Understanding the Results

Inside this report are graphs that present the combined survey results for the National Park System. The report contains three categories of data—park facilities, visitor services, and recreational opportunities. Within these categories are graphs for each indicator evaluated by park visitors. For example, the park facilities category includes indicators such as visitor center, exhibits, restrooms, and so forth. In addition, responses for indicators within each category are averaged into a combined graph for the category (e.g., combined park facilities).

Each graph includes the following information:
- the number of parks and visitor responses for the indicator;
- FY01 data (black) and baseline data (gray);
- the percentage of responses which were "very good," "good," "average," "poor," and "very poor;"
- a satisfaction measure that combines the percentage of total responses which were "very good" or "good;" and
- an average evaluation score (mean score) based on the following values: very poor = 1, poor = 2, average = 3, good = 4, very good = 5.

The higher the average evaluation score, the more positive the visitor response.

FY01 GPRA Reporting Measure for Goal IIa1

Percentage of park visitors satisfied overall with appropriate facilities, services, and recreational opportunities:

95%
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National Park System
Park Facilities

Visitor center
FY01: 303 parks; 26007 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Very poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY01</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline (FY98-00)</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proportion of respondents
FY01: Satisfaction measure: 93%
Average evaluation score: 4.6

Exhibits
FY01: 303 parks; 26300 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Very poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY01</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline (FY98-00)</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proportion of respondents
FY01: Satisfaction measure: 90%
Average evaluation score: 4.5

Restrooms
FY01: 303 parks; 24175 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Very poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY01</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline (FY98-00)</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proportion of respondents
FY01: Satisfaction measure: 82%
Average evaluation score: 4.3

Walkways, trails, and roads
FY01: 303 parks; 26252 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Very poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY01</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline (FY98-00)</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proportion of respondents
FY01: Satisfaction measure: 91%
Average evaluation score: 4.5

Campgrounds and/or picnic areas
FY01: 303 parks; 12187 respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Very poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY01</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline (FY98-00)</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proportion of respondents
FY01: Satisfaction measure: 85%
Average evaluation score: 4.3

Combined park facilities
FY01: 26300 responses (based on 5 indicators)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Very poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY01</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline (FY98-00)</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proportion of respondents
FY01: Satisfaction measure: 89%
Average evaluation score: 4.4
National Park System
Visitor Services

Assistance from park employees
FY01: 303 parks; 26893 respondents

- Very good: 77% (FY01) vs. 78% (Baseline)
- Good: 19% (FY01) vs. 18% (Baseline)
- Average: 3% (FY01) vs. 3% (Baseline)
- Poor: 1% (FY01) vs. 1% (Baseline)
- Very poor: 0% (FY01) vs. 0% (Baseline)

FY01: Satisfaction measure: 96%
Average evaluation score: 4.7

Park map or brochure
FY01: 303 parks; 25170 respondents

- Very good: 65% (FY01) vs. 65% (Baseline)
- Good: 28% (FY01) vs. 27% (Baseline)
- Average: 6% (FY01) vs. 6% (Baseline)
- Poor: 1% (FY01) vs. 1% (Baseline)
- Very poor: 0% (FY01) vs. 0% (Baseline)

FY01: Satisfaction measure: 93%
Average evaluation score: 4.6

Ranger programs
FY01: 303 parks; 14249 respondents

- Very good: 68% (FY01) vs. 69% (Baseline)
- Good: 25% (FY01) vs. 24% (Baseline)
- Average: 6% (FY01) vs. 6% (Baseline)
- Poor: 1% (FY01) vs. 1% (Baseline)
- Very poor: 0% (FY01) vs. 0% (Baseline)

FY01: Satisfaction measure: 93%
Average evaluation score: 4.6

Commercial services in the park
FY01: 303 parks; 13183 respondents

- Very good: 38% (FY01) vs. 37% (Baseline)
- Good: 34% (FY01) vs. 35% (Baseline)
- Average: 21% (FY01) vs. 21% (Baseline)
- Poor: 5% (FY01) vs. 5% (Baseline)
- Very poor: 2% (FY01) vs. 2% (Baseline)

FY01: Satisfaction measure: 72%
Average evaluation score: 4.6

Combined visitor services
FY01: 26893 responses (based on 4 indicators)

- Very good: 65% (FY01) vs. 66% (Baseline)
- Good: 25% (FY01) vs. 25% (Baseline)
- Average: 8% (FY01) vs. 7% (Baseline)
- Poor: 2% (FY01) vs. 2% (Baseline)
- Very poor: 1% (FY01) vs. 1% (Baseline)

FY01: Satisfaction measure: 90%
Average evaluation score: 4.5
Survey cards were distributed to a random sample of visitors in 327 units in the National Park System during the period February 1- August 31, 2001. At each park, visitors were sampled at selected locations representative of the general visitor population.

Returned cards were electronically scanned and the data analyzed. Responses from individual parks in the National Park System were combined into one dataset. Data from parks with less than 30 returned cards, or from parks with discrepancies in data collection methods, were omitted from this report. Frequency distributions were calculated for each indicator and category.

All percentage calculations were rounded to the nearest percent. Therefore, individual percentages in each graph may not add to 100 percent. The response rate was calculated by dividing the total number of returned survey cards by the total number of survey cards distributed. The sample size (“N”) varies from figure to figure, depending on the number of responses.

The results do not necessarily apply to visitors during other times of the year, to park visitors who did not visit the survey locations, or to park units in the National Park System that did not participate in the survey.

For more information about the VSC, contact Jennifer Hoger, VSC Project Coordinator at the University of Idaho Cooperative Park Studies Unit (208) 885-4806