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Legacy Foundation celebrated its 25th anniversary in 2017, and it commemorated this milestone by asking Lake County residents to come together to discuss the positive work happening in their communities as well as the challenges their communities face. On September 26, 2017, residents joined together in On the Table conversations. This conversation-oriented initiative was an opportunity for friends, families, neighbors, colleagues, and even people who were meeting for the first time to gather around a shared meal and have a real dialogue about what is important to them with the intention of fueling meaningful change.

On the Table provided the opportunity for residents to share their vision for improving Lake County and allowed Legacy Foundation to hear from residents and learn what they have envisioned for their communities in their conversations. As part of this commitment to listen to and learn from Lake County residents, Legacy Foundation will use feedback generated from the On the Table conversations in its strategic planning process. Additionally, the Foundation will use this information to guide its future grantmaking and to establish new connections and collaborations, and it will share the information with leaders and residents throughout Lake County to help individuals and organizations better understand the needs of the community.

Legacy Foundation organized On the Table with support from The John S. and James L. Knight Foundation. Knight Foundation brought On the Table to 10 cities across the country in 2017: Lexington, KY (March 15); Philadelphia, PA (May 23); Long Beach, CA (September 23); Gary, IN (September 26); Akron, OH (October 3); Detroit, MI (October 4); Miami, FL (October 17); Charlotte, NC (October 25); Columbus, GA (November 7); and San Jose, CA (November 15). This On the Table replication project draws from an initiative that originated in Chicago in 2014 as part of The Chicago Community Trust’s Centennial celebration. Since its inception and expansion into other cities, On the Table has been an occasion for residents of a city or region to convene and discuss local opportunities and challenges while focusing on strategies to make their communities safer, stronger, and more dynamic.

All 10 cities designated one day in 2017 to convene residents in mealtime conversations for discussions on how to make their city a better place to live, work, and play. Following the conversations, participants had the opportunity to take a survey about their On the Table experience. This survey featured 28 questions that were standard across all 10 cities, plus up to five additional questions that were unique to each city. Following the collection of survey data, all cities receive a report summarizing and analyzing the survey data and a link to a data exploration tool. Community foundations can use insights from the data to inform strategic planning, and local decision-makers, organizations, and residents can use the data to collaborate around improving the quality of life in their cities. A national report incorporating data from all 10 cities and exploring correlations and comparisons in the full data set will be produced in early 2018.

Research Methodology
Knight Foundation invited the University of Illinois at Chicago’s (UIC) Institute for Policy and Civic Engagement (IPCE) to serve as the research partner for this On the Table initiative. We set out to gain a deeper understanding of the conversations through results gathered from a survey of On the Table
This report presents the results of the survey and incorporates analyses to provide insight into the summary data. The data itself can be accessed and explored through ipce.shinyapps.io/OTTLC.

The central questions guiding this research include: Who responded to the survey? How did the conversations go? How did the conversations impact respondents? Legacy Foundation was interested in learning more specifically about community needs, such as issues respondents would like to see their communities address, and service needs. They also wanted to understand attitudes toward the Lake County community, such as barriers to community involvement, pride in the community, and satisfaction with the quality of services offered. The research questions and learning objectives influenced the formatting of the survey, which included a total of 32 questions.

We collected survey data using three methods: a public web link to the Qualtrics survey, an e-mailed unique link to the Qualtrics survey, and distributed print surveys, upon request. To accommodate non-English speakers, the survey was translated into Spanish. The collection of survey data began the morning of the On the Table conversations (September 26) when the public web link opened. On the same day and immediately following conversations, print surveys were made available to participants. Following the conversations, 991 participants received an e-mail invitation to take the survey. Surveys were collected through October 27, 2017.

The respondent population discussed in this report is a self-selected sample of participants who partially or fully completed the survey. All three survey sources yielded a total of 1,179 responses (98 through the e-mailed unique link, 48 through the web link, and 1,033 through the print survey). Because this group constitutes a non-random sample of total participants, conclusions cannot be scientifically generalized beyond the respondent group. However, the data and analysis provide useful insight into the opinions, habits, and backgrounds of a number of engaged Lake County residents.

Legacy Foundation also developed a youth component to On the Table in order to support engagement in schools across Lake County. After their On the Table conversations, youth were encouraged to reflect on their experience in a post-event activity. They were asked to use the outline of a person to reflect on the idea discussed in conversations that has the most potential to bring about change in their community (head), the issue they care about most in their community (heart), and the action they could

---

1 See Appendix A for the full survey.
2 We had contact information (e-mail addresses) only for those who provided it through the registration process or during sign-in on the day of the conversation. Registration and signing in were not required for participation, and those who did not register or sign in were able to access the survey through the public web link shared by Legacy Foundation or through print surveys. In total, we sent a survey to 991 unique and valid e-mail addresses, correcting for duplicates and inaccurate e-mail addresses.
3 See Appendix B for a summary report featuring visualizations for responses of all survey questions.
4 The estimated survey participation rate is 87%. This is calculated by dividing the total number of survey respondents (1,179) by the estimated number of On the Table participants (1,352). Legacy Foundation provided the estimated number of On the Table participants.
take to address that issue (feet). This activity was featured on one side of a worksheet shared with students and was an individual exercise. On the other side of the worksheet was a group exercise where youth were encouraged to again use the same outline of the person to reflect on what they learned while participating in the event (head), how their experience while participating in the event made them feel (heart), and based on what they learned and experienced, one thing they are going to do to make a difference on issues they care about (feet). We received Head, Heart, and Feet exercises from 116 anonymous individual youth participants, as well as eight anonymous group summary sheets from classrooms. Altogether, the data reflect information shared from conversations that involved approximately 150 youth from Gary and Hammond.

This report features two primary sections. ‘The Conversations’ is a summary of results for all survey questions; it includes geographic subgroup analyses for a number of questions, which was of particular interest to Legacy Foundation. Legacy Foundation provided four distinct regions in Lake County for our geographic analysis: North East, North West, Central, and South. We categorized respondents into these regions by their self-reported place of residence in Lake County. The ‘Analysis’ presents analyses that reference other subgroup comparisons as well as the disparity between important issues to respondents and respondents’ contributions to those issues. Along with geography, our subgroups include gender, age, education level, race, and homeownership status. Definitions of these subgroups are provided in the ‘Analysis’ section. Our analyses go beyond the original guiding questions referenced above and help deepen understanding of the summary data.

THE CONVERSATIONS

Who Responded?
The perspectives, ideas, and experiences of nearly 1,200 respondents inform this report, which means it is worth exploring what we know about who responded to the survey. This section summarizes data about respondent demographics, and it presents information about respondents’ civic attitudes and engagement behaviors. Additionally, it incorporates Lake County comparison data and national comparison data where available. When comparing On the Table data to Lake County resident data, only those respondents who live in Lake County (and not the full set of respondents) are compared to the representative data; therefore, the percentages representing the full respondent group show slightly different than the percentages for Lake County respondents, as not all respondents live in Lake County.

Without having survey data for everyone who participated in the On the Table initiative, we are unable to explain differences (if any) between our respondent group and regional and national comparison groups. While we have survey data for respondents, this data does not fully reflect participation in the

---

5 For example, the respondent group is 64% female and 35% male. While it is possible that this accurately reflects participant make-up, it is also possible that the participant breakdown was closer to 50/50, but females responded to the survey at disproportionately higher rates. Without having data for all participants, we cannot know if the rate at which certain groups participated was proportional or disproportional.
On the Table initiative. It is important to note that this study represents a subset of On the Table participants—its itself a subset of the Lake County population—who self-selected to respond to the survey.

Demographics
For respondent demographics, we report on gender, age, educational attainment, race and/or ethnicity, geography, length of residence, and homeownership status. We also incorporate respondents’ self-reported relationship to Legacy Foundation. Two goals of On the Table are for the conversations about Lake County to act as a unifying force for people of all backgrounds and opinions and to act as an opportunity for different people to share new ideas that are reflective of their own community needs. The demographics presented below help to show who took the On the Table survey and, from this subset of On the Table participants, who also came together over shared meals to discuss the opportunities and challenges facing their communities.

Gender and Age
Nearly two-thirds (64%) of respondents identified as female, and 35% identified as male (see Figure B.1). One-third (33%) of respondents reported an age in the 60 years and up range, making it the largest age group. The smallest age group was made up of respondents who reported an age in the 18 to 29-year-old range, which was 12% of respondents (see Figure B.2). The percentage of respondents who reported living in Lake County and who fell within the 60 years and up age group was slightly higher than the county percentage of those in this age range. Just over one-third (34%) of Lake County respondents were aged 60 years and up, and 27% of all Lake County residents are aged 60 years and up. Lake County respondents who made up the youngest age group (18 to 29) were underrepresented. Whereas 11% of Lake County respondents were aged 18 to 29 years, 20% of all Lake County residents make up this age group. The percentages of Lake County respondents in their 30s, 40s, and 50s were nearly, if not entirely, representative of county data (see Figure B.3).

Educational Attainment
In reporting on educational attainment, both respondent data and Lake County data reflect highest degree obtained. Over one-quarter (28%) of respondents have earned a graduate degree, 30% have earned a bachelor’s degree, and 19% have attained some college. Additionally, 12% have earned a high school diploma or GED (see Figure B.4). When compared to Lake County as a whole, there was overrepresentation of Lake County respondents who are in possession of a graduate or bachelor’s degree. Whereas 7% of all Lake County residents have a graduate degree, over four times more, or 29% of, Lake County respondents have earned the same. Likewise, whereas 14% of all Lake County residents have a bachelor’s degree, 31% of Lake County respondents have achieved the same. Respondents who have a high school diploma or GED and respondents who have completed less than high school were underrepresented groups. While 35% of all Lake County residents have a high school diploma or GED, respondents who have earned a college degree have taken the survey over a larger percentage.

6 U.S. Census Bureau; American Community Survey, 2015 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Table S0101; generated using American FactFinder; <http://factfinder2.census.gov>; (17 May 2017).
7 For the education variable, in addition to including only those respondents who live in Lake County when comparing to representative data, only those 25 years of age or older are included as well (as opposed to the full data set).
only 10% of Lake County respondents have the same level of education. And while 13% of all Lake County residents have completed less than high school, only 1% of Lake County respondents have the same level of education (see Figure B.5).\(^8\)

**Race**

In terms of race and/or ethnicity, 58% identified as White and 25% identified as Black or African American. Smaller percentages of respondents identified as Hispanic or Latino/a (8%) and Multiracial (7%) (see Figure B.6).\(^9\) At 57%, the percentage of Lake County respondents who identified as White was nearly equivalent to the 59% of Lake County residents who identify as the same. Similarly, the 26% of Lake County respondents who identified as Black or African American was almost on par with the 23% of Lake County residents who name the same race. Furthermore, there was underrepresentation of Hispanic or Latino/a respondents and overrepresentation of Multiracial respondents. In terms of ethnicity, 16% of all Lake County residents identify as Hispanic or Latino/a, compared to the 9% of Lake County respondents who selected this ethnicity. Finally, while only 1% of all Lake County residents identify as Multiracial, 7% of Lake County respondents did the same (see Figure B.7).\(^10\)

**Geography**

A majority (89%) of respondents said they currently live in Lake County, IN. Additionally, 6% indicated they live in Porter County, IN, and 2% said Cook County, IL (see Figure B.8). Respondents reported currently living in a variety of cities. Just over one-fifth (21%) of respondents said they live in Gary, followed by 12% in Crown Point and 10% in Hammond. Smaller percentages said they live in Hobart (6%), Merrillville (6%), East Chicago (4%), Highland (4%), Munster (4%), Cedar Lake (4%), and Lowell (3%) (see Figure B.9). The top respondent ZIP codes include 46307 (12%), 46403 (10%), 46342 (6%), 46410 (6%), 46324 (5%), and 46312 (5%) (see Figure B.10). Lake County divided into four regions shows nearly equal distribution of respondents: 26% live in the North West region, 25% live in the South region, 25% live in the North East region, and 24% live in the Central region (see Figure B.11).

**Length of Residence**

Nearly one-half (47%) of respondents indicated they were long-term residents who have lived in their local community for 20 or more years; comparatively, 32% of people in the United States have lived in their local community for this length of time. At 17%, newcomers, or those who have lived in their local community for 0-4 years, featured the next greatest number of respondents. This was an underrepresented group, as 28% of people in the U.S. have lived in their local community for this short amount of time.\(^11\) Respondents who have lived in their local community for 10 to 14 years made up 14%

\(^8\) U.S. Census Bureau; American Community Survey, 2015 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Table S0101; generated using American FactFinder; <http://factfinder2.census.gov>; (17 May 2017).

\(^9\) Unlike census data, the On the Table race variable features an “Other” response option. Because of this, the On the Table race percentages are very modestly lower than they would be if the “Other” was not a featured category.

\(^10\) U.S. Census Bureau; 2011-2015 American Community Survey 5-year estimates, Voting Age Population by Citizenship and Race (CVAP), published 02/01/2017.

of the respondent pool, followed by those who have lived in their local community for five to nine years (11%) and 15 to 19 years (11%) (see Figure B.12).

Homeownership Status
Regarding homeownership status, 73% of respondents indicated they own their primary residence, and 21% said they rent (see Figure B.13).\textsuperscript{12} Compared to Lake County as a whole, respondent homeowners were an overrepresented group and respondent renters were an underrepresented group. Whereas 78% of Lake County respondents reported owning their primary residence, 69% of all Lake County residents are homeowners. And whereas 22% of Lake County respondents reported renting their primary residence, 31% of all Lake County residents are renters (see Figure B.14).\textsuperscript{13}

Relationship to Legacy Foundation
When asked about their relationship to Legacy Foundation, 39% said they had not heard of the Foundation prior to participating in On the Table. However, a number of respondents have had some kind of relationship with Legacy Foundation: 35% said they have attended one of their events and 21% said they have been a grantee. Furthermore, 8% said they have volunteered with them, 5% said they are a funder, and 2% said they work there. Finally, 12% indicated some other relationship to Legacy Foundation than that which were listed, with the top “other” response being that respondents were aware of the Foundation (see Figure B.15).

