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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 $29^{\text {th }}$ June to $3^{\text {rd }}$ July 2017 and is based on 1,025 respondents.

Aside from the standard question on voting intention, this week's report includes questions on same sex marriage, housing affordability and Tony Abbott.

The methodology used to carry out this research is described in the appendix on page 13.

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> $27 / 6 / 17$ | 2 weeks <br> ago <br> 20/6/17 | 4 weeks <br> ago <br> $6 / 6 / 17$ | Election <br> 2 Jul 16 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Liberal | $35 \%$ | $35 \%$ | $35 \%$ | $36 \%$ |  |
| National | $3 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $3 \%$ |  |
| Total Liberal/National | $38 \%$ | $39 \%$ | $38 \%$ | $39 \%$ | $42.0 \%$ |
| Labor | $36 \%$ | $36 \%$ | $35 \%$ | $37 \%$ | $34.7 \%$ |
| Greens | $11 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $10.2 \%$ |
| Nick Xenophon Team | $3 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $3 \%$ |  |
| Pauline Hanson's One Nation | $7 \%$ | $7 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $6 \%$ |  |
| Other/Independent | $5 \%$ | $5 \%$ | $5 \%$ | $6 \%$ | $13.1 \%$ |
| 2 party preferred |  |  |  |  |  |
| Liberal National | $\mathbf{4 7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{5 0 . 4 \%}$ |
| Labor | $53 \%$ | $52 \%$ | $52 \%$ | $52 \%$ | $\mathbf{4 9 . 6 \%}$ |

NB. Sample $=1,797$. 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.

## Same sex marriage

Q Do you think people of the same sex should or should not be allowed to marry?

|  | Total | Vote Labor | Vote Lib/Nat | Vote Greens | Vote Other | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Oct } \\ & 2013 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Jun } \\ 2014 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Oct } \\ & 2015 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Mar } \\ 2016 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Jul } \\ 2016 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Aug } \\ & 2016 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Jun } \\ 2017 \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Should be allowed to marry I | 63\% | 75\% | 52\% | 86\% | 51\% | 57\% | 60\% | 59\% | 64\% | 58\% | 62\% | 60\% |
| Should not be allowed to marry | 25\% | 15\% | 35\% | 11\% | 36\% | 31\% | 28\% | 30\% | 26\% | 28\% | 27\% | 26\% |
| Don't know | 12\% | 9\% | 13\% | 3\% | 13\% | 12\% | 12\% | 11\% | 10\% | 14\% | 12\% | 14\% |

$63 \%$ thought that people of the same sex should be able to marry (up $3 \%$ since June 6), and $25 \%$ thought that they should not (down $1 \%$ ).
Women (70\% support) were more likely than men (56\%) to support same sex marriage.
$74 \%$ of 18-24 year olds supported same sex marriage, compared to $48 \%$ of over 65 year olds.
This poll represents the highest level of support for same sex marriage in over a year - since 64\% support was recorded in March 2016.

## Decision on same sex marriage

Q Do you think the issue of same sex marriage should be decided by Parliament or should there be a national vote?

|  | Total | Vote <br> Labor | Vote Lib/Nat | Vote Greens | Vote other | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Sep } \\ & 2015 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Mar } \\ 2016 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Jul } \\ 2016 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Aug } \\ & 2016 \end{aligned}$ | June $2017$ | Vote "Yes" | Vote <br> "No" |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Should be decided by Parliament | 29\% | 35\% | 23\% | 53\% | 25\% | 21\% | 23\% | 25\% | 25\% | 27\% | 35\% | 19\% |
| Should have a national vote | 59\% | 54\% | 68\% | 43\% | 68\% | 67\% | 66\% | 60\% | 59\% | 61\% | 57\% | 74\% |
| Don't know | 12\% | 11\% | 9\% | 4\% | 8\% | 12\% | 11\% | 15\% | 16\% | 12\% | 8\% | 7\% |

$59 \%$ thought that same sex marriage should be decided by a national vote (down $2 \%$ since June 6), and $29 \%$ thought it should be decided by parliament (up 2\%).

Those who do not support same sex marriage were much more likely to prefer a national vote (74\% prefer, compared to $57 \%$ of same sex marriage supporters).

Men were more likely to prefer a vote in parliament (34\% prefer) than women (24\%).

