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**Project Overview**

The Sangamon County Economic Outlook Survey is a survey examining the economic perceptions, expectations, and evaluations of Sangamon County businesses, public, and non-profit organizations. The survey has been conducted biannually (March and September) since 2008[[1]](#footnote-1) with the goal of providing a longitudinal analysis of the local economy through the lens of area organizations.

The 2015 survey results are from 249 local organizations who were contacted in March 2015 by interviewers at the University of Illinois Springfield’s Survey Research Office (SRO). A detailed discussion of this project’s methodology is available in the Transparency Initiative Methodological Report- available at the end of this report.[[2]](#footnote-2)

For more information about this survey, please contact Dr. Ashley Kirzinger at akirz2@uis.edu or (217) 206-6591. Special thanks to Richard Schuldt, Dr. Beverly Bunch, Dr. Patricia Byrnes at the University of Illinois Springfield, and Josh Collins at the Greater Springfield Chamber of Commerce for their guidance on this project.
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**Intensity Index Scores**

The “Intensity Index Score” is developed using the economic indicator questions, which have consistently appeared in every Outlook Survey. The score is the average of all ratings when the following values are assigned to each response: large decline (-100), small decline (-50), stay the same (0), small increase (+50), and large increase (+100). The Intensity Index score measures the expected change in each of the economic factors over the next 12 months.

**Table 1. Business demographics of respondents**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Responses | Valid frequency |
| Sector |  |  |
| Private sector (for-profit) | 172 | 69.4% |
| Non-profit sector | 42 | 16.9% |
| Public sector (government) | 33 | 13.4% |
| Primary Economic Activity |  |  |
| Construction | 32 | 13.8% |
| Manufacturing | 5 | 2.2% |
| Wholesale trade | 5 | 2.2% |
| Retail trade | 31 | 13.4% |
| Transportation/warehousing | 11 | 4.7% |
| Finance/insurance/real estate | 37 | 15.9% |
| Medical/health care | 19 | 8.2% |
| Education/educational services | 17 | 7.3% |
| Accommodations/food/entertainment/recreation | 16 | 6.9% |
| Information and communication systems | 9 | 3.9% |
| Business and professional support services | 24 | 10.3% |
| Personal services | 17 | 7.3% |
| Natural resources and mining | 3 | 1.3% |
| Public administration | 6 | 2.6% |
| Years in operation | Mean | Median |
| Number of years in current location | 22.9 | 13.0 |
| Number of years in Sangamon County | 32.0 | 21.0 |
| Number of years in Illinois | 37.2 | 25.0 |
| Number of employees |  |  |
| Less than 5 employees | 82 | 33.3% |
| 5-14 employees | 75 | 30.5% |
| 15-29 employees | 27 | 11.0% |
| 30-44 employees | 17 | 6.9% |
| 45-59 employees | 10 | 4.1% |
| 60-79 employees | 5 | 2.0% |
| 80-99 employees | 5 | 2.0% |
| 100-149 employees | 5 | 2.0% |
| 150-299 employees | 11 | 4.5% |
| 300 or more employees | 9 | 3.7% |

**Executive Summary**

The Sangamon County Economic Outlook Survey studies local businesses/firms as well as non-profit and public organizations in order to gauge expectations for the next twelve months across several economic indicators. For over two years, local businesses and organizations’ positive expectations have increased significantly. The Intensity Index Scores (the main indicator for economic expectations) have grown increasingly positive for individual firms, their firm’s sectors, and the overall Sangamon County economy. Since Fall 2012, local firms’ expectations for their own firms have increased 30 points, expectations for their firm’s sector have increased 23 points, and expectations for the overall Sangamon County economy have increased 36 points. All three measures indicate strong positive expectations for the economy over the next 12 months. Figure 1 displays the longitudinal analysis of Intensity Index Scores (*IIS*) for the overall Sangamon County economy, respondents’ firm’s sector, and individual firms/businesses/organizations.

As seen in the figure, local employers report positive expectations for the overall Sangamon County economy (*IIS*  of +22) and their firm’s sector (*IIS*  of +25), but their most positive expectations are for their own organization/firm/business, with an increase in *IIS* of 18 points, from an *IIS*  of +14 in Fall 2014 to an *IIS*  of +32 in Spring 2015. This is the largest increase in expectations measured in the survey to date.

**Workers’ Compensation in Illinois**

In 2011, the Illinois General Assembly passed *The Illinois Workers’ Compensation Act* in order to institute workers’ compensation reforms in the state. In an effort to examine the effectiveness of this reform, one of the topical sections in the Spring 2015 survey includes questions about workers’ compensation in Illinois. Respondents were asked how compensation premiums and requirements affect their business, the number of workers’ compensation claims filed within their organization, and how they deal with workplace injuries.

More than half, 52.6 percent, of Sangamon County employers report that Illinois workers’ compensation requirements are unfair to businesses and organizations. In addition, 17.8 percent of respondents report that complying with Illinois workers’ compensation requirements places a “significant burden” on their firm or organization and 36 percent report that it places “somewhat of a burden” (see figure 2). Despite this, only 6.8 percent report that the current workers’ compensation system in Illinois is preventing their firm from hiring new employees.

Illinois is a state with one of the highest workers’ compensation premiums. However, it is important to note that its ranking has improved somewhat in recent years. In 2011 (prior to the reform), Illinois was the state with the third highest workers’ compensation premium rate (according to a study conducted by Oregon’s Department of Consumer and Business Services).[[3]](#footnote-3) In 2014, Illinois was ranked as the state with the seventh highest workers’ compensation premium rate with $2.35 per $100 of payroll, or 127 percent of the national median. A study by the Workers Compensation Research Institute showed that since instituting the reforms, there have been significant decreases in medical fees associated with workers’ compensation in Illinois.[[4]](#footnote-4) Interestingly, while Sangamon County employers have negative evaluations of Illinois compensation premiums, when they are asked to guess where Illinois places on the rankings, they actually gave Illinois a higher ranking (13th), instead of the 7th ranking that it earned in 2014.

* **In 2011, Illinois had the third highest workers’ compensation premiums.**
* **In 2014, Illinois had the seventh highest workers’ compensation premiums.**
* **The average survey respondent thought that Illinois had the 13th highest workers’ compensation premiums.**

**The Sangamon County Economy**

The Spring 2015 survey indicates very positive expectations for the overall Sangamon County economy. Table 3 displays the current Intensity Index Scores, the Fall 2014 Intensity Index scores, as well as the changes between the scores. In general, respondents’ expectations are more positive for Sangamon County now than in the fall.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 3. Intensity Index Scores for overall Sangamon County factors | | | |  |  |  |
|  | **Spring 2015 *IIS*** | **Fall 2014 *IIS*** | **Difference**  **(Spring 2015- Fall 2014)** | | | |
| Overall employment | +17 | +10 | +7 | | | |
| Capital investment | +15 | +11 | +4 | | | |
| Interest rates | +25 | +22 | +3 | | | |
| Gross sales/revenue | +29 | +19 | +10 | | | |
| Inflation/ price of goods | +33 | +40 | -7[[5]](#footnote-5) | | | |
| Contributions to non-profits | +6 | -11 | +17 | | | |
| Overall economy | +22 | +8 | +14 | | | |

Respondents have more positive expectations on all economic indicators including a significant increase in expectations for contributions to non-profits. In the Fall 2014 report, researchers drew specific attention to the fact that Sangamon County employers, on average, had been pessimistic about expected contributions to non-profit organizations as this was the single item in the survey that had not rebounded since the recession. The Spring 2015 survey indicates a significant shift with the first positive expectations since Fall 2010. However, this expectation still lags behind all other overall Sangamon County factors. As seen in figure 3, a majority of employers expect an increase in the overall economy, overall gross sales/revenue, interest rates, and inflation/price of goods.

