
Strongly oppose	212	53	159	53	66	94

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Q6A: Where do you think reallocated funds from the police department should go?

		City vs. Suburb		Chicago Area Type		
	Total (A)	**City (B)**	**Suburbs (C)**	**City of Chicago (D)**	**Cook County Suburb**	**Non-Cook County Suburb (F)**
Total	565	204	361	204	137	224
Total (Unweighted)	560	188	372	188	159	213
Mental health care programs	363	124	239	124	93	146
Homeless services and shelters	334	127	208	127	88	120
Gun violence prevention	320	109	211	109	87	124
Youth services (e.g., community centers, mentorship programs, after-school programs)	291	101	191	101	80	111
Affordable housing services	269	108	161	108	78	83
Hiring/integrating social workers into police forces to handle situations where police may not be needed	266	91	175	91	73	102
Local education/schools	240	93	147	93	49	98
Local healthcare services	222	80	142	80	54	88
Substance abuse services	220	70	150	70	71	80
People returning to their communities from jail or prison (e.g., social/family reintegration, expungement, healthcare assistance)	203	78	125	78	61	64
Unemployment/Re-employment services	176	71	105	71	46	58
Other (please specify):	9	1	8	1	0	8
Not at all sure	15	5	10	5	6	4

* Table Base: SUPPORTS POLICE BUDGET REALLOCATION

Q6B: Which of the following should have the highest priority for reallocated funds from the police department?

		City vs. Suburb		Chicago Area Type		
	Total (A)	**City (B)**	**Suburbs (C)**	**City of Chicago (D)**	**Cook County Suburb**	**Non-Cook County Suburb (F)**
Total	545	198	346	198	132	214
Total (Unweighted)	541	182	359	182	153	206
Gun violence prevention	169	61	108	61	46	62
Hiring/integrating social workers into police forces to handle situations where police may not be needed	68	20	48	20	20	28
Youth services (e.g., community centers, mentorship programs, after-school programs)	59	27	31	27	11	20

Mental health care programs	58	18	40	18	15	24
Homeless services and shelters	53	17	36	17	10	26
Affordable housing services	46	24	23	24	10	12
Local education/schools	35	12	22	12	5	18
Unemployment/Re-employment services	25	10	15	10	7	8
Local healthcare services	15	4	11	4	2	9
Substance abuse services	8	1	8	1	1	6
People returning to their communities from jail or prison (e.g., social/family reintegration, expungement, healthcare assistance)	8	3	5	3	4	1

* Table Base: THINK POLICE BUDGET FUNDS SHOULD BE REALLOCATED TO AT LEAST ONE LISTED SERVICE

Q7: How likely do you think it is that the following situations will happen as a result of reallocating funds from the police department to underfunded social services?

Reallocating police department funds will lead to fewer officers in my neighborhood.

		City vs. Suburb			Chicago Area Type	
	Total (A)	**City (B)**	**Suburbs (C)**	**City of Chicago (D)**	**Cook County Suburb**	**Non-Cook County Suburb (F)**
Total	1,001	332	669	332	262	406
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	299	702	299	296	406
Likely (Net)	680	239	441	239	183	258
Very likely	267	94	174	94	75	99
Somewhat likely	413	145	268	145	108	160
Not likely (Net)	321	94	227	94	79	148
Not very likely	263	77	185	77	65	121
Not at all likely	58	16	42	16	15	27

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Reallocating police department funds will mean more funding for social services that can improve issues such as mental health, addiction, and homelessness.

		City vs. Suburb			Chicago Area Type	
	Total (A)	**City (B)**	**Suburbs (C)**	**City of Chicago (D)**	**Cook County Suburb**	**Non-Cook County Suburb (F)**
Total	1,001	332	669	332	262	406
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	299	702	299	296	406
Likely (Net)	622	221	400	221	152	249
Very likely	196	87	109	87	54	56
Somewhat likely	426	135	291	135	98	193
Not likely (Net)	379	111	268	111	111	158
Not very likely	276	89	187	89	81	106
Not at all likely	103	22	81	22	30	52

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Reallocating police department funds will lead to an increase in crime in my neighborhood.

		City vs. Suburb			Chicago Area Type	
	Total (A)	**City (B)**	**Suburbs (C)**	**City of Chicago (D)**	**Cook County Suburb**	**Non-Cook County Suburb (F)**
Total	1,001	332	669	332	262	406
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	299	702	299	296	406
Likely (Net)	548	184	364	184	152	212
Very likely	230	68	162	68	74	88
Somewhat likely	318	116	202	116	78	124
Not likely (Net)	453	149	305	149	110	195
Not very likely	331	111	220	111	79	141
Not at all likely	123	37	85	37	31	54

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Reallocating police department funds will start a real dialogue about the changes needed for policing in Chicago.

		City vs. Suburb			Chicago Area Type	
	Total (A)	**City (B)**	**Suburbs (C)**	**City of Chicago (D)**	**Cook County Suburb**	**Non-Cook County Suburb (F)**
Total	1,001	332	669	332	262	406
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	299	702	299	296	406
Likely (Net)	582	230	352	230	133	219
Very likely	173	74	98	74	52	47
Somewhat likely	409	156	253	156	81	172
Not likely (Net)	419	103	317	103	130	187
Not very likely	264	66	198	66	88	109
Not at all likely	155	37	119	37	41	78

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Reallocating police department funds will only benefit communities of color.

		City vs. Suburb			Chicago Area Type	
	Total (A)	**City (B)**	**Suburbs (C)**	**City of Chicago (D)**	**Cook County Suburb**	**Non-Cook County Suburb (F)**
Total	1,001	332	669	332	262	406
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	299	702	299	296	406
Likely (Net)	396	140	256	140	103	153
Very likely	83	32	51	32	27	25
Somewhat likely	313	108	205	108	77	128
Not likely (Net)	605	192	412	192	159	254
Not very likely	379	123	256	123	95	161
Not at all likely	226	69	156	69	64	93

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Reallocating police department funds will not contribute to repairing the relationship between the police and Chicago residents.

		City vs. Suburb			Chicago Area Type	
	Total (A)	**City (B)**	**Suburbs (C)**	**City of Chicago (D)**	**Cook County Suburb**	**Non-Cook County Suburb (F)**
Total	1,001	332	669	332	262	406
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	299	702	299	296	406
Likely (Net)	606	180	426	180	164	262
Very likely	241	77	163	77	67	96
Somewhat likely	365	103	262	103	96	166
Not likely (Net)	395	152	243	152	99	144
Not very likely	274	103	172	103	70	101

Not at all likely	121	50	71	50	28	43

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Q6: Perhaps you have heard of the campaign "Defund the Police," which refers to the movement to reduce police department budgets and redistribute those funds towards essential social services that are often underfunded, such as housing, education, employment, mental health care, and youth services. Given this understanding, how much do you support or oppose this campai

		City vs. Suburb		Chicago Area Type		
	Total (A)	**City (B)**	**Suburbs (C)**	**City of Chicago (D)**	**Cook County Suburb**	**Non-Cook County Suburb (F)**
Total	1,001	332	669	332	262	406
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	299	702	299	296	406
Support (Net)	463	174	289	174	116	173
Strongly support	162	64	98	64	49	49
Somewhat support	301	110	191	110	67	124
Oppose (Net)	538	158	380	158	146	233
Somewhat oppose	208	74	134	74	49	85
Strongly oppose	330	84	245	84	97	148

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Q9: What would reform of Chicago law enforcement look like to you?

		City vs. Suburb		Chicago Area Type		
	Total (A)	**City (B)**	**Suburbs (C)**	**City of Chicago (D)**	**Cook County Suburb**	**Non-Cook County Suburb (F)**
Total	743	256	487	256	196	291
Total (Unweighted)	754	237	517	237	226	291
Sensitivity training for all officers	416	157	259	157	114	145
De-escalation training for all officers	388	134	254	134	114	140
Race-focused training for all officers	376	139	237	139	95	142
New policies on gun use	373	130	243	130	99	144
Introduction of social workers onto police force	372	126	247	126	112	135
Bias training for all officers	368	120	247	120	109	138
Increased racial and ethnic diversity within the department	311	110	201	110	82	119
Stricter rules and regulations from the Chicago Police Board (the disciplinary body for Chicago police officers)	302	107	196	107	91	105
Greater reliance on non-lethal weapons	294	106	189	106	79	110
More stringent recruiting requirements	267	99	168	99	73	95
Civilian oversight committee	241	82	159	82	70	90
Completely new leadership	211	66	145	66	66	79
Reduced funding for the police department	168	70	98	70	39	59
Consent decree (i.e., a court order that establishes an enforceable plan for reform)	143	62	81	62	39	43
Other (please specify):	30	6	24	6	2	22
Not at all sure	39	6	33	6	15	18

* Table Base: AGREE CHICAGO LAW ENFORCEMENT NEEDS REFORM

Q9A: How would you rate the training of Chicago police officers on each of the following?

Racial and cultural awareness

		City vs. Suburb		Chicago Area Type		
	Total (A)	**City (B)**	**Suburbs (C)**	**City of Chicago (D)**	**Cook County Suburb**	**Non-Cook County Suburb (F)**
Total	1,001	332	669	332	262	406
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	299	702	299	296	406
Excellent	78	22	57	22	16	40
Good	211	67	144	67	52	92
Fair	259	68	191	68	72	119
Poor	213	85	129	85	58	71
Terrible	85	43	41	43	17	24
I don't think CPD officers have been trained for this at all	80	36	45	36	19	25
Not at all sure	74	11	63	11	28	35

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Bias awareness

		City vs. Suburb		Chicago Area Type		
	Total (A)	**City (B)**	**Suburbs (C)**	**City of Chicago (D)**	**Cook County Suburb**	**Non-Cook County Suburb (F)**
Total	1,001	332	669	332	262	406
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	299	702	299	296	406
Excellent	63	23	40	23	13	27
Good	200	66	133	66	40	93
Fair	260	67	194	67	75	119
Poor	207	78	130	78	56	74
Terrible	79	38	41	38	16	24
I don't think CPD officers have been trained for this at all	100	44	56	44	28	28
Not at all sure	92	16	75	16	34	41

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Sensitivity toward those of a different gender, religion, age, orientation, income, etc.

		City vs. Suburb		Chicago Area Type		
	Total (A)	**City (B)**	**Suburbs (C)**	**City of Chicago (D)**	**Cook County Suburb**	**Non-Cook County Suburb (F)**
Total	1,001	332	669	332	262	406
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	299	702	299	296	406
Excellent	81	20	61	20	14	46
Good	191	57	135	57	49	86
Fair	275	90	185	90	76	110
Poor	193	73	120	73	52	68
Terrible	94	42	52	42	20	32

I don't think CPD officers have been trained for this at all	84	37	47	37	25	22
Not at all sure	83	15	69	15	27	42

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

De-escalating tense or dangerous situations

		City vs. Suburb		Chicago Area Type		
	Total (A)	**City (B)**	**Suburbs (C)**	**City of Chicago (D)**	**Cook County Suburb**	**Non-Cook County Suburb (F)**
Total	1,001	332	669	332	262	406
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	299	702	299	296	406
Excellent	92	26	66	26	13	53
Good	230	60	170	60	64	107
Fair	267	87	180	87	75	105
Poor	197	80	118	80	48	69
Terrible	84	40	44	40	21	23
I don't think CPD officers have been trained for this at all	55	28	27	28	16	11
Not at all sure	75	11	63	11	25	38

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Prioritizing non-lethal actions or weapons when dealing with individuals

		City vs. Suburb		Chicago Area Type		
	Total (A)	**City (B)**	**Suburbs (C)**	**City of Chicago (D)**	**Cook County Suburb**	**Non-Cook County Suburb (F)**
Total	1,001	332	669	332	262	406
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	299	702	299	296	406
Excellent	88	24	64	24	17	47
Good	204	71	133	71	42	90
Fair	295	101	194	101	77	117
Poor	164	59	105	59	48	56
Terrible	100	39	61	39	32	28
I don't think CPD officers have been trained for this at all	60	25	35	25	13	22
Not at all sure	90	13	77	13	32	45

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Responding to situations involving mental or behavioral health concerns

		City vs. Suburb		Chicago Area Type		
	Total (A)	**City (B)**	**Suburbs (C)**	**City of Chicago (D)**	**Cook County Suburb**	**Non-Cook County Suburb (F)**
Total	1,001	332	669	332	262	406
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	299	702	299	296	406
Excellent	57	13	44	13	12	32
Good	163	46	117	46	37	80
Fair	224	61	162	61	64	98
Poor	252	98	154	98	61	93
Terrible	113	45	68	45	38	30
I don't think CPD officers have been trained for this at all	102	52	50	52	23	27
Not at all sure	89	16	73	16	27	46

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Responding to situations involving family safety concerns (e.g., domestic abuse, child endangerment)

		City vs. Suburb		Chicago Area Type		
	Total (A)	**City (B)**	**Suburbs (C)**	**City of Chicago (D)**	**Cook County Suburb**	**Non-Cook County Suburb (F)**
Total	1,001	332	669	332	262	406
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	299	702	299	296	406
Excellent	102	37	65	37	23	42
Good	290	83	207	83	65	142
Fair	285	90	194	90	94	100
Poor	133	49	84	49	38	46
Terrible	62	32	30	32	10	21
I don't think CPD officers have been trained for this at all	57	25	31	25	8	24
Not at all sure	73	16	57	16	25	32

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Responding to situations involving personal safety concerns (e.g., stalking, harassment, physical fights)

		City vs. Suburb		Chicago Area Type		
	Total (A)	**City (B)**	**Suburbs (C)**	**City of Chicago (D)**	**Cook County Suburb**	**Non-Cook County Suburb (F)**
Total	1,001	332	669	332	262	406
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	299	702	299	296	406
Excellent	107	26	81	26	20	61
Good	272	90	183	90	66	116
Fair	278	83	195	83	88	107
Poor	154	58	96	58	41	56
Terrible	61	33	28	33	11	17
I don't think CPD officers have been trained for this at all	47	27	20	27	8	12
Not at all sure	82	16	67	16	29	38

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Q10: Which of the following do you think are effective policies for reducing gun violence in Chicago?

		City vs. Suburb		Chicago Area Type		
	Total (A)	**City (B)**	**Suburbs (C)**	**City of Chicago (D)**	**Cook County Suburb**	**Non-Cook County Suburb (F)**
Total	950	311	639	311	250	389
Total (Unweighted)	945	281	664	281	278	386
Background checks for all gun sales	619	213	406	213	167	239
Higher penalties for gun-related crimes	607	197	409	197	149	260
Increased police presence in neighborhoods with high gun violence	550	184	367	184	139	227

Increase the police's community involvement with residents in neighborhoods with high gun violence	510	175	335	175	123	212
Red flag laws/Extreme risk protection orders (i.e., police can remove or block an individual's access to firearms if they believe the weapons will be used for harm)	472	156	316	156	135	181
Neighborhood initiatives (e.g., neighborhood watch, community clubs, resident oversight communities)	456	161	295	161	117	178
Youth services and after-school programs	452	139	313	139	122	191
Police follow-up after gun violence situations	437	147	290	147	111	179
Support resources for residents with mental or behavioral health conditions (e.g., counseling services, social workers, housing services)	427	155	271	155	110	162
In-school youth programs	405	137	267	137	104	164
Buy-back of certain firearms (e.g., semi-automatic assault weapons)	318	114	204	114	89	115
Other (please specify):	43	8	35	8	14	21
Not at all sure	35	5	30	5	12	18

* Table Base: AGREE GUN VIOLENCE NEEDS TO BE REDUCED IN CHICAGO

Q13A: Which do you think best describes the level of involvement that the Chicago Police department should have in each of the following situations?

Truancy (i.e., a student's repeated unexcused absence from school)

		City vs. Suburb		Chicago Area Type		
	Total (A)	**City (B)**	**Suburbs (C)**	**City of Chicago (D)**	**Cook County Suburb**	**Non-Cook County Suburb (F)**
Total	1,001	332	669	332	262	406
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	299	702	299	296	406
Sole responsibility - CPD should respond independently unless another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) is specifically requested	89	41	48	41	22	26
Primary responsibility - CPD should take the lead, but another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should be present	93	32	61	32	25	37
Shared responsibility - CPD should respond to the call alongside another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works)	258	70	188	70	63	125
Limited responsibility - another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should take the lead, but CPD should be present	213	70	143	70	47	96
No responsibility - another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should respond independently unless CPD is specifically requested	265	93	173	93	77	95
N/A - this issue should be handled without a response team(s) (e.g., between residents, involving a private organization)	82	26	56	26	28	28

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Medical emergency (e.g., heart attack, allergic reaction, overdose)

		City vs. Suburb		Chicago Area Type		
	Total (A)	**City (B)**	**Suburbs (C)**	**City of Chicago (D)**	**Cook County Suburb**	**Non-Cook County Suburb (F)**
Total	1,001	332	669	332	262	406
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	299	702	299	296	406
Sole responsibility - CPD should respond independently unless another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) is specifically requested	109	42	67	42	24	43
Primary responsibility - CPD should take the lead, but another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should be present	135	57	77	57	26	52
Shared responsibility - CPD should respond to the call alongside another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works)	345	89	256	89	103	153
Limited responsibility - another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should take the lead, but CPD should be present	237	84	153	84	59	94
No responsibility - another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should respond independently unless CPD is specifically requested	156	55	101	55	44	58
N/A - this issue should be handled without a response team(s) (e.g., between residents, involving a private organization)	20	6	14	6	7	7

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Drug-related issue (e.g., intoxication, addiction, possession of an illicit substance)

		City vs. Suburb		Chicago Area Type		
	Total (A)	**City (B)**	**Suburbs (C)**	**City of Chicago (D)**	**Cook County Suburb**	**Non-Cook County Suburb (F)**
Total	1,001	332	669	332	262	406
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	299	702	299	296	406
Sole responsibility - CPD should respond independently unless another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) is specifically requested	207	79	128	79	52	76
Primary responsibility - CPD should take the lead, but another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should be present	281	85	196	85	68	128
Shared responsibility - CPD should respond to the call alongside another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works)	358	115	244	115	98	146

Limited responsibility - another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should take the lead, but CPD should be present	110	39	71	39	28	44
No responsibility - another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should respond independently unless CPD is specifically requested	32	13	19	13	9	10
N/A - this issue should be handled without a response team(s) (e.g., between residents, involving a private organization)	13	2	11	2	8	3

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Mental or behavioral health concern (e.g., suicidal tendency, unstable behavior)

			City vs. Suburb		Chicago Area Type	
	Total (A)	**City (B)**	**Suburbs (C)**	**City of Chicago (D)**	**Cook County Suburb**	**Non-Cook County Suburb (F)**
Total	1,001	332	669	332	262	406
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	299	702	299	296	406
Sole responsibility - CPD should respond independently unless another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) is specifically requested	87	38	49	38	17	32
Primary responsibility - CPD should take the lead, but another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should be present	134	53	81	53	27	54
Shared responsibility - CPD should respond to the call alongside another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works)	418	118	300	118	112	188
Limited responsibility - another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should take the lead, but CPD should be present	265	97	168	97	75	93
No responsibility - another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should respond independently unless CPD is specifically requested	76	22	55	22	19	36
N/A - this issue should be handled without a response team(s) (e.g., between residents, involving a private organization)	21	5	16	5	12	5

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Domestic dispute (e.g., suspected abuse, child endangerment)

			City vs. Suburb		Chicago Area Type	
	Total (A)	**City (B)**	**Suburbs (C)**	**City of Chicago (D)**	**Cook County Suburb**	**Non-Cook County Suburb (F)**
Total	1,001	332	669	332	262	406
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	299	702	299	296	406
Sole responsibility - CPD should respond independently unless another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) is specifically requested	242	101	141	101	53	88
Primary responsibility - CPD should take the lead, but another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should be present	347	113	234	113	89	145
Shared responsibility - CPD should respond to the call alongside another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works)	325	86	239	86	96	143
Limited responsibility - another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should take the lead, but CPD should be present	58	24	34	24	13	20
No responsibility - another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should respond independently unless CPD is specifically requested	10	4	6	4	2	4
N/A - this issue should be handled without a response team(s) (e.g., between residents, involving a private organization)	19	4	15	4	9	6

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Personal safety concern (e.g., physical fight, stalking, harassment)

			City vs. Suburb		Chicago Area Type	
	Total (A)	**City (B)**	**Suburbs (C)**	**City of Chicago (D)**	**Cook County Suburb**	**Non-Cook County Suburb (F)**
Total	1,001	332	669	332	262	406
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	299	702	299	296	406
Sole responsibility - CPD should respond independently unless another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) is specifically requested	373	146	228	146	88	140
Primary responsibility - CPD should take the lead, but another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should be present	315	90	226	90	83	143
Shared responsibility - CPD should respond to the call alongside another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works)	232	67	164	67	64	101
Limited responsibility - another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should take the lead, but CPD should be present	51	18	33	18	15	18
No responsibility - another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should respond independently unless CPD is specifically requested	15	8	7	8	5	1
N/A - this issue should be handled without a response team(s) (e.g., between residents, involving a private organization)	15	4	11	4	7	4

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Wellness check (i.e., requested in-person visit to verify a resident's personal well-being)

	City vs. Suburb	Chicago Area Type

	Total (A)	City (B)	Suburbs (C)	City of Chicago (D)	Cook County Suburb	Non-Cook County Suburb (F)
Total	1,001	332	669	332	262	406
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	299	702	299	296	406
Sole responsibility - CPD should respond independently unless another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) is specifically requested	148	65	83	65	37	46
Primary responsibility - CPD should take the lead, but another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should be present	175	52	123	52	41	83
Shared responsibility - CPD should respond to the call alongside another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works)	366	117	249	117	92	157
Limited responsibility - another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should take the lead, but CPD should be present	187	58	129	58	48	81
No responsibility - another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should respond independently unless CPD is specifically requested	103	32	71	32	35	36
N/A - this issue should be handled without a response team(s) (e.g., between residents, involving a private organization)	21	8	14	8	9	4

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Suspicious behavior (e.g., trespassing, loitering, unfamiliar vehicles)

		City vs. Suburb			Chicago Area Type	
	Total (A)	City (B)	Suburbs (C)	City of Chicago (D)	Cook County Suburb	Non-Cook County Suburb (F)
Total	1,001	332	669	332	262	406
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	299	702	299	296	406
Sole responsibility - CPD should respond independently unless another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) is specifically requested	440	158	282	158	111	171
Primary responsibility - CPD should take the lead, but another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should be present	270	80	190	80	81	109
Shared responsibility - CPD should respond to the call alongside another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works)	209	71	138	71	44	95
Limited responsibility - another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should take the lead, but CPD should be present	56	17	39	17	16	23
No responsibility - another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should respond independently unless CPD is specifically requested	7	2	5	2	1	4
N/A - this issue should be handled without a response team(s) (e.g., between residents, involving a private organization)	19	5	14	5	10	4

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Neighborhood concern (e.g., noise complaints, disorderly conduct)

		City vs. Suburb			Chicago Area Type	
	Total (A)	City (B)	Suburbs (C)	City of Chicago (D)	Cook County Suburb	Non-Cook County Suburb (F)
Total	1,001	332	669	332	262	406
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	299	702	299	296	406
Sole responsibility - CPD should respond independently unless another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) is specifically requested	337	118	219	118	83	136
Primary responsibility - CPD should take the lead, but another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should be present	277	99	177	99	77	101
Shared responsibility - CPD should respond to the call alongside another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works)	245	60	185	60	63	121
Limited responsibility - another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should take the lead, but CPD should be present	94	41	53	41	19	34
No responsibility - another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should respond independently unless CPD is specifically requested	28	10	18	10	9	9
N/A - this issue should be handled without a response team(s) (e.g., between residents, involving a private organization)	20	3	17	3	11	6

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Homelessness (e.g., tent locations, panhandling)

		City vs. Suburb			Chicago Area Type	
	Total (A)	City (B)	Suburbs (C)	City of Chicago (D)	Cook County Suburb	Non-Cook County Suburb (F)
Total	1,001	332	669	332	262	406
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	299	702	299	296	406
Sole responsibility - CPD should respond independently unless another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) is specifically requested	97	37	60	37	20	40
Primary responsibility - CPD should take the lead, but another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should be present	119	46	74	46	33	40
Shared responsibility - CPD should respond to the call alongside another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works)	377	105	272	105	95	178

Limited responsibility - another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should take the lead, but CPD should be present	245	93	151	93	64	88
No responsibility - another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should respond independently unless CPD is specifically requested	123	36	86	36	35	52
N/A - this issue should be handled without a response team(s) (e.g., between residents, involving a private organization)	40	15	25	15	16	9

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Q13B: Which group(s) should be involved in responding to each of the following situations?

Truancy (i.e., a student's repeated unexcused absence from school)

		City vs. Suburb			Chicago Area Type	
	Total (A)	**City (B)**	**Suburbs (C)**	**City of Chicago (D)**	**Cook County Suburb**	**Non-Cook County Suburb (F)**
Total	912	291	620	291	240	381
Total (Unweighted)	924	265	659	265	276	383
Non-police first responder (e.g., Chicago Fire Department, EMS)	81	36	45	36	14	31
Social services (e.g., mental health professional, social worker)	559	183	376	183	152	224
Branch(es) of local government (e.g., Department of Public Works, Department of Parks and Recreation)	124	37	87	37	35	52
Private organization(s) (e.g., insurance company, neighborhood watch, homeowner's association)	92	42	50	42	16	34
Residents	109	38	71	38	22	49
None of these	104	22	82	22	29	53

* Table Base: THINKS CPD SHOULD NOT HAVE SOLE RESPONSIBILITY FOR THIS SITUATION

Medical emergency (e.g., heart attack, allergic reaction, overdose)

		City vs. Suburb			Chicago Area Type	
	Total (A)	**City (B)**	**Suburbs (C)**	**City of Chicago (D)**	**Cook County Suburb**	**Non-Cook County Suburb (F)**
Total	892	291	602	291	239	363
Total (Unweighted)	912	265	647	265	272	375
Non-police first responder (e.g., Chicago Fire Department, EMS)	723	231	491	231	198	293
Social services (e.g., mental health professional, social worker)	126	40	86	40	39	47
Branch(es) of local government (e.g., Department of Public Works, Department of Parks and Recreation)	70	27	43	27	17	26
Private organization(s) (e.g., insurance company, neighborhood watch, homeowner's association)	44	13	31	13	13	18
Residents	41	16	25	16	6	19
None of these	30	12	18	12	5	14

* Table Base: THINKS CPD SHOULD NOT HAVE SOLE RESPONSIBILITY FOR THIS SITUATION

Drug-related issue (e.g., intoxication, addiction, possession of an illicit substance)

		City vs. Suburb			Chicago Area Type	
	Total (A)	**City (B)**	**Suburbs (C)**	**City of Chicago (D)**	**Cook County Suburb**	**Non-Cook County Suburb (F)**
Total	794	253	541	253	211	330
Total (Unweighted)	797	231	566	231	236	330
Non-police first responder (e.g., Chicago Fire Department, EMS)	338	112	226	112	89	137
Social services (e.g., mental health professional, social worker)	389	117	272	117	109	163
Branch(es) of local government (e.g., Department of Public Works, Department of Parks and Recreation)	95	35	59	35	19	40
Private organization(s) (e.g., insurance company, neighborhood watch, homeowner's association)	63	22	41	22	19	22
Residents	40	17	23	17	10	13
None of these	117	28	88	28	32	56

* Table Base: THINKS CPD SHOULD NOT HAVE SOLE RESPONSIBILITY FOR THIS SITUATION

Mental or behavioral health concern (e.g., suicidal tendency, unstable behavior)

		City vs. Suburb			Chicago Area Type	
	Total (A)	**City (B)**	**Suburbs (C)**	**City of Chicago (D)**	**Cook County Suburb**	**Non-Cook County Suburb (F)**
Total	914	294	620	294	245	375
Total (Unweighted)	929	273	656	273	275	381
Non-police first responder (e.g., Chicago Fire Department, EMS)	287	103	183	103	73	110
Social services (e.g., mental health professional, social worker)	716	212	504	212	201	302
Branch(es) of local government (e.g., Department of Public Works, Department of Parks and Recreation)	86	30	57	30	16	40
Private organization(s) (e.g., insurance company, neighborhood watch, homeowner's association)	78	31	47	31	22	25
Residents	60	23	36	23	11	26
None of these	23	4	19	4	4	15

* Table Base: THINKS CPD SHOULD NOT HAVE SOLE RESPONSIBILITY FOR THIS SITUATION

Domestic dispute (e.g., suspected abuse, child endangerment)

		City vs. Suburb			Chicago Area Type	
	Total (A)	**City (B)**	**Suburbs (C)**	**City of Chicago (D)**	**Cook County Suburb**	**Non-Cook County Suburb (F)**
Total	759	231	527	231	210	318
Total (Unweighted)	784	220	564	220	240	324

Non-police first responder (e.g., Chicago Fire Department, EMS)	179	55	124	55	54	70
Social services (e.g., mental health professional, social worker)	449	141	308	141	126	182
Branch(es) of local government (e.g., Department of Public Works, Department of Parks and Recreation)	87	26	61	26	26	34
Private organization(s) (e.g., insurance company, neighborhood watch, homeowner's association)	56	9	46	9	12	34
Residents	54	20	34	20	10	24
None of these	152	36	116	36	45	71

* Table Base: THINKS CPD SHOULD NOT HAVE SOLE RESPONSIBILITY FOR THIS SITUATION

Personal safety concern (e.g., physical fight, stalking, harassment)

		City vs. Suburb		Chicago Area Type		
	Total (A)	**City (B)**	**Suburbs (C)**	**City of Chicago (D)**	**Cook County Suburb**	**Non-Cook County Suburb (F)**
Total	628	187	441	187	174	267
Total (Unweighted)	630	176	454	176	198	256
Non-police first responder (e.g., Chicago Fire Department, EMS)	168	47	121	47	49	73
Social services (e.g., mental health professional, social worker)	179	57	122	57	46	77
Branch(es) of local government (e.g., Department of Public Works, Department of Parks and Recreation)	97	27	70	27	25	45
Private organization(s) (e.g., insurance company, neighborhood watch, homeowner's association)	77	36	41	36	14	27
Residents	82	37	45	37	16	29
None of these	200	50	149	50	63	86

* Table Base: THINKS CPD SHOULD NOT HAVE SOLE RESPONSIBILITY FOR THIS SITUATION

Wellness check (i.e., requested in-person visit to verify a resident's personal well-being)

		City vs. Suburb		Chicago Area Type		
	Total (A)	**City (B)**	**Suburbs (C)**	**City of Chicago (D)**	**Cook County Suburb**	**Non-Cook County Suburb (F)**
Total	853	267	586	267	225	360
Total (Unweighted)	871	251	620	251	253	367
Non-police first responder (e.g., Chicago Fire Department, EMS)	306	85	221	85	77	144
Social services (e.g., mental health professional, social worker)	515	152	363	152	153	211
Branch(es) of local government (e.g., Department of Public Works, Department of Parks and Recreation)	77	37	40	37	21	19
Private organization(s) (e.g., insurance company, neighborhood watch, homeowner's association)	98	35	63	35	26	37
Residents	119	54	66	54	22	44
None of these	41	7	34	7	11	23

* Table Base: THINKS CPD SHOULD NOT HAVE SOLE RESPONSIBILITY FOR THIS SITUATION

Suspicious behavior (e.g., trespassing, loitering, unfamiliar vehicles)

		City vs. Suburb		Chicago Area Type		
	Total (A)	**City (B)**	**Suburbs (C)**	**City of Chicago (D)**	**Cook County Suburb**	**Non-Cook County Suburb (F)**
Total	561	174	386	174	151	235
Total (Unweighted)	565	167	398	167	171	227
Non-police first responder (e.g., Chicago Fire Department, EMS)	116	42	74	42	27	47
Social services (e.g., mental health professional, social worker)	81	20	61	20	24	36
Branch(es) of local government (e.g., Department of Public Works, Department of Parks and Recreation)	100	44	56	44	15	41
Private organization(s) (e.g., insurance company, neighborhood watch, homeowner's association)	97	33	63	33	28	35
Residents	73	26	47	26	19	27
None of these	218	55	162	55	66	97

* Table Base: THINKS CPD SHOULD NOT HAVE SOLE RESPONSIBILITY FOR THIS SITUATION

Neighborhood concern (e.g., noise complaints, disorderly conduct)

		City vs. Suburb		Chicago Area Type		
	Total (A)	**City (B)**	**Suburbs (C)**	**City of Chicago (D)**	**Cook County Suburb**	**Non-Cook County Suburb (F)**
Total	664	214	450	214	179	271
Total (Unweighted)	667	202	465	202	200	265
Non-police first responder (e.g., Chicago Fire Departm	124	37	87	37	36	51
Social services (e.g., mental health professional, social	139	52	87	52	35	52
Branch(es) of local government (e.g., Department of P	122	43	78	43	26	52
Private organization(s) (e.g., insurance company, neigl	177	58	119	58	43	76
Residents	139	58	81	58	27	55
None of these	170	39	130	39	56	74

* Table Base: THINKS CPD SHOULD NOT HAVE SOLE RESPONSIBILITY FOR THIS SITUATION

Homelessness (e.g., tent locations, panhandling)

		City vs. Suburb		Chicago Area Type		
	Total (A)	**City (B)**	**Suburbs (C)**	**City of Chicago (D)**	**Cook County Suburb**	**Non-Cook County Suburb (F)**
Total	904	295	609	295	242	367
Total (Unweighted)	906	264	642	264	273	369
Non-police first responder (e.g., Chicago Fire Department, EMS)	148	48	100	48	41	59
Social services (e.g., mental health professional, social worker)	615	198	417	198	166	251

Branch(es) of local government (e.g., Department of Public Works, Department of Parks and Recreation)	182	65	117	65	48	70
Private organization(s) (e.g., insurance company, neighborhood watch, homeowner's association)	128	33	95	33	41	54
Residents	71	19	52	19	21	30
None of these	69	16	53	16	18	35

* Table Base: THINKS CPD SHOULD NOT HAVE SOLE RESPONSIBILITY FOR THIS SITUATION

ign?

