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We stand in footsteps millennia old, may we acknowledge all traditional owners of this great brown land both past and present.

Prepared in partnership with BWM.
WHO ENGAGED IN CONVERSATION?

195,831 people engaged with questions online March - May 2017

Generating a reach of 2,824,702 impressions

199,961 website views

70,570 Facebook & Twitter likes, comments, shares

5,300 survey participants

TOP 5 LOCATIONS

PERTH

BRISBANE

SYDNEY

CANBERRA

MELBOURNE

GENDER

FEMALE 43.35%

MALE 54.65%

AGE

24-35yr & 65+yr greatest participation on social

Television identified as source of most information on the issue for non-aboriginal & Torres Strait Islander population

Word of mouth, social & community events were key information sources for the aboriginal & Torres Strait Islander population
About this report

This report summarises the findings of a social and digital consultation project (the consultations) hosted by Cox Inall Ridgeway (in partnership with BWM Dentsu), to explore levels of support for constitutional reform and to determine the key reactions to the five options for reform that formed the basis of the Referendum Council's consultations.

The five options for reform included:

- Inserting an acknowledgement of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples as the First Peoples of Australia,
- Amending or replacing the 'race power',
- Inserting a guarantee against racial discrimination,
- Providing for an Indigenous voice to be heard by Parliament, and
- Deleting section 25.

The level of support for constitutional change was measured in two ways - a survey conducted online and via telephone, and through sentiment tracking across social and digital consultations held on the Council's website and social media platforms.

The two methods delivered starkly different results. The majority of those who participated in the online and telephone surveys were in favour of constitutional reform. This result was in direct contrast to social media sentiment, which was overwhelmingly neutral or negative.

Social and digital consultations

Social and digital consultations were carried out across the Referendum Council website (www.referendumcouncil.org.au), Facebook page and Twitter feed.

Consultation began in February 2017 and finished on 15 May 2017. During this time, the platforms were updated weekly with news, content and weekly themes to engage the Australian population to share their ideas, opinions and thoughts on the options for reform. Approved questions relating to the five reform options were also posed to facilitate discussion.

Total reach generated by digital consultation efforts was 2,824,702 impressions.

As well as hosting consultation and encouraging discussion, the Council's digital platforms provided a place for the public to access information about constitutional reform and the Referendum Council. The platforms were intended to exist only for the duration of the consultation and the Referendum Council's tenure.

The process for developing the platforms included research to determine current awareness of, and attitudes towards, constitutional reform. A review was undertaken of the cultural appropriateness for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander audiences of digital strategies and content.

Measuring online sentiment

Council's digital platforms were constructed with integrated consultation tools via social media and an on-site submission form.

Data was collected throughout the digital consultation period using reporting software that included Google Analytics, Facebook Dashboard, Twitter Reports and Sysomos Social Monitoring.
Sentiment was measured and reviewed through a dual process of machine filtering and analysis by research experts to ensure humour, sarcasm and irony, as well as overall intonation, were evaluated. All posts were reviewed in relation to the specific options for reform. The following defines how sentiment has been identified in this report.

- Positive sentiment represents a positive opinion towards the option.
- Neutral sentiment represents an indecisive opinion or a question regarding the topic requesting further information.
- Negative sentiment represents a negative opinion on the options for reform.
- ‘Not Applicable’ sentiment represents comments not providing any indication of positive, negative or neutral support on the options for reform.

**Surveys**

A total of 5,300 people participated in online and telephone surveys over a six month period between November 2016 and May 2017. Surveys were conducted in three phases during this period.

Two samples of 2,500 Australians completed a 5-minute online survey. The first survey was conducted in November 2016, the second survey in April 2017, both with different samples. The third survey re-contacted all participants from both surveys at the completion of the digital consultations (May 2017) to assess any significant changes in sentiment and preference for the reform options. Participants were representative of Australia’s diverse geography and demography.

