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ABSTRACT

This exploratory study examined people who self identify as gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender or intersex (GLBTI) to determine the extent of workplace discrimination based on sexual identity in Queensland. While there have been other studies in Australia, Queensland has either not been included or relevant data is unable to be easily identified. All Australian businesses are governed by legislation that aim to prevent discrimination based on sexual orientation and sexual identity in the workplace and serious penalties apply to companies found guilty of this discrimination. Therefore the findings of this study are important to determine the compliance of different companies with workplace legislation.

The sample population consisted of GLBTI employees aged 18 years or older living in the State of Queensland. As GLTBI’s are a hidden population, snowball sampling using an online survey was determined to be the most appropriate method to reach the target audience. The researcher handed out flyers at GLBTI functions in Brisbane and regional Queensland, had banner advertisements on relevant websites, used media announcements and social networking sites such as Facebook resulting in 152 responses in an eight week period. Respondents self-identified as gay males (39%), lesbians (23%), bisexual females (15%), gay female (7%), bisexual males (6%), transgender (3%) and intersex (.7%). Respondents ranged from 18 to more than 55 years of age with a mean age between 30 and 34 years. Further analysis of survey responses involved repeated Descriptive Frequencies and Chi-square test Correlations along with Pearson 2-tailed correlation.

Significant differences were found between this study and previous studies undertaken both internationally and within Australia. This study has found that respondents were less likely to be as highly educated as previous studies had reported as only 20% had completed a University degree. In addition, the rate of disclosure of sexual identity to fellow workers was relatively high compared with previous research which suggested that GLBTI employees are more open about their sexual orientation/sexual identity at work.
New findings based on this survey found that jokes, ridicule and negative remarks were the most common types of discrimination faced by GLBTI employees within Queensland. Importantly, less than 1% of respondents reported discrimination to the Anti-Discrimination Commission of Queensland. While discrimination was more often reported to Supervisor or a person above the Supervisor or to the Union, this did not reduce the likelihood of being a further recipient of discrimination. Training was the most utilised tool of organisations where discrimination was reported, however this also had no effect on repeated discrimination in the workplace.

The findings of this study support the importance of ensuring that workplace policies and procedures are communicated with all staff to ensure that the workplace is not in breach of legislation. This research also supports that reporting discrimination has no effect the presence of anti-discrimination policies has a positive effect on performance within the workplace.
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CHAPTER ONE - Introduction

Researchers within the United Kingdom and the United States have provided the majority of knowledge concerning discrimination against gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender or intersex (GLBTI) employees. While some areas of this research are applicable to Australia, others are not. For example, the United States has a politically active, powerful and wealthy antigay Christian movement (Herman 1997), whereas in Australia this group is less developed. As exploratory research, this study will explore discrimination against GLBTI workers in the state of Queensland in Australia. It will add to the very limited knowledge of GLBTI discrimination that occurs in the workplace in Australia. This research will augment existing research by providing an understanding of what impact the discrimination in the workplace has had on GLBTI workers and the key forms of discrimination. In addition, the findings of this study have implications for those working in the Human Resource area in Australia as discrimination in the workplace has been legislated against.

Justification

This is an exploratory study undertaken in Queensland to determine the occurrence and potential workplace impacts of sexual orientation and sexual identity. While there have been other studies in Australia, Queensland has not been included nor able to be singled out easily from the data collected with the exception of Berman and Robinson (Berman & Robinson 2010). Their study concentrated on homophobic and transphobic abuse in Queensland as a whole, and only minimally covered the Queensland workplace. All Australian businesses are governed by legislation that aim at preventing discrimination based on sexual orientation and sexual identity in the workplace and serious penalties apply to companies found guilty of this discrimination. Therefore the findings of this study are important to begin to explore the usefulness of workplace legislation.

Purpose of the study

This exploratory study examines people who self identify as gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender or intersex (GLBTI) in order to determine the extent of workplace discrimination in Queensland. In addition, this study will determine the industries and postcodes in which discrimination against GLBTI respondents occur and the impact that this
discrimination had in the workplace on the GLTBI employees. The study will also determine whether discrimination was reported to employers, unions or the Anti-discrimination Commission Queensland. Finally the study will also be able to identify the discrimination faced by GLBTI employees as well as by whom, how often, and how severe the discrimination was to the GLBTI employee.

**Definition of Terms**

To assist the reader in understanding some of the more frequently used terms within this paper, a list of key terms is provided for reference. This list is by no means exhaustive as there are many colloquial terms used within every section and subsection of society.

**Actual discrimination**: discrimination directed at a particular individual or group. National Academies Press (2004, p. 1) refers to discrimination as ‘... a subjective, social construct that evolves over time with shifts in societal views, political norms, and other changes’.

**Bisexual**: an individual physically, emotionally and sexually attracted to both sexes; the individual may be male or female (Gay and Lesbian Counselling Services of NSW 2006).

**Discrimination**: behaviour that adversely affects another person. Affirming that every individual is equal before and under the law, and has the right to the equal protection and equal benefit of the law (Attorney Generals Department 1984). This term has been defined using broad conceptual language for the purposes of this thesis, however is defined further using precise legal language in the Anti-Discrimination Act 1991.

**Coming out**: an open declaration of one's homosexuality. Coming out is an act of self-affirmation (Kitsuse 1980). The act of coming out represents an individual’s struggle for individual self-determination among demoralised and silenced groups; it represents a shift in perspective from a private undisclosed realm into a public discourse (Sedgwick 1990).

**Come out of the closet**: to make public one's previously concealed sexual preferences, in particular to admit one's homosexuality. The closet refers ‘to a life-shaping pattern of
homosexual concealment’ where ‘individuals hide their homosexuality in the most important areas of life, with family, friends and at work’ (Seidman 2002, p. 25).

**Deviant:** a person whose behaviour deviates from what is socially acceptable, especially in terms of sexual behaviour (Goffman 1963).

**Gay:** Men usually describe themselves as homosexual, or ‘gay’, when they are physically, emotionally and sexually attracted to other men (Family Planning NSW 2009).

**Gender Identity:** an individual person’s internal self-awareness of being male or female, masculine or feminine, or something in-between. It is the internal framework, constructed over time, which enables an individual to organise a self-concept and to perform socially in regards to their perceived sex and gender (University of Western Australia 2006).

**Heterosexual:** an individual sexually attracted to members of the opposite sex.

**Homosexual:** an individual sexually attracted to a member of the same sex.

**Homophobia:** The fear and hatred of those who love and sexually desire those of the same sex. Homophobia which has some of its roots in sexism, includes prejudice, discrimination, harassment, and acts of violence brought on by fear and hatred (Penley-Miller & Mahamati 2000).

**Intersex:** People who have congenital hormonal physical or genetic differences who can be seen as being neither male/female, or both male/female at once, or somewhere between male/female or something else that escapes current paradigms for describing humanity (Organisation Internationale des Intersexués Australia 2009).

**Lesbian:** a woman who is physically, emotionally and sexually attracted towards other women (Gay and Lesbian Counselling Services of NSW 2006).
**Perceived discrimination:** discrimination that is subtle in nature and not directly pointed at an individual or group and may be thinly veiled. The perception of individuals or groups as being the targets of some or a great deal of discrimination (Ministry of Social Development 2005).

**Sexuality:** sexuality refers to the expression of sexual sensation and related emotional intimacy between humans.

**Sexual orientation:** Our sexual orientation is about who we are attracted to sexually and emotionally (Children Youth and Women's Health Line 2010).

**Transgender:** Of or relating to an individual whose gender identity is different from their physical gender. Transgender persons are those whose physical characteristics and self- or social-identity are not in harmony. The NSW *Anti-Discrimination Act* defines a transgender person as including someone who identifies as, lives as, or seeks to live as a member of the opposite sex (Australian Institute of Criminology 2006).

**Research Questions**

This exploratory study was guided by an overarching research question: What is the extent of discrimination in the workplace against gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender and intersex employees in Queensland? To answer this question specifically, additional sub-questions are posed:

1. In which industries does discrimination occur based on the sexual orientation or sexual identity of GLBTI individuals?
2. In which Queensland postcodes does discrimination based upon the sexual orientation or sexual identity of GLBTI workers occur at its highest?
3. To what extent has discrimination based on the sexual orientation or sexual identity of GLBTI workers been reported to employers, unions, or the Anti-discrimination Commission Queensland?
Within a workplace, what types of discrimination are most likely used against GLBTI individuals based on sexual orientation or sexual identity and what ramifications are created by this discrimination?

What level of impact has discrimination based on the sexual orientation or sexual identity of GLBTI workers had on these employees?

The answers to these research questions have implications for those who work in Human Resources within a company in which an employee experiences sexual discrimination. These research questions draw upon established results and findings from both international and Australian research efforts that have focussed on GLBTI discrimination namely Pitts et al. (2006), Flood and Hamilton (2005), and Irwin (1999). It also draws upon stigma theory as the underlying concept of discrimination and the processes that are undertaken when a person discriminates. Australian legislation and more specifically, Queensland legislation has also played a part in determining the research questions as legislation prohibits discrimination on the basis or either sexual orientation or sexuality. Anecdotal consultation with GLBTI communities has also assisted in determining the research questions.

**Significance of the study**

Researchers within the United Kingdom and the United States have provided the vast majority of knowledge concerning discrimination against GLBTI workers. This study is significant for adding to the very limited knowledge of GLBTI discrimination in the Australian workplace. Existing research undertaken by Irwin in 1999 is currently being cited by Pride in Diversity; ‘Australia’s first and only not-for-profit workplace program designed specifically to assist Australian employers with the inclusion of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) employees’ (Pride in Diversity 2010). Irwin’s research is now over a decade old and may not be relevant in a contemporary context.

This study also augments existing research by providing an understanding of the key issues Queensland GLBTI workers face in the workplace, the forms of discrimination that are experienced as well as the ramifications of workplace discrimination on the individual.
addition, the findings of this study have implications for those working in the Human Resource area in Australia as legislative requirements forbid sexual discrimination in the workplace.

**Implications for Human Resource professionals**

A number of demographic groups are reported to be discriminated against within employment. Women, ethnic, national and religious minorities, disabled workers, as well as sexual minorities have been observed to face unfavourable employment market outcomes (Weichselbaumer 2001). Race, ethnicity and gender are the most recognised forms of diversity (Kossek & Lobel 1996; Miller & Katz 2002) within a workplace and have been targeted by many organisations inside their equal employment opportunity policies. However, there are other types of diversities that have important implications for human resource management systems with one of these being sexual orientation. Many people assume that diversity merely relates to a person’s racial and ethnic background or gender, whereas in reality, diversity is an attribute embodied in everyone (Miller & Katz 2002).

There is some evidence that human resource departments are not fully supporting the growing need for organisations to address the need for workplace tolerance. In a United States survey conducted by Day and Schoenrade (2000) with a sample of human resource professionals, found that even though most believed that sexual orientation should be formally addressed within the workplace, and that they would individually speak out against homophobic acts, only 20 percent of their companies had diversity programs that specifically addressed gay and lesbian work issues. Non-discrimination is a strong moral and ethical obligation and the willingness to suppress intentional and unintentional bias in human resources management requires a proactive and sustained effort on the behalf of human resource professionals. This includes, clear and concise anti-discrimination policies, who is responsible for administering the policies, training staff in anti-discrimination and, becoming aware of stereotypes in order to reduce the effect of them (Demuijnck 2009).

Human resource practices provide the background for how employees; whether they identify as heterosexual or GLBTI, learn an organisation’s values regarding inclusion and
diversity within that particular organisation. Therefore, anti-discrimination and harassment policies that include sexual orientation and sexual identity inform all members of the organisation about the extent to which GLBTI workers are respected and valued (Munoz & Thomas 2006). These policies are imperative if GLBTI workers are to feel supported in ways that sustain their employment.

**Why adapt Human Resource systems to manage diversity?**

Organisations in essence are a function of the people that work within them. Human Resource (HR) policies enable organisations to attract, select and retain a wide variety of employees, which is why some organisations act and behave as if they have different cultures. HR policies of many organisations are based on homogeneity in that they promote, attract and retain employees that are similar rather than diverse. Those that do not fit the culture of the organisation eventually leave. Long-term growth and the ability to respond to changing market demands, new technologies or the changing expectations of the workforce are stifled by this homogeneity (Kossek & Lobel 1996).

HR policies that support diversity can assist the culture of the organisation to adapt to changes within the external environment (Kossek & Lobel 1996). Organisations that promote and leverage diversity and build inclusion achieve and sustain higher performance than those organisations that do not. Inclusive and diverse organisations open themselves up to a wide variety of views, opinions, ideas and thoughts from a wide variety of people. Organisations lose opportunities to tap into varied skills, knowledge and expertise if they exclude certain employees. Individuals who do not fit the cultural background will tend to feel marginalised which could end up leading to dissatisfaction in their work and in the organisation (Miller & Katz 2002).

**Limitations of prevailing approaches to managing diversity**

Strategies for managing diversity have often been introduced on an ad hoc basis with no integration into the overall HR function or even into the business plan. They therefore they do not assist in managing cultural change. There are three (3) main strategies for approaching diversity within HR: diversity enlargement, diversity sensitivity, and cultural
audits. Diversity enlargement focuses on increasing the number of employees within the organisation that come from diverse backgrounds. Diversity sensitivity relates to educating/training employees about differences between employees within the workplace and acknowledging those differences. Cultural audits attempt to determine the barriers that are in place within an organisation that prohibits employing or promoting non-traditional employees (Kossek & Lobel 1996).

The methods described above have a major flaw in their design in that they do not reinforce cultural change (Kossek & Lobel 1996). These methods often are not linked to other relevant HR subsystems and assumes that all members of a minority group, whether they be racial and ethnic minorities or GLBTI have the same HR needs (Kossek & Lobel 1996). Managing diversity within the workplace must be aligned with other strategic goals such as the mission statement and business strategy. This can then be aligned with HR policy areas such as labour and market strategies, selection and recruitment, succession planning, organisational development and work/life balances.

Limitations

This exploratory study has only been conducted in Queensland but attempts were made to have respondents from all over the state and not just from metropolitan areas. To this end, the author attended GLBTI events in order to gather support and respondents for the study. Time and monetary limitations prevented the study being conducted over a wider area. In addition, the study only focused on discrimination based on sexual orientation and sexual identity. The author acknowledges that there are many other forms of discrimination in the workplace but they are beyond the scope of this study.

Outline of the study

The following outlines the content of the chapters of this thesis. Existing literature exploring GLBTI discrimination within the United Kingdom, United States and Australia is examined in Chapter Two. The literature begins by exploring the research paradigm of stigmatisation, more specifically the Link and Phelan (2001) Stigmatisation Model. The literature review then moves into current Australian legislation that covers discrimination within the
workplace. A more detailed section specifically covering Queensland is also mentioned. The literature review will demonstrate the paucity of research in Australian research concerning GLBTI discrimination within the workplace.

The quantitative research design used in this study will be illustrated and justified in Chapter Three. This chapter also includes a description of the sampling method and justification for using the sampling method. The sample size calculation will be shown along with justification for the calculation. The survey design, operationalisation, pilot test and research process are also outlined in this Chapter. The next Chapter, Chapter Four will focus on the analysis of the results of the survey for each of the research questions, including the demographics of respondents and the types of discrimination faced within the Queensland workplace. Chapter Five provides a discussion on the research questions in relation to previous literature and outlines the important research findings from this study. Chapter Five also presents implications for practice and a discussion on future research areas.

**Conclusion**

It is essential that Human Resource (HR) Professionals consider the effects of discrimination on GLBTI employees as organisations could be losing top quality staff because of their inaction. The loss of top quality staff could mean that the organisation is unable to respond to changing demands in the external environment due to lack of differing opinions and views. It is also necessary for HR Practitioners to ensure that their organisation is meeting the requirements of relevant legislation.
CHAPTER TWO - Literature Review

With the introduction of anti-discrimination legislation in Queensland in 1991, there is a need for an understanding of discrimination and its relationship to the disclosure of a person’s sexual orientation or gender identity. This is particularly important for Managers, Supervisors, Human Resource Practitioners and employees working with gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender and intersex (GLBTI) workers as these people must recognise the diverse set of influences that shape those workers lives and decisions (Irwin 1999). GLBTI issues have become more prominent in the workplace and thus supervisors, human resource managers and organisations must consider how they will comply with the respective legislation. Not complying with legislation can lead to monetary penalties against the organisation and also against individuals within the organisation (The State of Queensland 1991). More importantly, ignoring these issues in workplaces can lead to various forms of stigmatisation for GLBTI employees who experience discrimination in particular organisations. As such, the underlying theory that forms the basis for this exploratory study links discrimination to social stigma.

**Stigma theory and discrimination – the research paradigm**

Research shows that membership of a minority group may lead to individuals becoming stigmatised by much of society (Berkley & Watt 2006; Busby & Middlemiss 2001; Dawson 2005; Herrington 2004; Ragins & Cornwell 2001; Ragins, Singh & Cornwell 2007; Troung & Kleiner 2001). Stigma was defined as a quality that discredits a person and reduces them from a whole person to one that is seen to be less than whole and tainted by that quality (Goffman 1963).

Stigma theory assumes that people who are stigmatised have (or are believed to have) an attribute that marks them as different and leads them to be devalued in the eyes of others. When an individual assumes that another individual has an attribute that is perceived to be stigmatised such as homosexuality, the first individual exercises variations of discrimination. The first individual effectively, if often unknowingly, reduces the other individual’s life chances, for example denying them a promotion (Goffman 1963).
Definitions of social stigma include homosexuality as, according to Goffman (1963), it is a blemish on one’s individual character. Stigma in a working context can lead to discrimination, stereotyping, social exclusion, low advancement opportunities and even job loss (King, Reilly & Hebel 2008). Administering personal and potentially stigmatising information is not unique to GLBTI individuals. Other groups, such as those with a mental illness and those with religious affiliations possess stigmatising attributes that often are not readily apparent to others (Cain 1990). These individuals must also manage information concerning their stigmatised trait if they hope to minimise associated social risks. Although groups such as these need to manage their stigmatised attribute, it is GLBTI individuals who can face extreme stigmatisation in the form of physical violence within the workplace. GLBTI people experience considerable marginalisation and stigmatisation as a result of their identity (Pitts et al. 2006).

Fears and misunderstandings about homosexuality are widespread. “Homophobia” is a term that refers to the irrational fear and prejudice against homosexual persons (Penley-Miller & Mahamati 2000). When compared to other social groups, homosexuals are still among the most stigmatised groups. Hate crimes are still prevalent within society. Many professional individuals and employees in all occupations are still fearful of identifying as gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender and intersex in their work settings. Part of this fear emerges from how discrimination and stigmatisation have been legitimised and authorised in legislation and state governance. For example, it was only in 1975 that the American Psychiatric Association (APA), recognising the power of stigma against homosexuality, called upon international health organisations and individual Psychological and Psychiatric practitioners to advocate for the repeal of legislation within their own countries that penalised homosexual acts by consenting adults in private. Furthermore, the APA called on these organisations and individuals to do all that was possible to decrease the stigma related to homosexuality wherever and whenever it may occur (American Psychological Association 1975).