MacArthur Foundation Chicagoan Opinions - Public Safety

Q1: Which of the following do you think is the most important problem in Chicago today?

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household	Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	**Less than $50,000 (B)**	**$50,000 - $74,999 (C)**	**$75,000 - $99,999 (D)**	**$100,000+ (E)**	**Less than HS (F)**	**Some college (G)**	**College grad+ (H)**	**Employed (I)**	**Not employed (J)**	**Yes (K)**	**No (L)**	**Married/Living with p**	**Not married (N)**	**1 HH member (O)**	**2+ HH members (P)**
Total	N=1001	N=414	N=181	N=124	N=283	N=35 *	N=598	N=368	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=300	N=701	N=483	N=518	N=222	N=779
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=418	N=216	N=132	N=235	N=27 **	N=538	N=436	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=265	N=736	N=486	N=515	N=232	N=769
Gun violence	57%	58%	56%	55%	55%	66%	59%	53%	0%	0%	52%	59%	58%	55%	58%	56%
Property taxes	11%	6%	10%	16% B	17% Bc	2%	8%	16% G	0%	0%	9%	12%	12%	10%	11%	11%
Economic inequality	6%	6%	4%	10% c	7%	0%	6%	7%	0%	0%	9% L	5%	8%	5%	6%	6%
Racial segregation across areas including education, housing, access to city services, etc.	5%	5%	4%	3%	6%	17% Gh	4%	6%	0%	0%	7%	4%	5%	5%	5%	5%
Lack of access to affordable housing	5%	7% E	6% E	5% e	1%	1%	6%	4%	0%	0%	7% I	4%	3%	7% M	5%	5%
Homelessness	4%	5%	4%	4%	2%	8%	4%	3%	0%	0%	5%	4%	3%	5%	2%	5%
Police treatment of Black and Latino people	3%	5% e	2%	2%	1%	6%	3%	2%	0%	0%	3%	3%	2%	4%	3%	3%
Lack of access to social services (e.g., income assistance, job training, food pantries)	3%	2%	3%	2%	3%	0%	2%	4%	0%	0%	3%	3%	3%	2%	3%	3%
Pension reform	2%	1%	2%	1%	3%	0%	1%	2%	0%	0%	1%	2%	2%	1%	3%	1%
Other (please specify):	4%	4%	6%	2%	5%	0%	5%	4%	0%	0%	3%	5%	4%	5%	5%	4%
N/A - Chicago does not have any serious problems.	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	1%	1%	0%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Q2: How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding the city of Chicago?

Race relations in Chicago are good right now.

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household	Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	**Less than $50,000 (B)**	**$50,000 - $74,999 (C)**	**$75,000 - $99,999 (D)**	**$100,000+ (E)**	**Less than HS (F)**	**Some college (G)**	**College grad+ (H)**	**Employed (I)**	**Not employed (J)**	**Yes (K)**	**No (L)**	**Married/Living with p**	**Not married (N)**	**1 HH member (O)**	**2+ HH members (P)**
Total	N=1001	N=414	N=181	N=124	N=283	N=35 *	N=598	N=368	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=300	N=701	N=483	N=518	N=222	N=779
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=418	N=216	N=132	N=235	N=27 **	N=538	N=436	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=265	N=736	N=486	N=515	N=232	N=769
Agree (Net)	22%	18%	20%	28% b	27% B	34% g	19%	27% G	0%	0%	26%	21%	27% N	18%	18%	23%
Strongly agree	4%	3%	4%	7% b	6% b	12% G	2%	7% G	0%	0%	7% L	3%	5%	4%	3%	5%
Somewhat agree	18%	16%	16%	22%	21%	23%	16%	20%	0%	0%	19%	18%	22% N	14%	16%	19%
Disagree (Net)	78%	82% dE	80%	72%	73%	66%	81% fH	73%	0%	0%	74%	79%	73%	82% M	82%	77%
Somewhat disagree	43%	45%	44%	42%	41%	37%	43%	43%	0%	0%	38%	45%	39%	47% m	45%	43%
Strongly disagree	34%	37%	36%	30%	32%	29%	38% H	30%	0%	0%	36%	34%	34%	35%	36%	34%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Compared to this time last year, race relations in Chicago have improved.

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household	Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	**Less than $50,000 (B)**	**$50,000 - $74,999 (C)**	**$75,000 - $99,999 (D)**	**$100,000+ (E)**	**Less than HS (F)**	**Some college (G)**	**College grad+ (H)**	**Employed (I)**	**Not employed (J)**	**Yes (K)**	**No (L)**	**Married/Living with p**	**Not married (N)**	**1 HH member (O)**	**2+ HH members (P)**
Total	N=1001	N=414	N=181	N=124	N=283	N=35 *	N=598	N=368	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=300	N=701	N=483	N=518	N=222	N=779
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=418	N=216	N=132	N=235	N=27 **	N=538	N=436	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=265	N=736	N=486	N=515	N=232	N=769
Agree (Net)	29%	23%	32% b	37% B	33% b	37%	27%	33%	0%	0%	30%	29%	30%	29%	24%	31%
Strongly agree	3%	2%	3%	5%	4%	5%	2%	5% g	0%	0%	5%	3%	3%	4%	2%	3%
Somewhat agree	26%	21%	29%	31% b	29%	33%	24%	28%	0%	0%	25%	26%	27%	25%	22%	27%
Disagree (Net)	71%	77% cDe	68%	63%	67%	63%	73%	67%	0%	0%	70%	71%	70%	71%	76%	69%
Somewhat disagree	42%	42%	39%	41%	44%	31%	41%	45%	0%	0%	37%	44%	44%	40%	47%	41%
Strongly disagree	29%	34% dE	29%	22%	24%	31%	32% H	23%	0%	0%	33%	27%	26%	31%	28%	29%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

There is a strong sense of community across Chicago.

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household	Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	**Less than $50,000 (B)**	**$50,000 - $74,999 (C)**	**$75,000 - $99,999 (D)**	**$100,000+ (E)**	**Less than HS (F)**	**Some college (G)**	**College grad+ (H)**	**Employed (I)**	**Not employed (J)**	**Yes (K)**	**No (L)**	**Married/Living with p**	**Not married (N)**	**1 HH member (O)**	**2+ HH members (P)**
Total	N=1001	N=414	N=181	N=124	N=283	N=35 *	N=598	N=368	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=300	N=701	N=483	N=518	N=222	N=779
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=418	N=216	N=132	N=235	N=27 **	N=538	N=436	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=265	N=736	N=486	N=515	N=232	N=769
Agree (Net)	48%	43%	49%	56% B	50%	44%	45%	52%	0%	0%	49%	47%	45%	50%	46%	48%
Strongly agree	10%	10% c	5%	14% C	13% C	10%	10%	10%	0%	0%	13%	9%	9%	12%	6%	11% o
Somewhat agree	37%	33%	45% B	42%	37%	34%	35%	42% g	0%	0%	36%	38%	36%	38%	40%	37%
Disagree (Net)	52%	57% D	51%	44%	50%	56%	55%	48%	0%	0%	51%	53%	55%	50%	54%	52%
Somewhat disagree	34%	35%	37%	29%	33%	41%	34%	33%	0%	0%	34%	34%	36%	32%	37%	33%
Strongly disagree	18%	23% C	13%	15%	17%	15%	21% h	15%	0%	0%	17%	19%	19%	18%	17%	19%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Mayor Lori Lightfoot has done a good job of investing in and supporting historically marginalized neighborhoods.

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household	Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	**Less than $50,000 (B)**	**$50,000 - $74,999 (C)**	**$75,000 - $99,999 (D)**	**$100,000+ (E)**	**Less than HS (F)**	**Some college (G)**	**College grad+ (H)**	**Employed (I)**	**Not employed (J)**	**Yes (K)**	**No (L)**	**Married/Living with p**	**Not married (N)**	**1 HH member (O)**	**2+ HH members (P)**
Total	N=1001	N=414	N=181	N=124	N=283	N=35 *	N=598	N=368	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=300	N=701	N=483	N=518	N=222	N=779
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=418	N=216	N=132	N=235	N=27 **	N=538	N=436	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=265	N=736	N=486	N=515	N=232	N=769
Agree (Net)	39%	36%	43%	34%	42%	36%	37%	41%	0%	0%	39%	38%	40%	38%	34%	40%
Strongly agree	6%	6%	8%	3%	6%	10%	6%	6%	0%	0%	8% I	5%	6%	6%	3%	7%
Somewhat agree	33%	30%	35%	31%	36%	25%	32%	35%	0%	0%	31%	34%	34%	32%	31%	33%
Disagree (Net)	61%	64%	57%	66%	58%	64%	63%	59%	0%	0%	61%	62%	60%	62%	66%	60%
Somewhat disagree	30%	32%	34%	31%	25%	47% g	29%	30%	0%	0%	30%	30%	31%	30%	33%	30%
Strongly disagree	31%	32% c	23%	34% c	33% c	17%	33%	29%	0%	0%	31%	31%	29%	33%	33%	30%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Race-related issues in Chicago are due to a few bad actors, not systemic issues.

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household	Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	**Less than $50,000 (B)**	**$50,000 - $74,999 (C)**	**$75,000 - $99,999 (D)**	**$100,000+ (E)**	**Less than HS (F)**	**Some college (G)**	**College grad+ (H)**	**Employed (I)**	**Not employed (J)**	**Yes (K)**	**No (L)**	**Married/Living with p**	**Not married (N)**	**1 HH member (O)**	**2+ HH members (P)**
Total	N=1001	N=414	N=181	N=124	N=283	N=35 *	N=598	N=368	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=300	N=701	N=483	N=518	N=222	N=779
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=418	N=216	N=132	N=235	N=27 **	N=538	N=436	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=265	N=736	N=486	N=515	N=232	N=769
Agree (Net)	37%	34%	41%	38%	39%	34%	35%	41%	0%	0%	37%	37%	39%	36%	39%	37%
Strongly agree	14%	14%	14%	16%	14%	6%	15%	15%	0%	0%	11%	16%	14%	15%	16%	14%
Somewhat agree	23%	20%	27%	22%	24%	28%	20%	26% g	0%	0%	26%	22%	25%	21%	23%	23%
Disagree (Net)	63%	66%	59%	62%	61%	66%	65%	59%	0%	0%	63%	63%	61%	64%	61%	63%
Somewhat disagree	36%	37%	33%	40%	35%	28%	36%	37%	0%	0%	33%	37%	35%	37%	39%	35%
Strongly disagree	27%	29%	26%	22%	26%	38%	29% h	22%	0%	0%	29%	26%	26%	27%	22%	28%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Mayor Lori Lightfoot could do more to tackle inequality across Chicago neighborhoods.

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household	Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B	$50,000 - $74,999 (C	$75,000 - $99,999 (D	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)	Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)	Not employed (J)	Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	N=1001	N=414	N=181	N=124	N=283	N=35 *	N=598	N=368	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=300	N=701	N=483	N=518	N=222	N=779
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=418	N=216	N=132	N=235	N=27 **	N=538	N=436	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=265	N=736	N=486	N=515	N=232	N=769
Agree (Net)	84%	84%	86%	82%	85%	82%	84%	85%	0%	0%	90% L	82%	85%	84%	77%	87% O
Strongly agree	40%	44% E	38%	46% E	33%	54%	40%	39%	0%	0%	48% L	37%	37%	43%	38%	41%
Somewhat agree	44%	40%	48%	36%	53% BD	28%	44%	46%	0%	0%	42%	45%	48% n	41%	39%	46%
Disagree (Net)	16%	16%	14%	18%	15%	18%	16%	15%	0%	0%	10%	18% K	15%	16%	23% P	13%
Somewhat disagree	11%	12%	10%	12%	11%	8%	11%	11%	0%	0%	8%	12%	10%	12%	16% P	10%
Strongly disagree	4%	5%	4%	6%	4%	10%	4%	4%	0%	0%	2%	5% k	4%	4%	7%	4%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Chicago law enforcement needs reform.

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household	Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B	$50,000 - $74,999 (C	$75,000 - $99,999 (D	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)	Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)	Not employed (J)	Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	N=1001	N=414	N=181	N=124	N=283	N=35 *	N=598	N=368	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=300	N=701	N=483	N=518	N=222	N=779
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=418	N=216	N=132	N=235	N=27 **	N=538	N=436	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=265	N=736	N=486	N=515	N=232	N=769
Agree (Net)	74%	76%	70%	72%	76%	85%	73%	76%	0%	0%	75%	74%	72%	76%	67%	76% O
Strongly agree	33%	36% c	27%	37%	29%	50%	32%	32%	0%	0%	39% L	30%	31%	34%	26%	35% o
Somewhat agree	42%	40%	42%	34%	47% d	35%	41%	43%	0%	0%	36%	44% k	41%	42%	41%	42%
Disagree (Net)	26%	24%	30%	28%	24%	15%	27%	24%	0%	0%	25%	26%	28%	24%	33% P	24%
Somewhat disagree	16%	16%	20%	18%	13%	10%	17%	15%	0%	0%	16%	16%	16%	17%	24% P	14%
Strongly disagree	10%	8%	10%	11%	11%	5%	10%	9%	0%	0%	9%	10%	12% N	7%	9%	10%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Gun violence in Chicago needs to be reduced.

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household	Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B	$50,000 - $74,999 (C	$75,000 - $99,999 (D	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)	Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)	Not employed (J)	Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	N=1001	N=414	N=181	N=124	N=283	N=35 *	N=598	N=368	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=300	N=701	N=483	N=518	N=222	N=779
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=418	N=216	N=132	N=235	N=27 **	N=538	N=436	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=265	N=736	N=486	N=515	N=232	N=769
Agree (Net)	95%	93%	94%	98%	97%	97%	94%	96%	0%	0%	95%	95%	96%	94%	94%	95%
Strongly agree	84%	83%	84%	88%	83%	94%	83%	84%	0%	0%	81%	85%	85%	83%	86%	83%
Somewhat agree	11%	10%	10%	10%	14%	3%	11%	12%	0%	0%	14%	10%	11%	11%	9%	12%
Disagree (Net)	5%	7%	6%	2%	3%	3%	6%	4%	0%	0%	5%	5%	4%	6%	6%	5%
Somewhat disagree	1%	1%	2% e	1%	0%	0%	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	2%	3% P	1%
Strongly disagree	4%	6%	3%	1%	3%	3%	5%	3%	0%	0%	5%	4%	4%	4%	3%	4%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

City government is doing enough to address gun violence in the city.

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household	Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B	$50,000 - $74,999 (C	$75,000 - $99,999 (D	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)	Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)	Not employed (J)	Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	N=1001	N=414	N=181	N=124	N=283	N=35 *	N=598	N=368	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=300	N=701	N=483	N=518	N=222	N=779
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=418	N=216	N=132	N=235	N=27 **	N=538	N=436	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=265	N=736	N=486	N=515	N=232	N=769
Agree (Net)	16%	17%	15%	14%	17%	28%	15%	17%	0%	0%	20% I	14%	14%	18%	14%	17%
Strongly agree	5%	5%	3%	5%	6%	7%	4%	6%	0%	0%	9% L	3%	4%	5%	1%	6% O
Somewhat agree	11%	11%	12%	10%	12%	21%	11%	11%	0%	0%	12%	11%	10%	13%	13%	11%
Disagree (Net)	84%	83%	85%	86%	83%	72%	85%	83%	0%	0%	80%	86% k	86%	82%	86%	83%
Somewhat disagree	31%	28%	35%	36%	31%	15%	31%	33%	0%	0%	29%	32%	30%	31%	31%	31%
Strongly disagree	53%	55%	50%	50%	52%	57%	54%	50%	0%	0%	50%	54%	55%	51%	55%	52%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Q2A: Do you think each of the following situations happening in Chicago are better, worse, or about the same compared to cities in the rest of the country?

Race relations

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household	Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B	$50,000 - $74,999 (C	$75,000 - $99,999 (D	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)	Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)	Not employed (J)	Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	N=1001	N=414	N=181	N=124	N=283	N=35 *	N=598	N=368	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=300	N=701	N=483	N=518	N=222	N=779
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=418	N=216	N=132	N=235	N=27 **	N=538	N=436	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=265	N=736	N=486	N=515	N=232	N=769
Better	6%	4%	5%	11% B	8% B	2%	5%	9% g	0%	0%	7%	6%	6%	6%	4%	7%
About the same	49%	45%	55% b	48%	50%	49%	47%	51%	0%	0%	43%	51% k	51%	46%	52%	47%
Worse	45%	51% ce	41%	42%	42%	48%	48% h	41%	0%	0%	50%	44%	42%	48%	43%	46%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Police relations with city residents

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household	Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B	$50,000 - $74,999 (C	$75,000 - $99,999 (D	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)	Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)	Not employed (J)	Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	N=1001	N=414	N=181	N=124	N=283	N=35 *	N=598	N=368	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=300	N=701	N=483	N=518	N=222	N=779
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=418	N=216	N=132	N=235	N=27 **	N=538	N=436	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=265	N=736	N=486	N=515	N=232	N=769
Better	7%	3%	7%	9% B	11% B	2%	7%	7%	0%	0%	11% L	5%	9% N	5%	3%	8% o
About the same	52%	55%	58% DE	44%	46%	58%	52%	50%	0%	0%	44%	55% K	54%	50%	59% P	49%
Worse	41%	42%	35%	47% c	42%	40%	41%	43%	0%	0%	45%	40%	37%	45% M	37%	43%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Gun violence

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household	Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B	$50,000 - $74,999 (C	$75,000 - $99,999 (D	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)	Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)	Not employed (J)	Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	N=1001	N=414	N=181	N=124	N=283	N=35 *	N=598	N=368	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=300	N=701	N=483	N=518	N=222	N=779
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=418	N=216	N=132	N=235	N=27 **	N=538	N=436	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=265	N=736	N=486	N=515	N=232	N=769
Better	2%	1%	2%	4% B	4% B	0%	2%	3%	0%	0%	4% I	1%	2%	2%	1%	3%
About the same	17%	16%	20%	18%	17%	10%	19%	15%	0%	0%	18%	17%	18%	17%	18%	17%
Worse	81%	84%	78%	78%	79%	90%	79%	83%	0%	0%	78%	82%	80%	81%	82%	80%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Police union relations with city government (e.g., the mayor, city council, city manager)

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household	Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B	$50,000 - $74,999 (C	$75,000 - $99,999 (D	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)	Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)	Not employed (J)	Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	N=1001	N=414	N=181	N=124	N=283	N=35 *	N=598	N=368	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=300	N=701	N=483	N=518	N=222	N=779
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=418	N=216	N=132	N=235	N=27 **	N=538	N=436	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=265	N=736	N=486	N=515	N=232	N=769
Better	5%	3%	1%	6% C	8% BC	8%	3%	8% G	0%	0%	7% I	4%	5%	4%	1%	6% O
About the same	48%	46%	56% be	51%	45%	59%	49%	45%	0%	0%	48%	48%	49%	47%	45%	49%
Worse	47%	51%	42%	42%	47%	33%	48%	48%	0%	0%	45%	48%	46%	49%	54% p	45%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Carjackings

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status				Child <18 in Household	Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)	Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)	Not employed (J)	Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	N=1001	N=414	N=181	N=124	N=283	N=35 *	N=598	N=368	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=300	N=701	N=483	N=518	N=222	N=779
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=418	N=216	N=132	N=235	N=27 **	N=538	N=436	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=265	N=736	N=486	N=515	N=232	N=769
Better	3%	1%	1%	4%	6% BC	0%	1%	5% G	0%	0%	4%	2%	2%	3%	3%	3%
About the same	21%	18%	26% b	24%	21%	42% GH	21%	19%	0%	0%	23%	20%	21%	21%	19%	22%
Worse	76%	80%	73%	73%	74%	58%	78% f	75%	0%	0%	73%	77%	76%	76%	77%	76%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Other violent crimes (e.g., mugging, assault)

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status				Child <18 in Household	Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)	Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)	Not employed (J)	Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	N=1001	N=414	N=181	N=124	N=283	N=35 *	N=598	N=368	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=300	N=701	N=483	N=518	N=222	N=779
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=418	N=216	N=132	N=235	N=27 **	N=538	N=436	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=265	N=736	N=486	N=515	N=232	N=769
Better	2%	1%	1%	3%	5% BC	0%	2%	4% g	0%	0%	3%	2%	3%	2%	1%	3%
About the same	34%	34%	36%	33%	34%	39%	34%	34%	0%	0%	33%	35%	34%	35%	36%	34%
Worse	63%	64%	63%	64%	61%	61%	64%	62%	0%	0%	64%	63%	64%	63%	63%	63%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Non-violent crimes (e.g., package theft, harassment, property damage)

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status				Child <18 in Household	Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)	Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)	Not employed (J)	Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	N=1001	N=414	N=181	N=124	N=283	N=35 *	N=598	N=368	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=300	N=701	N=483	N=518	N=222	N=779
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=418	N=216	N=132	N=235	N=27 **	N=538	N=436	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=265	N=736	N=486	N=515	N=232	N=769
Better	4%	4%	3%	5%	5%	13% Gh	4%	4%	0%	0%	5%	4%	5%	3%	3%	4%
About the same	54%	51%	57%	58%	55%	61%	51%	59% g	0%	0%	50%	56%	52%	56%	59%	53%
Worse	42%	45%	40%	37%	40%	25%	45% fh	37%	0%	0%	45%	40%	42%	41%	38%	43%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Q11: How concerned are you about the personal safety of each of the following groups of people in the Chicago area?

Police officers

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status				Child <18 in Household	Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)	Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)	Not employed (J)	Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	N=1001	N=414	N=181	N=124	N=283	N=35 *	N=598	N=368	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=300	N=701	N=483	N=518	N=222	N=779
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=418	N=216	N=132	N=235	N=27 **	N=538	N=436	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=265	N=736	N=486	N=515	N=232	N=769
Concerned (Net)	76%	77%	82% d	70%	74%	92% g	75%	77%	0%	0%	74%	77%	75%	77%	81%	75%
Very concerned	41%	42%	43%	38%	39%	66% GH	41%	38%	0%	0%	42%	40%	39%	42%	41%	41%
Somewhat concerned	36%	36%	39%	32%	35%	26%	34%	39%	0%	0%	32%	37%	36%	36%	40%	34%
Not concerned (Net)	24%	23%	18%	30% c	26%	8%	25% f	23%	0%	0%	26%	23%	25%	23%	19%	25%
Not very concerned	18%	15%	15%	23% b	23% Bc	6%	20%	17%	0%	0%	21%	17%	20%	17%	15%	19%
Not at all concerned	5%	8% e	3%	7%	3%	2%	5%	6%	0%	0%	5%	5%	5%	6%	4%	6%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Residents of color (e.g., Black, Latino, Asian)

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status				Child <18 in Household	Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)	Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)	Not employed (J)	Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	N=1001	N=414	N=181	N=124	N=283	N=35 *	N=598	N=368	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=300	N=701	N=483	N=518	N=222	N=779
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=418	N=216	N=132	N=235	N=27 **	N=538	N=436	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=265	N=736	N=486	N=515	N=232	N=769
Concerned (Net)	83%	88% DE	82%	76%	80%	95%	84%	82%	0%	0%	82%	84%	80%	86% M	81%	84%
Very concerned	44%	48%	42%	44%	40%	69% GH	45%	40%	0%	0%	51% L	41%	41%	47%	41%	45%
Somewhat concerned	39%	40%	40%	32%	41%	26%	39%	42%	0%	0%	31%	43% K	39%	39%	40%	39%
Not concerned (Net)	17%	12%	18%	24% B	20% B	5%	16%	18%	0%	0%	18%	16%	20% N	14%	19%	16%
Not very concerned	13%	7%	14% B	21% B	17% B	5%	12%	15%	0%	0%	15%	12%	17% N	10%	13%	13%
Not at all concerned	4%	5%	3%	3%	3%	0%	4%	4%	0%	0%	3%	4%	3%	4%	6%	3%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Tourists

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status				Child <18 in Household	Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)	Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)	Not employed (J)	Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	N=1001	N=414	N=181	N=124	N=283	N=35 *	N=598	N=368	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=300	N=701	N=483	N=518	N=222	N=779
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=418	N=216	N=132	N=235	N=27 **	N=538	N=436	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=265	N=736	N=486	N=515	N=232	N=769
Concerned (Net)	67%	69%	70%	65%	65%	76%	67%	67%	0%	0%	63%	69%	66%	69%	74% p	66%
Very concerned	27%	23%	30%	25%	30%	23%	26%	28%	0%	0%	27%	27%	27%	26%	27%	26%
Somewhat concerned	41%	46% E	40%	40%	35%	53%	41%	39%	0%	0%	36%	43%	39%	43%	46%	39%
Not concerned (Net)	33%	31%	30%	35%	35%	24%	33%	33%	0%	0%	37%	31%	34%	31%	26%	34% o
Not very concerned	26%	22%	26%	26%	30% b	14%	26%	26%	0%	0%	30%	24%	27%	25%	22%	27%
Not at all concerned	7%	9% Ce	4%	9%	5%	10%	7%	7%	0%	0%	8%	7%	8%	6%	4%	8%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

City residents

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status				Child <18 in Household	Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)	Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)	Not employed (J)	Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	N=1001	N=414	N=181	N=124	N=283	N=35 *	N=598	N=368	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=300	N=701	N=483	N=518	N=222	N=779
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=418	N=216	N=132	N=235	N=27 **	N=538	N=436	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=265	N=736	N=486	N=515	N=232	N=769
Concerned (Net)	86%	93% CDE	84%	83%	79%	93%	87%	84%	0%	0%	84%	87%	83%	89% M	90%	85%
Very concerned	43%	49% DE	45% D	31%	37%	49%	47% H	36%	0%	0%	45%	42%	40%	46%	42%	43%
Somewhat concerned	43%	43%	39%	51% c	42%	44%	40%	48% g	0%	0%	39%	45%	43%	43%	48%	42%
Not concerned (Net)	14%	7%	16% B	17% B	21% B	7%	13%	16%	0%	0%	16%	13%	17% N	11%	10%	15%
Not very concerned	13%	7%	14% B	16% B	21% B	7%	13%	15%	0%	0%	16%	12%	16% N	10%	8%	15% o
Not at all concerned	1%	1%	2%	1%	1%	0%	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%	1%	1%	1%	2%	1%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Suburban residents

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status				Child <18 in Household	Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)	Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)	Not employed (J)	Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	N=1001	N=414	N=181	N=124	N=283	N=35 *	N=598	N=368	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=300	N=701	N=483	N=518	N=222	N=779
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=418	N=216	N=132	N=235	N=27 **	N=538	N=436	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=265	N=736	N=486	N=515	N=232	N=769
Concerned (Net)	58%	63% De	59% d	46%	54%	58%	61% H	52%	0%	0%	59%	57%	57%	58%	53%	59%
Very concerned	23%	26% d	26%	16%	20%	21%	26% h	19%	0%	0%	26%	22%	20%	26% m	20%	24%

| | | |

Q4A: How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding local law enforcement?

Members of the Chicago Police Department are handling their job well.

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household	Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	**Less than $50,000 (B)**	**$50,000 - $74,999 (C)**	**$75,000 - $99,999 (D)**	**$100,000+ (E)**	**Less than HS (F)**	**Some college (G)**	**College grad+ (H)**	**Employed (I)**	**Not employed (J)**	**Yes (K)**	**No (L)**	**Married/Living with p**	**Not married (N)**	**1 HH member (O)**	**2+ HH members (P)**
Total	N=1001	N=414	N=181	N=124	N=283	N=35 *	N=598	N=368	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=300	N=701	N=483	N=518	N=222	N=779
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=418	N=216	N=132	N=235	N=27 **	N=538	N=436	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=265	N=736	N=486	N=515	N=232	N=769
Agree (Net)	62%	62% d	63% d	50%	66% D	70%	58%	68% G	0%	0%	59%	63%	63%	61%	69% P	60%
Strongly agree	12%	10%	17% B	13%	12%	9%	12%	14%	0%	0%	13%	12%	12%	13%	12%	12%
Somewhat agree	49%	52% D	46%	37%	53% D	61%	46%	54% g	0%	0%	46%	51%	51%	48%	57% P	47%
Disagree (Net)	38%	38%	37%	50% bcE	34%	30%	42% H	32%	0%	0%	41%	37%	37%	39%	31%	40% O
Somewhat disagree	28%	26%	27%	41% BcE	26%	14%	32% fH	24%	0%	0%	32%	26%	29%	27%	20%	30% O
Strongly disagree	10%	12%	10%	9%	8%	16%	11%	9%	0%	0%	10%	10%	8%	12%	11%	10%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

I would rather the Chicago police spend less time than they currently do in my neighborhood.

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household	Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	**Less than $50,000 (B)**	**$50,000 - $74,999 (C)**	**$75,000 - $99,999 (D)**	**$100,000+ (E)**	**Less than HS (F)**	**Some college (G)**	**College grad+ (H)**	**Employed (I)**	**Not employed (J)**	**Yes (K)**	**No (L)**	**Married/Living with p**	**Not married (N)**	**1 HH member (O)**	**2+ HH members (P)**
Total	N=1001	N=414	N=181	N=124	N=283	N=35 *	N=598	N=368	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=300	N=701	N=483	N=518	N=222	N=779
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=418	N=216	N=132	N=235	N=27 **	N=538	N=436	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=265	N=736	N=486	N=515	N=232	N=769
Agree (Net)	28%	30%	27%	30%	25%	26%	29%	27%	0%	0%	33%	26%	26%	30%	19%	31% O
Strongly agree	9%	11%	6%	11%	9%	12%	8%	11%	0%	0%	11%	9%	10%	9%	6%	10%
Somewhat agree	19%	19%	21%	19%	17%	14%	21%	16%	0%	0%	22%	17%	16%	21%	13%	20% o
Disagree (Net)	72%	70%	73%	70%	75%	74%	71%	73%	0%	0%	67%	74%	74%	70%	81% P	69%
Somewhat disagree	42%	40%	38%	47%	44%	52%	40%	44%	0%	0%	39%	43%	43%	41%	41%	42%
Strongly disagree	30%	30%	34% d	23%	31%	22%	31%	30%	0%	0%	29%	31%	31%	29%	40% P	27%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

If I were to have an interaction with the Chicago police in my area, I am confident that they would treat me with courtesy and respect.

