



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

Telephone Survey

Preliminary Research Report

Prepared for

**Dunedin City Council**

By

**Research**  
*First*

Christchurch

Friday, 25 May 2007

## Table of Contents

1	Key Messages.....	4
1.1	Overview.....	4
1.2	The Telephone Survey.....	4
1.3	Synopsis of Key Results.....	5
1.3.1	Should a Stadium Be Built in Awatea St? (Mail and Telephone Survey).....	5
1.3.2	Should the DCC Be Involved in Funding the Stadium? .....	6
1.3.3	Should the DCC be Involved in Funding at a Level of \$91.4 Million?.....	6
1.3.4	Should the Rate Increase be in Line with Those Proposed in the Supplied Brochure?.....	7
1.3.5	Should Any DCC Rate Increase Be General or Targeted? .....	7
2.0	Research Design.....	8
2.1	Telephone Survey .....	8
3	Dunedin Research Results - Data Analysis.....	9
3.1	Overview of Data.....	9
3.2	Response Rates.....	9
3.3	Representativeness of the Responses.....	9
3.4	Responses, Raw Data.....	9
3.4.1	Overall Preference of the Population.....	9
3.4.2	Dunedin City Suburban Analysis of Stadium Support (by Telephone Exchange) .....	11
3.4.3	Dunedin City Suburban Analysis of Stadium Support (by income level) .....	11
3.4.4	Should The DCC Be Involved In Funding The Stadium.....	12
3.4.5	Should The Rate Increase Be In Line With Those Proposed In The Supplied Brochure? ...	13
3.4.6	Should Any DCC Rate Increase Be General Or Targeted? .....	13
3.5	Responses, Normalised Data.....	14
3.5.1	Overall Preference of the Population.....	14
3.5.2	Should The DCC Being Involved In Funding The Stadium? .....	14
3.5.3	Should The DCC Be Involved In Funding At A Level Of \$91.4 Million?.....	15
3.5.4	Should The Rate Increase Be In Line With Those Proposed In The Supplied Brochure? ...	15
3.5.5	Should Any DCC Rate Increase Be General Or Targeted? .....	16



# 1 Key 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 randomly selected 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 Dunedin residents' over the age of 18. These surveys provide a valuable insight into the attitudes and perceptions of different members of the Dunedin and Otago populations.

This report focuses on the outcomes of the telephone survey dealing with the Dunedin City results.

## 1.2 The Telephone Survey

The telephone survey involved a random sample of 2,200 Dunedin City residents<sup>1</sup>. The telephone survey used random-digit dialling to select from the population of the Dunedin City region. Calls were only made to residential addresses. Calls answered by commercial operations were excluded from participation. The sample was designed to provide a statistically valid picture of both the total Dunedin City population, and of sub-groups within that population. To ensure the data from responses is accurate, the responses from the telephone survey has been normalised to the Dunedin City population.

---

<sup>1</sup> Note that the mail survey was targeted at ratepayers, while the telephone survey targeted residents in general.

### 1.3 Synopsis of Key Results

The survey has produced the following key results:

- There is a clear - albeit small - preference for a new stadium to be built in Awatea Street.
- Respondents are divided about the DCC being involved with the stadium, albeit showing a small preference for the DCC being involved as a funder.
- The results indicate the community is divided with regard to the question of the DCC funding the stadium to the level of \$91.4M.
- The response of those opposed to increased rates for a new stadium is higher than that of those supporting the increase (among those who support the stadium, a significant majority approve of the proposed rating level).
- There is no clear preference for a general or targeted rate as the mechanism to collect the extra rates needed to fund the stadium.

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

#### 1.3.1 Should a Stadium Be Built in Awatea St? (Mail and Telephone Survey)

The telephone survey shows a measure of support for the proposal.