When labels and stereotypes that are perceived to have undesirable characteristics are applied to people, rejection and exclusion of those people can occur (Link & Phelan 2001). This is the case of perceived discrimination in the workplace for GLBTI workers. Link and
Phelan (2001) suggested that when a relationship exists between an attribute and a stereotype it produces a stigma (attribute) that links a person to undesirable characteristics (stereotypes). The Link and Phelan Stigmatisation Model provides further insight into stigma theory.

**Link and Phelan stigmatisation Model**

Link and Phelan purport that stigma exists when five (5) specific components converge. The components being (i) individuals differentiate and label human variations; (ii) prevailing cultural beliefs tie those labelled to adverse attributes; (iii) labelled individuals are placed in distinct categories that serve to establish a sense of detachment and a differentiation between “us” and “them”; (iv) labelled individuals experience a loss of status and face discrimination that leads to unequal circumstances; and finally (v) stigmatisation is contingent on access to social, economic and political power. The social economic and political power component allows for the full execution of disapproval, rejection, exclusion and discrimination. Consequently in the Link and Phelan Stigmatisation Model, the term stigma is applied when elements of the first four (4) components co-occur within a power situation; or fifth component, facilitating stigma to take place (Link & Phelan 2001).

**Differentiation and labelling**

According to Link and Phelan (2001), identifying which human differences are significant, and therefore worthy of labelling, is a socially constructed process. The greater part of human differences is often overlooked and ignored and are therefore not worthy of being labelled; for example differences in height and shoe size. There are two principles to look at when taking into account the extent to which differentiation and labelling is a social one. The first principle that needs to be considered is that significant oversimplification is needed to create groups. The broad groups of homosexual and heterosexual, and young and old, are examples of this. The second principle that is taken into consideration is differences that are socially judged to be relevant differ vastly according to time and place. An example of this is the emphasis that was put on writing with the right hand instead of the left hand in
the late nineteenth century. Writing with the left hand was believed to be an indication that the person was evil (Link & Phelan 2001).

**Associating human differences with negative attributes**

The second component of the Link and Phelan stigmatisation model centres on the joining of the identified labelled differences with stereotypes. Although the human brain cannot operate without stereotyping, it is this aspect of stigma that has been central to the formation of stigma theory due to Goffman’s work in 1963 and is still applicable today. The process of applying certain stereotypes to differentiated groups of individuals helps us to understand the psychological nature of the thought process taking place as the linkage between associating human difference with negative attributes occurs. For example a labelled difference could be ‘mental patient’ and individuals may stereotype such a label with being dangerous and therefore would want to distance themselves socially from such a person that had been labelled. Another example of this could be a homosexual label and associating stereotype such as effeminate (Link & Phelan 2001).

**Separating us and them**

The linking of negative attributes to differentiated groups of individuals facilitates a sense of separation between the proverbial “us” and “them.” The sense that individuals of a labelled group are fundamentally different and/or flawed causes stereotyping to take place with little hesitation. The us and them principle of the stigmatisation process implies that the labelled group is slightly less human in nature and at the extreme not human at all. It is at this extreme that the most horrific events occur, such as the Nazi genocide of Jewish people. Link and Phelan (2001) suggest that efforts to separate us from them are sometimes directly available in the very nature of the labels conferred such as people speaking of individuals as being schizophrenics rather than describing them as having schizophrenia. This practice is revealing regarding this component of stigma because it is different for other diseases for example a person has the plague; such a person is one of “us”, a person who just happens to be beset by a serious illness; however a person is a schizophrenic (Link & Phelan 2001).
Loss of Status and Discrimination

The fourth component of stigmatisation in this model includes the loss of status and discrimination that is experienced by the individual, which can be seen in discrimination against gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender, and intersex groups and/or individuals. Various definitions of stigma do not include this aspect when seeking to outline stigma; however it is the belief of Link and Phelan (2001) that this loss occurs inherently as individuals that are labelled, excluded, and linked to undesirable characteristics experience the loss of status and discrimination. The members of the labelled groups are subsequently disadvantaged in potential earnings, education, and career opportunities. A loss of status is the successful negative labelling and stereotyping and demoting the individual in a status hierarchy. Hierarchies are created by humans in nearly all contexts including the workplace, in an organisational chart. A low level in the hierarchy itself can be the form of discrimination experienced (Link & Phelan 2001).

Necessity of power

Link and Phelan (2001) highlight the necessity of power (social, economic, and political power) to stigmatisation as one cannot happen without the other. The role of power in stigmatisation can be quite clear and overt in some situations, however in other situations it can become masked as the difference in power levels are so stark. An extreme example of a situation in which the power role was explicitly clear is shown above in the treatment of Jewish people by the Nazis. On the other hand, an example of a situation in which individuals of a stigmatised group have “stigma-related processes” occurring would be institutionalised mental patients. It is very imaginable that each of the steps described above would take place regarding the mental patients thoughts about doctors. However, this situation cannot involve true stigmatisation according to this model because the mental patients do not have the economic, political, or social power to act on these thoughts with any serious discriminatory consequences (Link & Phelan 2001).

Discrimination can affect multiple domains of people’s lives having dramatic bearing on the distribution of life chances on potential earnings or employment opportunities (Link &
Protection from discrimination and aggression motivates GLBTI individuals to conceal their sexual identity and this is more likely in a relatively GLBTI antagonistic and highly stigmatising work environment. The relationships between concealing sexual identity will be weaker or nonexistent if sexual identity is not a significant or central factor within the workplace (Link & Phelan 2001).

Link and Phelan have discussed that stigma can affect multiple domains of people’s lives and have a dramatic bearing on the distribution of life chances including earnings within the workplace. They further define stigma as the co-occurrence of its components specifically, labelling, stereotyping, separation, status loss and discrimination. These are all concerns demonstrated as impacting in various ways on the lives of GLBTI people, particularly in workplaces. As such, some research has examined these concerns in workplaces. Before discussing this, it is useful to consider who GLBTI employees actually are in the research.

**Who are GLBTI employees in the current research?**

Studies on GLTB1 demographics in the United States, the United Kingdom and Australia have revealed many similarities between Ragins and Cornwell (2001), Pitts et al. (2006), Irwin (1999) and Tejeda (2006). Tejeda stated that 27% of respondents reported completing high school, 36% possessed a bachelor’s degree, and 27% held a master’s degree and 9% held a doctorate. When broken down in terms of job characteristics, 30% of respondents reported that their job was clerical or they were support staff, the remaining 70% classified themselves as professional. Tejeda also found that 27% of respondents were within 1-2 levels of the chief executive officer (CEO), 45% were within 3-4 levels from the CEO, and the remaining 28% reported being seven or more levels from the CEO.

The demographics of the gay/lesbian participants in a survey by Griffith and Hebl (2002) in the United States matched those of previous studies in that they tended to consist of Caucasian respondents who were, more educated, and had higher salaries than what was generally observed with heterosexual participants. These statistics are similar to studies conducted in Australia (Flood & Hamilton 2005; Irwin 1999) and also with other studies conducted in the United States (Tejeda 2006; Wright et al. 2006). An Australian survey
conducted by Pitts et al. (2006) reported that nearly 50% of participants hold a university degree which is higher than the Australian Bureau of Statistics (Australian Bureau of Statistics 2008) ‘figures for the population in general’. This occurrence of higher education representation in the survey respondents was also noted in Irwin’s research (Irwin 1999).

These demographics suggest GLBTI people are more likely to be more highly educated and to have higher salaries than their heterosexual counterparts. This is important to consider in any type of research examining workplace-based discrimination among GLBTI employees. The following section discusses GLBTI discrimination in a workplace context firstly in regards to the United States, followed by the United Kingdom and finally Australia.

GLBTI Discrimination in the United States

The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) formally defined sexual harassment as a form of sex discrimination in 1980. Despite this sexual orientation is still not explicitly covered as a form of sex discrimination under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act, although the intuitive nature of the legislation could call for its inclusion (Berkley and Watt, 2006). Herrington (2004) stated that under US Federal laws, discrimination was prohibited under the Civil Rights Act (Title VII 1964 and Section 1981 of 1866), Americans with Disabilities Act, Age Discrimination in Employment Act and the Equal Pay Act. Herrington (2004) further states that these Federal laws are enhanced by a myriad of State and local laws that may provide protection against discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation.

The United States Employment Non-Discrimination Act (ENDA) was first drafted in 1994 to protect the rights of gay and lesbian individuals against employment discrimination (Herrington 2004). There were seven main points to ENDA to protect the rights of gays and lesbians, for example, prohibiting employers with 15 or more staff from discrimination against a potential employee on the basis of their sexual orientation. According to Troung and Kleiner (2001), the most vocal of opponents toward the inception of ENDA was the Family Research Group (FRG) and other religious organisations. Religious groups opposed the introduction of the ENDA legislation as they argued that they would be forced to hire employees who did not share the same beliefs and values and would be contrary to the
teachings of their religion. FRG has stated that they would also be forced to hire employees who they believed had committed immoral acts. Troung and Kleiner (2001) state that the last attempt at passing ENDA was in 1997, however they stated that the House of Representatives in 2001 had a Republican majority who were not supporting the ENDA Bill. While opponents of ENDA were not opposing the idea of eliminating employment discrimination on the grounds of sexual orientation, they believed that ENDA would be used as a stepping stone for future legislation granting homosexuals rights in health, insurance and social security, along with same-sex marriages.

However, this was not necessarily the case. As Berkley and Watt (2006) state, homosexuality is controversial and this is evidenced by the recent inception of new legislation, in particular the *Defense of Marriage Act* (DOMA) in 1996. Wording in the Act states that, the word “marriage” means only a legal union between one man and one woman as husband and wife, and the word “spouse” refers only to a person of the opposite sex who is a husband or a wife (Alliance Defense Fund 2008). Legislation like this clearly marginalises GLBTI people making them more likely to experience discrimination as discrimination is in this case legitimised at the highest level of government.

Research conducted within the United States focussed on discrimination in the workplace, coming out at work, sexual orientation discrimination and non discrimination policies. National polls and surveys conducted within the United States indicated that most Americans were supportive of laws that ended discrimination against gays and lesbians in employment (Troung & Kleiner 2001). They reported that under Title VII of the *Civil Rights Act*, homosexuals are not protected against sexual harassment within the workplace as it was designed to prohibit sexual discrimination on the basis of sex i.e. male and female. However, if an employer tries to coerce a homosexual employee into sexual acts then this is a case of discrimination and they are protected under Title VII of the *Civil Rights Act*. Workers who are the recipients of harassment in the workplace from their peers based on their sexual orientation are not protected by the *Civil Rights Act*. In Smith v. Liberty Mutual Insurance Co., 569 F.2d 325 (1982) congress ‘intended only to guarantee equal job opportunities for males and females’.
Troung and Kleiner (2001) stated that violence against homosexuals was isolated and that incidences of violence did not represent the current attitude in America. They further stated that more and more people were tolerant of homosexuality despite not condoning it. The authors did not state where this data has been sourced and this may question the validity of the statement. Troung and Kleiner (2001) stated that national polls and surveys had been conducted but failed to provide evidence of where they had sourced their data to provide comment on the trends and attitudes. While the situation in the United States is not entirely clear, there is some evidence discrimination against GLBTI people is occurring in workplaces.

**Concealment of sexual identity in a workplace context within the United States of America**

Ragins and Cornwell (2001) stated that their most striking finding was that there was a significant variation in the degree to which individuals were out at work and that most respondents concealed their sexual orientation from others at work. Only 26.7% of respondents identified that they were open about their sexuality at their workplace. In addition, 69.8% of respondents worked in locales that provided protection under legislation and 30.2% worked in states lacking protective legislation. Ragins and Cornwell (2001) reported that of their respondents, 53.8% worked in organisations that had formal policies forbidding discrimination based on sexual orientation. There is a clear discrepancy, then, between disclosure and the extent to which policies protect GLBTI people from discrimination.

Perceived workplace discrimination was significantly related to the degree of disclosure of sexual orientation in the workplace and that the presence of gay co-workers significantly predicted disclosure at work, whereas the presence of gay supervisors did not statistically have a direct effect on disclosure. A key finding to the research conducted by Ragins and Cornwell (2001) was that organisational policies and practices had a stronger impact on perceptions of sexual orientation discrimination. Most GLBTI individuals conceal their sexual orientation at work due to the lack of protection from discrimination and negative work attitudes as well as to escape stigmatisation (Dawson 2005; Ragins & Cornwell 2001;
A 2007 study conducted reported that 33.9% of respondents had faced discrimination in previous positions and 37.2% of respondents had encountered discrimination based on others perceptions of the individuals sexual orientation (Ragins, Singh & Cornwell 2007). This has led to individuals concealing their sexual orientation within the workplace for fear of discrimination. Discrimination within the workplace in the United States varied from merely a lack of inclusion at work, to more explicit forms of discrimination, such as hate crimes (Dawson 2005).

Ragins and Cornwell (2001) attempted to survey a population of 2919 respondents who were members of three national gay rights organisations in the United States using a stratified random sampling technique whereby equal numbers of men and women were selected by their geographic area. How the survey was distributed was not stated, however the fact that two (2) reminder postcards and a reminder letter were sent to respondents, leads to the assumption that the questionnaire had initially been mailed. Questionnaires were completed by 768 respondents which yielded a response rate of 30% an adequate response rate. Respondents consisted mainly of highly educated professional, technical and managerial employees. Ragins and Cornwell (2001) noted that a limitation of their research centred on having asked respondents if they identified as heterosexual, gay, lesbian, bisexual or unsure of the orientation. This did not allow for people who identified as transgender or intersex to respond adequately to the survey. Furthermore, the design of the survey prevented them from making attributions about the direction of the relationships found within the study. One of the most striking results for Ragins and Cornwell (2001) was that there was a large variance in the degree to which GLBTI individuals were ‘out’ at work, with most of the respondents (73%) concealing their sexual orientation from some or all staff within their organisation.

Ragins and Cornwell (2001) stated that over half of the respondents (53%) to their survey worked for organisations that had workplace policies prohibiting discrimination within the workplace. Ragins and Cornwell (2001) further stated that the greater the extent of supportive policies and practices within an organisation, the less discrimination was reported by GLBTI employees. It was also interesting to note in the study that those GLBTI employees who concealed their sexual orientation in the workplace, perceived a higher
degree of discrimination than those employees who did not conceal (Ragins & Cornwell 2001).

Herrington (2004) stated that harassment can be committed by both male and female supervisors, co-workers and even non-employees such as contractors and customers. Harassment that was in contravention of the Federal laws carried penalties such as awarding damages to the plaintiff. Herrington (2004) stated that Federal law had not provided protection from harassment in cases of sexual orientation and courts had refused to recognise such claims. While Herrington (2004) did raise the issue that discrimination based on the grounds of sexual orientation was not covered by Federal laws in The United States, it is however covered in State and local laws (Dawson 2005; Hirata & Kleiner 2001; Troung & Kleiner 2001). Some states have passed laws and ordinances to establish workplace protection for gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender and intersex employees, but it remains legal in 29 States to discriminate against job applicants and employees because of their sexual orientation, and in 38 States because of their gender identity. Despite this patchwork of state laws, private employers have implemented fully inclusive non-discrimination polices at rates that are leaps and bounds ahead of lawmakers (Human Rights Campaign 2010).

**Impact on GLBTI individuals when companies enact anti-discrimination policies**

The most successful companies in the United States are protecting their employees from discrimination on the basis of their sexual orientation (Hirata & Kleiner 2001). The majority of Fortune 500 companies; a Fortune 500 company is defined as being one of the top 500 organisations (according to gross revenue) within the United States according to the Fortune Magazine, have included sexual orientation in their anti-discrimination policies since 1996. Currently 77 of the Fortune 100 and 41 of the Fortune 500 companies also have policies protecting their lesbian, gay and bisexual employees (Hirata & Kleiner 2001). Hirata and Kleiner (2001) performed an in depth search of literature across a myriad of media platforms and have raised pertinent issues with regards to discrimination of LGB individuals. Hirata and Kleiner (2001) have clearly defined terms and have provided references for most material used, thus providing other researchers with means to replicate the information.
that has been used. However, the reference for the Fortune 500 companies that included sexual orientation in their anti-discrimination policies was not given.

Tejeda (2006) conducted a survey of 65 gay men in the United States, to examine perceived workplace discrimination between gay men working for organisations that employed anti-discrimination policies and those organisations that did not employ anti-discrimination policies. He also examined whether disclosure of sexual orientation to a supervisor affected perceived hostility in the workplace along with job satisfaction, turnover intentions and job satisfaction. Tejeda (2006) found that the presence of anti-discrimination policies influenced positive variables such as performance, position availability, and type of work whereas disclosure influenced career variables such as career progression and promotion. All respondents were caucasian gay men giving a biased sample as only members of one race were surveyed. The sample was also only directed at males, was geographically limiting and was designed to preselect respondents.

Respondents to Tejeda’s survey were gathered from an email list of individuals primarily from the Chesapeake watershed/mid-Atlantic area of the United States. Tejeda used the following criteria for inclusion in the survey, (i) male, (ii) homosexual, (iii) employed full-time and (iv) employed in an area that provided no legal protection against discrimination based on sexual orientation (2006). Tejeda (2006) evaluated the extent of non-discrimination policies within organisations and found that 55% of respondents worked in an organisation that had a non-discrimination policy. Tejeda found that gay men in organizations with a non-discrimination policy reported significantly higher hostility than gay men in organizations without such a policy. Within the sample size it was found that 9% of respondents were in employed in an organisation with less than 50 employees, 45% of respondents were employed by an organisation which had 51-500 employees, 27% were employed in companies with 1000–5000 employees and 18% of respondents stated that their company employed over 5000 employees. Tejeda found that respondents had worked for the same organisation for an average period of 6.2 years and had worked with their current supervisor for an average of 4.7 years (2006). Tejeda’s (2006) findings reflect most other research in the United State that suggest that GLBTI workers are discriminated against
within the workplace and that anti-discrimination policies; unless extensively supported by
the organisation, are ineffective in lessening the effects of discrimination.