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household	Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	**Less than $50,000 (B)**	**$50,000 - $74,999 (C)**	**$75,000 - $99,999 (D)**	**$100,000+ (E)**	**Less than HS (F)**	**Some college (G)**	**College grad+ (H)**	**Employed (I)**	**Not employed (J)**	**Yes (K)**	**No (L)**	**Married/Living with p**	**Not married (N)**	**1 HH member (O)**	**2+ HH members (P)**
Total	N=1001	N=414	N=181	N=124	N=283	N=35 *	N=598	N=368	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=300	N=701	N=483	N=518	N=222	N=779
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=418	N=216	N=132	N=235	N=27 **	N=538	N=436	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=265	N=736	N=486	N=515	N=232	N=769
Agree (Net)	75%	69%	82% Bd	72%	82% Bd	60%	72%	82% FG	0%	0%	74%	76%	79% n	72%	83% P	73%
Strongly agree	28%	24%	33% b	30%	30%	32%	28%	29%	0%	0%	23%	30%	32% n	25%	31%	27%
Somewhat agree	47%	44%	49%	42%	51%	28%	44%	53% FG	0%	0%	50%	45%	47%	47%	52%	46%
Disagree (Net)	25%	31% CE	18%	28% ce	18%	40% H	28% H	18%	0%	0%	26%	24%	21%	28% m	17%	27% O
Somewhat disagree	19%	22% C	13%	22% c	16%	33% H	21% H	14%	0%	0%	18%	19%	18%	20%	11%	21% O
Strongly disagree	6%	9% E	5%	6%	3%	7%	7% h	4%	0%	0%	8%	5%	3%	8% M	6%	6%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

When I see a police officer in my neighborhood, I feel safer.

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household	Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	**Less than $50,000 (B)**	**$50,000 - $74,999 (C)**	**$75,000 - $99,999 (D)**	**$100,000+ (E)**	**Less than HS (F)**	**Some college (G)**	**College grad+ (H)**	**Employed (I)**	**Not employed (J)**	**Yes (K)**	**No (L)**	**Married/Living with p**	**Not married (N)**	**1 HH member (O)**	**2+ HH members (P)**
Total	N=1001	N=414	N=181	N=124	N=283	N=35 *	N=598	N=368	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=300	N=701	N=483	N=518	N=222	N=779
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=418	N=216	N=132	N=235	N=27 **	N=538	N=436	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=265	N=736	N=486	N=515	N=232	N=769
Agree (Net)	77%	71%	81% B	80%	81% B	51%	75% F	82% Fg	0%	0%	76%	77%	81% N	73%	82% p	75%
Strongly agree	32%	28%	33%	35%	35%	30%	28%	37% G	0%	0%	28%	33%	37% N	27%	31%	32%
Somewhat agree	45%	43%	48%	46%	46%	21%	47% F	44% f	0%	0%	48%	44%	45%	45%	51%	44%
Disagree (Net)	23%	29% CE	19%	20%	19%	49% GH	25% h	18%	0%	0%	24%	23%	19%	27% M	18%	25% o
Somewhat disagree	16%	19%	15%	12%	15%	37% GH	16%	15%	0%	0%	18%	15%	14%	18%	11%	18% O
Strongly disagree	7%	10% ce	5%	8%	4%	12% h	9% H	4%	0%	0%	6%	8%	4%	9% M	7%	7%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

I approve of the way that the Chicago Police Department handled the summer 2020 protests.

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household	Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	**Less than $50,000 (B)**	**$50,000 - $74,999 (C)**	**$75,000 - $99,999 (D)**	**$100,000+ (E)**	**Less than HS (F)**	**Some college (G)**	**College grad+ (H)**	**Employed (I)**	**Not employed (J)**	**Yes (K)**	**No (L)**	**Married/Living with p**	**Not married (N)**	**1 HH member (O)**	**2+ HH members (P)**
Total	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=0 **
Total (Unweighted)	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=0 **
Agree (Net)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Strongly agree	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Somewhat agree	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Disagree (Net)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Somewhat disagree	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Strongly disagree	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

There is evidence of persistent racial bias in Chicago's policing practices.

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household	Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	**Less than $50,000 (B)**	**$50,000 - $74,999 (C)**	**$75,000 - $99,999 (D)**	**$100,000+ (E)**	**Less than HS (F)**	**Some college (G)**	**College grad+ (H)**	**Employed (I)**	**Not employed (J)**	**Yes (K)**	**No (L)**	**Married/Living with p**	**Not married (N)**	**1 HH member (O)**	**2+ HH members (P)**
Total	N=1001	N=414	N=181	N=124	N=283	N=35 *	N=598	N=368	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=300	N=701	N=483	N=518	N=222	N=779
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=418	N=216	N=132	N=235	N=27 **	N=538	N=436	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=265	N=736	N=486	N=515	N=232	N=769
Agree (Net)	65%	68%	60%	59%	67%	76%	64%	66%	0%	0%	70%	63%	65%	65%	64%	65%
Strongly agree	23%	26%	19%	19%	24%	38%	23%	23%	0%	0%	28% I	21%	24%	23%	19%	25%
Somewhat agree	42%	42%	41%	40%	43%	38%	41%	43%	0%	0%	42%	42%	41%	42%	45%	41%
Disagree (Net)	35%	32%	40%	41%	33%	24%	36%	34%	0%	0%	30%	37%	35%	35%	36%	35%
Somewhat disagree	23%	22%	29% E	24%	19%	15%	23%	22%	0%	0%	19%	24%	22%	23%	21%	23%
Strongly disagree	12%	10%	11%	17%	14%	9%	13%	12%	0%	0%	11%	13%	12%	12%	15%	12%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Major reforms are needed within the Chicago Police Department regarding treatment of Black and Latino people.

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household	Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	**Less than $50,000 (B)**	**$50,000 - $74,999 (C)**	**$75,000 - $99,999 (D)**	**$100,000+ (E)**	**Less than HS (F)**	**Some college (G)**	**College grad+ (H)**	**Employed (I)**	**Not employed (J)**	**Yes (K)**	**No (L)**	**Married/Living with p**	**Not married (N)**	**1 HH member (O)**	**2+ HH members (P)**
Total	N=1001	N=414	N=181	N=124	N=283	N=35 *	N=598	N=368	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=300	N=701	N=483	N=518	N=222	N=779
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=418	N=216	N=132	N=235	N=27 **	N=538	N=436	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=265	N=736	N=486	N=515	N=232	N=769
Agree (Net)	71%	76% C	60%	69%	71% C	82%	70%	72%	0%	0%	75%	69%	70%	72%	68%	72%
Strongly agree	31%	34%	26%	31%	31%	49% h	32%	29%	0%	0%	34%	30%	29%	34%	27%	32%
Somewhat agree	40%	42%	34%	38%	41%	33%	38%	43%	0%	0%	41%	39%	41%	38%	41%	39%
Disagree (Net)	29%	24%	40% BE	31%	29%	18%	30%	28%	0%	0%	25%	31%	30%	28%	32%	28%
Somewhat disagree	18%	17%	29% BDE	16%	16%	9%	20%	17%	0%	0%	13%	21% K	18%	19%	22%	17%
Strongly disagree	11%	7%	11%	15% B	13% b	9%	10%	11%	0%	0%	13%	10%	12%	9%	10%	11%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

The Chicago Police Department is doing enough to address gun violence in the city.

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household	Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B)	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D)	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)	Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)	Not employed (J)	Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	N=1001	N=414	N=181	N=124	N=283	N=35 *	N=598	N=368	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=300	N=701	N=483	N=518	N=222	N=779
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=418	N=216	N=132	N=235	N=27 **	N=538	N=436	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=265	N=736	N=486	N=515	N=232	N=769
Agree (Net)	29%	28%	32%	20% d	31% d	24%	31%	26%	0%	0%	32%	28%	29%	28%	30%	29%
Strongly agree	6%	7%	5%	4%	4%	13%	5%	6%	0%	0%	7%	5%	4%	7%	7%	5%
Somewhat agree	23%	21%	27%	16% d	27% d	11%	26%	20%	0%	0%	24%	23%	25%	21%	23%	23%
Disagree (Net)	71%	72%	68%	80% ce	69%	76%	69%	74%	0%	0%	68%	72%	71%	72%	70%	71%
Somewhat disagree	35%	37%	39%	33%	31%	52% g	33%	38%	0%	0%	32%	37%	33%	37%	39%	34%
Strongly disagree	36%	34%	29%	46% bC	38%	24%	36%	36%	0%	0%	37%	35%	38%	34%	31%	37%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Q4B: How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding local law enforcement?

Chicago police have been effective at reducing or preventing crime in my neighborhood.

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household	Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B)	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D)	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)	Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)	Not employed (J)	Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	N=1001	N=414	N=181	N=124	N=283	N=35 *	N=598	N=368	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=300	N=701	N=483	N=518	N=222	N=779
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=418	N=216	N=132	N=235	N=27 **	N=538	N=436	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=265	N=736	N=486	N=515	N=232	N=769
Agree (Net)	56%	55%	61%	49%	58%	47%	54%	60%	0%	0%	55%	57%	55%	57%	63% p	54%
Strongly agree	11%	11%	13%	10%	10%	7%	9%	14% g	0%	0%	13%	10%	11%	11%	11%	11%
Somewhat agree	45%	44%	48%	39%	48%	40%	45%	46%	0%	0%	42%	47%	45%	46%	51%	44%
Disagree (Net)	44%	45%	39%	51%	42%	53%	46%	40%	0%	0%	45%	43%	45%	43%	37%	46% o
Somewhat disagree	31%	27%	31%	37%	34%	34%	31%	31%	0%	0%	34%	30%	34% n	28%	25%	33% o
Strongly disagree	13%	18% CE	9%	14%	8%	19%	15% H	9%	0%	0%	11%	14%	10%	15% m	13%	13%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

I have confidence in the Chicago Police Department to act fairly and without bias.

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household	Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B)	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D)	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)	Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)	Not employed (J)	Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	N=1001	N=414	N=181	N=124	N=283	N=35 *	N=598	N=368	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=300	N=701	N=483	N=518	N=222	N=779
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=418	N=216	N=132	N=235	N=27 **	N=538	N=436	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=265	N=736	N=486	N=515	N=232	N=769
Agree (Net)	52%	46%	55% b	47%	62% BD	34%	49%	58% FG	0%	0%	49%	53%	55%	49%	56%	51%
Strongly agree	12%	12%	15%	10%	13%	11%	12%	12%	0%	0%	13%	12%	13%	12%	13%	12%
Somewhat agree	40%	34%	41%	37%	49% B	23%	37%	46% fG	0%	0%	36%	41%	42%	37%	43%	39%
Disagree (Net)	48%	54% cE	45%	53% E	38%	66% H	51% H	42%	0%	0%	51%	47%	45%	51%	44%	49%
Somewhat disagree	32%	37% E	31%	35% e	23%	50% h	33%	29%	0%	0%	35%	30%	31%	33%	27%	33%
Strongly disagree	16%	17%	14%	19%	15%	17%	18%	13%	0%	0%	16%	16%	14%	18%	17%	16%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Chicago police are often able to solve crimes that occur in the city.

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household	Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B)	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D)	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)	Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)	Not employed (J)	Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	N=1001	N=414	N=181	N=124	N=283	N=35 *	N=598	N=368	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=300	N=701	N=483	N=518	N=222	N=779
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=418	N=216	N=132	N=235	N=27 **	N=538	N=436	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=265	N=736	N=486	N=515	N=232	N=769
Agree (Net)	53%	52%	59%	49%	54%	36%	54%	55%	0%	0%	51%	54%	51%	55%	56%	53%
Strongly agree	9%	10%	7%	9%	9%	5%	9%	9%	0%	0%	12%	8%	10%	9%	8%	10%
Somewhat agree	44%	42%	51% b	40%	45%	31%	44%	46%	0%	0%	39%	46%	41%	47%	49%	43%
Disagree (Net)	47%	48%	41%	51%	46%	64%	46%	45%	0%	0%	49%	46%	49%	45%	44%	47%
Somewhat disagree	34%	34%	30%	36%	34%	45%	34%	33%	0%	0%	38%	32%	36%	32%	32%	34%
Strongly disagree	13%	14%	11%	15%	12%	18%	13%	13%	0%	0%	10%	14%	13%	13%	12%	13%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

The Chicago Police Department has the support of most city residents.

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household	Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B)	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D)	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)	Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)	Not employed (J)	Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	N=1001	N=414	N=181	N=124	N=283	N=35 *	N=598	N=368	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=300	N=701	N=483	N=518	N=222	N=779
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=418	N=216	N=132	N=235	N=27 **	N=538	N=436	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=265	N=736	N=486	N=515	N=232	N=769
Agree (Net)	56%	55%	58%	56%	56%	65%	51%	62% G	0%	0%	53%	57%	59%	53%	58%	55%
Strongly agree	11%	9%	12%	11%	12%	17%	11%	10%	0%	0%	14%	9%	11%	11%	11%	10%
Somewhat agree	45%	45%	46%	46%	44%	49%	40%	52% G	0%	0%	40%	47% k	49% n	42%	46%	45%
Disagree (Net)	44%	45%	42%	44%	44%	35%	49% H	38%	0%	0%	47%	43%	41%	47%	42%	45%
Somewhat disagree	33%	31%	35%	30%	36%	20%	36%	30%	0%	0%	34%	33%	33%	33%	29%	34%
Strongly disagree	11%	14% ce	8%	14%	8%	15%	13% h	8%	0%	0%	13%	10%	8%	14% M	14%	10%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

The Chicago Police Department has the support of most BIPOC (i.e., Black, Indigenous, and People of Color) residents.

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household	Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B)	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D)	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)	Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)	Not employed (J)	Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	N=1001	N=414	N=181	N=124	N=283	N=35 *	N=598	N=368	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=300	N=701	N=483	N=518	N=222	N=779
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=418	N=216	N=132	N=235	N=27 **	N=538	N=436	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=265	N=736	N=486	N=515	N=232	N=769
Agree (Net)	33%	31%	33%	36%	35%	29%	31%	36%	0%	0%	35%	32%	33%	33%	34%	33%
Strongly agree	7%	8%	4%	6%	8%	12%	8%	6%	0%	0%	7%	7%	6%	8%	9%	7%
Somewhat agree	26%	22%	29%	31%	26%	17%	24%	29%	0%	0%	28%	25%	27%	24%	25%	26%
Disagree (Net)	67%	69%	67%	64%	65%	71%	69%	64%	0%	0%	65%	68%	67%	67%	66%	67%
Somewhat disagree	42%	43%	50% De	35%	38%	37%	43%	40%	0%	0%	36%	44% k	42%	41%	43%	41%
Strongly disagree	25%	27% C	17%	29% c	28% C	34%	26%	24%	0%	0%	29%	24%	25%	26%	23%	26%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Chicago police should be brought in to handle situations regarding mental health patients and the homeless.

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household	Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B)	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D)	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)	Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)	Not employed (J)	Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	N=1001	N=414	N=181	N=124	N=283	N=35 *	N=598	N=368	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=300	N=701	N=483	N=518	N=222	N=779
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=418	N=216	N=132	N=235	N=27 **	N=538	N=436	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=265	N=736	N=486	N=515	N=232	N=769
Agree (Net)	51%	53% d	54% d	41%	50%	60%	54% H	44%	0%	0%	60% L	47%	52%	50%	50%	51%
Strongly agree	14%	15%	13%	13%	14%	20%	15%	12%	0%	0%	20% L	12%	13%	15%	11%	15%
Somewhat agree	37%	38%	41% d	28%	36%	40%	39%	32%	0%	0%	41%	35%	39%	35%	39%	36%
Disagree (Net)	49%	47%	46%	59% bc	50%	40%	46%	56% G	0%	0%	40%	53% K	48%	50%	50%	49%
Somewhat disagree	31%	30%	31%	33%	31%	25%	29%	34%	0%	0%	22%	35% K	30%	32%	32%	31%
Strongly disagree	18%	17%	15%	26% bC	19%	15%	16%	22% g	0%	0%	18%	18%	18%	18%	19%	18%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Increased police presence is necessary for reducing gun violence in the city.

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status			Child <18 in Household	Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B)	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D)	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)	Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)	Not employed (J)	Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	N=1001	N=414	N=181	N=124	N=283	N=35 *	N=598	N=368	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=300	N=701	N=483	N=518	N=222	N=779
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=418	N=216	N=132	N=235	N=27 **	N=538	N=436	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=265	N=736	N=486	N=515	N=232	N=769
Agree (Net)	81%	77%	83%	82%	84% b	75%	79%	84%	0%	0%	80%	81%	83% n	78%	83%	80%
Strongly agree	42%	41%	45%	45%	41%	42%	42%	43%	0%	0%	41%	42%	45%	39%	43%	42%
Somewhat agree	39%	36%	38%	37%	43%	33%	37%	41%	0%	0%	39%	38%	38%	39%	40%	38%
Disagree (Net)	19%	23% e	17%	18%	16%	25%	21%	16%	0%	0%	20%	19%	17%	22% m	17%	20%
Somewhat disagree	13%	15%	13%	11%	12%	10%	14%	12%	0%	0%	15%	13%	12%	15%	12%	14%
Strongly disagree	6%	8% e	4%	7%	4%	15% h	7%	4%	0%	0%	4%	7%	5%	7%	5%	6%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

There should be more funding for non-policing alternatives (e.g., social worker dispatches, neighborhood patrols, restorative justice circles).

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status			Child <18 in Household	Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B)	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D)	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)	Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)	Not employed (J)	Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	N=1001	N=414	N=181	N=124	N=283	N=35 *	N=598	N=368	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=300	N=701	N=483	N=518	N=222	N=779
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=418	N=216	N=132	N=235	N=27 **	N=538	N=436	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=265	N=736	N=486	N=515	N=232	N=769
Agree (Net)	73%	77% C	65%	76%	72%	87%	74%	71%	0%	0%	74%	73%	75%	71%	67%	75% o
Strongly agree	32%	32%	31%	29%	32%	28%	30%	35%	0%	0%	37% I	29%	31%	32%	28%	33%
Somewhat agree	41%	44% c	34%	47% c	40%	59% H	44% H	36%	0%	0%	36%	44% k	44%	39%	39%	42%
Disagree (Net)	27%	23%	35% B	24%	28%	13%	26%	29%	0%	0%	26%	27%	25%	29%	33% p	25%
Somewhat disagree	17%	15%	23% b	14%	19%	11%	18%	17%	0%	0%	19%	17%	15%	19%	21%	16%
Strongly disagree	10%	8%	12%	11%	10%	2%	9%	12%	0%	0%	7%	11%	9%	10%	12%	9%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

The current level of funding for the Chicago Police Department is too high.

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status			Child <18 in Household	Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B)	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D)	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)	Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)	Not employed (J)	Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	N=1001	N=414	N=181	N=124	N=283	N=35 *	N=598	N=368	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=300	N=701	N=483	N=518	N=222	N=779
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=418	N=216	N=132	N=235	N=27 **	N=538	N=436	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=265	N=736	N=486	N=515	N=232	N=769
Agree (Net)	40%	38%	35%	44%	44%	34%	40%	39%	0%	0%	46% I	37%	36%	43% m	36%	41%
Strongly agree	12%	14%	9%	15%	11%	10%	12%	13%	0%	0%	13%	12%	11%	14%	11%	13%
Somewhat agree	27%	24%	26%	29%	33% b	24%	28%	26%	0%	0%	33% I	25%	26%	29%	25%	28%
Disagree (Net)	60%	62%	65%	56%	56%	66%	60%	61%	0%	0%	54%	63% k	64% n	57%	64%	59%
Somewhat disagree	37%	42% E	43% E	33%	26%	58% gH	38%	32%	0%	0%	32%	38%	38%	35%	37%	36%
Strongly disagree	24%	20%	22%	23%	30% B	9%	21%	29% fG	0%	0%	22%	25%	26%	21%	27%	23%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Q5a: Are any of the following statements true for you?

I have had a negative experience with a member of the Chicago Police Department.

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status			Child <18 in Household	Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B)	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D)	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)	Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)	Not employed (J)	Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	N=1001	N=414	N=181	N=124	N=283	N=35 *	N=598	N=368	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=300	N=701	N=483	N=518	N=222	N=779
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=418	N=216	N=132	N=235	N=27 **	N=538	N=436	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=265	N=736	N=486	N=515	N=232	N=769
Yes	23%	28% Ce	18%	24%	19%	23%	27% H	17%	0%	0%	29% L	21%	21%	26%	18%	25%
No	77%	72%	82% B	76%	81% b	77%	73%	83% G	0%	0%	71%	79% K	79%	74%	82%	75%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

I have been racially profiled in at least one interaction with police officers in Chicago.

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status			Child <18 in Household	Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B)	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D)	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)	Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)	Not employed (J)	Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	N=1001	N=414	N=181	N=124	N=283	N=35 *	N=598	N=368	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=300	N=701	N=483	N=518	N=222	N=779
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=418	N=216	N=132	N=235	N=27 **	N=538	N=436	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=265	N=736	N=486	N=515	N=232	N=769
Yes	17%	21% E	15%	17%	13%	33% H	19% h	13%	0%	0%	25% L	14%	17%	17%	13%	19%
No	83%	79%	85%	83%	87% B	67%	81%	87% Fg	0%	0%	75%	86% K	83%	83%	87%	81%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

If I were to report police misconduct to the Chicago Police Department, I believe I would receive retaliation from officers for filing a complaint.

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status			Child <18 in Household	Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B)	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D)	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)	Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)	Not employed (J)	Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	N=1001	N=414	N=181	N=124	N=283	N=35 *	N=598	N=368	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=300	N=701	N=483	N=518	N=222	N=779
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=418	N=216	N=132	N=235	N=27 **	N=538	N=436	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=265	N=736	N=486	N=515	N=232	N=769
Yes	39%	42% C	31%	45% c	36%	43%	39%	39%	0%	0%	47% L	35%	38%	40%	32%	41% o
No	61%	58%	69% Bd	55%	64%	57%	61%	61%	0%	0%	53%	65% K	62%	60%	68% p	59%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

I have been afraid to report police misconduct to the Chicago Police Department because I believed I would receive retaliation from officers.

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status			Child <18 in Household	Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B)	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D)	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)	Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)	Not employed (J)	Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	N=1001	N=414	N=181	N=124	N=283	N=35 *	N=598	N=368	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=300	N=701	N=483	N=518	N=222	N=779
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=418	N=216	N=132	N=235	N=27 **	N=538	N=436	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=265	N=736	N=486	N=515	N=232	N=769
Yes	23%	28% CE	16%	31% CE	16%	23%	27% H	16%	0%	0%	30% L	19%	23%	22%	17%	24%
No	77%	72%	84% BD	69%	84% BD	77%	73%	84% G	0%	0%	70%	81% K	77%	78%	83%	76%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Growing up, I was taught that the police were a friend to me and my community.

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status			Child <18 in Household	Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B)	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D)	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)	Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)	Not employed (J)	Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	N=1001	N=414	N=181	N=124	N=283	N=35 *	N=598	N=368	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=300	N=701	N=483	N=518	N=222	N=779
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=418	N=216	N=132	N=235	N=27 **	N=538	N=436	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=265	N=736	N=486	N=515	N=232	N=769
Yes	84%	80%	93% BE	86%	84%	77%	82%	88% G	0%	0%	78%	86% K	88% N	80%	88%	83%
No	16%	20% C	7%	14%	16% C	23%	18% H	12%	0%	0%	22% L	14%	12%	20% M	12%	17%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

As an adult, I feel that the police are a friend to me and my community.

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status			Child <18 in Household	Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B)	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D)	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)	Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)	Not employed (J)	Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	N=1001	N=414	N=181	N=124	N=283	N=35 *	N=598	N=368	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=300	N=701	N=483	N=518	N=222	N=779
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=418	N=216	N=132	N=235	N=27 **	N=538	N=436	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=265	N=736	N=486	N=515	N=232	N=769

Yes	68%	61%		76%	B	72%	b	71%	B	48%		64%		77%	FG	0%		0%		57%		72%	K	73%	N	63%		77%	P	65%	
No	32%	39%	CdE	24%		28%		29%		52%	H	36%	H	23%		0%		0%		43%	L	28%		27%		37%	M	23%		35%	O

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

I have a friend of family member who works for the Chicago Police Department.

		Household Income								Education				Employment Status				Child <18 in Household				Marital Status				Size of Household			
	Total (A)	**Less than $50,000 (B)**		**$50,000 - $74,999 (C)**		**$75,000 - $99,999 (D)**		**$100,000+ (E)**		**Less than HS (F)**		**Some college (G)**		**College grad+ (H)**		**Employed (I)**		**Not employed (J)**		**Yes (K)**		**No (L)**		**Married/Living with**		**Not married (N)**		**1 HH member (O)**		**2+ HH members (P)**	
Total	N=1001	N=414		N=181		N=124		N=283		N=35	*	N=598		N=368		N=0	**	N=0	**	N=300		N=701		N=483		N=518		N=222		N=779	
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=418		N=216		N=132		N=235		N=27	**	N=538		N=436		N=0	**	N=0	**	N=265		N=736		N=486		N=515		N=232		N=769	
Yes	26%	23%		31%		25%		29%		34%		28%		23%		0%		0%		29%		25%		27%		26%		26%		26%	
No	74%	77%		69%		75%		71%		66%		72%		77%		0%		0%		71%		75%		73%		74%		74%		74%	

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

I have felt the need to intervene or observe the interactions between a Chicago police officer and a resident.

		Household Income								Education				Employment Status				Child <18 in Household				Marital Status				Size of Household			
	Total (A)	**Less than $50,000 (B)**		**$50,000 - $74,999 (C)**		**$75,000 - $99,999 (D)**		**$100,000+ (E)**		**Less than HS (F)**		**Some college (G)**		**College grad+ (H)**		**Employed (I)**		**Not employed (J)**		**Yes (K)**		**No (L)**		**Married/Living with**		**Not married (N)**		**1 HH member (O)**		**2+ HH members (P)**	
Total	N=1001	N=414		N=181		N=124		N=283		N=35	*	N=598		N=368		N=0	**	N=0	**	N=300		N=701		N=483		N=518		N=222		N=779	
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=418		N=216		N=132		N=235		N=27	**	N=538		N=436		N=0	**	N=0	**	N=265		N=736		N=486		N=515		N=232		N=769	
Yes	21%	25%	cE	17%		22%		16%		42%	gH	23%	H	15%		0%		0%		24%		19%		19%		23%		14%		23%	O
No	79%	75%		83%	b	78%		84%	B	58%		77%	f	85%	FG	0%		0%		76%		81%		81%		77%		86%	P	77%	

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Q12: In an effort to support essential social services that are often underfunded - such as housing, education, employment, mental health care, and youth services - there have been proposals to reduce police department budgets and redistribute those funds towards these essential social services. How much do you support or oppose such proposals?

		Household Income								Education				Employment Status				Child <18 in Household				Marital Status				Size of Household			
	Total (A)	**Less than $50,000 (B)**		**$50,000 - $74,999 (C)**		**$75,000 - $99,999 (D)**		**$100,000+ (E)**		**Less than HS (F)**		**Some college (G)**		**College grad+ (H)**		**Employed (I)**		**Not employed (J)**		**Yes (K)**		**No (L)**		**Married/Living with**		**Not married (N)**		**1 HH member (O)**		**2+ HH members (P)**	
Total	N=1001	N=414		N=181		N=124		N=283		N=35	*	N=598		N=368		N=0	**	N=0	**	N=300		N=701		N=483		N=518		N=222		N=779	
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=418		N=216		N=132		N=235		N=27	**	N=538		N=436		N=0	**	N=0	**	N=265		N=736		N=486		N=515		N=232		N=769	
Support (Net)	56%	59%		57%		56%		53%		75%	h	57%		53%		0%		0%		65%	L	53%		54%		58%		45%		60%	O
Strongly support	23%	25%		23%		25%		19%		31%		24%		20%		0%		0%		27%		21%		18%		27%	M	19%		24%	
Somewhat support	34%	34%		34%		31%		34%		44%		34%		33%		0%		0%		38%		32%		36%		31%		25%		36%	O
Oppose (Net)	44%	41%		43%		44%		47%		25%		43%		47%	f	0%		0%		35%		47%	K	46%		42%		55%	P	40%	
Somewhat oppose	22%	25%		19%		21%		22%		18%		23%		23%		0%		0%		18%		24%	k	20%		25%		32%	P	20%	
Strongly oppose	21%	17%		25%	b	23%		25%	b	6%		20%		25%	f	0%		0%		17%		23%		26%	N	17%		24%		20%	

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Q6A: Where do you think reallocated funds from the police department should go?

		Household Income								Education				Employment Status				Child <18 in Household				Marital Status				Size of Household			
	Total (A)	**Less than $50,000 (B)**		**$50,000 - $74,999 (C)**		**$75,000 - $99,999 (D)**		**$100,000+ (E)**		**Less than HS (F)**		**Some college (G)**		**College grad+ (H)**		**Employed (I)**		**Not employed (J)**		**Yes (K)**		**No (L)**		**Married/Living with**		**Not married (N)**		**1 HH member (O)**		**2+ HH members (P)**	
Total	N=565	N=242		N=103		N=70	*	N=150		N=26	**	N=344		N=195		N=0	**	N=0	**	N=194		N=370		N=262		N=303		N=99	*	N=466	
Total (Unweighted)	N=560	N=244		N=118		N=76	*	N=122		N=19	**	N=302		N=239		N=0	**	N=0	**	N=164		N=396		N=252		N=308		N=111		N=449	
Mental health care programs	64%	60%		66%		82%	BcE	62%		73%		64%		65%		0%		0%		65%		64%		64%		65%		56%		66%	
Homeless services and shelters	59%	69%	CE	51%		61%		48%		85%	H	63%	H	49%		0%		0%		59%		59%		55%		62%		47%		62%	O
Gun violence prevention	57%	52%		61%		65%		57%		55%		57%		57%		0%		0%		58%		56%		62%	n	52%		50%		58%	
Youth services (e.g., community centers, mentorship programs, after-school programs)	52%	51%		51%		57%		49%		40%		56%	h	45%		0%		0%		53%		51%		58%	N	46%		31%		56%	O
Affordable housing services	48%	46%		57%		46%		44%		46%		50%		44%		0%		0%		50%		47%		45%		49%		42%		49%	
Hiring/integrating social workers into police forces to handle situations where police may not be needed	47%	35%		55%	B	49%		59%	B	22%		45%		54%	F	0%		0%		44%		49%		49%		46%		41%		48%	
Local education/schools	43%	35%		39%		51%	b	54%	Bc	48%		45%		38%		0%		0%		53%	L	37%		43%		42%		21%		47%	O
Local healthcare services	39%	36%		34%		58%	BCe	39%		39%		39%		40%		0%		0%		43%		38%		40%		39%		29%		42%	o
Substance abuse services	39%	37%		37%		52%	b	38%		30%		38%		42%		0%		0%		41%		38%		42%		37%		29%		41%	o
People returning to their communities from jail or prison (e.g., social/family reintegration, expungement, healthcare assistance)	36%	29%		41%	b	32%		46%	B	44%		34%		38%		0%		0%		32%		38%		36%		36%		33%		36%	
Unemployment/Re-employment services	31%	29%		31%		37%		32%		48%		32%		28%		0%		0%		33%		30%		31%		31%		19%		34%	O
Other (please specify):	2%	3%		0%		1%		0%		0%		1%		2%		0%		0%		1%		2%		1%		2%		4%		1%	
Not at all sure	3%	4%		4%		0%		1%		6%		3%		1%		0%		0%		2%		3%		2%		4%		6%	p	2%	

* Table Base: SUPPORTS POLICE BUDGET REALLOCATION

Q6B: Which of the following should have the highest priority for reallocated funds from the police department?

