

Parks & Recreation and Cultural Programs

A series of 8 questions in the survey specifically examined Parks & Recreation and Cultural programs. Initially, the respondents were asked if they had participated in the Parks & Recreation programs. They were also asked to name which program(s) they were involved/location and to rate various aspects of the program including *instructor quality*, *ease of registration*, *program quality*, *overall experience*, *facility quality*, and *cost or fee*. The same 9-point grading scale was utilized.

The results showed that approximately 32.8% or 133 of the respondents (26.7% in 2006) indicated someone in their household had participated in a Parks & Recreation or Cultural Program in the past two years. This represents a relatively large increase in the level of participation. The programs they participated in and locations are illustrated in Appendix E. The most commonly mentioned were baseball, Lazy Days, basketball, classes, senior citizen activities, recreation programs, concerts, and tennis. Tables 26-31 (placed in descending order of rating) specifically examined the service dimensions related to the Parks & Recreation and Cultural programs. This year, the dimensions received continued high ratings with a degree of improvement. All the dimensions earned a grade of A- with the means for 4 of the 6 service dimension increasing this year. The means for *facility quality* and *cost or fee* decreased slightly while the grades remained unchanged. However, there was one grade improvement this year and it was for *program quality* which rose from a B+ to A-. Overall, Parks & Recreation earned high marks that have shown a degree of improvement over the past two years.

Table 26. Parks & Recreation: Instructor Quality.

| Year | Mean | Very Poor 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | Excellent 9 | Grade |
|------|------|----------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|------|----------------|-------|
| 08 | 8.31 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.9 | 0.0 | 0.9 | 0.9 | 15.0 | 21.5 | 59.8 | A- |
| 06 | 8.22 | 1.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.1 | 2.1 | 12.8 | 28.7 | 53.2 | A- |
| 04 | 8.21 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 2.7 | 1.8 | 14.3 | 22.3 | 57.1 | A- |

Table 27. Parks & Recreation: Ease of Registration.

| Year | Mean | Very Poor 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | Excellent 9 | Grade |
|------|------|----------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|------|----------------|-------|
| 08 | 8.26 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.7 | 0.0 | 1.8 | 2.7 | 11.8 | 19.1 | 61.8 | A- |
| 06 | 8.20 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 2.0 | 5.1 | 10.2 | 30.6 | 51.0 | A- |
| 04 | 8.32 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 2.5 | 3.3 | 7.5 | 21.7 | 63.3 | A- |

Table 28. Parks & Recreation: Program Quality.

| Year | Mean | Very Poor 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | Excellent 9 | Grade |
|-----------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------|-------------|----------------|-----------|
| 08 | 8.23 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 2.4 | 1.6 | 15.2 | 27.2 | 52.8 | A- |
| 06 | 8.03 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 3.8 | 3.8 | 17.1 | 31.4 | 42.9 | B+ |
| 04 | 8.36 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 2.9 | 10.7 | 27.9 | 57.1 | A- |
| 02 | 8.01 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.3 | 4.5 | 3.9 | 15.6 | 31.2 | 43.5 | B+ |
| 00 | 7.97 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.4 | 6.2 | 15.9 | 35.4 | 38.1 | B+ |
| 98 | 7.85 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 5.8 | 22.6 | 37.2 | 32.1 | B+ |

Table 29. Parks & Recreation: Overall Experience.

| Year | Mean | Very Poor 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | Excellent 9 | Grade |
|-----------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------|-------------|----------------|-----------|
| 08 | 8.21 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 1.6 | 3.2 | 13.5 | 31.0 | 50.0 | A- |
| 06 | 8.14 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.9 | 6.6 | 14.2 | 34.0 | 44.3 | A- |
| 04 | 8.30 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 2.8 | 12.5 | 29.2 | 54.2 | A- |
| 02 | 8.11 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 3.9 | 1.3 | 13.7 | 32.7 | 46.4 | A- |
| 00 | 8.11 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.3 | 2.6 | 13.2 | 33.3 | 45.6 | A- |
| 98 | 7.88 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 5.8 | 22.6 | 37.2 | 32.1 | B+ |

Table 30. Parks & Recreation: Facility Quality.

| Year | Mean | Very Poor 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | Excellent 9 | Grade |
|-----------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------|-------------|----------------|-----------|
| 08 | 8.11 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 0.8 | 3.8 | 0.8 | 15.4 | 27.7 | 50.0 | A- |
| 06 | 8.18 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 1.9 | 4.7 | 13.1 | 29.0 | 50.5 | A- |
| 04 | 8.30 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.5 | 4.9 | 7.7 | 20.4 | 62.7 | A- |
| 02 | 8.06 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 4.6 | 3.3 | 17.1 | 28.3 | 46.1 | A- |
| 00 | 7.59 | 0.0 | 1.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.3 | 9.7 | 24.8 | 28.3 | 30.1 | B |
| 98 | 7.72 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 2.2 | 7.4 | 27.2 | 28.7 | 32.4 | B |