Civic Attitudes and Activities
The first five subsections in ‘Civic Attitudes and Activities’ (Pride in Community; More Services; Quality of Services, Barriers to Involvement; and Community Issues) report on results from custom survey questions that Legacy Foundation helped create based on their desire to learn more about community needs and service needs, as well as attitudes toward the Lake County community. The remaining subsections (Social Issue Priority; Primary Social Issue Contribution; Community Attachment and Personal Impact; Engagement Habits; Places to Connect; and Engagement with News Sources) incorporate findings from the core survey questions—included in all 10 Knight On the Table surveys—that ask about community attitudes and to what degree respondents participate in engagement activities. Geographic subgroup analyses are included with the results for the five custom questions, as well as with the results for social issue priority and social issue contribution.

As this section of the report demonstrates, the respondent group is a highly engaged group who, overall, maintain areas of pride regarding their communities and areas of concern regarding their communities. The geographic subgroup comparisons help to highlight the variances among the different regions regarding what respondents in those regions like about their communities and what they believe needs to be done to improve their communities. Having a sense of both the assets and the

\textsuperscript{12} Just like the race variable, the On the Table homeownership variable also features an “Other” response option (unlike in the Census data), which has slight implications for the On the Table homeownership percentages showing lower than they otherwise would.

\textsuperscript{13} U.S. Census Bureau; American Community Survey, 2015 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Table DP04; generated using American FactFinder; <http://factfinder2.census.gov>; (17 May 2017).
needs of communities is a balance On the Table strives to strike by exploring not only the good in communities, but also what could be done to make communities even better.

Pride in Community

When asked what they are most proud of in their local community, respondents provided a variety of responses that highlight the strengths of their communities. The top six responses include sense of community, people, education and schools, community involvement, nature and parks, and diversity (see Figure B.45).14

Overall, 17% of respondents said they are most proud of the sense of community. “I love the feeling of community,” said one respondent. Some respondents described their community as having “community spirit” and a “community feeling,” which is often marked by “closeness of the community” and a “sense of ‘love’ for community.” Others described their community as “close-knit” as well as “safe and friendly.” A number of respondents spoke to the “small community atmosphere” or “small town community.” The small town “feel,” “pride,” “flavor,” and “identity” promote a “sense of togetherness” and a “family atmosphere.” Not only do their communities have a “family feel” because they are a “good location to raise a family,” “family friendly,” and “family oriented,” for example, but also the community itself provides a “sense of family”; “we are still a family community,” said one respondent.

Additionally, 16% of respondents said they are most proud of the people in their local community. Respondents most frequently described the people as “friendly,” though they also attributed other positive characteristics to their fellow community members, such as “giving,” “resilient,” “caring,” “invested,” and “generous.” There were some respondents who expressed being proud of “the people who care,” “the way people work together,” and “the people that volunteer and work hard to improve our town.” Other respondents noted that “people are willing to work on the issues,” and they see “people collaborating” and have noticed “their willingness to be involved.”

Education and schools was also a common source of pride, with 14% of respondents saying they are most proud of education and schools in their local community. A number of respondents mentioned “our schools” and the “school system,” with one respondent describing schools as “good” and another respondent describing the school system as “caring [and] awesome.” A few respondents are specifically proud of the “programs [our] school has,” the “classes the schools offer,” and “school spirit.” Some respondents also brought up “education,” including “early childhood education” and “accessible education,” with one respondent expressing pride for the community “prioritizing education over sports.” Finally, a few respondents indicated that they are proud of their local public libraries, describing their own personal libraries as “great.” According to one respondent, “The library and its service is the pride of this community. I love my library!”

---

14 More detail on these themes and the other themes that emerged within this variable can be found in Appendix C, which describes the themes that make up the ‘Pride in Community’ codebook.
In addition, 11% of respondents said they are most proud of the community involvement. For example, they commented on being proud of both “people’s involvement” and their own personal “constant involvement.” Some made note of “participation from the community,” including from “community member[s],” “youth,” or “parent[s].” These respondents said they see much “local involvement” and are proud of “efforts to bring community together.”

Furthermore, 10% of respondents said they are most proud of nature and parks in their local community. Respondents frequently mentioned the parks and trails across the county, for example, describing them as “great” and “beautiful.” They indicated they are proud of the “development of parks” and the “revitalized Lakefront parks” as well as “parks with diverse recreational use.” Some respondents also brought up the park district and the park systems—along with specific parks—as areas of the community of which they are proud. A few respondents also named Lake Michigan as a point of pride in their community.

Finally, 10% of respondents said they are most proud of the diversity in their local community. For example, respondents mentioned the “diversity of cultures” and “diversity of the people” and spoke to their sense of pride in “our diversity and ability to coexist.” Some respondents pointed out that their local community may not be diverse—although diversity is “growing” across the county—but Lake County as a whole is diverse, and that makes them proud. In addition to diversity, other respondents expressed pride in the inclusivity that their communities show and embrace.

Analyses by geographic subgroups showed differences in how respondents in the four regions were likely to answer this question about areas of pride in the community. At 17%, North East respondents were most likely to say they are proud of their community’s diversity, while only 2% of South respondents indicated the same. However, with regard to education and schools, North East respondents were least likely to mention a response related to education and schools. While 2% of respondents in the North East brought up education and schools as a point of pride, an average of 17% of respondents in the North West, Central, and South regions did the same. Finally, 9% of South respondents said they are proud of their community’s safety, compared to an average of only 3% of respondents in the Central, North West, and North East regions.

More Services
Respondents also identified services they wish they had more of in their community. While they named a range of services, transportation services, youth services, recreation services, economic and employment services, education services, and shopping and food services were mentioned most frequently (see Figure B.43).15

Just under one-quarter (23%) of respondents said they wish they had more transportation services. A large proportion of respondents referred to public transportation, citing a need for “better,”

---

15 More detail on these themes and the other themes that emerged within this variable can be found in Appendix D, which describes the themes that make up the ‘Services’ codebook.
“dependable,” and “affordable” public transit, for example. Some respondents mentioned providing public transportation to areas that are currently underserved, whether that be “across the county,” or “intra-county and interstate.” They also want public transportation for specific populations, including seniors, youth, and people with disabilities. Respondents tended to name buses as a mode of transit where more are needed. A few respondents also named a need for more “bike trails,” “bike paths,” and “bike lanes.” As one respondent stated, they would like to see “alternate modes of transportation.”

Many respondents (15%) cited a need for more youth services. For example, they largely want to see more “youth programs” and “youth activities,” such as “after[-]-school programs,” “summer programs,” “youth recreation activities,” and “youth[-]-oriented, family[-]-friendly events.” Essentially, these respondents want “fun things for our kids” that are “cost-effective” and “something other than sports.” There also needs to be “places for kids to safely get together.” “Youth development” and “positive opportunities for youth” were provided as important reasons for requiring more youth services.

Additionally, 11% of respondents named recreational services as something they would like to see more of in their community. Overall, they want recreational opportunities that are “family friendly,” “safe,” and “free.” Some indicated that there should be more “active” recreation options, as well as more “recreation center[s]” and more outdoor “recreational facilities.” These respondents want “better” recreational activities for all ages, including youth, young adults, and adults. Activities also fell within this theme, including “community activities” and “outdoor activities.”

More economic and employment services were also frequently mentioned by respondents, with 10% naming a related issue. Many want more “job opportunities” and “job fairs,” and they’d also like to see “job readiness” programs, especially “job training,” “trade job training,” and “job training for un[employed] and underemployed.” Some respondents want “networking [opportunities] for professional individuals.” Additionally, respondents indicated they want to see more “business opportunities” and “new business development.” As one respondent said, “Without expanded jobs and opportunities[,] everything else is a downhill future.”

Another 10% of respondents said they want to see more education services in their community. They want more “education,” especially “quality early education,” as well as “new schools,” “better schools,” and “good K-12 schools.” Some respondents also expressed interest in “free education programs” and a curriculum that incorporates “arts education” and “STEM programs.” They want more “technology access in the schools,” “mentoring programs,” “counseling in schools,” and “apprenticeship programs.” “Parent education” is also a priority, including “parents education on everything and anything—respect, morals, courtesy, etc.”

Finally, 10% of respondents said they wish they had more shopping and food services. For example, respondents largely said they want “more grocery stores [and] affordable food,” citing a need for not only more “food” and “food access,” but “fresh food locations,” “better food sources,” “high quality food,” “better food selections,” “natural food venues,” and “stores with more fresh produce” in order to address the “food desert situation.” Specific grocers were also named, with one respondent wanting a
“good grocery store like Aldi, Trader Joe’s, or Mariano’s.” Some respondents also wanted “help for homeless and food shelters” and wanted more “local food pantries,” a “community fridge[, and] restaurant donations to food kitchens.” Additionally, respondents wanted to see more “stores,” especially “local stores,” “department stores,” “retail stores,” and “drug stores.”

With regard to geographic region, North East respondents wanted, to a much greater extent, more shopping and food services than the other regions. One-quarter (25%) of respondents in the North East region said they wanted to see more shopping and food services, which was six times greater than the average of 4% of respondents in the North West, Central, and South regions who wanted the same.

Quality of Services
Although there were a number of services respondents would like to see more of in their community, there were also a variety of services with which they expressed being happy in terms of the quality. Over one-half (51%) of respondents indicated they are happy with the quality of local schools, 43% said they are happy with the quality of environment and parks, and 33% of respondents specified they are happy with the quality of recreational opportunities (see Figure B.46).

The most notable between-group differences were seen in the geographic subgroup analysis for this question. Compared to the other three regions where many respondents indicated they are happy with the quality of their local schools, North East respondents were much less likely to say they are happy with this service. While 75% of South respondents, 55% of Central respondents, and 51% of North West respondents said they are happy with the quality of their local schools, only 15% of North East respondents said the same. North East respondents were also much less likely to be happy with public safety and the judicial system. Compared to 47% of South respondents, 33% of Central respondents, and 25% of North West respondents, 6% of North East respondents expressed happiness with the quality of this service. Additionally, North East respondents were less likely to select housing as well as jobs and new business development as services with which they are happy. While an average of 30% of respondents in the three other regions said they are happy with the quality of housing, only 15% of North East respondents felt the same. Similarly, while an average of 20% of respondents in the three other regions indicated they are happy with the quality of jobs and new business development, only 9% of North East respondents said the same. However, North East respondents were more likely to say they are happy with arts and culture, as 35% of North East respondents selected this service, compared to an average of 22% in the other three regions.

Barriers to Involvement
While 45% of respondents consider themselves actively involved in the issues they care about most, a number of respondents find themselves prevented from engaging in and with the community. Additionally, 42% said they are too busy and do not have enough time, and 32% said they are unsure of how to get involved. Only 12% of respondents indicated they believe their efforts will not make a difference, 9% named another reason than that which was listed, and 8% said they are not interested in getting involved (see Figure B.44).
Geographic analyses revealed no notable differences among the North East, North West, Central, and South regions with regard to barriers to involvement.

**Community Issues**
Respondents were asked to identify the top three social issues they would like to see their community address. Over one-half (53%) said education and youth development. Following that, 37% indicated economic issues and poverty, 25% said family, and 23% chose environment and parks (see Figure B.42).16

When respondents were analyzed by geographic region, there were differences with regard to housing and homelessness, education and youth development, and government. At 28%, North East respondents were most likely to select housing and homelessness as a social issue they would like to see their community address, and they chose it more than twice as often as South respondents (12%). Central respondents were most likely to choose education and youth development, with 66% of this group naming this issue; respondents from the Central region named education and youth development at a higher rate than South and North East respondents, as 48% of South respondents and 45% of North East respondents selected this issue. Finally, at 17%, South respondents were most likely to select government, compared to an average of 8% for the other three regions.

**Social Issue Priority**
When respondents were asked to identify the social issues that are most important to them, 57% said education and youth development, 39% said economic issues and poverty, and 31% said family (see Figure B.18).

Analyses by geographic subgroups showed discrepancies with regard to several social issues. At 27%, respondents who live in the South region were most likely to select religion and morals, and they were three times as likely to select this issue as those respondents who live in the North East region (9%). Respondents in the South region were also most likely to choose government, with 14% of them selecting this issue; additionally, they were almost five times as likely as respondents who live in the North East region to select government (3%). The two northern regions (North East and North West) were more likely to select arts and culture as one of the most important issues, with an average of 25% of respondents between these two regions naming this issue; however, an average of only 14% of respondents in the Central and South regions selected arts and culture as one of the most important issues. Finally, the North East region was least likely to choose family as one of the most important social issues; while 20% of respondents in the North East region selected family, an average of 35% in the North West, Central, and South regions did the same.

---

16 We used our issues codebook (see Appendix E) to populate the response options for this question highlighting social issues respondents would like to see their community address, as well as the questions highlighting important social issues and contributions to social issues.
Primary Social Issue Contribution
Using the same set of issue areas as social issue priority, respondents were asked to identify the social issues to which they primarily contribute their time, talent, and/or financial resources. In response, 44% indicated they contribute to education and youth development, 40% indicated family, and 27% indicated religion and morals (see Figure B.19).

Most notable from the analyses by geographic region were the differences between North East respondents and respondents from the three other regions. At 8%, North East respondents were most likely to indicate they contribute to transportation, compared to an average of 1% of respondents from the North West, Central, and South regions. Furthermore, North East respondents were least likely to say they contribute to family and education. While 30% of North East respondents said they contribute to family, an average of 45% of the remaining three regions indicated the same. Similarly, while 36% of North East respondents indicated they contribute to education and youth development, an average of 47% of respondents in the other three regions said the same.

