

Public funding – Disclosure

Short disclosure statement

Panel provider	Dynata
Research company	The Australia Institute
Client commissioning the research	NA
Fieldwork dates	10 July 2024 to 16 July 2024
Mode of data collection	Online recruited from research panel
Target population	Australian adults aged 18+
Sample size	1,014. A further 498 South Australians were sampled to produce more precise results, but weighting was used to ensure that people from the state were not over-represented in national results.
Australian Polling Council compliant	Yes
Voting intention published	Yes
Long disclosure statement	See below

Long disclosure statement

Effective sample size after weighting applied	1,031
Margin of error associated with effective sample size	±3%
Variables used in weighting	Age, gender, state or territory based on Australian Bureau of Statistics “National, state and territory population” data
Gender identity categorisation	Those who answered the gender identity question as “Non-binary”, “I use a different term”, or “Prefer not to answer” had their responses included with females for the purpose of reporting, due to constraints from weighting data availability
Weighting method used	Raking method
Full question text, responses categories and randomisation	See below
Source of online sample	Dynata’s online panel
Positioning of voting intention questions in questionnaire	Immediately after demographics, before policy questions. Lower house voting intention was asked first, followed by upper house voting intention.
How were undecided voters handled?	Respondents who answered “Don’t know / Not sure” for voting intention were then asked a leaning question; these leanings are included in voting intention crosstabs
Method of calculating 2PP	N/A
Voting intention categorisation	Voting crosstabs show voting intentions for the House of Representatives. “Coalition” includes separate responses for Liberal and National. “Other” refers to Independent/Other, and minor parties in cases where they were included in the voting intention but represent too small a sample to be reported separately in the crosstabs
Location results	Results are shown only for larger states



**Australian
Polling Council
Quality Mark**

Alternative public funding models – Disclosure

Short disclosure statement

Panel provider	Dynata
Research company	The Australia Institute
Client commissioning the research	NA
Fieldwork dates	31 October and 3 November 2023
Mode of data collection	Online recruited from research panel
Target population	Australian adults aged 18+
Sample size	1,002 Australians, and a further 377 South Australians
Australian Polling Council compliant	Yes
Voting intention published	No
Long disclosure statement	See below

Long disclosure statement

Effective sample size after weighting applied	1,059
Margin of error associated with effective sample size	±3%
Variables used in weighting	Age, gender, state/territory based on Australian Bureau of Statistics “National, state and territory population” data
Gender identity categorisation	Those who answered the gender identity question as “Non-binary”, “I use a different term”, or “Prefer not to answer” had their responses included with females for the purpose of reporting, due to constraints from weighting data availability
Weighting method used	Raking method
Full question text, responses categories and randomisation	See below
Source of online sample	Dynata’s online panel
Positioning of voting intention questions in questionnaire	Immediately after demographics, before policy questions
How were undecided voters handled?	Respondents who answered “Don’t know / Not sure” for voting intention were then asked a leaning question; these leanings are included in voting intention crosstabs
Method of calculating 2PP	NA
Voting intention categorisation	Voting crosstabs show voting intentions for the House of Representatives. “Coalition” includes separate responses for Liberal and National. “Other” refers to Independent/Other, and minor parties in cases where they were included in the voting intention

	but represent too small a sample to be reported separately in the crosstabs
Location results	Results are shown only for larger states



**Australian
Polling Council
Quality Mark**

Detailed results – Public funding polling

Preceding questions in the poll, which were only asked to respondents in South Australia, are expected to have influenced the results of the questions published for those respondents in South Australia.

The questions, and the response options for each question, are as follows:

Have you ever donated to a political party or candidate?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / Not sure

How likely or unlikely are you to donate to a political party or candidate at the next South Australian election?

- Very likely
- Likely
- Unlikely
- Very unlikely
- Don't know / Not sure

The City of Seattle uses a public funding model for its elections, called “democracy vouchers”. Before an election, each voter is sent four vouchers worth \$25 each. They can allocate these vouchers to the candidates that they support, or recycle them if there are no candidates they wish to support.

If South Australia adopted a voucher system, and you received four vouchers each worth \$25 before the next South Australian election, how likely or unlikely is it that you would use some or all of the vouchers to support political parties or candidates?