Table 31. Parks & Recreation: Cost or Amount of Fee.

| Year | Mean | Very Poor 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | Excellent 9 | Grade |
|-----------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------|-------------|----------------|-----------|
| 08 | 8.09 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 4.2 | 5.1 | 16.1 | 21.2 | 52.5 | A- |
| 06 | 8.12 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 5.1 | 15.3 | 26.5 | 50.0 | A- |

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|------|------|----|
| 04 | 8.10 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 4.0 | 8.0 | 10.4 | 19.2 | 56.8 | A- |
| 02 | 7.99 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 9.7 | 2.1 | 17.9 | 20.7 | 49.7 | B+ |
| 00 | 8.01 | 0.0 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.7 | 6.6 | 10.4 | 33.0 | 44.3 | B+ |
| 98 | 7.67 | 4.4 | 1.5 | 2.2 | 0.7 | 2.2 | 3.7 | 14.8 | 20.7 | 49.6 | B |

The respondents were additionally asked how many school-age children would participate at least once a year in a Parks & Recreation or cultural program specifically designed for year-round school students during the track-out periods (Table 32). Approximately 83% of the respondents did not have any children who would participate in such programs. However, 8.5% had one child and 8.5% had 2 children who would participate. The results indicate a relatively large number of potential children for the program. Assuming there are 43,000 households in Cary (2006 American Community Survey), the potential number of children for the program would be approximately 11,000.

Table 32. Number of School-Age Children Likely to Participate in Parks, Recreation, or Cultural Program Designed for Year-Round Students During Track-Out Periods.

| Year | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 or more |
|------|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----------|
| 08 | 83.1 | 8.5 | 8.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

The survey also included a question to assess the number of people in the household of any age who would benefit from recreation services that accommodate individuals with such disabilities (Table 33). The results show 95.0% of the respondents did not have anyone in the home who would benefit from such services. There were 4.2% with one person, 0.5% with 2 people, and 0.2% with 3 people in the household. This extrapolates to approximately 2,500 disabled individuals who would benefit from the program.

Table 33. Number of People in the Home of Any Age Who Would Benefit from Recreation Services that Accommodate People with Disabilities.

| Year | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 or more |
|------|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----------|
| 08 | 95.0 | 4.2 | 0.5 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

Parks & Recreation Crosstabulations

The crosstabulations (age, education, gender, housing type, income, internet access,

language, race) for participation in Parks & Recreation programs are shown in Tables B175-B182. The highest levels of participation (in order) were for those with a college degree (37.9%), over \$100,000 income level (37.4%), \$70,001-\$100,000 income level (36.0%), 26-55 age group (35.9%), and single family housing (35.6%). The lowest levels of participation were by those without internet access (12.5%), \$20,001-\$30,000 income level (15.4%), apartment dwellers (16.1%), and 18-25 age group (18.5%).

The crosstabulations for the Parks & Recreation service dimensions are shown in Tables B183-B230. The grades for *instructor quality*, *ease of registration*, *facility quality*, *overall experience*, *cost or fee*, and *program quality* were generally high and consistent throughout the subgroupings. The few lower marks came from the subgroups with very small sample sizes. The crosstabulations for the number of school age children likely to participate in parks & recreation programs for year-round students during track-out periods are shown in Tables B231-B235. There were no subgroups (other than low sample size ones) with inordinately higher percentages if judged by combining the percentages for 1 and 2 children categories (the overall sample mean for these combined categories was 17.0%). The highest percentages of participants would be from the 26-55 age group (17.8%) while the lowest percentages would be from the \$50,001-\$70,000 income level (9.1%). Finally, the crosstabulations for number of people in the home who would benefit from recreation services that accommodate people with disabilities are shown in Tables B236-B240. In this case, the combined percentage for 1, 2, and 3 people categories for the entire sample was 4.9%. The subgroups with highest percentages of participants (excluding low sample size subgroups) would be from \$20,001-30,000 income level (23.1%), 56-65 age group (13.7%), those without internet access (12.5%), townhouse/condo dwellers (11.5%), and those without a college degree (9.0%). While the lowest percentages of participants would be from \$50,001-\$70,000 income level (2.7%) and over \$100,000 income level (2.9%).