Community Attachment and Personal Impact
Respondents reported largely positive attitudes toward their local community and their own potential for influencing change. With regard to how much impact respondents think people like themselves can have in making their community a better place to live, 52% indicated that they believe they can have a big impact, and 31% said they believe they can have a moderate impact. The 52% of respondents who think they can have a big impact was higher than the 32% of people nationally who believe they have this level of efficacy (see Figure B.16). Respondents also reported high levels of attachment to their local community. Nearly one-half (49%) reported feeling very attached, and 39% said they feel somewhat attached. Nationally, 19% of people feel very attached, which is much lower than the 49% of respondents who feel the same level of attachment (see Figure B.17).

Engagement Habits
With regard to engagement, respondents reported high levels of engagement across all measures. Whereas 29% of respondents said they were very involved in neighborhood and community activities where they live, only 11% of people nationally indicated this level of involvement. An even larger percentage (42%) of respondents said they are somewhat involved, which is slightly higher than the 39% of people nationally who said the same (see Figure B.20).

In terms of how they engaged with their community over the past year, respondents were most likely to donate and volunteer. At 70%, respondents were most likely to say they donated more than $25 to a charitable organization within the past year, and 68% said they volunteered within the past year. With regard to how respondents compare to national percentages, respondents who donated and respondents who volunteered were both overrepresented groups; 50% of people nationally donated
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17 Pew Research Center, November 2016, “Civic Engagement Strongly Tied to Local News Habits.”
18 Ibid.
(compared to the 70% of respondents), and 24% volunteered (compared to the 68% of respondents). Over one-half (53%) of respondents reported attending a public meeting about community affairs within the past year, which is nearly seven times greater than the 8% of U.S. residents who did the same. Finally, 43% said they worked with people in their neighborhood to fix or improve something in the past year, which is over five times greater than the 8% of people nationally who did the same (see Figure B.21). When it comes to voting in local elections, 73% reported that they always vote (see Figure B.22).

Places to Connect
Respondents reported connecting with others in a variety of places. Nearly one-half (49%) said they like to connect with others at religious institutions, 41% cited schools, and 38% identified parks. Over one-quarter (26%) of respondents indicated that they like to connect with others at the library, and 26% said they like to connect at community rec centers. Additionally, 22% of respondents specified a place other than those provided in the response options, with the top three “other” responses being at community events and meetings (5%), at restaurants (4%), and at work (3%). Finally, 22% of respondents indicated they like to connect with others at public squares (see Figure B.23).

Engagement with News Sources
Respondents also reported the frequency with which they get information about their local community from common online and offline sources. Over two-thirds (69%) of respondents said they receive information about their local community from word of mouth several times a week to every day, which was over double the percentage of people who rely on word of mouth this frequently nationally (31%) (see Figure B.30). Just over one-half (51%) of respondents indicated they rely on social networking sites several times a week to every day to consume information about their local community, which was almost five times the percentage at which people nationally use social media sites to get local information this frequently (11%) (see Figure B.28). With regard to local newspapers, 49% of respondents said they consult a newspaper for information about their community several times a week to everyday, while 28% of people nationally do the same (see Figure B.24). In terms of local television news, 46% of respondents said they watch the news several times a week to every day, which was less than the 51% of people nationally who watch the news this frequently (see Figure B.25). The 42% of respondents who reported tuning in to local radio for information about their community several times a week to every day was slightly higher than the 35% of people nationally who listen to the radio for news this frequently (see Figure B.26). Over one-quarter (29%) of respondents reported gathering information from newsletters or e-mail listservs several times a week to every day; this was greater than the 8% of people nationally who rely on a newsletter or e-mail listserv several times a week to every day (see Figure B.29). Finally, 22% of respondents indicated they read blogs for information about their local community several times a week to every day, which was greater than the national percentage of 5% for this level of frequency (see Figure B.27).

---


How Did the Conversations Go?

Conversation is the driving force behind On the Table. Therefore, an essential aspect of this research is exploring the conversations themselves. This section groups data on the dynamics of the conversation. It also uncovers the range of issues respondents raised in conversation, it describes the solutions or next steps that respondents reported were generated from their conversations, and it incorporates youth voices around issues and solutions that came out of their own unique reflection activity. Finally, it discusses content shared about On the Table on social media.

Conversation Dynamics

This section presents findings on why respondents were drawn to the conversations (in other words, their motivation for participating), where the conversations took place, and the relative familiarity or unfamiliarity with other participants in the conversation. As is shown below, respondents were largely interested in participating in On the Table in order to discuss issues and learn from others—the “others” ultimately turning out to be primarily people respondents knew before the conversation. The act of connecting over shared or divergent interests can be a learning opportunity that may, in the end, lead to an exploration of collaborative action to address the issues respondents’ communities face.

Respondents reported participating in On the Table for a number of reasons. Over two-thirds (67%) of respondents said they participated to discuss and address important issues in their community, and 56% said they wanted to learn from and listen to others. Furthermore, 33% of respondents wanted to support the organizer of the conversation, 31% participated to get more involved in their community, and 30% intended to meet and build relationships with new people (see Figure B.31).

In terms of who made up the other people at the conversation, 41% of respondents said they were mostly people respondents knew before the conversation. Additionally, 34% said there was an equal mix of both people respondents knew and did not know before the conversation, and 25% said others at the conversation were mostly people respondents did not know before the conversation (see Figure B.32).

A majority (98%) of conversations took place in Lake County (see Figure B.33). Top cities where conversations took place include Gary (25%), Hammond (14%), Crown Point (12%), and Merrillville (11%) (see Figure B.34). In terms of ZIP code, 13% of respondents participated in a conversation in 46307, 12% participated in 46410, and 10% participated in 46403. Other top ZIP codes include 46303 (8%), 46342 (7%), 46324 (7%), 46321 (5%), 46312 (5%), 46405 (4%), and 46356 (3%) (see Figure B.35). With regard to regions, 27% of conversations took place in the Central region, 25% took place in the North West region, 25% took place in the South region, and 22% took place in the North East region (see Figure B.36).

Issues Raised

On the Table is an opportunity for participants to raise and discuss issues that impact the quality of life in and around Lake County. A majority of respondents (73%) reported raising an issue of concern in their conversation. As seen through survey responses, respondents touched on a range of issues, with the top five being education and youth development, economic issues and poverty, equity and social inclusion, transportation, and public safety and the judicial system (see Figure B.37). These five issues that
emerged help identify respondents’ priorities and concerns and where they would like to see their communities headed. Furthermore, when responses to this question were analyzed by geography, no notable differences were found between geographic regions.

Youth had their own process for raising issues of concern in their community that was separate from the survey. Through their Head, Heart, and Feet exercise, youth respondents identified a range of issues that they perceive to be affecting their communities. The top three issues mentioned were violence and gangs, youth and family, and economic issues—all three of which find some overlap in the issues talked about by adult respondents.22

Education and Youth Development
According to the issue areas we developed, education and youth development ranked first as the most talked about issue in On the Table, with 28% having raised an issue related to this theme. Respondents primarily discussed the state of education and schools in Lake County, as well as brought up the need for more programs and activities for youth. With regard to education, many respondents mentioned it in general terms, indicating that education itself is (and schools themselves are) a cause for concern, especially with regard to the public education system. Where respondents were more specific, they talked about a “lack of proper schooling,” for example, which is often associated with a “lack of funding” (or “defunding”); another example provided by some respondents was a “lack of educational resources,” especially for “students who struggle.” According to some respondents, within the current education system, schools are problematic, as they are overcrowded, lacking in quality, and face closure due to financial struggles. A few respondents perceive the schools as “decaying” and the school system as “deplorable.” They are also worried about the “direction the school system is going” because of a “low budget,” and they believe “better” schools are needed.

A number of respondents expressed concern for early childhood education in particular and indicated that it is underfunded. One respondent pointed out that there is “limited investment in early education in the community” and another respondent said there needs to be “parent education on why early childhood education is so vital.” A few respondents mentioned the education referendum in their responses, and one respondent talked about education reform that “teach[es] to the child—not to the test.” This respondent would like to see the school day “match a work parent[’]s schedule. This will eliminate the excessive before and after-school tuition and allow the kids more time for diverse play [and] free play. An 8[-]hour school day could allow multiple recesses, science, art classes, free play [and] a standard curriculum.”

With regard to providing more programs and activities for youth, many respondents believe having an extracurricular focus is necessary for healthy youth development. Some respondents currently perceive a “lack” in this area and believe “more involvement” from youth, “more recreational activities” for youth, and more “arts[-]infused, youth[-]-oriented programs” are needed. One respondent rhetorically asked, “outside of school sports, what else do the youth . . . have to do?” Essentially, they want to see

22 See ‘Youth Voices’ for a list of all the issues discussed by youth and further explanation of the top three issues.
“more for kids to do.” They want to see “more people come together to make the youth a priority.” For example, this could be accomplished through providing “youth opportunities,” “mentoring programs,” and “school tutoring programs.”

Youth expressed a similar desire for youth programming in their Head, Heart, and Feet exercise. In relation to youth and family issues, youth often mentioned needing and wanting more activities for those in their age range. According to some youth respondents, they need “places for us teens to go and hang out” and “places for children to play.”

Economic Issues and Poverty
Just under one-fifth (19%) of respondents raised an issue related to economic issues and poverty. Within this theme, respondents expressed their concerns in terms of what they perceive to be lacking in their region. For example, they noticed a “lack of resources”; a “lack of access to” and “availability of” resources; and, where there are resources available, a “lack of awareness of resources.” One respondent pointed out that there is a “lack of development resources in the region . . . [despite being] located by the lake, near Chicago, the Port, and the Dunes.”

Some respondents also focused their attention on economic development, especially the need for more businesses and more jobs. A number of respondents want to see the region do more to attract businesses, especially local small businesses. As some respondents said, the region needs to “[build] more local business” and better “support local business.” They also want to see “a stronger business network.” According to one respondent, “redevelopment” of the region is crucial. This respondent wants to see “business recruitment and development” in order to develop “a [destination] downtown and place where people want to play, live, work, eat.” In addition to business development, respondents expressed a need for more jobs, including “jobs for younger people” and “higher[-]paying jobs.”

Equity and Social Inclusion
Additionally, 18% of respondents brought up an issue around equity and social inclusion. Within this theme, many respondents turned their attention to groups that are often disadvantaged or in need of extra support, especially youth and seniors. With regard to youth, there is some overlap here with education and youth development, as respondents brought up the need for more “programs” and “activities” for youth, including ones that are “affordable.” Currently, some respondents perceive an absence of these kinds of opportunities for youth, especially for “at-risk youth” and “underprivileged youth.” One respondent noted that they want to see “our youth getting on the correct path [and] getting them tapped into correct resources.” Another respondent wondered “how the youth in the community could be reached out to before they participate in negative activities (gangs, drugs).”
some respondents, this means providing “employment for youth” or “drug prevention programs for youth.” Others want to see more “positive role models” and “male role models” for youth.

Furthermore, some respondents focused on seniors, or the “elderly community,” in their conversation and noted that there are “senior citizen needs” that should be met. Several respondents mentioned “transportation specifically for seniors” and “transportation for the elderly community activities.” According to respondents, there also needs to be more “senior services,” “senior citizen resources,” and “senior activities.” One respondent said they would like to see “more senior citizen involvement.”

Other respondents brought up issues of “diversity and inclusion.” These respondents were interested in “community differences . . . [and] understanding” and wanted to see “more mingling between groups,” perhaps aided by the creation of “inclusive programs throughout the city.” One example was providing “more exposure to other parts of our areas and their experiences,” and another idea involved “convening a diverse group of community residents to identify potential opportunities to build bridges between various cultures residing in the community.” While one respondent noted “people not accepting diversity,” another was curious about how others “are adjusting to . . . growing diversity.” One respondent pointed out the diversity across the county: “North[/]South, economic, racial.” According to one respondent, the region is “sometimes perceived as a secretive community. We need to show more clearly that we are open and welcoming to all and accessible.”

**Transportation**

The 17% of respondents who mentioned a transportation-related issue primarily spoke about public transportation and expressed concern for its availability and accessibility. For example, some described a “lack of public transportation” and others indicated “public transportation is limited.” One respondent pronounced the public transportation as “deplorable,” another respondent said there is a “lack of trustworthy transportation,” and a third respondent described transportation as “difficult.” Other respondents said the county needs “better local transportation” and more “access to public transportation.” One hopeful respondent wanted to help “Lake [County] . . . be more cohesive in transportation . . . and [support] transportation through and around the county.” According to respondents, there are “transportation needs,” especially for seniors and for families who are disadvantaged—one respondent said there needs to be “transportation to various agencies [and] services for those in need”—and for the general population. There are “people without transportation,” and many respondents want to see this issue addressed.

Additionally, within transportation, a few respondents were thinking about pedestrian needs. According to a small number of respondents, their communities do not have sidewalks, and therefore there is a need for “more sidewalks.” As one respondent said, “all residential areas need to have sidewalks.” For communities that do have sidewalks, respondents think the sidewalks need to be “better.”

**Public Safety and the Judicial System**

Finally, 17% of respondents raised an issue around public safety and the judicial system. Respondents were primarily concerned with safety, particularly with “neighborhood safety.” For example, one
respondent mentioned their displeasure with the “negative perception of Gary” as it is related to the issue of safety. Some respondents brought up the issue of “youth safety” and wanting to see “a place for young people to go.”

Other topics respondents mentioned within public safety and the judicial system include “drugs” and “crime.” With regard to drugs, respondents were troubled by “drug abuse” and the current “drug crisis.” They want to see “more drug treatment programs” to treat “addictions.” Respondents were also troubled by a lack of safety and a relationship between “drugs and violence within [the] community.” Some respondents indicated that there is a “prevalence” of drugs and made note of the presence of “drugs in the communities of Lake County.” As one respondent noted, “hard drug use [is] increasing among youth.” The accessibility of drugs, according to another respondent, require that communities offer “activities for young people,” and other respondents argued for the availability of “educational resources” and “preventative programs” to combat drug use, especially among youth. With regard to crime, respondents mentioned “increased crime,” “drugs and crime,” and “rising” crime rates. One respondent was worried about “crime carrying over [the Illinois] border.” A couple of respondents talked about the “importance of parks with crime reduction” and “how parks can [affect] the crime rate.”