		Household Income								Education				Employment Status				Child <18 in Household				Marital Status				Size of Household			
	Total (A)	**Less than $50,000 (B)**		**$50,000 - $74,999 (C)**		**$75,000 - $99,999 (D)**		**$100,000+ (E)**		**Less than HS (F)**		**Some college (G)**		**College grad+ (H)**		**Employed (I)**		**Not employed (J)**		**Yes (K)**		**No (L)**		**Married/Living with**		**Not married (N)**		**1 HH member (O)**		**2+ HH members (P)**	
Total	N=545	N=228		N=98	*	N=70	*	N=149		N=25	**	N=332		N=188		N=0	**	N=0	**	N=191		N=353		N=258		N=287		N=89	*	N=455	
Total (Unweighted)	N=541	N=230		N=114		N=76	*	N=121		N=18	**	N=291		N=232		N=0	**	N=0	**	N=162		N=379		N=249		N=292		N=101		N=440	
Gun violence prevention	31%	33%		35%		35%		24%		19%		32%		30%		0%		0%		27%		33%		35%		28%		32%		31%	
Hiring/integrating social workers into police forces to handle situations where police may not be needed	13%	8%		8%		7%		25%	BCD	0%		10%		19%	G	0%		0%		10%		14%		13%		12%		17%		12%	
Youth services (e.g., community centers, mentorship programs, after-school programs)	11%	11%		9%		8%		13%		17%		12%		8%		0%		0%		15%	I	8%		13%		9%		10%		11%	
Mental health care programs	11%	10%		19%	E	8%		7%		8%		10%		11%		0%		0%		6%		13%	k	11%		10%		15%		10%	
Homeless services and shelters	10%	11%		9%		12%		7%		35%	GH	9%		9%		0%		0%		12%		9%		8%		12%		7%		10%	
Affordable housing services	9%	12%		8%		6%		5%		8%		11%	H	4%		0%		0%		9%		8%		5%		12%	M	9%		8%	
Local education/schools	6%	5%		2%		9%	c	10%	C	2%		5%		9%		0%		0%		9%		5%		7%		6%		1%		7%	o
Unemployment/Re-employment services	5%	6%		4%		3%		3%		8%		6%		3%		0%		0%		5%		5%		2%		7%	m	4%		5%	
Local healthcare services	3%	2%		2%		4%		4%		0%		2%		5%		0%		0%		5%	I	2%		3%		2%		2%		3%	
Substance abuse services	2%	1%		2%		2%		1%		0%		2%		2%		0%		0%		1%		2%		2%		1%		0%		2%	
People returning to their communities from jail or prison (e.g., social/family reintegration, expungement, healthcare assistance)	2%	1%		3%		4%		0%		3%		1%		2%		0%		0%		1%		2%		2%		1%		2%		1%	

* Table Base: THINK POLICE BUDGET FUNDS SHOULD BE REALLOCATED TO AT LEAST ONE LISTED SERVICE

Q7: How likely do you think it is that the following situations will happen as a result of reallocating funds from the police department to underfunded social services?

Reallocating police department funds will lead to fewer officers in my neighborhood.

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household	Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B)	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D)	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)	Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)	Not employed (J)	Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	N=1001	N=414	N=181	N=124	N=283	N=35 *	N=598	N=368	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=300	N=701	N=483	N=518	N=222	N=779
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=418	N=216	N=132	N=235	N=27 **	N=538	N=436	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=265	N=736	N=486	N=515	N=232	N=769
Likely (Net)	68%	70%	64%	68%	67%	84%	67%	67%	0%	0%	69%	67%	68%	68%	70%	67%
Very likely	27%	28%	28%	25%	25%	23%	26%	28%	0%	0%	24%	28%	27%	26%	33% p	25%
Somewhat likely	41%	43%	36%	43%	41%	61% gh	41%	39%	0%	0%	45%	39%	41%	41%	37%	43%
Not likely (Net)	32%	30%	36%	32%	33%	16%	33%	33%	0%	0%	31%	33%	32%	32%	30%	33%
Not very likely	26%	24%	29%	23%	29%	16%	26%	27%	0%	0%	25%	27%	25%	27%	24%	27%
Not at all likely	6%	6%	7%	8%	4%	0%	6%	6%	0%	0%	5%	6%	7%	5%	6%	6%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Reallocating police department funds will mean more funding for social services that can improve issues such as mental health, addiction, and homelessness.

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household	Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B)	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D)	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)	Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)	Not employed (J)	Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	N=1001	N=414	N=181	N=124	N=283	N=35 *	N=598	N=368	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=300	N=701	N=483	N=518	N=222	N=779
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=418	N=216	N=132	N=235	N=27 **	N=538	N=436	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=265	N=736	N=486	N=515	N=232	N=769
Likely (Net)	62%	64%	56%	68% c	61%	75%	61%	62%	0%	0%	64%	61%	61%	63%	56%	64% o
Very likely	20%	22%	19%	17%	18%	34%	19%	19%	0%	0%	21%	19%	16%	23% M	20%	20%
Somewhat likely	43%	42%	37%	51% c	43%	41%	42%	43%	0%	0%	44%	42%	45%	40%	36%	44%
Not likely (Net)	38%	36%	44% d	32%	39%	25%	39%	38%	0%	0%	36%	39%	39%	37%	44% p	36%
Not very likely	28%	27%	31%	23%	28%	22%	29%	26%	0%	0%	28%	27%	28%	27%	30%	27%
Not at all likely	10%	9%	14%	9%	10%	4%	10%	12%	0%	0%	7%	12%	10%	10%	14% p	9%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Reallocating police department funds will lead to an increase in crime in my neighborhood.

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household	Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B)	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D)	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)	Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)	Not employed (J)	Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	N=1001	N=414	N=181	N=124	N=283	N=35 *	N=598	N=368	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=300	N=701	N=483	N=518	N=222	N=779
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=418	N=216	N=132	N=235	N=27 **	N=538	N=436	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=265	N=736	N=486	N=515	N=232	N=769
Likely (Net)	55%	51%	60% b	60%	54%	60%	54%	55%	0%	0%	53%	56%	54%	55%	62% P	53%
Very likely	23%	22%	23%	23%	23%	19%	22%	24%	0%	0%	22%	24%	24%	22%	27%	22%
Somewhat likely	32%	29%	37% b	36%	31%	41%	32%	31%	0%	0%	31%	32%	30%	33%	35%	31%
Not likely (Net)	45%	49% c	40%	40%	46%	40%	46%	45%	0%	0%	47%	44%	46%	45%	38%	47% O
Not very likely	33%	37% d	31%	25%	33%	36%	35%	30%	0%	0%	36%	32%	33%	34%	28%	34%
Not at all likely	12%	12%	9%	15%	13%	4%	11%	15%	0%	0%	11%	13%	13%	11%	10%	13%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Reallocating police department funds will start a real dialogue about the changes needed for policing in Chicago.

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household	Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B)	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D)	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)	Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)	Not employed (J)	Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	N=1001	N=414	N=181	N=124	N=283	N=35 *	N=598	N=368	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=300	N=701	N=483	N=518	N=222	N=779
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=418	N=216	N=132	N=235	N=27 **	N=538	N=436	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=265	N=736	N=486	N=515	N=232	N=769
Likely (Net)	58%	61%	59%	52%	57%	69%	57%	59%	0%	0%	67% L	54%	58%	58%	50%	61% O
Very likely	17%	21% e	16%	13%	14%	36% Gh	15%	19%	0%	0%	25% L	14%	15%	19%	13%	18%
Somewhat likely	41%	40%	43%	38%	43%	33%	42%	39%	0%	0%	42%	41%	43%	39%	36%	42%
Not likely (Net)	42%	39%	41%	48%	43%	31%	43%	41%	0%	0%	33%	46% K	42%	42%	50% P	39%
Not very likely	26%	23%	21%	37% BC	30%	15%	28%	26%	0%	0%	24%	27%	27%	25%	29%	26%
Not at all likely	16%	16%	21% d	11%	14%	16%	15%	16%	0%	0%	9%	18% K	15%	16%	21% p	14%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Reallocating police department funds will only benefit communities of color.

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household	Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B)	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D)	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)	Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)	Not employed (J)	Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	N=1001	N=414	N=181	N=124	N=283	N=35 *	N=598	N=368	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=300	N=701	N=483	N=518	N=222	N=779
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=418	N=216	N=132	N=235	N=27 **	N=538	N=436	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=265	N=736	N=486	N=515	N=232	N=769
Likely (Net)	40%	41%	38%	31%	42% d	50%	39%	39%	0%	0%	41%	39%	40%	39%	41%	39%
Very likely	8%	8%	9%	4%	9%	1%	10%	7%	0%	0%	9%	8%	8%	8%	8%	8%
Somewhat likely	31%	33%	28%	27%	33%	49% g	30%	32%	0%	0%	31%	31%	32%	31%	33%	31%
Not likely (Net)	60%	59%	62%	69% e	58%	50%	61%	61%	0%	0%	59%	61%	60%	61%	59%	61%
Not very likely	38%	35%	39%	43%	38%	20%	41% f	35%	0%	0%	41%	37%	39%	37%	39%	38%
Not at all likely	23%	23%	23%	26%	20%	30%	20%	26% g	0%	0%	19%	24%	20%	25%	20%	23%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Reallocating police department funds will not contribute to repairing the relationship between the police and Chicago residents.

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household	Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B)	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D)	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)	Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)	Not employed (J)	Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	N=1001	N=414	N=181	N=124	N=283	N=35 *	N=598	N=368	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=300	N=701	N=483	N=518	N=222	N=779
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=418	N=216	N=132	N=235	N=27 **	N=538	N=436	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=265	N=736	N=486	N=515	N=232	N=769
Likely (Net)	61%	61% c	52%	64% c	64% C	71%	58%	64%	0%	0%	67% L	58%	59%	62%	60%	61%
Very likely	24%	24%	19%	22%	28%	28%	23%	25%	0%	0%	28%	23%	25%	23%	24%	24%
Somewhat likely	36%	37%	32%	42%	36%	43%	35%	39%	0%	0%	40%	35%	34%	39%	36%	37%
Not likely (Net)	39%	39%	48% bdE	36%	36%	29%	42%	36%	0%	0%	33%	42% K	41%	38%	40%	39%
Not very likely	27%	26%	34% d	22%	28%	16%	30%	24%	0%	0%	25%	28%	30%	25%	24%	28%
Not at all likely	12%	13%	15% e	14%	8%	14%	13%	11%	0%	0%	7%	14% K	10%	14%	16%	11%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Q6: Perhaps you have heard of the campaign "Defund the Police," which refers to the movement to reduce police department budgets and redistribute those funds towards essential social services that are often underfunded, such as housing, education, employment, mental health care, and youth services. Given this understanding, how much do you support or oppose this campaign?

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household	Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B)	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D)	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)	Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)	Not employed (J)	Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	N=1001	N=414	N=181	N=124	N=283	N=35 *	N=598	N=368	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=300	N=701	N=483	N=518	N=222	N=779
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=418	N=216	N=132	N=235	N=27 **	N=538	N=436	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=265	N=736	N=486	N=515	N=232	N=769
Support (Net)	46%	52% de	44%	40%	43%	60%	48%	43%	0%	0%	52% I	44%	43%	49%	35%	49% O
Strongly support	16%	19%	14%	16%	13%	33% GH	16%	15%	0%	0%	18%	16%	12%	20% M	14%	17%
Somewhat support	30%	32%	30%	24%	30%	26%	32%	27%	0%	0%	35%	28%	30%	30%	21%	33% O
Oppose (Net)	54%	48%	56%	60% b	57% b	40%	52%	57%	0%	0%	48%	56% k	57%	51%	65% P	51%
Somewhat oppose	21%	21%	19%	22%	21%	27%	21%	20%	0%	0%	20%	21%	21%	20%	26% p	19%
Strongly oppose	33%	28%	37% b	37%	36% b	13%	32% f	37% F	0%	0%	28%	35% k	36%	30%	38%	31%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Q9: What would reform of Chicago law enforcement look like to you?

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household	Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B)	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D)	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)	Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)	Not employed (J)	Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	N=743	N=314	N=126	N=89 *	N=215	N=30 *	N=435	N=279	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=224	N=519	N=347	N=396	N=149	N=594
Total (Unweighted)	N=754	N=333	N=151	N=96 *	N=174	N=23 **	N=403	N=328	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=202	N=552	N=348	N=406	N=166	N=588
Sensitivity training for all officers	56%	51%	60%	67% B	55%	39%	55%	59%	0%	0%	53%	57%	52%	59%	63%	54%
De-escalation training for all officers	52%	45%	47%	64% BC	60% Bc	55%	48%	58% G	0%	0%	59% I	49%	56%	49%	49%	53%
Race-focused training for all officers	51%	45%	54%	66% Be	51%	49%	52%	49%	0%	0%	50%	51%	49%	52%	53%	50%
New policies on gun use	50%	49%	54%	63% bE	44%	67%	49%	50%	0%	0%	48%	51%	47%	53%	46%	51%
Introduction of social workers onto police force	50%	44%	48%	68% BCe	53%	40%	49%	53%	0%	0%	52%	49%	49%	51%	50%	50%
Bias training for all officers	50%	46%	44%	67% BCe	51%	37%	47%	54%	0%	0%	48%	50%	50%	49%	54%	48%
Increased racial and ethnic diversity within the department	42%	36%	38%	50% b	50% B	35%	39%	47%	0%	0%	46%	40%	42%	42%	37%	43%
Stricter rules and regulations from the Chicago Police Board (the disciplinary body for Chicago police officers)	41%	41%	49% e	42%	35%	28%	43%	39%	0%	0%	40%	41%	37%	44%	41%	41%
Greater reliance on non-lethal weapons	40%	37%	38%	57% BCE	37%	50%	41%	36%	0%	0%	41%	39%	37%	42%	37%	40%
More stringent recruiting requirements	36%	31%	32%	47% Bc	41% b	44%	36%	36%	0%	0%	32%	38%	30%	41% M	38%	36%
Civilian oversight committee	32%	25%	37% B	53% BcE	33%	27%	32%	34%	0%	0%	36%	31%	33%	32%	25%	34%
Completely new leadership	28%	28%	27%	43% BcE	24%	30%	31%	25%	0%	0%	35% I	26%	29%	28%	22%	30%
Reduced funding for the police department	23%	24%	20%	24%	22%	25%	22%	24%	0%	0%	24%	22%	21%	24%	16%	24% o
Consent decree (i.e., a court order that establishes an enforceable plan for reform)	19%	20%	21%	22%	16%	11%	17%	24% g	0%	0%	20%	19%	17%	21%	20%	19%
Other (please specify):	4%	5%	1%	3%	5% c	0%	5%	3%	0%	0%	3%	5%	3%	5%	5%	4%
Not at all sure	5%	6%	6%	2%	5%	5%	5%	5%	0%	0%	7%	4%	6%	5%	7%	5%

* Table Base: AGREE CHICAGO LAW ENFORCEMENT NEEDS REFORM

Q9A: How would you rate the training of Chicago police officers on each of the following?

Racial and cultural awareness

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household	Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B)	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D)	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)	Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)	Not employed (J)	Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	N=1001	N=414	N=181	N=124	N=283	N=35 *	N=598	N=368	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=300	N=701	N=483	N=518	N=222	N=779
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=418	N=216	N=132	N=235	N=27 **	N=538	N=436	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=265	N=736	N=486	N=515	N=232	N=769
Excellent	8%	6%	9%	8%	10%	0%	9%	7%	0%	0%	7%	8%	8%	7%	8%	8%
Good	21%	20%	19%	21%	25%	18%	19%	25% g	0%	0%	20%	21%	24% n	18%	22%	21%
Fair	26%	23%	28%	28%	27%	25%	25%	27%	0%	0%	26%	26%	28%	24%	20%	28% o
Poor	21%	23%	20%	22%	19%	24%	22%	20%	0%	0%	20%	22%	21%	22%	22%	21%
Terrible	8%	8%	11%	10%	7%	11%	10%	6%	0%	0%	13% L	7%	8%	9%	10%	8%
I don't think CPD officers have been trained for this at all	8%	11% ce	5%	9%	5%	14%	8%	8%	0%	0%	11%	7%	6%	10% m	6%	9%
Not at all sure	7%	9% d	8%	3%	7%	8%	8%	7%	0%	0%	3%	9% K	5%	9% m	12% P	6%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Bias awareness

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household	Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B)	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D)	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)	Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)	Not employed (J)	Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	N=1001	N=414	N=181	N=124	N=283	N=35 *	N=598	N=368	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=300	N=701	N=483	N=518	N=222	N=779
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=418	N=216	N=132	N=235	N=27 **	N=538	N=436	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=265	N=736	N=486	N=515	N=232	N=769
Excellent	6%	4%	8%	5%	9% b	0%	7%	7%	0%	0%	5%	7%	8%	5%	6%	6%
Good	20%	17%	19%	21%	24% b	11%	16%	27% G	0%	0%	21%	19%	20%	20%	20%	20%
Fair	26%	28%	27%	25%	23%	33%	27%	24%	0%	0%	22%	28%	27%	25%	25%	26%
Poor	21%	19%	18%	24%	23%	27%	20%	21%	0%	0%	20%	21%	22%	19%	18%	21%
Terrible	8%	8%	12% e	8%	6%	22% gH	9%	5%	0%	0%	13% L	6%	7%	8%	8%	8%
I don't think CPD officers have been trained for this at all	10%	12% c	6%	10%	9%	3%	11%	8%	0%	0%	13%	9%	8%	12% m	9%	10%
Not at all sure	9%	12% E	11% e	7%	5%	5%	10%	8%	0%	0%	5%	11% K	8%	11%	14% P	8%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Sensitivity toward those of a different gender, religion, age, orientation, income, etc.

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household	Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B)	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D)	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)	Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)	Not employed (J)	Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	N=1001	N=414	N=181	N=124	N=283	N=35 *	N=598	N=368	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=300	N=701	N=483	N=518	N=222	N=779
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=418	N=216	N=132	N=235	N=27 **	N=538	N=436	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=265	N=736	N=486	N=515	N=232	N=769
Excellent	8%	7%	6%	9%	11%	0%	8%	9%	0%	0%	6%	9%	7%	9%	7%	8%
Good	19%	17%	20%	17%	22%	5%	18%	22% f	0%	0%	19%	19%	22% N	16%	21%	19%
Fair	27%	28%	23%	31%	27%	30%	27%	28%	0%	0%	25%	29%	27%	28%	32%	26%
Poor	19%	18%	26% bE	21%	15%	37% gH	19%	17%	0%	0%	22%	18%	18%	20%	17%	20%
Terrible	9%	9%	11%	9%	9%	13%	10%	8%	0%	0%	17% L	6%	12% n	7%	8%	10%
I don't think CPD officers have been trained for this at all	8%	11% C	4%	9% c	8%	0%	10%	7%	0%	0%	8%	8%	6%	10% m	7%	9%
Not at all sure	8%	9%	10%	4%	8%	16%	8%	8%	0%	0%	4%	10% K	8%	9%	8%	8%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

De-escalating tense or dangerous situations

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household	Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B)	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D)	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)	Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)	Not employed (J)	Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	N=1001	N=414	N=181	N=124	N=283	N=35 *	N=598	N=368	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=300	N=701	N=483	N=518	N=222	N=779
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=418	N=216	N=132	N=235	N=27 **	N=538	N=436	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=265	N=736	N=486	N=515	N=232	N=769
Excellent	9%	9%	6%	5%	13% Cd	2%	8%	11%	0%	0%	7%	10%	9%	9%	10%	9%
Good	23%	23%	23%	23%	23%	20%	24%	22%	0%	0%	24%	23%	25%	21%	25%	22%
Fair	27%	24%	32% b	33%	25%	41%	27%	26%	0%	0%	28%	26%	28%	25%	25%	27%
Poor	20%	16%	22%	22%	23% b	8%	18%	24% g	0%	0%	21%	19%	20%	20%	15%	21%
Terrible	8%	9%	6%	9%	8%	12%	9%	7%	0%	0%	11%	7%	8%	8%	9%	8%
I don't think CPD officers have been trained for this at all	6%	9% CE	3%	7%	3%	12%	6%	4%	0%	0%	6%	6%	4%	7%	6%	5%
Not at all sure	7%	10% D	9% D	1%	6%	5%	8%	6%	0%	0%	4%	9% k	6%	9%	10%	7%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Prioritizing non-lethal actions or weapons when dealing with individuals

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household	Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)	Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)	Not employed (J)	Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	N=1001	N=414	N=181	N=124	N=283	N=35 *	N=598	N=368	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=300	N=701	N=483	N=518	N=222	N=779
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=418	N=216	N=132	N=235	N=27 **	N=538	N=436	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=265	N=736	N=486	N=515	N=232	N=769
Excellent	9%	6%	10%	12%	10%	8%	8%	10%	0%	0%	11%	8%	11%	7%	7%	9%
Good	20%	22%	18%	14%	22%	8%	20%	22%	0%	0%	16%	22%	20%	21%	24%	19%
Fair	29%	31%	31%	31%	26%	21%	31%	28%	0%	0%	31%	29%	31%	28%	28%	30%
Poor	16%	12%	17%	20% b	21% B	36% G	11%	23% G	0%	0%	18%	16%	17%	16%	14%	17%
Terrible	10%	10%	14% e	12%	7%	12%	13% H	5%	0%	0%	13% I	9%	10%	10%	9%	10%
I don't think CPD officers have been trained for this at all	6%	8% C	3%	6%	5%	12% h	7% h	3%	0%	0%	6%	6%	5%	7%	4%	7%
Not at all sure	9%	11% d	8%	4%	9%	5%	9%	9%	0%	0%	4%	11% K	7%	10%	13% P	8%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Responding to situations involving mental or behavioral health concerns

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household	Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)	Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)	Not employed (J)	Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	N=1001	N=414	N=181	N=124	N=283	N=35 *	N=598	N=368	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=300	N=701	N=483	N=518	N=222	N=779
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=418	N=216	N=132	N=235	N=27 **	N=538	N=436	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=265	N=736	N=486	N=515	N=232	N=769
Excellent	6%	5%	6%	5%	6%	5%	5%	6%	0%	0%	7%	5%	6%	5%	6%	6%
Good	16%	13%	14%	16%	23% BC	5%	15%	19%	0%	0%	19%	15%	18%	15%	14%	17%
Fair	22%	22%	25%	21%	21%	17%	21%	25%	0%	0%	19%	24%	23%	22%	23%	22%
Poor	25%	26%	24%	27%	23%	47% GH	26%	21%	0%	0%	27%	24%	25%	25%	22%	26%
Terrible	11%	12%	11%	8%	11%	11%	12%	9%	0%	0%	13%	10%	11%	12%	11%	11%
I don't think CPD officers have been trained for this at all	10%	12% e	8%	16% cE	7%	7%	10%	11%	0%	0%	9%	11%	8%	12%	12%	10%
Not at all sure	9%	9%	12%	6%	8%	8%	9%	8%	0%	0%	6%	10%	8%	10%	12%	8%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Responding to situations involving family safety concerns (e.g., domestic abuse, child endangerment)

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household	Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)	Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)	Not employed (J)	Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	N=1001	N=414	N=181	N=124	N=283	N=35 *	N=598	N=368	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=300	N=701	N=483	N=518	N=222	N=779
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=418	N=216	N=132	N=235	N=27 **	N=538	N=436	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=265	N=736	N=486	N=515	N=232	N=769
Excellent	10%	9%	10%	6%	14% d	11%	9%	12%	0%	0%	10%	10%	10%	10%	11%	10%
Good	29%	26%	32%	26%	32%	13%	28%	32% f	0%	0%	23%	32% K	33% N	25%	30%	28%
Fair	28%	26%	26%	41% BCE	27%	28%	28%	28%	0%	0%	34% I	26%	29%	28%	25%	29%
Poor	13%	14%	16%	11%	11%	33% GH	14%	10%	0%	0%	13%	14%	13%	14%	12%	14%
Terrible	6%	7%	5%	6%	6%	7%	7%	6%	0%	0%	9% I	5%	5%	8%	6%	6%
I don't think CPD officers have been trained for this at all	6%	8%	4%	5%	4%	3%	7% h	4%	0%	0%	8% I	4%	5%	7%	5%	6%
Not at all sure	7%	9%	7%	6%	6%	5%	7%	8%	0%	0%	3%	9% K	6%	9%	10%	6%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Responding to situations involving personal safety concerns (e.g., stalking, harassment, physical fights)

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household	Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)	Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)	Not employed (J)	Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	N=1001	N=414	N=181	N=124	N=283	N=35 *	N=598	N=368	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=300	N=701	N=483	N=518	N=222	N=779
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=418	N=216	N=132	N=235	N=27 **	N=538	N=436	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=265	N=736	N=486	N=515	N=232	N=769
Excellent	11%	6%	10%	11%	18% Bc	3%	9%	15% G	0%	0%	13%	10%	13%	9%	6%	12% o
Good	27%	27%	31%	29%	25%	14%	27%	28%	0%	0%	19%	31% K	27%	27%	33%	26%
Fair	28%	27%	26%	32%	28%	35%	28%	26%	0%	0%	29%	27%	31% n	25%	28%	28%
Poor	15%	15%	15%	15%	16%	26%	16%	14%	0%	0%	20% L	13%	15%	16%	9%	17% O
Terrible	6%	8% e	5%	6%	4%	5%	7%	5%	0%	0%	7%	6%	5%	7%	8%	5%
I don't think CPD officers have been trained for this at all	5%	7% e	5%	3%	2%	9%	5%	4%	0%	0%	7%	4%	3%	6%	4%	5%
Not at all sure	8%	10%	9%	5%	7%	7%	8%	9%	0%	0%	5%	10% k	6%	10%	12%	7%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Q10: Which of the following do you think are effective policies for reducing gun violence in Chicago?

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household	Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)	Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)	Not employed (J)	Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	N=950	N=385	N=170	N=121	N=274	N=34 *	N=562	N=354	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=284	N=665	N=461	N=489	N=210	N=740
Total (Unweighted)	N=945	N=392	N=200	N=127	N=226	N=26 **	N=505	N=414	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=251	N=694	N=460	N=485	N=219	N=726
Background checks for all gun sales	65%	61%	69%	66%	68%	54%	65%	66%	0%	0%	58%	68% K	63%	67%	63%	66%
Higher penalties for gun-related crimes	64%	62%	65%	71%	62%	59%	67%	60%	0%	0%	57%	67% K	61%	67%	70%	62%
Increased police presence in neighborhoods with high gun violence	58%	56%	62%	60%	57%	55%	60%	55%	0%	0%	60%	57%	58%	57%	58%	58%
Increase the police's community involvement with residents in neighborhoods with high gun violence	54%	54%	60% E	59% e	46%	48%	56%	51%	0%	0%	54%	53%	54%	53%	58%	52%
Red flag laws/Extreme risk protection orders (i.e., police can remove or block an individual's access to firearms if they believe the weapons will be used for harm)	50%	44%	54% b	53%	54% b	51%	49%	51%	0%	0%	49%	50%	51%	48%	46%	51%
Neighborhood initiatives (e.g., neighborhood watch, community clubs, resident oversight communities)	48%	46%	53%	55%	44%	29%	49% f	48%	0%	0%	45%	49%	50%	46%	48%	48%
Youth services and after-school programs	48%	42%	51%	53%	51%	30%	51% f	45%	0%	0%	45%	49%	49%	46%	45%	48%
Police follow-up after gun violence situations	46%	42%	45%	54% b	48%	66% gh	45%	45%	0%	0%	49%	45%	49%	43%	48%	46%
Support resources for residents with mental or behavioral health conditions (e.g., counseling services, social workers, housing services)	45%	46%	42%	42%	46%	33%	46%	45%	0%	0%	44%	45%	45%	45%	48%	44%
In-school youth programs	43%	38%	46%	47%	45%	28%	43%	44%	0%	0%	51% L	39%	46% n	39%	38%	44%
Buy-back of certain firearms (e.g., semi-automatic assault weapons)	33%	32%	37%	37%	32%	40%	31%	37%	0%	0%	35%	33%	38% N	30%	28%	35%
Other (please specify):	5%	5%	3%	4%	4%	0%	5%	4%	0%	0%	3%	5%	4%	5%	8% P	4%
Not at all sure	4%	5%	3%	1%	4%	10%	3%	4%	0%	0%	3%	4%	3%	5%	5%	3%

* Table Base: AGREE GUN VIOLENCE NEEDS TO BE REDUCED IN CHICAGO

Q13A: Which do you think best describes the level of involvement that the Chicago Police department should have in each of the following situations?