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

Phone Survey - Raw Data		Phone Survey - Normalised Data	
Support	Oppose	Support	Oppose
60.8%	34.8%	62.2%	28.0%

Phone Survey N= 2,202, margin of error = 2.0%

### 1.3.2 Should the DCC Be Involved in Funding the Stadium?

In the telephone survey, the raw and the normalised responses show a preference for the DCC's involvement.

**Table 1.2: Should the DCC Be Involved in Funding the Stadium?:**

Phone Survey - Raw Data		Phone Survey - Normalised Data	
Support	Oppose	Support	Oppose
51.9%	44.6%	65.0%	30.1%

N = 2,202, margin of error = 2.0%

### 1.3.3 Should the DCC be Involved in Funding at a Level of \$91.4 Million?

The phone survey, as shown in Table 1.3 shows the level of support of all phone survey respondents for the proposed level of funding. The results indicate a strong split in the community with regard to the question of the DCC funding the stadium to the level of \$91.4M, indicating that of those who support funding (1.3.2), a significant proportion do not support funding at the prescribed level.

**Table 1.3: Should the DCC Be Involved in Funding at a Level of \$91.4 Million?**

Phone Survey - Raw Data		Phone Survey - Normalised Data	
Support	Oppose	Support	Oppose
43.6%	50.5%	48.8%	44.0%

### 1.3.4 Should the Rate Increase be in Line with Those Proposed in the Supplied Brochure?

Table 1.4 shows the level of support of all phone survey respondents for the proposed rate increase.<sup>22</sup> In both the raw and normalised data the response of those opposed to the increase is higher than that of those supporting the increase.

**Table 1.4: Should the Rate Increase be in Line with Those Proposed in the Supplied Brochure**

Phone Survey - Raw Data		Phone Survey - Normalised Data	
Support	Oppose	Support	Oppose
37.4%	56.4%	37.5%	53.6%

### 1.3.5 Should Any DCC Rate Increase Be General or Targeted?

The key point that the council should take from both surveys is that a large majority of respondents (63%) either had no preference, or did not respond to this question. This suggests that further work will be required to consult on funding options if a decision is taken to proceed with the stadium proposal.

**Table 1.5: Should Any DCC Rate Increase Be General or Targeted?**

Phone Survey - Raw Data		Phone Survey - Normalised Data	
General	Targeted	General	Targeted
18.2%	16.9%	18.6%	17.0%

<sup>22</sup> The telephone interviewers were asked to use the instruction "the Council will need to make a decision based on the response to this survey. If you had to give a response, what would you choose?". Therefore, the difference in results between the mail and telephone survey reflect the role that the interviewer plays in interviewer-administered surveys. This is one of the key strengths that interviewer-administered surveys (such as telephone surveys) have over self-administered surveys (such as mail surveys) - the fact there is an interview present to explain questions or clear up confusion among respondents.

## **2.0 Research Design**

### **2.1 Telephone Survey**

For the telephone survey an initial pilot telephone survey was conducted to validate the format and structure of the questions, and ensure that the more complex aspects of the rating structure were able to be explained via telephone. Following this, minor changes were made to the questions, including provision of a broader range of rating categories, and telephone survey operators were given access to a web-site to provide details of the 'rateable value' of properties for those being surveyed.

In the telephone survey proper, calls were made to householders within the Dunedin City Council area, using Random Digit dialling. Phone calls were conducted with a six-time call back on each randomly generated number if previous attempts were unsuccessful (engaged/no answer), at various times of the day, in order to maintain the random nature of calling. Data was entered directly into the database, using Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing techniques (CATI). Industry standards of 15% of calls were audited to ensure data collection was accurate.

A total of 2,202 phone calls were completed, providing a representative sample of the population, able to be selectively analysed in a range of sub-groups and demographic grouping with statistically valid responses.

## **3 Dunedin 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**

- 4,750 telephone calls were placed to lines within the DCC area.
- 1,594 calls were not connected (No answer, Answering Machine, Uncollected Appointments).
- 954 calls were refused.
- 2,202 calls resulted in successful interviews were returned.