**Examining Expectations for Economic Sectors**

In examining all respondents’ expectations for each economic sector, we find that the majority of economic sectors expect significant growth while a few sectors (mainly manufacturing, education, natural resources/mining, and public administration) do not expect the same increases over the next 12 months. Still, for all but a few sectors, the Intensity Index Scores display positive expectations (see Table 4).

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 4. Intensity Index Scores for specific economic sectors | | | |  |
|  | **Spring 2015 *IIS*** | **Fall 2014 *IIS*** | **Difference**  **(Spring 2015- Fall 2014)** | |
|
| Own firm's sector | +25 | +11 | +14 | |
| Construction | +28 | +19 | +9 | |
| Manufacturing | -7 | -10 | +3 | |
| Wholesale trade | +16 | +5 | +11 | |
| Retail trade | +27 | +8 | +17 | |
| Transportation/ warehousing | +12 | +4 | +8 | |
| Finance/ insurance/ real estate | +34 | +18 | +16 | |
| Medical/ health care | +54 | +41 | +13 | |
| Education/ educational services | -3 | +6 | -9 | |
| Accommodations/ food/ entertainment / recreation | +21 | +7 | +14 | |
| Information and communications systems | +31 | +19 | +12 | |
| Business and professional services | +15 | +10 | +5 | |
| Personal services | +13 | +6 | +7 | |
| Natural resources/ mining | -20 | -14 | -6 | |
| Public administration | -2 | -4 | +2 | |

And, respondents remain optimistic about their own firm’s sector, regardless of which sector they work in. For example, while all respondents report negative expectations for the manufacturing sector, on average, those working in manufacturing still report positive expectations.

The four sectors that receive the most negative ratings by respondents are public administration (-2), education/educational services (-3), manufacturing (-7), and natural resources/mining (-20). It is important to note that this is the first negative *IIS* for the education/educational services sector since Fall 2013. In fact, this is the sector that has seen the most movement over the past several years with expectations frequently changing from positive to negative, and vice versa.

Once again, the medical/ health care sector is the most positively rated economic sector in Sangamon County with an *IIS* of +54. This is a thirteen point increase from Fall 2014 and continues an upward trend in expectations regarding the medical/health care sector. As seen in figure 4, the medical/ health care sector, information sector, financial sector, and construction sector continue to be the most positively rated sectors in Sangamon County; however, the medical/health care sector has significantly higher economic expectations than even these other positively rated sectors.

**Overall Expectations for “Your” Firm/ Organization**

The Spring 2015 Survey indicates that expectations for individual business­­es/ firms/ organizations over the next 12 months are more positive than the Fall 2014 results (see Table 5). Respondents rate all economic aspects of their own firm/ business/ organization positively, with gross revenue/ sales (*IIS* of +37) and overall status (*IIS* of +33) receiving the most positive ratings.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 5. Intensity Index Scores for own firm/ business/ organization expectations | | | |
|  | **Spring 2015 *IIS*** | **Fall 2014 *IIS*** | **Difference (Spring 2015 - Fall 2014)** |
|
| Capital investment | +16 | +8 | +8 |
| Total number of employees | +16 | +11 | +5 |
| Gross revenue/ sales | +37 | +14 | +23 |
| Profitability | +27 | +9 | +18 |
| Overall status | +33 | +14 | +19 |

Expectations regarding the total number of employees have increased steadily over the past year. In Spring 2014, the survey reported an *IIS* for “total number of employees”of +6. In Fall 2014, this increased to +11. It currently has an *IIS* of +16. The current unemployment rate, as reported by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (found at data.bls.gov), is 6.0 percent, which is a 1.3 percentage point decrease from the unemployment rate of 7.3 percent in Spring 2014. Put another way, local employers report even more positive expectations for employment rates over the next twelve months than they did during a period in which the overall unemployment rate decreased 1.3 percent.

As seen in figure 5, a majority of respondents report an expected increase on three out of five measures (profitability, overall status, and gross revenue/ sales). This includes 73.5 percent of respondents reporting they expect an increase in their gross revenue/ sales over the next 12 months.

**Biggest Challenges Facing Sangamon County Employers**

Survey respondents were asked to identify the three biggest challenges for their business/ firm/ organization over the next 12 months from a list of pre-identified challenges. As seen in Table 6, government regulations and taxation weigh the heaviest on the minds of local area employers (which is consistent with previous results). Of the 249 employers who responded to this survey, 39 percent (n=98) report that government regulations and taxation is going to be one of the biggest challenges facing them in the next 12 months. Two challenges that topped this year’s list are relatively new concerns. Competition from local/state/national firms and availability of skilled trained workers both had over 30 percent of respondents reporting this as one of their three biggest challenges. This represents a 10 percent increase for competition from local/state/national and five percent increase for availability of skilled trained workers. One area in which employers are experiencing a decrease in concern is providing healthcare for employees (including the implementation of the Affordable Care Act). [[6]](#footnote-6) In Spring 2014, 41.8 percent of employers reported that providing healthcare for their employees was going to be one of their biggest concerns. In Spring 2015, only 24.1 percent of employers report that this is one of their top concerns.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Table 6. Biggest Challenges Facing Sangamon County Employers | |
|  | **Valid percent(*n*)** |
| Government regulations and taxation | 39.3% (98) |
| Competition from local/ state/ national firms | 34.5% (86) |
| Availability of skilled/ trained workers | 31.3% (78) |
| State government finances | 30.5% (76) |
| Employee (union and nonunion) compensation and benefits (not healthcare) | 24.5% (61) |
| Healthcare for employees (e.g., Affordable Care Act) | 24.1% (60) |
| Consumer confidence/ spending | 22.9% (57) |
| Energy prices | 12.8% (32) |
| Commodity prices | 12.4% (31) |
| Interest rates | 12.0% (30) |
| Inflation | 9.6% (24) |
| Global competition | 4.0% (10) |

It is important to note that none of the challenges received a majority of respondents reporting that it was going to be one of the three biggest challenges facing their organization over the next twelve months. This may be due to differences in responses among types of sectors (public, non-profit, or private). While all three types of employers report that government regulations and taxation is one of their biggest challenges, a lower percentage of non-profit and public sector respondents report facing this challenge[[7]](#footnote-7). Instead, a higher percentage of non-profit employers and public sector employers, than those in the private sector, report that the state government finances is one of their biggest challenges.

**The Spring 2015 Topical Section**

The Spring 2015 survey includes three topical sections: an examination of the perceived competitiveness in (or for) respondents’ business/industrial sectors, assets and liabilities for doing business in Sangamon County, and attitudes toward workers compensation regulations.

