

## **The first Deliberative Poll® in Poland**

### **The inhabitants of Poznan deliberate on the management and use of the stadium on Bulgarska street after the EURO2012.**

On Saturday the 21st of November 148 inhabitants of Poznań met in the International Trade Hall to discuss issues relevant to the management and use of the stadium on Bułgarska street. Few days before they participated in the survey on the same topic that was conducted on the representative sample of 854 people. The stadium is being modernized for the European Football Championship in 2012 and the cost of it is to be covered from the public money. On the deliberation day from 9.00 am to 6.00 pm the invited inhabitants of Poznan were considering pros and cons of four scenarios for the future of the stadium including aspects such as: an operator, financing, infrastructure and facilities, accessibility of the building and its surroundings.

Prior to deliberation the participants received the briefing materials covering the most important information on the discussed topic. The materials were consulted with the experts and interested parties. People could gain additional knowledge asking questions the experts and politicians during two plenary sessions on the deliberation day. Participants expressed opinions in the anonymous questionnaires that were filled in before and after the group discussions. The results allow not only obtaining information about the preferences of inhabitants of Poznan, but also observing the changes in opinion after people receive information, familiarize themselves with competing arguments and opposing viewpoints.

The social microcosm of participants was a scientific random sample of the residents of Poznan. Every resident had an equal chance of being invited. The method permits a systematic analysis of the participants' opinions compared to all those who took the survey but did not participate in deliberation. Our preliminary analysis shows very few differences on the policy attitudes between participants and non-participants. However, those who attended the event were somewhat more interested in sports in general and football in particular.

### **Main findings**

#### **1. Who should manage the stadium?**

The participants were presented four alternatives regarding management of the stadium. It could be administered by: the football club Lech; or a city institution like POSIR (Poznan Center for Sport and Recreation); or a private operator to commercialize activities on the stadium, leaving the surrounding area to the city; or a private operator to commercialize the stadium and the surrounding area.

The first alternative – management of the stadium by the football club Lech – was accepted by 41% of participants before deliberation compared to 28% after. At the same time this scenario was rejected by 29% of participants before deliberation while 46% after. Thus, it is possible to conclude that deliberation contributed to a statistically significant difference in opinions.

Similarly to the first scenario, the support for the second alternative has also decreased. Before deliberation 44% of participants agreed with the management of the stadium by a city institution

like POSIR (Poznan Center for Sport and Recreation) while 24% of them disagreed with it. After deliberation 33% of participants were for the scenario while 43% were against it.

There was a considerable growth in support for the third alternative: a private operator that would commercialize activities on the stadium, leaving the surrounding area to the city, sport and recreation. Before deliberation this choice was approved by 48% of participants, and 64% after. It was disapproved by 26% of participants before and 15% after deliberation.

The change in opinions occurred also in relation to the most commercial scenario that would enable the use of stadium and surrounding area for the profit oriented activities according to the business plan of a private operator. It was given support by 49% of participants before deliberation and 40% after. At the same time before deliberation it was rejected by 28% of participants, and 37% after.

The respondents asked for their priorities clearly changed opinions before and after deliberation:

#### **Management by the football club Lech**

Before	After
<b>20%</b>	<b>16%</b>

#### **Management by the Poznan Center for Sport and Recreation**

Before	After
<b>35%</b>	<b>16%</b>

#### **Management of the stadium by the commercial operator**

Before	After
<b>28%</b>	<b>48%</b>

#### **Management of the stadium and the surrounding area by the commercial operator**

Before	After
<b>17%</b>	<b>18%</b>

Before deliberation the most favored alternative was the stadium management by the Poznan

Center for Sport and Recreation. After it, the choice of the commercial operator that would generate the profit from activities in the stadium was evident. In this case the area around the stadium would remain accessible for sport and recreation to all inhabitants of Poznan.

## 2. How the stadium should be financed?

Alternatives that were presented to participants included the financial aspect. After the stadium modernization, the cost of its maintenance will grow dramatically. Then, who should cover it? And from what resources?

