



# Evaluating Public Perceptions of the Opportunity to Build a New Carisbrook Stadium

Research Report

Prepared for

**Otago Regional Council**

By

**Research**  
*First*

Christchurch

Friday, 25 May 2007

## Table of Contents

1	Regional Messages .....	3
1.1	Overview .....	3
1.2	The Survey.....	3
1.3	Synopsis of Results.....	4
1.4	Response Data.....	4
1.4.1	Should a Stadium Be Built in Awatea St? .....	4
1.4.2	Should the ORC be involved in Funding the Stadium? .....	4
1.4.3	Should the ORC Provide Funding to \$37.5 million?.....	4
1.4.4	What Level of Rates Increase is Supported to Meet the ORC Funding of \$37.5M? .....	6
2	Research Design.....	7
2.1	Survey Details .....	7
3	Research Results - Data Analysis .....	8
3.1	Overview of Data .....	8
3.2	Response Rates .....	8
3.3	Responses, Raw Data .....	10
3.3.1	Overall Preference of the Population .....	10
3.3.2	Should The ORC Be Involved In Funding The Stadium? .....	11
3.3.3	Should The ORC Provide Funding To A Level Of \$37.5 Million? .....	12
3.3.4	What Level Of Rates Increase Is Supported To Meet The Orc Funding Of \$37.5m? .....	13
4	Appendix One: Regional Breakdown of Responses.....	15

# 1 Regional Messages

## 1.1 Overview

In April of 2007, two surveys were commissioned to better understand the attitudes of Dunedin and Otago ratepayers and residents towards the opportunity to develop a new Carisbrook Stadium. These surveys were:

- A mail survey of ratepayers in the Otago region; and
- A telephone survey of 2,200 Dunedin City Residents.

The mail survey was jointly commissioned by the Otago Regional Council (ORC) and the Dunedin City Council (DCC) and targeted ratepayers. The telephone survey was commissioned by the DCC and was a survey of all residents. These surveys provide a comprehensive insight into the attitudes and perceptions of different members of the Dunedin and Otago populations.

This report presents the outcomes of the mail survey, and represents responses relevant to the ORC portion of the research.

## 1.2 The Survey

The mail survey was sent to 74,759 ratepayers across the Otago Region. From these, 29,222 were returned, for a response rate of 39%. This is a significant response rate, and means the mail survey provides a valuable insight into the attitudes and perceptions of segments of the Dunedin and Otago populations.

Because of the self-selection inherent in self-completed survey such as mail surveys, it is important to note that sample sizes do not necessarily equate to representative responses of the population at large. In the mail survey there is a significant measure of self-selection bias<sup>1</sup> present in the achieved sample, and particularly so in regard to the gender and age of respondents. This means that the raw results are not representative (in a statistical sense) of the target populations.

---

<sup>1</sup> 'Self-selection bias' occurs when members of a survey sample essentially select themselves in response to an invitation to participate. The results of such surveys reflect only the views of those who felt strongly enough about the particular issues to go to the trouble of responding. Clearly, the views of such respondents are unlikely to be closely representative of those of the wider population of interest.

## 1.3 Synopsis of Results

The survey has produced the following key results:

- For the whole region there is a clear – albeit small – preference for a new stadium to be built in Awatea Street.
- Support for, and opposition to, ORC’s involvement with funding the stadium is almost equal

These results are discussed below, and are analysed in detail in the body of the report that follows this key results section.

## 1.4 Response Data

### 1.4.1 Should a Stadium Be Built in Awatea St?

**Table 1.1: Should a Stadium Be Built in Awatea St, Dunedin?:**

Mail Survey - Raw Data	
Support	Oppose
52.5%	45.2%

*N* = 29,220

### 1.4.2 Should the ORC be involved in Funding the Stadium?

On the question of whether the ORC should be involved in funding the new stadium, the raw responses show a response that is almost equally divided about the ORC’s involvement.