**Perceived Competitiveness in (or for) respondents’ sectors**

Respondents were asked about perceptions of their industry based on Porter’s model of competitive forces.[[8]](#footnote-8) Additionally, this analysis provides insight on strategic planning processes for potential start-up businesses within Sangamon County.

Respondents were asked about the level of difficulty for new firms/organizations to enter their industrial sector nationally and within the boundaries of Sangamon County. Perceived level of difficulty of entering industrial sectors did not vary drastically between the two questions; however, there is a slightly lower perceived level of difficulty in Sangamon County. Seventy percent of respondents report that it is difficult (either “very difficult,” or “somewhat difficult”) for new firms/organizations to enter the market on national level, while 66 percent of respondents report they feel it is difficult for new firms/organizations to enter their sector in Sangamon County.

This somewhat varies across sectors. Respondents within the information and communications system sector had the highest percent (44 percent) who reported that it was “very difficult” to enter their sector while respondents from the manufacturing sector had the highest percent who reported that it was “not difficult at all” to enter their sector with 40 percent saying this.[[9]](#footnote-9)

When asked about the level of competitiveness from existing rivals from within their sector, 54.8 percent of respondents feel that their sector is competitive (either “somewhat” or “very”). Typically, a higher level of competitiveness from existing incumbents causes more difficulty for new firms attempting to enter the sector. In Sangamon County, it appears that level of difficulty and level of competitiveness are related, with 66 percent reporting that it is difficult for new businesses to enter the sector within Sangamon County and 54.8 percent reporting that their industrial sector is competitive.

In regards to strategic planning for established firms, as well as for new market entrants, product differentiation (how distinct your product is) is a key element in any industry. When asked, 44.4 percent of Sangamon County businesses do not think that their product is that distinct. When asked how difficult, if at all, it is for their product or service to be substituted by a competitor’s product or service in Sangamon County, 18.5 percent of respondents report “not difficult at all” and 25.9 percent report “not very difficult.” In addition, 53.3 percent of respondents state that it is not difficult for customers to affect the price of their product or service by switching to the product or service of their competitor. While the level of competition, in terms of product differentiation and market pressures, is seemingly high in Sangamon County, the survey did find that Sangamon County businesses do not have difficulty obtaining supplies. Nearly 86 percent of respondents from Sangamon County stated that it is not difficult to obtain their essential supplies.

**Biggest assets and liabilities for Sangamon County employers**

The past two iterations of the Sangamon County Economic Outlook Survey (Fall 2014 and Spring 2015) have included a topical section examining the assets and liabilities for doing business in Sangamon County. Respondents were given 23 items and asked to report whether the item was a “big asset,” “small asset,” “neither asset nor liability,” “small liability,” or “big liability” for doing business in Sangamon County.

Table 7 presents the mean and standard deviation (the amount of variation in responses) for each item. Lower scores indicate more positive ratings. As seen in the table, respondents believe that “health care facilities and quality” is the greatest asset for doing business in Sangamon County, while the “total state taxes on business” is the greatest liability. The other top asset in Sangamon County is “proximity to colleges/universities/technical schools.” It is important to note that there were no significant changes between the Fall 2014 scores and the Spring 2015 scores -- indicating that employers’ attitudes towards these 23 items remained relatively stable. However, the majority of the items (21 out of 23) saw a decrease in scores, indicating a more positive assessment. This may be a result in the change in methodology of the survey (mixed mode to telephone only), or a result of a more positive overall evaluation of the economy.

**Table 7. Assets or liabilities for doing business in Sangamon County**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Asset or liability? | Fall 2014 scores | Spring 2015 scores | Change in scores |
| Health care facilities and quality | 1.96(.870) | 1.66(.874) | -.30 |
| Proximity to colleges/universities/technical schools | 2.35(.844) | 2.02(.868) | -.33 |
|  |  |  |  |
| Cost of living and housing | 2.57(1.01) | 2.21(1.07) | -.36 |
| Access/proximity to transportation systems (highway, rail, air) | 2.59(.902) | 2.45(1.08) | -.14 |
| Crime and public safety services | 2.71(.888) | 2.60(1.04) | -.11 |
| Being located in the state capital | 2.72(.871) | 2.28(.976) | -.44 |
| Recreational, social, and cultural opportunities | 2.75(.851) | 2.53(1.03) | -.22 |
| Cost of/ availability of land and business or expansion possibilities | 2.78(.818) | 2.81(1.05) | +.03 |
| Access to/cost of communications networks | 2.81(.808) | 2.79(.947) | -.02 |
| Utilities- access to/cost of (electricity, natural gas, water supply, waste disposal) | 2.83(1.00) | 2.75(1.14) | -.08 |
| Environment and climate | 2.87(.841) | 2.80(1.03) | -.07 |
| Local government incentives to business | 2.91(.905) | 2.94(.952) | +.03 |
| K-12 education system | 2.92(.929) | 2.67(1.07) | -.25 |
| Local business climate and reputation | 2.94(1.05) | 2.40(1.13) | -.54 |
| Availability of workforce | 2.98(1.05) | 2.89(1.27) | -.07 |
| Quality of workforce | 3.01(1.16) | 2.79(1.35) | -.22 |
| State government incentives to business | 3.22(.973) | 3.19(1.12) | -.02 |
| Local zoning/permits and regulations | 3.50(.849) | 3.41(.904) | -.09 |
|  |  |  |  |
| State permits and regulations | 3.65(.814) | 3.60(.949) | -.05 |
| Total local taxes on business | 3.72(.976) | 3.66(.937) | -.06 |
| State business climate and reputation | 3.81(1.17) | 3.68(1.28) | -.13 |
| Workers compensation processes | 3.82(.969) | 3.80(.965) | -.92 |
| Total state taxes on business | 4.05(1.00) | 3.99(.980) | -.06 |

**Workers’ Compensation in Illinois**

In 2011, Illinois enacted *The Illinois Workers’ Compensation Act* in an effort to reform workers’ compensation in the state. Despite this, 52.6 percent of Sangamon County employers report that Illinois workers’ compensation requirements are unfair to businesses and organizations.

In addition, 60.2 percent of Sangamon County employers report that since early 2012, workers’ compensation premiums have gone up. This is compared to 35 percent who report that they have stayed the same and only 4.9 percent who report that they have gone down.

Sangamon County employers were asked if four different aspects of Illinois workers’ compensation insurance are a significant concern, somewhat of a concern, not much of a concern, or not a concern at all. As seen in figure 7, employers are most concerned with the overall cost of insurance. In fact, it is the only item in which a majority of respondents reported that it was either “a significant concern,” or “somewhat of a concern.”

Almost three-fourths of respondents report that in the past twelve months, their firm/organization has not had any workers’ compensation claims filed while 28.3 percent of respondents report that they have had such claims filed. A majority of the respondents (86.6 percent) report that if they had a workplace injury case, their organizations would be able to accommodate the worker.