A boost sample of 100 participants identifying as Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander were also surveyed via CATI (telephone interviews) at the same time that each online survey was conducted. Telephone surveys were conducted with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples to understand their views compared to those of the wider community.

The aim of the surveys was to benchmark and determine levels of awareness and attitudes toward constitutional reform across a range of demographic groups, within both Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities and the wider community. Importantly, the surveys were also used to determine any changes in awareness or attitudes across the consultation period. The survey included a mix of nominal and interval questions. The specific issues quantified related to levels of:

- awareness of constitutional reform,
- understanding of possible reforms,
- positive/negative views on the options, and
- understanding of information sources that influenced respondents’ awareness of constitutional reform.

**Survey results**

The majority of those who participated in the online and telephone surveys were in favour of the Council’s five reform options. This includes a majority among the wider community and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities.

A very strong level of support was expressed for the guarantee against racial discrimination, with three in four members of the wider community and four in five Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples, in favour of the option.
While strong support was also expressed for an Indigenous voice to Parliament, this option was favoured by a larger proportion of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples (80%) than the non-Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander population (68%).

A majority of both groups supported removing or amending the ‘race power’ (65% and 62% respectively).

A similar majority supported the insertion of a statement acknowledging Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples as the First Australians, with 63% of online survey participants and 67% of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples in favour of this option for reform.

The lowest levels of support were expressed for the deletion of section 25 (62% of the wider community and 56% of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples).

Overall, support was highest amongst young and educated Australians. For example, 76% of higher educated Australians supported the option for a statement of acknowledgement compared with 63% of the broader population.

These survey results are indicative only and provide a point of comparison for the online sentiment results. They also assist in measuring changes in views over time, including as a result of the Referendum Council’s public engagement process.
Sentiment: Survey vs Social

Majority of those who participated in the online and telephone surveys were in favour of the options for reform. Public conversations on social media during the consultation period were largely neutral or negative.

Who was most supportive?

Overall, support was highest amongst young and educated Australians.

- 80% of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people supported the option for an Indigenous voice to Parliament.
- 63% of the broader population supported the option for a statement of acknowledgement.
### Sentiment Across Surveys

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Prepared to Support</th>
<th>Not Prepared to Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Changes to Prevent Racial Discrimination</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An Indigenous Voice to Parliament</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power to Make Laws for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Peoples</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement about the First Peoples of Australia</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removing Section 25</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:
- Green: Prepared to support
- Red: Not prepared to support

### Sentiment Across Social

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Changes to Prevent Racial Discrimination</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement about the First Peoples of Australia</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removing Section 25</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An Indigenous Voice to Parliament</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>42.65%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power to Make Laws for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Peoples</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:
- Green: Positive
- Blue: Neutral
- Red: Negative
- Orange: N/A
Access to information
The online and telephone surveys generated other insights into perceptions of the adequacy and availability of information about the reform options and preferred channels for receiving information.

Among online survey participants, just two in five people felt they had access to enough information to make an educated decision on constitutional reform. Television was identified as the biggest channel for information on the issue, followed by print media. Only 22% could recall the last place they saw reference to constitutional reform.

Levels of awareness were higher among Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples, with one in two reporting they felt adequately informed on the issues. Word of mouth, social media and community events were prioritised as key information sources by Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.

Social and digital consultation sentiment
In contrast to the popular support expressed in the online and telephone surveys, public conversations on social media during the consultation period were largely neutral or negative.

Negative sentiment was sitting around 40% for the proposed guarantee against racial discrimination (41.2%). The option to include a statement acknowledging Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples as the First Australians was at 37.7% negative and the option to delete section 25 was at 42.5% negative. In each case, negative sentiment was two to three times higher than positive sentiment.

Social media commentary in relation to the option to include an Indigenous voice to Parliament and the option to amend or remove the ‘race power’ was largely neutral, although one in four expressed negative sentiment (24.9% and 27% respectively). Positive sentiment was at its lowest level for options for an Indigenous voice to Parliament (8.35% in favour) and for removing or amending the ‘race power’ (less than 1% in favour).