**GLBTI Discrimination in the United Kingdom**

The European Union (EU) directed all EU states, one of which is the United Kingdom, to
employ legislation to combat discrimination on the grounds of sexual orientation by 2003
(Wright et al. 2006). The number of cases taken to the Employment Tribunal in the United
Kingdom using the Sexual Orientation Regulations rose from 61 in 2003-2004 to 349 in
2004-2005, but this number was still small compared to over 3,000 taken under the much
longer established race discrimination legislation. Despite organisations within the United
Kingdom employing anti-discrimination policies to encourage a gay friendly working
environment, skilled trades workers (e.g. Welders) still felt unable to disclose their sexuality
at work in 2005 (Wright et al. 2006).

The Department of Trade and Industries estimates that six percent of the UK population is
lesbian, gay or bisexual. The European Union (EU) directed all EU states to employ
legislation to combat discrimination on the grounds of sexual orientation by 2003. However,
Wright et al. (2006) state that implementation was far from complete with countries such as
Germany and Luxembourg still to establish legislation. Wright et al. (2006) stated that the
European Union (EU) had directed all states to implement legislation to reduce
discrimination based on sexual orientation, however they failed to define the EU states in
their report. Wright et al. (2006) also stated that Germany and Luxembourg were still to
establish legislation however they provided no reason as to why this has not occurred and
this was some three years after the EU directive. The study by Wright et al. (2006) in
London and Yorkshire was undertaken as 16 case studies of organisations that consisted of
local authorities, fire authorities, and two schools in the public sector, two volunteer
organisations, and four private sector companies. Wright et al. (2006) state that this
research was not a “window” into the average UK workplace, but was however a window
into 16 good practice organisations.

In-depth interviews were conducted with 154 lesbian, gay and bisexual employees from
across the good practice organisations and were accessed through mailing lists, general
publicity within the organisation, and lesbian, gay and bisexual groups (Wright et al. 2006). The response rate was broken down by gender and represented by 61.7 percent male and 38.3 percent female respondents. There was an under-representation of black and minority ethnic (BME) totalling only 8.4 percent of respondents and an over-representation of managerial and professional respondents totalling 80.6 percent. Wright et al. state that it was clear during the study that manual, administrative, service and skilled trades workers as well as BME workers were less likely to be “out” in the case study organisations and thus much less likely to participate in a research project on LGB issues. It was noted by Wright et al. that despite the organisation’s anti-discrimination policies to encourage a gay friendly working environment that skilled trades workers and BME workers were still not comfortable to be out at work (2006). Wright et al. (2006) offer no explanation as to why they are not comfortable in being out at work however postulation could be that this was due to negativity regarding anti-discrimination. The research undertaken by Wright et al. (2006) reflects the majority of the research undertaken within the United Kingdom. GLBTI employees are more likely to conceal their sexual orientation within the workplace and that despite anti-discrimination policies within organisations, workplace discrimination still occurs within the United Kingdom.

**GLBTI Discrimination in Australia**

**Australian Legislation**

In 1948 the United Nations, of which Australia is a founding member, adopted and proclaimed The Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Article 2 of the Declaration states

‘Everyone is entitled to all the rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration, without distinction of any kind, such as race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status’ (United Nations 1948).

During the intervening years Australia enacted many forms of legislation on a Federal level that covered different forms of discrimination including *Racial Discrimination Act 1975*, the

Despite the intervening years since legislation was enacted in Australia, it can be said that the turning point of legislative change started with the first Sydney Gay and Lesbian Mardi Gras in 1978. An activist group of gays and lesbians sought permission to conduct a rally march through the centre of Sydney. At the time of this march homosexual acts between men were illegal; however in stark contrast homosexual acts between women were never illegal as they were not recognised in legislation. The petition to march was declined, yet numerous gays and lesbians defied police orders and still rallied and a number of arrests occurred. Since 1978 the Sydney Gay and Lesbian Mardi Gras has grown from an annual rally to a full month’s calendar of events each year which draw people nationally and internationally and inject millions of dollars into the Australian economy. Despite the acceptance of the Sydney Gay and Lesbian Mardi Gras by many people, legislative changes have occurred at a slow rate (Elliott 2005).

In Australia, the first Human Rights Commission (now Australian Human Rights Commission) was established in 1981 as the peak body for human rights in Australia (Human Rights & Equal Opportunity Commission 2009). However in 1986 the organisation underwent a name change to the Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission as enacted under the Australian Human Rights Commission Act 1986. With this name change, the existing structure of the organisation which had effectively been operating on a part-time basis was replaced by a full-time organisation (Human Rights & Equal Opportunity Commission 2009). In 2009, the Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission was again to undergo a fundamental name change to be entitled the Australian Human Rights Commission. Legislation directly referring to gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender and intersex (GLBTI) people was not specifically enacted by the Commonwealth government which means any determinations by the Australian Human Rights Commission are more of a conciliatory nature. Therefore a structure is in place in which to combat discrimination; however should the AHRC not be able to resolve a complaint it can then be handled by the appropriate Australian Court; Federal Court of Federal Magistrates Court. It is noted however, that from
1 June 2009, employees are able to make complaints about workplace discrimination to Fair Work Australia which includes sex and sexual preference.

**Queensland Legislation**

After the Commonwealth Government had ratified a number of international human rights instruments, the *Queensland Anti-Discrimination Act* (hereto referred to as the Act) was assented to on 9 December 1991. The Act commenced on 30 June 1992 and it is of note that at the time of commencement only Queensland, the Northern Territory and Tasmania did not have any form of state anti-discrimination legislation (The State of Queensland 1991).

One of the main purposes of the Act was to promote equality of opportunity for everyone by protecting them from unfair discrimination in certain areas of activity, including work, education and accommodation (see Table 1). Of the 16 attributes covered under this Act, three (3) directly relate to the gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender and intersex (GLBTI) communities and these were lawful sexual activity, gender identity and sexuality.

Table 1 – *Queensland Anti-Discrimination Act 1991*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grounds of unlawful discrimination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex, relationship status, pregnancy, parental status, breast feeding (goods and services only), race, age, physical impairment, religion, political belief or activity, trade union activity, lawful sexual activity, gender identity, sexuality, family responsibilities, or association with a person who has any of these attributes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other unlawful conduct</th>
<th>Areas covered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sexual harassment</td>
<td>Work and work related; education; goods and services; superannuation and insurance; disposal of land; accommodation; club membership; administration of state laws and programs; local government; existing partnership and in pre-partnership.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Complaints can be made under the Act to the Anti-Discrimination Commission Queensland (ADCQ) as this body has the responsibility for handling complaints of discrimination, sexual harassment and racial and religious vilification. Once a complaint is raised to the ADCQ a conciliation process takes place between the two (2) parties to come to an amicable solution. Should an amicable solution not be reached the complaint is then passed to the Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal (the Tribunal); a complaint cannot proceed to the Tribunal without having been raised with the ADCQ. The Tribunal operates in a similar fashion to a traditional court albeit in a less formal manner and focuses on alternative dispute resolution. The ADCQ is also responsible for raising awareness of human rights, sexual harassment and discrimination through a variety of avenues such as publications, training and conducting research in relation to human rights issues (Anti-Discrimination Commission Queensland 2010a). In respect of workplace policies put into place under the Anti-Discrimination Act, the legislation does not provide any clear instruction on how an anti-discrimination policy should be written, its length, procedures for handling complaints and other avenues for support services. Despite the enactment of various legislative requirements within Australia, previous research shows that discrimination within the workplace still occurs.

Workplace discrimination in 1999

The largest Australian study into discrimination in the workplace was conducted in 1999 by the Australia Centre for Gay and Lesbian Research (ACGLR) in conjunction with the Gay and Lesbian Rights Lobby of New South Wales. Approximately 900 gay men, lesbians and transgender people across NSW, the ACT and Victoria took part in the research. One of the major findings of the research was that 52.8% of respondents had been the subject of harassment or discrimination in their current or previous workplace (Irwin 1999). Another key finding was that 50.3% of respondents had been ridiculed in front of colleagues or subject to homophobic remarks or jokes in the workplace.

The ACGLR reported that on the basis of homosexuality or gender identity 59% of respondents reported experiencing harassment and/or prejudicial treatment in their current or previous workplace (Irwin 1999). It was also found that whilst a high percentage of
lesbians and gay men had experienced harassment, overall transgender people experienced harassment at a higher rate than lesbians and gay men. Although this research has been very useful in understanding these issues in an Australian context, only three states were included in this study and is a limitation of this study. The results therefore may be less relevant to a contemporary Queensland context.

Irwin (1999) explored and analysed the workplace experiences of discrimination of gay men, lesbians and transgender individuals. The research focussed on their experiences within their current or previous workplace and how this affected their dealings with that company and also how it had affected them in their personal lives. Data was collected from self-completion questionnaires and focus groups. The research found that harassment and/or prejudicial treatment was widespread with 59% of the respondents experiencing discrimination in their current or previous workplace. The type of behaviour recorded by participants included but was not limited to sexual and physical assault, destruction of property and verbal abuse and harassment. The effects of discrimination were also recorded in this study.

Irwin (1999) reported that discrimination had a negative effect on GLBTI employees. Indeed, there were a number of areas in which respondents reported negative effects, ranging from increased stress levels to attempting suicide. However the highest reported negative effects were increased stress levels (76%), depression (60%), loss of confidence (55%), negative effects on relationships outside of work (46%) and illness (45%). Respondents were also asked the effect that discrimination had on their work from achieving less at work through to resigning their position and changing careers. Nearly half (48%) of respondents indicated that they achieved less at work as a result of discrimination. Approximately 36% had taken sick leave or changed careers as a consequence of their experiences of discrimination and 30% resigned.

The research also showed that homophobic harassment and treatment extended across all occupations and industries regardless of the size of the employing company. However, the research also pointed out that discrimination was far more likely to occur in traditionally male dominated organisations, such as the mining industry, and in traditionally male
dominated occupations. These findings are particularly relevant to this research as this study will include rural Queensland where there are many mining companies and employees.

Irwin (1999) reported that only a small percentage of those individuals who were the recipients of homophobic treatment took action. Despite the negative findings of the report, Irwin stated that any positive experiences by respondents was due to a workplace culture that promoted difference and this is where gays, lesbians and transgendered individuals felt safe to be acknowledged as their true selves.

Although the Irwin study stated that the research had been conducted on 900 gay men, lesbians and transgender individuals there was no indication as to how many surveys had been distributed or an indication of the response rate (1999). The survey can be considered to have been conducted on a geographically small sample as only metropolitan areas of New South Wales and Victoria were covered and it is hard to make a generalisation based on such a small geographically located sample. With reference to transgender individuals facing more discrimination than gay men and lesbians, the survey does not ask the reasons behind the extent of such discrimination. The Irwin study (1999) states that only 36% of gay men, lesbians and transgender individuals took action when they were recipients of homophobic behaviour but does not state the outcomes of such action.

Irwin (1999) also indicates that positive experiences were reported by gay men, lesbians and transgender individuals due to workplace culture being supportive but does not state in which industries these positive workplace cultures can be found. It was noted that this research was focussed on New South Wales and Victorian metropolitan areas and this creates limitation as the study did not include metropolitan areas of other states or regional areas within Australia in the sample. The next study conducted into areas of discrimination was conducted in 2005 focussing specifically on homophobia across Australia. Homophobia is highly relevant as this can lead into various forms of discrimination not only in a social context but also a working context.
Homophobia in 2005

Homophobia, the fear or dislike of homosexual people and homosexuality (Flood & Hamilton 2005), was found to vary within Australian States and Territories, with higher instances of homophobia being identified in Queensland and Tasmania with Victoria being identified as the least homophobic. Furthermore Northern Territory males were considered the most homophobic, and males working/living in large city areas in all Australian States and Territories were less homophobic than males working/living in country areas.

Flood and Hamilton (2005) also found that there were some exceptions, for example, Newcastle and the Hunter Region of New South Wales were less homophobic than several areas in the greater Sydney area. However Flood and Hamilton (2005) did not offer any explanation as to these discrepancies. The discrepancies showing that some areas outside of the Sydney metropolitan area were less homophobic than regional areas of New South Wales cannot be explained without further study and research into the population living within these areas.

The study conducted by Flood and Hamilton (2005) analysed and reported on the belief that homosexuality is immoral to determine the extent of homophobia within all states and territories of Australia. However, the research does not define the term immoral and many people can define the term immoral in many different ways. The research also investigated the individual effects of homophobia on gay men, lesbians and transgender people by analysing a study conducted by Irwin (1999). The research focussed on individuals aged 14 years and over and included most religions as well as those that did not identify any religious affiliations. This study defined homophobia as those who believed that homosexuality is immoral. The research utilised the results from a Roy Morgan Research survey conducted from October 2003 to September 2004 of 24,718 respondents aged 14 and over to identify the extent of homophobia in Australia.

The statistics were also analysed by regions within larger metropolitan areas to determine the extent of homophobia. It was found by Flood and Hamilton (2005) that the most homophobic areas were the Moreton district, Central/South-West Queensland and the
Burnie/Western district of Tasmania where 50 percent believe that homosexuality is immoral. Flood and Hamilton (2005) discovered that the least homophobic region was the Inner City of Melbourne where only 14 percent of respondents believed homosexuality to be immoral. Flood and Hamilton (2005) state that when analysing the results of males, the most homophobic area was Central South-West Queensland where 63 percent of men believe that homosexuality is immoral. Looking at these statistics, it can be postulated that discrimination within the workplace will be higher within Central South-West Queensland given the high percentage of men that consider homosexuality to be immoral.

The data collected by Flood and Hamilton shows that the study was a quantitative survey. However, the study does not show how individuals over the age of 14 were contacted or what percentage of the population is over 14 years of age or how parental consent was obtained. This being the case a question of validity arises as it is not certain how the research data was collected. The study conducted by Flood and Hamilton also defines cities by regions but does not report on how these regions were determined whether they were using suburb boundaries as determined by respective city councils or if these regions where determined by geographical landmarks (2005).

It was noted in this study (Flood & Hamilton 2005) that it only covered very limited issues regarding workplace discrimination such as unreasonable work expectations and career restrictions, towards gay men, lesbians and transgender people. Questions surrounding the validity of how respondents were selected, what methods were used in selecting respondents, if closed or open-ended questions were asked and if it the sample size was representative of the population are also raised as these are not mentioned in the study.

Despite these limitations, Flood and Hamilton discovered that homophobia was most likely to occur at a higher rate amongst 14-17 year old males, 25% of tertiary educated individuals, 40-50% of individuals that did not complete high school and in those that follow the Baptist faith. It was noted however that amongst those individuals with religious affiliations, Catholics were the most tolerant (Flood & Hamilton 2005). These findings clearly suggest evidence of homophobia in Australia, and that certain states and/or territories are
homophobic to different extents. The effects of this homophobic sentiment are reflected in other studies seeking to document discrimination amongst GLBTI people in Australia.

**Discrimination in 2006**

In another Australian study (Pitts et al. 2006) that examined discrimination against GLBTI individuals, it was found that fear of prejudicial treatment or discrimination caused 67% of GLBTI individuals to modify their daily activities. Personal insults and/or verbal abuse were experienced by 59.3% of respondents and this percentage was higher in major cities although threats of violence and/or physical attacks were more likely in regional or remote areas. As a consequence of their sexuality, one in eight GLBTI respondents had been physical assaulted and 10.3% had been refused employment or promotion (Pitts et al. 2006). Therefore, sexual discrimination in the workplace in Queensland is an area worthy of more detailed study.

This study titled ‘Private Lives’ was funded by a grant from La Trobe University and conducted in conjunction with Gay and Lesbian Health Victoria. This collaborative study analysed and reported on the aspects of the health and wellbeing of a large sample of Gay men, Lesbians, Bisexuals, Transgender and Intersex (GLBTI) individuals in Australia. ‘Private Lives’ also reported on the impact of factors such as homophobia, discrimination, family and community connection on health and wellbeing, and also investigated aspects of health service use of GLBTI individuals. The study was conducted in 2005 with a total of 5476 respondents aged between 16 and 92 years of age via an online survey covering all States and Territories in Australia (Pitts et al. 2006). Recruitment for the ‘Private Lives’ survey was through internet sites, personal email networks, media publicity, press advertisements and wide distribution of promotional cards allowing for a large response rate. The data collected in ‘Private Lives’ constitutes the largest study ever undertaken of GLBTI people in Australia and one of the largest in the world reporting on the health and wellbeing of GLBTI individuals. Previous Australian research has been on a smaller scale and has relied on largely unrepresentative samples recruited in restricted geographical areas, through membership lists of community organisations or at community events. Major national
surveys of the general population, while providing useful comparisons between heterosexual and non-heterosexual people, inevitably provide only a small number of cases.

Pitts et al. (2006) determined that 63% of respondents were male and 35% of respondents were female, with 1.8% being transgender and .3% being intersex individuals. The study found that 92% of men reported being predominantly or exclusively attracted to men where only 80% of women reported being predominantly or exclusively attracted to women. When analysing discrimination against Gay men, Lesbians, Bisexual, Transgender and Intersex individuals Pitts et al. (2006) found that 67% indicated fear of prejudicial treatment or discrimination caused them to modify their daily activities.

Discrimination in the form of personal insults or verbal abuse was experienced by 59.3% of respondents and was higher in major cities although threats of violence and/or physical attacks were more likely in regional or remote areas. One in eight respondents recorded having been physical attacked because of their sexuality and 10.3% were refused employment or promotion because of their sexuality (Pitts et al. 2006).

This was a quantitative study and evidence was provided for the methodology and recruitment of respondents. The study was conducted as an online survey due to the proliferation of websites targeting gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender and intersex (GLBTI) individuals, particularly males. This could be a biased sample as not all GLBTI individuals may have access to the internet, thus only providing a sample of those GLBTI individuals that have internet access (Pitts et al. 2006). Although the study makes poignant points with regards to discrimination and other services (health), there are limitations. The first is that some of the statistical data represented does not equal 100% of the sample size; this does bring into question the validity of the data. The research also does not define the terms used in the research namely Trans-male/female, Intersex male/female and many could interpret these labels differently. The study (Pitts et al. 2006) states that 59.3% of respondents had experienced personal insults or verbal abuse, but the study fails to mention in which area this was experienced, for example, was it experienced in the home, at work, or even on the street.
The study by Pitts et al. (2006) also does not define regional and remote areas and this leaves it open to misinterpretation of the definitions of these two terms. When analysing the data from individuals’ sexual experiences, Pitts et al. (2006) reported that 91% of men had either predominantly or exclusively had sex with other men, but it was less clear with women. Pitts et al. (2006) do not state why it was unclear to determine the predominant or exclusiveness of women having sex with women, but do state that a higher proportion of women reported having sex equally with both men and women.

Pitts et al. (2006) have stated in their executive summary that the age bracket of respondents was 16-92 years however they state further that the age bracket that was utilised was 16-86 years of age with the majority being in their 20’s and most having been born in Australia. This 6 year unrepresented age bracket may call into question the validity of the data provided. It is also not clear from the survey how consent was garnered from those individuals that were under 18 years of age. Even so, this study is important in terms of the levels of discriminatory treatment reported by respondents in Australia, a theme reflected in a more recent study of discrimination against GLBTI people in Queensland.