**Table 1.2: Should the ORC Be involved in Funding the Stadium?:**

Mail Survey - Raw Data	
Support	Oppose
44.0%	43.5%

*N* = 29,222

### 1.4.3 Should the ORC Provide Funding to \$37.5 million?

In response to the specific question about whether the ORC should provide support to the sum of \$37.5 million, the mail survey shows that more respondents support funding to this level than oppose it. To better understand this pattern of responses, these data have been analysed according to

those who support the proposed stadium and those who oppose it.<sup>2</sup> Responses from supporters only are shown in Table 1.3. All responses are shown in Table 1.3A.

**Table 1.3: Should the ORC Provide Funding to \$37.5 Million?:**

Supporters of ORC Funding - Raw Data	
Support	Oppose
78.9%	12.6%

N = 14,121

**Table 1.3A: Should the ORC Be Involved in Funding the Stadium?**

All respondents - Raw Data	
Support	Oppose
39.7%	23.0%

N = 29,219

As would be anticipated, these tables show that those who support the new stadium are considerably more likely to also support the ORC's involvement.

---

<sup>2</sup> The questionnaire included an instruction for this question to be skipped if respondents were not in favour of the stadium being built. Many who are opposed to the stadium being built did respond to this (and other subsequent questions).

#### 1.4.4 What Level of Rates Increase is Supported to Meet the ORC Funding of \$37.5M?

Overall, the most common response to the question about the appropriate rate increase was ‘no increase’. This was followed by ‘increase of \$20’. Responses were relatively uniform across all statistical breakdowns (age, gender and location). Those that supported the ORC’s funding involvement with the stadium, however, were more likely to nominate an ‘increase of \$20’. Responses from supporters only are shown in Table 1.4. All responses are shown in Table 1.4A.

**Table 1.4: What Level of Rates Increase is Supported to Meet the ORC Funding?**

All Respondents: Raw Data			
No increase	Increase of \$20	Increase of \$35	Increase of \$50
22.8%	17.2%	10.6%	11.5%

N = 29,131

**Table 1.4a: What Level of Rates Increase is Supported to Meet the ORC Funding?**

Supporters of ORC Funding: Raw Data			
No increase	Increase of \$20	Increase of \$35	Increase of \$50
12.8%	32.9%	20.9%	22.9%

N = 14,109

## 2 Research Design

### 2.1 Survey Details

A total of 74,759 questionnaires were mailed to ratepayers across the Otago region. These ratepayers were identified from the ORC ratepayer database, once the database was filtered to ensure no ratepayer received the opportunity to present their views more than once for their entire property portfolio owned within one Territorial Authority (TLA)<sup>3</sup>.

Three formats of mail-out were used:

1. A brochure with a DLE-sized card enclosed. The DLE card was printed in black, with questions from both the DCC and ORC. The DCC questions were listed first. These were mailed to ratepayers who owned property within the Dunedin City Council area. A total of 19,000 items were in this format.
2. A brochure with a DLE-sized card enclosed. The DLE card was printed in blue, with questions from both the DCC and ORC. The ORC questions were listed first. These were mailed to ratepayers who owned property within the Dunedin City Council area. A total of 19,000 items were in this format.
3. A brochure with an A4 reply mail form attached. The A4 mail form was individually identified. These were mailed to ratepayers who owned property within Otago, but outside the Dunedin City Council area. A total of 37,000 items were in this format.

Returned questionnaires were scanned into a database. To ensure the accuracy of this process, 10% of questionnaires were selected random and manually checked to ensure data security. In addition, any data that the scanners identified as incomplete were manually checked to ensure all information was captured.

---

<sup>3</sup> Where a property owner was listed in the database as owning property in more than one TLA, forms were dispatched appropriate to each separate TLA.

## 3 Research Results – Data Analysis

### 3.1 Overview of Data

Both mail items (DLE cards for the Dunedin City area and A4 cards for the remainder of the Otago region) had the final date for responses clearly listed. Despite this, a significant number of responses were received after the close-off date (2,162). All of these responses have been analysed.