Insights into levels of negative sentiment are further explained in ‘Interpreting the Findings.’

Preferred options across all platforms
When the levels of positive sentiment from the surveys, website and social media sentiment are combined, an Indigenous voice to Parliament is the most popular reform (39.3%). This is followed by changes to prevent racial discrimination (35.6%), a statement about the First Peoples of Australia (34%) and removing section 25 (31.9%). There was significantly less overall positive support for the inclusion of a power to make laws for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples (16.3%).

Consistent themes
A number of themes emerged throughout the consultation period in relation to the options for reform and constitutional recognition more broadly.

Mistrust of Government: There was a high level of mistrust expressed among both the wider community and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples, as well as suspicion as to the ‘true motivation’ for some of the options for reform.

Interest in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander preferences: There was strong interest from the wider community as to which options Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples prefer, and why, as a way to inform their own decision-making.

Closing the Gap agenda: There was some concern that constitutional reform will ‘replace’ or ‘draw attention away from’ other pressing issues including social justice and the Closing the Gap agenda.
Lack of community input: There was concern that this was a 'government driven' rather than 'community driven' process and that community leadership had limited opportunities to participate in the discussion. This was one of the most discussed topics throughout the digital consultations.

For example, many people expressed their frustration at the Referendum Council’s dialogues. Some social media users criticised the Council for not running the dialogues with the broader community and raised concerns that key members were not allowed to participate in conversations. Others raised the issue that some Elders live in remote areas with no access to internet and may be unaware of the conversations taking place.

Substantive versus ‘meaningless’ change: There was some concern that the options offered meaningless changes that would not positively impact the lives and experiences of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.

Recognition stops Treaty: Some discussed the move toward recognition being a ploy by the Government that sounded beneficial to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples but that would prevent any chance of having a Treaty in Australia.

Special treatment: The singling out of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples in the constitution was viewed by some as a backwards step in terms of achieving racial equality in Australia.

Interpreting the findings: considerations and insights

Online disinhibition

It is strongly suggested the Council give the online and phone survey results more weight (than the social results) in understanding levels of support for its options. Using online opinion as an indicator of what the wider population thinks about an issue is problematic for a number of reasons, most significantly because of the online disinhibition effect.

This is a tendency for online commentators to act out or be less civil than in 'real' life.

Social media tracking was helpful in providing a strong sense of the way people who are active online are talking about constitutional reform. It is also useful in understanding the key misapprehensions and concerns of people who are unfamiliar with the issues.

Low participation

There were a number of challenges in attracting a wide and diverse audience to the digital conversation. Although an advertising budget of $50,000 was spread across the full eight week campaign to ensure maximum visibility of posts, this proved to be insufficient to engage a large number of commentators in the discussion.

Almost 200,000 people viewed content on the digital platform, but few chose to actively engage through comments, shares or reactions to the posts. This participation was mostly limited to people with extreme views, including those making racist comments, or expressing a singularly pro-sovereignty view.

Some commenters who supported the Council’s reform options or asked questions were trolled, while others appeared to have a vendetta against the Council. Others asked for an anonymous method of providing their views.

Through the screening and moderation process profanity and discriminatory posts were discarded, as per the terms and conditions of participation.
Sentiment change in online surveys
Across many of the options for reform, support from online survey participants dropped between sampling waves one to two, but returned to original levels by wave three.

Although no research was undertaken into why this may be the case, it should be noted that by wave three (post consultation period) the topic of constitutional reform was gaining strong mainstream media attention and was being mentioned more frequently across multiple media platforms. This could be attributed to a stronger level of support or a ‘return’ of support within both populations.

A number of other national debates were also taking place alongside the digital consultations, such as the option to change section 18c of the Racial Discrimination Act. During this time, numerous negative comments were made on the Council’s social platforms about these issues. This demonstrates confusion by members of the population and the impact of related national debates on sentiment during the consultation period.

