

# TOWN of CARY

> Home > Departments > Town Manager's Office > Public Information > Surveys and Research > 2006 Biennial Survey > Town Government

## Town Government

### Town Government

The performance of the Town Government staff was assessed with a set of five items or questions. These questions were only administered to those respondents who had contact with the Town Government in the past two years. Approximately 25% (25% in 2004) or 103 respondents indicated they had contact within that time frame. A nine-point scale from "very poor" (1) to "excellent" (9) was used to measure performance.

The results of the 1998, 2000, 2002, and 2004 Cary Biennial Surveys will be included in tables throughout the report when applicable. The 2006 Biennial Survey covered more topics and was inclusive of more questions. For that reason, tables with no comparisons represent the new items to the survey and will be labeled as 06 in the table. The incorporation of the previous survey facilitates comparisons between survey periods to examine trends.

The results shown in Tables 3-7 indicated continued positive ratings for the Town Government staff. However, this year four of the service dimension means and grades decreased while only one increased. The tables are placed in descending order of ratings. Note that the grades decreased slightly for *courteous* (A- to B), *professionalism* (A- to B), *knowledgeable* (B+ to B), and *promptness of response* (B+ to B-), while the grade for *ability to resolve issues* increased from a C+ to a B-. These service dimensions can represent a difficult area to receive higher marks since it can be a challenge for the Town Government staff to resolve all issues to the satisfaction of every citizen. Overall, the Town Government staff continued to receive good marks from the citizens. However, there should be some degree of concern that 4 of the means and related grades decreased this year with only one service dimension showing improvement of the 5 dimensions measured.

Table 3. Town Government Staff: Courteous.

Year	Mean	Very Poor	2	3	4	Average	6	7	8	Excellent	Grade
		1				5				9	
06	7.77	2.9	0.0	0.0	1.0	5.9	4.9	14.7	27.5	43.1	B
04	8.33	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	5.1	5.1	25.3	61.6	A-
02	7.81	3.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	6.9	1.0	8.9	35.6	43.6	B+
00	7.98	1.2	2.3	1.2	1.2	3.5	3.5	8.1	23.3	55.8	B+
98	7.63	2.4	0.8	0.0	2.4	4.0	1.6	19.8	39.7	29.4	B

Table 4. Town Government Staff: Professionalism.

Year	Mean	Very Poor	2	3	4	Average	6	7	8	Excellent	Grade
		1				5				9	
06	7.57	2.0	1.0	1.0	2.0	6.9	3.9	22.5	20.6	40.2	B
04	8.10	2.0	1.0	0.0	1.0	5.0	1.0	9.0	21.0	60.0	A-

02	7.55	3.0	1.0	0.0	1.0	7.9	3.0	17.8	32.7	33.7	B
00	7.73	1.2	2.3	1.2	0.0	3.5	7.0	19.8	19.8	45.3	B
98	7.32	3.2	1.6	3.2	0.8	4.0	2.4	27.0	31.7	26.2	B-

Table 5. Town Government Staff: Knowledgeable.

Year	Mean	Very Poor	2	3	4	Average	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
		1				5					
06	7.54	2.9	1.0	2.0	0.0	7.8	3.9	18.6	23.5	40.2	B
04	7.95	2.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	4.1	4.1	15.3	22.4	51.0	B+
02	7.44	4.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	10.1	2.0	17.2	27.3	36.4	B-
00	7.70	2.4	1.2	1.2	2.4	2.4	2.4	21.2	24.7	42.4	B
98	7.30	1.6	2.4	1.6	1.6	6.3	9.4	20.5	29.1	27.6	B-

Table 6. Town Government Staff: Promptness of Response.

Year	Mean	Very Poor	2	3	4	Average	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
		1				5					
06	7.27	2.9	2.0	2.0	2.0	9.8	3.9	19.6	24.5	33.3	B-
04	7.79	2.1	1.0	2.1	2.1	7.2	3.1	5.2	25.8	51.5	B+
02	7.32	4.9	1.0	0.0	1.0	8.8	1.0	21.6	35.3	26.5	B-
00	7.45	3.6	3.6	1.2	0.0	3.6	6.0	18.1	25.3	38.6	B-
98	7.26	4.8	0.0	0.8	1.6	4.0	8.0	24.0	35.2	21.6	B-

Table 7. Town Government Staff: Ability to Resolve Issues.

Year	Mean	Very Poor	2	3	4	Average	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
		1				5					
06	7.27	5.4	1.1	1.1	0.0	11.8	5.4	16.1	20.4	38.7	B-
04	7.15	9.4	2.1	2.1	2.1	8.3	2.1	8.3	16.7	49.0	C+
02	7.06	8.3	0.0	1.0	2.1	8.3	5.2	16.7	28.1	30.2	C+
00	7.12	5.1	5.1	1.3	1.3	3.8	6.4	23.1	16.7	37.2	C+
98	6.77	8.2	0.0	3.3	4.1	6.6	4.1	28.7	21.3	23.8	C

## Town Government Crosstabulations

The crosstabulations (Appendix B) were conducted on various demographic and classification variables. The crosstabulations for contact with the Town Government are shown in Tables B1-B9. The groups with the higher levels of contact were 56-65 year olds (38.1%), those with college education (26.1%), males (30.3%), and single family households (30.2%). The upper income levels exhibited more contact including \$50,001-\$70,000 (27.5%), \$70,001-\$100,000 (23.6%), and over \$100,000 (33.3%). Respondents with internet access had significantly higher levels of contact with the Town Government compared to those without access (26.8% versus 4.3%). Caucasians (26.3%) and Asians (33.3%) were the races that demonstrated the higher levels of contact with the Town Government. Those with over 10 years in Cary had the highest levels of contact (29.1%). Finally, the zip codes all had similar levels of contact with the highest in 27519 (27.0%) and the lowest in 27560 (20.0%), but the sample size was very small at 5.

The crosstabulations for the service dimension of *courteous* are shown in Tables B10-B18. They were conducted on age, education, gender, housing type, income, internet access, race, years in Cary, and zip code for the Town Government. There were a few lower grades such as the mark from the over 65 age group (C-). However, the sample size was only 6 and precludes any valid discussion due to the limited sample size. It is important to remember the sample sizes for these crosstabulations can be restricted due to the fact only respondents who had actual contact with the Town were asked to rate the service dimensions. This is a problem with crosstabulations based on a subset within a larger breakdown. This further compounds the generalizability issue inherent in crosstabulations. Another issue with small samples is that the poor marks from only 1 or 2 individuals who have had a negative experience with the Town can dramatically pull down the overall grade for the service dimension (or vice versa). When examining these dimension grades, be cognizant of the fact that the sample sizes are generally limited for many of the groupings. For that reason, only crosstabulations with a minimum sample size of 10 or above will be shown in this report and then for exploratory purposes only.

The crosstabulations for *professionalism* and *knowledgeable* are shown in Tables B19-B27 and B28-B36, respectively. Note that all of the lower grades for these dimensions were in very small sample groups. However, several of the grades for the crosstabulations for *promptness of response* represent an area of concern. The lower marks were more numerous for this dimension among the demographic variables (Tables B37-B45). These include the 56-65 age group (C+), those with college degrees (C+), and single family households (C+). In addition, the grades from the \$50,001-\$70,000 income level (C+), over \$100,000 income level (C+), 6-10 years residents (C), and 27513 zip code (C+) were also lower. Another area of concern were four of the grades given for the *ability to resolve issues* dimension (Tables B46-B54). This dimension garnered low marks from those with college degrees (C+), females (C+), 6-10 year residents (C), and 27513 zip code (C+).

