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## $4 \mathrm{MSR} \odot$

Essential Media Communications is a member of the Association of Market and Social Research Organisations

## AMSRS

Our researchers are members of the Australian Market and Social Research Society.

## About this poll

This report summarises the results of a weekly omnibus conducted by Essential Research with data provided by Your Source. The survey was conducted online from the $11^{\text {th }}$ to $14^{\text {th }}$ November 2016 and is based on 1,014 respondents.

Aside from the standard question on voting intention, this week's report includes questions on racial discrimination, party leaders, environmental groups, the US election, political donations, compensation for victims of child sex abuse and health priorities.

The methodology used to carry out this research is described in the appendix on page 16.

Note that due to rounding, not all tables necessarily total $100 \%$ and subtotals may also vary.

## Federal voting intention

Q If a Federal Election was held today to which party will you probably give your first preference vote? If not sure, which party are you currently leaning toward? If don't know - Well which party are you currently leaning to?

|  | Total | Last <br> week <br> $8 / 11 / 16$ | 2 weeks <br> ago <br> 1/11/16 | 4 weeks <br> ago <br> $18 / 10 / 16$ | Election <br> 2 Jul 16 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Liberal | $34 \%$ | $35 \%$ | $36 \%$ | $34 \%$ |  |
| National | $3 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $3 \%$ |  |
| Total Liberal/National | $37 \%$ | $38 \%$ | $38 \%$ | $37 \%$ | $42.0 \%$ |
| Labor | $37 \%$ | $37 \%$ | $37 \%$ | $37 \%$ | $34.7 \%$ |
| Greens | $11 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $11 \%$ | $10.2 \%$ |
| Nick Xenophon Team | $3 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $3 \%$ |  |
| Pauline Hanson's One Nation | $6 \%$ | $6 \%$ | $6 \%$ | $5 \%$ |  |
| Other/Independent | $6 \%$ | $6 \%$ | $7 \%$ | $6 \%$ | $13.1 \%$ |
| 2 party preferred |  |  |  |  |  |
| Liberal National | $\mathbf{4 7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{5 0 . 4 \%}$ |
| Labor | $53 \%$ | $53 \%$ | $52 \%$ | $53 \%$ | $\mathbf{4 9 . 6 \%}$ |

NB. Sample = 1,786 The data in the above tables comprise 2-week averages derived from the first preference/leaning to voting questions. Respondents who select 'don't know' are not included in the results. The two-party preferred estimate is calculated by distributing the votes of the other parties according to their preferences at the 2016 election.

## Racial discrimination laws

Q Overall, do you think that laws governing racial discrimination in Australia are too strict, too weak or about right?

|  | Total | Vote <br> Labor | Vote <br> Lib/Nat | Vote <br> Greens | Vote <br> other |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Too strict | $\mathbf{1 7 \%}$ | $11 \%$ | $22 \%$ | $7 \%$ | $32 \%$ |
| Too weak | $\mathbf{2 6 \%}$ | $31 \%$ | $21 \%$ | $45 \%$ | $22 \%$ |
| About right | $\mathbf{4 0 \%}$ | $43 \%$ | $44 \%$ | $35 \%$ | $36 \%$ |
| Don't know | $\mathbf{1 7 \%}$ | $15 \%$ | $13 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $11 \%$ |

$40 \%$ think Australia current laws governing racial discrimination are about right, $26 \%$ think they are too weak and $17 \%$ think they are too strict. Those most likely to think they are too weak were Greens voters (45\%), Labor voters (31\%) and women (31\%)
Those most likely to think they are too strict were Liberal/National voters (22\%), other voters (32\%) and men (22\%)

## Racial Discrimination Act

Q Do you approve or disapprove of the proposal to change the Racial Discrimination Act so that it is no longer unlawful to "offend or insult" someone because of their race or ethnicity? It will still be unlawful to "humiliate or intimidate" someone because of their race or ethnicity.