Through their Head, Heart and Feet exercise, some youth participants discussed gun violence and/or gang violence. As one example shows, this is “because [violence] is a big issue in our community today.” “I feel,” said one youth respondent, “that we need to put the guns down and come together.”

Solutions Generated

On the Table is rooted in the idea that dialogue can spur new ideas for action. In addition to the discussion and dissection of issues in conversations, 59% of respondents said their conversation(s) generated a specific solution. We randomly selected a number of solutions to share for illustrative purposes only. These demonstrate the range respondents put forward—from high-level and complex ideas to simple actions that impact everyday life. All solutions submitted via the On the Table survey are available for viewing in the data exploration tool (ipce.shinyapps.io/OTTLC).

Several of the randomly selected ideas focus on youth. One idea proposed that students be given the opportunity to take field trips to different communities so they can acquire new experiences. Another suggested that young people be given more opportunities to engage in positive activities. A third idea focused on getting parents more involved with youth programs and activities.

Other respondents turned their attention to the community, its residents, and its leaders. One respondent wanted to give out good citizen awards, and another wanted to hold a conversation with
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23 The mention of a specific solution does not indicate an endorsement from IPCE or Legacy Foundation. Furthermore, Legacy Foundation should not be assumed to take responsibility for a solution mentioned in this report. We randomly selected the ideas referenced above in order to show the types of solutions that respondents proposed.

24 The responses in the data exploration tool have been scrubbed of all identifying information.
those in their city who have the ability and influence to help solve problems. There were respondents who suggested better development along the lakefront to provide and support recreational activities, as well as having the newly purchased electronic community sign installed. One respondent planned to talk to a non-profit about using their facility as a meeting space. Another wanted to provide assistance to help people transition into the role of homeowner from renter. Additionally, there was a respondent who provided the idea of using volunteer interns to fill gaps in service when there is a lack of organizational funding.

Community Action Awards
To encourage On the Table participants to take action on solutions generated in their conversations, Legacy Foundation announced the Community Action Awards. The awards were open to any individual or organization that took part on September 26. Applicants were asked to submit a 60 to 120 second video or a brief narrative describing their project and its impact on the community. Legacy Foundation received over 25 submissions. Ten projects were awarded $1,000 to kick-start implementation. Projects include a positive news podcast, an exchange program for girls from different communities, a community photo contest, monthly community networking dinners, and student led beautification activities.

Youth Solutions
Youth respondents also raised ideas for solutions in their Head, Heart, and Feet exercises. Similar to survey respondents, they arrived at a variety of ideas to help address the issues they see as facing their communities. The top three youth solutions include build up and improve community, help others, and speak up and take a stand. With regard to build up and improve the community, some youth respondents said they want to beautify their community. For example, one youth respondent wanted to “walk around the community environments and help pick up trash from the streets” and another wanted to “clean up abandon[ed] homes so they can look and be more safe.” Help others refers to youth respondents’ desire to “help out a lot,” as one respondent said. Another said they wanted to “[come] together and [help] people who need our help.” Finally, within speak up and take a stand, youth respondents outlined the importance of talking to others and standing up for what they believe is right. One youth respondent proposed “a bully-free and stop the violence campaign.”

Youth Voices
Below is a more detailed summary of what youth respondents brought up in their Head, Heart, and Feet reflection activities regarding their On the Table experiences. Given the activity’s focus on issues, sentiment, and solutions, we categorized the data according to these three classifications.

We received Head, Heart, and Feet exercises from 116 anonymous individual youth participants, as well as eight anonymous group summary sheets from classrooms. Altogether, the data reflect information
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25 See ‘Youth Voices’ for a list of all the solutions mentioned by youth and further explanation of the top three solutions.
26 For a description of the Head, Heart, and Feet activity, see the Research Methodology.
shared from conversations that involved approximately 150 youth from Gary and Hammond. While this data is not representative of the region, it does highlight what a collection of students who participated in the Head, Heart, and Feet reflection activity think and feel.

**Issues**

Youth respondents mentioned a variety of issues affecting their communities. The top three issues brought up were violence and gangs, youth and family, and economic issues. While the summary below focuses on these top three issues, there was also a range of other issues youth respondents raised, including (in descending order of frequency) parks and recreation, bullying, public safety, health, schools and education, lack of respect for community, poverty, abandoned houses and buildings, discrimination, environment, and transportation (see Appendix F).

A large proportion of youth respondents mentioned the issue of violence and gangs. “I care most about violence to our community,” explained one youth respondent. Another youth respondent noted, “I noticed that [there is] so much violence going on in my community and the violence is getting out of hand.” In mentioning violence and gangs, one youth respondent said, “people should stop the violence and be more caring.” “We can do something about it,” said another youth respondent.

Next, youth respondents raised the issue of youth and family. Within this theme, youth respondents often talked about creating more activities and opportunities for youth. According to some of the youth respondents, “We learned our community need[s] teenage places” and “we need to have a place where all [teenagers] can go and get out of trouble.” “I care most about the safety of the children in my community,” said one youth respondent, and another said, “protect kids.” Some youth respondents expressed care and concern for their own family.

A number of youth respondents expressed concern for economic issues. Overall, youth respondents primarily mentioned a need for more businesses and more jobs in the community. “I learn[ed] that we need more businesses,” said one youth respondent.” Several youth respondents pointed out that “there are not many jobs in Lake County” and there is a need for “creating jobs.” One youth respondent lamented the difficulty of getting a job and acquiring resources: “I feel as if getting good jobs shouldn’t be as hard. I wish things would be a little easier, getting supplies are hard.”

**Sentiment**

Some of the youth respondents shared how their experience made them feel while participating in the event. The youth respondents who provided an answer to this question indicated two primary sentiments: some said they felt they wanted to help and make a difference and others said they felt sad and upset given the issues discussed. A few other youth respondents expressed a range of emotions, from disappointed to good and happy, from angry to loving and caring; a very small number said they felt hopeless because of the issues they see as affecting their communities (see Appendix F).

A number of youth respondents said they felt they wanted to help and to make a difference. These youth respondents sounded optimistic in their ability to bring about change. As one youth respondent
said, “I feel that even though I’m one person I can still make a difference because it hurts to see us hurting each other every other day.” Another pointed out, “I can help change it . . . [and] I will help to change it.”

A similar number of youth respondents said they felt sad and upset because the issues they discussed were sad and upsetting. Some of those who mentioned feeling sad said they felt that way because “some people have no hope”; “sometimes you can’t even go outside because there is something happening by you”; “people . . . get bullied;” and “homelessness is a big issue.”

**Solutions**

Youth respondents also arrived at a variety of potential solutions to help address the issues they perceive as facing Lake County. The top three solutions they generated include build up and improve community, help others, and speak up and take a stand. Other solutions less frequently mentioned but still important include come together and organize, be a better person, create opportunities, and work harder (see Appendix F).

A large proportion of youth respondents mentioned build up and improve community as an idea for addressing community issues. As one youth respondent said, “I love my city and it feels good. Good to make my city better.” Many youth respondents mentioned cleaning up the community; for example, according to two respondents, “I’m going to act on this and help clean up the community when I [have] time” and “we all can get together as a whole and clean up, pick up trash, cut grass, and just be helpful to our city.” Similarly, other youth respondents want to “clean up the environment” and “plant more trees.”

A proportion of youth respondents also suggested helping others as a solution to community issues. Some youth respondents mentioned they want to “[help] people [that are] doing wrong” or “[help] people who need our help.” Many indicated they could help by fundraising—“we can volunteer by doing a fundraiser and making more money for our community”—and by volunteering their time—“we’re going to act on this by each volunteering [two] hours a week for a worthy cause.” Some youth respondents had specific audiences in mind, such as wanting to help their school and wanting to help the homeless. Others wanted to “increase support for at-risk communities (women, children, homeless, low-income).”

Finally, youth respondents also mentioned the need to speak up and take a stand. For example, some said they wanted to “share consequences of disrespectful behavior.” Many youth respondents cited bullying and violence as actions against which they wanted to talk to others and take a stand. “Every time I see someone being bullied[,] I’ll report it,” one youth respondent said. Similarly, another youth respondent brought up “taking a stand [against] violence.” A few others want to speak up to city leadership; actions surrounding this include “go stand up to the government” and “tell our parents to elect good people.”
As a method for modeling civic responsibility and encouraging students to learn about other perspectives and explore ways to become more engaged in their communities, the On the Table conversations and the follow-up ‘Head, Heart, and Feet’ exercises were unique learning opportunities for students. Students had the potential to expand their familiarity with and understanding of local issues, brainstorm ways to take action and make a difference in their communities, and build and grow their connection and commitment to their schools and communities.

Social Media
Social media provided an opportunity to deepen engagement efforts with On the Table and expand participation in the initiative. Legacy Foundation launched its social media campaign in June 2017 as a method of promoting On the Table and creating a virtual space where conversations could begin or continue. The campaign served as a useful tool in capturing live content from conversations as they occurred and providing opportunities for online engagement by those who were not able to participate in physical conversations.

We used the social media monitoring platform Meltwater Buzz to analyze social media activity and understand the influence of this initiative in the digital realm.27 We tracked the Legacy Foundation-designated hashtag #OnTheTable219. In total, #OnTheTable219 saw nearly 400 public mentions; these mentions were amplified, generating 412,000 total impressions. The month of September saw the highest number of mentions, which not surprisingly, peaked on the day of the On the Table initiative.

Social media captured the enthusiasm surrounding the initiative through an array of posts and picture-sharing on Twitter and Instagram; Twitter saw 193 tweets and Instagram featured 186 posts. Additionally, Twitter saw 98 unique influencers. When it comes to breaking down the levels of engagement on Twitter, 62% were original tweets and 38% were retweets. Furthermore, 48% of tweets featured links, and 18% of tweets contained media.

Social connections went beyond advertising the initiative and spreading the word. Many offered commentary on what social media users were thinking about in the context of On the Table or what they had discussed in conversations. Some comments from social media users include: “It was evident today that we are in good hands with this group being the future leaders of our country!”; “Powerful student led conversations at #OnTheTable219 about issues facing #GaryIndiana & how we can be a part of the solution!”; “Non-profit leaders in #nwindiana talk about common challenges & strength created through partnership”; and “The importance of art as an economic driver, therapeutic resource & community unifier was discussed.”

How Did Conversations Impact Respondents?
The short-term impact On the Table conversations had on respondents demonstrates the significance and value of these types of civic conversations. On the Table conversations are designed to convene
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27 See Appendix G for a visual summary of key findings from the social media analysis.
people for the purpose of connection and discussion. This section brings together data regarding the outcomes of the conversations and the potential for future action by respondents.

Conversation Outcomes and Future Action
This section reports on the conversation outcomes of On the Table, including new connections forged and an understanding of how to address community issues. Additionally, it reports the likelihood of a respondent taking action following their conversation and the actions that respondents are most likely to take. With respondents establishing connections, learning about issues, and making plans to take action, the On the Table initiative has likely helped these respondents build their capacity to create change in their communities and across Lake County.

Over one-half (53%) of respondents reported connecting with others at their conversation by speaking with one or more attendees they did not already know before and/or after the conversation. Another 20% of respondents exchanged contact information with one or more attendees they did not already know, and 17% made specific plans to work with one or more attendees. Furthermore, 29% indicated not connecting with other conversation attendees in any of the ways listed in the response options (see Figure B.38).

One-quarter (25%) of respondents indicated they have a much better understanding of how they, personally, can help address the issues facing their community after participating in their conversation. At 42%, an even greater percentage of respondents said they have a somewhat better understanding of how to help address issues following their conversations. Just under one-quarter (24%) of respondents said they have a little better understanding, and 10% indicated no change in their understanding of how to help address community issues (see Figure B.39). In terms of how likely they are to take specific actions or next steps regarding an issue or solution discussed, 87% of respondents indicated they are somewhat-to-very likely to take action (see Figure B.40). Of the actions or next steps respondents are likely to take, 62% expressed interest in building relationships and collaborating, 57% said they wanted to raise awareness and educate others, 53% hoped to get more involved in community, and 45% indicated they intend to volunteer (see Figure B.41).

ANALYSIS

We conducted a set of analyses that go beyond the original guiding questions of this study. These analyses help deepen understanding of the survey response summary data and are useful in identifying areas of opportunity for further investigation or action. These additional analyses include an exploration of subgroup comparisons for groups such as gender, age, level of education, race, and homeownership status across responses to a variety of questions. They also include a disparity analysis between the social issues respondents reported are most important to them and the social issues to which they said they contribute their time, talent, and/or financial resources.
Subgroup Comparisons
Each question analyzed in this section contains comparisons between various subgroups based on gender, age, level of education, race, and homeownership status.28

Gender
Regarding gender, analyses were conducted between male- and female-identifying respondents. While the original survey provided an “Other” gender option, too few respondents selected this option for inclusion in subgroup analyses.

Age
Based on the original survey question, there were five age groups categorized by decade: the youngest group (made up of respondents who were 18-29 years old), the 30s group, the 40s group, the 50s group, and the oldest group (made up of respondents who were 60 years old and older).

Education Level
Though more specific information regarding respondents’ educational background was obtained, responses were dichotomized for the purpose of analysis. Responses were divided into two categories: college-educated (made up of respondents with a college degree or higher) and not college-educated (made up of respondents with some college or less).

Race
For an analysis by race, four racial subgroups were created: Blacks (consisting of respondents indicating Black or African American), Whites (consisting of respondents indicating White), Latinos (consisting of respondents indicating Hispanic or Latino/a), and Other (which includes respondents indicating American Indian/Alaska Native, Asian, Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander, and Other).