Complex nature of issues
It should also be noted that throughout the entire project, many respondents commented on the complex nature of the material being discussed and limited access to educational materials. This may have led to negative responses from people who may have misunderstood or not fully understood the options and their impacts.

Some participants reported the complexity of the information being a barrier to interest and engagement.

Through focus testing which occurred prior to the consultation period, many people reported having low levels of awareness of the Constitution, the process of Referendums and the political system in general.

Topic 1: Changing the Constitution to help stop racial discrimination

Online survey results
Survey participants, both in the wider community and among Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples, were overwhelmingly in favour of changing the Constitution to help stop racial discrimination.

Approximately three quarters of people supported inclusion of a constitutional prohibition on racial discrimination.

Support was consistently around 75% throughout the process for the wider community. Support dropped off slightly (5%) among Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander participants between waves one and two, however had returned to 80% by the third wave.

Social media sentiment
In contrast, overall sentiment across the social channels was negative in relation to changing the Constitution to help stop racial discrimination.

Key issues raised
Social media discussion
The launch of the Council’s website and educational videos on constitutional reform, generated some social media commentary on the option to include a constitutional prohibition of racial discrimination that was largely negative.

Addressing racism
A popular topic was whether a constitutional prohibition of racial discrimination would actually prevent racism. Some people expressed the view that the option would add words to the Constitution without resulting in substantive change. Others argued that simply adding words to the Constitution will not
change the mentality of those that intimidate others, and that further education is needed to stop racism in Australia.

'Singling out' particular communities
There was some commentary about the unfairness of certain groups being singled out for ‘special treatment’ and a preference expressed for options that provide benefits to all. Many comments accused Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples of also being the perpetrators of racism in Australia (so called ‘reverse racism’). Other participants accused the Government of being racist for having certain programs that are exclusive to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.

Broadening the scope of discrimination
On the other hand, some expressed frustration that the option did not also include a prohibition on other forms of discrimination, including on the basis of gender, sexual orientation, religion and political views.

Bill of Rights
A bill of rights, or human rights clause for all Australians, was suggested by some people. These suggestions were seen as preferable to providing special treatment to certain groups. Some suggested the bill of rights should guarantee equal opportunity to work, to housing, to a living income and legal aid.

Interaction with racial discrimination laws
Among the other negative viewpoints, some argued the option is irrelevant and unnecessary as Australia already has racial discrimination laws, while some participants were concerned about the potential impact on sovereignty and treaty.
Topic 2: Removing Section 25

Online survey results
A majority of survey participants, in both the wider community and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities, expressed support for removing section 25.

Support for removing section 25 began at 63% for the wider community and 59% for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples in November 2016, but decreased by 5% and 9% respectively for wave two in April 2017. After the consultations ended, support in wave three had returned to close to the original levels of support from wave one.

Social media sentiment
Overall, online sentiment was negative in relation to removing section 25 from the Constitution.

Key Issues raised

Social media discussion
Overall, there were some people who supported the option to delete section 25 on the basis that it refers to race rather than culture. Others supported the inclusion of an anti-racism clause provided race is properly defined.

Section 25 as a ‘Dead Letter’
Section 25 was referred to as a ‘dead letter’ by some who argued there was no need to remove it because it is now a meaningless provision, based on the assumption that no states will ever disqualify certain races from voting in state elections.

Prioritising ‘real’ change
Others expressed concern that the referendum will fail if it includes too many options and suggested prioritising changes that will result in real change, unlike the removal of section 25.
Topic 3: Removing or amending the ‘race power’

**Online survey results**

Two thirds of survey participants expressed support for the option to remove or amend references to race, in both the wider community and among Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.

Support for removing or amending references to race initially enjoyed support of over 60% across both waves one and two. While support remained relatively steady within the wider community, it dropped significantly among Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples between samples one and two (by 8%), but returned to original levels of support by wave 3.

