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;
- FY02 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.

FY02 GPRA Reporting Measure for Goal IIa1

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

95%
National Park System
Park Facilities

**Visitor Center**
FY02: 307 parks; 26532 respondents

- **Rating**
  - Very good: 67%
  - Good: 27%
  - Average: 6%
  - Poor: 1%
  - Very poor: 0%

FY02: Satisfaction measure: 93%
Average evaluation score: 4.6

---

**Restrooms**
FY02: 307 parks; 24473 respondents

- **Rating**
  - Very good: 48%
  - Good: 32%
  - Average: 14%
  - Poor: 4%
  - Very poor: 1%

FY02: Satisfaction measure: 82%
Average evaluation score: 4.3

---

**Campgrounds and/or picnic areas**
FY02: 307 parks; 11628 respondents

- **Rating**
  - Very good: 49%
  - Good: 34%
  - Average: 13%
  - Poor: 3%
  - Very poor: 1%

FY02: Satisfaction measure: 85%
Average evaluation score: 4.3

---

**Exhibits**
FY02: 307 parks; 26659 respondents

- **Rating**
  - Very good: 58%
  - Good: 32%
  - Average: 11%
  - Poor: 1%
  - Very poor: 0%

FY02: Satisfaction measure: 91%
Average evaluation score: 4.5

---

**Walkways, trails, and roads**
FY02: 307 parks; 26640 respondents

- **Rating**
  - Very good: 59%
  - Good: 32%
  - Average: 9%
  - Poor: 1%
  - Very poor: 0%

FY02: Satisfaction measure: 91%
Average evaluation score: 4.5

---

**Combined park facilities**
FY02: 26659 responses (based on 5 indicators)

- **Rating**
  - Very good: 58%
  - Good: 31%
  - Average: 10%
  - Poor: 2%
  - Very poor: 1%

FY02: Satisfaction measure: 89%
Average evaluation score: 4.4
National Park System
Visitor Services

**Assistance from park employees**
FY02: 307 parks; 27356 respondents
- Very good: 78%
- Good: 18%

**Ranger programs**
FY02: 307 parks; 14301 respondents
- Very good: 69%
- Good: 24%

**Park map or brochure**
FY02: 307 parks; 25348 respondents
- Very good: 66%
- Good: 27%

**Commercial services in the park**
FY02: 307 parks; 13558 respondents
- Very good: 37%
- Good: 35%

**Combined visitor services**
FY02: 27356 responses (based on 4 indicators)
- Very good: 65%
- Good: 25%

FY02: Satisfaction measure: 96%
Average evaluation score: 4.7

FY02: Satisfaction measure: 93%
Average evaluation score: 4.6

FY02: Satisfaction measure: 73%
Average evaluation score: 4
National Park System
Recreational Opportunities

Learning about nature, history, or culture
FY02: 307 parks; 24229 respondents

Sightseeing
FY02: 307 parks; 23872 respondents

Outdoor recreation
FY02: 307 parks; 13168 respondents

Combined recreational opportunities
FY02: 24229 responses (based on 3 indicators)

Research Methods

Survey cards were distributed to a random sample of visitors in 329 units in the system during the periods from February 1- August 31, 2002. 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 system were combined into one dataset. Data from parks with less than 30 returned cards, or from park with discrepancies in the 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.

For most indicators, the survey data are expected to be accurate within ±6% with 95% confidence. This means that if different samples had been drawn, the results would have been similar (±6%) 95 out of 100 times.

The results do not necessarily apply to visitors during other times of the year, or to park units in the 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 Park Studies Unit (208) 885-4806