### 3.2 Response Rates

For the survey:

- 74,759 questionnaires were mailed to ratepayers.
- 161 of the DCC council area (DLE) mail items were returned as undeliverable.
- 358 of the ORC regional (A4) mail items were returned as undeliverable.
- 76 ratepayers not included on the regional database due to the last date of update, were sent a late copy of the survey (in the format appropriate for their TLA).
- 3 surveys were faxed to Research First, all on the closing date. These were included in the survey. One photocopy of a survey form was removed from the analysis.
- 29,222 questionnaires were returned.

The response rate to the mail survey was around 39% of the total distributed.

**Table 4.1 Response Rates To Mail Survey By Age Group And Gender**

Group	Male	Female
	% of Responses	% of Responses
Age under 24	0.4%	0.2%
Age 25-34	3.7%	2.0%
Age 35-44	10.3%	5.0%
Age 45-54	17.7%	6.7%
Age 55-64	17.6%	6.7%
Age 65+	19.9%	10.5%

N = 29,216

This analysis reveals that:

- Male respondents, and particularly older male respondents, are over represented on a total regional population basis in the survey data for the Otago Region
- Older respondents are over represented on a total regional population basis in the survey data. The response from age groups 45-54; 55-64 and 65+ was significantly higher than the proportions of the population those groups represent. In the regional population this was true of both males and females.

This is shown in table 4.2 below:

**Table 4.2: Age and Gender of respondents, Otago Region**

	Central Otago	Clutha	Dunedin City	Queenstown Lakes	Waitaki
<b>Male</b>	73.3%	70.6%	63.6%	72.8%	70.3%
<b>Female</b>	24.0%	27.2%	33.3%	25.2%	27.0%
<b>Not Stated</b>	2.7%	2.3%	3.1%	1.9%	2.7%
<b>Age 18-24</b>	0.5%	0.7%	0.6%	0.2%	0.5%
<b>Age 25-34</b>	3.5%	4.6%	6.5%	5.0%	3.0%
<b>Age 35-44</b>	12.6%	13.8%	15.9%	15.3%	10.5%
<b>Age 45-54</b>	22.2%	24.3%	23.0%	26.1%	20.2%
<b>Age 55-64</b>	29.6%	24.1%	22.5%	27.1%	23.7%
<b>Age 65+</b>	30.2%	30.9%	29.8%	25.3%	40.2%
<b>Not Stated</b>	1.3%	1.6%	1.7%	1.0%	1.7%

N = 29,216

### 3.3 Responses, Raw Data

#### 3.3.1 Overall Preference of the Population

There is a clear – albeit small – preference for a new stadium to be built in Awatea Street.

**Table 4.3: Should a Stadium Be Built in Awatea St, Dunedin ?:**

Mail Survey - Raw Data <sup>4</sup>	
Support	Oppose
52.5%	45.2%

N = 29,220

The mail survey results can be broken down by territorial authority (Central Otago District, Clutha District, Dunedin City, Queenstown Lakes District and Waitaki District).

**Table 4.4: Stadium Support by Region :**

	Central Otago	Clutha	Dunedin City	Queenstown Lakes	Waitaki
<b>Total Supporting Stadium</b>	63.5%	57.7%	46.5%	66.3%	44.4%
<b>Total Opposing Stadium</b>	35.2%	41.0%	49.9%	32.5%	53.8%
<b>Not Stated</b>	1.3%	1.3%	3.6%	1.2%	1.8%
	N = 3,383	N = 2,497	N = 16,458	N = 3,834	N = 2,994

N = 29,220

<sup>4</sup> Where data do not add to 100%, the variance is those who have not responded.

### 3.3.2 Should The ORC Be Involved In Funding The Stadium?

The survey of the Otago region posed the question of whether the ORC should be involved as a funder. The raw data shows a sample equally divided about the ORC's involvement. The response was as follows:

**Table 4.5: Responses Towards ORC Funding :**

	Total Responses
Total Supporting ORC Funding	44.0%
Total Opposing ORC Funding	43.5%
No Response / Undecided	12.5%

N = 29,222

**Table 4.6: Responses Towards ORC Funding :**

	Central Otago	Clutha	Dunedin City	Queenstown Lakes	Waitaki
I support it	51.6%	45.7%	42.0%	52.2%	35.1%
I oppose it	24.3%	27.2%	55.8%	25.8%	33.2%
Not stated	24.1%	27.1%	2.3%	22.0%	31.7%