Truancy (i.e., a student's repeated unexcused absence from school)

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household	Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)	Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)	Not employed (J)	Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	N=1001	N=414	N=181	N=124	N=283	N=35 *	N=598	N=368	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=300	N=701	N=483	N=518	N=222	N=779
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=418	N=216	N=132	N=235	N=27 **	N=538	N=436	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=265	N=736	N=486	N=515	N=232	N=769
Sole responsibility - CPD should respond independently unless another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) is specifically requested	9%	11%	7%	5%	9%	15%	8%	10%	0%	0%	12%	8%	9%	9%	8%	9%
Primary responsibility - CPD should take the lead, but another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should be present	9%	10%	8%	6%	10%	12%	9%	10%	0%	0%	10%	9%	9%	9%	10%	9%
Shared responsibility - CPD should respond to the call alongside another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works)	26%	24%	23%	28%	30%	9%	27% f	25%	0%	0%	29%	24%	26%	26%	22%	27%
Limited responsibility - another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should take the lead, but CPD should be present	21%	20%	30% BE	22%	17%	19%	23%	20%	0%	0%	17%	23%	22%	21%	26%	20%
No responsibility - another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should respond independently unless CPD is specifically requested	26%	23%	25%	29%	31%	17%	24%	31% g	0%	0%	23%	28%	26%	27%	28%	26%
N/A - this issue should be handled without a response team(s) (e.g., between residents, involving a private organization)	8%	12% cE	6%	10% e	4%	28% GH	9% H	4%	0%	0%	10%	7%	8%	8%	6%	9%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Medical emergency (e.g., heart attack, allergic reaction, overdose)

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household	Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)	Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)	Not employed (J)	Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	N=1001	N=414	N=181	N=124	N=283	N=35 *	N=598	N=368	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=300	N=701	N=483	N=518	N=222	N=779
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=418	N=216	N=132	N=235	N=27 **	N=538	N=436	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=265	N=736	N=486	N=515	N=232	N=769
Sole responsibility - CPD should respond independently unless another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) is specifically requested	11%	14% E	11%	8%	7%	9%	11%	10%	0%	0%	13%	10%	8%	14% M	12%	11%
Primary responsibility - CPD should take the lead, but another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should be present	13%	15% c	9%	12%	15%	17%	14%	13%	0%	0%	13%	14%	14%	13%	16%	13%
Shared responsibility - CPD should respond to the call alongside another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works)	34%	30%	44% B	36%	34%	44%	34%	34%	0%	0%	34%	35%	36%	33%	32%	35%
Limited responsibility - another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should take the lead, but CPD should be present	24%	24%	21%	19%	26%	16%	24%	24%	0%	0%	21%	25%	24%	24%	23%	24%
No responsibility - another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should respond independently unless CPD is specifically requested	16%	14%	13%	22% bc	17%	7%	15%	18%	0%	0%	17%	15%	17%	14%	14%	16%
N/A - this issue should be handled without a response team(s) (e.g., between residents, involving a private organization)	2%	3%	2%	2%	1%	8% H	3% H	0%	0%	0%	2%	2%	2%	2%	3%	2%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Drug-related issue (e.g., intoxication, addiction, possession of an illicit substance)

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household	Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)	Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)	Not employed (J)	Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	N=1001	N=414	N=181	N=124	N=283	N=35 *	N=598	N=368	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=300	N=701	N=483	N=518	N=222	N=779
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=418	N=216	N=132	N=235	N=27 **	N=538	N=436	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=265	N=736	N=486	N=515	N=232	N=769
Sole responsibility - CPD should respond independently unless another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) is specifically requested	21%	22%	21%	17%	21%	23%	21%	20%	0%	0%	21%	21%	19%	22%	20%	21%
Primary responsibility - CPD should take the lead, but another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should be present	28%	28%	24%	29%	30%	16%	28%	29%	0%	0%	25%	29%	28%	28%	34%	27%
Shared responsibility - CPD should respond to the call alongside another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works)	36%	36%	36%	34%	35%	44%	36%	34%	0%	0%	38%	35%	38%	33%	32%	37%
Limited responsibility - another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should take the lead, but CPD should be present	11%	9%	12%	17% b	11%	5%	10%	13%	0%	0%	11%	11%	10%	12%	11%	11%
No responsibility - another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should respond independently unless CPD is specifically requested	3%	3%	5%	3%	3%	8%	3%	4%	0%	0%	3%	3%	4%	2%	2%	3%
N/A - this issue should be handled without a response team(s) (e.g., between residents, involving a private organization)	1%	2%	2%	0%	0%	4% H	2% h	0%	0%	0%	2%	1%	0%	2% m	2%	1%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Mental or behavioral health concern (e.g., suicidal tendency, unstable behavior)

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household	Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)	Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)	Not employed (J)	Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	N=1001	N=414	N=181	N=124	N=283	N=35 *	N=598	N=368	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=300	N=701	N=483	N=518	N=222	N=779
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=418	N=216	N=132	N=235	N=27 **	N=538	N=436	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=265	N=736	N=486	N=515	N=232	N=769
Sole responsibility - CPD should respond independently unless another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) is specifically requested	9%	11%	8%	6%	7%	16%	8%	9%	0%	0%	12% I	7%	6%	11% M	9%	9%
Primary responsibility - CPD should take the lead, but another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should be present	13%	16%	11%	12%	12%	10%	15%	11%	0%	0%	15%	13%	12%	15%	12%	14%

Shared responsibility - CPD should respond to the call alongside another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works)	42%	38%	41%	48%	45%	47%	42%	40%	0%	0%	38%	43%	46% N	38%	44%	41%
Limited responsibility - another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should take the lead, but CPD should be present	26%	26%	33%	22%	25%	18%	24%	31% g	0%	0%	21%	29% k	26%	27%	28%	26%
No responsibility - another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should respond independently unless CPD is specifically requested	8%	7%	4%	11% c	10%	3%	8%	8%	0%	0%	12% L	6%	9%	7%	5%	8%
N/A - this issue should be handled without a response team(s) (e.g., between residents, involving a private organization)	2%	3%	3%	1%	1%	6% H	3% H	0%	0%	0%	2%	2%	1%	3%	2%	2%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Domestic dispute (e.g., suspected abuse, child endangerment)

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household		Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	**Less than $50,000 (B**	**$50,000 - $74,999 (C**	**$75,000 - $99,999 (D**	**$100,000+ (E)**	**Less than HS (F)**	**Some college (G)**	**College grad+ (H)**	**Employed (I)**	**Not employed (J)**	**Yes (K)**	**No (L)**	**Married/Living with**	**Not married (N)**	**1 HH member (O)**	**2+ HH members (P)**
Total	N=1001	N=414	N=181	N=124	N=283	N=35 *	N=598	N=368	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=300	N=701	N=483	N=518	N=222	N=779
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=418	N=216	N=132	N=235	N=27 **	N=538	N=436	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=265	N=736	N=486	N=515	N=232	N=769
Sole responsibility - CPD should respond independently unless another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) is specifically requested	24%	29% dE	24%	18%	20%	49% GH	25%	20%	0%	0%	29% l	22%	21%	27%	23%	25%
Primary responsibility - CPD should take the lead, but another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should be present	35%	31%	36%	45% B	34%	26%	34%	37%	0%	0%	33%	35%	34%	35%	38%	34%
Shared responsibility - CPD should respond to the call alongside another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works)	32%	31%	31%	29%	37%	20%	32%	34%	0%	0%	29%	34%	36%	29%	31%	33%
Limited responsibility - another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should take the lead, but CPD should be present	6%	5%	4%	6%	9%	3%	5%	7%	0%	0%	7%	5%	6%	5%	5%	6%
No responsibility - another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should respond independently unless CPD is specifically requested	1%	1%	3% e	1%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	1%	1%	0%	1%
N/A - this issue should be handled without a response team(s) (e.g., between residents, involving a private organization)	2%	3%	2%	1%	1%	1%	3% h	1%	0%	0%	1%	2%	2%	2%	3%	2%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Personal safety concern (e.g., physical fight, stalking, harassment)

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household		Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	**Less than $50,000 (B**	**$50,000 - $74,999 (C**	**$75,000 - $99,999 (D**	**$100,000+ (E)**	**Less than HS (F)**	**Some college (G)**	**College grad+ (H)**	**Employed (I)**	**Not employed (J)**	**Yes (K)**	**No (L)**	**Married/Living with**	**Not married (N)**	**1 HH member (O)**	**2+ HH members (P)**
Total	N=1001	N=414	N=181	N=124	N=283	N=35 *	N=598	N=368	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=300	N=701	N=483	N=518	N=222	N=779
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=418	N=216	N=132	N=235	N=27 **	N=538	N=436	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=265	N=736	N=486	N=515	N=232	N=769
Sole responsibility - CPD should respond independently unless another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) is specifically requested	37%	39%	34%	32%	39%	25%	38%	38%	0%	0%	36%	38%	38%	37%	39%	37%
Primary responsibility - CPD should take the lead, but another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should be present	31%	27%	34%	37%	34%	40%	29%	34%	0%	0%	29%	33%	33%	30%	27%	33%
Shared responsibility - CPD should respond to the call alongside another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works)	23%	23%	23%	27%	21%	19%	25%	20%	0%	0%	26%	22%	22%	24%	24%	23%
Limited responsibility - another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should take the lead, but CPD should be present	5%	6%	5%	4%	5%	8%	4%	7%	0%	0%	7%	4%	5%	5%	5%	5%
No responsibility - another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should respond independently unless CPD is specifically requested	1%	1%	3%	1%	1%	0%	2%	1%	0%	0%	2%	1%	1%	2%	2%	1%
N/A - this issue should be handled without a response team(s) (e.g., between residents, involving a private organization)	1%	3% E	1%	0%	0%	8% H	2% H	0%	0%	0%	1%	2%	1%	2%	3% p	1%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Wellness check (i.e., requested in-person visit to verify a resident's personal well-being)

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household		Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	**Less than $50,000 (B**	**$50,000 - $74,999 (C**	**$75,000 - $99,999 (D**	**$100,000+ (E)**	**Less than HS (F)**	**Some college (G)**	**College grad+ (H)**	**Employed (I)**	**Not employed (J)**	**Yes (K)**	**No (L)**	**Married/Living with**	**Not married (N)**	**1 HH member (O)**	**2+ HH members (P)**
Total	N=1001	N=414	N=181	N=124	N=283	N=35 *	N=598	N=368	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=300	N=701	N=483	N=518	N=222	N=779
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=418	N=216	N=132	N=235	N=27 **	N=538	N=436	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=265	N=736	N=486	N=515	N=232	N=769
Sole responsibility - CPD should respond independently unless another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) is specifically requested	15%	17% d	14%	8%	15%	19%	14%	15%	0%	0%	18%	13%	14%	16%	13%	15%
Primary responsibility - CPD should take the lead, but another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should be present	18%	18%	24% e	15%	15%	7%	17%	19%	0%	0%	18%	17%	19%	16%	16%	18%
Shared responsibility - CPD should respond to the call alongside another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works)	37%	33%	32%	42%	42% bc	27%	39%	33%	0%	0%	36%	37%	38%	35%	33%	38%
Limited responsibility - another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should take the lead, but CPD should be present	19%	19%	19%	19%	18%	36% G	17%	20%	0%	0%	17%	20%	20%	18%	21%	18%
No responsibility - another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should respond independently unless CPD is specifically requested	10%	10%	9%	14%	10%	10%	10%	11%	0%	0%	11%	10%	8%	12%	13%	10%
N/A - this issue should be handled without a response team(s) (e.g., between residents, involving a private organization)	2%	4% E	2%	1%	0%	2%	3%	1%	0%	0%	2%	2%	1%	3%	4%	2%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Suspicious behavior (e.g., trespassing, loitering, unfamiliar vehicles)

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household	Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B)	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D)	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)	Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)	Not employed (J)	Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	N=1001	N=414	N=181	N=124	N=283	N=35 *	N=598	N=368	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=300	N=701	N=483	N=518	N=222	N=779
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=418	N=216	N=132	N=235	N=27 **	N=538	N=436	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=265	N=736	N=486	N=515	N=232	N=769
Sole responsibility - CPD should respond independently unless another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) is specifically requested	44%	45%	44%	42%	43%	41%	46%	41%	0%	0%	47%	43%	45%	43%	40%	45%
Primary responsibility - CPD should take the lead, but another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should be present	27%	24%	27%	23%	33% b	21%	24%	33% G	0%	0%	24%	28%	26%	28%	32%	26%
Shared responsibility - CPD should respond to the call alongside another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works)	21%	20%	22%	26%	19%	17%	21%	21%	0%	0%	20%	21%	20%	22%	20%	21%
Limited responsibility - another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should take the lead, but CPD should be present	6%	6%	5%	7%	5%	16% gh	5%	5%	0%	0%	8% I	4%	6%	5%	4%	6%
No responsibility - another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should respond independently unless CPD is specifically requested	1%	1%	0%	0%	1%	0%	1%	1%	0%	0%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%
N/A - this issue should be handled without a response team(s) (e.g., between residents, involving a private organization)	2%	4% E	1%	1%	0%	6% H	3% H	0%	0%	0%	1%	2%	2%	2%	3%	1%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Neighborhood concern (e.g., noise complaints, disorderly conduct)

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household	Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B)	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D)	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)	Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)	Not employed (J)	Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	N=1001	N=414	N=181	N=124	N=283	N=35 *	N=598	N=368	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=300	N=701	N=483	N=518	N=222	N=779
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=418	N=216	N=132	N=235	N=27 **	N=538	N=436	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=265	N=736	N=486	N=515	N=232	N=769
Sole responsibility - CPD should respond independently unless another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) is specifically requested	34%	37% d	32%	25%	34%	35%	33%	34%	0%	0%	37%	32%	33%	34%	33%	34%
Primary responsibility - CPD should take the lead, but another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should be present	28%	24%	30%	36% b	28%	28%	25%	31%	0%	0%	24%	29%	28%	27%	28%	28%
Shared responsibility - CPD should respond to the call alongside another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works)	24%	25%	21%	29%	25%	18%	26%	23%	0%	0%	24%	25%	26%	23%	23%	25%
Limited responsibility - another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should take the lead, but CPD should be present	9%	9%	13%	8%	9%	8%	10%	8%	0%	0%	8%	10%	9%	10%	12%	9%
No responsibility - another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should respond independently unless CPD is specifically requested	3%	3%	1%	2%	4% c	9% G	2%	4%	0%	0%	4%	2%	3%	3%	2%	3%
N/A - this issue should be handled without a response team(s) (e.g., between residents, involving a private organization)	2%	3%	4% e	1%	0%	2%	3% H	0%	0%	0%	2%	2%	1%	2%	3%	2%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Homelessness (e.g., tent locations, panhandling)

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household	Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B)	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D)	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)	Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)	Not employed (J)	Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	N=1001	N=414	N=181	N=124	N=283	N=35 *	N=598	N=368	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=300	N=701	N=483	N=518	N=222	N=779
Total (Unweighted)	N=1001	N=418	N=216	N=132	N=235	N=27 **	N=538	N=436	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=265	N=736	N=486	N=515	N=232	N=769
Sole responsibility - CPD should respond independently unless another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) is specifically requested	10%	11% C	5%	9%	11% c	3%	9%	11%	0%	0%	13% I	8%	9%	11%	6%	11%
Primary responsibility - CPD should take the lead, but another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should be present	12%	13%	14%	9%	10%	15%	13%	10%	0%	0%	14%	11%	13%	11%	11%	12%
Shared responsibility - CPD should respond to the call alongside another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works)	38%	37%	39%	40%	37%	45%	40%	33%	0%	0%	33%	40%	36%	39%	46% P	35%
Limited responsibility - another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should take the lead, but CPD should be present	24%	21%	27%	28%	25%	20%	22%	29% g	0%	0%	21%	26%	26%	23%	19%	26%
No responsibility - another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should respond independently unless CPD is specifically requested	12%	11%	8%	14%	15% c	7%	11%	15%	0%	0%	16% I	11%	14%	11%	9%	13%
N/A - this issue should be handled without a response team(s) (e.g., between residents, involving a private organization)	4%	6% DE	6% DE	0%	2%	9% H	5% H	2%	0%	0%	2%	5%	2%	6% M	8% P	3%

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Q13B: Which group(s) should be involved in responding to each of the following situations?

Truancy (i.e., a student's repeated unexcused absence from school)

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household	Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B)	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D)	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)	Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)	Not employed (J)	Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	N=912	N=369	N=168	N=117	N=257	N=30 *	N=549	N=333	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=264	N=648	N=439	N=473	N=205	N=707
Total (Unweighted)	N=924	N=378	N=201	N=127	N=218	N=23 **	N=493	N=408	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=239	N=685	N=449	N=475	N=216	N=708
Non-police first responder (e.g., Chicago Fire Department, EMS)	9%	10%	9%	8%	8%	5%	11%	7%	0%	0%	14% L	7%	11% n	7%	5%	10%
Social services (e.g., mental health professional, social worker)	61%	61%	59%	60%	64%	40%	63% f	61% f	0%	0%	56%	63%	64%	58%	60%	62%
Branch(es) of local government (e.g., Department of Public Works, Department of Parks and Recreation)	14%	10%	16%	14%	17% b	3%	11%	20% fG	0%	0%	19% L	11%	16%	12%	8%	15% O

Private organization(s) (e.g., insurance company, neighborhood watch, homeowner's association)	10%	10%		11%		9%		11%		16%		8%		14%	G	0%		0%		9%		11%		8%		12%		13%		9%
Residents	12%	16%	dE	13%		7%		8%		29%	GH	12%		11%		0%		0%		12%		12%		10%		13%		14%		11%
None of these	11%	11%		12%		16%		9%		8%		12%		11%		0%		0%		9%		12%		10%		13%		13%		11%

* Table Base: THINKS CPD SHOULD NOT HAVE SOLE RESPONSIBILITY FOR THIS SITUATION

Medical emergency (e.g., heart attack, allergic reaction, overdose)

		Household Income							Education				Employment Status				Child <18 in Household				Marital Status				Size of Household			
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B		$50,000 - $74,999 (C)		$75,000 - $99,999 (D		$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)		Some college (G)		College grad+ (H)		Employed (I)		Not employed (J)		Yes (K)		No (L)		Married/Living with		Not married (N)		1 HH member (O)		2+ HH members (P)	
Total	N=892	N=356		N=160		N=114		N=263	N=32	*	N=529		N=331		N=0	**	N=0	**	N=261		N=632		N=446		N=447		N=196		N=697	
Total (Unweighted)	N=912	N=372		N=195		N=124		N=221	N=24	**	N=483		N=405		N=0	**	N=0	**	N=231		N=681		N=447		N=465		N=211		N=701	
Non-police first responder (e.g., Chicago Fire Department, EMS)	81%	82%		83%		87%	e	76%	65%		81%		83%	f	0%		0%		75%		83%	K	80%		82%		86%	p	79%	
Social services (e.g., mental health professional, social worker)	14%	14%		16%		10%		15%	21%		12%		16%		0%		0%		14%		14%		13%		16%		12%		15%	
Branch(es) of local government (e.g., Department of Public Works, Department of Parks and Recreation)	8%	7%		6%		6%		11%	23%	GH	7%		8%		0%		0%		10%		7%		10%	n	6%		1%		10%	O
Private organization(s) (e.g., insurance company, neighborhood watch, homeowner's association)	5%	5%		5%		4%		6%	3%		4%		7%		0%		0%		9%	L	3%		7%	N	3%		2%		6%	o
Residents	5%	6%		2%		4%		4%	0%		4%		5%		0%		0%		8%	L	3%		5%		4%		5%		5%	
None of these	3%	3%		3%		4%		5%	0%		4%		3%		0%		0%		4%		3%		3%		4%		3%		4%	

* Table Base: THINKS CPD SHOULD NOT HAVE SOLE RESPONSIBILITY FOR THIS SITUATION

Drug-related issue (e.g., intoxication, addiction, possession of an illicit substance)

		Household Income							Education				Employment Status				Child <18 in Household				Marital Status				Size of Household			
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B		$50,000 - $74,999 (C)		$75,000 - $99,999 (D		$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)		Some college (G)		College grad+ (H)		Employed (I)		Not employed (J)		Yes (K)		No (L)		Married/Living with		Not married (N)		1 HH member (O)		2+ HH members (P)	
Total	N=794	N=323		N=143		N=103		N=225	N=27	**	N=473		N=294		N=0	**	N=0	**	N=237		N=557		N=392		N=403		N=178		N=616	
Total (Unweighted)	N=797	N=327		N=169		N=112		N=189	N=22	**	N=418		N=357		N=0	**	N=0	**	N=210		N=587		N=386		N=411		N=186		N=611	
Non-police first responder (e.g., Chicago Fire Department, EMS)	43%	45%		42%		40%		41%	32%		45%		39%		0%		0%		44%		42%		44%		41%		42%		43%	
Social services (e.g., mental health professional, social worker)	49%	46%		53%		49%		51%	28%		48%		52%	f	0%		0%		41%		53%	K	46%		52%		53%		48%	
Branch(es) of local government (e.g., Department of Public Works, Department of Parks and Recreation)	12%	10%		11%		15%		14%	15%		11%		14%		0%		0%		13%		12%		14%		9%		9%		13%	
Private organization(s) (e.g., insurance company, neighborhood watch, homeowner's association)	8%	7%		10%		11%		7%	11%		7%		10%		0%		0%		10%		7%		8%		8%		7%		8%	
Residents	5%	6%		6%		6%		3%	0%		5%		6%		0%		0%		8%	L	4%		4%		6%		6%		5%	
None of these	15%	17%		12%		12%		15%	30%	g	14%		15%		0%		0%		15%		15%		14%		15%		14%		15%	

* Table Base: THINKS CPD SHOULD NOT HAVE SOLE RESPONSIBILITY FOR THIS SITUATION

Mental or behavioral health concern (e.g., suicidal tendency, unstable behavior)

		Household Income							Education				Employment Status				Child <18 in Household				Marital Status				Size of Household			
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B		$50,000 - $74,999 (C)		$75,000 - $99,999 (D		$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)		Some college (G)		College grad+ (H)		Employed (I)		Not employed (J)		Yes (K)		No (L)		Married/Living with		Not married (N)		1 HH member (O)		2+ HH members (P)	
Total	N=914	N=369		N=165		N=117		N=263	N=29	**	N=551		N=334		N=0	**	N=0	**	N=264		N=650		N=453		N=461		N=202		N=712	
Total (Unweighted)	N=929	N=382		N=198		N=126		N=223	N=23	**	N=496		N=410		N=0	**	N=0	**	N=235		N=694		N=459		N=470		N=217		N=712	
Non-police first responder (e.g., Chicago Fire Department, EMS)	31%	31%		38%	E	35%		26%	17%		34%		28%		0%		0%		30%		32%		28%		34%		29%		32%	
Social services (e.g., mental health professional, social worker)	78%	76%		73%		88%	BC	80%	74%		78%		79%		0%		0%		72%		81%	K	79%		78%		75%		79%	
Branch(es) of local government (e.g., Department of Public Works, Department of Parks and Recreation)	9%	6%		14%	B	11%		12%	B	3%		9%		11%		0%		0%		12%		9%		10%		9%		7%		10%
Private organization(s) (e.g., insurance company, neighborhood watch, homeowner's association)	9%	9%		12%		7%		7%		0%		7%		12%	G	0%		0%		11%		7%		9%		8%		7%		9%
Residents	7%	9%	E	6%		7%		3%		9%		6%		6%		0%		0%		7%		6%		6%		7%		6%		7%
None of these	3%	4%		1%		0%		3%		0%		2%		3%		0%		0%		1%		3%		2%		3%		3%		2%

* Table Base: THINKS CPD SHOULD NOT HAVE SOLE RESPONSIBILITY FOR THIS SITUATION

Domestic dispute (e.g., suspected abuse, child endangerment)

		Household Income							Education				Employment Status				Child <18 in Household				Marital Status				Size of Household			
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B		$50,000 - $74,999 (C)		$75,000 - $99,999 (D		$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)		Some college (G)		College grad+ (H)		Employed (I)		Not employed (J)		Yes (K)		No (L)		Married/Living with		Not married (N)		1 HH member (O)		2+ HH members (P)	
Total	N=759	N=292		N=138		N=102		N=227	N=18	**	N=448		N=293		N=0	**	N=0	**	N=212		N=546		N=380		N=379		N=172		N=587	
Total (Unweighted)	N=784	N=308		N=173		N=111		N=192	N=16	**	N=410		N=358		N=0	**	N=0	**	N=194		N=590		N=393		N=391		N=182		N=602	
Non-police first responder (e.g., Chicago Fire Department, EMS)	24%	23%		22%		30%		22%	25%		24%		23%		0%		0%		32%	L	20%		26%		21%		19%		25%	
Social services (e.g., mental health professional, social worker)	59%	62%	c	52%		61%		58%	46%		58%		61%		0%		0%		50%		63%	K	56%		62%		62%		58%	
Branch(es) of local government (e.g., Department of Public Works, Department of Parks and Recreation)	11%	9%		16%	b	14%		11%	13%		12%		10%		0%		0%		13%		11%		9%		14%		6%		13%	O
Private organization(s) (e.g., insurance company, neighborhood watch, homeowner's association)	7%	7%		4%		8%		9%	22%	gH	8%		6%		0%		0%		8%		7%		9%		6%		3%		9%	O
Residents	7%	9%	d	9%	d	2%		6%	6%		7%		7%		0%		0%		11%	I	6%		8%		6%		9%		7%	
None of these	20%	20%		22%		17%		20%	29%		22%		17%		0%		0%		18%		21%		22%		19%		18%		21%	

* Table Base: THINKS CPD SHOULD NOT HAVE SOLE RESPONSIBILITY FOR THIS SITUATION

Personal safety concern (e.g., physical fight, stalking, harassment)

		Household Income							Education				Employment Status				Child <18 in Household				Marital Status				Size of Household			
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B		$50,000 - $74,999 (C)		$75,000 - $99,999 (D		$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)		Some college (G)		College grad+ (H)		Employed (I)		Not employed (J)		Yes (K)		No (L)		Married/Living with		Not married (N)		1 HH member (O)		2+ HH members (P)	
Total	N=628	N=251		N=119		N=85	*	N=173	N=26	**	N=372		N=229		N=0	**	N=0	**	N=191		N=437		N=300		N=327		N=135		N=492	
Total (Unweighted)	N=630	N=258		N=136		N=93	*	N=143	N=19	**	N=339		N=272		N=0	**	N=0	**	N=165		N=465		N=311		N=319		N=143		N=487	
Non-police first responder (e.g., Chicago Fire Department, EMS)	27%	27%		35%	e	27%		22%	14%		29%		25%		0%		0%		27%		27%		29%		25%		17%		29%	O
Social services (e.g., mental health professional, social worker)	29%	29%		24%		36%		28%	37%		26%		31%		0%		0%		24%		31%		28%		29%		24%		30%	
Branch(es) of local government (e.g., Department of Public Works, Department of Parks and Recreation)	15%	14%		17%		20%		14%	21%		17%		13%		0%		0%		13%		16%		15%		16%		12%		16%	
Private organization(s) (e.g., insurance company, neighborhood watch, homeowner's association)	12%	14%		8%		12%		13%	13%		13%		11%		0%		0%		15%		11%		11%		13%		11%		13%	
Residents	13%	15%		11%		12%		12%	0%		11%		18%	fg	0%		0%		10%		14%		12%		14%		13%		13%	

None of these	32%	28%	28%	34%	39% b	21%	30%	36%	0%	0%	35%	31%	33%	31%	36%	31%

* Table Base: THINKS CPD SHOULD NOT HAVE SOLE RESPONSIBILITY FOR THIS SITUATION

Wellness check (i.e., requested in-person visit to verify a resident's personal well-being)

	Household Income					Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household	Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B)	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D)	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)	Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)	Not employed (J)	Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	N=853	N=343	N=155	N=114	N=241	N=28 **	N=511	N=313	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=246	N=607	N=415	N=438	N=193	N=660
Total (Unweighted)	N=871	N=352	N=190	N=121	N=208	N=22 **	N=468	N=381	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=224	N=647	N=427	N=444	N=204	N=667
Non-police first responder (e.g., Chicago Fire Department, EMS)	36%	32%	43% b	38%	36%	28%	37%	34%	0%	0%	40%	34%	38%	34%	35%	36%
Social services (e.g., mental health professional, social worker)	60%	61%	54%	65%	62%	64%	57%	65% g	0%	0%	55%	63%	57%	63%	55%	62%
Branch(es) of local government (e.g., Department of Public Works, Department of Parks and Recreation)	9%	10%	13% E	7%	6%	29% GH	9%	6%	0%	0%	12% I	8%	11%	8%	6%	10%
Private organization(s) (e.g., insurance company, neighborhood watch, homeowner's association)	12%	13%	11%	12%	10%	14%	10%	14%	0%	0%	11%	12%	13%	10%	11%	12%
Residents	14%	16%	11%	16%	12%	14%	14%	14%	0%	0%	13%	15%	12%	16%	17%	13%
None of these	5%	4%	5%	4%	6%	0%	5%	5%	0%	0%	6%	4%	5%	5%	7%	4%

* Table Base: THINKS CPD SHOULD NOT HAVE SOLE RESPONSIBILITY FOR THIS SITUATION

Suspicious behavior (e.g., trespassing, loitering, unfamiliar vehicles)

	Household Income					Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household	Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B)	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D)	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)	Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)	Not employed (J)	Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	N=561	N=227	N=100	N=72 *	N=161	N=21 **	N=322	N=218	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=160	N=401	N=266	N=294	N=132	N=428
Total (Unweighted)	N=565	N=238	N=116	N=82 *	N=129	N=18 **	N=294	N=253	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=145	N=420	N=269	N=296	N=141	N=424
Non-police first responder (e.g., Chicago Fire Department, EMS)	21%	20%	31% bde	15%	17%	31%	19%	22%	0%	0%	25%	19%	25% n	17%	15%	23%
Social services (e.g., mental health professional, social worker)	14%	12%	16%	25% Be	12%	0%	13%	18% f	0%	0%	14%	15%	16%	13%	13%	15%
Branch(es) of local government (e.g., Department of Public Works, Department of Parks and Recreation)	18%	16%	27% bD	11%	17%	12%	20%	15%	0%	0%	22%	16%	17%	18%	22%	17%
Private organization(s) (e.g., insurance company, neighborhood watch, homeowner's association)	17%	22% e	12%	21%	13%	14%	18%	16%	0%	0%	22%	15%	16%	19%	14%	18%
Residents	13%	17%	9%	10%	12%	0%	16%	10%	0%	0%	10%	14%	10%	16%	10%	14%
None of these	39%	37%	31%	38%	46% c	44%	36%	42%	0%	0%	33%	41%	39%	39%	45%	37%

* Table Base: THINKS CPD SHOULD NOT HAVE SOLE RESPONSIBILITY FOR THIS SITUATION

Neighborhood concern (e.g., noise complaints, disorderly conduct)

	Household Income					Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household	Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B)	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D)	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)	Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)	Not employed (J)	Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	N=664	N=262	N=122	N=93 *	N=186	N=23 **	N=398	N=243	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=188	N=476	N=322	N=341	N=150	N=514
Total (Unweighted)	N=667	N=273	N=137	N=100	N=157	N=20 **	N=353	N=294	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=173	N=494	N=327	N=340	N=156	N=511
Non-police first responder (e.g., Chicago Fire Department, EMS)	19%	18%	21%	17%	18%	19%	20%	16%	0%	0%	21%	18%	19%	18%	19%	19%
Social services (e.g., mental health professional, social worker)	21%	22%	19%	25%	19%	13%	21%	21%	0%	0%	20%	21%	20%	21%	19%	22%
Branch(es) of local government (e.g., Department of Public Works, Department of Parks and Recreation)	18%	13%	23% B	21%	21% b	11%	16%	22%	0%	0%	15%	20%	17%	19%	15%	19%
Private organization(s) (e.g., insurance company, neighborhood watch, homeowner's association)	27%	30% d	26%	18%	26%	18%	26%	28%	0%	0%	35% L	23%	25%	28%	22%	28%
Residents	21%	22%	23%	22%	18%	22%	18%	25%	0%	0%	23%	20%	20%	22%	17%	22%
None of these	26%	22%	23%	30%	29%	25%	25%	26%	0%	0%	20%	28%	27%	24%	30%	24%

* Table Base: THINKS CPD SHOULD NOT HAVE SOLE RESPONSIBILITY FOR THIS SITUATION

Homelessness (e.g., tent locations, panhandling)

	Household Income					Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household	Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B)	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D)	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)	Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)	Not employed (J)	Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	N=904	N=367	N=172	N=113	N=253	N=34 *	N=542	N=329	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=261	N=644	N=441	N=463	N=208	N=696
Total (Unweighted)	N=906	N=369	N=202	N=120	N=215	N=26 **	N=482	N=398	N=0 **	N=0 **	N=226	N=680	N=444	N=462	N=217	N=689
Non-police first responder (e.g., Chicago Fire Department, EMS)	16%	16%	14%	17%	18%	15%	17%	15%	0%	0%	25% L	13%	16%	16%	14%	17%
Social services (e.g., mental health professional, social worker)	68%	61%	67%	76% B	76% B	48%	66%	74% Fg	0%	0%	61%	71% K	70%	66%	73%	67%
Branch(es) of local government (e.g., Department of Public Works, Department of Parks and Recreation)	20%	21%	16%	21%	22%	24%	19%	22%	0%	0%	25% I	18%	19%	21%	15%	22%
Private organization(s) (e.g., insurance company, neighborhood watch, homeowner's association)	14%	17% c	9%	18% c	11%	25%	13%	14%	0%	0%	16%	13%	14%	14%	10%	15%
Residents	8%	8%	7%	9%	8%	8%	7%	9%	0%	0%	8%	8%	8%	8%	7%	8%
None of these	8%	9% d	9%	3%	6%	8%	9% H	5%	0%	0%	5%	9%	8%	8%	6%	8%

* Table Base: THINKS CPD SHOULD NOT HAVE SOLE RESPONSIBILITY FOR THIS SITUATION

MacArthur Foundation Chicagoan Opinions - Public Safety

Q1: Which of the following do you think is the most important problem in Chicago today?

		Household Income				Education				Employment Status				Child <18 in Household		Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	**Less than $50,000 (B)**	**$50,000 - $74,999 (C)**	**$75,000 - $99,999 (D)**	**$100,000+ (E)**	**Less than HS (F)**		**Some college (G)**	**College grad+ (H)**	**Employed (I)**		**Not employed (J)**		**Yes (K)**	**No (L)**	**Married/Living with p**	**Not married (N)**	**1 HH member (O)**	**2+ HH members (P)**
Total	1,001	414	181	124	283	35	*	598	368	0	**	0	**	300	701	483	518	222	779
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	418	216	132	235	27	**	538	436	0	**	0	**	265	736	486	515	232	769
Gun violence	567	241	102	68	156	23		351	194	0		0		154	413	281	287	128	439
Property taxes	109	24	18	19	48	1		50	58	0		0		26	83	57	52	24	85
Economic inequality	62	24	7	12	19	0		37	25	0		0		28	34	38	24	13	49
Racial segregation across areas including education, housing, access to city services, etc.	52	22	8	4	18	6		23	23	0		0		21	31	24	28	10	42
Lack of access to affordable housing	49	29	12	6	3	0		35	13	0		0		22	27	13	36	10	39
Homelessness	40	21	8	5	6	3		26	12	0		0		15	25	15	25	4	36
Police treatment of Black and Latino people	30	19	5	3	4	2		20	7	0		0		9	21	9	21	6	24
Lack of access to social services (e.g., income assistance, job training, food pantries)	26	9	6	3	8	0		12	14	0		0		9	18	17	10	6	20
Pension reform	15	3	5	1	7	0		8	8	0		0		4	11	8	8	6	9
Other (please specify):	44	18	10	3	13	0		31	13	0		0		8	36	20	24	12	32
N/A - Chicago does not have any serious problems.	6	4	1	0	1	0		5	1	0		0		3	3	1	5	3	3

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Q2: How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding the city of Chicago?

Race relations in Chicago are good right now.

		Household Income				Education				Employment Status				Child <18 in Household		Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	**Less than $50,000 (B)**	**$50,000 - $74,999 (C)**	**$75,000 - $99,999 (D)**	**$100,000+ (E)**	**Less than HS (F)**		**Some college (G)**	**College grad+ (H)**	**Employed (I)**		**Not employed (J)**		**Yes (K)**	**No (L)**	**Married/Living with p**	**Not married (N)**	**1 HH member (O)**	**2+ HH members (P)**
Total	1,001	414	181	124	283	35	*	598	368	0	**	0	**	300	701	483	518	222	779
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	418	216	132	235	27	**	538	436	0	**	0	**	265	736	486	515	232	769
Agree (Net)	224	75	36	35	77	12		112	99	0		0		79	145	129	95	41	183
Strongly agree	43	10	7	9	17	4		15	24	0		0		21	22	22	21	6	38
Somewhat agree	180	65	29	27	60	8		98	75	0		0		57	123	107	73	35	145
Disagree (Net)	777	338	145	89	206	23		486	269	0		0		221	556	354	424	182	596
Somewhat disagree	432	185	79	51	117	13		259	160	0		0		114	319	190	243	101	331
Strongly disagree	345	154	65	37	89	10		226	109	0		0		107	238	164	181	81	264

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Compared to this time last year, race relations in Chicago have improved.