**Transparency Initiative Methodological Report**

In 2015, the UIS Survey Research Office (SRO) became a charter member of the American Association for Public Opinions Research’s Transparency Initiative (TI). By joining the TI, the SRO is supporting broader and more effective disclosure of research methods by all organizations. The Transparency Initiative provides formal public recognition by AAPOR of an organization's voluntary commitment to abide by the disclosure standards in the AAPOR Code of Professional Ethics and Practices, while benefiting the public by providing more information with which to evaluate the quality of individual surveys. As part of SRO’s continued investment in this initiative, it has committed to providing a detailed methodological report of all of its survey projects. For more information on the TI, please visit <http://www.aapor.org/AAPORKentico/Transparency-Initiative.aspx>.

**Sangamon County Economic Outlook Survey**

The project is sponsored by the Greater Springfield Chamber of Commerce with a contribution from the University of Illinois Springfield’s Chancellor’s Office. It was conducted by researchers at the University of Illinois Springfield’s Survey Research Office. A steering committee assisted with questionnaire development (comprised of University and Chamber representatives). The topline report includes actual question wording and frequencies for each answer category as well as all open-ended responses.

**Sample and Methodology**

A list of local firms and organizations to be included in the Spring 2015 Sangamon County Economic Outlook Survey was generated by combining previous survey samples as well as the most recent list of Greater Springfield Chamber of Commerce members. By combining these two sources of business data, the Survey Research Office was able to identify 1371 local businesses, firms, or organizations. The SRO sent introductory letters to all of these entities on March 2nd, 2015 explaining the purpose of the project and informing them that they would be contacted via telephone to participate. Telephone interviews began on March 5th, 2015 and concluded on March 26th, 2015. Interviewers asked for the primary contact for the organization but were also trained to ask to speak to any individual within the organization helps with the financial planning. Sample members were contacted between the hours of 9am and 5pm, Monday through Friday. All respondents were contacted at least once with the average number of attempted phone calls of 2.84. The maximum number of attempts for a respondent is 10 attempts.

Of the 1371 possible respondents, 103 never answered the telephone, 18 were no longer operating in Sangamon County, and 40 were either wrong numbers or disconnected numbers. One hundred and eighty organizations refused to participate in the survey and 590 organizations were never able to coordinate a time to complete the interview. Overall, 249 organizations completed the telephone survey- which lasted, on average, 21 minutes. The response rate for this project is 19.1 percent (AAPOR Response Rate 3 which includes estimate proportion of cases of unknown eligibility that are eligible) and the cooperation rate for this project is 58 percent. The refusal rate is 15.4 percent. The margin of error for this project is plus or minus 5.6 percentage points. When examining subgroups of data respondents, the margin of error will increase. Margins of error for this survey are not adjusted for design effect. In addition, the data is not weighted.

For more information on this study, please contact SRO Director, Dr. Ashley Kirzinger at [akirz2@uis.edu](mailto:akirz2@uis.edu), or 217-206-6591.

**Sangamon County Economic Outlook Survey Topline Report**

**(*N=249)***

Section 1: Sangamon County Economic Expectations

Over the next 12 months, what are your expectations for the local economy in Sangamon County? Do you think each aspect of the local economy will see a large decline, small decline, stay the same, small increase, or large increase?

Overall employment (Intensity index score: +17.3)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Valid percent(*n)* |
| Large decline | 0.4% (1) |
| Small decline | 10.3% (25) |
| Stay the same | 44.2% (107) |
| Small increase | 44.2% (107) |
| Large increase | 0.8% (2) |
| Don’t know | (6) |
| Refused | (0) |

Capital investment (Intensity index score: +15.3)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Valid percent(*n)* |
| Large decline | 1.3% (3) |
| Small decline | 14.0% (32) |
| Stay the same | 41.0% (94) |
| Small increase | 40.2% (92) |
| Large increase | 3.5% (8) |
| Don’t know | (19) |
| Refused | (0) |

Interest rates (Intensity index score: +25.3)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Valid percent (*n*) |
| Large decline | 0.4% (1) |
| Small decline | 5.9% (14) |
| Stay the same | 37.6% (89) |
| Small increase | 54.9% (130) |
| Large increase | 1.3% (3) |
| Don’t know | (11) |
| Refused | (0) |

Gross sales/revenue (Intensity index score: +29.0)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Valid percent(*n*) |
| Large decline | 1.2% (3) |
| Small decline | 7.9% (19) |
| Stay the same | 27.0% (65) |
| Small increase | 59.3% (143) |
| Large increase | 4.6% (11) |
| Don’t know | (7) |
| Refused | (0) |

Inflation/price of goods (Intensity index score: +33.1)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Valid percent(*n*) |
| Large decline | 0% (0) |
| Small decline | 3.4% (8) |
| Stay the same | 32.5% (77) |
| Small increase | 58.6% (139) |
| Large increase | 5.5% (13) |
| Don’t know | (11) |
| Refused | (0) |

Contributions to non-profits (Intensity index score: +5.8)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Valid percent(*n*) |
| Large decline | 1.7% (2) |
| Small decline | 14.6% (26) |
| Stay the same | 55.4% (133) |
| Small increase | 27.1%(65) |
| Large increase | 1.3% (3) |
| Don’t know | (7) |
| Refused | (1) |

The overall economy (Intensity index score: +22.1)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Valid percent(*n*) |
| Large decline | 0.8% (2) |
| Small decline | 10.7% (26) |
| Stay the same | 32.6% (79) |
| Small increase | 55.0% (133) |
| Large increase | 0.8% (2) |
| Don’t know | (6) |
| Refused | (0) |

Section 2: Expectations for Sangamon County Economic Sectors

Over the next 12 months, what are your expectations for following economic sectors in Sangamon County? Do you think each aspect of the local economy will see a large decline, small decline, stay the same, small increase, or large increase?

Construction (Intensity index score: +28.1)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Valid percent(*n*) |
| Large decline | 0.4% (1) |
| Small decline | 12.3% (29) |
| Stay the same | 27.2% (64) |
| Small increase | 50.6% (119) |
| Large increase | 9.4% (22) |
| Don’t know | (13) |
| Refused | (0) |

Manufacturing (Intensity index score: -7.0)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Valid percent(*n*) |
| Large decline | 0.9% (2) |
| Small decline | 27.1% (62) |
| Stay the same | 58.1% (133) |
| Small increase | 13.1% (30) |
| Large increase | 0.9% (2) |
| Don’t know | (19) |
| Refused | (0) |

Wholesale trade (Intensity index score: +16.0)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Valid percent(*n*) |
| Large decline | 0% (0) |
| Small decline | 5.1% (11) |
| Stay the same | 59.3% (128) |
| Small increase | 34.3% (74) |
| Large increase | 1.4% (3) |
| Don’t know | (32) |
| Refused | (0) |

Retail trade (Intensity index score: +26.9)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Valid percent(*n*) |
| Large decline | 0% (0) |
| Small decline | 11.5% (27) |
| Stay the same | 26.4% (62) |
| Small increase | 59.1% (139) |
| Large increase | 3.0% (7) |
| Don’t know | (13) |
| Refused | (0) |

Transportation/ warehousing (Intensity index score: +12.0)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Valid percent(*n*) |
| Large decline | 0% (0) |
| Small decline | 7.4% (16) |
| Stay the same | 64.5% (140) |
| Small increase | 24.9% (54) |
| Large increase | 3.2% (7) |
| Don’t know | (31) |
| Refused | (0) |