|  | Total | Vote <br> Labor | Vote <br> Lib/Nat | Vote <br> Greens | Vote <br> other | Sep 2016 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total approve | $44 \%$ | $37 \%$ | $58 \%$ | $\mathbf{2 6 \%}$ | $\mathbf{5 1 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 5 \%}$ |
| Total disapprove | $33 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $23 \%$ | $\mathbf{6 2 \%}$ | $\mathbf{3 1 \%}$ | $\mathbf{3 5 \%}$ |
| Strongly approve | $15 \%$ | $11 \%$ | $22 \%$ | $7 \%$ | $18 \%$ | $16 \%$ |
| Approve | $29 \%$ | $26 \%$ | $36 \%$ | $19 \%$ | $33 \%$ | $29 \%$ |
| Disapprove | $18 \%$ | $22 \%$ | $13 \%$ | $26 \%$ | $22 \%$ | $18 \%$ |
| Strongly disapprove | $15 \%$ | $18 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $36 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $17 \%$ |
| Don't know | $23 \%$ | $23 \%$ | $19 \%$ | $12 \%$ | $17 \%$ | $21 \%$ |

$44 \%$ approve of changing the Racial Discrimination Act so that it is no longer unlawful to "offend or insult" someone because of their race or ethnicity and $33 \%$ disapprove. $58 \%$ of Liberal/National voters approve of changing the Act while $62 \%$ of Greens voters disapproved. Labor voters were split 37\% approve/40\% disapprove.

These results are very similar to those when this question was asked in September.

## Best leader of the Liberal Party

Q Which of the following do you think would make the best leader of the Liberal Party?

|  | Total | Vote <br> Labor | Vote Lib/Nat | Vote Greens | Vote other | $\begin{gathered} \text { Jun } \\ 2014 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Feb } \\ & 2015 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Aug } \\ & 2015 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Sep } \\ & 2015 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Dec } \\ 2015 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Mar } \\ 2016 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Jul } \\ 2016 \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Malcolm Turnbull | 21\% | 19\% | 36\% | 12\% | 10\% | 31\% | 24\% | 24\% | 37\% | 42\% | 39\% | 30\% |
| Tony Abbott | 11\% | 6\% | 19\% | 4\% | 13\% | 18\% | 11\% | 18\% | 9\% | 9\% | 9\% | 9\% |
| Julie Bishop | 20\% | 20\% | 20\% | 33\% | 22\% | 4\% | 21\% | 17\% | 14\% | 13\% | 12\% | 16\% |
| Christopher Pyne | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 5\% | 3\% | <1\% | <1\% | 1\% | 1\% | 2\% | 1\% | 3\% |
| Scott Morrison | 3\% | 2\% | 4\% | 1\% | 3\% | 1\% | 2\% | 3\% | 4\% | 2\% | 2\% | 3\% |
| Someone else | 18\% | 23\% | 7\% | 17\% | 36\% | 19\% | 13\% | 13\% | 10\% | 9\% | 15\% | 19\% |
| Don't know | 25\% | 29\% | 12\% | 28\% | 14\% | 21\% | 24\% | 22\% | 21\% | 22\% | 21\% | 21\% |

21\% (down 9\% since July) think Malcolm Turnbull would make the best leader of the Liberal Party, 20\% prefer Julie Bishop (up 4\%) and 11\% prefer Tony Abbott (up 2\%). 18\% (down 1\%) prefer someone else.
Among Liberal/National voters, 36\% (down 14\%) prefer Malcolm Turnbull, 20\% (up 3\%) Julie Bishop and 19\% (up 6\%) prefer Tony Abbott.
Preferences of men were Malcolm Turnbull 25\% (-6\%), Julie Bishop 19\% (+2\%) and Tony Abbott 13\% (+4\%).
Preferences of women were Julie Bishop 22\% (+7\%), Malcolm Turnbull 17\% (-11\%) and Tony Abbott 9\% (+1\%).