N = 29,222

### 3.3.3 Should The ORC Provide Funding To A Level Of \$37.5 Million?

In response to the specific question about whether the ORC should provide support to the sum of \$37.5 million, again the mail survey shows that considerably more respondents support funding to this level than oppose it. To better understand this pattern of responses, these data have been analysed according to those who support the proposed stadium and those who oppose it (the questionnaire instructed those opposed to the funding should skip this question - many did, but some provided a response):

**Table 4.7: Response Towards a Level of \$37.5 Million of ORC Funding :**

	All Responses	Those Who Support The Stadium
<b>Total Supporting ORC Funding at \$37.5M</b>	39.7%	78.9%
<b>Total Opposing ORC Funding at \$37.5M</b>	23.0%	12.6%
<b>No Response / Undecided</b>	37.3%	8.5%

*All responses N=29,219; Support Stadium N = 14,121*

**Table 4.8: District Responses Towards a Level of \$37.5 Million of ORC Funding:**

	Central Otago	Clutha	Dunedin City	Queenstown Lakes	Waitaki
<b>I support it</b>	45.8% N=1551	41.5% N=1035	38.2% N=6302	46.9% N=1798	30.4% N=908
<b>I oppose it</b>	22.2% N=752	22.9% N=571	22.3% N=36861	21.9% N=838	29.4% N=8781
<b>Not stated</b>	31.9% N=1080	35.7% N=890	39.5% N=6518	31.2% N=1196	40.3% N=1204

*N = 29,219*

### 3.3.4 What Level Of Rates Increase Is Supported To Meet The ORC Funding Of \$37.5m?

The survey canvassed four levels of rate increase for the ORC to meet the cost of the stadium. The survey was formatted to suggest that those who were opposed to the funding should skip this question. Many did, while some provided a response. For the purpose of comprehensive analysis, both sets of data are shown:

**Table 4.9: Responses To What Level Of Rate Increase Is Supported As An Additional ORC Rate Per Annum Required to Meet This Request :**

	All Responses	Those Who Support The Stadium
No increase	22.8%	12.8%
An increase of \$20 per annum	17.2%	32.9%
An increase of \$35 per annum	10.6%	20.9%
An increase of \$50 per annum	11.5%	22.9%
No Response / Undecided	37.9%	10.5%

N = 29.131

**Table 4.10: District Responses To What Level Of Rate Increase Is Supported As An Additional ORC Rate Per Annum Required to Meet This Request :**

	Central Otago	Clutha	Dunedin City	Queenstown Lakes	Waitaki
<b>Nil</b>	19.9% N= 674	22.2% N= 554	23.3% N=3819	20.0% N= 766	27.3% N= 817
<b>\$20</b>	20.6% N=696	19.4% N= 485	15.8% N=2593	19.3% N= 739	16.8% N= 502
<b>\$35</b>	13.0% N= 440	10.7% N= 267	10.2% N=1680	11.8% N= 454	8.5% N= 253
<b>\$50</b>	13.8% N= 466	11.6% N= 290	10.8% N= 1772	16.8% N= 645	5.7% N= 171

N = 29.131

**- Research First Ltd**

Friday, 25 May 2007

## 4 Appendix One: Regional Breakdown of Responses

Table A.1 Breakdown of Responses by District

	Central Otago	Clutha	Dunedin City	Queenstown Lakes	Waitaki
<b>Male</b>	73.3% N= 2481	70.6% N= 1762	63.6% N= 10498	72.8% N= 2793	70.3% N= 2104
<b>Female</b>	24.0% N= 812	27.2% N= 678	33.3% N= 5497	25.2% N= 967	27.0% N= 809
<b>Not Stated</b>	2.7% N= 90	2.3% N= 57	3.1% N= 504	1.9% N= 74	2.7% N= 81
<b>Total</b>	100% N= 3383	100% N= 2497	100% N= 16499	100% N= 3834	100% N= 2994

N = 29,207