Homeownership Status
Respondents were split into two groups by their indicated homeownership status: homeowner versus renter. Respondents who responded “Other” to this question were not included in the analysis, as there were too few of such responses.

Pride in Community
In this section, subgroup analyses were performed on categorized responses to the open-response question, “What are you most proud of in your local community?” Responses were categorized using a codebook created specifically for this question.29

With regard to educational background, college-educated respondents were more likely to say they are proud of their local community’s diversity than were non-college-educated respondents. At 13%,

28 Geographic subgroup comparisons can be found in the first part of the report—‘The Conversations’—within the ‘Civic Attitudes and Activities’ section.
29 See Appendix C for the full list of areas of community pride and their definitions.
college-educated respondents expressed pride for diversity in their community over three times as often as the 4% of non-college-educated respondents who did the same.

**More Services**

Survey respondents were asked to answer the open-response question, “What services do you wish you had more of in your community?” We categorized their responses using a codebook created specifically for this question.³⁰

Analyses by age revealed the following services had the most differences between groups: economic and employment, family, senior, and transportation services. Respondents in their 40s and 50s were most likely to want more economic and employment services, as an average of 15% of respondents in their 40s and 50s identified a service related to this theme; comparatively, an average of 7% of respondents in the remaining age groups identified an economic and employment service. At 12%, respondents in their 30s were most likely to want more family services. In comparison, an average of 4% of respondents in the remaining age groups provided a similar response. Respondents ages 60 years old and up were much more likely to want more senior services. Four times as many (12%) respondents in this oldest age group named a service related to this theme as compared to an average of 3% of respondents in the other age groups did the same. Finally, the two oldest age groups (respondents in their 50s and respondents 60 years old and up) were more likely to want more transportation services. An average of 30% of respondents in the two oldest age groups named a kind of transportation service, while an average of 18% of respondents in the remaining age groups also named this kind of service.

Analyses by race showed that Black respondents were most likely to want more economic and employment services and White respondents, while least likely to want more housing and homelessness services, were most likely to want more transportation services. Whereas only 8% of Latino respondents and 7% of White respondents named a need for more economic and employment services, 15% of Black respondents cited a service related to this theme. At 4%, White respondents were least likely to want more housing and homelessness services; comparatively, 11% of Black respondents and 9% of Latino respondents wanted more housing and homelessness services. However, White respondents were most likely to want more transportation services. Over one-quarter (27%) of Whites said they wish they had more transportation services, while 20% of Black respondents and 11% of Latino respondents said the same.

In terms of homeownership status, renters were more likely to want more economic and employment services and more education services. At 18%, more than twice as many renters wanted more services related to economics and employment than the 7% of homeowners who said the same. Similarly, 15% of renters wanted more education-related services, and 8% of homeowners wanted the same.

³⁰See Appendix D for the full list of services and their definitions.
Quality of Services
Survey respondents were also asked to complete the close-ended, multiple-choice statement, “I’m happy with the quality of the following services in my community.”

Analyses conducted by age groups revealed differences between groups for the following services: public safety and the judicial system, healthcare, and arts and culture. The youngest age group (18 to 29 year olds) was much less likely to say they are happy with public safety and the judicial system, as only 13% of 18 to 29 year olds selected this service compared to an average of 30% for the other age groups. Additionally, the two youngest age groups (18 to 29 year olds and respondents in their 30s) were much less likely to say they are happy with healthcare. An average of 20% of respondents in the two youngest age groups selected healthcare as a service with which they are happy, while an average of 30% of respondents in the remaining three age groups expressed satisfaction with this service. Finally, at 35%, the oldest age group (60 years old and up) was most likely to say they are happy with arts and culture, as opposed to an average of 22% for the other age groups.

With regard to education level, college-educated respondents were happier than non-college-educated respondents with civic engagement, recreational opportunities, and public safety and the judicial system. At 20%, more college-educated respondents expressed happiness with the quality of civic engagement in their community, compared to 9% of non-college-educated respondents. In terms of recreational opportunities, 39% of college-educated respondents said they are happy with the quality of these kinds of opportunities while 26% of non-college educated respondents said the same. Finally, whereas 21% of non-college-educated respondents said they are happy with their public safety and the judicial system, 32% of college-educated respondents said they are satisfied with the quality of this service.

In terms of race, White respondents were much happier with the quality of local schools, recreational opportunities, and public safety and the judicial system, and Black respondents were least likely to be happy with environment and parks. More than half (60%) of White respondents said they are happy with local schools, as opposed to 38% of Latino respondents and 34% of Black respondents. Additionally, 40% of White respondents said they are happy with recreational opportunities, while 30% of Latino respondents and 20% of Black respondents said the same. And whereas 17% of Latino respondents and 17% of Black respondents indicated they are happy with public safety and the judicial system, nearly twice as many, or 33% of, White respondents felt the same with regard to this service. Finally, 25% of Black respondents said they are happy with environment and parks, compared to 42% of Latinos and 50% of Whites.

Analyses by homeownership status revealed homeowners were much more likely to be happy with their local schools and their public safety and the judicial system, while renters were twice as likely to be happy with transportation services. At 57%, homeowners said they are happy with local schools in their community, while 36% of renters felt the same. Nearly one-third (32%) of homeowners indicated they are happy with public safety and the judicial system, compared to 19% of renters. Renters, on the other
hand, were more likely to be happy with transportation in their community, as 19% of renters expressed happiness with this service and only 9% of homeowners did the same.

Barriers to Involvement
Subgroup analyses in this section were based off responses to the close-ended question, “What, if anything, prevents you from getting involved in the issues you care about most?”

Age analyses revealed that older respondents were more likely to be actively involved in the issues that matter to them than were younger respondents. For example, 58% of respondents ages 60 and up said they are actively involved in the issues they care about, while 24% of respondents ages 18 to 29 years old said the same. However, younger respondents were more likely to be too busy. At 52%, respondents in the youngest age group (18 to 29 years old) indicated they were too busy or did not have enough time to be involved in the issues they care about; in comparison, 30% of the oldest age group (60 years old and up) chose the same reason.

With regard to educational background, college-educated respondents were more likely to be actively involved in the issues they care about. Over one-half (51%) of college-educated respondents indicated they were already involved, as opposed to 37% of non-college-educated respondents.

Analyses by homeownership status showed that renters were less sure of how to get involved and homeowners were more likely to be actively involved already. At 41%, renters were more likely to say they were unsure of how to get involved than the 28% of homeowners who said the same. Half (50%) of homeowners, however, indicated they were already actively involved in the issues they care about, while only 35% of renters said the same.

Community Issues
Within this section, subgroups were analyzed by their responses to the closed-response question, “What are the top three social issues you’d like to see your community address?”

With regard to gender, male respondents were more than twice as likely (17%) to choose religion and morals as a social issue they would like to see their community address than the 8% of female respondents who said the same.

When respondents were analyzed by age, there were discrepancies regarding multiple social issues they would like to see their community address, such as family, transportation, and housing and homelessness. Respondents in their 30s and their 40s were most likely to select family, with an average of 32% of respondents between these two age groups choosing this issue; in comparison, an average of 22% of respondents in the remaining age groups selected family. The two oldest age groups (respondents in their 50s and respondents 60 years old and up) were most likely to choose transportation. An average of 20% of respondents in the two oldest groups selected transportation.

31 See Appendix E for the full list of issues and their definitions.
compared to an average of 11% of respondents in the other age groups. Finally, the youngest and oldest age groups were most likely to select housing and homelessness (29% and 22%, respectively), while an average of 16% of respondents in the other age groups chose the same.

Respondents without a college degree were more than twice as likely to choose housing and homelessness as a social issue they would like to see their community address. While 28% of non-college-educated respondents selected housing and homelessness, 13% of college-educated respondents did the same. College-educated respondents were twice as likely to select equity and social inclusion. While 22% of college-educated respondents chose equity and social inclusion, 11% of non-college-educated respondents also did so.

Analyses by race revealed that White respondents were much more likely to select environment and parks as a social issue they would like to see their community address, and Black respondents were much more likely to select housing and homelessness. Over one-quarter (27%) of White respondents chose environment and parks, compared to 15% of Black respondents and 13% of Latino respondents. Nearly one-third (31%) of Black respondents chose housing and homelessness, while 17% of Latino respondents and 14% of White respondents chose the same.

Analyses by homeownership status showed that renters were nearly twice as likely as homeowners to name housing and homelessness as a social issue they would like to see their community address. Whereas only 15% of homeowners selected housing and homelessness, 28% of renters selected the same issue.

Social Issue Priority
In this section, subgroups were analyzed by their responses to a close-ended, multiple-choice question asking, “Which of the following social issues are most important to you?” Response options were identical to the question above regarding community issues.

Analyses by gender indicated that government was typically more important to male respondents than to female respondents, as males were more than three times as likely to choose government as one of the social issues most important to them. Compared to 4% of females, 14% of males selected government.

When respondents were analyzed by age, both education and youth development as well as transportation were the issues with the most difference between groups. Respondents in their 30s were most likely to select education and youth development, with 70% of respondents in this age group naming this issue as most important; respondents ages 60 and up were least likely to choose education and youth development, with 50% of respondents in this oldest age group selecting this issue as most important. At 14%, respondents ages 60 and up were most likely to select transportation, and at 5%, respondents in their 30s were least likely to select this issue.
In considering education level, college-educated respondents were more likely to choose education and youth development and equity and social inclusion as social issues most important to them. Nearly two-thirds (63%) of college-educated respondents selected education and youth development, compared to 46% of non-college-educated respondents. Additionally, 21% of college-educated respondents selected equity and social inclusion while only 9% of non-college-educated respondents chose the same. Respondents who were not college educated were more likely to select housing and homelessness as one of the most important issues. Nearly one-fifth (19%) of non-college-educated respondents named housing and homelessness, compared to 8% of college-educated respondents.

With regard to race, there were noteworthy differences between Latino respondents and Black and White respondents, as well as between Black respondents and Latino and White respondents. At 16%, Latino respondents were much more likely to select immigration and migration as one of the issues most important to them, compared to 0% of Black respondents and 3% of White respondents. Furthermore, Black respondents were much less likely to select environment and parks, as only 9% of them chose this issue; comparatively, 25% of Latino respondents and 29% of White respondents named environment and parks as one of the most important issues. Black respondents were also much more likely to select housing and homelessness. While 8% of Latino respondents and 8% of White respondents chose this issue, 22% of Black respondents did the same.

Analyses by homeownership status showed that respondents who were renters were more than twice as likely to choose housing and homelessness as one of the social issues most important to them. Just over one-fifth (21%) of renters selected housing and homelessness, compared to 9% of owners.

Primary Social Issue Contribution
The following subgroup analyses were based off the closed-response question, “To which social issues do you PRIMARILY contribute your time, talent, and/or financial resources?” Response options were identical to the questions above regarding community issues and social issue priorities.

Gender analyses revealed that male respondents were more than twice as likely to choose government as one of the social issues to which they primarily contribute. Whereas only 6% of female respondents said they contribute to government, 16% of male respondents said they give their time, talent, and/or financial resources to government.

Analyses by age showed notable differences regarding to which social issues respondents across age groups said they primarily contribute. Respondents who fell within the middle-aged groups (30s, 40s, and 50s) were more likely to say they contribute to education and youth development and family than the oldest age group. An average of 51% of respondents in the middle-aged groups said they give to education and youth development efforts, compared to 35% of those 60 years old and up. Additionally, an average of 45% of those in their 30s through 50s indicated they give to family, while 32% of those 60 years old and up said the same. The younger age groups (18 to 29 years old and those in their 30s) were more likely to say they contribute to technology than older groups, as an average of 10% of respondents in the younger age groups said they give to technology while only an average of 3% of respondents in
the older age groups did the same. Finally, the oldest group (those 60 years old and up) were more likely to indicate they contribute to government as well as religion and morals than all of the younger groups. Twice as many (14%) respondents who were 60 years old and up indicated they give to government than the average of 7% of all of the younger age groups who did so. Likewise, 33% of the oldest group said they give to religion and morals, while an average of 24% of respondents in the younger age groups did the same.

College-educated respondents were more likely to select education and youth development as one of the social issues to which they primarily contribute, whereas respondents who were not college-educated were more likely to select family. One-half (50%) of college-educated respondents said they contribute to education and youth development, while 34% of non-college-educated respondents said the same. With regard to respondents who were not college-educated, 47% of this group said they contribute to family, whereas 36% of college-educated respondents said they contribute to the same social issue.

When respondents were grouped by race, differences were seen regarding multiple social issues, including environment and parks, housing and homelessness, and immigration and migration. At 19%, White respondents were much more likely to say they contribute to environment and parks than were Latino respondents (9%) and Black respondents (4%). Black respondents were more likely to indicate they contribute to housing and homelessness; 14% of Black respondents said they contribute to this social issue, compared to 7% of Latinos and 6% of Whites. Finally, Latino respondents were much more likely to say they contribute to immigration and migration, as 10% of them named this social issue and only 1% of Black respondents and 1% of White respondents did the same.

**Issues Raised During Conversation**
Survey respondents were asked to respond to the question, “Did you raise an issue of concern regarding your community? If yes, please specify.” We categorized their responses using our issues codebook.32

Analyses by age showed differences in which groups brought up an issue related to education and youth development. At 38%, the youngest age group was most likely to raise an issue around this theme, and at 20%, the oldest group was least likely to name an issue related to education and youth development.

**Disparity between Important Issues and Contributions**
When considering the social issues that were most important to respondents (important issues) and the social issues to which they contribute their time, talent, and/or financial resources (contributions), the data reveal disparities between these two variables (see Figure H.1). These disparities can be useful indicators of social issues where greater contributions of time, talent, and financial resources are needed.