Before deliberation 37% of participants accepted financing of the stadium from the city budget. After deliberation it decreased to 30%. Simultaneously, before deliberation 28% of respondents were reluctant to this idea, and after discussions with other fellow citizens their proportion grew to 35%. Still, after deliberation 38% of disputants chose the answer in the middle of the scale neither definitely supporting nor rejecting the financing of the stadium with the public money.

The respondents asked who should cover the cost of stadium infrastructure maintenance (building, sports equipment) indicated:

### The city

Before	After
27%	7%

### The users, with little financial support of the city

Before	After
48%	60%

### The users only

Before	After
3%	4%

### The users, and the city should also be able to earn by renting space

Before	After
18%	29%

### 3. How the stadium should be used?

The participants of deliberation have changed their opinions regarding the sport infrastructure and facilities in the stadium building and around it. On the top of the list of most expected solutions there are: parking places, bike paths, publicly accessible football pitches, services related to fitness and health. It is also very important to have a good public transport connections. After deliberation, there was observed the statistically significant increase in importance of training facilities in the open space around the stadium, a skate park, health and fitness related services. At the same time the support for a tennis court and a swimming pool has dropped. The respondents' interest in an ice rink and a sport equipment rental in the proximity of the stadium remained at about the same relatively low level before and after discussions.

The changes in opinion refer also to the activities in the stadium building, particularly the main pitch. Before the group discussions people were more keen on allowing all amateur football teams and other sports fans to use the stadium space. The deliberation based on expertise contributed to the opinion shift in favor of professional sport teams using the main pitch. Inhabitants of Poznan participating in discussions were stable in their support for the organization of concerts and shows in the stadium.

Of the following events that could take place at the stadium on the Bulgarska street in the future how much do you support organizing each			
Professional soccer games			
	0.793	0.803	0.813
Very bad idea - 1	0%	0.70%	0.00%
2	0%	0%	1%
3	2.70%	1.30%	0.70%
4	3.30%	0.70%	0.70%
5	12%	9.40%	6.20%
Very good idea - 6	81.30%	87.90%	91.70%
DK	0.70%	0.70%	3.30%

Amateur soccer games					
	0.67	0.617	0.553	***	***
Very bad idea - 1	6%	2.80%	7.00%		
2	2%	2.80%	7.00%		
3	4.70%	12.40%	9.90%		
4	11.30%	16.60%	21.10%		
5	28.70%	34.50%	28.90%		
Very good idea - 6	46%	31%	24%		
DK	0.70%	3.30%	5.30%		

Concerts					
		0.76	0.753	0.755	
Very bad idea - 1	1	1.30%	1.30%	0.70%	
	2	0%	0.70%	0.70%	
	3	1.30%	0.70%	1.40%	
	4	6%	6.70%	9.50%	
	5	21.30%	23.50%	17.70%	
Very good idea - 6	6	70%	67.10%	69.40%	
	DK	0.70%	0.70%	2.00%	

Shows					
		0.69	0.648	0.662	
Very bad idea - 1	1	2.70%	2.80%	2.80%	
	2	0.70%	2.80%	2.80%	
	3	3.30%	6.20%	2.80%	
	4	13.30%	15.30%	18.30%	
	5	33.30%	36.80%	29.60%	
Very good idea - 6	6	46.70%	36.10%	40.10%	
	DK	0.70%	4%	5%	

Film screenings					
		0.654	0.591	0.599	+
Very bad idea - 1	1	4%	2%	4%	
	2	1.30%	7.50%	5.70%	
	3	4%	11.60%	5.00%	
	4	17.30%	21.80%	28.60%	
	5	38%	27.20%	27.10%	
Very good idea - 6	6	34.70%	29.90%	27.90%	
	DK	0.70%	2%	7%	