## Best leader of the Labor Party

Q Which of the following do you think would make the best leader of the Labor Party?

|  | Total | Vote <br> Labor | Vote <br> Lib/Nat | Vote <br> Greens | Vote <br> other | Aug <br> 2015 | Dec <br> 2015 | Mar <br> 2016 | 2016 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

$17 \%$ (down 10\% since July) think Bill Shorten would make the best leader of the Labor Party, 14\% (up 2\%) prefer Tanya Plibersek and 12\% (up 1\%) Anthony Albanese. 18\% prefer someone else and 32\% don't know.

Among Labor voters, 37\% (down 14\%) prefer Bill Shorten, 16\% (up 4\%) Tanya Plibersek and 14\% (up 3\%) Anthony Albanese.
Preferences of men were Bill Shorten 19\% (-10\%), Anthony Albanese 16\% (+3\%) and Tanya Plibersek 13\% (-1\%).
Preferences of women were Bill Shorten 16\% (-9\%), Tanya Plibersek 14\% (+3\%) and Anthony Albanese 9\% (no change).

## Environmental groups

Q Currently, donations to charities, including environmental protection, social welfare and religious organisations, are tax deductible. Donations to political parties are also tax deductible. Do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

|  | Total agree | Total disagree | Strongly agree | Agree | Disagree | Strongly disagree | Don't know |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Environmental groups should be able to publicly criticise the government if it makes decisions that cause environmental destruction. | 74\% | 11\% | 34\% | 40\% | 7\% | 4\% | 15\% |
| I should be able to make a tax deduction for donations \| make to environmental groups such as WWF and ACF | 70\% | 13\% | 30\% | 40\% | 8\% | 5\% | 17\% |
| Environmental groups play an important role to play in holding the government to account for environmentally destructive decisions. | 69\% | 14\% | 28\% | 41\% | 9\% | 5\% | 16\% |
| Environmental groups should be able to take the government to court if the government makes a decision that does not comply with environmental law | 67\% | 16\% | 32\% | 35\% | 10\% | 6\% | 17\% |

More than two-thirds agreed with each statement.
$70 \%$ agree that donations to environmental groups should be tax deductible and 74\% agree that environmental groups should be able to publicly criticise the Government.
$82 \%$ of Greens voters, $73 \%$ of Labor voters and $69 \%$ of Liberal/National voters agree donations should be tax deductible.

## Interest in US election

Q Thinking about elections, have you taken more or less interest in the US election than the July election in Australia?

|  | Total | Vote <br> Labor | Vote <br> Lib/Nat | Vote <br> Greens | Vote <br> other |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Taken more interest in the US election | $33 \%$ | $32 \%$ | $37 \%$ | $31 \%$ | $36 \%$ |
| Taken less interest in the US election | $22 \%$ | $22 \%$ | $24 \%$ | $25 \%$ | $22 \%$ |
| About the same interest | $38 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $37 \%$ | $41 \%$ | $38 \%$ |
| Don't know | $6 \%$ | $6 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $4 \%$ |

$33 \%$ say they took more interest in the US election than the Australian election, $22 \%$ took less interest and $38 \%$ about the same interest. Those more likely to take more interest in the US election than the Australian election were aged 18-24 ( $45 \%$ ), full-time workers ( $38 \%$ ) and incomes over \$1,500pw (39\%).