**Discrimination in 2010**

The most recent study into the discrimination of GLBTI individuals, ‘Speaking Out: stopping homophobic and transphobic abuse in Queensland was conducted in 2010 by Dr Alan Berman and Dr Shirleene Robinson. The ‘Speaking Out’ study was funded by a grant administered by the Queensland Department of Justice and Attorney General. Primarily this study focussed on the ways that homophobic and transphobic harassment and violence impact on the lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, intersex and queer community (LGBTIQ). ‘Speaking Out’ received 1,094 responses via an online survey covering all regions of Queensland. The main research method for this study was utilising the snowball technique in which to generate responses (Berman & Robinson 2010).

Electronic methods in recruitment of respondents were conducted via the internet, personal and community email networks along with traditional methods such as print media, radio and attendance at LGBTIQ events. A total of 44% of respondents were male, 52% female,
1% were male to female transgender, 1% female to male transgender and 2% selected the response ‘other’. Of the respondents, 44% identified as gay, 40% identified as lesbian, 11% identified as bisexual, and 5% identified as ‘other’. It is interesting to note respondents who had identified themselves as being gay was made up of 92% male respondents, 7% female respondents and 1% transgender female to male. A total of 80% of respondents to ‘Speaking Out’ were employed at the time of the study and it was found that 9% of perpetrators of homophobic or transphobic abuse were drawn from the workplace (Berman & Robinson 2010). This serves to validate the need for a more in-depth study of discrimination in the workplace.

A total of 53% of respondents had reported that they had been harassed or abused within the last two years on the basis of sexuality or gender identity. Berman and Robinson stated that the five most predominant forms of abuse and harassment experienced by respondents were verbal abuse, spitting and offensive gestures, threats of physical violence, written threats and abuse and physical attack or assault (without a weapon). Berman and Robinson found that 12% of respondents counted the workplace as their most recent experience of abuse, harassment or violence. Fear was a major contributing factor as to why 62% of respondents concealed their sexual orientation or gender identity whilst at work (Berman & Robinson 2010). Although this study is by far the most comprehensive within Queensland, and Australia to date, little is still known concerning discrimination within the workplace. It is the lack of knowledge in this area that underpins the need for further research into discrimination within the workplace and indeed within the wider construct of the community at large.

**Reported discrimination in Queensland 2009-2010**

In the 2009-2010 Annual report recently released by the Anti-Discrimination Commission of Queensland (ADCQ), only 2.6% of complaints that were accepted by the ADCQ were related to sexuality (2.5%), gender identity (.7%) and gender identity vilification (.3%). The ADCQ encompasses four regions within Queensland, South East, Central, North and Far North. These regions are consistent with most Queensland Government Departments with the exception of South East Queensland as no differentiation is made between the South East
corner of Queensland and South West Queensland (Anti-Discrimination Commission Queensland 2010b).

A total of 13 complaints were made in the South East region relating to sexuality, whilst 1 complaint concerning sexuality was made in both the Central and Northern regions. Four complaints to the ADCQ on the grounds of gender identity were only lodged within the South East region. Two gender identity vilification complaints were only received from the South East region. Table 2 outlines the areas in which complaints were made:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ground for complaint</th>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Goods and Services</th>
<th>Accommodation</th>
<th>Pre Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sexuality</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender identity</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender identity vilification</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is not known as to how many of these complaints were finalised within the 2009-2010 reporting timeframe - however the lack of reporting incidents to the ADCQ is reflected. Australian researchers concluded that discrimination was more likely to occur in a regional area as opposed to a metropolitan area (Berman & Robinson 2010; Flood & Hamilton 2005; Irwin 1999; Pitts et al. 2006)

**Characteristics of supervisors**

Only limited research has focused on the characteristics and role of the supervisor in relation to workplace-based discrimination against GLBTI people. Tejeda (2006) found that 100% of respondents reported their supervisors were heterosexual, 55% of supervisors were male, and 68% of the respondents had disclosed their sexual orientation to their supervisor. Tejeda (2006) noted that gay men who disclosed to a supervisor reported a significantly higher hostile work environment, significantly lower perceived promotion opportunities, and significantly higher turnover intentions. Tejeda (2006) does not clearly define why this is the case in the sample.
Research indicates that the following qualities of a workplace assists GLBTI people ‘coming out’: equal opportunities and diversity policies which include: sexual orientation; the establishment and promotion of same sex benefits; positive employer and trade union signals; the existence of GLBTI groups; the presence of GLBTI colleagues; and GLBTI senior managers. However, GLBTI people may be prevented from coming out by: fears about career progression; lack of visible senior GLBTI staff; temporary employment status; previous negative experiences of discrimination and harassment; desiring privacy; and “macho” or religious attitudes/behaviours of co-workers (Wright et al. 2006). Clearly, these areas of concern require further exploration in future empirical research.

**Summary of research disparity**

Although research has been conducted within an Australian context concerning discrimination faced by GLBTI individuals, there has been no clear research conducted concerning the workplace as a potential for discrimination to occur. Furthermore, research that has been conducted to date has centred mainly on other areas of Australia with no focus on Queensland. Current gaps in research can be found in employment status and GLBTI status, disclosure and promotion opportunities, reporting of incidents to the ADCQ, types of discrimination faced by workers, clearly defined geographical areas where discrimination occurs and the reasons behind not reporting discrimination within the workplace to a supervisor and/or manager.

**Conclusion**

This Chapter has looked at discrimination across the United States, the United Kingdom and Australia. Research clearly states that discrimination against GLBTI employees is still occurring despite the enactment of legislation and workplace policies prohibiting discrimination. An outline of current legislative requirements in Australia and more specifically Queensland was provided. The research questions for this study which are based on previous research data are also stated. The next Chapter will look at the
methodology of this current study including why an online method of participation was used along with a description of snowball sampling in the virtual and physical environments.
CHAPTER THREE - Method

Introduction

This chapter begins with a justification for the use of a research framework incorporating a theoretical framework grounded in the concept of stigma. It then details how an online survey approach, using quantitative items, was used to fully explore the research questions posed for this study. Typically the terminology of survey and questionnaire is interchangeable. McBurney (2001, p. 215) defines a survey as ‘accessing public opinion or individual characteristics by the use of questionnaire and sampling methods’. However, for the purpose of this study and consistency, the term survey will be utilised. This is followed with a discussion of the process of ethical approval, including key ethical considerations involved in the study. Discussion then moves to the mechanisms implemented by the researcher to ensure a high level of reliability and validity for the study and the survey instrument. The chapter concludes with a discussion of the data analysis processes used as part of the research design.

Justification for utilising a quantitative approach

Utilising a quantitative approach in the form of an online survey has the ability to access remote and or hidden communities. As discrimination, stigmatisation, and exclusion are all measurable variables in terms of this research, a quantitative research paradigm is supported as it is objective, generalisable, provides an “outsider” perspective, and is a controlled measure. Quantitative research allows for a degree of verifiability and provides for legitimacy, objectivity, and reliability. Drawing on this approach also allows the research to be reproduced by other researchers (Blaxter, Hughes & Tight 2006; Grix 2004). A quantitative approach is being utilised to operationalise the survey as previous research undertaken in similar areas has shown that this is an effective method to attract respondents that may be hidden within the larger context of multiple communities (Salganik 2006). A quantitative approach is also appropriate as it allows for ease of replication for future studies into GLBTI discrimination in the workplace. Utilising an online survey also allows respondents the option of anonymity and the ability to complete the survey at time and place that is convenient to them.
Justification for the use of a survey

In line with a quantitative approach, a survey design was utilised for this study. While using the Internet to survey a population requires the use of special tools, the survey can be easily accessed and used by respondents by providing them with a Uniform Resource Locator (URL). Surveys are a principal form of collecting data as they are cased around a reliance on quantifiable information (Veal 1997; Veal 2006). There is a transparency of the research technique in which the questions are easily understood and the responses allow the researcher to identify perceptions and attitudes among the population as a whole (Veal 1997; Veal 2006).

A survey is a list of carefully structured questions, chosen after considerable testing, with a view to eliciting reliable responses from the sample population (Hussey & Hussey 1997). As each respondent is asked to respond to the same questions, it provides an efficient way of collecting equivalent responses from a large sample prior to quantitative analysis (Saunders, Thornhill & Lewis 2007). Moreover, personal surveys are an inexpensive way (in terms of money and time) of data collection, particularly when the sample size is expected to come from such a large geographical area such as Queensland. Respondents are also more likely to fill out a survey as it is less time consuming compared to other collection methods (Carr 2003). However, what respondents report depends on their own powers of recall, honesty and on the format of the questions included in the survey (Veal 1997). Importantly, the validity of using questions to answer questions about characteristics and perceptions is widely accepted (Carr 2003; Hussey & Hussey 1997; Loker & Perdue 1992; Saunders, Thornhill & Lewis 2007; Veal 1997). As outlined, an internet survey was deemed to be the most appropriate way to gather responses due to the geographical size of Queensland and also to allow respondents the choice of being anonymous and completing the survey at a time and place that was convenient to them. Using an online survey method also allows a greater reach into the hidden population of GLBTI communities. Hidden populations are typically those in which a population size cannot be determined (Salganik 2006).

Online measure and the GLBTI community

As this is an exploratory study, it is necessary for the researcher to use study techniques appropriate for gaining a better understanding of discrimination in the workplace as perceived by gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender and intersex (GLBTI) populations. Reaching
the GLBTI population can be difficult. However, the use of the Internet has been used by previous researchers to access GLBTI communities (Berman & Robinson 2010; Faugier & Sargeant 1997; Pitts et al. 2006). The use of an internet survey is most suited to accessing GLBTI individuals as they are not easily identifiable in mainstream society. Even the Australian Bureau of Statistics (2006b) still does not ask for sexual orientation or sexual identity in census questions, therefore concealing GLBTI individuals within society at large. It also allows the respondent to retain anonymity should they wish and affords respondents the option of completing and online survey at a time and place that is convenient to them. Previous research conducted within GLBTI communities has under sampled GLBTI people living outside major metropolitan areas with the exception of Berman and Robinson in 2010. The largest survey conducted in Australia that incorporated workplace discrimination was conducted by Irwin in 1999 and the vast majority of respondents were located in metropolitan areas of Sydney and Melbourne. To extend the opportunity to participate to those working outside major metropolitan areas, an online survey was used by Irwin (1999). According to the Australian Bureau of Statistics (2009), the number of internet subscribers in Queensland is 21% or 1.6 million households, of all Australian internet subscribers. In addition, since 2002 the proportion of households who had access to a mobile phone had jumped to 72% increasing internet access (Australian Bureau of Statistics 2009). Therefore an internet survey allows individuals who have the capability to access the internet from either a computer or a mobile phone to access the online survey and complete it at a time that is convenient for them and in a place where they feel safe.

Berman and Robinson (2010) used a snowball technique in Queensland to target GLBTI individuals in the most comprehensive survey into homophobic and transphobic abuse in Australia to date. Queensland comprises approximately 1,852,642 square kilometres and using an internet based survey to garner responses from such a wide area where the researcher may not be able to attend in person was deemed appropriate. Berman and Robinsons (2010) also used the snowball technique to drive responses to the survey website. An online survey is an important tool to gather responses from an otherwise unknown sample size. The research method used by Berman and Robinson (2010) is a similar method to that used in this research.
**Sample Size**

As this study seeks to access a hard to reach group, snowball sampling was chosen as the most appropriate sampling method. Snowball sampling begins with selecting potential respondents from the target population; these potential respondents are also called seeds (Salganik 2006). Once respondents complete the survey, they are encouraged to recruit other potential respondents from within the target population. The new sample members are then asked to further recruit others from within the target population. Sampling in this fashion continues until the desired number of respondents is reached from within the target population. Salganik (2006) states experience has shown this sample selection method is practical and it has already been used to study a number of different hidden populations ‘such as injection drug users and sex workers’ (Salganik 2006, p. 98). As noted above, hidden populations are typically those in which a population size cannot be determined. As sexual orientation or sexual identity are not questions that are asked in census data collection by the Australian Bureau of Statistics, the population size of GLBTI individuals in Queensland cannot be pre-determined. Snowball sampling is therefore best suited to GLBTI populations whose size is as yet unknown.

Based on research findings by Berman and Robinson (2010), an estimated 12% of GLBTI individuals surveyed within Queensland had experienced discrimination within the workplace. Using this information, along with the hidden population sample size calculation (See Figure 1) described by Salganik (2006), the intended sample size for the survey was 84 participants (See Figure 2). As this study utilised the snowball technique to gather data, 152 responses were received for this study indicating a good and statistically valid sample.

---

**Figure 1 - Sample size formula**

\[ n = \text{deff} \cdot \frac{P_A(1-P_A)}{(se(P_A))^2} \]

**Figure 2 - Sample size calculation**

\[ n = 2 \cdot \frac{.12(1-.12)}{(.05(.999))^2} \implies n \approx 84 \]
**Survey design**

The survey developed for this study was intended to gather information from respondents to address the proposed research questions. To this end, a series of closed items were utilised along with a Likert scale. McIver and Carmines (1981) describe the Likert scale as being comprised of an equal number of positive and negative statements. When presented with the Likert scale in a survey, respondents are asked to mark each item in the scale in terms to their own agreement or disagreement. Survey questions were developed after reviewing previous research conducted by Irwin (1999) and also reviewing the *Queensland Anti-Discrimination Act* (1991) and the 2004 *Code of Practice ‘Prevention of Workplace Harassment’* (Queensland Government).

**Operationalisation of Survey**

Survey questions were developed using current legislation on bullying, harassment (*Prevention of Workplace Harassment – Code of Practice 2004*) and discrimination (*Anti-Discrimination Act 1991*). A pivotal question in the survey was question 5, in your workplace based on assumptions made by others about your sexual orientation or sexual identity, have you experienced any of the following? This item, being the largest of all required responses is based on both current legislation and anecdotal evidence from within the GLBTI communities. The *Prevention of Workplace Harassment – Code of Practice* (Queensland Government 2004) defines harassment within the workplace as behaviour, by a person, including the person’s employer or a co-worker or group of co-workers of the person that:

a) is unwelcome and unsolicited  
b) the person considers to be offensive, intimidating, humiliating or threatening  
c) a reasonable person would consider to be offensive, humiliating, intimidating or threatening.

Examples of this type behaviour are seen in Appendix 6 – Examples of discrimination and harassment. The Queensland *Anti-Discrimination Act* states that it is unlawful to discriminate against someone because of their sex, lawful sexual activity or association with, or relation to, a person identified on the basis of any of the above attributes.
Prior to the main survey there are a series of qualifier questions to determine the suitability of respondents. Respondents are asked to self-identify their sexuality, employment status, workplace postcode, and if they had experienced any form of personal discrimination in their current workplace. Based on the qualifying questions all respondents within the main survey had experienced some form of discrimination within the workplace.

The first question of the survey asks respondents to nominate the industry in which they work. This question will answer research question one: in which industries do GLBTI employees face discrimination? Respondents are asked the postcode of their home which will answer research question two: in which postcodes does discrimination occur at its highest against GLBTI employees? Survey question six asks respondents if they have reported discrimination to their employer or other organisation; responses to this question will answer research question three: to what extent has discrimination been reported? Question ten of the survey asks respondents what type of impact discrimination in the workplace has had on them; these responses will answer research question four: what impact has discrimination had on GLBTI employees? Lastly, questions five, eight and nine of the survey will answer research question five: what types of discrimination are most likely faced by GLBTI individuals at work and their effects?

Pilot test of survey instrument

A pilot study is used as a pre-test of the main study on a much smaller scale. Pilot studies serve to improve or modify the study instrument and refine the research process. Conducting a pilot study helps to prevent costly errors in the main study and serves to inform potential respondents about the study (McMurray, Pace & Scott 2004). The sample used for the pilot test consisted of ten individuals recruited through the Queensland Association of Healthy Communities in Brisbane, personal networks and a non-profit organisation, Pride in Diversity. As a result of the pilot test, some minor modifications were made to the survey in terms of phrasing of questions, readability, and aesthetics. For example, questions regarding HIV status were regarded by pilot test participants as inappropriate for this research and were subsequently removed. Another question regarding previous town/city of residence and the level of acceptance participants felt was
deemed unnecessary by pilot test participants as it had no bearing on the research questions.

**Snowballing procedure**

Snowball sampling, where respondents refer other potential respondents to the survey, will be used as the primary sampling procedure. The snowball technique involves the nomination of other potentially eligible people by study participants (Platzer & James 1997). Research participants for the online survey were approached from a variety of sources. The sources ranged from University email lists, personal networks, organisations specifically designed to assist GLBTI individuals, GLBTI websites and GLBTI events and media releases sent to the general press. However, in all instances the snowball methodology was utilised to drive participation in the survey through asking participants to forward the link of the survey to friends and family that may have been interested in the research.

**Virtual Snowballing**

Initial snowballing was undertaken through an electronic mail sent to all staff and students located on a Queensland campus of CQUUniversity Australia, including Rockhampton, Gladstone, Emerald, Bundaberg and Mackay. Permission was granted by Ms Deborah Green, Regional HR Manager for Department of Education and Training to send an email to all staff within Queensland to assist in the snowballing of the survey. Mr Ian Riggs, Equity Officer, CQUUniversity Australia, was able to forward an email to other Equity Officers within other Tertiary Organisations to also assist in the snowballing of this survey. This was undertaken to gain the widest possible reach for participants for the research. A media release (see Appendix 1) was drafted and sent to a number of Queensland Newspapers/Publications (see Appendix 2).

The survey was posted to a number of websites including Queensland Association of Healthy Communities (QAHC), Boot Co, CQUUniversity Australia, My Gay Brisbane and the Brisbane Gay and Lesbian Business Network. A Facebook page was also constructed to ensure a wider reach within GLBTI communities (See Appendix 11 – Facebook). The website link along with a short description was also posted to discussion forums on LinkedIn
specifically targeting GLBTI professional in Australia. In each instance respondents were asked to forward the survey information and link to those within their own networks, thus driving the snowball technique.

Physical Snowballing
Snowballing was also conducted by the researcher in different locations in Queensland. Business cards (See Appendix 9 – Promotional Items) were distributed by the researcher at venues specifically targeting the GLBTI demographic in Queensland. Attendance by the researcher at The Wickham and The Sportsman bars in Brisbane, The Sovereign Hotel in Townsville, Tropical Pride Cairns, Turtle Cove Resort North of Cairns as well as Brisbane Gay Marriage Equality Rally were used to distribute fliers and business cards to promote the survey. In all instances, permission was sought and agreed to by management prior to visiting each venue.