## Housing affordability

Q Do you think housing in your area is affordable or unaffordable for someone on an average income?

| Support by party preference | Total | Vote Labor | Vote Lib/Nat | Vote Greens | Vote other | Capital Cities | Regional | NSW | VIC | $\begin{aligned} & \text { June } \\ & 2015 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Affordable | 25\% | 27\% | 26\% | 23\% | 24\% | 21\% | 32\% | 17\% | 27\% | 33\% |
| Unaffordable | 66\% | 67\% | 67\% | 67\% | 63\% | 72\% | 56\% | 76\% | 68\% | 60\% |
| Don't know | 9\% | 6\% | 7\% | 10\% | 12\% | 7\% | 12\% | 7\% | 5\% | 7\% |

$25 \%$ thought that housing in their area is affordable for someone on an average income (down 8\% since June 2015), and 66\% thought it is unaffordable (up 6\%)

Those most likely to think housing was unaffordable were those from NSW (76\%), those aged 45-54 (75\%) and 55-64 (73\%), and those earning less than $\$ 31 \mathrm{k}$ per year ( $72 \%$ ).

Those most likely to think housing is affordable were South Australians (36\%) and Queenslanders (30\%).
There was little difference between Labor, Liberal/National and Greens voters on this question.

## Change in housing affordability

Q Do you think housing in your area has become more affordable or less affordable over the last few years?

| Support by party preference | Total | Vote Labor | Vote <br> Lib/Nat | Vote Greens | Vote other | Capital Cities | Region al | NSW | VIC | $\begin{aligned} & \text { June } \\ & 2015 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total more affordable | 12\% | 13\% | 13\% | 13\% | 10\% | 11\% | 13\% | 7\% | 7\% | 11\% |
| Total less affordable | 72\% | 74\% | 73\% | 74\% | 70\% | 76\% | 66\% | 82\% | 81\% | 75\% |
| A lot more affordable | 3\% | 4\% | 2\% | 2\% | 1\% | 2\% | 3\% | 1\% | 3\% | 1\% |
| A little more affordable | 9\% | 9\% | 11\% | 11\% | 9\% | 9\% | 10\% | 6\% | 4\% | 10\% |
| A little less affordable | 26\% | 25\% | 27\% | 29\% | 27\% | 25\% | 27\% | 22\% | 25\% | 33\% |
| A lot less affordable | 46\% | 49\% | 46\% | 45\% | 43\% | 51\% | 39\% | 60\% | 56\% | 42\% |
| No change | 9\% | 7\% | 9\% | 6\% | 16\% | 7\% | 12\% | 5\% | 6\% | 10\% |
| Don't know | 7\% | 5\% | 5\% | 6\% | 5\% | 6\% | 9\% | 5\% | 6\% | 5\% |

$72 \%$ thought that housing in their area has become less affordable over the last few years (up 1\% from June 2015) - including 46\% who though it was a lot less affordable.
$82 \%$ of residents of NSW and $81 \%$ of Victorians thought housing has become less affordable.
A majority of each demographic group thought that housing has become less affordable.
There was little difference between Labor, Liberal/National and Greens voters on this question.

## Importance of home ownership

Q How important do you feel home ownership is to a person's financial security?

| Support by party preference | Total | Vote <br> Labor | Vote <br> Lib/Nat | Vote <br> Greens | Vote <br> other |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total important | $\mathbf{8 9 \%}$ | $\mathbf{9 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{9 2 \%}$ | $\mathbf{8 7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{9 1 \%}$ |
| Total not important | $\mathbf{8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{6 \%}$ | $\mathbf{7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{6 \%}$ |
| Very important | $51 \%$ | $55 \%$ | $51 \%$ | $44 \%$ | $53 \%$ |
| Somewhat important | $38 \%$ | $35 \%$ | $41 \%$ | $43 \%$ | $38 \%$ |
| Not very important | $6 \%$ | $6 \%$ | $5 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $4 \%$ |
| Not important at all | $2 \%$ | - | $2 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $2 \%$ |
| Don't know | $4 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $3 \%$ |

$89 \%$ think that home ownership is important to a person's financial security, including $51 \%$ who think it is very important.
Over $80 \%$ of each demographic group think home ownership is important to a person's financial security

## Cost of housing

Q If house prices were to rise in the future, do you think the following groups would be better or worse off?