Finance/insurance/real estate (Intensity index score: +33.7)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Valid percent(*n*) |
| Large decline | 0.4% (1) |
| Small decline | 6.3% (15) |
| Stay the same | 23.0% (55) |
| Small increase | 66.1% (158) |
| Large increase | 4.2% (10) |
| Don’t know | (9) |
| Refused | (0) |

Medical/health care (Intensity index score: +53.8)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Valid percent(*n*) |
| Large decline | 1.3% (3) |
| Small decline | 2.5% (6) |
| Stay the same | 15.2% (36) |
| Small increase | 49.4% (117) |
| Large increase | 31.6% (75) |
| Don’t know | (11) |
| Refused | (0) |

Education/ educational services (Intensity index score: -3.1)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Valid percent(*n*) |
| Large decline | 2.9% (7) |
| Small decline | 24.5% (59) |
| Stay the same | 51.5% (124) |
| Small increase | 18.3% (44) |
| Large increase | 2.9% (7) |
| Don’t know | (7) |
| Refused | (0) |

Accommodations/food/entertainment/recreation (Intensity index score: +21.5)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Valid percent(*n*) |
| Large decline | 0.4% (1) |
| Small decline | 8.4% (20) |
| Stay the same | 42.7% (102) |
| Small increase | 44.8% (107) |
| Large increase | 3.8% (9) |
| Don’t know | (9) |
| Refused | (0) |

Information and communications systems (Intensity index score: +31.4)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Valid percent(*n*) |
| Large decline | 0.4% (1) |
| Small decline | 1.3% (3) |
| Stay the same | 40.2% (94) |
| Small increase | 51.3% (120) |
| Large increase | 6.8% (16) |
| Don’t know | (14) |
| Refused | (0) |

Business and professional support services (Intensity index score: +15.0)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Valid percent(*n*) |
| Large decline | 0.4% (1) |
| Small decline | 7.7% (18) |
| Stay the same | 53.8% (126) |
| Small increase | 37.6% (88) |
| Large increase | 0.4% (1) |
| Don’t know | (14) |
| Refused | (0) |

Personal services (Intensity index score: +13.4)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Valid percent(*n*) |
| Large decline | 0.9% (2) |
| Small decline | 10.0% (23) |
| Stay the same | 51.9% (120) |
| Small increase | 35.9% (83) |
| Large increase | 1.3% (3) |
| Don’t know | (16) |
| Refused | (1) |

Natural resources and mining (Intensity index score: -20.3)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Valid percent(*n*) |
| Large decline | 6.6% (14) |
| Small decline | 37.7% (80) |
| Stay the same | 46.2% (98) |
| Small increase | 8.5% (18) |
| Large increase | 0.9% (2) |
| Don’t know | (36) |
| Refused | (0) |

Public administration (Intensity index score: -1.8)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Valid percent(*n*) |
| Large decline | 2.2% (5) |
| Small decline | 24.1% (55) |
| Stay the same | 50.9% (116) |
| Small increase | 20.6% (47) |
| Large increase | 2.2% (5) |
| Don’t know | (20) |
| Refused | (0) |

Which of the above economic sectors best describes your firm’s primary economic activity (Intensity index score for own sector: +25.2)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Valid percent(*n*) |
| Construction | 13.8% (32) |
| Manufacturing | 2.2% (5) |
| Wholesale trade | 2.2% (5) |
| Retail trade | 13.4% (31) |
| Transportation/warehousing | 4.7% (11) |
| Finance/insurance/real estate | 15.9% (37) |
| Medical/health care | 8.2% (19) |
| Education/educational services | 7.3% (17) |
| Accommodations/food/entertainment/recreation | 6.9% (16) |
| Information and communication systems | 3.9% (9) |
| Business and professional support services | 10.3% (24) |
| Personal services | 7.3% (17) |
| Natural resources and mining | 1.3% (3) |
| Public administration | 2.6% (6) |
| Don’t know | (15) |
| Refused | (1) |

Section 3: Expectations for Your Business/Firm/Organization Sangamon County

Over the next 12 months, what are your expectations for your business/firm/ organization in Sangamon County? Do you think each aspect of the local economy will see a large decline, small decline, stay the same, small increase, or large increase?

Capital investment in firm (Intensity index score: +16.4)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Valid percent(*n*) |
| Large decline | 1.3% (3) |
| Small decline | 10.5% (25) |
| Stay the same | 49.2% (117) |
| Small increase | 32.4% (77) |
| Large increase | 6.7% (16) |
| Don’t know | (9) |
| Refused | (1) |

Total number of employees (Intensity index score: +15.6)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Valid percent(*n*) |
| Large decline | 0.4% (1) |
| Small decline | 8.9% (22) |
| Stay the same | 52.8% (130) |
| Small increase | 34.6% (85) |
| Large increase | 3.3% (8) |
| Don’t know | (2) |
| Refused | (0) |

Gross revenue/sales (Intensity index score: +36.8)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Valid percent(*n*) |
| Large decline | 2.1% (5) |
| Small decline | 7.1% (17) |
| Stay the same | 17.2% (41) |
| Small increase | 62.2% (148) |
| Large increase | 11.3% (27) |
| Don’t know | (9) |
| Refused | (1) |

Profitability (Intensity index score: +26.7)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Valid percent(*n*) |
| Large decline | 2.1% (5) |
| Small decline | 9.2% (22) |
| Stay the same | 30.4% (72) |
| Small increase | 50.0% (120) |
| Large increase | 8.3% (20) |
| Don’t know | (8) |
| Refused | (0) |

Overall status (Intensity index score: +32.6)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Valid percent(*n*) |
| Large decline | 1.3% (3) |
| Small decline | 3.8% (9) |
| Stay the same | 32.6% (78) |
| Small increase | 53.1% (127) |
| Large increase | 9.2% (22) |
| Don’t know | (9) |
| Refused | (0) |

Right now, as you look over the next 12 months, what are the three biggest challenges facing your business/firm/organization.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Number of responses |
| Government regulations and taxation | 98 |
| Competition from local/ state/ national firms | 86 |
| Availability of skilled/ trained workers | 78 |
| State government finances | 76 |
| Employee (union and nonunion) compensation and benefits (not healthcare) | 61 |
| Healthcare for employees (e.g., Affordable Care Act) | 60 |
| Consumer confidence/ spending | 57 |
| Energy prices | 32 |
| Commodity prices | 31 |
| Interest rates | 30 |
| Inflation | 24 |
| Global competition | 10 |
| Government regulations and taxation | 98 |
| Competition from local/ state/ national firms | 86 |
| Availability of skilled/ trained workers | 78 |

Others mentioned: charitable contributions, infrastructure, acquisition of compensation, exposure, funding, fundraising and marketing, governor’s budget, lack of grants and donors, construction, community involvement, money availability, liability insurance and regulations.

Section 4: Sangamon County Strengths and Weaknesses

*This section is the topical portion of the survey and changes during each survey administration.*

Thinking about businesses or organizations like yours, do you think the following are a big asset, small asset, neither an asset nor a liability, a small liability, or a big liability for doing business in Sangamon County?