---

32 See Appendix E for the full list of issues and their definitions.
Transportation resulted in the greatest issues-to-contributions disparity. Among the respondents who mentioned transportation as an important social issue, only 9% also reported that they contribute their time, talent, and/or financial resources to this cause. Public safety and the judicial system featured the next greatest disparity, with 24% of those concerned with this social issue also contributing toward it. Notably, education and youth development had by far the highest number of respondents considering it the most important social issue (n=446), and nearly two-thirds, or 64%, of respondents reported contributing their time, talent, and financial resources to it. Religion and morals received a moderate amount of attention in the important issues question (n=139), but had 76% of respondents contributing to it, making it the social issue area with the least amount of disparity.

CONCLUSION

This report was an exploratory study examining the content of On the Table conversations and information about survey respondents. While results cannot be generalized to the broader Lake County population, this study reveals important insights that are worth highlighting.

First, On the Table respondents were a highly engaged group across all measures considered, especially when comparing Lake County respondents to national data. The majority of respondents said they are involved in community and neighborhood activities, with notable proportions of respondents reporting having donated and volunteered this past year. Slightly smaller but still noteworthy percentages were seen for respondents who have been involved in less common but highly impactful engagement activities, such as attending a public meeting about community affairs and working with people in their neighborhood to fix or improve something. Given their habits, these respondents are in a unique position to work to help improve the community and enhance the quality of life for other Lake County residents. Having such an engaged respondent group can be useful to Legacy Foundation as it seeks to broaden the reach and impact of these kinds of community conversations. Respondents can, in a sense, serve as community liaisons to bring the outcomes and aftereffects of these conversations to residents who are less involved in and less connected to their communities.

Second, both education and youth development and family stood out as high priorities for respondents. These issues consistently ranked within the top three issue areas for most important social issues to respondents, social issues to which respondents contribute their time, talent, and/or financial resources, and social issues respondents would like to see their community address. Additionally, according to the disparity analysis, these two issues were among the top four that featured the least amount of disparity between social issues respondents consider to be most important and social issues to which they contribute. Furthermore, economic issues and poverty was named as a social issue important to respondents and one that they would like to see their community address, yet was not as prominent of an issue area to which respondents contribute their time, talent, and financial resources. Thus, a notable disparity exists for economic issues and poverty, as it was an important issue and yet many of the respondents who considered it so were not contributing to it as a cause.
With these three issue areas being top of mind for respondents, Legacy Foundation has an opportunity to work with the community to bolster efforts already underway and initiate new efforts to address these areas of concern and improve Lake County for all of its residents. Legacy Foundation can potentially prioritize these issue areas in their funding and grant-making initiatives and can help create a platform for each of these areas upon which the community can problem-solve and work with local decision makers to address their community’s needs.

Third, transportation ranked first as a service respondents wished they had more of in their community and ranked last as a service in their community with which they are happy regarding its quality. (In the first instance, respondents named transportation-related services they wanted to see more of in their community, and in the latter instance, they had the opportunity to select or not select transportation as a service with which they are happy.) Transportation was also a top issue (ranked fourth) raised by respondents during their conversations. Overall, respondents were concerned with the accessibility of public transportation and wanted to see efforts to improve access to underserved and disadvantaged groups across the county. However, transportation featured the largest issue-to-contribution disparity, which means a very small percentage of respondents who named it as an important social issue also selected it as a social issue to which they contribute. Similar to the second insight highlighted above, with respondents focusing their attention on transportation as a service the county needs to improve and as an issue respondents talked about, Legacy Foundation can focus part of its grant-making efforts on outreach to people who prioritize transportation improvements in order to foster collaboration and enhance these residents’ ability to advocate effectively on transportation issues, especially in areas underserved by transit.

Fourth, a notable proportion of differences among subgroups had to do with education and youth development. Respondents who were 18-29 years old were most likely to raise it as an issue of concern in their conversation, and respondents 60 years old and up were least likely to bring up this issue in their conversation. Those in their 30s were most likely to choose it as an important social issue, while those in their 60s were least likely to select it. Furthermore, those respondents in their 30s through 50s were most likely to identify it as a social issue to which they contribute. College-educated respondents were more likely to select it as an important social issue and a social issue to which they contribute. Central respondents identified it as one of the social issues they would like to see their community address; however, North East respondents were least likely to select it as a social issue to which they contribute. Interestingly, while North East respondents were least likely to contribute to education and youth development as a cause, they were also much less likely than the other regions to be happy with the quality of their local schools.

Similarly, an equally noteworthy proportion of differences among subgroups had to do with the issue of housing and homelessness. The youngest and oldest age groups (18 to 29 year olds and 60 years old and up) were most likely to select housing and homelessness as a social issue they would like to see their community address. Respondents without a college education were more likely to choose housing and homelessness as an important social issue and a social issue to which they contribute. Additionally, Black respondents were most likely to identify this issue as an important social issue, a social issue to which
they contribute, and one of the social issues they would like to see their community address. Renters were more likely to select it as an important social issue and a social issue they would like to see their community address. Finally, respondents in the North East region were most likely to choose it as an issue they would like to see their community address.

These two issue areas attracted different respondent subgroups. Knowing which respondent subgroups were most concerned with education and youth development as well as housing and homelessness can help Legacy Foundation determine with whom in the community it should be connecting in order to work to address these issues. It is useful to reach out to those who are more inclined to care about and express investment in a particular issue; when people feel a personal connection to an issue area, they are more likely to be a willing advocate for addressing that issue.

*On the Table* was an opportunity for residents of Lake County to get together with old friends and new acquaintances to have conversations about the issues that they care about the most. In doing so, many people came together to share their experiences about life in Lake County and how they would like to see it become an even better county that serves all of its residents. Conversations served as a catalyst for generating ideas and potential actions and created a space for participants to make personal connections so that they might find ways to ignite change with fellow residents.
APPENDICES

Appendix A: On the Table Survey

Welcome, and thank you for taking part in this survey!

The purpose of this research is to understand who participated in On the Table and the nature and quality of the conversation event in which you participated on September 26, 2017, coordinated by Legacy Foundation. The University of Illinois at Chicago’s Institute for Policy and Civic Engagement (IPCE) is administering the survey.

The survey will take approximately 10 minutes to complete. Completion of this survey is voluntary, you may skip any question, and there are no right or wrong answers. Your responses will be kept confidential. Collected data will be stored in locked offices in a locked suite, and data with direct identifiers will be password protected. Data will be kept throughout the research study period and will be deleted after five years. No personally identifiable data will be reported, and confidentiality will be protected to the fullest extent possible. IPCE and Legacy Foundation will have access to your e-mail address, but Legacy Foundation will not have access to your individual responses. Results of this study will be publicly available at www.ipce.uic.edu and www.legacyfdn.org.

The principal investigator of this research is IPCE Director Joseph Hoereth. If you have any questions about the survey, you may contact IPCE by phone at 312-355-0088 or by e-mail at jhoereth@uic.edu. You may also contact the Office for the Protection of Human Subjects (OPRS) by phone at 312-996-1711 or by e-mail at uicorb@uic.edu.

By responding the survey, you acknowledge the following:
• You have read the above information
• You voluntarily agree to participate in this study
• You are at least 18 years of age

Please mark your answers like this: • not like this: ☑ ✗ □

Begin here

1. Please provide the e-mail address used to register you for On the Table. If you DID NOT register online, please provide your e-mail address below.

   E-mail Address: ___________________________

2. Which best describes your MOST IMPORTANT reason(s) for participating in On the Table? (Select all that apply)
   □ To discuss and address important issues in my community
   □ To learn from and listen to others
   □ To meet and build relationships with new people
   □ To get more involved in my community
   □ To support the organizer of the conversation
   □ Other (please specify): ___________________________

If you participated in MORE THAN ONE On the Table conversation, please refer to only one of your conversations for the next two questions.

3. Where did your conversation take place?
   □ County: ___________________________
   □ City or Town: ___________________________
   □ Neighborhood: ___________________________

4. The other people at my conversation were:
   □ Mostly people I did NOT know before the conversation
   □ Mostly people I knew before the conversation
   □ An equal mix of both

5. Did you raise an issue of concern regarding your community?
   □ Yes
   □ No

   If yes, please provide examples:

   _____________________________________________

   _____________________________________________
6. Did your conversation(s) generate any specific solutions?
   - Yes
   - No

If yes, please provide examples:

7. How did you connect with others at your conversation(s)? (Select all that apply)
   - I spoke with one or more attendees I did not already know before and/or after the conversation(s)
   - I exchanged contact information with one or more attendees I did not already know
   - I made specific plans to work with one or more attendees to address a new idea, issue, or project in the future
   - None of the above

8. After participating in your conversation(s), to what extent do you better understand how you, personally, can help address the issues facing your community?
   - Much better
   - Somewhat better
   - A little better
   - No change

9. How likely are you to take specific actions or next steps regarding an issue or solution discussed?
   - Very likely
   - Somewhat likely
   - Not too likely
   - Not at all likely

If you answered NOT TOO LIKELY or NOT AT ALL LIKELY, please skip to Question 11.

10. Please select the actions or next steps you are likely to take regarding an issue or solution discussed. (Select all that apply)
    - Build relationships and collaborate
    - Get more involved in community
    - Improve myself through personal development and learning
    - Raise awareness and educate others
    - Become more politically involved
    - Donate
    - Volunteer
    - Provide support for my family
    - Take action through my job
    - Mentor or motivate others
    - Other (please specify):

11. How much impact do you think people like you can have in making your community a better place to live?
    - A big impact
    - A moderate impact
    - A small impact
    - No impact at all

12. In general, how attached do you feel to your local community?
    - Very attached
    - Somewhat attached
    - Not very attached
    - Not at all attached

13. Which of the following social issues are most important to you? (CHOOSE UP TO THREE)
    - Arts and Culture
    - Economic Issues and Poverty
    - Education and Youth Development
    - Environment and Parks
    - Religion and Morals
    - Equity and Social Inclusion
    - Family
    - Food Access
    - Government
    - Health
    - Housing and Homelessness
    - Immigration and Migration
    - Public Safety and Judicial System
    - The Media
    - Technology
    - Transportation
    - Other (please specify):
    - Other (please specify):
    - Other (please specify):
14. To which of the following social issues do you PRIMARILY contribute your time, talent (knowledge or skills), and/or financial resources? (CHOOSE UP TO THREE)
   O Arts and Culture
   O Economic Issues and Poverty
   O Education and Youth Development
   O Environment and Parks
   O Religion and Morals
   O Equity and Social Inclusion
   O Family
   O Food Access
   O Government
   O Health
   O Housing and Homelessness
   O Immigration and Migration
   O Public Safety and Judicial System
   O The Media
   O Technology
   O Transportation
   O Other (please specify): __________________________
   O Other (please specify): __________________________
   O Other (please specify): __________________________

15. How involved are you in community and neighborhood activities where you live?
   O Very involved
   O Somewhat involved
   O Not too involved
   O Not at all involved

16. Since September 2016, have you: (Select all that apply)
   O Worked with people in your neighborhood to fix or improve something?
   O Donated money, assets, or property with a combined value of more than $25 to charitable or religious organizations?
   O Done any volunteer activities through or for an organization?
   O Attended any public meetings in which there was discussion of community affairs?
   O None of the above

17. How often do you vote in local elections, such as for mayor or a school board? Across the nation, these elections have about 20% voter turnout.
   O Always vote
   O Sometimes vote
   O Rarely vote
   O Never vote
   O Prefer not to answer / Not eligible to vote

18. Where do you like to connect with others? (Select all that apply)
   O Parks
   O Library
   O Community rec center
   O Schools
   O Public squares
   O Religious institution, such as a church
   O Community garden
   O Shopping centers
   O Other (please specify): __________________________

19. How often, if ever, do you get information about YOUR LOCAL COMMUNITY from each of the following sources, whether online or offline?
   O Local newspaper
   O Local television news
   O Local radio
   O A blog about your local community
   O A person or organization you follow on a social networking site
   O A newsletter or e-mail listserv about your local community
   O Word of mouth from friends, family, co-workers and neighbors

   To help us better understand who participated in *On the Table*, please respond to the following demographic questions. Your responses are confidential.

20. Where do you currently live?
   County: __________________________
   City or Town: __________________________
   Neighborhood: __________________________
   ZIP code: __________________________

21. About how many years have you lived in your local community?
   Number of Years: __________
22. Do you own or rent your primary residence?
- Own
- Rent
- Other (please specify): __________________________

23. What is your current gender identity? (Select all that apply)
- Male
- Female
- A gender identity not listed here (please specify):

24. What is the highest level of education you have completed?
- Less than high school
- High school diploma or GED
- Some college
- Associate/Vocational degree
- Bachelor’s degree
- Graduate degree

25. In what year were you born? Year: ____________

26. How would you identify your race and/or ethnicity? (Select all that apply)
- American Indian/Alaska Native
- Asian
- Black or African American
- Hispanic or Latino/a
- Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander
- White
- Other (please specify): __________________________

27. What is your relationship to Legacy Foundation? (Select all that apply)
- Funder
- Grantee (my organization has received funds from them)
- I have volunteered with them
- I work there
- I’ve attended one of their events
- I had not heard of Legacy Foundation before On the Table.
- Other (please specify): __________________________

28. What are the top three (3) social issues you’d like to see your community address?
- Arts and Culture
- Economic Issues and Poverty
- Education and Youth Development
- Environment and Parks
- Religion and Morals
- Equity and Social Inclusion
- Family
- Food Access
- Government
- Health
- Housing and Homelessness
- Immigration and Migration
- Public Safety and Judicial System
- The Media
- Technology
- Transportation
- Other (please specify): __________________________

29. What services do you wish you had more of in your community?

30. What, if anything, prevents you from getting involved in the issues you care about most? (Select all that apply)
- I am too busy / I do not have enough time
- I am unsure of how to get involved
- I believe my efforts will not make a difference
- I am actively involved in the issues I care about
- I am not interested in getting involved
- Other (please specify): __________________________

31. What are you most proud of in your local community? __________________________

32. I’m happy with the quality of the following services in my community: (Select all that apply)
- Local Schools
- Public Safety and Judicial System
- Transportation
- Recreational Opportunities
- Healthcare
- Childcare
- Housing
- Jobs / New Business Development
- Civic Engagement
- Government
- Arts and Culture
- Environment and Parks
- Food Access
On the Table 2017
Summary of Results for All Respondents

Following On the Table, 98 participants responded to the survey by clicking on an e-mail link, 48 responded by clicking on the web link, and 1,033 responded by submitting a print survey.