Ethical considerations
As this research was conducted using human participants, Human Research Ethics Committee approval was sought prior to research being undertaken as outlined in the CQUUniversity policy Code of Conduct for Research (CQUUniversity Australia 2010). During the course of the research, adherence to the CQUUniversity Code of Conduct for Research and the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Research Involving Humans (1999) was maintained. The online survey contained an Information Sheet (see Appendix 3 – Survey Information Sheet) and a Consent Form (see Appendix 4 – Survey Consent Form) explaining the nature of the survey, its purpose and confidentiality provision as well as the right to withdraw at any time. The opening page of the survey also detailed counselling organisations available to respondents should they suffer any unforeseen discomfort, stress or adverse effects from completing the online survey. Due to the nature of the survey, it was envisaged that additional counselling would not be required by participants and that no harm, either physical or mental ensued. During the course of the collection of data from participants, no ethical concerns were raised regarding the project.
**Analytical Process**

Data for this study was gathered using an online survey and results were represented in an Excel spreadsheet. The Excel spreadsheet was imported into the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) computer program. Once the file was imported into SPSS data cleaning commenced in which incorrectly entered data was identified along with labelling of the data and the checking of variables to ensure validity and reliability of the data. The cleaning of the data was done utilising the descriptive frequencies to identify which variables contained errors. A number of statistical analyses were considered along with T Tests and ANOVA’s, however were discounted due to the nature of the data collected. Chi-square test analysis was utilised in determining if significant correlations existed between the geographical location of research participants and the frequency of discrimination for Research Question 2. Pearson 2-tailed correlation analysis was conducted to assist in analysing Research Question 4.

**Conclusion**

This chapter detailed the methods that have been utilised to conduct this research project. This chapter demonstrates the suitability of a quantitative research approach and, in line with this approach, has justified the use of an online survey method as well as the snowballing technique for collecting data on the extent of workplace discrimination within Queensland. A quantitative research approach was most appropriate for this under-researched topic as GLBTI populations remain hidden within wider community groups. This chapter has also outlined the ethical considerations that were required. The following chapter will report the analysis of the survey data generated through the methodology outlined in this chapter, with a focus on using a variety of analytical instruments in SPSS.
CHAPTER FOUR - Results

Introduction

The previous chapter described the research design including the different methods of snowballing. This chapter outlines the analysis and results obtained from the online survey. The number of completed online surveys due to snowballing was 152 which exceed the 84 suggested as the minimum sample size needed when surveying a hidden population (Salganik 2006). Therefore this sample size can be regarded as statistically valid and results can be viewed as reliable.

The first step of the analysis will be to look at the characteristics of the respondents followed by results for each of the five research questions.

GLBTI employees do experience discrimination

This study has also found that Queensland GLBTI employee’s experience discrimination. Importantly, 54% of respondents had experienced discrimination in their workplace (See Table 3).

Table 3 - Respondents who had experienced discrimination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>53.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>46.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Demographics

Most respondents lived in the Brisbane Metropolitan Region (37.5%) or the Fitzroy Region (27%) (See Figure 3). Responses were received from all Queensland regions. Regions were defined as according to the Queensland Department of Transport and Main Roads (See Appendix 14 – Queensland Region Maps ). Where postcodes overlapped regions, the closest major centre was chosen to represent the Region (Queensland Government 2010).
Respondents who had experienced discrimination in the workplace worked in a variety of industries. The highest percentage of respondents (22%), worked within the Health and Community Services industry followed by tertiary education (10%) and government, administration and defence (10%) (See Figure 4).
More respondents (25.7%) classified themselves as working at a professional level (see Figure 5) than any other level of work and 65% reported that they were working fulltime (See Figure 6).

![Figure 5 - Respondent Occupation as defined by ABS Census (2006)](image)

![Figure 6 - Employment Status](image)

The majority of respondents identified as gay males (39%), lesbian (23%), bisexual female (15%), gay female (7%) or bisexual male (6%). In addition, there were 3% transgender and 0.7% intersex respondents (see Figure 7).
Respondents recorded that their highest level of education completed was Secondary School at 21.7% (See Figure 8), followed by completion of an undergraduate degree at 20.4%.

Figure 7 - Self-identification of respondents

Figure 8 - Respondent Education Level as defined by ABS Census (2006)
The age range of respondents varied from over 18 years of age to over 55 years of age. The mean age of the respondents was between 30 and 34 years of age (See Figure 9).

**Figure 9 - Respondent Age Range**

![Bar chart showing the age range distribution of respondents.]

Respondents were more likely to have been employed at their current workplace for more than 5 years (31%) (See Table 4).

**Table 4 - Number of years in current workplace**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 1 and 2 years</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 3 and 4 years</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 years or more</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sexual identity disclosure**

Analysis of staff awareness of the respondent’s sexual identity revealed that less than 8% had not disclosed their sexual identity in the workplace and that 40% were comfortable enough in their workplace to disclose their sexual identity to more than 10 staff members in their workplace (See Table 5).
Table 5 - Disclosure of respondent’s sexual identity in the workplace

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>None</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-2 staff</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5 staff</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 staff</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 10 staff</td>
<td>40.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents indicated that disclosing their sexual orientation or sexual identity was more likely to include more than one co-worker (38%) whilst disclosure to superiors was most likely to be to their Manager/Supervisor (30%) rather than an owner/operator (10.7%) (See Figure 10).

Figure 10 - Co-workers knowledge of respondent’s sexual identity

Throughout their working history, the majority of respondents had experienced discrimination based on their sexual orientation or sexual identity at either one (36%) or two (34%) workplaces (See Table 6).
Table 6 - Number of workplaces where respondents have experienced discrimination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 workplace</td>
<td>35.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 workplaces</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 workplaces</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 workplaces</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or more</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When asked if their place of employment had policies in place preventing discrimination, 74% of respondents stated in the affirmative (see Table 7).

Table 7 - The companies for which the respondent workplace had policies in place

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>74.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Importantly, of the 34% of respondents who had reported discrimination (See Table 8) within the workplace, the reporting had no effect (66%) for the majority (See Table 9). Only 2.7% of respondents reported discrimination ceasing altogether (See Table 10).

Table 8 - Respondents reported discrimination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>34.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>65.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10 - Discrimination ceased

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>97.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9 - Reported discrimination having an effect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>89.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When asked for the reason why 66% of respondents had not reported discrimination within their workplace, ‘other’ responses ranged from having no-one to report discrimination to and being not overly concerned by it, to nothing will be done based on past experiences and that society is homophobic and assumes hetero-normality (12.8% of respondents). Heteronormality is where a person assumes someone that they have just met is heterosexual (Case, Hesp & Eberly 2005). However, 10.7% of respondents reported that they feared repercussions should they report discrimination within their workplace (See Figure 11).

When respondents were asked if they believed that factors other than their sexuality or sexual identity had an effect on discrimination within the workplace, 7.4% of respondents believed that gender may also have played a part in discrimination within their current workplace (See Figure 12). In addition age (5%) and religion (3%) accounted for most frequent responses which are areas in which discrimination should not be occurring according to the *Queensland Anti-Discrimination Act*. 

![Figure 11 - Why discrimination was not reported](image-url)
The most common course of action that was undertaken by employers once discrimination was reported was staff training (8.1%) (See Table 11). Overall only 19 respondents indicated that action had been undertaken by their employer.

Table 11 - Action undertaken by company after reports discrimination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meetings</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Inclusion policy introduced</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question 1.
In which industries does discrimination occur based on the sexual orientation or sexual identity of GLBTI individuals?

Respondents who had experienced discrimination in the workplace (54%) worked in a variety of industries. The industry with the highest number of respondents (22%) was within the Health and Community Services industry, followed equally by Education – Tertiary and Government Administration and Defence (10%) and then Retail Trade (9%) (Figure 13). Despite Queensland having a large mining industry, respondents from mining only constituted 6% as did Education – Secondary and Personal and other Services.

Figure 13 - Respondent Industries

When questioned as to their position within the industry in which they worked, the majority of respondents (26%) reported working in a Professional capacity, followed by Manager (13%) and Clerical and Administrative Worker (12%) (See Figure 14).
Therefore the majority of GLTBI’s who have experienced discrimination work in a professional capacity as well as being employed in the Health and Community Services industry.
Research Question 2.

In which Queensland postcodes does discrimination based upon the sexual orientation or sexual identity of GLBTI workers occur at its highest?

The chi-square test for "Experienced Discrimination" and "Region" and/or "Postcode" violates the assumptions of the chi-square test concerning the minimum expected cell frequency in that only 66.7% of cells have an expected count of less than 5 (See Table 12). The chi-square test shows no significant correlation between GLBTI individuals experiencing discrimination and the geographical location ($\chi^2(11, N = 152) = 0.20, p > .05$). However, a large number of respondents from the Metropolitan and Fitzroy Regions did experience discrimination.

Table 12 - Chi-square test between experienced discrimination and location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi-Square Tests</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>14.697a</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>18.077</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>2.898</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>152</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. 16 cells (66.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .46.

Symmetric Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Asymp. Std. Errora</th>
<th>Approx. Tb</th>
<th>Approx. Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interval by Interval Pearson’s R</td>
<td>-.139</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>-1.713</td>
<td>.089c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordinal by Ordinal Spearman Correlation</td>
<td>-.151</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>-1.867</td>
<td>.064c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>152</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.
b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.
c. Based on normal approximation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REGION</th>
<th>Experienced discrimination</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REGION</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Region</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td></td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>58.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Coast Region</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Coast Region</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West Region</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darling Downs Region</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wide Bay/Burnett Region</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitzroy Region</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td></td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>41.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central West Region</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mackay/Whitsunday Region</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Region</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West Region</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Far North Region</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>82</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td></td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>152.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question 3.

To what extent has discrimination based on the sexual orientation or sexual identity of GLBTI workers been reported to employers, unions, or the Anti-discrimination Commission Queensland?

Of the 54% who had reported that they had experienced discrimination, only 34% had reported discrimination within their workplace (See Figure 15).

Figure 15 - Reported Harassment

The 34% who had reported discrimination, mainly reported to their Supervisor (13%) or someone above the level of their Supervisor (10%). It is important to note that only 0.7% of respondents reported discrimination to the Anti-Discrimination Commission of Queensland (See Figure 16). The Anti-Discrimination Commission of Queensland (ADCQ) is an independent statutory authority that was established under the Queensland Anti-Discrimination Act 1991. The core business of the ADCQ is to resolve complaints that are directly related to contraventions of the Queensland Anti-Discrimination Act and also to promote human rights within Queensland.

Figure 16 – To whom discrimination was reported
Research Question 4.

Within a workplace, what types of discrimination are most likely used against GLBTI individuals based on sexual orientation or sexual identity and what are the ramifications created by this discrimination?

The three most frequently reported types of discrimination based on the respondent’s sexual identity were remarks (27%), ridicule (27%) and jokes (25%) (See Figure 17).

According to respondents the most frequent types of discrimination carried out by more than one co-worker were remarks (59%), ridicule (56%) and jokes (58%) (See Figure 18).
The most frequent types of discrimination carried out by a single co-worker in written form are threats of physical abuse (100%), while verbal threats (57%) and telephone threats of physical abuse (67%) were most commonly carried out by one co-worker (See Figure 19).

Figure 19 - Frequent types of discrimination carried out by single co-worker

![Figure 19 - Frequent types of discrimination carried out by single co-worker](image)

If respondents have experienced discrimination in their current workplace more than three times, the types of discrimination were: death threats (80%), threats of physical abuse via telephone (67%), property damage (33%), verbal threats of sexual abuse (30%), verbal threats of physical abuse (29%) and verbal threats of sexual abuse via telephone (25%) (See Figure 20).

Figure 20 - Frequency of discrimination

![Figure 20 - Frequency of discrimination](image)
**Research Question 5.**

**What level of impact has discrimination based on the sexual orientation or sexual identity of GLBTI workers had on these employees?**

The impact of discrimination on GLBTI workers was categorised into two categories, workplace impacts and personal impacts. When respondents were asked to indicate how many times discrimination in their current workplace had impacted on themselves and their work, the highest response was ‘more than three times’ with over half of the respondents reporting that they had achieved less at work (55.7%). Other impacts included becoming ill (38.2%), considered taking leave (30.9%) and applying for workers compensation (25%) (See Figure 21).

**Figure 21 - Frequent workplace impacts of discrimination**

![Figure 21](image)

While the impact on employees who had experienced discrimination varied, the most frequent impacts reported by respondents on the 6-point Likert-type scale in the ‘strongly agree’ response were increased stress (80%), becoming more anxious at work (45%), taking prescribed drugs (40%), depression (31%), and seeking medical assistance (29%). Personal relationships (27%) and the contemplation of suicide (23%) were also ranked highly. It is important to note that respondents also agreed (15%) or strongly agreed (8%) that they had attempted suicide (See Figure 22).
There is a highly significant positive correlation ($r = .80, p<.001$) between the contemplation of suicide and attempting suicide (See Table 13), showing that those GLBTI employees who are affected by discrimination within the workplace and contemplate suicide are consequently more likely to attempt suicide.

Table 13 - Correlation between contemplating and attempting suicide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contemplate suicide</th>
<th>Attempt suicide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.798***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of results**

This study indicates that most respondents were from the Health and Community Services industry (22%) and worked in a professional capacity (26%). Despite previous research indicating that regional areas were likely to be more discriminatory, this research indicates that there is no significant correlation between experiencing discrimination in the workplace and location, although respondents indicated higher levels of discrimination in the Metropolitan Region and the Fitzroy Region. Of the participants in this study that reported discrimination (34%) only 1 participant reported discrimination to an external agency (ADCQ). The most frequent forms of discrimination used against GLBTI employees in the
workplace are remarks (27%), ridicule (27%) and jokes (25%). This research also indicates that GLBTI workers who experience discrimination more than three times in their place of employment 80% of these workers will experience death threats. As a consequence of experiencing discrimination within the workplace, GLBTI employees are more often inclined to achieve less at work, become ill, take leave or make a claim for workers compensation. The most frequent personal impact of discrimination is increased stress levels (80%), however of the participants that had indicated they had contemplated suicide, most if not all had attempted suicide as a direct result of facing discrimination within the workplace.

Conclusion

This chapter has presented the results of the demographics of the respondents for this study as well as the results for the research questions that were posed in Chapter 1. It was found that GLBTI employees living closer to the capital city of Queensland were more likely to be victims of discrimination than those employed in regional areas. There were significant correlations between experiencing discrimination, contemplating suicide and attempting suicide. (Include here the relationships for all your research questions?)

Chapter 5 will discuss the results from this study in more detail and as they relate to previous Australian studies, particularly the study that Irwin (1999) conducted within this area of research. Chapter 5 will also discuss the research questions, important research findings, the practical implications of this research and areas for future research.
CHAPTER FIVE - Discussion

This exploratory study has examined the key areas of discrimination faced by gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender and intersex (GLBTI) employees in Queensland. The previous chapter outlined the results of the online survey. This chapter will provide a discussion of the results found in the exploratory study in relation to the posed research questions and previous research undertaken. The research questions will be examined in this chapter in the order they are presented in below.

1. In which industries does discrimination occur based on the sexual orientation or sexual identity of GLBTI individuals?
2. In which Queensland postcodes does discrimination based upon the sexual orientation or sexual identity of GLBTI workers occur at its highest?
3. To what extent has discrimination based on the sexual orientation or sexual identity of GLBTI workers been reported to employers, unions, or the Anti-Discrimination Commission Queensland?
4. Within a workplace, what types of discrimination are most likely used against GLBTI individuals based on sexual orientation or sexual identity and what are the ramifications created by this discrimination?
5. What level of impact has discrimination based on the sexual orientation or sexual identity of GLBTI workers had on these employees?
**Research Question 1 - Industries where discrimination occurs against GLBTI employees**

In which industries does discrimination occur based on the sexual orientation or sexual identity of GLBTI individuals?

Most GLBTI individuals conceal their sexual orientation at work due to the lack of protection from discrimination and negative work attitudes as well as to escape stigmatisation (Dawson 2005; Ragins & Cornwell 2001; Ragins, Singh & Cornwell 2007). However, Wright et al. (2006) stated that in their United Kingdom study, manual, administrative, service and skilled workers were less likely to be “out” in the workplace and therefore less likely to participate in research concerning GLBTI issues.

On the other hand, Australian research provides us with some knowledge of the industries where GLBTI individuals may experience discrimination. Irwin (1999) pointed out that discrimination was far more likely to occur in male dominated organisations such as the mining industry and in traditionally male dominated occupations. Participants in Irwin’s study were employed across a range of industries. The most frequent being in the education industry (19%) followed by health services (16%), community services (13%) and finance, communication and business (12%) (See Figure 23).

This research study confirms the findings of Irwin in that the industry with the highest number of respondents (22%) who had experienced discrimination was within the Health and Community Services industry followed by Education (16.9%) and Government and Administration (10.4%) (See Figure 24). This research found that discrimination occurred in most industries with the exception of Education – Primary and the Construction industries. These exceptions were largely due to having no respondents from these two industries.
Therefore, this study confirms Irwin’s (1999) findings with Health and Community Services industry as being the industry in 2010 in which discrimination against gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender and intersex employees occurs more often.
Research Question 2 - Queensland postcodes where discrimination occurs against GLBTI employees

In which Queensland postcodes/regions does discrimination based upon the sexual orientation or sexual identity of GLBTI workers occur at its highest?

According to the Office of Economic and Statistical Research (2011), the population of the Metropolitan, North Coast and South Coast regions as at 30 June 2009 was approximately 2.7 million people or 64% of the total population of Queensland. This exposes GLBTI employees to a wider range of views and opinions relating to sexuality, sexual orientation and sexual identity that they may not otherwise face within a regional context.

Previous research within Australia was conducted on a state level (Berman & Robinson 2010; Irwin 1999) and at a national level (Flood & Hamilton 2005; Pitts et al. 2006). Flood and Hamilton (2005) reported that homophobia varied within Australian States and Territories, however there were higher instances of homophobia within Queensland and Tasmania. The Central/South-West Queensland region was particularly highlighted by Flood and Hamilton (2005) as the most homophobic area where 63% of male respondents believed that homosexuality is immoral. Therefore it was postulated that discrimination within this region would be high. Pitts et al. (2006) reported that threats of violence and/or physical attacks were more likely in regional or remote areas of Australia. However, this study indicates that it is in the metropolitan region of Queensland that GLBTI employees are more likely to experience discrimination based on the number of respondents from across the Regions.

In 2010 research within Queensland conducted by Berman and Robinson (2010) analysis was conducted of the results according to regions, however, these regions were not defined or stated. Australian researchers concluded that discrimination was more likely to occur in a regional area as opposed to a metropolitan area (Berman & Robinson 2010; Flood & Hamilton 2005; Irwin 1999; Pitts et al. 2006); however this research has shown that discrimination occurs both within a metropolitan area and a regional area.
Research Question 3 - Extent that discrimination has been reported by GLBTI employees

To what extent has discrimination based on the sexual orientation or sexual identity of GLBTI workers been reported to employers, unions, or the Anti-Discrimination Commission Queensland?