		Household Income				Education				Employment Status				Child <18 in Household		Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	**Less than $50,000 (B)**	**$50,000 - $74,999 (C)**	**$75,000 - $99,999 (D)**	**$100,000+ (E)**	**Less than HS (F)**		**Some college (G)**	**College grad+ (H)**	**Employed (I)**		**Not employed (J)**		**Yes (K)**	**No (L)**	**Married/Living with p**	**Not married (N)**	**1 HH member (O)**	**2+ HH members (P)**
Total	1,001	414	181	124	283	35	*	598	368	0	**	0	**	300	701	483	518	222	779
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	418	216	132	235	27	**	538	436	0	**	0	**	265	736	486	515	232	769
Agree (Net)	293	97	58	45	92	13		159	121	0		0		89	204	144	149	54	239
Strongly agree	32	8	6	6	11	2		13	18	0		0		14	18	13	19	5	27
Somewhat agree	261	89	52	39	81	11		146	103	0		0		75	185	131	130	49	211
Disagree (Net)	708	317	122	79	191	22		439	247	0		0		211	498	338	370	168	540
Somewhat disagree	421	176	71	51	124	11		246	164	0		0		111	311	212	209	105	316
Strongly disagree	287	141	51	28	67	11		193	83	0		0		100	187	127	160	63	224

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

There is a strong sense of community across Chicago.

		Household Income				Education				Employment Status				Child <18 in Household		Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	**Less than $50,000 (B)**	**$50,000 - $74,999 (C)**	**$75,000 - $99,999 (D)**	**$100,000+ (E)**	**Less than HS (F)**		**Some college (G)**	**College grad+ (H)**	**Employed (I)**		**Not employed (J)**		**Yes (K)**	**No (L)**	**Married/Living with p**	**Not married (N)**	**1 HH member (O)**	**2+ HH members (P)**
Total	1,001	414	181	124	283	35	*	598	368	0	**	0	**	300	701	483	518	222	779
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	418	216	132	235	27	**	538	436	0	**	0	**	265	736	486	515	232	769
Agree (Net)	478	177	89	70	142	15		271	192	0		0		148	330	218	260	102	376
Strongly agree	103	40	8	18	37	3		62	38	0		0		39	64	42	60	14	89
Somewhat agree	375	137	81	52	105	12		209	154	0		0		109	266	176	199	88	287
Disagree (Net)	523	236	91	54	141	20		327	176	0		0		151	371	264	259	120	403
Somewhat disagree	339	143	67	35	94	14		204	121	0		0		101	239	173	166	83	257
Strongly disagree	183	93	24	19	47	5		124	55	0		0		51	133	91	93	38	146

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Mayor Lori Lightfoot has done a good job of investing in and supporting historically marginalized neighborhoods.

		Household Income				Education				Employment Status				Child <18 in Household		Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	**Less than $50,000 (B)**	**$50,000 - $74,999 (C)**	**$75,000 - $99,999 (D)**	**$100,000+ (E)**	**Less than HS (F)**		**Some college (G)**	**College grad+ (H)**	**Employed (I)**		**Not employed (J)**		**Yes (K)**	**No (L)**	**Married/Living with p**	**Not married (N)**	**1 HH member (O)**	**2+ HH members (P)**
Total	1,001	414	181	124	283	35	*	598	368	0	**	0	**	300	701	483	518	222	779
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	418	216	132	235	27	**	538	436	0	**	0	**	265	736	486	515	232	769
Agree (Net)	387	149	77	43	118	13		224	150	0		0		117	270	192	195	75	312
Strongly agree	58	23	14	4	16	4		33	20	0		0		25	33	29	29	6	51
Somewhat agree	329	126	63	39	102	9		190	130	0		0		92	237	163	166	69	260
Disagree (Net)	614	265	103	81	165	22		374	218	0		0		183	431	291	324	147	467
Somewhat disagree	303	132	61	39	71	17		175	112	0		0		89	214	149	154	73	230
Strongly disagree	311	132	42	43	95	6		199	106	0		0		94	218	142	170	74	237

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Race-related issues in Chicago are due to a few bad actors, not systemic issues.

		Household Income				Education				Employment Status				Child <18 in Household		Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	**Less than $50,000 (B)**	**$50,000 - $74,999 (C)**	**$75,000 - $99,999 (D)**	**$100,000+ (E)**	**Less than HS (F)**		**Some college (G)**	**College grad+ (H)**	**Employed (I)**		**Not employed (J)**		**Yes (K)**	**No (L)**	**Married/Living with p**	**Not married (N)**	**1 HH member (O)**	**2+ HH members (P)**
Total	1,001	414	181	124	283	35	*	598	368	0	**	0	**	300	701	483	518	222	779
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	418	216	132	235	27	**	538	436	0	**	0	**	265	736	486	515	232	769
Agree (Net)	372	141	74	47	109	12		209	151	0		0		112	261	186	186	87	285
Strongly agree	144	57	26	20	41	2		87	54	0		0		34	109	67	77	36	108
Somewhat agree	229	84	49	28	68	10		122	97	0		0		77	151	120	109	51	177
Disagree (Net)	629	272	106	77	174	23		389	217	0		0		188	441	296	333	135	493
Somewhat disagree	361	153	59	49	100	10		215	136	0		0		100	261	168	193	87	274
Strongly disagree	268	119	47	27	74	13		174	81	0		0		88	180	128	140	48	219

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Mayor Lori Lightfoot could do more to tackle inequality across Chicago neighborhoods.

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status				Child <18 in Household		Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)		Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)		Not employed (J)		Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	1,001	414	181	124	283	35	*	598	368	0	**	0	**	300	701	483	518	222	779
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	418	216	132	235	27	**	538	436	0	**	0	**	265	736	486	515	232	769
Agree (Net)	845	347	156	102	241	29		504	312	0		0		269	576	412	434	172	674
Strongly agree	402	183	70	57	92	19		239	144	0		0		143	259	180	222	86	317
Somewhat agree	443	164	86	44	149	10		265	168	0		0		126	317	231	212	86	357
Disagree (Net)	156	66	25	22	42	6		94	56	0		0		30	125	71	85	51	105
Somewhat disagree	112	48	18	14	32	3		67	41	0		0		24	87	49	62	36	76
Strongly disagree	44	19	7	8	11	3		26	15	0		0		6	38	21	23	15	29

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Chicago law enforcement needs reform.

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status				Child <18 in Household		Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)		Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)		Not employed (J)		Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	1,001	414	181	124	283	35	*	598	368	0	**	0	**	300	701	483	518	222	779
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	418	216	132	235	27	**	538	436	0	**	0	**	265	736	486	515	232	769
Agree (Net)	743	314	126	89	215	30		435	279	0		0		224	519	347	396	149	594
Strongly agree	327	149	49	46	83	17		191	119	0		0		117	210	150	177	59	269
Somewhat agree	416	164	76	43	132	12		244	160	0		0		107	309	196	219	90	325
Disagree (Net)	258	100	55	35	68	5		163	89	0		0		76	182	136	122	74	184
Somewhat disagree	162	68	36	22	36	4		103	55	0		0		49	113	75	86	53	109
Strongly disagree	96	32	19	13	32	2		61	34	0		0		27	70	60	36	21	76

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Gun violence in Chicago needs to be reduced.

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status				Child <18 in Household		Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)		Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)		Not employed (J)		Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	1,001	414	181	124	283	35	*	598	368	0	**	0	**	300	701	483	518	222	779
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	418	216	132	235	27	**	538	436	0	**	0	**	265	736	486	515	232	769
Agree (Net)	950	385	170	121	274	34		562	354	0		0		284	665	461	489	210	740
Strongly agree	840	345	151	109	235	33		497	310	0		0		242	598	408	432	190	650
Somewhat agree	110	40	18	12	39	1		65	44	0		0		43	67	53	57	19	90
Disagree (Net)	51	29	11	3	9	1		36	14	0		0		15	36	21	30	13	38
Somewhat disagree	10	4	4	1	0	0		7	3	0		0		0	9	2	8	6	4
Strongly disagree	41	25	6	2	9	1		29	11	0		0		15	26	20	22	7	34

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

City government is doing enough to address gun violence in the city.

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status				Child <18 in Household		Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)		Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)		Not employed (J)		Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	1,001	414	181	124	283	35	*	598	368	0	**	0	**	300	701	483	518	222	779
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	418	216	132	235	27	**	538	436	0	**	0	**	265	736	486	515	232	769
Agree (Net)	163	69	27	18	49	10		92	61	0		0		61	102	70	93	32	131
Strongly agree	48	21	5	6	16	3		24	21	0		0		27	22	21	27	2	46
Somewhat agree	114	48	22	12	33	7		67	40	0		0		35	80	48	66	30	85
Disagree (Net)	838	345	153	106	234	25		506	307	0		0		238	600	413	425	190	648
Somewhat disagree	310	116	62	44	87	5		183	121	0		0		88	222	147	163	68	242
Strongly disagree	528	229	91	62	147	20		323	186	0		0		150	378	266	262	122	406

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Q2A: Do you think each of the following situations happening in Chicago are better, worse, or about the same compared to cities in the rest of the country?

Race relations

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status				Child <18 in Household		Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)		Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)		Not employed (J)		Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	1,001	414	181	124	283	35	*	598	368	0	**	0	**	300	701	483	518	222	779
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	418	216	132	235	27	**	538	436	0	**	0	**	265	736	486	515	232	769
Better	61	15	9	13	24	1		28	31	0		0		21	39	31	30	10	51
About the same	486	188	99	59	141	17		283	186	0		0		129	357	248	238	116	370
Worse	454	211	73	52	119	17		287	150	0		0		149	305	203	251	96	358

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Police relations with city residents

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status				Child <18 in Household		Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)		Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)		Not employed (J)		Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	1,001	414	181	124	283	35	*	598	368	0	**	0	**	300	701	483	518	222	779
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	418	216	132	235	27	**	538	436	0	**	0	**	265	736	486	515	232	769
Better	69	14	12	12	31	1		44	24	0		0		33	36	44	25	8	61
About the same	517	226	106	54	131	20		311	185	0		0		132	385	259	258	132	385
Worse	415	174	63	58	120	14		243	159	0		0		135	280	180	235	83	333

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Gun violence

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status				Child <18 in Household		Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)		Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)		Not employed (J)		Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	1,001	414	181	124	283	35	*	598	368	0	**	0	**	300	701	483	518	222	779
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	418	216	132	235	27	**	538	436	0	**	0	**	265	736	486	515	232	769
Better	22	2	3	5	12	0		12	10	0		0		12	10	11	11	2	20
About the same	173	65	36	22	49	3		116	54	0		0		54	119	86	86	39	134
Worse	806	346	142	96	223	32		471	304	0		0		234	572	385	421	181	625

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Police union relations with city government (e.g., the mayor, city council, city manager)

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status				Child <18 in Household		Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)		Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)		Not employed (J)		Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	1,001	414	181	124	283	35	*	598	368	0	**	0	**	300	701	483	518	222	779
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	418	216	132	235	27	**	538	436	0	**	0	**	265	736	486	515	232	769
Better	48	14	2	8	24	3		18	28	0		0		22	26	26	22	1	47
About the same	481	189	102	64	126	21		296	164	0		0		143	337	236	245	100	380
Worse	472	210	77	52	133	12		285	176	0		0		135	338	220	252	121	351

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Carjackings

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status				Child <18 in Household		Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)		Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)		Not employed (J)		Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	1,001	414	181	124	283	35	*	598	368	0	**	0	**	300	701	483	518	222	779
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	418	216	132	235	27	**	538	436	0	**	0	**	265	736	486	515	232	769
Better	28	6	1	4	17	0		9	20	0		0		13	15	11	18	7	21
About the same	211	76	48	29	58	15		126	71	0		0		68	143	104	108	43	168
Worse	762	332	132	90	208	20		464	278	0		0		218	543	368	393	172	589

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Other violent crimes (e.g., mugging, assault)

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status				Child <18 in Household		Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)		Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)		Not employed (J)		Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	1,001	414	181	124	283	35	*	598	368	0	**	0	**	300	701	483	518	222	779
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	418	216	132	235	27	**	538	436	0	**	0	**	265	736	486	515	232	769
Better	24	6	1	3	14	0		9	15	0		0		9	15	12	12	2	22
About the same	344	142	66	41	95	14		204	126	0		0		100	244	163	181	80	264
Worse	633	266	114	80	174	21		385	227	0		0		191	443	307	326	141	493

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Non-violent crimes (e.g., package theft, harassment, property damage)

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status				Child <18 in Household		Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)		Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)		Not employed (J)		Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	1,001	414	181	124	283	35	*	598	368	0	**	0	**	300	701	483	518	222	779
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	418	216	132	235	27	**	538	436	0	**	0	**	265	736	486	515	232	769
Better	41	16	5	6	14	5		22	15	0		0		16	25	26	16	7	34
About the same	543	211	104	72	156	21		305	217	0		0		150	393	252	291	130	413
Worse	417	186	72	46	113	9		271	137	0		0		133	283	205	212	85	332

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Q11: How concerned are you about the personal safety of each of the following groups of people in the Chicago area?

Police officers

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status				Child <18 in Household		Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)		Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)		Not employed (J)		Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	1,001	414	181	124	283	35	*	598	368	0	**	0	**	300	701	483	518	222	779
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	418	216	132	235	27	**	538	436	0	**	0	**	265	736	486	515	232	769
Concerned (Net)	764	320	148	87	209	32		448	283	0		0		222	542	362	401	180	584
Very concerned	406	172	78	47	109	23		244	139	0		0		126	280	190	216	91	316
Somewhat concerned	357	148	70	40	100	9		204	144	0		0		95	262	172	185	89	268
Not concerned (Net)	237	93	33	37	74	3		150	85	0		0		78	159	120	117	42	195
Not very concerned	183	62	27	29	65	2		119	61	0		0		62	121	97	86	33	149
Not at all concerned	54	31	6	8	9	1		30	23	0		0		16	38	23	31	9	46

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Residents of color (e.g., Black, Latino, Asian)

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status				Child <18 in Household		Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)		Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)		Not employed (J)		Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	1,001	414	181	124	283	35	*	598	368	0	**	0	**	300	701	483	518	222	779
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	418	216	132	235	27	**	538	436	0	**	0	**	265	736	486	515	232	769
Concerned (Net)	834	365	149	94	227	33		500	301	0		0		247	587	387	448	181	653
Very concerned	441	198	76	54	112	24		269	147	0		0		153	287	197	244	92	349
Somewhat concerned	394	166	73	40	115	9		231	154	0		0		93	300	190	204	89	304
Not concerned (Net)	167	49	32	30	56	2		98	67	0		0		53	114	96	71	41	126
Not very concerned	129	30	26	26	48	2		74	53	0		0		44	86	80	49	28	102
Not at all concerned	38	19	6	4	8	0		24	14	0		0		9	28	16	21	13	24

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Tourists

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status				Child <18 in Household		Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)		Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)		Not employed (J)		Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	1,001	414	181	124	283	35	*	598	368	0	**	0	**	300	701	483	518	222	779
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	418	216	132	235	27	**	538	436	0	**	0	**	265	736	486	515	232	769
Concerned (Net)	675	285	126	80	184	27		402	247	0		0		188	487	317	358	164	511
Very concerned	266	96	54	31	85	8		155	103	0		0		80	187	130	137	61	205
Somewhat concerned	409	188	72	49	99	19		247	143	0		0		108	301	187	222	103	306
Not concerned (Net)	326	129	54	44	99	8		196	121	0		0		112	214	165	160	58	267
Not very concerned	256	90	48	33	86	5		155	97	0		0		89	168	129	128	49	208
Not at all concerned	69	39	6	11	13	4		41	24	0		0		23	46	37	32	10	60

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

City residents

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status				Child <18 in Household		Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)		Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)		Not employed (J)		Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	1,001	414	181	124	283	35	*	598	368	0	**	0	**	300	701	483	518	222	779
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	418	216	132	235	27	**	538	436	0	**	0	**	265	736	486	515	232	769
Concerned (Net)	861	383	152	102	223	32		518	310	0		0		250	610	401	460	200	660
Very concerned	429	204	82	39	104	17		278	134	0		0		134	295	191	238	94	335
Somewhat concerned	432	180	70	64	118	15		240	176	0		0		116	316	210	222	106	325
Not concerned (Net)	140	30	28	22	60	3		80	58	0		0		49	91	82	58	22	118
Not very concerned	132	27	25	20	59	3		75	54	0		0		48	83	79	53	18	113
Not at all concerned	9	3	3	1	2	0		5	4	0		0		1	8	3	5	4	5

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Suburban residents

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status				Child <18 in Household		Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)		Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)		Not employed (J)		Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	1,001	414	181	124	283	35	*	598	368	0	**	0	**	300	701	483	518	222	779
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	418	216	132	235	27	**	538	436	0	**	0	**	265	736	486	515	232	769
Concerned (Net)	578	260	107	57	153	20		368	190	0		0		177	401	275	303	118	461
Very concerned	230	108	46	20	56	7		153	69	0		0		77	153	96	134	45	185

Somewhat concerned	348	153	61	37	97	13	214	121	0	0	100	248	179	169	72	276
Not concerned (Net)	423	153	73	67	130	15	230	178	0	0	122	301	207	215	105	318
Not very concerned	331	122	57	44	108	11	188	133	0	0	89	243	155	176	86	245
Not at all concerned	91	32	16	23	21	4	43	45	0	0	33	58	52	39	18	73

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Homeless Chicagoans

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household		Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	**Less than $50,000 (B**	**$50,000 - $74,999 (C)**	**$75,000 - $99,999 (D**	**$100,000+ (E)**	**Less than HS (F)**	**Some college (G)**	**College grad+ (H)**	**Employed (I)**	**Not employed (J)**	**Yes (K)**	**No (L)**	**Married/Living with**	**Not married (N)**	**1 HH member (O)**	**2+ HH members (P)**
Total	1,001	414	181	124	283	35 *	598	368	0 **	0 **	300	701	483	518	222	779
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	418	216	132	235	27 **	538	436	0 **	0 **	265	736	486	515	232	769
Concerned (Net)	853	373	163	94	222	32	519	301	0	0	250	603	384	469	191	662
Very concerned	438	223	66	47	101	25	270	143	0	0	137	300	190	248	94	344
Somewhat concerned	415	150	97	47	121	7	249	159	0	0	112	303	194	221	96	318
Not concerned (Net)	148	41	17	30	60	3	79	67	0	0	50	98	99	50	32	117
Not very concerned	130	35	15	25	55	3	66	61	0	0	45	85	89	41	24	106
Not at all concerned	19	6	2	5	6	0	13	6	0	0	5	13	10	9	7	11

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Residents with mental or behavioral health conditions (e.g., psychiatric disorders, cognitive disabilities)

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household		Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	**Less than $50,000 (B**	**$50,000 - $74,999 (C)**	**$75,000 - $99,999 (D**	**$100,000+ (E)**	**Less than HS (F)**	**Some college (G)**	**College grad+ (H)**	**Employed (I)**	**Not employed (J)**	**Yes (K)**	**No (L)**	**Married/Living with**	**Not married (N)**	**1 HH member (O)**	**2+ HH members (P)**
Total	1,001	414	181	124	283	35 *	598	368	0 **	0 **	300	701	483	518	222	779
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	418	216	132	235	27 **	538	436	0 **	0 **	265	736	486	515	232	769
Concerned (Net)	867	373	161	103	230	33	518	317	0	0	251	616	407	460	187	680
Very concerned	447	218	77	44	107	26	271	150	0	0	152	295	189	258	89	358
Somewhat concerned	420	155	84	59	123	7	246	167	0	0	99	322	218	202	98	323
Not concerned (Net)	134	41	19	21	53	2	80	51	0	0	49	85	75	59	36	98
Not very concerned	121	33	16	21	51	1	70	49	0	0	44	77	72	49	29	92
Not at all concerned	13	8	3	0	2	1	10	3	0	0	5	8	4	9	7	7

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Q3aNEW: My trust in the police

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household		Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	**Less than $50,000 (B**	**$50,000 - $74,999 (C)**	**$75,000 - $99,999 (D**	**$100,000+ (E)**	**Less than HS (F)**	**Some college (G)**	**College grad+ (H)**	**Employed (I)**	**Not employed (J)**	**Yes (K)**	**No (L)**	**Married/Living with**	**Not married (N)**	**1 HH member (O)**	**2+ HH members (P)**
Total	1,001	414	181	124	283	35 *	598	368	0 **	0 **	300	701	483	518	222	779
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	418	216	132	235	27 **	538	436	0 **	0 **	265	736	486	515	232	769
Do not trust at all	49	32	5	6	6	1	36	12	0	0	13	36	16	33	5	43
1	47	29	8	4	6	4	31	13	0	0	11	36	10	37	20	27
2	46	18	4	11	13	2	34	10	0	0	18	28	23	23	3	43
3	52	21	8	4	18	5	28	19	0	0	20	32	24	28	5	47
4	51	27	8	6	11	3	25	23	0	0	22	29	19	32	13	38
5	94	30	17	15	32	2	61	31	0	0	40	53	53	41	15	79
6	127	48	28	12	40	6	70	51	0	0	36	91	53	74	31	96
7	157	73	28	15	41	2	96	59	0	0	40	117	70	88	27	130
8	187	69	39	28	51	3	107	78	0	0	47	140	100	87	58	129
9	85	25	16	13	32	0	52	33	0	0	19	66	50	35	20	65
Completely trust	106	40	21	10	35	7	58	40	0	0	34	72	64	41	24	81

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Q3bNEW: Safety level in my neighborhood

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household		Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	**Less than $50,000 (B**	**$50,000 - $74,999 (C)**	**$75,000 - $99,999 (D**	**$100,000+ (E)**	**Less than HS (F)**	**Some college (G)**	**College grad+ (H)**	**Employed (I)**	**Not employed (J)**	**Yes (K)**	**No (L)**	**Married/Living with**	**Not married (N)**	**1 HH member (O)**	**2+ HH members (P)**
Total	1,001	414	181	124	283	35 *	598	368	0 **	0 **	300	701	483	518	222	779
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	418	216	132	235	27 **	538	436	0 **	0 **	265	736	486	515	232	769
Not at all safe	10	7	1	2	0	2	7	1	0	0	3	7	4	6	0	10
1	17	13	3	0	0	2	14	1	0	0	2	15	4	13	9	8
2	17	12	1	3	1	2	12	2	0	0	3	14	3	14	6	11
3	27	23	3	0	2	4	15	8	0	0	11	16	7	21	5	22
4	65	32	10	9	15	3	41	21	0	0	28	37	18	47	19	47
5	98	38	16	10	34	2	56	39	0	0	35	62	57	40	18	80
6	104	42	15	12	35	0	71	33	0	0	29	75	45	60	32	73
7	166	61	37	23	46	5	89	72	0	0	52	114	84	82	33	134
8	208	82	44	21	61	10	127	72	0	0	49	159	109	99	46	162
9	182	58	31	28	65	1	105	76	0	0	53	129	99	82	28	154
Completely safe	106	47	19	16	24	3	60	42	0	0	34	72	52	54	27	79

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Q3cNEW: How respectful police are to me

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household		Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	**Less than $50,000 (B**	**$50,000 - $74,999 (C)**	**$75,000 - $99,999 (D**	**$100,000+ (E)**	**Less than HS (F)**	**Some college (G)**	**College grad+ (H)**	**Employed (I)**	**Not employed (J)**	**Yes (K)**	**No (L)**	**Married/Living with**	**Not married (N)**	**1 HH member (O)**	**2+ HH members (P)**
Total	1,001	414	181	124	283	35 *	598	368	0 **	0 **	300	701	483	518	222	779
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	418	216	132	235	27 **	538	436	0 **	0 **	265	736	486	515	232	769
Not at all respectful	21	15	1	4	1	0	14	6	0	0	3	18	5	15	1	20
1	15	11	1	0	2	0	11	4	0	0	4	11	2	13	7	8
2	19	7	0	4	7	0	14	5	0	0	5	14	5	14	0	19
3	29	17	7	0	5	6	18	5	0	0	6	22	10	19	9	20
4	51	24	14	5	8	1	34	16	0	0	31	21	22	29	11	40
5	101	45	16	14	26	7	66	28	0	0	42	58	45	55	14	87
6	107	34	20	14	39	2	69	35	0	0	43	64	45	62	26	81
7	136	58	19	16	42	4	82	50	0	0	35	101	72	63	22	113
8	180	75	31	25	49	5	97	79	0	0	37	143	91	89	50	131
9	146	49	28	19	50	5	82	59	0	0	48	98	87	59	31	116
Completely respectful	196	77	44	23	52	4	111	81	0	0	45	151	96	100	51	145

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Q4A: How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding local law enforcement?

Members of the Chicago Police Department are handling their job well.

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household		Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	**Less than $50,000 (B)**	**$50,000 - $74,999 (C)**	**$75,000 - $99,999 (D)**	**$100,000+ (E)**	**Less than HS (F)**	**Some college (G)**	**College grad+ (H)**	**Employed (I)**	**Not employed (J)**	**Yes (K)**	**No (L)**	**Married/Living with (**	**Not married (N)**	**1 HH member (O)**	**2+ HH members (P)**
Total	1,001	414	181	124	283	35 *	598	368	0 **	0 **	300	701	483	518	222	779
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	418	216	132	235	27 **	538	436	0 **	0 **	265	736	486	515	232	769
Agree (Net)	619	257	114	62	185	24	345	250	0	0	176	443	303	316	154	465
Strongly agree	124	42	31	16	35	3	69	52	0	0	38	86	58	65	27	97
Somewhat agree	495	215	83	46	150	21	276	198	0	0	138	357	245	251	127	368
Disagree (Net)	382	156	67	62	97	11	253	118	0	0	124	258	180	203	68	314
Somewhat disagree	281	108	49	50	73	5	189	87	0	0	95	186	141	141	44	237
Strongly disagree	101	48	17	12	24	6	64	31	0	0	29	72	39	62	24	77

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

I would rather the Chicago police spend less time than they currently do in my neighborhood.

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household		Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	**Less than $50,000 (B)**	**$50,000 - $74,999 (C)**	**$75,000 - $99,999 (D)**	**$100,000+ (E)**	**Less than HS (F)**	**Some college (G)**	**College grad+ (H)**	**Employed (I)**	**Not employed (J)**	**Yes (K)**	**No (L)**	**Married/Living with (**	**Not married (N)**	**1 HH member (O)**	**2+ HH members (P)**
Total	1,001	414	181	124	283	35 *	598	368	0 **	0 **	300	701	483	518	222	779
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	418	216	132	235	27 **	538	436	0 **	0 **	265	736	486	515	232	769
Agree (Net)	280	122	49	37	72	9	173	98	0	0	98	182	124	156	42	238
Strongly agree	93	44	11	14	24	4	50	39	0	0	33	61	46	47	13	80
Somewhat agree	187	78	38	23	47	5	123	59	0	0	65	121	77	109	29	158
Disagree (Net)	721	292	132	87	211	26	425	270	0	0	202	519	359	362	180	541
Somewhat disagree	419	166	69	59	125	18	239	161	0	0	116	303	207	212	91	328
Strongly disagree	302	126	62	28	86	8	186	109	0	0	86	217	152	151	89	213

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

If I were to have an interaction with the Chicago police in my area, I am confident that they would treat me with courtesy and respect.

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household		Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	**Less than $50,000 (B)**	**$50,000 - $74,999 (C)**	**$75,000 - $99,999 (D)**	**$100,000+ (E)**	**Less than HS (F)**	**Some college (G)**	**College grad+ (H)**	**Employed (I)**	**Not employed (J)**	**Yes (K)**	**No (L)**	**Married/Living with (**	**Not married (N)**	**1 HH member (O)**	**2+ HH members (P)**
Total	1,001	414	181	124	283	35 *	598	368	0 **	0 **	300	701	483	518	222	779
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	418	216	132	235	27 **	538	436	0 **	0 **	265	736	486	515	232	769
Agree (Net)	752	285	148	89	231	21	429	302	0	0	222	531	379	374	184	568
Strongly agree	283	101	59	37	86	11	165	107	0	0	70	213	153	130	69	214
Somewhat agree	469	184	89	52	145	10	265	195	0	0	151	318	226	243	114	355
Disagree (Net)	249	129	32	35	52	14	169	66	0	0	78	170	104	145	38	210
Somewhat disagree	189	93	23	28	45	12	125	52	0	0	55	133	87	102	25	164
Strongly disagree	60	36	9	7	7	2	44	14	0	0	23	37	17	43	13	47

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

When I see a police officer in my neighborhood, I feel safer.

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household		Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	**Less than $50,000 (B)**	**$50,000 - $74,999 (C)**	**$75,000 - $99,999 (D)**	**$100,000+ (E)**	**Less than HS (F)**	**Some college (G)**	**College grad+ (H)**	**Employed (I)**	**Not employed (J)**	**Yes (K)**	**No (L)**	**Married/Living with (**	**Not married (N)**	**1 HH member (O)**	**2+ HH members (P)**
Total	1,001	414	181	124	283	35 *	598	368	0 **	0 **	300	701	483	518	222	779
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	418	216	132	235	27 **	538	436	0 **	0 **	265	736	486	515	232	769
Agree (Net)	769	294	146	100	229	18	450	301	0	0	228	541	393	376	183	586
Strongly agree	317	116	60	43	99	10	169	138	0	0	83	234	177	140	70	247
Somewhat agree	452	179	86	57	130	8	281	163	0	0	145	307	216	236	113	339
Disagree (Net)	232	119	34	24	54	17	148	67	0	0	72	160	90	142	39	193
Somewhat disagree	162	80	26	14	42	13	96	53	0	0	54	108	68	94	24	138
Strongly disagree	70	40	8	10	13	4	52	14	0	0	18	53	22	49	16	54

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

I approve of the way that the Chicago Police Department handled the summer 2020 protests.

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household		Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	**Less than $50,000 (B)**	**$50,000 - $74,999 (C)**	**$75,000 - $99,999 (D)**	**$100,000+ (E)**	**Less than HS (F)**	**Some college (G)**	**College grad+ (H)**	**Employed (I)**	**Not employed (J)**	**Yes (K)**	**No (L)**	**Married/Living with (**	**Not married (N)**	**1 HH member (O)**	**2+ HH members (P)**
Total	0 **	0 **	0 **	0 **	0 **	0 **	0 **	0 **	0 **	0 **	0 **	0 **	0 **	0 **	0 **	0 **
Total (Unweighted)	0 **	0 **	0 **	0 **	0 **	0 **	0 **	0 **	0 **	0 **	0 **	0 **	0 **	0 **	0 **	0 **
Agree (Net)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Strongly agree	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Somewhat agree	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Disagree (Net)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Somewhat disagree	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Strongly disagree	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

There is evidence of persistent racial bias in Chicago's policing practices.

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household		Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	**Less than $50,000 (B)**	**$50,000 - $74,999 (C)**	**$75,000 - $99,999 (D)**	**$100,000+ (E)**	**Less than HS (F)**	**Some college (G)**	**College grad+ (H)**	**Employed (I)**	**Not employed (J)**	**Yes (K)**	**No (L)**	**Married/Living with (**	**Not married (N)**	**1 HH member (O)**	**2+ HH members (P)**
Total	1,001	414	181	124	283	35 *	598	368	0 **	0 **	300	701	483	518	222	779
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	418	216	132	235	27 **	538	436	0 **	0 **	265	736	486	515	232	769
Agree (Net)	651	280	108	73	189	27	382	242	0	0	209	441	316	335	142	508
Strongly agree	234	106	35	24	69	13	136	85	0	0	85	149	117	117	42	192
Somewhat agree	417	174	73	49	120	13	246	158	0	0	125	292	199	218	101	316
Disagree (Net)	350	134	73	51	93	8	216	126	0	0	90	260	166	184	80	270
Somewhat disagree	227	91	53	29	53	5	140	82	0	0	58	169	107	120	47	180
Strongly disagree	124	42	20	21	40	3	77	44	0	0	33	91	60	64	33	90

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Major reforms are needed within the Chicago Police Department regarding treatment of Black and Latino people.