In total, 1,179 On the Table participants fully or partially responded to the survey. This document provides a summary of responses by question. The 'n' provided in each question is the number of respondents for that question.

Section 1: Who Participated?

Respondent Demographics

Figure B.1: What is your current gender identity?
% of respondents (n = 1,138)
Figure B.2: Age of Respondents by Decade

% of respondents (n = 1,052)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decade</th>
<th>Lake County Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 to 29</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30s</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40s</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50s</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60s and up</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure B.3: Age of Respondents by Decade, Comparison

% of Lake County RESPONDENTS (n = 923) compared to Lake County RESIDENTS

Figure B.4: What is the highest level of education you have completed?

% of respondents (n = 1,142)

- Graduate degree: 28%
- Bachelor's degree: 30%
- Associate/Vocational degree: 9%
- Some college: 19%
- High school diploma or GED: 12%
- Less than high school: 2%

Figure B.5: Highest Level of Education, Comparison

% of Lake County RESPONDENTS ages 25+(n = 859) compared to Lake County RESIDENTS ages 25+


- Graduate degree: Lake County RESPONDENTS 7%, Lake County RESIDENTS 29%
- Bachelor's degree: Lake County RESPONDENTS 14%, Lake County RESIDENTS 31%
- Associate/Vocational degree: Lake County RESPONDENTS 9%, Lake County RESIDENTS 8%
- Some college: Lake County RESPONDENTS 19%, Lake County RESIDENTS 23%
- High school diploma or GED: Lake County RESPONDENTS 10%, Lake County RESIDENTS 35%
- Less than high school: Lake County RESPONDENTS 1%, Lake County RESIDENTS 13%
Figure B.6: How would you identify your race and/or ethnicity?
% of respondents (n = 1,141)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>% of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino/a</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure B.7: Racial and/or Ethnic Identity, Comparison
% of Lake County RESPONDENTS (n = 983) compared to Lake County RESIDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>% of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino/a</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure B.8: Where do you currently live? Top counties:
% of respondents (n = 1,140)

- Lake County, IN: 89%
- Porter County, IN: 6%
- Cook County, IL: 2%
- Will County, IL: 0.5%
- LaPorte County, IN: 0.5%
- Jasper County, IN: 0.5%
- St. Joseph County, IN: 0.3%
- White County, IN: 0.2%
- Newton County, IN: 0.2%
- Allen County, IN: 0.1%

Figure B.9: Where do you currently live? Top cities:
% of respondents (n = 1,136)

- Gary, IN: 21%
- Crown Point, IN: 12%
- Hammond, IN: 10%
- Hobart, IN: 6%
- Merrillville, IN: 6%
- East Chicago, IN: 4%
- Highland, IN: 4%
- Munster, IN: 4%
- Cedar Lake, IN: 4%
- Lowell, IN: 3%
Figure B.10: Where do you currently live? Top Zip Codes:

% of respondents (n = 1,126)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zip Code</th>
<th>% of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>46307</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46403</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46342</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46410</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46324</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46312</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46303</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46322</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46404</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46321</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where Respondents LIVE

# of Respondents by Zip Code
Figure B.11: Where do you currently live? Regions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>% of respondents (n = 958)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where Respondents LIVE

# of Respondents by Region of Lake County

![Map of Lake County showing the distribution of respondents by region. The map highlights the areas of North West, South, North East, and Central, with corresponding counts of respondents.](image-url)
**Figure B.12**: About how many years have you lived in your local community?

% of respondents (n = 1,133) compared to National Rate


**Figure B.13**: Do you own or rent your primary residence?

% of respondents (n = 1,135)

*Own* 73%

*Rent* 21%

*Other* 6%

**Figure B.14**: Homeownership Comparison

% of Lake County RESPONDENTS (n = 935) compared to Lake County RESIDENTS

*SOURCE: U.S. Census, ACS 2011 - 2015*
Figure B.15: What is your relationship to Legacy Foundation?

% of respondents (n = 1,098 // select all that apply)

- I had not heard of Legacy Foundation: 39%
- I've attended one of their events: 35%
- Grantee: 21%
- Other*: 12%
- I have volunteered with them: 8%
- Funder: 5%
- I work there: 2%

*Other’ response: Aware of (1%).
Civic Attitudes and Activities

Figure B.16: How much impact do you think people like you can have in making your community a better place to live?

% of respondents (n = 1,144) compared to National Rate

SOURCE: Pew Research Center, November, 2016, ‘Civic Engagement Strongly Tied to Local News Habits’

![Bar chart showing responses to Figure B.16]

Figure B.17: In general, how attached do you feel to your local community?

% of respondents (n = 1,150) compared to National Rate

SOURCE: Pew Research Center, November, 2016, ‘Civic Engagement Strongly Tied to Local News Habits’

![Bar chart showing responses to Figure B.17]
Figure B.18: Which of the following social issues are most important to you?

% of respondents (n = 846 // choose up to three)

- Education and Youth Development: 57%
- Economic Issues and Poverty: 39%
- Family: 31%
- Environment and Parks: 23%
- Arts and Culture: 19%
- Health: 17%
- Religion and Morals: 17%
- Equity and Social Inclusion: 16%
- Public Safety and Judicial System: 13%
- Housing and Homelessness: 12%
- Food Access: 10%
- Transportation: 9%
- Government: 8%
- Technology: 4%
- The Media: 3%
- Immigration and Migration: 3%
- Misc.: 0.4%

*‘Other’ responses: Community Development (0.2%), and Community Engagement (0.1%).*
Figure B.19: To which social issues do you PRIMARILY contribute your time, talent, and/or financial resources?

% of respondents (n = 973 // choose up to three)

- Education and Youth Development: 44%
- Family: 40%
- Religion and Morals: 27%
- Arts and Culture: 20%
- Economic Issues and Poverty: 19%
- Health: 15%
- Environment and Parks: 15%
- Equity and Social Inclusion: 11%
- Food Access: 10%
- Government: 10%
- Housing and Homelessness: 8%
- Public Safety and Judicial System: 6%
- Technology: 5%
- The Media: 5%
- Transportation: 3%
- Misc.: 2%
- Immigration and Migration: 2%

*The top 3 'other' responses are: Philanthropy (0.8%), Community Development (0.5%), and Community Engagement (0.3%).
Figure B.20: How involved are you in community and neighborhood activities where you live?

% of respondents (n = 1,142) compared to National Rate


Figure B.21: Engagement Activities in the Past Year, Comparison

% of respondents (n = 1,143) compared to National Rate

**Figure B.22**: How often do you vote in local elections, such as for mayor or a school board?

% of respondents (n = 1,142)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>73%</td>
<td>Always vote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13%</td>
<td>Sometimes vote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Rarely vote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6%</td>
<td>Never vote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4%</td>
<td>Prefer not to answer / Not eligible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure B.23**: Where do you like to connect with others?

% of respondents (n = 1,102 // select all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>49%</td>
<td>Religious institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41%</td>
<td>Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38%</td>
<td>Parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26%</td>
<td>Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26%</td>
<td>Community rec center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22%</td>
<td>Other*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22%</td>
<td>Public squares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15%</td>
<td>Shopping centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13%</td>
<td>Community garden</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The top 3 'other' responses are: Community events / meetings (5.5%), Restaurants (4.4%), and Work (2.7%).
Figures B.24 through B.30 present results on how often respondents get information about their local community from each of the following sources, whether online or offline.

SOURCE of comparison data: Pew Research Center, November, 2016, ‘Civic Engagement Strongly Tied to Local News Habits’

**Figure B.24: Local Newspaper**

% of respondents (n = 1,058) compared to National Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>National Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Every day</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Several times a week</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Several times a month</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less often</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure B.25: Local television news**

% of respondents (n = 1,030) compared to National Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>National Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Every day</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Several times a week</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Several times a month</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less often</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure B.26: Local radio
% of respondents (n = 1,004) compared to National Rate

- Every day: 24%
- Several times a week: 17%
- Several times a month: 15%
- Less often: 23%
- Never: 26%

Respondents: [bar chart]
National Rate: [bar chart]

Figure B.27: A blog about your local community
% of respondents (n = 962) compared to National Rate

- Every day: 1%
- Several times a week: 4%
- Several times a month: 5%
- Less often: 22%
- Never: 43%

Respondents: [bar chart]
National Rate: [bar chart]

Figure B.28: A person or organization you follow on a social networking site
% of respondents (n = 1,022) compared to National Rate

- Every day: 3%
- Several times a week: 8%
- Several times a month: 11%
- Less often: 13%
- Never: 19%

Respondents: [bar chart]
National Rate: [bar chart]
Figure B.29: A newsletter or e-mail listserv about your local community
% of respondents (n = 1,008) compared to National Rate

- Every day: 3% (Respondents) vs. 12% (National Rate)
- Several times a week: 5% (Respondents) vs. 17% (National Rate)
- Several times a month: 10% (Respondents) vs. 22% (National Rate)
- Less often: 23% (Respondents) vs. 30% (National Rate)
- Never: 26% (Respondents) vs. 52% (National Rate)

Figure B.30: Word of mouth from friends, family, co-workers and neighbors
% of respondents (n = 1,079) compared to National Rate

- Every day: 9% (Respondents) vs. 34% (National Rate)
- Several times a week: 22% (Respondents) vs. 35% (National Rate)
- Several times a month: 20% (Respondents) vs. 30% (National Rate)
- Less often: 9% (Respondents) vs. 29% (National Rate)
- Never: 2% (Respondents) vs. 10% (National Rate)
Section 2: Conversation Dynamics, Topics, and Impact

Conversation Dynamics and Topics

Figure B.31: Which best describes your MOST IMPORTANT reason(s) for participating in On the Table?

% of respondents (n = 1,155 // select all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discuss and address important issues in my community</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn from and listen to others</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support the organizer of the conversation</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get more involved in my community</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet and build relationships with new people</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure B.32: 'The other people at my conversation were ...'

% of respondents (n = 1,138)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interaction Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mostly people I knew before the conversation</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An equal mix of both</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly people I did NOT know before the conversation</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure B.33: Where did your conversation take place? Top counties:
% of respondents (n = 1,140)

- Lake County, IN: 98%
- Porter County, IN: 1.0%
- Cook County, IL: 0.4%
- Lake County, IL: 0.1%
- Jasper County, IN: 0.1%

Figure B.34: Where did your conversation take place? Top cities:
% of respondents (n = 1,130)

- Gary, IN: 25%
- Hammond, IN: 14%
- Crown Point, IN: 12%
- Merrillville, IN: 11%
- Cedar Lake, IN: 7%
- Hobart, IN: 7%
- Munster, IN: 5%
- East Chicago, IN: 5%
- Lake Station, IN: 4%
- Lowell, IN: 3%
Figure B.35: Where did your conversation take place? Top ZIP codes:

% of respondents (n = 1,037)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZIP Code</th>
<th>% of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>46307</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46410</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46403</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46303</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46342</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46324</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46321</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46312</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46405</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46356</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure B.36: Where did your conversation take place? Regions:

% of respondents (n = 1,016)

- Central: 27%
- North West: 25%
- South: 25%
- North East: 22%

Where Respondents Attended OTT Conversations

# of Respondents by Region of Lake County

- Central: 278
- North West: 256
- North East: 224
- South: 256
- Lake County
Figure B.37: Issues Raised During the Conversation
% of respondents (n = 789)

- Education and Youth Development: 28%
- Economic Issues and Poverty: 19%
- Equity and Social Inclusion: 18%
- Transportation: 17%
- Public Safety and Judicial System: 17%
- Media and Awareness: 13%
- Community Development: 12%
- Environment and Parks: 11%
- Health: 11%
- Government: 7%
- Family: 7%
- Collaboration: 7%
- Housing and Homelessness: 7%
- Philanthropy: 5%
- Arts and Culture: 5%
- Community Engagement: 4%
- Religion and Morals: 4%
- Food Access: 2%
- Misc.: 1%
- Immigration and Migration: 1%
- Technology: 0.8%
- International: 0.0%
**Impact of the Conversation**

**Figure B.38:** How did you connect with others at your conversation(s)?

% of respondents (n = 1,135 // select all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I spoke with one or more attendees I did not already know</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the above</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I exchanged contact information with one or more attendees I did not already know</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I made specific plans to work with one or more attendees</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure B.39:** After participating in your conversation(s), to what extent do you better understand how you, personally, can help address the issues facing your community?

% of respondents (n = 1,152)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Much better</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat better</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little better</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure B.40: How likely are you to take specific actions or next steps regarding an issue or solution discussed?
% of respondents (n = 1,146)

- Very likely: 42%
- Somewhat likely: 45%
- Not too likely: 10%
- Not at all likely: 2%

Figure B.41: Actions or next steps respondents are likely to take regarding an issue or solution discussed
% of respondents (n = 999 // select all that apply)

- Build relationships and collaborate: 62%
- Raise awareness and educate others: 57%
- Get more involved in community: 52%
- Volunteer: 45%
- Mentor or motivate others: 32%
- Take action through my job: 30%
- Improve myself through personal development and learning: 29%
- Donate: 20%
- Provide support for my family: 17%
- Become more politically involved: 16%
- Other: 2%
Section 3: Custom Questions

Figure B.42: What are the top three (3) social issues you’d like to see your community address?