**Social media sentiment**

Online sentiment varied from neutral to negative across the social channels, with only 1% viewing the reform positively.

**Key issues raised**

*Social media discussion*

Concerns about the option to remove or amend the ‘race power’ in section 51 were widespread and opinions were divided into four main areas.
Impact on laws for the benefit of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples

Some objected to the attempt to amend the ‘race power’ because of fear that any meddling with the power would ultimately lead to it being removed from the Constitution. The concern is that without the ‘race power’ the Government cannot make special laws for certain races which might be necessary to protect or preserve those races. This would negatively impact laws that protect the rights of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples (such as the Native Title Act) and prevent the Government legislating for programs that provide Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples with education, training and employment opportunities.

Overlap with an option for a constitutional prohibition of racial discrimination

There was some overlap between the suggestions on this option and the option to insert a constitutional prohibition of racial discrimination. For example, one respondent supported deletion of section 51 (XXVI), subject to both a provision that its deletion has no impact on Native Title laws or other funding provisions now in place for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples, and the insertion of an anti-discrimination clause in the Constitution. This respondent also suggested “the word ‘race’ should not appear, as it is an outdated and erroneous concept”.

Legalised discrimination and ‘special treatment’

Others expressed concern that the ‘race power’ constitutes legalised discrimination and should be removed on principle and a clause inserted that applies to all people. Others were worried that singling Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples out in this way would be divisive and lead to further inequality between Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander and other Australians.
Preference for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander autonomy

Others asserted that today’s Government should no longer be making decisions on behalf of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples – they should be able to make their own constitutional decisions about laws that impact them. Instead, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples’ autonomy should be reflected in the Constitution. The ability of the Government to make laws for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples was viewed as a way of continuing assimilation via ‘dependency’ and ‘overt control’, which they argued will continue to fail and create division.

Topic 4: An Indigenous voice to Parliament

Online survey results

Over two thirds of people support an Indigenous voice to Parliament, in both the wider community and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities.

Support for an Indigenous voice remained fairly steady for waves one and two, across both the wider community and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities. There is significantly more support for an Indigenous voice to Parliament among Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples (over 75%). While support among Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples dropped slightly between waves one and two, it had returned to original levels in wave three.

Social media sentiment

Online sentiment towards an Indigenous voice to Parliament varied across the social channels between negative, neutral and positive. Website sentiment was largely positive (66.7%), contrasted with the largely negative or neutral sentiment on Facebook and Twitter.

Key issues raised

Social media discussion

This issue generated broader commentary about the need to listen to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander voices in general.
Consultation with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples

Some pro-treaty participants argued that it is now incumbent on the Australian Government to ask Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples if they would like to be specifically included, especially since they were excluded from the Constitution when it was established. For example, one participant observed, “We cannot force our Constitution onto them, especially after they were excluded by us from the beginning.”

Past Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander representative bodies

Other people referred to past representative bodies that they believe failed due to difficulty implementing cohesive plans. There was also a view that implementation of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples’ aspirations for a voice to Parliament is not realistic and may be politically untenable.

Indigenous Productivity Commission

Some participants suggested a different approach, such as an Indigenous Productivity Commission, established in the Constitution to analyse and direct Government spending to the best programs and services to effectively ‘Close the Gap’.
Topic 5: A statement about the First Peoples of Australia

Online survey results
Survey participants expressed a high level of support for inserting a statement about the First Peoples of Australia, including in the wider community and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander populations, with two in three people in favour.

Support for drafting a Statement of Acknowledgement has remained very steady among the wider community (at 63%), but it has seen a decrease in support among Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples (from 73% to 67%).

Social media sentiment
Sentiment on social channels was again different between the website and social media. The website showed 38.5% positive sentiment and 30.8% negative sentiment, while the average sentiment on Facebook and Twitter was 37.7% negative, with a much smaller proportion of positive views (16.4%).

