

TOWN of CARY

> [Home](#) > [Departments](#) > [Town Manager's Office](#) > [Public Information](#) > [Surveys and Research](#) > [2006 Biennial Survey](#) > [Demographics](#)

Demographics

Demographic Characteristics of the Sample

The demographic profile of the sample is exhibited in Figures 1A-1H and Table 2. The age profile of the sample is illustrated in Figure 1A. A large percentage of the respondents (74.4%) fell between the ages of 26 to 55 with the largest portion (32.6%) in the 36-45 year-old category. Figure 1B represents the number of years the respondents had lived in the Town of Cary. As for years of residency, 56.0% of the respondents had lived in Cary for 6 years or more. There was also a large percentage who lived in the Town only from 2 to 5 years (28.8%) or a year or less (15.3%).

Table 1A. Sample: Age Distribution.

Age Groups	%
18-25	5.7
26-35	19.2
36-45	32.6
46-55	22.6
56-65	10.4
66-75	5.5
Over 75	4.0

Table 1B. Sample: Years Lived in Cary.

Years in Cary	%
0-1	15.3
2-5	28.8
6-10	19.0
11-20	23.5
Over 20	13.5

Figure 1C illustrates the number of children under the age of 18 living in the household. Approximately 56% of the sample had no children under 18 living at home, 36.1% had 1-2 children, and 7.8% had 3-5 children. The sample represented a highly educated group (Table 1D). Most of the respondents had graduated with a college degree (41.9%) or graduate degree (29.0%). Figure 1E shows the racial breakdown of the sample. Approximately 86% of the respondents were Caucasian, 5.4% were Asian, 4.1% were African-American, and 2.1% were Hispanic.

Table 1C. Sample: Children Under 18 in HH.

Children in Household	%
0	55.8
1-2	36.1
3-5	7.8
Over 5	0.3

Table 1D. Sample: Educational Level.

Education	%
High School or Less	11.1
Some College	18.0
College Degree	41.9
Graduate Degree	29.0

Table 1E: Sample: Race.

Race	%
Caucasian	85.6
Asian	5.4
African-American	4.1
Hispanic	2.1
Native American	1.3
Other	1.5

There were high levels of household income for the sample. This is illustrated in the high percentage of respondents in the \$70,001-\$100,000 (23.4%) and over \$100,000 (37.0%) income categories (Figure 1F). In terms of gender, 55.9% of the sample were female and 44.1% were male (Figure 1G). This is a common occurrence in telephone surveying. Females are more likely to answer the telephone in a married household. Table 1H exhibits the job classifications. Technical (21.5%), retired (16.0%), homemakers (9.7%), service (8.4%), and professionals (7.3%) were the classifications that were most represented in the sample. The sample zip codes were 27511 (39.5%), 27513 (42.9%), 27519 (16.3%), and 27560 (1.3%).

Table 1F Sample: Income Level.

Income Levels	%
0-\$20,000	5.2
\$20,001-\$30,000	6.5
\$30,001-\$50,000	14.9
\$50,001-\$70,000	13.0
\$70,001-\$100,000	23.4
Over \$100,000	37.0

Table 1G. Sample: Gender.

Gender	%
Male	44.1
Female	55.9

Table 1H. Sample: Job Classifications (Categories below 0.5% not included).

Job Classification	%	Job Classification	%
Technical	21.5	Marketing/Sales	3.7
Retired	16.0	Clerical/Support	3.4
Homemakers	9.7	Self-Employed	1.8
Service	8.4	Laborers	1.6
Professionals	7.3	Unemployed	1.3
Managers	6.5	Students	1.0
Education	5.5	Government	1.0
Retail	5.2	Business (general)	1.0

Healthcare	4.2	Nonprofit	0.5
------------	-----	-----------	-----

The largest percentage of the respondents resided in single family dwellings (72.5%), 14.1% in an apartment, 11.1% in a townhouse/condominium, 1.3% in a mobile home, and 1.0% in a duplex. The respondents were also asked where they moved from to Cary. There were 54.0% who moved from another state, 40.2% moved from within North Carolina, 3.8% moved from another country, and only 2.0% were natives of Cary. The respondents came to Cary from 37 other states with the most frequently mentioned New York (28), Virginia (25), Florida (18), California (17), Ohio (12), Texas (10), Michigan (9), and Maryland (8). In addition, respondents moved to Cary from 11 other countries including Africa (3), Canada (2) and Japan (2).

Several of the means for the service dimensions in the survey were converted into grades. The mean score was changed into a percentage (using 9 as the denominator) and compared to the grading scale shown in Table 2. This was primarily done only for questions that rated services on the 9-point scale using the "very poor" to "excellent" descriptors. Grades tend to be easier to understand and use in goal setting for planning cycles. The respondents were also asked if they would agree to participate in a focus group session to give Cary even more insight into their citizen's opinions and attitudes. Approximately 49% of the respondents agreed to participate in a session. This reflects the citizen's strong involvement and concern for Cary.

Table 2. Grading Scale.

Rating (%)	Grade
97-100	A+
94-96	A
90-93	A-
87-89	B+
84-86	B
80-83	B-
77-79	C+
74-76	C
70-73	C-
67-69	D+
64-66	D
60-63	D-
Below 60	F

The report will include selected crosstabulations specifically chosen by the Town for questions in the survey (Appendix B). It is important to exercise caution in the interpretation of crosstabulations. They will act to segment or slice up the sample size and in turn increase the margin of error for a question. For example, it is difficult to interpret crosstabulations with small sample sizes such as those for mobile homes (n=5), duplexes (n=4), Hispanics (n=8), and 27560 zip code (n=5). For that reason, these groupings will not be included in the discussion. The percentages in the tables are rounded off to one decimal place. Due to rounding this may result in row totals that do not always add up to exactly 100.0%. The demographic recodes for the crosstabulations were age (18-25, 26-55, 56-65, over 65), education (no college degree, college degree), children in household under 18 (no children, children), race (Caucasian, African-American, Asian, Hispanic, other), internet (no access, access), and years in Cary (0-1, 2-5, 6-10, over 10).