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household		Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	**Less than $50,000 (B)**	**$50,000 - $74,999 (C)**	**$75,000 - $99,999 (D)**	**$100,000+ (E)**	**Less than HS (F)**	**Some college (G)**	**College grad+ (H)**	**Employed (I)**	**Not employed (J)**	**Yes (K)**	**No (L)**	**Married/Living with (**	**Not married (N)**	**1 HH member (O)**	**2+ HH members (P)**
Total	1,001	414	181	124	283	35 *	598	368	0 **	0 **	300	701	483	518	222	779
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	418	216	132	235	27 **	538	436	0 **	0 **	265	736	486	515	232	769
Agree (Net)	710	315	108	86	202	29	418	264	0	0	224	486	336	374	152	558
Strongly agree	313	141	47	38	87	17	191	105	0	0	101	212	138	176	60	253
Somewhat agree	397	174	61	47	115	11	227	158	0	0	123	274	199	198	92	305
Disagree (Net)	291	99	72	38	81	6	180	105	0	0	76	215	146	145	70	220
Somewhat disagree	185	69	52	19	44	3	119	63	0	0	38	147	87	97	49	136
Strongly disagree	106	30	20	19	37	3	61	41	0	0	38	68	59	47	21	84

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

The Chicago Police Department is doing enough to address gun violence in the city.

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household		Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B)	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D)	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)	Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)	Not employed (J)	Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	1,001	414	181	124	283	35 *	598	368	0 **	0 **	300	701	483	518	222	779
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	418	216	132	235	27 **	538	436	0 **	0 **	265	736	486	515	232	769
Agree (Net)	288	117	58	25	88	9	183	97	0	0	95	193	140	148	66	222
Strongly agree	57	31	10	5	12	5	30	22	0	0	22	35	20	37	15	43
Somewhat agree	231	86	48	20	76	4	153	74	0	0	73	158	120	111	51	180
Disagree (Net)	713	296	123	99	195	26	415	271	0	0	205	508	342	371	156	556
Somewhat disagree	354	154	71	41	88	18	198	138	0	0	95	259	161	194	87	268
Strongly disagree	358	142	52	58	107	8	217	133	0	0	110	249	181	177	70	289

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Q4B: How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding local law enforcement?

Chicago police have been effective at reducing or preventing crime in my neighborhood.

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household		Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B)	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D)	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)	Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)	Not employed (J)	Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	1,001	414	181	124	283	35 *	598	368	0 **	0 **	300	701	483	518	222	779
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	418	216	132	235	27 **	538	436	0 **	0 **	265	736	486	515	232	769
Agree (Net)	562	227	110	61	164	16	326	220	0	0	165	397	267	295	139	422
Strongly agree	109	46	23	12	28	2	55	51	0	0	40	68	51	58	25	83
Somewhat agree	453	181	87	49	136	14	270	168	0	0	125	328	216	237	114	339
Disagree (Net)	439	187	71	63	119	19	272	149	0	0	135	305	215	224	83	356
Somewhat disagree	310	114	55	45	96	12	183	115	0	0	101	209	166	144	55	256
Strongly disagree	129	73	15	18	23	6	90	33	0	0	34	95	49	80	29	101

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

I have confidence in the Chicago Police Department to act fairly and without bias.

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household		Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B)	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D)	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)	Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)	Not employed (J)	Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	1,001	414	181	124	283	35 *	598	368	0 **	0 **	300	701	483	518	222	779
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	418	216	132	235	27 **	538	436	0 **	0 **	265	736	486	515	232	769
Agree (Net)	520	188	100	58	174	12	294	214	0	0	148	372	266	255	124	396
Strongly agree	123	49	26	12	36	4	74	45	0	0	39	83	61	62	29	93
Somewhat agree	397	139	73	46	138	8	220	169	0	0	108	289	205	193	95	302
Disagree (Net)	481	225	81	66	109	23	304	154	0	0	152	329	217	264	98	383
Somewhat disagree	319	154	56	43	66	17	196	106	0	0	105	213	149	170	59	259
Strongly disagree	162	71	25	23	43	6	108	49	0	0	47	115	68	94	38	124

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Chicago police are often able to solve crimes that occur in the city.

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household		Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B)	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D)	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)	Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)	Not employed (J)	Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	1,001	414	181	124	283	35 *	598	368	0 **	0 **	300	701	483	518	222	779
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	418	216	132	235	27 **	538	436	0 **	0 **	265	736	486	515	232	769
Agree (Net)	535	215	106	60	153	13	321	201	0	0	154	381	247	287	125	410
Strongly agree	92	42	13	11	25	2	57	33	0	0	36	56	47	45	17	75
Somewhat agree	443	172	93	49	129	11	264	168	0	0	118	325	200	243	108	335
Disagree (Net)	466	199	74	64	129	22	277	167	0	0	146	320	235	231	97	369
Somewhat disagree	336	142	54	45	96	16	201	120	0	0	114	222	173	164	71	266
Strongly disagree	130	57	20	19	34	6	76	47	0	0	31	98	62	67	26	103

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

The Chicago Police Department has the support of most city residents.

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household		Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B)	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D)	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)	Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)	Not employed (J)	Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	1,001	414	181	124	283	35 *	598	368	0 **	0 **	300	701	483	518	222	779
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	418	216	132	235	27 **	538	436	0 **	0 **	265	736	486	515	232	769
Agree (Net)	558	226	104	70	158	23	306	229	0	0	159	399	285	273	128	430
Strongly agree	107	39	21	13	34	6	65	36	0	0	41	66	51	56	25	81
Somewhat agree	451	187	83	57	124	17	241	193	0	0	118	333	235	217	103	348
Disagree (Net)	443	187	77	54	125	12	292	139	0	0	141	303	197	246	94	349
Somewhat disagree	331	129	63	37	102	7	215	110	0	0	101	230	158	174	64	267
Strongly disagree	112	58	14	17	23	5	77	29	0	0	39	73	39	72	30	82

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

The Chicago Police Department has the support of most BIPOC (i.e., Black, Indigenous, and People of Color) residents.

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household		Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B)	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D)	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)	Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)	Not employed (J)	Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	1,001	414	181	124	283	35 *	598	368	0 **	0 **	300	701	483	518	222	779
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	418	216	132	235	27 **	538	436	0 **	0 **	265	736	486	515	232	769
Agree (Net)	329	126	60	45	98	10	187	131	0	0	105	223	158	170	75	254
Strongly agree	73	34	8	7	23	4	46	23	0	0	21	52	29	44	20	52
Somewhat agree	256	92	52	38	74	6	142	108	0	0	84	172	130	126	55	201
Disagree (Net)	672	287	121	79	185	25	411	237	0	0	194	478	324	348	147	525
Somewhat disagree	417	177	90	43	107	13	257	147	0	0	108	309	205	212	95	322
Strongly disagree	255	110	31	36	78	12	153	90	0	0	86	169	119	136	52	203

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Chicago police should be brought in to handle situations regarding mental health patients and the homeless.

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household		Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B)	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D)	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)	Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)	Not employed (J)	Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	1,001	414	181	124	283	35 *	598	368	0 **	0 **	300	701	483	518	222	779
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	418	216	132	235	27 **	538	436	0 **	0 **	265	736	486	515	232	769
Agree (Net)	509	221	97	51	140	21	325	163	0	0	181	328	252	257	110	399
Strongly agree	142	63	24	16	39	7	91	44	0	0	59	83	65	78	24	118
Somewhat agree	367	158	73	35	102	14	234	119	0	0	122	245	188	179	86	281
Disagree (Net)	492	193	83	73	142	14	273	205	0	0	119	373	230	261	112	380
Somewhat disagree	309	123	57	40	89	9	176	124	0	0	65	244	143	166	70	239
Strongly disagree	183	70	27	32	54	5	97	81	0	0	53	129	87	95	42	141

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Increased police presence is necessary for reducing gun violence in the city.

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status				Child <18 in Household		Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)		Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)		Not employed (J)		Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	1,001	414	181	124	283	35	*	598	368	0	**	0	**	300	701	483	518	222	779
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	418	216	132	235	27	**	538	436	0	**	0	**	265	736	486	515	232	769
Agree (Net)	806	317	149	102	238	26		472	308	0		0		241	565	402	404	185	621
Strongly agree	420	168	81	56	115	15		248	157	0		0		123	297	218	202	96	324
Somewhat agree	386	149	68	46	123	12		224	151	0		0		118	268	184	202	89	297
Disagree (Net)	195	96	32	22	45	9		126	60	0		0		59	136	80	115	37	158
Somewhat disagree	134	62	24	13	35	4		87	44	0		0		46	88	57	77	26	108
Strongly disagree	61	35	7	9	10	5		40	16	0		0		13	48	23	37	11	50

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

There should be more funding for non-policing alternatives (e.g., social worker dispatches, neighborhood patrols, restorative justice circles).

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status				Child <18 in Household		Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)		Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)		Not employed (J)		Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	1,001	414	181	124	283	35	*	598	368	0	**	0	**	300	701	483	518	222	779
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	418	216	132	235	27	**	538	436	0	**	0	**	265	736	486	515	232	769
Agree (Net)	731	317	118	94	203	30		441	260	0		0		220	511	363	368	149	582
Strongly agree	316	134	56	36	90	10		178	128	0		0		112	204	152	164	62	254
Somewhat agree	415	183	61	58	112	21		263	131	0		0		108	307	211	204	87	328
Disagree (Net)	270	97	63	30	80	5		157	108	0		0		79	191	120	150	73	197
Somewhat disagree	174	64	41	17	53	4		106	64	0		0		58	116	74	100	46	128
Strongly disagree	96	33	22	13	28	1		51	44	0		0		22	74	46	50	27	69

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

The current level of funding for the Chicago Police Department is too high.

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status				Child <18 in Household		Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)		Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)		Not employed (J)		Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	1,001	414	181	124	283	35	*	598	368	0	**	0	**	300	701	483	518	222	779
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	418	216	132	235	27	**	538	436	0	**	0	**	265	736	486	515	232	769
Agree (Net)	398	157	62	55	124	12		242	145	0		0		138	260	174	224	80	318
Strongly agree	124	57	16	19	32	3		72	49	0		0		40	84	51	74	24	100
Somewhat agree	274	100	46	36	92	8		169	96	0		0		98	176	123	151	56	218
Disagree (Net)	603	257	118	69	159	23		356	223	0		0		162	441	309	294	142	460
Somewhat disagree	366	174	78	41	73	20		229	117	0		0		97	269	183	183	82	284
Strongly disagree	237	83	40	28	86	3		127	106	0		0		65	172	126	111	60	177

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Q5a: Are any of the following statements true for you?

I have had a negative experience with a member of the Chicago Police Department.

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status				Child <18 in Household		Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)		Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)		Not employed (J)		Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	1,001	414	181	124	283	35	*	598	368	0	**	0	**	300	701	483	518	222	779
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	418	216	132	235	27	**	538	436	0	**	0	**	265	736	486	515	232	769
Yes	234	116	33	30	54	8		162	64	0		0		88	146	102	133	40	194
No	767	297	147	94	228	27		436	304	0		0		212	555	381	386	182	585

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

I have been racially profiled in at least one interaction with police officers in Chicago.

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status				Child <18 in Household		Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)		Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)		Not employed (J)		Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	1,001	414	181	124	283	35	*	598	368	0	**	0	**	300	701	483	518	222	779
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	418	216	132	235	27	**	538	436	0	**	0	**	265	736	486	515	232	769
Yes	173	89	27	21	37	11		113	49	0		0		74	99	83	90	29	145
No	828	325	154	103	246	24		485	320	0		0		226	602	399	429	194	634

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

If I were to report police misconduct to the Chicago Police Department, I believe I would receive retaliation from officers for filing a complaint.

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status				Child <18 in Household		Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)		Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)		Not employed (J)		Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	1,001	414	181	124	283	35	*	598	368	0	**	0	**	300	701	483	518	222	779
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	418	216	132	235	27	**	538	436	0	**	0	**	265	736	486	515	232	769
Yes	389	176	57	56	101	15		232	142	0		0		141	248	181	208	72	317
No	612	238	124	68	182	20		366	226	0		0		158	454	301	311	150	462

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

I have been afraid to report police misconduct to the Chicago Police Department because I believed I would receive retaliation from officers.

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status				Child <18 in Household		Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)		Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)		Not employed (J)		Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	1,001	414	181	124	283	35	*	598	368	0	**	0	**	300	701	483	518	222	779
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	418	216	132	235	27	**	538	436	0	**	0	**	265	736	486	515	232	769
Yes	226	114	28	39	44	8		160	58	0		0		91	135	111	114	39	187
No	775	299	152	85	239	27		438	310	0		0		209	567	371	404	184	592

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Growing up, I was taught that the police were a friend to me and my community.

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status				Child <18 in Household		Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)		Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)		Not employed (J)		Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	1,001	414	181	124	283	35	*	598	368	0	**	0	**	300	701	483	518	222	779
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	418	216	132	235	27	**	538	436	0	**	0	**	265	736	486	515	232	769
Yes	841	329	168	107	237	27		490	324	0		0		235	606	424	417	196	645
No	160	84	13	17	45	8		108	44	0		0		65	95	59	101	26	134

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

As an adult, I feel that the police are a friend to me and my community.

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status				Child <18 in Household		Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)		Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)		Not employed (J)		Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	1,001	414	181	124	283	35	*	598	368	0	**	0	**	300	701	483	518	222	779
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	418	216	132	235	27	**	538	436	0	**	0	**	265	736	486	515	232	769

Yes	680	251	137	89	202	17	381	282	0	0	172	508	353	327	171	509
No	321	162	44	34	81	18	217	86	0	0	128	194	130	192	51	270

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

I have a friend of family member who works for the Chicago Police Department.

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household		Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	**Less than $50,000 (B)**	**$50,000 - $74,999 (C)**	**$75,000 - $99,999 (D)**	**$100,000+ (E)**	**Less than HS (F)**	**Some college (G)**	**College grad+ (H)**	**Employed (I)**	**Not employed (J)**	**Yes (K)**	**No (L)**	**Married/Living with (**	**Not married (N)**	**1 HH member (O)**	**2+ HH members (P)**
Total	1,001	414	181	124	283	35 *	598	368	0 **	0 **	300	701	483	518	222	779
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	418	216	132	235	27 **	538	436	0 **	0 **	265	736	486	515	232	769
Yes	264	96	56	30	82	12	169	83	0	0	87	177	128	135	58	206
No	737	318	125	94	201	23	429	285	0	0	213	524	354	383	165	572

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

I have felt the need to intervene or observe the interactions between a Chicago police officer and a resident.

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household		Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	**Less than $50,000 (B)**	**$50,000 - $74,999 (C)**	**$75,000 - $99,999 (D)**	**$100,000+ (E)**	**Less than HS (F)**	**Some college (G)**	**College grad+ (H)**	**Employed (I)**	**Not employed (J)**	**Yes (K)**	**No (L)**	**Married/Living with (**	**Not married (N)**	**1 HH member (O)**	**2+ HH members (P)**
Total	1,001	414	181	124	283	35 *	598	368	0 **	0 **	300	701	483	518	222	779
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	418	216	132	235	27 **	538	436	0 **	0 **	265	736	486	515	232	769
Yes	209	105	30	27	46	15	137	57	0	0	72	136	91	118	32	177
No	792	309	150	97	237	20	461	311	0	0	227	565	392	401	190	602

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Q12: In an effort to support essential social services that are often underfunded - such as housing, education, employment, mental health care, and youth services - there have been proposals to reduce police department budgets and redistribute those funds towards these essential social services. How much do you support or oppose such proposals?

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household		Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	**Less than $50,000 (B)**	**$50,000 - $74,999 (C)**	**$75,000 - $99,999 (D)**	**$100,000+ (E)**	**Less than HS (F)**	**Some college (G)**	**College grad+ (H)**	**Employed (I)**	**Not employed (J)**	**Yes (K)**	**No (L)**	**Married/Living with (**	**Not married (N)**	**1 HH member (O)**	**2+ HH members (P)**
Total	1,001	414	181	124	283	35 *	598	368	0 **	0 **	300	701	483	518	222	779
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	418	216	132	235	27 **	538	436	0 **	0 **	265	736	486	515	232	769
Support (Net)	565	242	103	70	150	26	344	195	0	0	194	370	262	303	99	466
Strongly support	229	102	41	31	54	11	143	74	0	0	80	149	88	140	42	186
Somewhat support	336	141	61	38	96	15	200	120	0	0	115	221	173	163	57	280
Oppose (Net)	436	171	78	54	133	9	254	173	0	0	105	331	221	215	123	313
Somewhat oppose	224	102	34	26	63	6	135	83	0	0	53	171	96	128	70	154
Strongly oppose	212	69	44	29	70	2	119	90	0	0	52	160	125	87	53	159

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Q6A: Where do you think reallocated funds from the police department should go?

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household		Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	**Less than $50,000 (B)**	**$50,000 - $74,999 (C)**	**$75,000 - $99,999 (D)**	**$100,000+ (E)**	**Less than HS (F)**	**Some college (G)**	**College grad+ (H)**	**Employed (I)**	**Not employed (J)**	**Yes (K)**	**No (L)**	**Married/Living with (**	**Not married (N)**	**1 HH member (O)**	**2+ HH members (P)**
Total	565	242	103	70 *	150	26 **	344	195	0 **	0 **	194	370	262	303	99 *	466
Total (Unweighted)	560	244	118	76 *	122	19 **	302	239	0 **	0 **	164	396	252	308	111	449
Mental health care programs	363	145	67	57	93	19	218	126	0	0	126	237	166	197	56	307
Homeless services and shelters	334	168	52	42	72	22	217	95	0	0	114	220	145	189	47	287
Gun violence prevention	320	126	62	45	86	15	195	110	0	0	112	208	161	158	49	270
Youth services (e.g., community centers, mentorship programs, after-school programs)	291	125	53	40	74	10	193	88	0	0	103	188	151	140	31	261
Affordable housing services	269	112	58	32	66	12	171	86	0	0	96	172	119	150	41	228
Hiring/integrating social workers into police forces to handle situations where police may not be needed	266	86	57	34	89	6	155	105	0	0	86	180	128	138	40	225
Local education/schools	240	85	40	36	80	13	155	73	0	0	102	138	113	127	20	220
Local healthcare services	222	88	35	40	59	10	134	77	0	0	83	139	104	118	28	194
Substance abuse services	220	90	37	36	57	8	130	83	0	0	79	141	109	111	29	191
People returning to their communities from jail or prison (e.g., social/family reintegration, expungement, healthcare assistance)	203	70	42	22	69	11	116	75	0	0	62	141	94	109	33	170
Unemployment/Re-employment services	176	70	32	26	48	13	108	55	0	0	65	111	81	95	19	157
Other (please specify):	9	8	0	0	0	0	4	4	0	0	2	7	2	6	4	5
Not at all sure	15	9	4	0	2	2	11	3	0	0	3	12	4	11	6	9

* Table Base: SUPPORTS POLICE BUDGET REALLOCATION

Q6B: Which of the following should have the highest priority for reallocated funds from the police department?

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household		Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	**Less than $50,000 (B)**	**$50,000 - $74,999 (C)**	**$75,000 - $99,999 (D)**	**$100,000+ (E)**	**Less than HS (F)**	**Some college (G)**	**College grad+ (H)**	**Employed (I)**	**Not employed (J)**	**Yes (K)**	**No (L)**	**Married/Living with (**	**Not married (N)**	**1 HH member (O)**	**2+ HH members (P)**
Total	545	228	98 *	70 *	149	25 **	332	188	0 **	0 **	191	353	258	287	89 *	455
Total (Unweighted)	541	230	114	76 *	121	18 **	291	232	0 **	0 **	162	379	249	292	101	440
Gun violence prevention	169	74	34	24	36	5	108	56	0	0	51	117	89	79	29	140
Hiring/integrating social workers into police forces to handle situations where police may not be needed	68	18	8	5	38	0	33	35	0	0	19	50	34	34	16	53
Youth services (e.g., community centers, mentorship programs, after-school programs)	59	24	9	6	20	4	40	14	0	0	30	29	33	26	9	49
Mental health care programs	58	24	18	6	10	2	34	21	0	0	11	46	28	30	14	44
Homeless services and shelters	53	26	8	8	10	9	28	16	0	0	23	30	20	33	6	47
Affordable housing services	46	26	8	4	8	2	37	7	0	0	17	29	12	34	8	38
Local education/schools	35	12	2	6	15	0	17	18	0	0	18	17	17	18	1	34
Unemployment/Re-employment services	25	14	4	2	5	2	18	5	0	0	9	16	6	19	3	22
Local healthcare services	15	4	2	3	6	0	7	9	0	0	10	5	8	7	2	13
Substance abuse services	8	3	2	2	1	0	5	3	0	0	2	6	6	3	0	8
People returning to their communities from jail or prison (e.g., social/family reintegration, expungement, healthcare assistance)	8	2	3	3	0	1	4	4	0	0	1	7	4	4	2	7

* Table Base: THINK POLICE BUDGET FUNDS SHOULD BE REALLOCATED TO AT LEAST ONE LISTED SERVICE

Q7: How likely do you think it is that the following situations will happen as a result of reallocating funds from the police department to underfunded social services?

Reallocating police department funds will lead to fewer officers in my neighborhood.

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household		Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B)	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D)	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)	Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)	Not employed (J)	Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	1,001	414	181	124	283	35 *	598	368	0 **	0 **	300	701	483	518	222	779
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	418	216	132	235	27 **	538	436	0 **	0 **	265	736	486	515	232	769
Likely (Net)	680	291	116	84	189	29	403	248	0	0	208	472	328	352	155	525
Very likely	267	115	50	31	72	8	156	103	0	0	71	196	131	137	73	194
Somewhat likely	413	176	66	54	117	21	247	145	0	0	136	276	198	215	81	331
Not likely (Net)	321	123	65	40	94	6	195	120	0	0	92	229	154	167	67	254
Not very likely	263	99	52	29	82	6	158	99	0	0	76	187	120	142	54	209
Not at all likely	58	23	13	10	12	0	37	21	0	0	16	42	34	25	13	45

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Reallocating police department funds will mean more funding for social services that can improve issues such as mental health, addiction, and homelessness.

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household		Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B)	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D)	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)	Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)	Not employed (J)	Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	1,001	414	181	124	283	35 *	598	368	0 **	0 **	300	701	483	518	222	779
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	418	216	132	235	27 **	538	436	0 **	0 **	265	736	486	515	232	769
Likely (Net)	622	264	101	84	173	26	367	229	0	0	193	429	297	325	124	498
Very likely	196	91	34	21	50	12	114	70	0	0	63	134	78	119	43	153
Somewhat likely	426	173	67	63	123	14	253	158	0	0	131	295	219	207	81	345
Not likely (Net)	379	149	80	40	110	9	231	139	0	0	106	273	186	193	98	281
Not very likely	276	111	55	29	80	8	173	96	0	0	85	191	137	140	66	210
Not at all likely	103	38	25	11	30	1	58	44	0	0	21	82	49	54	32	71

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Reallocating police department funds will lead to an increase in crime in my neighborhood.

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household		Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B)	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D)	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)	Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)	Not employed (J)	Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	1,001	414	181	124	283	35 *	598	368	0 **	0 **	300	701	483	518	222	779
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	418	216	132	235	27 **	538	436	0 **	0 **	265	736	486	515	232	769
Likely (Net)	548	211	109	74	153	21	323	203	0	0	158	390	260	287	138	409
Very likely	230	93	42	29	66	7	134	89	0	0	65	165	116	114	60	169
Somewhat likely	318	118	67	45	87	14	189	114	0	0	93	225	144	173	78	240
Not likely (Net)	453	202	72	50	130	14	275	165	0	0	142	312	222	231	84	370
Not very likely	331	151	56	31	93	13	207	111	0	0	108	223	157	174	62	269
Not at all likely	123	51	16	19	37	1	67	54	0	0	34	89	65	58	22	101

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Reallocating police department funds will start a real dialogue about the changes needed for policing in Chicago.

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household		Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B)	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D)	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)	Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)	Not employed (J)	Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	1,001	414	181	124	283	35 *	598	368	0 **	0 **	300	701	483	518	222	779
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	418	216	132	235	27 **	538	436	0 **	0 **	265	736	486	515	232	769
Likely (Net)	582	252	106	64	160	24	341	216	0	0	201	381	279	303	111	471
Very likely	173	88	28	17	40	13	88	72	0	0	76	97	74	99	30	143
Somewhat likely	409	164	78	47	120	11	253	145	0	0	124	285	205	204	81	328
Not likely (Net)	419	162	75	60	123	11	257	152	0	0	99	320	203	216	112	308
Not very likely	264	97	38	46	83	5	165	94	0	0	73	191	132	132	65	199
Not at all likely	155	65	37	14	39	5	92	58	0	0	26	129	72	84	47	109

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Reallocating police department funds will only benefit communities of color.

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household		Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B)	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D)	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)	Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)	Not employed (J)	Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	1,001	414	181	124	283	35 *	598	368	0 **	0 **	300	701	483	518	222	779
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	418	216	132	235	27 **	538	436	0 **	0 **	265	736	486	515	232	769
Likely (Net)	396	170	68	38	120	18	234	145	0	0	122	275	195	201	90	306
Very likely	83	35	17	5	26	0	58	26	0	0	28	55	41	43	18	66
Somewhat likely	313	135	51	33	94	17	177	119	0	0	93	220	155	158	73	240
Not likely (Net)	605	243	113	86	163	17	364	223	0	0	178	426	287	317	132	473
Not very likely	379	147	71	54	107	7	244	128	0	0	122	257	189	190	87	292
Not at all likely	226	97	41	32	56	11	120	95	0	0	56	169	98	127	45	181

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Reallocating police department funds will not contribute to repairing the relationship between the police and Chicago residents.

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household		Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B)	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D)	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)	Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)	Not employed (J)	Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	1,001	414	181	124	283	35 *	598	368	0 **	0 **	300	701	483	518	222	779
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	418	216	132	235	27 **	538	436	0 **	0 **	265	736	486	515	232	769
Likely (Net)	606	252	93	80	181	25	344	237	0	0	201	404	286	320	134	472
Very likely	241	100	35	27	78	10	137	94	0	0	83	158	120	120	54	187
Somewhat likely	365	152	58	52	103	15	207	143	0	0	119	247	165	200	80	285
Not likely (Net)	395	162	87	44	102	10	254	131	0	0	98	297	197	198	88	307
Not very likely	274	107	61	27	79	5	179	90	0	0	76	198	147	127	53	221
Not at all likely	121	55	27	17	23	5	75	41	0	0	22	99	50	71	35	86

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Q6: Perhaps you have heard of the campaign "Defund the Police," which refers to the movement to reduce police department budgets and redistribute those funds towards essential social services that are often underfunded, such as housing, education, employment, mental health care, and youth services. Given this understanding, how much do you support or oppose this campaign?

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household		Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B)	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D)	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)	Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)	Not employed (J)	Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	1,001	414	181	124	283	35 *	598	368	0 **	0 **	300	701	483	518	222	779
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	418	216	132	235	27 **	538	436	0 **	0 **	265	736	486	515	232	769
Support (Net)	463	213	79	50	121	21	286	157	0	0	157	307	207	257	79	385
Strongly support	162	80	25	20	37	12	94	56	0	0	53	109	60	102	32	130
Somewhat support	301	133	54	30	84	9	191	101	0	0	104	198	147	154	47	255
Oppose (Net)	538	200	101	74	162	14	312	211	0	0	143	395	276	262	144	394
Somewhat oppose	208	86	34	28	60	10	124	75	0	0	60	148	103	105	59	149
Strongly oppose	330	114	67	46	102	5	189	136	0	0	82	247	173	156	85	245

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Q9: What would reform of Chicago law enforcement look like to you?

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household		Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B)	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D)	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)	Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)	Not employed (J)	Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	743	314	126	89 *	215	30 *	435	279	0 **	0 **	224	519	347	396	149	594
Total (Unweighted)	754	333	151	96 *	174	23 **	403	328	0 **	0 **	202	552	348	406	166	588
Sensitivity training for all officers	416	161	76	59	119	11	240	164	0	0	119	297	181	234	93	322
De-escalation training for all officers	388	142	59	57	129	16	209	163	0	0	132	256	195	193	72	315
Race-focused training for all officers	376	141	68	58	109	15	225	137	0	0	111	265	171	205	79	298
New policies on gun use	373	153	68	56	96	20	214	139	0	0	107	266	163	209	68	304
Introduction of social workers onto police force	372	137	61	60	114	12	214	146	0	0	116	256	171	202	74	298
Bias training for all officers	368	144	56	59	109	11	206	150	0	0	108	260	175	193	80	287
Increased racial and ethnic diversity within the department	311	113	47	45	107	11	170	131	0	0	103	209	144	167	55	257
Stricter rules and regulations from the Chicago Police Board (the disciplinary body for Chicago police officers)	302	129	61	37	75	8	185	109	0	0	90	212	129	173	61	242
Greater reliance on non-lethal weapons	294	116	48	51	79	15	179	101	0	0	91	203	129	165	54	240
More stringent recruiting requirements	267	97	40	42	89	13	155	100	0	0	73	195	105	163	56	211
Civilian oversight committee	241	78	47	47	70	8	138	95	0	0	81	160	116	125	38	204
Completely new leadership	211	87	34	38	52	9	134	69	0	0	78	133	99	112	32	179
Reduced funding for the police department	168	76	25	21	46	7	94	67	0	0	54	114	73	96	23	145
Consent decree (i.e., a court order that establishes an enforceable plan for reform)	143	62	26	20	34	3	73	66	0	0	46	97	58	85	29	114
Other (please specify):	30	15	1	2	11	0	22	7	0	0	6	23	12	18	8	22
Not at all sure	39	19	8	2	11	2	23	14	0	0	16	23	19	19	10	29

* Table Base: AGREE CHICAGO LAW ENFORCEMENT NEEDS REFORM

Q9A: How would you rate the training of Chicago police officers on each of the following?

Racial and cultural awareness

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household		Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B)	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D)	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)	Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)	Not employed (J)	Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	1,001	414	181	124	283	35 *	598	368	0 **	0 **	300	701	483	518	222	779
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	418	216	132	235	27 **	538	436	0 **	0 **	265	736	486	515	232	769
Excellent	78	24	16	10	28	0	53	25	0	0	20	58	39	39	18	60
Good	211	81	35	26	70	6	114	91	0	0	61	151	116	96	49	162
Fair	259	97	51	34	77	9	150	100	0	0	78	180	135	123	44	215
Poor	213	97	36	28	53	8	131	74	0	0	60	153	99	114	48	165
Terrible	85	32	19	12	21	4	57	24	0	0	38	47	39	46	23	62
I don't think CPD officers have been trained for this at all	80	45	9	11	15	5	47	29	0	0	32	49	28	52	13	68
Not at all sure	74	38	14	3	19	3	46	25	0	0	10	64	26	49	27	47

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Bias awareness

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household		Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B)	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D)	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)	Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)	Not employed (J)	Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	1,001	414	181	124	283	35 *	598	368	0 **	0 **	300	701	483	518	222	779
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	418	216	132	235	27 **	538	436	0 **	0 **	265	736	486	515	232	769
Excellent	63	18	14	6	26	0	39	24	0	0	16	47	38	25	14	50
Good	200	71	34	26	69	4	95	100	0	0	63	136	98	102	45	154
Fair	260	115	49	31	66	11	162	87	0	0	67	193	131	130	55	206
Poor	207	80	32	30	65	9	122	76	0	0	61	146	107	100	40	167
Terrible	79	32	21	10	16	8	51	20	0	0	38	41	35	44	18	60
I don't think CPD officers have been trained for this at all	100	49	11	13	27	1	68	31	0	0	38	62	37	63	20	80
Not at all sure	92	48	20	9	15	2	61	29	0	0	16	76	37	55	31	61

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Sensitivity toward those of a different gender, religion, age, orientation, income, etc.