Cost of/availability of land and expansion possibilities

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Valid percent(*n*) |
| Big asset | 13.0% (30) |
| Small asset | 20.4% (47) |
| Neither an asset nor liability | 46.1% (106) |
| Small liability | 13.5% (31) |
| Big liability | 7.0% (16) |
| Don’t know | (17) |
| Refused | (1) |

Access to/cost of communications networks

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Valid percent(*n*) |
| Big asset | 8.4% (20) |
| Small asset | 29.5% (70) |
| Neither an asset nor liability | 39.2% (93) |
| Small liability | 20.3% (48) |
| Big liability | 2.5% (6) |
| Don’t know | (10) |
| Refused | (1) |

Access/proximity to transportation systems (highway, rail, air)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Valid percent(*n*) |
| Big asset | 23.8% (57) |
| Small asset | 27.5% (66) |
| Neither an asset nor liability | 32.1% (77) |
| Small liability | 13.8% (33) |
| Big liability | 2.9% (7) |
| Don’t know | (7) |
| Refused | (1) |

Availability of workforce

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Valid percent(*n*) |
| Big asset | 14.6% (35) |
| Small asset | 30.0% (72) |
| Neither an asset nor liability | 19.6% (47) |
| Small liability | 23.3% (56) |
| Big liability | 12.5% (30) |
| Don’t know | (7) |
| Refused | (1) |

Quality of workforce

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Valid percent(*n*) |
| Big asset | 21.8% (53) |
| Small asset | 24.3% (59) |
| Neither an asset nor liability | 20.6% (50) |
| Small liability | 19.3% (47) |
| Big liability | 14.0% (34) |
| Don’t know | (4) |
| Refused | (1) |

Total state taxes on business

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Valid percent(*n*) |
| Big asset | 2.1% (5) |
| Small asset | 4.3% (10) |
| Neither an asset nor liability | 23.0% (54) |
| Small liability | 34.0% (80) |
| Big liability | 36.6% (86) |
| Don’t know | (1) |
| Refused | (2) |

Total local taxes on business

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Valid percent(*n*) |
| Big asset | 3.4% (8) |
| Small asset | 4.6% (11) |
| Neither an asset nor liability | 32.5% (77) |
| Small liability | 41.8% (99) |
| Big liability | 17.7% (42) |
| Don’t know | (10) |
| Refused | (1) |

Local zoning/permit and regulations

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Valid percent(*n*) |
| Big asset | 2.6% (6) |
| Small asset | 8.1% (19) |
| Neither an asset nor liability | 47.9% (112) |
| Small liability | 28.6% (67) |
| Big liability | 12.8% (30) |
| Don’t know | (12) |
| Refused | (2) |

State permits and regulations

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Valid percent(*n*) |
| Big asset | 1.7% (4) |
| Small asset | 9.4% (22) |
| Neither an asset nor liability | 34.9% (82) |
| Small liability | 35.7% (84) |
| Big liability | 18.3% (43) |
| Don’t know | (12) |
| Refused | (1) |

Local business climate and reputation

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Valid percent(*n*) |
| Big asset | 22.9% (55) |
| Small asset | 37.5% (90) |
| Neither an asset nor liability | 20.4% (49) |
| Small liability | 14.6% (35) |
| Big liability | 4.6% (11) |
| Don’t know | (7) |
| Refused | (1) |

State business climate and reputation

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Valid percent(*n*) |
| Big asset | 6.8% (16) |
| Small asset | 14.8% (35) |
| Neither an asset nor liability | 19.0% (45) |
| Small liability | 23.2% (55) |
| Big liability | 36.3% (86) |
| Don’t know | (10) |
| Refused | (1) |

Workers compensation process

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Valid percent(*n*) |
| Big asset | 2.1% (5) |
| Small asset | 3.8% (9) |
| Neither an asset nor liability | 34.3% (82) |
| Small liability | 31.4% (75) |
| Big liability | 28.5% (68) |
| Don’t know | (7) |
| Refused | (2) |

Local government incentives to business

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Valid percent(*n*) |
| Big asset | 6.4% (15) |
| Small asset | 23.0% (54) |
| Neither an asset nor liability | 46.4% (109) |
| Small liability | 18.3% (43) |
| Big liability | 6.0% (14) |
| Don’t know | (11) |
| Refused | (2) |

State government incentives to business

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Valid percent(*n*) |
| Big asset | 6.0% (14) |
| Small asset | 19.4% (45) |
| Neither an asset nor liability | 40.5% (94) |
| Small liability | 17.7% (41) |
| Big liability | 16.4% (38) |
| Don’t know | (14) |
| Refused | (2) |

Crime and public safety services

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Valid percent(*n*) |
| Big asset | 13.6% (33) |
| Small asset | 36.4% (88) |
| Neither an asset nor liability | 31.4% (76) |
| Small liability | 13.6% (33) |
| Big liability | 5.0% (12) |
| Don’t know | (5) |
| Refused | (1) |

Being located in the state capital

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Valid percent(*n*) |
| Big asset | 23.0% (56) |
| Small asset | 37.9% (92) |
| Neither an asset nor liability | 30.5% (74) |
| Small liability | 5.8% (14) |
| Big liability | 2.9% (7) |
| Don’t know | (4) |
| Refused | (1) |

Cost of living and housing

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Valid percent(*n*) |
| Big asset | 27.6% (67) |
| Small asset | 41.2% (100) |
| Neither an asset nor liability | 17.3% (42) |
| Small liability | 10.3% (25) |
| Big liability | 3.7% (9) |
| Don’t know | (4) |
| Refused | (1) |

Recreational, social, and cultural opportunities

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Valid percent(*n*) |
| Big asset | 13.1% (32) |
| Small asset | 43.9% (107) |
| Neither an asset nor liability | 24.6% (60) |
| Small liability | 13.9% (34) |
| Big liability | 4.5% (11) |
| Don’t know | (3) |
| Refused | (1) |

Health care facilities and quality

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Valid percent(*n*) |
| Big asset | 54.5% (134) |
| Small asset | 29.7% (73) |
| Neither an asset nor liability | 12.2% (30) |
| Small liability | 2.4% (6) |
| Big liability | 1.2% (3) |
| Don’t know | (1) |
| Refused | (1) |

Environment and climate

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Valid percent(*n*) |
| Big asset | 11.8% (29) |
| Small asset | 24.9% (61) |
| Neither an asset nor liability | 40.0% (98) |
| Small liability | 18.0% (44) |
| Big liability | 5.3% (13) |
| Don’t know | (2) |
| Refused | (1) |

K-12 education system

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Valid percent(*n*) |
| Big asset | 15.4% (36) |
| Small asset | 28.6% (67) |
| Neither an asset nor liability | 33.8% (79) |
| Small liability | 17.9% (42) |
| Big liability | 4.3% (10) |
| Don’t know | (12) |
| Refused | (2) |

Proximity to colleges/universities/technical schools

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Valid percent(*n*) |
| Big asset | 29.0% (71) |
| Small asset | 47.3% (116) |
| Neither an asset nor liability | 17.6% (43) |
| Small liability | 5.3% (13) |
| Big liability | 0.8% (2) |
| Don’t know | (2) |
| Refused | (1) |