## Political donations

Q Would you support or oppose introducing the following requirement concerning political donation?

|  | Total support | Total oppose | Strongly support | Support | Oppose | Strongly oppose | Don't know |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All politicians to publicly disclose meetings with representatives of companies, donors or unions | 77\% | 6\% | 41\% | 36\% | 4\% | 2\% | 17\% |
| Political donations to be reported immediately by political parties, compared to annual reports at the moment | 73\% | 6\% | 37\% | 36\% | 5\% | 1\% | 21\% |
| A ban on foreign donations | 66\% | 12\% | 40\% | 26\% | 9\% | 3\% | 23\% |
| A cap on donations of \$5000 | 61\% | 13\% | 27\% | 34\% | 10\% | 3\% | 26\% |
| A ban on political donations by companies and unions | 59\% | 16\% | 29\% | 30\% | 14\% | 2\% | 26\% |
| All donations banned and all political party spending to be taxpayer funded | 25\% | 49\% | 11\% | 14\% | 24\% | 25\% | 26\% |


| Support by party preference | Total <br> support | Vote <br> Labor | Vote <br> Lib/Nat | Vote <br> Greens | Vote <br> other |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All politicians to publicly disclose meetings with <br> representatives of companies, donors or unions | $77 \%$ | $77 \%$ | $80 \%$ | $84 \%$ | $88 \%$ |
| Political donations to be reported immediately by political <br> parties, compared to annual reports at the moment | $73 \%$ | $72 \%$ | $73 \%$ | $84 \%$ | $88 \%$ |
| A ban on foreign donations | $66 \%$ | $61 \%$ | $70 \%$ | $70 \%$ | $83 \%$ |
| A cap on donations of \$5000 | $61 \%$ | $59 \%$ | $64 \%$ | $69 \%$ | $73 \%$ |
| A ban on political donations by companies and unions | $59 \%$ | $53 \%$ | $64 \%$ | $64 \%$ | $75 \%$ |
| All donations banned and all political party spending to <br> be taxpayer funded | $25 \%$ | $25 \%$ | $31 \%$ | $27 \%$ | $26 \%$ |

There was majority support for all listed reforms except taxpayer funding for political parties ( $25 \%$ support/49\% oppose).
There was particularly strong support for public disclosure of meetings ( $77 \%$ ) and immediate reporting of donations ( $73 \%$ ).
$64 \%$ of Liberal/National voters supported a ban on donations from companies and unions compared to $53 \%$ of Labor voters. Labor voters were a little less supportive than Liberal/National voters of all reforms listed.

## Compensation for victims

Q Do you support the Government's proposal to pay compensation to victims of child sex abuse or do you think the institutions like the churches should pay the compensation?

|  | Total | Vote <br> Labor | Vote <br> Lib/Nat | Vote <br> Greens | Vote <br> other |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Support Government paying compensation | $14 \%$ | $18 \%$ | $15 \%$ | $13 \%$ | $9 \%$ |
| Institutions should pay the compensation | $63 \%$ | $59 \%$ | $65 \%$ | $76 \%$ | $74 \%$ |
| Neither should pay compensation | $7 \%$ | $6 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $5 \%$ | $8 \%$ |
| Don't know | $16 \%$ | $18 \%$ | $12 \%$ | $5 \%$ | $10 \%$ |

$63 \%$ think that institutions should pay compensation to victims of child abuse and $14 \%$ support the Government's proposal to pay compensation. Those most likely to think the institutions should pay compensation were Greens voters (76\%), other party voters (74\%) and aged $55+$ ( $80 \%$ ).

## Government health priorities

Q Thinking about the Health System where do you think the government's top 3 funding priorities should lie?