This research study has found that of the 54% of respondents who had experienced discrimination, only 34% had reported its occurrence. This therefore agrees with the small percentage (36%), found by Irwin (1999), of those who actually report discrimination. However, the outcomes of taking action were not reported.

This study found that reporting of discrimination occurred mainly to Supervisors (13%) or someone above the level of Supervisor (10%). It is important to note that only 0.7% of respondents reported discrimination to the Anti-Discrimination Commission of Queensland (ADCQ). One of the main roles of the ADCQ is to resolve complaints of discrimination and other contraventions of the Queensland Anti-Discrimination Act 1991. The 2010 annual report by the Anti-Discrimination Commission of Queensland (ADCQ, 2010) reported that only 2.6% of complaints that were accepted by the ADCQ were related to sexuality. Therefore, GLTBI employees in Queensland who experience discrimination are unlikely to take their case to the ADCQ. While the underlying reason for not using the ADCQ was not asked in this study, there is a link between the lack of cases reported and the reasons why GLBTI employees do not report discrimination. In this study, GLBTI employees reported responses ranging from having no-one to report discrimination to and being not overly concerned by it, to stating that nothing would be done in relation to the discrimination based on past experiences and that society is homophobic and assumes hetero-normality (13% of respondents). Heteronormality is where a person assumes someone that they have just met is heterosexual (Case, Hesp & Eberly 2005). However, 11% of respondents reported that they feared repercussions should they report discrimination within their workplace.
This research shows that once again, GLBTI employees are not inclined to report discrimination within the workplace to either internal sources within their own workplace such as Supervisors or HR managers or to external bodies specifically set up for this purpose. Therefore, the education and advocacy programs run by the ADCQ appear to be ineffective in reaching the communities it was designed to assist under legislation and this is an area that ADCQ needs to address.

It is important that policies and procedures managed by human resource professionals; for example, anti-discrimination policies or sexual harassment policies, must be clearly worded and communicated to all staff and in addition that no repercussions for reporting discrimination would occur and that all cases would be treated with the utmost confidentiality. It is possible that this communication and reinforcing of policies would reduce the number of GLBTI employees who feared repercussions as a result of reporting discrimination.
Research Question 4 - Types of discrimination faced by GLBTI employees

Within a workplace, what types of discrimination are most likely used against GLBTI individuals based on sexual orientation or sexual identity?

In Australian research, Irwin (1999) highlighted that harassment and/or prejudicial treatment (See Table 14) was widespread with 59% of the respondents experiencing discrimination in their current or previous workplace. The most common behaviour was experienced by 79% of GLBTI employees as a result of being ridiculed in front of colleagues or subject to homophobic remarks or jokes in the workplace (See Table 15)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Homophobic Behaviour</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jokes</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwelcome questions</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-work social exclusion</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual harassment</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threats of sexual abuse</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threats of physical abuse</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridicule</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property damage</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14 - Homophobic Behaviour (Irwin 1999)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Homophobic Behaviour</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jokes</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwelcome questions</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-work social exclusion</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual harassment</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threats of sexual abuse</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threats of physical abuse</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridicule</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property damage</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remarks</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work social exclusion</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death threats</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15 - Homophobic Behaviour 2010

While jokes were the most frequently reported discriminatory behaviour in 1999, ridicule predominates in 2010 potentially indicating discrimination has become more personalised over time (See Table 14, and Table 15). The three most frequently reported types of discrimination in 2010 based on the respondent’s sexual identity were remarks (27%), ridicule (27%) and jokes (25%).

Similarly, when more than one co-worker was involved, the most frequent types of discrimination were remarks (59%), ridicule (56%) and jokes (58%) in 2010 (See Figure 18). The types of behaviour that have been highlighted are of a personal nature which can easily
be directed at an individual rather than against a group. For example, ridicule is language or behaviour that is intended to mock or humiliate and in a workplace context would be easier against an individual as opposed to a group. The behaviour is also most certainly in these instances to be verbal therefore with no evidence that the discrimination occurred it is harder to prove that happened.

Of concern is that for respondents who had experienced discrimination in their workplace more than three times, the types of discrimination faced were very severe. Death threats (80%), threats of physical abuse over the telephone (66.7%), property damage (33.3%), verbal threats of sexual abuse (30%), verbal threats of physical abuse (28.6%) and verbal threats of sexual abuse over the telephone (25%) were faced by respondents. Therefore the threat of personal injury as a result of the disclosure of sexual identity was very high and this should be of concern to Supervisors, HR Managers as well as the ADCQ. Employers have a responsibility under Workplace Health and Safety regulations to provide a safe working environment and this includes a working environment that is free from the threat of personal injury due to discrimination. The impact of discrimination on workers who had been discriminated against more than three times in the workplace resulted in over half of the respondents reporting that they achieved less at work (55.7%) or they became ill (38.2%). This has serious implications for the productivity of a business, especially those industries where discrimination occurs more frequently such as Health and Allied Industries, and Education. In addition to lost productivity, there are also financial implications to the business. In the United States (Kovach & Millsapugh 1996) the loss to the economy resulting from discrimination against GLBTI employees was estimated at USD$47million. In addition, USD$1.4 billion in lost output was attributed to achieving less at work from GLBTI employees that work within a hostile workplace (Kovach & Millsapugh 1996). These losses to business have not been considered within an Australian context and further research in this area should be conducted in relationship to the Australian economy.
**Research Question 5 - Impact of discrimination on GLBTI employees**

What level of impact has discrimination based on the sexual orientation or sexual identity of GLBTI workers had on these employees?

Very little research has been conducted worldwide that looks into the impact of discrimination upon a GLBTI individual. Most research focuses on whether discrimination occurs, to whom it occurs and who is covered by law. It is Australian research that provides the largest body of knowledge in relation to the impacts that discrimination within the workplace has on GLBTI individuals.

Irwin (1999) reported that discrimination had a negative effect on GLBTI employees. Indeed, there were a number of areas in which respondents reported negative effects, ranging from increased stress levels to attempting suicide. However the highest reported negative effects were increased stress levels (76%), depression (60%), loss of confidence (55%), negative effects on relationships outside of work (46%) and illness (45%) (See Figure 25).

**Figure 25 - Effect of discrimination 1999 (Irwin 1999)**

**Figure 26 - Effect of discrimination 2010**
In 2010, the impact on employees in this study who had experienced discrimination varied (See Figure 26) with the most frequent impacts reported by respondents for increased stress and anxiety (100%), taking prescribed drugs (57%), depression (51%), increased drug and alcohol (42%) and effecting relationships (49%). It is important to note that those males that had contemplated suicide (7%) had also attempted suicide. Only a small number of individuals reported to Irwin (1999) (13%) and to this current study (12%) that they had sought any form of counselling for personal support and to develop strategies to cope with discrimination within the workplace.

This study confirms Irwin’s (1999) findings with increased stress levels, depression, and personal relationships having the most effect on GLBTI individuals; however there has been a significant increase in the usage of drugs (illicit) and alcohol and also the taking of prescribed medication. This increase may be a coping mechanism by GLBTI individuals who are experiencing discrimination at work and warrants further research.

In Irwin’s study (1999) respondents were also asked about the effect that discrimination had on their work with responses ranging from achieving less at work through to resigning their position and changing careers. Nearly half (48%) of respondents indicated (See Figure 27) that they achieved less at work as a result of discrimination. Approximately 194 (36%) respondents had taken sick leave or changed careers as a consequence of their experiences of discrimination and 157 (36%) respondents resigned.
In this study, just over half (56%) of respondents (See Figure 28) indicated that they achieved less at work on more than one occasion. This confirms Irwin’s (1999) study that GLBTI employees who experience workplace discrimination are less likely to be productive. Similarly, 31% of respondents indicated that they had taken sick leave as a result of discrimination, also confirming the results from Irwin (1999). However, there has been an increase in the number of respondents (60%) recording that they had claimed against Workers Compensation as a result of discrimination. Although Queensland has a ‘no fault’ scheme in place, meaning that employees ‘have the right to apply for statutory benefits, no matter who or what caused their workplace injury’ (Workcover Queensland n.d.), there is still a cost not only to Government but also to the organisation in terms of insurance premiums and lost productivity as a result of Workcover claims.

One finding of this study that is of major concern is that all male respondents who had contemplated suicide had also attempted suicide. Therefore the severity of the discrimination that is being faced by GLBTI employees requires significant action to address workplace discrimination. Future research into GLBTI discrimination within a workplace context should consider the monetary and psychological effects that discrimination has not only on an individual but also to the organisation and society at large.
**Additional important research findings**

**Education level of respondents**

This research has highlighted a number of important findings that are different from previous research undertaken in both an international and national context. Previous research within the United States and the United Kingdom states that most GLBTI individuals are more highly educated than their heterosexual counterparts, although researchers have provided little in the way of statistical data (Hirata & Kleiner 2001; Mink & O'Connor 2004; Ragins & Cornwell 2001; Ragins, Singh & Cornwell 2007; Troung & Kleiner 2001; Wright et al. 2006). One study (Ragins, Singh & Cornwell 2007) conducted in the United States suggested that 39% hold a Bachelors Degree, 28% a Masters Degree and 17% a Doctorate. Only the Irwin study (1999) provides an Australian context (see Figure 29).

Irwin (1999) reported that 33% of respondents had completed a Degree, 28% had completed Post-Graduate degrees, 15% held TAFE qualifications and 13% had obtained their Higher School Certificate (HSC). According to the Australian Bureau of Statistics 2006 census, approximately 39% of people living in Queensland have Tertiary qualifications (2006a). However, in contrast to previous research conducted in the United States and also in Australia, this study has found that GLBTI employees in Queensland are not more highly educated than their heterosexual counterparts. Approximately 57% of respondents to this study indicated that their highest level of education ranged from primary school, up to TAFE qualifications, compared with 36% of respondents indicating Tertiary level education (see Figure 30).

*Figure 29 - Education level 1999 (Irwin 1999)*
Identity concealment

Research conducted in the United States, United Kingdom and Australia strongly suggests that GLBTI employees are most likely to hide their sexual orientation/sexual identity within the workplace from fear of prejudicial treatment (Pitts et al. 2006; Ragins & Cornwell 2001; Ragins, Singh & Cornwell 2007; Wright et al. 2006). This research however, has found that GLBTI employees within Queensland have a high disclosure rate within their workplace which supports previous research in New South Wales and Victoria conducted by Irwin (1999). Approximately 92% of respondents to this study had reported disclosing their sexual orientation/sexual identity to staff within their workplace. This may indicate that Australia is a country that accepts individual differences and thus GLBTI individuals are more confident to be out at work.

Workplace policy

In previous research conducted by Irwin (1999), approximately 35% of participants identified that they had been the target of homophobic behaviour or harassment in a previous workplace. This research project demonstrated the majority of respondents (61%) reported having experienced discrimination in two or more workplaces despite 74% of
respondents stating that their workplaces had policies to prevent discrimination from occurring. Therefore this study has shown that despite workplace policies, the rate of discrimination within the workplace against GLBTI employees has increased from 35% to 61% in the space of 12 years. This study, along with previous research (Irwin 1999) has demonstrated that workplace policies are not necessarily effective in managing discrimination in the workforce. Training, proactive management staff and effective workplace policies are all ways in which to combat the gap between discrimination and workplace policy, however further research within this area needs to be undertaken to ascertain the reasons why workplace policy is failing to address discrimination.

**Action taken**

Irwin (1999) reported that 36% of respondents had taken some form of action in relation to experiencing discrimination. The most frequent response to Irwin’s study (32%) was to discuss the discrimination with a senior staff person, which over 50% of respondents stated had a positive outcome. In this study, 34% of respondents had reported discrimination and of those that reported discrimination, 12.7% had reported it to Supervisors. Importantly in this study, the 34% of respondents who had reported discrimination, the majority reported that despite reporting the discrimination to a senior member of staff that this had no effect on the discrimination. Significantly, only 11% of respondents reported that discrimination had ceased as an outcome of reporting it to Supervisors. In comparison between Irwin (1999) and this study, it is clear that less respondents are now reporting discrimination to their supervisors within the workplace and that less positive outcomes are occurring from this action. Supervisors within an organisation need to be aware of company policy and procedure when dealing within discrimination within the workplace and have avenues of support to ensure more positive outcomes for employees.

This study shows that only 0.7% of respondents had reported discrimination to the Anti-Discrimination Commission of Queensland (ADCQ) whereas Irwin reported approximately 5% of cases to the Anti-Discrimination Board of NSW. It is clear from this study and also from Irwin (1999) that despite the fact that society is now more educated than ever in relation to GLBTI issues (Berman & Robinson 2010; Flood & Hamilton 2005; Irwin 1999; Pitts
et al. 2006) and the services available to support GLBTI individuals in the instance of discrimination, that perhaps the wider community still do not know about this avenue of complaint. This is perhaps an area in which the ADCQ needs to focus on so that they are effectively and efficiently handling cases relating to GLBTI discrimination within the Queensland workplace.

When participants were asked for the reason why 66% had not reported discrimination within their workplace, a variety of responses was given ranging from having no-one to report it to, to nothing will be done about it based on previous experience and also that society is homophobic and assumes hetero-normality (12.8% of respondents). Respondents also expressed that they feared repercussions (10.7%) if they reported discrimination. This is similar findings to Irwin (1999) who reported 64% of respondents had taken no action in relation to discrimination. Irwin (1999) states that the most common reason for not taking action was related to high personal costs and for many respondents this included the fear of consequences. Policies within the workplace relating to discrimination should be written in such a way that outlines that there are no repercussions from reporting discrimination within the workplace. This will, in some way, alleviate the fear of repercussions from reporting discrimination. However, training should reiterate this and how persons found breaching the policy will be reprimanded.

This study has found that training is the most common tool used by an organisation to combat discrimination against GLBTI employees. Even so, the study has also shown training to be ineffectual in lessening or removing discrimination. It could be said in this instance that organisations are treating training as a form of legal protection rather than a cultural change process. The researcher suggests that the delivery of training in respect of diversity needs to be encompassed by the organisation rather than just something that is done; training in diversity should be driven from the top down to encourage a cultural shift in thinking, therefore avoiding discrimination.
Implications for Practice

All organisations within Australia must adhere to Government legislation including anti-discrimination legislation. Within Queensland, organisations must adhere to the Queensland Anti-Discrimination Act 1991 which specifically prohibits discrimination against GLBTI employees. Under the Queensland Anti-Discrimination Act 1991, an employer, regardless of their size, is potentially responsible for behaviour of a worker or an agent, which contravenes the Act; unless it can be shown that all ‘reasonable steps’ have been taken to reduce what is called vicarious liability. Although ‘reasonable steps’ are not defined within the Act, the impact that this has for organisations is that they must actively implement precautionary measures to minimise the risk of discrimination and harassment. One such method is the introduction of an anti-discrimination policy.

The researcher suggests that anti-discrimination policies should contain definitions of terminology, contact information for support officers, the complaint resolution process, a confidentiality statement, who is responsible for administering the policy, examples of harassment and discrimination and the possible outcomes associated with reporting discrimination. The Queensland Government legislation does not dictate how large or small anti-discrimination policies should be. Therefore, current policies that have been written to address discrimination may be ineffective in handling complaints with regards to discrimination faced by GLBTI employees due to their lack of substance. This study shows that having policies has neither a positive effect nor a negative effect on GLBTI employees in the workplace. However, despite policies being in place, discrimination is still occurring within the Queensland workplace and all HR Managers need to be aware of this and proactively implement anti-discrimination training.

Queensland Government legislation provides some measure of recourse for individuals that face discrimination and one of those avenues is to seek assistance from the Anti-Discrimination Commission of Queensland (ADCQ). The ADCQ provides information on their website on how to lodge a complaint, the process and procedure and also information regarding the grounds of unfair treatment. Should the ADCQ be unable to resolve the complaint it may be forwarded to the Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal (2010c).
This research has shown that only one person from the entire sample had reported discrimination to the ADCQ. This shows that the ADCQ may be ineffective in reaching one of their target audiences. One of the aims of the ADCQ is to promote equality across the board and to provide training options for organisations. It is vastly important that the ADCQ address issues relating to GLBTI employees and that employers have access to information from the ADCQ in determining how best to address discrimination within the workplace. The ADCQ must also promote itself to business managers and HR Professionals so that they are aware of the services that the ADCQ offers and can refer their employees to the ADCQ if appropriate.

This is the one of the very few studies within Queensland that has specifically questioned respondents about the ADCQ although the ADCQ does carry out its own surveys. The ADCQ offer an education service to organisations, which provides training programs on anti-discrimination and harassment. It is unclear from the information provided on the ADCQ website whether these programs include sexual orientation and/or gender identity. As the information is unclear on the ADCQ website, it is therefore difficult for HR Professionals to determine whether a training package will meet their organisations requirements. It is suggested that the ADCQ elaborate on the training packages available and if a package does not exist that manages diversity within the workplace in relation to GLBTI individuals, a package should be considered.

It is essential that Human Resource (HR) Professionals promote and leverage diversity and build inclusion to achieve and sustain higher levels of performance and open up their organisation to a wide variety of views, opinions, ideas and thoughts (Johnston & Malina 2008). Organisations that do not promote leverage and diversity run the risk of losing the opportunity to tap into the varied skills, knowledge and expertise of GLBTI employees. HR professionals also need to consider the effects of discrimination on GLBTI employees and put mechanisms in place in which to address anti-discrimination to ensure that their organisation is meeting the requirements of relevant legislation. This is particularly vital considering the sometimes serious impact these forms of discrimination have on the GLBTI workers who are subjected to it in Queensland workplaces.
Discrimination within the workplace not only affects the individuals involved or the organisation for which they work, but there are also ripple effects that can be seen within society. Respondents have noted in this study that workplace discrimination not only affects them personally and their work, but also their personal relationships. Furthermore, sexual identity discrimination results in a high degree of illicit drug usage and an increase in the amount of alcohol consumed. In the long term, discrimination within the workplace has effects on support services for people with drug and alcohol addictions and also on mental health organisations including hospitals for individuals who are managing the effects of discrimination. This places an economic burden on society for the increased use in services. Lessening GLBTI discrimination within the workplace would reduce the increased demands on these services within society.

**Further Research**

This study has noted a number of areas in which future research is warranted based on results. A nationwide study into workplace discrimination against GLBTI individuals is needed to explore areas that have been highlighted within this study. It is the economical and psychological effects that present with a number of areas for future research, not only within Queensland, but also within Australia.