Utilities- access to/cost of (electricity, natural gas, water supply, waste disposal)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Valid percent(*n*) |
| Big asset | 11.5% (28) |
| Small asset | 36.9% (90) |
| Neither an asset nor liability | 25.0% (61) |
| Small liability | 18.0% (44) |
| Big liability | 8.6% (21) |
| Don’t know | (3) |
| Refused | (1) |

*For this next set of questions we are interested in learning more about overall perceptions of your firm’s sector.*

Thinking about the country in general, how difficult, if at all, would you say that it is for new firms/organizations to enter your industrial sector? Would you say it is…

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Valid percent(*n*) |
| Very difficult | 27.1% (65) |
| Somewhat difficult | 42.5% (102) |
| Not very difficult | 17.1% (41) |
| Not difficult at all | 13.3% (32) |
| Don’t know | (8) |
| Refused | (0) |

And thinking about Sangamon County specifically, how difficult, if at all, would you say that it is for new firms/organizations to enter your industrial sector? Would you say it is…

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Valid percent(*n*) |
| Very difficult | 24.9% (59) |
| Somewhat difficult | 41.8% (99) |
| Not very difficult | 21.9% (52) |
| Not difficult at all | 11.4% (27) |
| Don’t know | (11) |
| Refused | (0) |

Now thinking about the products or service that you provide. How difficult, if at all, would you say that it is for your product or service to be substituted by a competitor’s product or service in Sangamon County?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Valid percent(*n*) |
| Very difficult | 20.2% (49) |
| Somewhat difficult | 35.4% (86) |
| Not very difficult | 25.9% (63) |
| Not difficult at all | 18.5% (45) |
| Don’t know | (5) |
| Refused | (0) |

And how difficult, if at all, is it for Sangamon County customers to affect the price of your product or service? (For instance by shopping elsewhere).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Valid percent(*n*) |
| Very difficult | 18.9% (43) |
| Somewhat difficult | 27.8% (63) |
| Not very difficult | 26.4% (60) |
| Not difficult at all | 26.9% (61) |
| Don’t know | (18) |
| Refused | (3) |

How difficult, if at all, is it for your firm or other firms like yours in Sangamon County to obtain supplies? (For instance raw materials, components, labor, and services.)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Valid percent(*n*) |
| Very difficult | 2.5% (6) |
| Somewhat difficult | 11.9% (29) |
| Not very difficult | 32.1% (78) |
| Not difficult at all | 53.5% (130) |
| Don’t know | (4) |
| Refused | (1) |

Thinking about the rivalry or competitiveness of firms within your industrial sector, how competitive, if at all, is your sector in general? (For instance, pricing strategies, marketing, advertising campaigns). Is it…

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Valid percent(*n*) |
| Very competitive | 12.9% (28) |
| Somewhat competitive | 41.9% (90) |
| Not very competitive | 22.0% (61) |
| Not competitive at all | 23.2% (44) |
| Don’t know | (7) |
| Refused | (0) |

In this next section we are interested in learning about your views on workers’ compensation in Illinois.

First, would you say that Illinois workers’ compensation requirements are:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Valid percent(*n*) |
| Unfair to businesses and organizations | 52.6% (120) |
| Fair to businesses and organizations | 20.6% (47) |
| Neither fair nor unfair | 26.8% (61) |
| Don’t know | (19) |
| Refused | (1) |

Now thinking specifically about your firm or organization, is complying with Illinois workers’ compensation requirements:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Valid percent(*n*) |
| A significant burden | 17.8% (42) |
| Somewhat of a burden | 36.0% (85) |
| Not much of a burden | 22.0% (52) |
| Not a burden at all | 24.2% (57) |
| Don’t know | (11) |
| Refused | (1) |

In the past twelve months, have you seen your premiums go up, go down, or have they largely stayed the same?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Valid percent(*n*) |
| Premiums have gone up | 44.0% (96) |
| Premiums have gone down | 2.8% (6) |
| Premiums have largely stayed the same | 53.2% (116) |
| Don’t know | (29) |
| Refused | (1) |

How about since early 2012, have you seen your premiums go up, go down, or have they largely stayed the same?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Valid percent(*n*) |
| Premiums have gone up | 60.2% (124) |
| Premiums have gone down | 4.9% (10) |
| Premiums have largely stayed the same | 35.0% (72) |
| Don’t know | (39) |
| Refused | (3) |

When thinking about Illinois workers’ compensation insurance, how much of a concern, if, at all, are each of the following items…

Overall cost of the insurance?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Valid percent(*n*) |
| A significant concern | 41.1% (102) |
| Somewhat of a concern | 32.3% (80) |
| Not much of a concern | 11.7% (29) |
| Not a concern at all | 9.7% (24) |
| Don’t know | (11) |
| Refused | (2) |

Working with insurance companies?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Valid percent(*n*) |
| A significant concern | 17.6% (41) |
| Somewhat of a concern | 29.2% (68) |
| Not much of a concern | 25.3% (59) |
| Not a concern at all | 27.9% (65) |
| Don’t know | (12) |
| Refused | (3) |

Working with employees through the settlement dispute process?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Valid percent(*n*) |
| A significant concern | 22.2% (45) |
| Somewhat of a concern | 26.1% (53) |
| Not much of a concern | 17.2% (35) |
| Not a concern at all | 34.5% (70) |
| Don’t know | (42) |
| Refused | (3) |

Working with Illinois Workers’ Compensation Commission?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Valid percent(*n*) |
| A significant concern | 16.3% (30) |
| Somewhat of a concern | 31.5% (58) |
| Not much of a concern | 17.4% (32) |
| Not a concern at all | 34.8% (64) |
| Don’t know | (61) |
| Refused | (3) |

Thinking about the county overall, if you were to place Illinois on a scale of 1 to 50, with 1 representing the state with the lowest average workers’ compensation premiums and 50 representing the state with the highest average workers’ compensation premiums, where would you place Illinois?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Number of responses |
| 1 (State with the lowest average premiums) | 0 |
| 2-10 | 8 |
| 11-20 | 8 |
| 21-30 | 32 |
| 31-40 | 54 |
| 41-49 | 52 |
| 50 (State with the highest average premiums) | 14 |
| Average response | 37th |
| Don’t know | 81 |
| Refused | 2 |

In the past twelve months, has your firm or organization had any workers’ compensation claims filed?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Valid percent(*n*) |
| Yes | 28.3% (65) |
| No | 71.7% (165) |
| Don’t know | (15) |
| Refused | (3) |

Thinking about your firm or organization, if you had a workplace injury case how likely, if at all, would your firm or organization be to accommodate the worker with, for example, restricted work or being reassigned to a job that accommodates the injury?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Valid percent(*n*) |
| Very likely | 66.0% (157) |
| Somewhat likely | 20.6% (49) |
| Not very likely | 7.6% (18) |
| Not likely at all | 5.9% (14) |
| Don’t know | (8) |
| Refused | (2) |

Would you say that the current workers’ compensation system in Illinois is:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Valid percent(*n*) |
| Preventing your firm or organization from hiring | 6.8% (16) |
| Not preventing your firm or organization from hiring | 45.7% (107) |
| Not currently looking to hire new employees | 47.4% (111) |
| Don’t know | (12) |
| Refused | (2) |