|  | Total <br> better <br> off | Total <br> worse <br> off | Much <br> better <br> off | Better <br> off | No <br> change | Worse <br> off | Much <br> worse <br> off | Don't <br> know |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current home owners | $\mathbf{4 1 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 2 \%}$ | $12 \%$ | $29 \%$ | $31 \%$ | $13 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $7 \%$ |
| People living in regional areas | $\mathbf{1 2 \%}$ | $\mathbf{5 0 \%}$ | $2 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $30 \%$ | $30 \%$ | $20 \%$ | $9 \%$ |
| People living in the inner city | $\mathbf{1 1 \%}$ | $\mathbf{5 6 \%}$ | $2 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $22 \%$ | $29 \%$ | $27 \%$ | $10 \%$ |
| People living in the outer suburbs | $\mathbf{1 1 \%}$ | $\mathbf{5 7 \%}$ | $2 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $23 \%$ | $36 \%$ | $21 \%$ | $10 \%$ |
| People receiving the age pension | $\mathbf{5 \%}$ | $\mathbf{7 1 \%}$ | $1 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $18 \%$ | $26 \%$ | $45 \%$ | $6 \%$ |
| Renters | $\mathbf{4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{7 7 \%}$ | $1 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $41 \%$ | $36 \%$ | $5 \%$ |
| Young people | $\mathbf{4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{8 3 \%}$ | $1 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $35 \%$ | $48 \%$ | $4 \%$ |
| People on low incomes | $\mathbf{2 \%}$ | $\mathbf{8 5 \%}$ | $1 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $8 \%$ | $26 \%$ | $59 \%$ | $3 \%$ |

The only group who respondents thought would be better off if house prices were to rise in the future were those who currently own homes (41\% better off). For all other groups, a majority thought they will be worse off.
Over $80 \%$ thought that young people and people on low incomes would be worse off if house prices were to rise.

## Housing affordability measures

Q Do you support or oppose the following measures to increase housing affordability?

|  | Total support | Total oppose | Strongly support | Support | Neither support nor oppose | Oppose | Strongly oppose | Don't know |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Increasing restrictions on foreign nationals purchasing existing residential property | 74\% | 6\% | 51\% | 23\% | 13\% | 3\% | 3\% | 7\% |
| Providing tax incentives for older residents to sell their family home and "downsize" | 56\% | 11\% | 19\% | 37\% | 24\% | 6\% | 5\% | 9\% |
| Make more land on city fringes available for housing development | 53\% | 14\% | 19\% | 34\% | 23\% | 8\% | 6\% | 11\% |
| A ban on "interest only" loans for property investors | 44\% | 17\% | 21\% | 23\% | 23\% | 10\% | 7\% | 16\% |
| Allowing first home buyers to withdraw a portion of their superannuation for a house deposit | 44\% | 30\% | 14\% | 30\% | 17\% | 16\% | 14\% | 9\% |
| Remove negative gearing tax concessions for property investors | 43\% | 23\% | 21\% | 22\% | 18\% | 12\% | 11\% | 15\% |

Each measure receive greater support than opposition, with three receiving majority support - increasing restrictions of foreign nationals purchasing property ( $74 \%$ support), providing tax incentives for downsizers (56\%), and making more land available for development on city fringes (53\%).

The most polarising measure was allowing first home buyers to use their superannuation for a house deposit, which received $44 \%$ support and $30 \%$ opposition.

## Tony Abbott

Q Do you think Tony Abbott should:

|  | Total | Vote <br> Labor | Vote <br> Lib/Nat | Vote Greens | Vote other | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Aug } \\ & 2016 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { April } \\ & 2017 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Stay in parliament on the backbench | 14\% | 13\% | 19\% | 10\% | 15\% | 21\% | 17\% |
| Stay in parliament and be given a ministry | 18\% | 12\% | 25\% | 9\% | 34\% | 25\% | 17\% |
| Resign from parliament | 43\% | 54\% | 35\% | 68\% | 36\% | 37\% | 40\% |
| Don't know | 24\% | 21\% | 22\% | 13\% | 15\% | 17\% | 26\% |

$43 \%$ think Tony Abbott should resign from parliament (up 3\% from April), while 32\% think he should stay in parliament in some capacity (down $2 \%$ ). Liberal/National voters were more likely to think Tony Abbott should stay in parliament (44\%) than Labor voters (25\%) and Greens voters (19\%). Other party/independent voters were most likely to think he should stay in parliament (49\%).

Since this questions was first asked in August 2016, the proportion of those who think Tony Abbott should stay in parliament has fallen from $46 \%$ to 32\%.

## 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.