The response rate to the telephone survey was around 46% of the calls made

### **3.3 Representativeness of the Responses**

The issue of representativeness in research addresses how well the results from the achieved sample can be generalised to the population from which that sample is drawn. The phone survey used a random approach to generate calls within all telephone exchanges in the Dunedin City area. A comparison against the census 2006 population is therefore credible to ensure successful calls represent a valid sample of the population. The raw results were therefore normalised on this basis.

### **3.4 Responses, Raw Data**

#### **3.4.1 Overall Preference of the Population**

When the results from the survey are analysed, a consistent pattern emerges. That is, there is a preference for a new stadium to be built in Awatea Street. This preference is present in the raw data from the telephone survey.

**Table 1.6: Should a Stadium Be Built in Awatea St, Dunedin (Raw Data)?**

Phone Survey - Raw Data	
Support	Oppose
60.8%	34.8%

Phone Survey N= 2,202 margin of error = 2.2%

### 3.4.2 Dunedin City Suburban Analysis of Stadium Support (by Telephone Exchange)

Across the city there is a moderate divergence of views. All suburbs are slightly in favour of building the stadium, with some areas of the city (Dunedin City, Mornington, Maori Hill west to Halfway Bush, the Mosgiel and Rural areas) showing stronger support than some other suburbs.

**Table 1.7: Stadium Support by District (Raw Data):**

	Corstophine	Dunedin City	Green Island	Mornington	Andersons Bay / Sth Dunedin	R'bourne / Port Chalmers	Northern Suburbs	Peninsula	Rural	Mosgiel / Outram	Maori Hill / Halfway Bush
Total Supporting Stadium	53.4%	69.6%	58.4%	68.2%	57.7%	59.8%	55.2%	59.1%	79.2%	64.5%	63.1%
Total Opposing Stadium	42.3%	25.7%	37.7%	31.1%	38.5%	36.4%	38.8%	37.3%	20.8%	31.3%	29.2%
Not Stated	4.3%	4.8%	3.9%	0.8%	3.8%	3.7%	6.1%	3.6%	0.0%	4.2%	7.6%

### 3.4.3 Dunedin City Suburban Analysis of Stadium Support (by income level)

The survey collected data about the income of respondents, and the data on attitudes towards the new stadium can be analysed by income. This shows a clear pattern of response, with higher levels of income correlated with a stronger likelihood of supporting the new stadium.

**Table 1.8: Stadium Support by Income (Raw Data):**

	Under \$20K p.a.	\$20-30K	\$30-40K	\$40-50K	\$50-60K	\$60-70K	\$70-80K	\$80-90K	\$90-100K	Over \$100K	Not stated
Total Supporting Stadium	53.3%	54.6%	59.3%	58.2%	62.8%	64.0%	63.9%	72.4%	70.8%	73.1%	53.4%
Total Opposing Stadium	41.8%	41.7%	34.2%	36.7%	33.2%	32.0%	32.7%	23.6%	27.7%	24.4%	40.7%
Not Stated	4.9%	3.7%	6.5%	5.1%	4.0%	4.0%	3.4%	4.1%	1.5%	2.5%	5.9%

### 3.4.4 Should The DCC Be Involved In Funding The Stadium

The survey of the Dunedin City Council posed the question of whether the DCC should be involved as a funder. The response was as follows:

**Table 1.9: What Level of Rates Increase is Supported to Meet the DCC Funding? (Raw Data):**

	Telephone Survey
Total Supporting DCC Funding	51.9%
Total Opposing DCC Funding	44.6%
No Response / Undecided	3.5%

*Mail Survey - Total N=16,490, Mail Survey - Supporters: N=6557, Phone Survey: N=2,202, margin of error = 2.0%*

### Should The DCC Be Involved In Funding At A Level Of \$91.4 Million?

The survey of the DCC posed the question of whether the council should be fund the stadium to the proposed level of \$91.4 million. The general picture from the surveys is one of mixed levels of support for the DCC's involvement to the level of \$91.4 million. As with questions about the DCC's involvement, the survey demonstrate that a sizeable minority of the Dunedin population remains opposed to the Council being involved to this level of funding.