Key issues raised

Social media discussion
Commentary about the option to insert a statement about the First Peoples of Australia centred on four main themes.

Inherent ‘whiteness’
Participants voiced concerns that the existing Constitution is inherently ‘white’ being formed, as it was, in an environment where Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples were treated as if they had never existed in the claimed territory of the Commonwealth of Australia.

Recognition and sovereignty
Some participants were of the view that (a) since Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples are excluded from the Constitution and (b) Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples never consented to being part of the Australian nation, there is an argument that Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples are not in fact ‘Australians’ but ‘people living pursuant to their continuing pre-1770 laws and customs.’ As such, there was concern that the option to now acknowledge them in the Constitution, is an attempt to formally bring them into the Australian nation, thereby undermining sovereignty and future treaty negotiations.

‘Special’ rights
Some participants expressed the view that adding a statement about the First Peoples of Australia is elevating a specific ethnic group above others by giving them special rights. It is believed that adding such a statement will not advance the cause of ‘Reconciliation’, but calcify differences in the structure of the Constitution.

An entirely new Constitution
Many participants felt the underlying exclusionary intention of the Constitution cannot be changed by simply adding in clauses. It was described as a ‘flawed legal document’, that needs to be entirely rewritten so that it is inclusive of all people and includes reference to the rich Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander heritage of Australia. In support of this argument, some participants referred to statements from current and previous Prime Ministers that there were ‘mistakes’ in the Constitution.
APPENDIX 1: ONLINE SURVEY QUESTIONS

The online survey questions were designed to measure and identify whether the representative sample of Australians know or have heard about an option to amend the constitution to recognise Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples, how they feel about any proposed changes and if they have heard of the website/digital consultations. The questions were measured and aligned to activity specifically related to the development and implementation of the website and associated digital consultations.

Survey Questions:

1. Have you heard about an option to amend the constitution to recognise Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples?
   a. Yes
   b. No

2. What in your own words do you think constitutional recognition means?
   [OPEN TEXT BOX with a Don’t know / No idea check box]

3. Have you heard about the Referendum Council, which has been established to lead a national consultation process on constitutional recognition?
   a. Yes
   b. No

4. Do you support Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples being recognised in the constitution as the First Australians?
   a. Strongly support
   b. Somewhat support
   c. Somewhat oppose
   d. Strongly oppose
   e. Not sure, will need more information [OPEN TEXT BOX – please explain why]

5. How prepared are you to support the following changes to the constitution (scaled response, including a ‘don’t know’ option):
   - Drafting a statement acknowledging Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples as the First Australians and inserting it either inside the constitution or outside the constitution
   - Removing or amending references to race
   - Prohibiting racial discrimination
   - Providing for an Indigenous voice to be heard in Parliament
   - Deleting section 25, which contemplates the possibility of a State government excluding some Australians from voting in State elections on the basis of their race.
   a. Strongly prepared
   b. Somewhat prepared
   c. Somewhat unprepared
   d. Very unprepared
   e. Don’t know
6. Do you feel you have had enough access to information in order to make an educated decision on constitutional recognition?
   a. Sufficient access to information
   b. Somewhat sufficient access to information
   c. Somewhat insufficient access to information
   d. Insufficient access to information
   e. Not sure, have not searched for information

7. Where have you received most of the information about the recognition of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples from?
   a. Online news channels
   b. Print media - Newspapers, Magazines
   c. TV
   d. Word of mouth / conversations with friends/family/colleagues
   e. Social media
   f. Community event
   g. Other
   h. (Referendum Council website – this option to be added in wave #2 and wave #3)

8. If you can remember, where was the last place you saw a reference to constitutional recognition?
   a. yes
   b. no

OPEN TEXT BOX [please insert where you saw the reference last]

9. How much do you understand about the constitution?
   a) I have strong understanding of the constitution
   b) I have some understanding of the constitution
   c) I don’t know very much about the constitution
   d) I don’t know anything about the constitution