The first area for future research should be related to the economy. No Australian study has been conducted that has considered the loss to the economy as a result of GLBTI discrimination within the workplace. Quantifying the loss to the economy provides a defining statement to organisations that their bottom line is affected by discrimination.

As this study has found that a larger number of respondents experienced discrimination within a metropolitan context that is in contrast to the findings of previous research within Australia, the second area in which future research should be considered is including questions related to a participant’s geographical location.

The third area that should be considered for future research relates to training and workplace policy. Training has been identified within this study as the most common tool
used by organisations to address discrimination, future research should consider the effectiveness of training packages. Future research should also consider the content to be included in such packages to ensure that their use has the desired effect. This can also be said for workplace policies as it has been noted in this research that despite workplace policies existing in organisations, high levels of discrimination against GLBTI individuals is still being recorded. Again, the content of policies should be examined and how they are being driven by the organisation, whether the policy is reactive to discrimination or proactive.

The fourth area for future research should focus on the adaptive coping mechanisms of GLBTI employees and the detriment that these mechanisms can have not only on the individuals, but also on those people around them. This is highlighted in this research by the illicit drug usage and increase in alcohol reported by respondents. These types of adaptive coping mechanisms can be seen as destructive, and potentially have far reaching consequences should they not be addressed. Primarily this research has utilised a quantitative method approach, future research should consider the use of quantitative and qualitative methods to undertake research involving GLBTI individuals.
Conclusion

The conceptualisation of stigma theory suggests that it is likely to be a key determinant in social detriments including within the workplace as can be noted through discrimination. GLBTI individuals are inherently labelled as a result of a socially constructed difference, their sexuality or sexual identity. Once a person is labelled, it is therefore easier to associate this difference with negative attributes, such as labelling a homosexual man effeminate; a trait seen by other men as devaluing their masculinity. Once labelling and assigning negative attributes has occurred it is then easier to associate the individual as “them” rather than “us”; homosexual and heterosexual. As GLBTI individuals have been labelled, linked to undesirable characteristics and excluded not only within the workplace, but also within a social context, then discrimination will occur (Link & Phelan 2001). As this study utilised the Link and Phelan (2001) stigmatisation model as a theoretical framework, the research shows that discrimination does indeed occur against GLBTI employees and enforces the stigmatisation theory.

This study has detected significantly more workplace discrimination against GLBTI employees than the most recent research undertaken by Berman and Robinson (2010). In their study only 12% of respondents had experienced abuse, harassment, or violence within the workplace, compared to this study where that figure is 54%. There has been a significant shift since 1999 in Australia that showed that 51% of respondents were ‘out’ within their workplace, compared to the findings of this study of 36% suggesting that employees are less likely to inform others at work of the sexual orientation/sexual identity. There is also a significant gap between the processes that supposedly support gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender and intersex (GLBTI) employees and discrimination as high levels of discrimination are still occurring (54%) despite 74% of workplaces having policies addressing discrimination. This suggests a shifting workplace environment for GLBTI people in terms of their experiences, one marked by the tension between a willingness to disclose and yet an increasing tendency to experience discrimination. Limited action has been taken by employers to address discrimination, with the most common action being training. Training has the potential to be ineffective if the values that it imparts are not driven by management and reflected in workplace policies and procedures.
Gender and sexuality are still closely linked in terms of discrimination within the workplace as just over 7% of respondents to this study reported that they believed that gender may have also been a concern. Gender equality within the workplace has been a focus for many years due to the introduction of the *Sex Discrimination Act 1984* (Attorney Generals Department 1984). The Act’s main focus was to promote equality between men and women, eliminate discrimination and harassment on the basis of sex, marital status and/or pregnancy. With the introduction of this legislation many organisations across Australia instituted Equal Employment Opportunity policies encouraging improved employment access and workplace participation for females.

As this study has reported a larger number of respondents from the Metropolitan Region, it is suggested that a more concerted effort be placed in educating suburban and inner city workplaces to combat the high levels of GLBTI discrimination. Therefore, the ADCQ needs to focus on metropolitan areas in which to offer support to GLBTI employees, and businesses in this area need to be vigilant about what employees are experiencing and provide avenues to report discrimination that is free from harassment/retribution. Governmental support for education and training packages should be sought as it will assist the Government in the long term with a reduction in costs for health and wellbeing spending with GLBTI workers in the future.

Despite the number of workplaces in which respondents have identified workplace policies, it is clear from this study that they have had little to no effect in combating discrimination within the workplace. One suggestion in which to assist in workplace policies providing the coverage that is required is to drive the policy from management level down to employees. Senior level managers and decision makers within the organisation should undergo diversity training specifically aimed at GLBTI employees. Once training has been undertaken and managers and decision makers are aware of the types of discrimination and the effects that discrimination has not only on the individual but also effects on the business, a policy can be written. A policy written in conjunction with GLBTI workers could provide a sense of ownership for the employees thereby allowing them to voice their thoughts and opinions on discrimination within the organisation. As this study noted, a large number of GLBTI
employees are reluctant to report discrimination, and a sense of ownership with the policy may affect this.

Although staff training in some organisations was identified by respondents, the fact that so many have experienced discrimination even in the face of workplace policies it is suggested that ongoing training be considered to address GLBTI discrimination within the workplace. It is further suggested that the industries identified as having higher discrimination, such as Health and Community Services conduct homophobia education campaigns to reduce discrimination within their workplaces. As a high level of disclosure was reported by respondents, there is a need for clear support processes in place within organisations to ensure that workers are not subjected to discrimination.

To assist in reducing the amount of homophobia within workplaces, resources need to be invested in education in schools, TAFE’s, and Universities, thereby educating future employees that discrimination is not appropriate. Recently a school in UK has been celebrated as a homophobia free environment because they invest substantial time in class teaching students about homophobia in history and people in the UK who have been discriminated against in the past (Shepherd & Learner 2010). By educating young students that discrimination is not appropriate, future generations of GLBTI employees may not be subjected to discrimination within the workplace.

This study has highlighted that discrimination of GLBTI employees is still occurring within the workplace despite moral and ethical considerations and potential legal ramifications. Human Resource Practitioners must ensure that their anti-discrimination policies are effective in combating discrimination within their workplace and also ensure that any training that is conducted covers GLBTI issues. Practitioners must also ensure that adequate support services are provided for GLBTI employees if they should face with discrimination within the workplace. Human Resources Practitioners can also encourage GLBTI participation within the workplace through providing GLBTI specific information such as services or on local GLBTI events. Practitioners may also like to support GLBTI events within their local community with the financial support of their organisation. Industries that have been highlighted by this study with higher levels of discrimination should undertake
immediate reviews of systems, processes and support structures to ensure they are meeting the needs of their GLBTI employees.

Little is still known about gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender and intersex discrimination within the Australian workplace, it is international research, particularly the United States and the United Kingdom, which dominates our understanding of workplace discrimination. An examination of previous Australian studies strongly suggests that gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender and intersex employees experience discrimination within the workplace. This study confirms that discrimination within the workplace against gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender and intersex individuals still exists in Queensland, Australia in 2010.
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Appendix 1 – Australian Legislation Summary

The following table is a summary of legislation currently enacted in the different states and territories of Australia. It is important to note that all current legislation by Australian States and Territories covers employment as an area where discriminating against either sexuality or sexual orientation is unlawful.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State/Territory</th>
<th>Name of Legislation</th>
<th>Grounds of unlawful discrimination</th>
<th>Areas covered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australian Capital Territory</td>
<td><em>Discrimination Act 1991</em></td>
<td>Sex, sexual harassment, sexuality, transsexuality, age, profession, trade, occupation or calling, relationship status, status as a parent or carer, pregnancy, race, racial vilification, religious or political conviction, impairment, membership or non-membership of association of employers or employees, breastfeeding, spent convictions, disability, religious practice in employment, having had one of the enumerated attributes in the past, or association with person with an above attribute.</td>
<td>Work; employment agencies; education; access to premises; goods, services or facilities; accommodation; clubs; qualifying bodies; professional or trade organisations; requests etc for information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New South Wales</td>
<td><em>Anti-Discrimination Act 1977</em></td>
<td>Race, (including colour, nationality and national or ethnic origin), sex (including pregnancy), marital status, disability, homosexuality, age (compulsory retirement only), transgender, carer's responsibility. Sexual harassment; vilification on the basis of race, homosexuality, transgender and HIV/AIDS</td>
<td>Employment; partnerships; trade unions; qualifying bodies; employment agencies; education; access to places and vehicles; provision of goods and services; accommodation; registered clubs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Act/Act</td>
<td>Covered Characteristics</td>
<td>Protected Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Territory</td>
<td>Anti-Discrimination Act 1996</td>
<td>Race, sex, sexuality, age, marital status, pregnancy, parenthood, breastfeeding, impairment, trade union or employer association activity, religious belief or activity, irrelevant criminal record, political opinion, affiliation or activity, irrelevant medical record, or association with person with an above attribute. Sexual harassment is also covered.</td>
<td>Education; work; accommodation; goods and services; facilities; clubs; insurance and superannuation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Australia</td>
<td>Equal Opportunity Act 1984</td>
<td>Sex, sexuality, marital status, pregnancy, race, age, physical and intellectual impairment (but does not include mental illness).</td>
<td>Employment; partnerships; clubs and associations; qualifying bodies; education; provision of goods and services; accommodation; sale of land; advertising (including employment agencies); conferral of qualifications; superannuation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasmania</td>
<td>Anti-Discrimination Act 1998</td>
<td>Age, breastfeeding, disability, family responsibilities, gender, industrial activity, irrelevant criminal record, irrelevant medical record, lawful sexual activity, marital status, relationship status, parental status, political activity, political belief or affiliation, pregnancy, race, religious activity, religious beliefs or affiliation, sexual orientation, association with a person who has, or is believed to have any of these attributes.</td>
<td>Employment (paid and unpaid); education and training; provision of facilities, goods and services; accommodation; membership and activities of clubs; and in relation to some grounds, administration of any law of state; and awards, enterprise agreements and industrial agreements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>Equal Opportunity Act</td>
<td>Sex, sexual orientation,</td>
<td>Employment;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>gender identity, pregnancy, breastfeeding, marital status, status as a carer, age, race (including colour, nationality, ethnic or national origin), parental status, physical features, childless or a de facto spouse, lawful religious or political belief or activity, impairment (including physical impairment, mental illness, mental retardation), industrial activity, lawful sexual activity, or personal association with persons having any of the above attributes.</td>
<td>partnerships; firms; professional and other organisations; qualifying bodies; employment agencies; education; provision of goods and services; accommodation (including alteration of accommodation); clubs or community service organisations; municipal or shire councils.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Australia</td>
<td><strong>Equal Opportunity Act 1984</strong></td>
<td>Sex, sexual orientation, marital status, pregnancy, race, religious or political conviction, age, racial harassment, impairment, family responsibility or family status, gender history.</td>
<td>Employment; partnerships; professional or trade organisations; qualifying bodies; employment agencies; applicants and employees and commission agents; application forms; advertisements; education; access to places and vehicles; provision of good services and facilities; accommodation; clubs; land.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix 3 – Survey Information Sheet

Online web survey

I am a Masters student in the Faculty of Arts, Business, Informatics and Education at CQUniversity Australia and I invite you to participate in a study identifying workplace experiences by those individuals that self identify as gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender or intersex (GLBTI). You do not have to be “out” in your workplace to participate in this study.

You are welcome to participate if you –

- Describe your sexuality as one of those listed above; and
- Are currently employed.

This is an opportunity to have a voice and share your views on discrimination within your workplace. This is a chance to make your contribution to the fields of sexuality and discrimination within the workplace. The findings will provide further information and understanding for other GLBTI individuals entering the workforce and their supporters such as counsellors, teachers, friends and family.

Your co-operation is greatly appreciated and the survey should take less than 15 minutes to complete.

The purpose of this study is to explore the experiences of GLBTI individuals in their workplaces, and to gather a range of data from across a variety of workplaces within Queensland. The main aim is to learn what types of discrimination within the workplace are faced by GLBTI individuals. It is anticipated that the findings will ascertain the effectiveness of Human Resources professionals and company policies that maintain requirements under the Equal Employment Opportunity, Workplace Harassment and Anti-discrimination legislation.
Participation in this survey is voluntary. In the event of the respondent not wanting to answer any question or to stop answering the survey, they have the option to do so at any time.

**Confidentiality:**

All surveys will be treated confidentially. Analysis of the surveys will be conducted by the researcher and all data whether in hard copy or electronic will be kept in a locked filing cabinet or on a password-protected computer. All raw data will be destroyed after five years, as required by the Ethics Committee of the CQUniversity Australia. No findings will be published in connection with your name. Only the combined results of all participants will be published.

As this survey is anonymous, we ask that should you wish to forward this survey to others that you respect their privacy and only forward to those people that are personally known to you and only to their personal email accounts. Please do not forward a copy of this survey to a work email account.

Should you have any further questions on the research project please contact:

Mr Nathan Barrett  
CQUniversity Australia  
Faculty of Arts Business, Informatics and Education  
Email: c0114093@student.cqu.edu.au

Should you wish to discuss this project with a University representative regarding the manner in which this project (Project Number H10/03-027) is being conducted, please do not hesitate to contact the CQUniversity Australia Office of Research on telephone +61 (7) 4923 2607.
Appendix 4 – Survey Consent Form

Consent Statement
Informed Consent indicates that you have given consent to participate in this research.

‘I have been informed of the nature of the study by the CQUniversity Australia, Faculty of Arts, Business, Informatics and Education research staff. I understand that agreeing to take part in the research means that I am willing to complete this survey. I understand that the information recorded in the survey will be kept strictly confidential and that any responses will go into a pool of data to be published and no individual respondent will be identified.

I understand that my participation is voluntary, that I can choose not to participate in part or in the entire project, and that I can withdraw at any stage of the research without being penalised or disadvantaged in any way’.

Withdrawal from Survey
If at any time throughout the online survey you feel upset or anxious you can stop and you can decide whether you want to continue or not. There is a national list of sexuality support services available online if you would like to contact and speak to a counsellor located near you:

General Support
Lifeline 13 1114 (24 hours – local call cost) www.lifeline.org.au

Sexuality support services Queensland
Gay and Lesbian Welfare Association
Telephone: (07) 32522997 or Freecall 1800184527
7:00pm - 10:00pm http://www.glwa.org.au

PLEASE PRINT A COPY OF THE INFORMATION SHEET AND CONSENT FORM FOR YOUR RECORDS.
Research Findings:
In case you are interested in receiving a copy of the findings, we will be happy to supply you with the outcome of this study, once this project has been completed. Contact details such as email addresses can be recorded at the end of the survey.

Informed consent:
- I am 18 years of age or older and give consent to participate in this survey
- I am under the age of 18
- I do not give consent
Appendix 5 – Survey

SURVEY QUALIFIER QUESTIONS

S1. Do you identify yourself as:
   - Gay:
     - Male
     - Female
   - Lesbian
     - Female
   - Bisexual
     - Male
     - Female
   - Transgender
     - Male
     - Female
   - Intersex
     - Male
     - Female
   - Heterosexual:
     - Yes  If yes go to T2
     - No
     - How would you describe your sexuality? __________
     - If no go to S3
   - Other
     - Please specify:____________________
     - Male
     - Female

   T2 - If they select “heterosexual” in S1
   Thank you for your time today. There are no further questions for you.

S2. Are you currently employed?
   - Yes – Go to S3
   - No – Go to T4

S3. Are you employed on a:
   - Casual basis
   - Part-time basis
   - Full-time basis
   - Other (please specify): ________________

S4. What is your workplace postcode? ______________

For postcodes other than those starting with a 4 – Go to T3

   T3 - If they do not live in postcode 4000 to 4999 area
Thank you for your time and interest in our study. We are trying to survey people that work in Queensland.

**T4 - If they are not currently employed.**
Thank you for your time and interest in our study. We need to survey people that are currently employed in Queensland.

**S5.** Have you experienced any form of personal discrimination in your current workplace based on your gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender or intersex identity?
- Yes – Go to S6
- No – Go to T5

**T5 - If they haven’t experienced any form of personal discrimination.**
Thank you for your time and interest in our study. We need to survey people that have experienced forms of personal discrimination in their current workplace.

**S6.** How many years have you worked in your current workplace?
- Less than 1 year
- Between 1 and 2 years
- Between 3 and 4 years
- 5 years or more, please state how many years: __________

**S7.** In how many workplaces have you experienced discrimination based on your sexual orientation/identity?
- One
- Two
- Three
- Four
- Five
- More than five, please state how many: __________
SURVEY QUESTIONS
For all responses, unless otherwise specified please respond based on the workplace that you identified at the beginning of this survey.