**Table 1.10: Should The DCC Be Involved In Funding to \$91.4 Million:**

	Telephone Survey
Total Supporting DCC Funding at \$91.4M	43.6%
Total Opposing DCC Funding at \$91.4M	50.5%
No Response / Undecided	5.6%

*Phone Survey: N=2,202, margin of error = 2.0%*

### 3.4.5 Should The Rate Increase Be In Line With Those Proposed In The Supplied Brochure?

The survey of the DCC posed the question of whether ratepayers supported an increase in rates to meet the payment of \$91.4M. Details were available to the telephone interviewers, to ensure respondents were informed. :

**Table 1.11: Should The Rate Increase Be In Line With Those Proposed In The Supplied Brochure:**

	Telephone Survey
Total Supporting proposed rate increase	37.4%
Total Opposing DCC proposed rate increase	56.4%
No Response / Undecided	2.1%
Tenant - don't pay rates	4.1%

*Phone Survey; N=2,202, margin of error = 2.2%*

### 3.4.6 Should Any DCC Rate Increase Be General Or Targeted?

Two rating structures have been proposed to generate sufficient funds to account for the costs of building a new stadium. Details of the rating structures were made available as a support document for those being interviewed by telephone.

**Table 1.12: Should Any DCC Rate Increase Be General Or Targeted:**

	Telephone Survey
Total Supporting General rate increase	18.2%
Total Supporting Targeted rate	16.9%
No Preference	1.8%
No response / undecided	63.1%

*Phone N = 2,202, margin of error = 2.0%*

### 3.5 Responses, Normalised Data

Attitudes to DCC's potential involvement with the stadium vary between the mail out and the telephone survey. The telephone survey shows a measure of support for the proposal.

In the telephone survey, the raw and the normalised responses show a preference for DCC involvement.

#### 3.5.1 Overall Preference of the Population

**Table 1.13: Overall Support for New Stadium, (Normalised Data):**

	Telephone Survey
Total Supporting Stadium	62.2%
Total Opposing Stadium	28.0%
No Response / Undecided	9.8%

Normalised responses to the overall support show a higher rate of "support" than the raw data, and lower level of opposition. This relates to the response level being significantly weighted towards the older proportion of the population, who in the mail survey exhibited a lower level of support for the stadium.

#### 3.5.2 Should The DCC Being Involved In Funding The Stadium?

**Table 1.14: DCC involvement in funding the Stadium (Normalised Data):**

	Telephone Survey
Total Supporting DCC Funding	65.0%
Total Opposing DCC Funding	30.1%
No Response / Undecided	4.9%

### 3.5.3 Should The DCC Be Involved In Funding At A Level Of \$91.4 Million?

**Table 1.15: DCC Funding Involvement At A Level Of \$91.4 Million (Normalised Data):**

	Telephone Survey
Total Supporting DCC Funding at \$91.4M	48.8%
Total Opposing DCC Funding at \$91.4M	44.0%
No Response / Undecided	7.2%

### 3.5.4 Should The Rate Increase Be In Line With Those Proposed In The Supplied Brochure?

**Table 1.16: DCC Rate increase to fund Stadium (Normalised Data)**

	Telephone Survey
Total Supporting proposed rate increase	37.5%
Total Opposing DCC proposed rate increase	53.6%
No Response / Undecided	1.7%
Tenant - don't pay rates	7.3%

### 3.5.5 Should Any DCC Rate Increase Be General Or Targeted?

**Table 1.17: DCC format of Rate Increase (Mail and Telephone Surveys, Normalised Data):**

	Telephone Survey
Total Supporting General rate increase	18.6%
Total Supporting Targeted rate	17.0%
No Preference	1.5%
No response / undecided	62.9%

Research First Ltd

Friday, 25 May 2007