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household		Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B)	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D)	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)	Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)	Not employed (J)	Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	1,001	414	181	124	283	35 *	598	368	0 **	0 **	300	701	483	518	222	779
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	418	216	132	235	27 **	538	436	0 **	0 **	265	736	486	515	232	769
Excellent	81	28	11	11	30	0	49	32	0	0	18	63	34	47	17	64
Good	191	72	35	21	63	2	107	82	0	0	56	136	108	83	46	146
Fair	275	117	42	38	77	10	161	104	0	0	74	201	128	147	70	204
Poor	193	76	47	26	43	13	116	64	0	0	65	128	87	105	38	155
Terrible	94	36	20	12	26	4	58	31	0	0	52	42	56	37	17	77
I don't think CPD officers have been trained for this at all	84	45	7	11	21	0	57	27	0	0	25	59	31	53	16	68
Not at all sure	83	39	18	5	22	5	50	28	0	0	11	72	37	46	18	65

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

De-escalating tense or dangerous situations

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household		Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B)	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D)	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)	Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)	Not employed (J)	Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	1,001	414	181	124	283	35 *	598	368	0 **	0 **	300	701	483	518	222	779
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	418	216	132	235	27 **	538	436	0 **	0 **	265	736	486	515	232	769
Excellent	92	38	10	6	37	1	51	41	0	0	22	70	44	48	23	69
Good	230	97	41	29	64	7	142	81	0	0	71	160	119	111	56	175
Fair	267	99	58	40	70	14	159	94	0	0	83	184	135	132	55	212
Poor	197	65	40	27	66	3	107	87	0	0	62	135	95	102	34	163
Terrible	84	39	10	12	23	4	54	26	0	0	32	52	41	44	19	65
I don't think CPD officers have been trained for this at all	55	35	5	8	7	4	36	15	0	0	17	39	20	36	13	42
Not at all sure	75	40	17	2	16	2	49	24	0	0	13	62	28	46	21	53

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Prioritizing non-lethal actions or weapons when dealing with individuals

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status				Child <18 in Household		Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)		Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)		Not employed (J)		Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	1,001	414	181	124	283	35	*	598	368	0	**	0	**	300	701	483	518	222	779
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	418	216	132	235	27	**	538	436	0	**	0	**	265	736	486	515	232	769
Excellent	88	26	18	15	29	3		50	35	0		0		32	56	51	37	15	73
Good	204	90	33	18	63	3		122	79	0		0		48	156	95	109	53	151
Fair	295	127	56	38	74	7		184	104	0		0		94	201	150	145	62	233
Poor	164	50	30	25	59	12		65	86	0		0		55	109	84	81	32	132
Terrible	100	40	24	15	20	4		78	17	0		0		40	60	46	53	20	80
I don't think CPD officers have been trained for this at all	60	34	5	8	13	4		44	13	0		0		18	42	22	39	9	51
Not at all sure	90	46	14	5	24	2		55	33	0		0		13	77	36	54	30	60

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Responding to situations involving mental or behavioral health concerns

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status				Child <18 in Household		Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)		Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)		Not employed (J)		Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	1,001	414	181	124	283	35	*	598	368	0	**	0	**	300	701	483	518	222	779
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	418	216	132	235	27	**	538	436	0	**	0	**	265	736	486	515	232	769
Excellent	57	22	11	7	18	2		33	23	0		0		20	38	30	27	13	45
Good	163	52	25	20	66	2		91	71	0		0		57	107	87	76	30	133
Fair	224	92	45	26	61	6		126	92	0		0		58	166	111	112	51	173
Poor	252	109	44	33	65	17		158	78	0		0		82	170	122	130	50	202
Terrible	113	51	20	10	32	4		75	35	0		0		40	74	54	60	24	89
I don't think CPD officers have been trained for this at all	102	49	15	20	18	3		60	39	0		0		26	76	40	61	27	74
Not at all sure	89	38	21	8	22	3		55	31	0		0		18	71	38	51	27	62

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Responding to situations involving family safety concerns (e.g., domestic abuse, child endangerment)

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status				Child <18 in Household		Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)		Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)		Not employed (J)		Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	1,001	414	181	124	283	35	*	598	368	0	**	0	**	300	701	483	518	222	779
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	418	216	132	235	27	**	538	436	0	**	0	**	265	736	486	515	232	769
Excellent	102	39	17	7	39	4		54	45	0		0		30	72	49	53	25	77
Good	290	108	59	33	91	4		168	117	0		0		68	221	160	130	68	222
Fair	285	110	48	50	77	10		170	105	0		0		102	182	139	146	56	229
Poor	133	60	29	14	30	12		83	38	0		0		38	95	62	71	26	106
Terrible	62	30	9	7	17	3		39	21	0		0		27	36	23	39	14	48
I don't think CPD officers have been trained for this at all	57	32	7	7	11	1		42	13	0		0		25	31	22	35	10	46
Not at all sure	73	35	12	7	18	2		42	29	0		0		9	64	28	45	23	50

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Responding to situations involving personal safety concerns (e.g., stalking, harassment, physical fights)

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status				Child <18 in Household		Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)		Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)		Not employed (J)		Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	1,001	414	181	124	283	35	*	598	368	0	**	0	**	300	701	483	518	222	779
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	418	216	132	235	27	**	538	436	0	**	0	**	265	736	486	515	232	769
Excellent	107	24	18	13	52	1		51	55	0		0		39	68	61	46	14	93
Good	272	111	56	36	70	5		164	103	0		0		56	216	130	143	73	199
Fair	278	112	46	39	80	12		169	96	0		0		86	192	150	128	61	216
Poor	154	63	27	19	46	9		94	51	0		0		61	94	72	82	20	134
Terrible	61	33	10	7	11	2		41	18	0		0		21	39	23	37	19	42
I don't think CPD officers have been trained for this at all	47	28	9	3	6	3		30	13	0		0		20	26	16	31	9	37
Not at all sure	82	42	16	6	19	2		48	32	0		0		15	67	30	52	26	57

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Q10: Which of the following do you think are effective policies for reducing gun violence in Chicago?

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status				Child <18 in Household		Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)		Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)		Not employed (J)		Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	950	385	170	121	274	34	*	562	354	0	**	0	**	284	665	461	489	210	740
Total (Unweighted)	945	392	200	127	226	26	**	505	414	0	**	0	**	251	694	460	485	219	726
Background checks for all gun sales	619	235	118	80	186	18		366	235	0		0		164	455	293	327	133	486
Higher penalties for gun-related crimes	607	240	110	86	171	20		375	212	0		0		162	445	280	327	146	461
Increased police presence in neighborhoods with high gun violence	550	216	105	72	157	19		336	196	0		0		170	380	270	280	121	429
Increase the police's community involvement with residents in neighborhoods with high gun violence	510	208	103	72	127	16		313	180	0		0		155	355	249	261	122	388
Red flag laws/Extreme risk protection orders (i.e., police can remove or block an individual's access to firearms if they believe the weapons will be used for harm)	472	168	93	64	147	17		274	180	0		0		139	332	237	234	96	375
Neighborhood initiatives (e.g., neighborhood watch, community clubs, resident oversight communities)	456	178	90	66	122	10		276	170	0		0		128	328	230	226	100	356
Youth services and after-school programs	452	163	87	64	139	10		284	158	0		0		129	323	226	227	95	357
Police follow-up after gun violence situations	437	163	77	65	132	23		254	160	0		0		140	297	225	212	100	337
Support resources for residents with mental or behavioral health conditions (e.g., counseling services, social workers, housing services)	427	178	71	51	126	11		257	158	0		0		126	301	207	220	100	326
In-school youth programs	405	147	77	57	124	10		241	154	0		0		145	260	213	192	80	325
Buy-back of certain firearms (e.g., semi-automatic assault weapons)	318	123	63	45	87	14		173	131	0		0		99	219	173	145	59	259
Other (please specify):	43	21	6	5	12	0		30	13	0		0		9	35	19	24	16	27
Not at all sure	35	18	5	1	11	4		18	13	0		0		9	25	12	23	11	24

* Table Base: AGREE GUN VIOLENCE NEEDS TO BE REDUCED IN CHICAGO

Q13A: Which do you think best describes the level of involvement that the Chicago Police department should have in each of the following situations?

Truancy (i.e., a student's repeated unexcused absence from school)

		Household Income				Education				Employment Status		Child <18 in Household		Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)	Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)	Not employed (J)	Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	1,001	414	181	124	283	35 *	598	368	0 **	0 **	300	701	483	518	222	779
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	418	216	132	235	27 **	538	436	0 **	0 **	265	736	486	515	232	769
Sole responsibility - CPD should respond independently unless another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) is specifically requested	89	44	13	6	26	5	49	35	0	0	35	54	44	45	18	72
Primary responsibility - CPD should take the lead, but another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should be present	93	43	15	7	28	4	51	38	0	0	29	64	44	49	22	71
Shared responsibility - CPD should respond to the call alongside another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works)	258	98	41	35	84	3	162	93	0	0	86	172	125	132	50	208
Limited responsibility - another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should take the lead, but CPD should be present	213	84	54	28	47	7	135	72	0	0	51	162	105	109	58	155
No responsibility - another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should respond independently unless CPD is specifically requested	265	96	46	36	87	6	145	114	0	0	68	197	125	140	62	203
N/A - this issue should be handled without a response team(s) (e.g., between residents, involving a private organization)	82	49	11	12	10	10	56	16	0	0	30	52	39	43	13	69

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Medical emergency (e.g., heart attack, allergic reaction, overdose)

		Household Income				Education				Employment Status		Child <18 in Household		Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)	Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)	Not employed (J)	Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	1,001	414	181	124	283	35 *	598	368	0 **	0 **	300	701	483	518	222	779
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	418	216	132	235	27 **	538	436	0 **	0 **	265	736	486	515	232	769
Sole responsibility - CPD should respond independently unless another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) is specifically requested	109	57	21	10	20	3	69	37	0	0	39	69	37	72	26	82
Primary responsibility - CPD should take the lead, but another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should be present	135	62	16	15	41	6	82	47	0	0	39	95	68	66	35	99
Shared responsibility - CPD should respond to the call alongside another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works)	345	124	79	45	97	15	202	127	0	0	101	244	172	173	71	274
Limited responsibility - another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should take the lead, but CPD should be present	237	101	38	24	74	6	142	89	0	0	64	173	114	123	51	185
No responsibility - another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should respond independently unless CPD is specifically requested	156	56	24	27	49	3	87	67	0	0	50	106	83	73	32	124
N/A - this issue should be handled without a response team(s) (e.g., between residents, involving a private organization)	20	13	3	2	2	3	17	1	0	0	6	14	9	11	6	14

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Drug-related issue (e.g., intoxication, addiction, possession of an illicit substance)

		Household Income				Education				Employment Status		Child <18 in Household		Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)	Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)	Not employed (J)	Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	1,001	414	181	124	283	35 *	598	368	0 **	0 **	300	701	483	518	222	779
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	418	216	132	235	27 **	538	436	0 **	0 **	265	736	486	515	232	769
Sole responsibility - CPD should respond independently unless another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) is specifically requested	207	90	37	21	58	8	125	74	0	0	63	144	91	116	44	163
Primary responsibility - CPD should take the lead, but another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should be present	281	116	44	36	85	6	170	106	0	0	76	206	136	146	75	207
Shared responsibility - CPD should respond to the call alongside another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works)	358	150	66	42	100	15	217	126	0	0	115	243	185	173	70	288
Limited responsibility - another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should take the lead, but CPD should be present	110	37	22	21	31	2	60	48	0	0	32	78	48	62	24	86
No responsibility - another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should respond independently unless CPD is specifically requested	32	11	9	3	8	3	16	14	0	0	10	23	21	11	5	27
N/A - this issue should be handled without a response team(s) (e.g., between residents, involving a private organization)	13	9	3	0	1	1	11	1	0	0	5	8	2	11	5	8

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Mental or behavioral health concern (e.g., suicidal tendency, unstable behavior)

		Household Income				Education				Employment Status		Child <18 in Household		Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)	Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)	Not employed (J)	Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	1,001	414	181	124	283	35 *	598	368	0 **	0 **	300	701	483	518	222	779
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	418	216	132	235	27 **	538	436	0 **	0 **	265	736	486	515	232	769
Sole responsibility - CPD should respond independently unless another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) is specifically requested	87	44	15	7	20	6	47	34	0	0	36	51	29	58	20	67
Primary responsibility - CPD should take the lead, but another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should be present	134	65	20	14	35	3	91	40	0	0	45	89	57	77	28	106

Shared responsibility - CPD should respond to the call alongside another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works)	418	157	73	60	128	16	253	149	0	0	114	304	223	196	97	321
Limited responsibility - another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should take the lead, but CPD should be present	265	107	59	27	71	6	144	114	0	0	64	201	126	139	63	202
No responsibility - another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should respond independently unless CPD is specifically requested	76	28	8	14	27	1	45	30	0	0	36	41	42	35	11	66
N/A - this issue should be handled without a response team(s) (e.g., between residents, involving a private organization)	21	12	5	1	2	2	18	1	0	0	5	16	6	15	5	16

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Domestic dispute (e.g., suspected abuse, child endangerment)

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household		Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B)	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D)	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)	Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)	Not employed (J)	Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	1,001	414	181	124	283	35 *	598	368	0 **	0 **	300	701	483	518	222	779
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	418	216	132	235	27 **	538	436	0 **	0 **	265	736	486	515	232	769
Sole responsibility - CPD should respond independently unless another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) is specifically requested	242	121	43	22	56	17	150	75	0	0	87	155	103	139	50	192
Primary responsibility - CPD should take the lead, but another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should be present	347	129	65	56	96	9	203	135	0	0	98	249	163	184	84	263
Shared responsibility - CPD should respond to the call alongside another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works)	325	128	57	36	104	7	191	127	0	0	88	237	173	152	70	255
Limited responsibility - another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should take the lead, but CPD should be present	58	19	8	7	24	1	30	27	0	0	22	36	30	28	11	47
No responsibility - another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should respond independently unless CPD is specifically requested	10	4	5	2	0	0	9	2	0	0	1	9	5	5	1	9
N/A - this issue should be handled without a response team(s) (e.g., between residents, involving a private organization)	19	12	3	1	2	0	16	3	0	0	4	15	9	10	6	13

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Personal safety concern (e.g., physical fight, stalking, harassment)

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household		Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B)	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D)	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)	Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)	Not employed (J)	Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	1,001	414	181	124	283	35 *	598	368	0 **	0 **	300	701	483	518	222	779
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	418	216	132	235	27 **	538	436	0 **	0 **	265	736	486	515	232	769
Sole responsibility - CPD should respond independently unless another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) is specifically requested	373	163	62	39	109	9	226	139	0	0	109	264	182	191	87	287
Primary responsibility - CPD should take the lead, but another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should be present	315	113	61	46	96	14	176	125	0	0	86	229	158	157	60	255
Shared responsibility - CPD should respond to the call alongside another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works)	232	96	42	33	61	7	149	75	0	0	76	155	107	124	54	178
Limited responsibility - another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should take the lead, but CPD should be present	51	24	8	5	14	3	23	25	0	0	21	30	26	25	11	40
No responsibility - another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should respond independently unless CPD is specifically requested	15	6	5	1	4	0	11	3	0	0	5	10	4	10	4	11
N/A - this issue should be handled without a response team(s) (e.g., between residents, involving a private organization)	15	12	3	0	0	3	12	0	0	0	2	13	5	10	7	8

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Wellness check (i.e., requested in-person visit to verify a resident's personal well-being)

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household		Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B)	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D)	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)	Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)	Not employed (J)	Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	1,001	414	181	124	283	35 *	598	368	0 **	0 **	300	701	483	518	222	779
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	418	216	132	235	27 **	538	436	0 **	0 **	265	736	486	515	232	769
Sole responsibility - CPD should respond independently unless another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) is specifically requested	148	71	25	10	41	7	87	55	0	0	54	94	68	81	30	119
Primary responsibility - CPD should take the lead, but another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should be present	175	73	43	19	41	3	102	71	0	0	53	122	91	84	36	139
Shared responsibility - CPD should respond to the call alongside another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works)	366	136	58	53	120	9	236	121	0	0	107	259	182	184	74	292
Limited responsibility - another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should take the lead, but CPD should be present	187	78	34	23	52	13	99	75	0	0	50	137	94	93	46	141
No responsibility - another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should respond independently unless CPD is specifically requested	103	41	16	18	28	3	58	42	0	0	32	72	41	63	29	75
N/A - this issue should be handled without a response team(s) (e.g., between residents, involving a private organization)	21	15	4	2	1	1	17	4	0	0	5	17	7	15	8	14

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Suspicious behavior (e.g., trespassing, loitering, unfamiliar vehicles)

		Household Income				Education				Employment Status				Child <18 in Household		Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)		Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)		Not employed (J)		Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	1,001	414	181	124	283	35	*	598	368	0	**	0	**	300	701	483	518	222	779
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	418	216	132	235	27	**	538	436	0	**	0	**	265	736	486	515	232	769
Sole responsibility - CPD should respond independently unless another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) is specifically requested	440	187	80	52	121	14		276	151	0		0		140	301	216	224	90	350
Primary responsibility - CPD should take the lead, but another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should be present	270	100	48	29	92	7		143	120	0		0		71	199	127	143	70	200
Shared responsibility - CPD should respond to the call alongside another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works)	209	83	40	33	54	6		127	76	0		0		59	150	97	112	45	164
Limited responsibility - another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should take the lead, but CPD should be present	56	25	9	8	14	5		32	19	0		0		25	31	31	25	8	48
No responsibility - another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should respond independently unless CPD is specifically requested	7	4	1	0	2	0		4	2	0		0		3	4	3	4	1	5
N/A - this issue should be handled without a response team(s) (e.g., between residents, involving a private organization)	19	15	3	2	0	2		17	0	0		0		2	17	8	11	7	11

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Neighborhood concern (e.g., noise complaints, disorderly conduct)

		Household Income				Education				Employment Status				Child <18 in Household		Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)		Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)		Not employed (J)		Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	1,001	414	181	124	283	35	*	598	368	0	**	0	**	300	701	483	518	222	779
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	418	216	132	235	27	**	538	436	0	**	0	**	265	736	486	515	232	769
Sole responsibility - CPD should respond independently unless another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) is specifically requested	337	151	58	31	97	12		200	125	0		0		111	226	160	177	73	264
Primary responsibility - CPD should take the lead, but another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should be present	277	100	54	44	78	10		152	115	0		0		73	203	134	142	61	215
Shared responsibility - CPD should respond to the call alongside another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works)	245	102	38	35	69	6		155	83	0		0		73	172	126	119	50	194
Limited responsibility - another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should take the lead, but CPD should be present	94	37	23	10	25	3		61	31	0		0		24	71	42	52	26	68
No responsibility - another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should respond independently unless CPD is specifically requested	28	13	1	2	12	3		11	14	0		0		13	15	13	15	4	24
N/A - this issue should be handled without a response team(s) (e.g., between residents, involving a private organization)	20	10	7	1	1	1		19	1	0		0		6	14	7	13	8	12

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Homelessness (e.g., tent locations, panhandling)

		Household Income				Education				Employment Status				Child <18 in Household		Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)		Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)		Not employed (J)		Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	1,001	414	181	124	283	35	*	598	368	0	**	0	**	300	701	483	518	222	779
Total (Unweighted)	1,001	418	216	132	235	27	**	538	436	0	**	0	**	265	736	486	515	232	769
Sole responsibility - CPD should respond independently unless another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) is specifically requested	97	47	9	11	30	1		56	39	0		0		39	58	41	56	14	83
Primary responsibility - CPD should take the lead, but another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should be present	119	54	26	11	29	5		76	38	0		0		43	76	62	58	25	94
Shared responsibility - CPD should respond to the call alongside another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works)	377	153	70	50	104	16		239	122	0		0		100	277	175	202	102	276
Limited responsibility - another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should take the lead, but CPD should be present	245	89	50	35	72	7		133	105	0		0		62	182	127	118	43	202
No responsibility - another response team(s) (e.g., EMS, social services, public works) should respond independently unless CPD is specifically requested	123	47	15	17	43	3		64	56	0		0		49	74	67	56	20	103
N/A - this issue should be handled without a response team(s) (e.g., between residents, involving a private organization)	40	24	11	0	4	3		30	7	0		0		6	34	11	29	18	21

* Table Base: ALL QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

Q13B: Which group(s) should be involved in responding to each of the following situations?

Truancy (i.e., a student's repeated unexcused absence from school)

		Household Income				Education				Employment Status				Child <18 in Household		Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)		Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)		Not employed (J)		Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	912	369	168	117	257	30	*	549	333	0	**	0	**	264	648	439	473	205	707
Total (Unweighted)	924	378	201	127	218	23	**	493	408	0	**	0	**	239	685	449	475	216	708
Non-police first responder (e.g., Chicago Fire Department, EMS)	81	37	15	9	20	1		58	22	0		0		36	45	49	32	11	70
Social services (e.g., mental health professional, social worker)	559	226	98	71	163	12		345	202	0		0		148	411	282	277	123	436
Branch(es) of local government (e.g., Department of Public Works, Department of Parks and Recreation)	124	37	27	16	44	1		58	65	0		0		50	74	69	55	17	107

Private organization(s) (e.g., insurance company, neighborhood watch, homeowner's association)	92	36	18	10	27	5	42	45	0	0	23	69	37	55	26	66
Residents	109	58	21	8	21	9	64	36	0	0	31	78	46	63	29	80
None of these	104	41	21	19	23	2	64	38	0	0	24	79	43	61	26	77

* Table Base: THINKS CPD SHOULD NOT HAVE SOLE RESPONSIBILITY FOR THIS SITUATION

Medical emergency (e.g., heart attack, allergic reaction, overdose)

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household		Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B)	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D)	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)	Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)	Not employed (J)	Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	892	356	160	114	263	32 *	529	331	0 **	0 **	261	632	446	447	196	697
Total (Unweighted)	912	372	195	124	221	24 **	483	405	0 **	0 **	231	681	447	465	211	701
Non-police first responder (e.g., Chicago Fire Department, EMS)	723	291	132	99	201	21	428	273	0	0	195	527	355	367	169	553
Social services (e.g., mental health professional, social worker)	126	51	25	11	39	7	65	55	0	0	37	90	56	70	23	103
Branch(es) of local government (e.g., Department of Public Works, Department of Parks and Recreation)	70	24	10	6	30	7	37	26	0	0	26	44	44	26	3	67
Private organization(s) (e.g., insurance company, neighborhood watch, homeowner's association)	44	17	8	5	15	1	20	23	0	0	22	21	31	12	3	40
Residents	41	23	4	4	10	0	23	18	0	0	21	20	24	16	9	31
None of these	30	9	4	5	13	0	22	9	0	0	11	19	14	16	6	25

* Table Base: THINKS CPD SHOULD NOT HAVE SOLE RESPONSIBILITY FOR THIS SITUATION

Drug-related issue (e.g., intoxication, addiction, possession of an illicit substance)

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household		Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B)	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D)	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)	Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)	Not employed (J)	Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	794	323	143	103	225	27 **	473	294	0 **	0 **	237	557	392	403	178	616
Total (Unweighted)	797	327	169	112	189	22 **	418	357	0 **	0 **	210	587	386	411	186	611
Non-police first responder (e.g., Chicago Fire Departm	338	145	61	41	92	8	214	115	0	0	105	233	171	167	75	262
Social services (e.g., mental health professional, social	389	148	76	51	115	7	227	154	0	0	96	293	181	208	94	295
Branch(es) of local government (e.g., Department of P	95	32	16	15	32	4	50	41	0	0	30	64	57	38	17	78
Private organization(s) (e.g., insurance company, neigl	63	23	14	11	15	3	32	29	0	0	23	40	32	31	12	51
Residents	40	18	8	6	7	0	22	18	0	0	20	20	17	23	10	30
None of these	117	54	17	13	33	8	65	43	0	0	36	81	54	62	24	92

* Table Base: THINKS CPD SHOULD NOT HAVE SOLE RESPONSIBILITY FOR THIS SITUATION

Mental or behavioral health concern (e.g., suicidal tendency, unstable behavior)

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household		Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B)	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D)	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)	Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)	Not employed (J)	Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	914	369	165	117	263	29 **	551	334	0 **	0 **	264	650	453	461	202	712
Total (Unweighted)	929	382	198	126	223	23 **	496	410	0 **	0 **	235	694	459	470	217	712
Non-police first responder (e.g., Chicago Fire Department, EMS)	287	113	63	41	69	5	188	94	0	0	79	208	128	159	59	228
Social services (e.g., mental health professional, social worker)	716	282	120	103	211	22	429	265	0	0	191	524	357	359	152	563
Branch(es) of local government (e.g., Department of Public Works, Department of Parks and Recreation)	86	20	22	12	31	1	49	36	0	0	31	56	44	42	13	73
Private organization(s) (e.g., insurance company, neighborhood watch, homeowner's association)	78	33	19	8	18	0	37	41	0	0	30	48	41	37	15	63
Residents	60	32	10	8	9	3	36	21	0	0	19	40	26	33	12	48
None of these	23	13	2	0	7	0	12	11	0	0	3	20	10	13	7	16

* Table Base: THINKS CPD SHOULD NOT HAVE SOLE RESPONSIBILITY FOR THIS SITUATION

Domestic dispute (e.g., suspected abuse, child endangerment)

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household		Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B)	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D)	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)	Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)	Not employed (J)	Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	759	292	138	102	227	18 **	448	293	0 **	0 **	212	546	380	379	172	587
Total (Unweighted)	784	308	173	111	192	16 **	410	358	0 **	0 **	194	590	393	391	182	602
Non-police first responder (e.g., Chicago Fire Department, EMS)	179	67	31	30	51	5	108	67	0	0	67	112	99	80	33	146
Social services (e.g., mental health professional, social worker)	449	182	71	62	133	8	261	179	0	0	107	342	214	235	106	343
Branch(es) of local government (e.g., Department of Public Works, Department of Parks and Recreation)	87	25	22	14	26	2	54	30	0	0	28	59	35	52	10	77
Private organization(s) (e.g., insurance company, neighborhood watch, homeowner's association)	56	20	6	8	21	4	34	18	0	0	17	39	32	23	5	51
Residents	54	27	12	2	13	1	31	22	0	0	22	31	32	22	15	39
None of these	152	57	31	18	46	5	97	50	0	0	39	113	82	70	31	121

* Table Base: THINKS CPD SHOULD NOT HAVE SOLE RESPONSIBILITY FOR THIS SITUATION

Personal safety concern (e.g., physical fight, stalking, harassment)

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household		Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B)	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D)	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)	Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)	Not employed (J)	Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	628	251	119	85 *	173	26 **	372	229	0 **	0 **	191	437	300	327	135	492
Total (Unweighted)	630	258	136	93 *	143	19 **	339	272	0 **	0 **	165	465	311	319	143	487
Non-police first responder (e.g., Chicago Fire Department, EMS)	168	67	41	23	37	4	107	58	0	0	51	117	86	82	23	145
Social services (e.g., mental health professional, social worker)	179	72	29	30	48	10	98	72	0	0	45	134	86	93	33	146
Branch(es) of local government (e.g., Department of Public Works, Department of Parks and Recreation)	97	35	21	17	25	6	63	29	0	0	25	72	46	51	16	81
Private organization(s) (e.g., insurance company, neighborhood watch, homeowner's association)	77	35	10	10	22	3	48	26	0	0	28	48	34	43	15	62
Residents	82	38	13	10	21	0	42	40	0	0	20	62	36	46	17	65
None of these	200	70	33	29	68	6	112	82	0	0	66	134	99	101	49	151

* Table Base: THINKS CPD SHOULD NOT HAVE SOLE RESPONSIBILITY FOR THIS SITUATION

Wellness check (i.e., requested in-person visit to verify a resident's personal well-being)

Household Income | Education | Employment Status | Child <18 in Household | Marital Status | Size of Household

	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B)	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D)	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)	Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)	Not employed (J)	Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	853	343	155	114	241	28 **	511	313	0 **	0 **	246	607	415	438	193	660
Total (Unweighted)	871	352	190	121	208	22 **	468	381	0 **	0 **	224	647	427	444	204	667
Non-police first responder (e.g., Chicago Fire Department, EMS)	306	109	66	43	88	8	191	107	0	0	98	208	157	150	67	239
Social services (e.g., mental health professional, social worker)	515	207	83	74	150	18	293	203	0	0	135	380	238	277	106	409
Branch(es) of local government (e.g., Department of Public Works, Department of Parks and Recreation)	77	35	20	8	13	8	48	20	0	0	31	46	44	33	12	65
Private organization(s) (e.g., insurance company, neighborhood watch, homeowner's association)	98	43	18	14	23	4	51	43	0	0	28	70	55	43	21	77
Residents	119	55	17	19	29	4	70	45	0	0	31	88	50	69	33	87
None of these	41	14	7	4	15	0	25	16	0	0	15	25	19	22	13	28

* Table Base: THINKS CPD SHOULD NOT HAVE SOLE RESPONSIBILITY FOR THIS SITUATION

Suspicious behavior (e.g., trespassing, loitering, unfamiliar vehicles)

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household		Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B)	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D)	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)	Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)	Not employed (J)	Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	561	227	100	72 *	161	21 **	322	218	0 **	0 **	160	401	266	294	132	428
Total (Unweighted)	565	238	116	82 *	129	18 **	294	253	0 **	0 **	145	420	269	296	141	424
Non-police first responder (e.g., Chicago Fire Department, EMS)	116	46	31	11	28	6	62	48	0	0	40	76	66	51	20	97
Social services (e.g., mental health professional, social worker)	81	27	17	18	19	0	42	38	0	0	23	58	44	37	17	64
Branch(es) of local government (e.g., Department of Public Works, Department of Parks and Recreation)	100	37	27	8	28	2	64	34	0	0	35	65	46	54	29	71
Private organization(s) (e.g., insurance company, neighborhood watch, homeowner's association)	97	49	12	15	20	3	59	35	0	0	35	62	42	55	18	78
Residents	73	38	9	7	19	0	50	23	0	0	16	56	27	46	13	60
None of these	218	85	31	27	74	9	117	92	0	0	52	165	104	114	60	158

* Table Base: THINKS CPD SHOULD NOT HAVE SOLE RESPONSIBILITY FOR THIS SITUATION

Neighborhood concern (e.g., noise complaints, disorderly conduct)

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household		Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B)	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D)	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)	Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)	Not employed (J)	Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	664	262	122	93 *	186	23 **	398	243	0 **	0 **	188	476	322	341	150	514
Total (Unweighted)	667	273	137	100	157	20 **	353	294	0 **	0 **	173	494	327	340	156	511
Non-police first responder (e.g., Chicago Fire Department, EMS)	124	48	26	15	34	4	80	40	0	0	40	84	63	61	28	95
Social services (e.g., mental health professional, social worker)	139	57	23	23	36	3	85	51	0	0	38	100	66	73	28	111
Branch(es) of local government (e.g., Department of Public Works, Department of Parks and Recreation)	122	34	28	20	39	3	65	54	0	0	28	93	55	66	23	99
Private organization(s) (e.g., insurance company, neighborhood watch, homeowner's association)	177	80	31	17	48	4	104	69	0	0	67	110	81	96	34	143
Residents	139	57	28	21	33	5	73	61	0	0	42	97	64	76	25	114
None of these	170	59	28	28	55	6	101	62	0	0	38	131	88	81	46	124

* Table Base: THINKS CPD SHOULD NOT HAVE SOLE RESPONSIBILITY FOR THIS SITUATION

Homelessness (e.g., tent locations, panhandling)

		Household Income				Education			Employment Status		Child <18 in Household		Marital Status		Size of Household	
	Total (A)	Less than $50,000 (B)	$50,000 - $74,999 (C)	$75,000 - $99,999 (D)	$100,000+ (E)	Less than HS (F)	Some college (G)	College grad+ (H)	Employed (I)	Not employed (J)	Yes (K)	No (L)	Married/Living with	Not married (N)	1 HH member (O)	2+ HH members (P)
Total	904	367	172	113	253	34 *	542	329	0 **	0 **	261	644	441	463	208	696
Total (Unweighted)	906	369	202	120	215	26 **	482	398	0 **	0 **	226	680	444	462	217	689
Non-police first responder (e.g., Chicago Fire Department, EMS)	148	59	25	19	45	5	95	48	0	0	66	82	72	76	30	118
Social services (e.g., mental health professional, social worker)	615	222	115	86	191	16	357	242	0	0	159	457	308	307	152	463
Branch(es) of local government (e.g., Department of Public Works, Department of Parks and Recreation)	182	76	28	23	55	8	100	73	0	0	65	117	85	97	32	150
Private organization(s) (e.g., insurance company, neighborhood watch, homeowner's association)	128	62	16	21	29	8	72	47	0	0	41	87	62	65	22	106
Residents	71	30	12	10	19	3	37	31	0	0	20	51	35	36	15	56
None of these	69	34	15	3	16	3	51	15	0	0	13	56	34	35	12	58

* Table Base: THINKS CPD SHOULD NOT HAVE SOLE RESPONSIBILITY FOR THIS SITUATION