% of respondents (n = 1,003 // choose up to three)

- Education and Youth Development: 53%
- Economic Issues and Poverty: 37%
- Family: 25%
- Environment and Parks: 23%
- Arts and Culture: 19%
- Housing and Homelessness: 19%
- Equity and Social Inclusion: 17%
- Public Safety and Judicial System: 17%
- Health: 16%
- Transportation: 15%
- Food Access: 11%
- Religion and Morals: 11%
- Government: 10%
- Technology: 5%
- Immigration and Migration: 4%
- The Media: 3%
- Other: 0.5%
Figure B.43: What services do you wish you had more of in your community?

% of respondents (n = 726)

- Transportation: 23%
- Youth: 15%
- Recreation: 11%
- Economic and Employment: 10%
- Education: 10%
- Shopping and Food: 10%
- Health: 7%
- Housing and Homelessness: 6%
- Arts and Culture: 6%
- Family: 6%
- Public Safety: 6%
- Senior: 5%
- Resources: 5%
- Misc.: 4%
- Parks: 4%
- Community Engagement: 3%
- Communication and Information: 2%
- Volunteer: 2%
- Maintenance and Public Works: 2%

Figure B.44: What, if anything, prevents you from getting involved in the issues you care about most?

% of respondents (n = 1,065 // select all that apply)

- I am actively involved in the issues I care about: 45%
- I am too busy / I do not have enough time: 42%
- I am unsure of how to get involved: 32%
- I believe my efforts will not make a difference: 12%
- Other: 9%
- I am not interested in getting involved: 8%
Figure B.45: What are you most proud of in your local community?

% of respondents (n = 750 // select all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Community</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Schools</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Involvement</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature and Parks</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Organizations</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth and Economic Development</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Programs and Resources</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Culture</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities and Events</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Institutions</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location and Downtown</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government and Leadership</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleanliness</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police and Fire Departments</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc.</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure B.46: I’m happy with the quality of the following services in my community:

% of respondents (n = 950 // select all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Schools</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment and Parks</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational Opportunities</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Access</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety and Judicial System</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Culture</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs / New Business Development</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Engagement</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childcare</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C: Pride in Community Codebook – Defined

Activities and Events
An activities and events code refers to local community events, particularly events and activities downtown put on by the city and community organizations.

Arts and Culture
An arts and culture code refers to local arts institutions, galleries, cultural events, and arts education.

Cleanliness
A cleanliness code refers to respondents’ pride in the cleanliness of their community and the willingness of community members to keep it clean.

Community Involvement
A community involvement code refers to pride in community members taking action to get involved and improve their communities. This code often refers to volunteering, collaboration and working together, and involvement and commitment on the part of people and organizations.

Diversity
A diversity code refers to pride respondents feel in their communities’ diversity, specifically cultural diversity.

Education and Schools
An education and schools code refers to pride in local education, especially the local public school system. Respondents often named their local schools, while also mentioning early childhood education programs and local institutions like the public library.

Growth and Economic Development
A growth and economic development code refers to pride in recent economic activity and growth in respondents’ communities. It frequently includes issues like economic growth, the revitalization of downtown, new businesses coming in, and redevelopment of old properties.

Local Government and Leadership
A local government and leadership code refers to respondents’ approval of local government entities and specific politicians. Often it includes mention of responsible stewardship of government finances and satisfaction with local public services.

Local Organizations
A local organizations code refers to pride in the many local organizations that are working for a better future in Lake County, including non-profits, social service organizations, local community organizations, and many other organizations that are trying to make a difference.

Location and Downtown
A location and downtown code most frequently refers to pride in the downtowns of respondents’ communities, while also including mention of other locations and positives of living in Lake County.
Nature and Parks
A nature and parks code refers to respondents’ pride in Lake County’s plentiful and beautiful parks and natural attractions, especially the lakefront, beach, and Indiana Dunes State Park. It also refers to local parks, trails, green space, outdoor opportunities, and conservation efforts.

People
A people code refers to the people, residents, and neighbors of Lake County, often mentioning attributes such as work ethic, courage, caring, friendly, proud, resilient, and referencing local people’s potential.

Police and Fire Departments
A police and fire departments code refers to respondents’ pride in their local police and fire departments.

Religious Institutions
A religious institutions code refers to pride in local religious institutions and the social work they do in the community.

Safety
A safety code refers to community safety, often mentioning that some respondents’ communities are quiet and calm with low crime.

Sense of Community
A sense of community code refers to characteristics of respondents’ hometowns and positive feelings about their communities. It is inclusive of ideas like sense of community, community feel, small town community, family friendly, and community spirit and unity, as well as attributes like welcoming, inclusive, and supportive.

Social Programs and Resources
A social programs and resources code refers to respondents’ pride in the many social programs and resources that are available in their communities, especially services targeted at youth, seniors, veterans, and residents in need.
Appendix D: Services Codebook – Defined

Arts and Culture
An arts and culture code refers most frequently to services related to arts education and youth arts programming, while also including public art, music, and theatre.

Communication and Information
A communication and information code refers to a desire for more local news and media, as well as communication and information sharing about events and news in local communities.

Community Engagement
A community engagement code refers to services related to community participation and improvement, inclusion and cooperation among residents, events to bring people together, and local community initiatives, such as a community garden.

Economic and Employment
An economic and employment code refers to employment opportunities, job training and business development with an emphasis on better jobs, workforce development and skills training, job fairs, business services, and resources to combat poverty.

Education
An education code refers to education-related services such as mentoring, tutoring, training, and education programming.

Family
A family code refers to services for parents, especially parenting classes and childcare, as well as services for low-income and working families. It also includes requests for more family-friendly activities.

Health
A health code refers to healthcare services including medical, mental health, drug abuse, addiction, rehab, and counseling services.

Housing and Homelessness
A housing and homelessness code refers to services related to housing, housing development, homelessness, affordable housing, and rent support.

Maintenance and Public Works
A maintenance and public works code primarily refers to a request for more garbage collection service, while also including road maintenance and better sidewalks.

Parks
A parks code refers to respondents’ desire for more parks and green space, for the improvement and expansion of existing parks, as well as trails and more parks designed for children.

Public Safety
A public safety code refers to services to improve safety in respondents’ neighborhoods, including neighborhood watch, more police and firefighters, and more police patrols.
Recreation
A recreation code refers to services related to recreation, entertainment, outdoor activities, community recreation centers, and recreation opportunities for seniors, youth, and families.

Resources
A resources code refers to a general request for more resources in respondents’ communities, particularly for more resources for underserved populations, non-profit organizations, and youth.

Senior
A senior code refers to services that are specifically targeted to seniors, including health, housing, and transportation services.

Shopping and Food
A shopping and food code refers to a desire for more shopping and shops, more retail and more pharmacies, as well as a need for more food access, grocery stores, restaurants, and food pantries in many communities.

Transportation
A transportation code refers to improving transportation services in Lake County, especially public transit, transportation access, and transportation for groups like youth and seniors. It also includes references to biking and trails.

Volunteer
A volunteer code refers to volunteering, non-profit organizations, and community volunteering programs.

Youth
A youth code refers to more services and programming targeted towards youth and teens, including interesting, cost-effective activities and events, after school and summer programming, sports, and social services.
Appendix E: Issues Codebook – Defined

**Arts and Culture**
An arts and culture code may refer to art initiatives such as art for social change as well as public art and art infrastructure, or it may acknowledge culture through cultural institutions (such as historic buildings) and city events and activities (such as festivals) as well as through opportunities for ethnic cultural awareness.

**Collaboration**
A collaboration code refers to working together and building relationships to create partnerships and expand networks. It may function at the community or individual level and often involves crossing divides and building bridges while working toward collective impact. Sharing resources and holding dialogues/conversations are other indicators of collaboration.

**Community Development**
A community development code refers to identifying community assets and building up the community, particularly through local economic development, in order to improve quality of life. It also refers to building a sense of community and creating community for those who live there.

**Community Engagement**
A community engagement code refers to overall involvement and participation in one’s neighborhood or community in order to make a difference. Often there is an organizing element at the grassroots level as well as intentions for improved neighbor relations and opportunities for neighborhood gatherings.

**Economic Issues and Poverty**
An economic issues and poverty code refers to economic development, on one end, and economic insecurity, or poverty, on the other, covering in the intermediate unemployment and jobs as well as income inequality and wage issues.

**Education and Youth Development**
An education and youth development code refers primarily to schools (such as school system or curriculum) and students (often at the high school level) with additional focal points on mentoring and general youth development. It is also inclusive of other related topics such as community relationships, parent involvement, and research.

**Environment and Parks**
An environment and parks code refers to overall environmental sustainability efforts and clean up as well as recreational opportunities for all. It is inclusive of greenspace as well as farmland and agriculture.

**Equity and Social Inclusion**
An equity and social inclusion code uses a social justice lens to account for forms of exclusion and issues of access and equality for underserved groups. Reference is largely made to youth access and engagement concerns as well as to issues of disparity as noted across income levels, racial groups, and neighborhoods.

**Family**
A family code refers to the overall functioning and behavior of the family unit, particularly through parent involvement and support (or lack thereof) and child concerns such as childcare.
**Food Access**
A food access code refers primarily to food insecurity, focusing on problems of hunger and food deserts and solutions regarding food assistance and urban agriculture.

**Government**
A government code refers to the governing habits of the state and regional municipalities, especially regarding fiscal issues and taxes, including pensions and cuts to social services, as well as transparency, accountability, and corruption. It also involves the function of government, particularly through elections, public engagement, and public policy.

**Health**
A health code refers to the wellbeing of both people and communities, considering in particular mental health issues and addiction while also taking into account public health, quality of life issues, nutrition and wellness, and heath care.

**Housing and Homelessness**
A housing and homelessness code primarily refers to homelessness and issues around home ownership and renting responsibilities.

**Immigration and Migration**
An immigration and migration code refers to the displacement, movement, and integration of immigrant communities, including those who are undocumented and those who are refugees.

**International**
An international code refers to world affairs.

**Media and Awareness**
A media and awareness code refers to raising awareness around issues of importance and addressing ignorance, particularly through the media and social media. It includes improving communication and building new narratives, especially around persistent stigmas.

**Religion and Morals**
A morals and religion code refers largely to personal attributes and attitudes, such as apathy or hope. It is also inclusive of faith-based community work.

**Philanthropy**
A philanthropy code refers to increased funding and support for programs and nonprofit organizations and often incorporates a need for organizational capacity building, institutional community outreach, and corporate social responsibility. On the individual level, it refers to civic responsibility and volunteering, with individuals taking action for the greater good.

**Public Safety and Judicial System**
A public safety and judicial system code may refer to public safety and crime as well as the criminal justice system, including instances of gang violence, gun violence, drugs, and trafficking, and how officials such as police can better provide community security.
Technology
A technology code refers to technology in a general sense and includes references to access, training, and improvement.

Transportation
A transportation code refers to transportation access and transportation infrastructure.
## Appendix F: Frequency of Codes for Youth Head, Heart, and Feet Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>% Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ISSUES</td>
<td>Violence and Gangs</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSUES</td>
<td>Youth and Family</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSUES</td>
<td>Economic Issues</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSUES</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSUES</td>
<td>Bullying</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSUES</td>
<td>Parks and Rec</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSUES</td>
<td>Public Safety</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSUES</td>
<td>Lack of Respect for Community</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSUES</td>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSUES</td>
<td>Schools and Education</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSUES</td>
<td>Abandoned Houses/Buildings</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSUES</td>
<td>Discrimination</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSUES</td>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSUES</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEELINGS</td>
<td>Want to Help/Make a Difference</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEELINGS</td>
<td>Sad/Upset</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEELINGS</td>
<td>Angry</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEELINGS</td>
<td>Disappointed</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEELINGS</td>
<td>Love and Care</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEELINGS</td>
<td>Good/Happy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEELINGS</td>
<td>Want to Unite</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEELINGS</td>
<td>Hopeless</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOLUTIONS</td>
<td>Build Up/Improve Community</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOLUTIONS</td>
<td>Help Others</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOLUTIONS</td>
<td>Speak Up/Take A Stand</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOLUTIONS</td>
<td>Be A Better Person</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOLUTIONS</td>
<td>Come Together/Organize</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOLUTIONS</td>
<td>Create Opportunities</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOLUTIONS</td>
<td>Work Harder</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix G: Social Media Analysis

Prepared by Meltwater Buzz

On The Table 2017

Social Media Analysis Report
Gary, IN

Hashtag Usage

385
Total mentions

412k
Total impressions

#OnTheTable219

The event occurred on Sept 26.
Platform Breakdown

98 Unique Twitter Influencers

Hashtag Usage

Top Influencers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Twitter User</th>
<th>Posts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>@yensAdaregion</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>@Envision</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>@Legacy7Dtn</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>@Kelby_anoe</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>@LakeCountyYD</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>@LCPLWeb</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>@Nthesse</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>@Tweetyh2020</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>@SteelCity219</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>@GrlCaLibrary</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Twitter Insight

Tweeters Platform

Engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>61.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>37.82%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Links

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>48.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>51.81%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Media

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>17.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>82.38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Top Sources

- Twitter for Android: 25.9%
- Twitter Lite: 22.8%
- Twitter for iPhone: 20.2%
- Twitter Web Client: 11.9%
- Facebook: 5.7%
- Other: 13.5%
## Appendix H: Visualization of Disparity between Important Issues and Contributions

### Figure H.1

### Themes Disparity Between Important Issues and Contributions

For example, only 9% of respondents who mentioned Transportation (n=66) as an important social issue also mentioned it as social issue to which they contribute their time, talent or financial resources. The ‘n’ represents the number of respondents who chose the corresponding variable as an important issue and also responded to the contribution question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>% of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religion and Morals (n=139)</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family (n=240)</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Culture (n=141)</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Youth Development (n=446)</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment and Parks (n=172)</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Access (n=79)</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Media (n=23)</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology (n=34)</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health (n=135)</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government (n=59)</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity and Social Inclusion (n=129)</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Issues and Poverty (n=295)</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing and Homelessness (n=91)</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration and Migration (n=20)</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety and Judicial System (n=96)</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation (n=66)</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>