*Section 5:* Demographic Information

*This last section is used for analysis purposes only and is not intended to identify respondents.*

Are you in the private sector, non-profit sector, or public sector?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Valid percent(*n*) |
| Private sector (for profit) | 69.8% (172) |
| Non-profit sector | 17.0% (42) |
| Public sector (government) | 13.4% (33) |
| Don’t know | (1) |
| Refused | (0) |

How many years has your organization been operating in your current location:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Valid percent(*n*) |
| 2 years or less | 17.8% (43) |
| 3-5 years | 12.4% (30) |
| 6-10 years | 14.1% (34) |
| 11-20 years | 22.4% (54) |
| 21-30 years | 11.2% (27) |
| 31-40 years | 7.1% (17) |
| 41- 50 years | 2.5% (6) |
| More than 50 years | 12.4% (30) |

How many years has your organization been operating in Sangamon County:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Valid percent(*n*) |
| 2 years or less | 10.7% (26) |
| 3-5 years | 6.6% (16) |
| 6-10 years | 8.2% (16) |
| 11-20 years | 23.9% (58) |
| 21-30 years | 17.7% (43) |
| 31-40 years | 10.3% (25) |
| 41- 50 years | 3.7% (9) |
| More than 50 years | 18.9% (46) |

How many years has your organization been operating in Illinois:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Valid percent(*n*) |
| 2 years or less | 8.3% (20) |
| 3-5 years | 3.3% (8) |
| 6-10 years | 9.1% (22) |
| 11-20 years | 23.6% (57) |
| 21-30 years | 17.4% (42) |
| 31-40 years | 10.7% (26) |
| 41- 50 years | 3.7%(9) |
| More than 50 years | 24.0% (58) |

Number of total full-time employees:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Valid percent(*n*) |
| Less than 5 | 33.3% (82) |
| 5-14 employees | 30.5% (75) |
| 15-29 employees | 11.0% (27) |
| 30-44 employees | 6.9% (17) |
| 45-59 employees | 4.1% (10) |
| 60-79 employees | 2.0% (5) |
| 80-99 employees | 2.0% (5) |
| 100-149 employees | 2.0% (5) |
| 150-299 employees | 4.5% (11) |
| 300 or more employees | 3.7% (9) |
| Don’t know | (0) |
| Refused | (2) |

Is there anything else you would like to tell us about your economic outlook for the next 12 months?

|  |
| --- |
|  |
| Looking for a very bright outlook |
| Being somewhat optimistic and hoping for better. Hoping to be better than we were. |
| Cautiously optimistic getting better. |
| Everything looks pretty good in Sangamon County. |
| First part of year for our business on the sale side indicates how the season. |
| Gas prices are going to spur a lot of individual activity. |
| Getting tougher |
| He wants all the luck and hopefully things work in the companies favor. |
| High looking forward to a good year |
| Hope I’m wrong on the interest rates question |
| Hope it’s rosy! |
| Hope to see a job increase especially amongst minorities |
| I am looking forward to increase in business. Revenue and profit will increase. |
| I am optimistic. |
| I don’t think so. |
| I hope things change |
| I think our outlook depends upon on state budget. |
| I would like Gov. Rauner to take care of the childcare budgeting |
| I’m actually optimistic we are coming out of the recession |
| I’m gonna just hang in like everyone else |
| If Rauner doesn’t turn it around you’re going to have to leave the state to find jobs |
| Illinois needs to get their finances in shape and encourage more corporate and… |
| I’m hopeful |
| Important to have a mayor and council that are pro-businesses and helping businesses |
| Industry isn’t growing very much but he is growing because he is outpacing and do… |
| It’s very unclear which cause great deal of conservatism. |
| Just looking positively into the future to continue to grow. |
| Look forward to having a Palazzolo administration and finally some economic devlopment |
| Looking forward a bit little economic growth. |
| Many of the Don’t Know answers were actually Non-applicable as we are a government |
| Money is ever certain |
| My business should increase |
| Need to continue to provide a service for district 186 |
| No |
| No |
| No |
| No everything is fine |
| No- that would be it! |
| No |
| No |
| No. pretty optimistic. |
| No. There are a lot of federal problems but there is nothing that I can say to… |
| Nope |
| Nope have to go |
| Nope I think that’s it. |
| Nope. |
| Not much |
| Not really |
| Nothing |
| Nothing additional |
| Nothing much |
| Optimistic |
| Optimistic |
| Positive |
| Positive for next 12 months. |
| Sangamon County real estate taxes are too high. |
| She does not think it will be better |
| State needs to revamp the workers compensation and health care like Medicare |
| The ag economy will be down for the next couple of years |
| The cuts the governor is making for low income people will not help the current |
| The industry they are in, she believes will grow considerably over the next 12 months. |
| The interesting part not reflective in questions asked. Our services tend to be |
| The rise in minimum wages |
| The state fiscal problem are a concern |
| The way the government is ran is disgraceful |
| They anticipate the changes with the affordable care act are going |
| Thinks interest rates will go up incrementally; |
| Upcoming remodeling projects will take out 15 rooms at a time. |
| Very bleak- we are actually looking at opportunities in other states |
| Waiting list… thinks they are looking good for them. |
| We are very optimistic- there’s no substitute for hard work! |
| We’re hoping it increases |
| Wish I would know about the funding cuts and to budget as of yet. |
| Wish they would have one on one with state of Texas and Alaska. |
| With the new Governor in place, how is he going to revitalize the economy? |
| Workman’s Compensations needs to get under control! |
| You can’t regulate everything. Government is trying to regulate everything. |

1. The only exception being September 2011. It is important to note that the methodology for the survey has changed slightly over the past seven years. More information on this is available in the Transparency Initiative Methodological Report. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. In 2015, the UIS Survey Research Office (SRO) became a charter member of the American Association for Public Opinions Research’s Transparency Initiative (TI). By joining the TI, the SRO is supporting broader and more effective disclosure of research methods by all organizations. The Transparency Initiative provides formal public recognition by AAPOR of an organization's voluntary commitment to abide by the disclosure standards in the AAPOR Code of Professional Ethics and Practices, while benefiting the public by providing more information with which to evaluate the quality of individual surveys. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. The study was published in October 2014 and is available at the following link: http://www.cbs.state.or.us/external/dir/wc\_cost/files/report\_summary.pdf [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. These changes are not necessarily due to the reform and could be correlated to a variety of market and economic variables. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. It is important to note that a decrease in expectations pertaining to inflation is not necessarily a negative change. Expectations for inflation are still up, but they are not as high as they were in Fall 2014. According to the Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis, a stable inflation rate is the most positive expectation so any change, positive or negative, could be seen as a challenge to financial stability. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. The Sangamon County Economic Outlook Survey has included “healthcare for employees, Affordable Care Act” as a pre-identified challenge since Spring 2014. In both surveys, it is one of the biggest challenges list for Sangamon County employers. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. It is important to note that fewer non-profit and public sector employers participate in the survey. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. For more information, see Porter, M.E. (1986). *Competition in Global Industries*. Harvard Business Press: Cambridge, MA. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. It is important to note that while the differences are interesting, due to small sample sizes within each sector, the differences are not statistically meaningful. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)