- Very likely
- Likely
- Unlikely
- Very unlikely
- Don't know / Not sure

The City of New York uses a different public funding model for its elections, called “multiple matching”. Before an election, voters who make small donations to a candidate can have their donations topped up by public money. For example, if eligible, a \$175 donation would become \$1,050 thanks to public funding.

If South Australia adopted a multiple matching system, and your small donation to a candidate would be topped up by public money, how likely or unlikely is it that you would

make a political donation to a political party or candidate at the next South Australian election?

- Very likely
- Likely
- Unlikely
- Very unlikely
- Don't know / Not sure

Have you heard of the South Australian Government's proposal to ban political donations?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / Not sure

What is your initial impression of the proposal to ban political donations?

- Very favourable
- Somewhat favourable
- Somewhat unfavourable
- Very unfavourable
- Don't know / Not sure

Which of the following statements are closer to your understanding of how the South Australian Government's proposal would actually work?

Please select one response per pair

- It would ban political donations to all parties and candidates
- It would ban political donations to some parties and candidates only

- It would advantage the major parties
- It would advantage new entrants

- It would increase the total amount of money spent on elections and political parties
- It would reduce the total amount of money spent on elections and political parties

- In total, the major parties would receive more money (public and private) than they did before
- In total, the major parties would receive less money than they did before

- Spending caps would only apply to political parties and candidates

- Spending caps would apply to third parties like companies, unions and lobby groups as well

Which is closer to your view of how changes to South Australian election laws should work?

Please select one response per pair

- Should ban political donations to all parties and candidates
- Should ban political donations to some parties and candidates only

- Should advantage new entrants
- Should advantage the major parties

- Should increase the total amount of money spent on elections and political parties
- Should reduce the total amount of money spent on elections and political parties

- In total, the major parties should receive more money (public and private) under the donation ban than they did before
- In total, the major parties should receive less money under the donation ban than they did before

- Spending caps should only apply to political parties and candidates
- Spending caps should apply to third parties like companies, unions and lobby groups as well

To what extent do you agree or disagree?

“Any major change to South Australian electoral law should be reviewed by a multi-party committee of parliamentarians to consider its design and impacts.”

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- Don't know / Not sure

Public funding refers to taxpayer money for political parties and candidates to run election campaigns and/or cover the administrative costs of running a political party.

In your view, who should be the main beneficiaries of public funding?

Choose as many as apply

- Existing major parties like Labor and the Liberals
- Existing minor parties like the Greens, One Nation and SA-BEST
- Sitting independent MPs
- Independent candidates
- New minor parties
- Don't know / Not sure

Public funding refers to taxpayer money for political parties and candidates to run election campaigns and/or cover the administrative costs of running a political party.

After the last federal election, political parties and candidates received about \$75 million in public funding to help fund their election campaigns.

Do you support or oppose public funding for political parties and candidates?

- Strongly support
- Support
- Oppose
- Strongly oppose
- Don't know / Not sure

The federal government may be considering a significant increase in public funding to political parties and candidates.

Do you support or oppose increasing public funding for political parties and candidates?

- Strongly support
- Support
- Oppose
- Strongly oppose
- Don't know / Not sure

Detailed results – Alternative public funding models

No preceding questions in the poll are expected to have influenced the results of the questions published here.

Have you ever donated to a political party or candidate?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / Not sure

How likely or unlikely are you to donate to a political party or candidate at the next federal election?

- Very likely
- Likely
- Unlikely
- Very unlikely
- Don't know / Not sure

The City of Seattle uses a public funding model for its elections, called “democracy vouchers”. Before an election, each voter is sent four vouchers worth \$25 each. They can allocate these vouchers to the candidates that they support, or recycle them if there are no candidates they wish to support.

If Australia adopted a voucher system, and you received four vouchers each worth \$25 before the next federal election, how likely or unlikely is it that you would use some or all of the vouchers to support political parties or candidates?

- Very likely
- Likely
- Unlikely
- Very unlikely
- Don't know / Not sure

The City of New York uses a different public funding model for its elections, called “multiple matching”. Before an election, voters who make small donations to a candidate can have their donations topped up by public money. For example, if eligible, a \$175 donation would become \$1,050 thanks to public funding.

If Australia adopted a multiple matching system, and your small donation to a candidate would be topped up by public money, how likely or unlikely is it that you would make a political donation to a political party or candidate at the next federal election?

- Very likely

- Likely
- Unlikely
- Very unlikely
- Don't know / Not sure