|  | Total | Priority 1 | Priority $2$ | Priority $3$ | Vote Labor | Vote <br> Lib/Nat | Vote Greens | Vote other |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Reducing emergency waiting lists | 57\% | 27\% | 18\% | 12\% | 55\% | 60\% | 52\% | 56\% |
| Building new public hospitals | 32\% | 11\% | 10\% | 11\% | 38\% | 32\% | 20\% | 33\% |
| Expanding access to free dental care | 32\% | 10\% | 11\% | 11\% | 34\% | 29\% | 35\% | 31\% |
| Subsidising more medicines under the PBS | 32\% | 10\% | 11\% | 11\% | 31\% | 32\% | 23\% | 38\% |
| Increasing the Medicare rebate | 30\% | 10\% | 11\% | 9\% | 30\% | 34\% | 22\% | 22\% |
| More resources for mental health | 27\% | 9\% | 9\% | 9\% | 30\% | 22\% | 38\% | 29\% |
| More investment in aged care facilities | 27\% | 7\% | 9\% | 11\% | 27\% | 30\% | 21\% | 29\% |
| Training more specialists | 20\% | 3\% | 8\% | 9\% | 19\% | 20\% | 14\% | 21\% |
| More public health campaigns to reduce demand | 13\% | 3\% | 4\% | 6\% | 9\% | 14\% | 26\% | 12\% |
| More resources for indigenous health | 12\% | 4\% | 3\% | 5\% | 10\% | 10\% | 28\% | 6\% |
| Expanding out of hours Medicare services (eg home visits) | 11\% | 2\% | 5\% | 4\% | 11\% | 11\% | 11\% | 8\% |
| Investing in capacity to deliver health services online | 8\% | 3\% | 2\% | 3\% | 6\% | 7\% | 10\% | 12\% |

Top health priorities for the Government were reducing emergency waiting lists (57\%), building new public hospitals (32\%), expanding access to free dental care (32\%) and subsidising more medicines under the PBS (32\%).

Labor voters were more likely to prioritise building new public hospitals (38\%).
Greens voters were more likely to prioritise more resources for mental health (38\%), more resources for indigenous health (28\%) and more public health campaigns to reduce demand (26\%).

## Appendix: Methodology, margin of error and professional standards

The data gathered for this report is gathered from a weekly online omnibus conducted by Your Source. Essential Research has been utilizing the Your Source online panel to conduct research on a week-by-week basis since November 2007.
Each week, the team at Essential Media Communications discusses issues that are topical and a series of questions are devised to put to the Australian public. Some questions are repeated regularly (such as political preference and leadership approval), while others are unique to each week and reflect media and social issues that are present at the time.

Your Source has a self-managed consumer online panel of over 100,000 members. The majority of panel members have been recruited using off line methodologies, effectively ruling out concerns associated with online self-selection.
Your Source has validation methods in place that prevent panelist over use and ensure member authenticity. Your Source randomly selects $18+$ males and females (with the aim of targeting 50/50 males/females) from its Australia wide panel. An invitation is sent out to approximately $7000-8000$ of their panel members.
The response rate varies each week, but usually delivers $1000+$ interviews. In theory, with a sample of this size, there is 95 per cent certainty that the results are within 3 percentage points of what they would be if the entire population had been polled. However, this assumes random sampling, which, because of non-response and less than $100 \%$ population coverage cannot be achieved in practice. Furthermore, there are other possible sources of error in all polls including question wording and question order, interviewer bias (for telephone and face-to-face polls), response errors and weighting. The best guide to a poll's accuracy is to look at the record of the polling company - how have they performed at previous elections or other occasions where their estimates can be compared with known population figures. In the last poll before the 2016 election, the Essential Report estimates of first preference votes averaged less than $1 \%$ difference from the election results and the two-party preferred difference was only $0.1 \%$.

The Your Source online omnibus is live from the Wednesday night of each week and closed on the following Sunday. Incentives are offered to participants in the form of points. Essential Research uses the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) software to analyse the data. The data is weighted against Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) data.

All Essential Research and senior Your Source staff hold Australian Market and Social Research Society (AMSRS) membership and are bound by professional codes of behaviour. Your Source is an Australian social and market research company specializing in recruitment, field research, data gathering and data analysis. Essential Research is a member of the Association Market and Social Research Organisations (AMSRO). Your Source holds Interviewer Quality Control Australia (IQCA) accreditation, Association Market and Social Research Organisations (AMSRO) membership and World Association of Opinion and Marketing Research Professionals (ESOMAR) membership.