Sporting activities other than soccer					
		0.712	0.703	0.659	* *
Very bad idea - 1	1	2.70%	2.10%	2.80%	
	2	0%	3.50%	2.80%	
	3	4%	1.40%	4.20%	
	4	8.70%	10.40%	17.40%	
	5	30%	29.20%	31.20%	
Very good idea - 6	6	54.70%	53.50%	38.90%	
	DK	0.70%	4%	4%	

City events such as fairs events to promote a healthy lifestyle					
		0.603	0.527	0.548	
Very bad idea - 1	1	6.70%	7.50%	7.70%	

	2	4.70%	7.50%	5.60%
	3	10%	11%	10%
	4	14.70%	26.70%	27.30%
	5	26.70%	29.50%	24.50%
	Very good idea - 6	37.30%	17.80%	23.80%
	DK	0.70%	2.70%	4.70%

Events for children who spend their vacations or holidays in the city				
		0.73	0.651	0.66
	Very bad idea - 1	0.70%	3.40%	2.10%
	2	0%	2%	4%
	3	4.70%	8.10%	9.00%
	4	8.70%	18.20%	15.30%
	5	27.30%	23.60%	21.50%
	Very good idea - 6	58.70%	44.60%	47.20%
	DK	0.70%	1.30%	4.00%

Extreme sports shows						
		0.72	0.628	0.573	***	**
	Very bad idea - 1	1.30%	4.70%	9.50%		
	2	0.70%	2.70%	5.40%		
	3	4.70%	8.10%	7.50%		
	4	9.40%	17.40%	19.70%		
	5	28.20%	30.20%	25.20%		
	Very good idea - 6	55%	36.90%	32.00%		
	DK	1.30%	0.70%	2.00%		

## Changes in knowledge

The participants of Deliberative Poll received information on the topic of discussion from the briefing materials. They could deepen their knowledge asking questions to the experts and sharing their experience with fellow citizens of different age and social backgrounds. So what are the changes in the knowledge on the discussed issues? The table below shows the percentage of people who gave the correct answers to the knowledge questions.

	Before (%)	After (%)
Which of the sports facilities below is currently being rebuilt for the European football championship in 2012?	96.0	93.3
The football stadium on Bulgarska street belongs to...?***	83.3	96.0
And so far has the stadium been mainly used by...?*	86.0	92.7

The stadium on Bulgarska street is funded by...?	86.0	90.7
How many sporting, cultural and other activities during the year take place at the football stadium on Bulgarska street?*	46.7	56.7
What is the population of Poznan?***	37.3	50.0
About what percentage of the City's budget is devoted to sports?*	32.7	40.7
Knowledge Index***	66.9	74.3

Note: Before deliberation for this analyses is at the time of arrival

\*p<.05; \*\*p<.01; \*\*\*p<.001

The above data provide evidence of the growth in knowledge among the deliberation participants. Considering seven questions testing the expertise, the average increase in correct answers was about 7%. Participants gained more substantial knowledge regarding the key issue of stadium ownership. Before deliberation the right answer was given by 83% of respondents, while after it by 96%. It means the growth of 13%.

### **The evaluation of consultation process**

The evaluation questions referred among others to the objectivity of briefing materials, the group discussions and moderation as well as the expert panels. The majority of participants expressed their satisfaction with the consultation process and regarded the discussion as balanced and impartial.

*Tables showing the results of evaluation (in English) to be inserted here.*

### **Team and partners**

The first Deliberative Poll® in Poland was completed in the frames of the Social Project 2012, at the Institute of Sociology, the University of Warsaw. It was financed from the grant of the **Trust for Civil Society in Central and Eastern Europe**. **Dr Anna Przybylska** with the team was responsible for its organization. The great meritoric support was given by **the Center for Deliberative Democracy at the Stanford University**, the author of the method - **prof. James Fishkin** and **dr Alice Siu**. **The City Hall in Poznań** offered the venue for debates and gratifications for participants. **Pentor Research International** conducted the poll and invited the inhabitants of Poznań to the discussion.