1. In which industry do you work?
   - Agriculture, Forestry and Fishing
   - Mining
   - Manufacturing
   - Electricity, Gas and Water Supply
   - Construction
   - Wholesale Trade
   - Retail Trade
   - Accommodation, Cafes and Restaurants
   - Transport and Storage
   - Communication Services
   - Finance and Insurance
   - Property and Business Services
   - Government Administration and Defence
   - Education - Primary
   - Education - Secondary
   - Education - Tertiary
   - Health and Community Services
   - Cultural and Recreational Services
   - Personal and Other Services
   - Other, please specify: ____________________________

2. What is your occupation?
   - Manager
   - Professional
   - Technician and trades worker
   - Community and Personal Service Worker
   - Clerical and Administrative Worker
   - Sales Worker
   - Machinery Operator and Driver
   - Labourer
   - I’d rather not say
   - Other, please specify: ________________________________

3. How many staff in your immediate workplace are aware of your sexual orientation/identity?
   - None
   - 1 - 2 staff
   - 3 - 5 staff
   - 6 - 10 staff
   - More than 10 staff
a) If staff in your immediate workplace are aware of your sexual orientation/identity does this constitute:
   - A few staff in your immediate workplace
   - Half of the staff in your immediate workplace
   - The majority of staff in your immediate workplace
   - All staff within your immediate workplace

b) If staff within your immediate workplace are aware of your sexual orientation/identity, which staff are aware? Check as many boxes as needed.
   - Manager/supervisor
   - Owner/Operator
   - One co-worker
   - More than one co-worker

4. (a) Does your workplace have harassment and anti-discrimination policies in place as well as being administered?
   - Yes
   - No

   (b) Are you aware of any action taken by your employer at your workplace to prevent discrimination based on sexual orientation/identity?
      - Yes - GOTO Q4c followed by GOTO4d
      - No – GOTO Q5
      - Unsure – GOTO Q5

   (c) What types of action has your employer taken to prevent discrimination based on sexual orientation/identity?
      - Policies (eg. EEO, Harassment)
      - Training
      - Meetings
      - Other (please describe)__________________

   (d) Did the actions taken by your employer improve work relations for you personally or for others?
      - Considerably improved work relations
      - Somewhat improved work relations
      - Neither improved nor worsened work relations
      - Somewhat worsened work relations
      - Considerably worsened work relations
      - Unsure
5. In your workplace based on assumptions made by others about your sexual orientation or sexual identity, have you experienced any of the following? (Please check all the boxes that apply).

a) **Homophobic sexual jokes:**
   - Yes GOTO 5a1.
   - No GOTO 5b.
   - Unsure GOTO 5b.
     1. If you have experienced this, by whom was it made?
        - Manager/supervisor
        - Owner/Operator
        - One co-worker
        - More than one co-worker
        - Clients/Customers
        - Other: please specify: _______________________________
     2. How many times have you experienced this?
        - Once
        - Twice
        - Three times
        - If more than three times, how many times? ______

b) **Homophobic remarks eg. That’s so gay:**
   - Yes GOTO 5b1 followed by 5b2.
   - No GOTO 5c.
   - Unsure GOTO 5c.
     1. If you have experienced this, by whom was it made?
        - Manager/supervisor
        - Owner/Operator
        - One co-worker
        - More than one co-worker
        - Clients/Customers
        - Other: please specify: _______________________________
     2. How many times have you experienced this?
        - Once
        - Twice
        - Three times
        - If more than three times, how many times? ______

c) **Unwelcome questions to you personally in relation to your sexual orientation/identity:**
   - Yes GOTO 5c1 followed by 5c2.
   - No GOTO 5d.
   - Unsure GOTO 5d.
     1. If you have experienced this, by whom was it made?
        - Manager/supervisor
        - Owner/Operator
        - One co-worker
        - More than one co-worker
d) Unwelcome disclosure of your sexual orientation/identity:
   o Yes GOTO 5d1 followed by 5d2.
   o No GOTO 5e.
   o Unsure GOTO 5e.
   1. If you have experienced this, by whom was it made?
      o Manager/supervisor
      o Owner/Operator
      o One co-worker
      o More than one co-worker
      o Clients/Customer
      o Other: please specify: _________________________________
   2. How many times have you experienced this?
      o Once
      o Twice
      o Three times
      o If more than three times, how many times? ________

e) Social exclusion within the workplace on the basis of your sexual orientation/identity:
   o Yes GOTO 5e1 followed by 5e2.
   o No GOTO 5f.
   o Unsure GOTO 5f.
   1. If you have experienced this, by whom was it made?
      o Manager/supervisor
      o Owner/Operator
      o One co-worker
      o More than one co-worker
      o Clients/Customer
      o Other: please specify: _________________________________
   2. How many times have you experienced this?
      o Once
      o Twice
      o Three times
      o If more than three times, how many times? ________
f) Social exclusion by other staff outside the workplace based on your sexual orientation/identity:
   o Yes GOTO 5f1 followed by 5f2.
   o No GOTO 5g.
   o Unsure GOTO 5g.
   1. If you have experienced this, by whom was it made?
      o Manager/supervisor
      o Owner/Operator
      o One co-worker
      o More than one co-worker
      o Clients/Customer
      o Other: please specify: _________________________________
   2. How many times have you experienced this?
      o Once
      o Twice
      o Three times
      o If more than three times, how many times? ________

g) Sexual harassment based on your sexual orientation/identity:
   o Yes GOTO 5g1 followed by 5g2.
   o No GOTO 5h.
   o Unsure GOTO 5h.
   1. If you have experienced this, by whom was it made?
      o Manager/supervisor
      o Owner/Operator
      o One co-worker
      o More than one co-worker
      o Clients/Customer
      o Other: please specify: _________________________________
   2. How many times have you experienced this?
      o Once
      o Twice
      o Three times
      o If more than three times, how many times? ________

h) Verbal threats of sexual abuse based on your sexual orientation/identity (eg face to face)
   o Yes GOTO 5h1 followed by 5h2.
   o No GOTO 5i.
   o Unsure GOTO 5i.
   1. If you have experienced this, by whom was it made?
      o Manager/supervisor
      o Owner/Operator
      o One co-worker
      o More than one co-worker
      o Clients/Customer
      o Other: please specify: _________________________________
2. How many times have you experienced this?
   o Once
   o Twice
   o Three times
   o If more than three times, how many times? ________

i) Written threats of sexual abuse based on your sexual orientation/identity (eg face to face)
   o Yes GOTO 5i1 followed by 5i2.
   o No GOTO 5j.
   o Unsure GOTO 5j.
   1. If you have experienced this, by whom was it made?
      o Manager/supervisor
      o Owner/Operator
      o One co-worker
      o More than one co-worker
      o Clients/Customer
      o Other: please specify: ________________________________
   2. How many times have you experienced this?
      o Once
      o Twice
      o Three times
      o If more than three times, how many times? ________

j) Telephone threats of sexual abuse based on your sexual orientation/identity (eg face to face)
   o Yes GOTO 5j1 followed by 5j2.
   o No GOTO 5k.
   o Unsure GOTO 5k.
   1. If you have experienced this, by whom was it made?
      o Manager/supervisor
      o Owner/Operator
      o One co-worker
      o More than one co-worker
      o Clients/Customer
      o Other: please specify: ________________________________
   2. How many times have you experienced this?
      o Once
      o Twice
      o Three times
      o If more than three times, how many times? ________
k) Electronic eg. Email/SMS/Online threats of sexual abuse based on your sexual orientation/identity (eg face to face)
   - Yes GOTO 5k1 followed by 5k2.
   - No GOTO 5I.
   - Unsure GOTO 5I.
      1. If you have experienced this, by whom was it made?
         - Manager/supervisor
         - Owner/Operator
         - One co-worker
         - More than one co-worker
         - Clients/Customer
         - Other: please specify: _________________________________
      2. How many times have you experienced this?
         - Once
         - Twice
         - Three times
         - If more than three times, how many times? ________

l) Verbal threats of physical abuse (eg face to face)
   - Yes GOTO 5l1 followed by 5l2.
   - No GOTO 5m.
   - Unsure GOTO 5m.
      1. If you have experienced this, by whom was it made?
         - Manager/supervisor
         - Owner/Operator
         - One co-worker
         - More than one co-worker
         - Clients/Customer
         - Other: please specify: _________________________________
      2. How many times have you experienced this?
         - Once
         - Twice
         - Three times
         - If more than three times, how many times? ________

m) Written threats of physical abuse
   - Yes GOTO 5m1 followed by 5m2.
   - No GOTO 5n.
   - Unsure GOTO 5n.
      1. If you have experienced this, by whom was it made?
         - Manager/supervisor
         - Owner/Operator
         - One co-worker
         - More than one co-worker
         - Clients/Customer
         - Other: please specify: _________________________________
      2. How many times have you experienced this?
         - Once
         - Twice
o  Three times
  o  If more than three times, how many times? ________

n)  **Telephone threats of physical abuse**
   o  Yes GOTO 5n1 followed by 5n2.
   o  No GOTO 5n.
   o  Unsure GOTO 5n.
     1.  If you have experienced this, by whom was it made?
         o  Manager/supervisor
         o  Owner/Operator
         o  One co-worker
         o  More than one co-worker
         o  Clients/Customer
         o  Other: please specify: ________________________________
     2.  How many times have you experienced this?
         o  Once
         o  Twice
         o  Three times
         o  If more than three times, how many times? ________

o)  **Electronic eg. Email/SMS/Online threats of physical abuse**
   o  Yes GOTO 5o1 followed by 5o2.
   o  No GOTO 5p.
   o  Unsure GOTO 5p.
     1.  If you have experienced this, by whom was it made?
         o  Manager/supervisor
         o  Owner/Operator
         o  One co-worker
         o  More than one co-worker
         o  Clients/Customer
         o  Other: please specify: ________________________________
     2.  How many times have you experienced this?
         o  Once
         o  Twice
         o  Three times
         o  If more than three times, how many times? ________

p)  **Ridiculing or belittling your sexual orientation/identity:**
   o  Yes GOTO 5i1 followed by 5i2.
   o  No GOTO 5p
   o  Unsure GOTO 5p.
     1.  If you have experienced this, by whom was it made?
         o  Manager/supervisor
         o  Owner/Operator
         o  One co-worker
         o  More than one co-worker
         o  Clients/Customer
         o  Other: please specify: ________________________________
2. How many times have you experienced this?
   - Once
   - Twice
   - Three times
   - If more than three times, how many times? ________

q) Property damage of your possessions as a consequence or related to your sexual orientation/identity?
   - Yes GOTO q1 followed by q2.
   - No GOTO 5r
   - Unsure GOTO 5r.
   1. If you have experienced this, by whom was it made?
      - Manager/supervisor
      - Owner/Operator
      - One co-worker
      - More than one co-worker
      - Clients/Customer
      - Other: please specify: _________________________________
   2. How many times have you experienced this?
      - Once
      - Twice
      - Three times
      - If more than three times, how many times? ________

r) Death threats as a consequence or related to your sexual orientation/identity:
   - Yes GOTO 5r1 followed by 5r2.
   - No GOTO 5s.
   - Unsure GOTO 5s.
   1. If you have experienced this, by whom was it made?
      - Manager/supervisor
      - Owner/Operator
      - One co-worker
      - More than one co-worker
      - Clients/Customer
      - Other: please specify: _________________________________
   2. How many times have you experienced this?
      - Once
      - Twice
      - Three times
      - If more than three times, how many times? ________

s) Other experience as a consequence or related to your sexual orientation/identity (please specify) _________________________________
GOTO 5s1 followed by 5s2
   1. If you have experienced this, by whom was it made?
      - Manager/supervisor
      - Owner/Operator
      - One co-worker
      - More than one co-worker
2. How many times have you experienced this?
   o Once
   o Twice
   o Three times
   o If more than three times, how many times? ______
   t) None of the above

6) Have you taken steps to report any harassment in your workplace related to your sexual orientation/identity?
   o Yes GOTO 6a followed by 6b.
   o No GOTO 6c.
   a) What steps did you take?
      o Reported incident to your immediate Supervisor
      o Reported incident to higher than your immediate Supervisor (eg. Manager)
      o Reported incident to your Union
      o Reported incident to Anti-Discrimination Commission
      o Reported incident to other party, please specify: _________________________________
   b) What was the outcome:
      o Harassment ceased
      o Harassment decreased
      o Nothing
      o Harassment increased
      o Had to change job
      o Anti-discrimination policies were enacted
      o Staff awareness training was conducted
      o Other, please specify: ___________________________________
   c) Why did you not report harassment?
      o Fear of repercussions
      o Intimidation
      o Fear of increased harassment
      o Fear of reprimand
      o Other, please specify: ___________________________________

7) Do you consider that factors other than your sexual orientation/identity may have been a factor in your experience of discrimination?
   o Yes GOTO 7a.
   o Maybe GOTO 7a.
   o No GOTO 8.
   o Don’t know GOTO 8.
a) Are any of the following factors that may have been applicable? Please tick all that apply
   o Gender
   o Race
   o Ethnicity
   o Disability
   o Age
   o Religion
   o Other, please specify: ____________________________

8) Do you believe that you have been discriminated against in any previous workplaces on the basis of your sexual orientation/identity?
   o Yes
   o No
   o Unsure

9) How many times has discrimination as a consequence or related to your sexual orientation/identity in your current workplace caused you to: (please tick all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>More than three times</th>
<th>Three times</th>
<th>Twice</th>
<th>Once</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Achieve less at work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Become ill (physically, emotionally, mentally)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider taking sick leave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apply for worker’s compensation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resign from job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change career</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change type of job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been given a letter of termination from your employer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10) Please respond to the following statements: What effect has personal discrimination had on you? (please tick all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increased your stress levels</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made you anxious</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made you more anxious</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made you depressed</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Led you to take prescribed drugs</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Led you to take more prescribed drugs</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Led you to lose confidence in your work ability</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affected personal relationships outside of work</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Led you to alcohol use</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Led you to increased alcohol use</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Led you to illicit drug use</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Led you to increased illicit drug usage</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Led you to seek counselling</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Led you to seek medical assistance</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Led you to contemplate suicide</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Led you to attempt suicide</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11) On a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being the worst workplace and 5 being the best workplace, how would you rate your workplace in terms of your acceptability based on your sexual orientation/identity?
   ○ 1. Worst workplace
   ○ 2. Bad, but not the worst
   ○ 3. Neutral workplace
   ○ 4. Good, but not the best
   ○ 5. Best workplace

12) In your workplace, what steps do you think your employer should take to minimise discrimination based on sexual orientation/identity?
   ○ Enacting anti-discrimination policies
   ○ Training staff in awareness
   ○ Unsure
   ○ No action necessary
   ○ Other, please specify: ____________________________________________
Some final questions about you. These are just to make sure that we get a good cross section of people. All information provided will be treated with the strictest of confidence.

D1. How old are you?
   - 18-19 years of age
   - 20-24 years of age
   - 25-29 years of age
   - 30-34 years of age
   - 35-39 years of age
   - 40-44 years of age
   - 45-49 years of age
   - 50-54 years of age
   - 55 years of age or older
   - I’d rather not say

D2. What is the highest level of education you have obtained?
   - Completed Primary School
   - Completed Grade 10
   - Completed Secondary School
   - Completed a diploma at a Technical Or Further Educational institution (including TAFE colleges)
   - Completed an undergraduate degree
   - Completed a postgraduate degree
   - None
   - I’d rather not say

D3. Would you like a copy of the results from this survey?  ○ Yes  ○ No
   If yes, please provide your email address: _________________________________

END OF COMPLETED SURVEY

Thank you for participating in this study. All answers given will be treated in strictest confidence and you will not be able to be identified from your responses or in future publications. Please feel free to pass on the link to this survey to your friends.

Should you have any further questions regarding the research project please contact:

Nathan Barrett
CQUniversity Australia
Faculty of Business and Informatics
Email: c0114093@student.cqu.edu.au

Should you wish to discuss this project with a University representative regarding the manner in which this project (Project Number H10/03-027) is being conducted, please do not hesitate to contact the CQUUniversity Australia Office of Research on telephone +61 (7) 4923 2607.
Appendix 6 – Examples of discrimination and harassment

The following examples are taken from the *Prevention of Workplace Harassment Code of Practice 2004*

- Abusing a person loudly, usually when others are present
- Repeated threats of dismissal or other severe punishment for no reason
- Constant ridicule and being put down
- Leaving offensive messages on email or the telephone
- Sabotaging a person’s work, for example, by deliberately withholding or supplying incorrect information, hiding documents or equipment, not passing on messages and getting a person into trouble in other ways
- Maliciously excluding and isolating a person from workplace activities
- Persistent and unjustified criticisms, often about petty, irrelevant or insignificant matters
- Humiliating a person through gestures, sarcasm, criticism and insults, often in front of customers, management or other workers
- Spreading gossip or false, malicious rumours about a person with an intent to cause the person harm.
CQUni student investigates workplace discrimination

A CQUniversity Masters student is putting the spotlight on discrimination in the workplace through a new research project.

Nathan Barrett (based in Gladstone) is examining the extent of discrimination in the workplace based on the sexuality or sexual identity of employees in Queensland.

Mr Barrett said the project looks at discrimination in the workplace faced by gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender and intersex (GLBTI) employees.

“This study will explore discrimination against GLBTI workers in Queensland. It will add to the very limited knowledge of GLBTI discrimination in the workplace in Australia.

“One of the biggest aims for this research is to inform HR practitioners about the types of discrimination faced by these employees, so that policies can be put in place to combat discrimination.”

This is the first study to be conducted in Queensland looking at differences between the discrimination experienced by GLBTI employees in the city and those in rural areas.

Although similar research has previously been conducted in Sydney and Melbourne metropolitan areas, these issues have not been investigated in the context of regional Australia, in particular in regional areas encompassing traditionally male dominated professions (e.g. the mining industry).

An online survey will be utilised to determine the extent of discrimination experienced in the workplace by GLBTI individuals.

Anyone wishing to participate in the research can find the survey online at www.cqu.edu.au/rainbowsuits.

For Further Media Information Contact :
Name: Nathan Barrett
Email: c01140936@student.cqu.edu.au
Appendix 8 – Newspapers and Publications

Media Releases were sent to the following newspapers/publications in Queensland:

Brisbane MX
Courier Mail
Daily Mercury
HR Daily
Longreach Leader
New Farm Village News
QNews
Queensland Pride
The Chronicle
Warwick Daily News
Appendix 9 – Promotional Items

Business Cards

Rainbow Suits at Work
GLBTI Discrimination in the workplace.
Have you been discriminated against in the workplace?
We would like to know about your experiences.
Find the survey online at www.cqu.edu.au/raingwsvts

Rainbow Suits at Work
GLBTI Discrimination in the workplace.
Have you been discriminated against in the workplace?
We would like to know about your experiences.
Find the survey online at www.cqu.edu.au/raingwsvts
Appendix 10 – Boot Co Brisbane

Mannlicher - another great dance party. Fetish and anything goes.

Give us a hand here - go to www.csq.edu.au/rainbowpubs and give our mate Nathan Barrett a hand with his research into discrimination in the workplace. Nate is examining the extent of discrimination in the workplace based on the sexuality or sexual identity. Hey - it’s for a Master’s degree - Boot Co would have it no other way!

Check the Get Gear page - leather pants for sale!
Appendix 11 – Facebook
Appendix 12 – CQUniversity Australia website

CQUni student investigates workplace discrimination

Published on 22 Jul, 2010

Media Contact:
For Immediate Release

A CQUniversity Masters student is putting the spotlight on discrimination in the workplace through a new research project...

Nathan Barrett (based in Gladstone) is examining the extent of discrimination in the workplace based on the sexuality or sexual identity of employees in Queensland.

CQUni Gladstone's Nathan Barrett is undertaking a research project looking at discrimination in the workplace.

Mr Barrett said the project looks at discrimination in the workplace faced by gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender and intersex (GLBTI) employees.

“This study will explore discrimination against GLBTI workers in Queensland. It will add to the very limited knowledge of GLBTI discrimination in the workplace in Australia.

“One of the biggest aims for this research is to inform HR practitioners about the types of discrimination faced by these employees, so that policies can be put in place to combat discrimination.”

This is the first study to be conducted in Queensland looking at differences between the discrimination experienced by GLBTI employees in the city and those in rural areas.

Although similar research has previously been conducted in Sydney and Melbourne metropolitan areas, these issues have not been investigated in the context of regional Australia, in particular in regional areas encompassing traditionally male dominated professions (e.g. the mining industry).

An online survey will be utilised to determine the extent of discrimination experienced in the workplace by GLBTI individuals.

Anyone wishing to participate in the research can find the survey online at www.cq.edu.au/rainbowsult.
Appendix 13 – My Gay Brisbane website
Appendix 14 – Queensland Region Maps
(Queensland Government 2010)

Metropolitan Region

North Coast Region
Wide Bay/Burnett Region

Fitzroy Region

Central West Region