Industry: Mining

ANZSIC: B)-Mining

All Data			Mining	
169		Organisations	6	
41,497		Respondents	956	
10,198	24.6%	LGBTQ+ respondents in the industry	186	19.5%
10,058	24.2%	% respondents of Diverse sexuality	182	19.0%
4,987	49.6%	% Diverse Sexuality respondents 'Out'*	70	47.3%
1,308	3.2%	% respondents of Diverse Gender	16	2.5%
546	41.7%	% Diverse Gender respondents 'open'*	8	50.0%

*Includes only those who responded to this question

Location

Respondents working in within the Mining industry were from all states except ACT and TAS, with the majority of them coming from Western Australia (all: 11.7% vs. mining: 84.4%) and Queensland (all: 21.1% vs. mining: 13.5%).

70% of respondents are located in Capital city (city centre and in city suburbs), while 30.0% are located in regional, rural and remote areas, at almost twice the rate of all respondents. Most significantly 15.1% are working in remote locations, which is 1070.5% higher than the 1.3% of all respondents.

Organisation position

88.3% of all mining respondents are employed full-time. The remaining being employed part-time (All: 9.2 % vs. Mining: 5.9%), or on contracts. (All: 3.9 % vs. Mining: 5.1%). Only 0.7% of respondents are temporary or casual staff. Respondents are more likely to have been employed for over 4 years, and 78.6% more likely to have been employed for 11-20 years. (All: 18.3 % vs. Mining: 32.7%)

Additionally,
- 36.2% fewer were employed in the Leadership/executive team roles (All: 3.8 % vs. Mining: 2.4%)
- 34.6% more were in Level 4 (Reporting to any level - New Workforce entrants). (All: 5.9 % vs. Mining: 3.9%)

Other demographics

Age

Mining respondents less likely by:
- 75.5% to be between age 18-24 (All: 5.1 % vs. Mining: 1.3%)
- 64.0% to be over year 65. (All: 1.5 % vs. Mining: 0.5%)

Respondents are more likely to be between 35 and 54.

Pronouns

They are less likely by:
- 76.7% to use gender neutral pronouns (All: 0.9% vs. Mining: 0.2%), and 21.5% fewer use rolling pronouns (All: 2.5% vs. Mining: 1.5%)

Diversities

Proportionately, respondents are:
- 31.7% less likely to be advise living with a disability or long-term health condition (All: 14.8% vs. Mining: 12.6%)
- 7.6% more likely to be neurodivergent. (All: 14.1% vs. Mining: 15.2%)
- 18.8% less likely to be a person of faith/religious belief. (All: 23.2% vs. Mining: 18.8%)
- 13.6% more likely to have another diversity not listed that could be a barrier to their career or being fully included at work. (All: 8.0% vs. Mining: 9.1%)

Personal Beliefs & Employee inclusion

Awareness and visibility
Respondents are more likely by:
- 9.1% to agree there has been visibility and promotion of an internal employee network for sexuality & gender diverse employees and allies. (All: 80.9% vs. Mining: 88.2%)
- 5.7% to have attended awareness or ally training here for LGBTQ+ inclusion within the last year. (All: 48.3% vs. Mining: 51.1%)

Mining industry respondents are 8.3% less likely to agree they believe there are more than two genders (All: 58.1% vs. Mining: 53.3%)

Bullying and Harassment

Respondents are more likely by:
- 6.4% to agree any negative commentary/jokes/innuendo targeting people of diverse sexuality and/or gender is acted upon quickly here. (All: 60.4% vs. Mining: 64.3%)
- 6.3% to agree managers/leaders are willing to address workplace incivility targeting people of diverse sexuality. (All: 71.0% vs. Mining: 75.4%)
- 11.7% to agree there are identified confidential avenues to safely report bullying/harassment related to one's diverse sexuality and/or gender. (All: 77.5% vs. Mining: 86.5%)
- 43.4to agree they have witnessed workplace incivility targeting people of diverse sexuality and/or gender here. (All: 13.6% vs. Mining: 19.5%)

They also are:
- 9.6% and 10.5% more likely to advise someone else called out workplace incivility (All: 14.7% vs. Mining: 16.1%) and serious negative behaviour actions (All: 27.3% vs. Mining: 23.0%), respectively.
- 10.6% and 18.5% more of the respondents thought that no one pointed out mild bullying behaviour actions (All: 28.6% vs. Mining: 31.6%) and serious negative behaviour (All: 23.0% vs. Mining: 21.3%), respectively.

In all instances, respondents were less to advise that they would not report with 7.3% fewer for workplace incivility, and 15.6% fewer for serious behaviours.

INDUSTRY INCLUSION INSIGHTS • **2023 AWEI SURVEY**

Allyship

Mining respondents are:

- 7.7% more likely to know of active allies within their immediate area. (All: 65.6% vs. Mining: 70.6%)
- 6.2% more likely to be able to list several behaviours that would be expected of an active ally. (All: 72.8% vs. Mining: 77.4 %)
- 6.8% more likely to know of material or training available that would show me how to be an active ally. (All: 56.7% vs. Mining: 60.5 %)
- 5.3% more likely to know of active executive allies or sponsor/s within my organisation. (All: 61.7% vs. Mining: 65.0%)
- 7.8% more likely to think employees who wish to be allies are supported to do so here. (All: 71.0% vs. Mining: 76.6%)

40% of Mining respondents are active allies (4.1% less than all respondents). Though 18.0% fewer respondents are not allies at all (All: 4.1% vs. Mining: 3.3%). Of those who are passive or not allies at all they are:

- 16.9% more likely agree that the concern of people thinking that they are of diverse sexuality or gender stops them from being an active ally. (All: 5.5% vs. Mining: 6.4%), and
- 15.2% more likely to agree to being too busy to be an active ally. (All: 41.1% vs. Mining: 47.3%)

They are less likely by:

- 15.0% agree that the concern of being ridiculed or the target of jokes stops them from being an active ally. (All: 4.8% vs. Mining: 4.1%)
- 17.0% to agree that being an active ally would conflict with their personal beliefs or values. (All: 14.2% vs. Mining: 11.8%)
- 10.7% less likely to think being an active ally would be frowned upon by

someone/people with influence over their careers. (All: 4.5% vs. Mining: 4.1%)

Relating to ways to influence them to become an active ally, they are:

- 18.6% less likely to think there is nothing that would convince me to be an active ally. (All: 23.3% vs. Mining: 19.0%)
- 18.3% more likely to agree that more information on being an active ally with limited time would influence. (All: 46.2% vs. Mining: 54.7%)
- 6.2% more likely to agree with having a better understanding of how to be an active ally. (All: 38.5% vs. Mining: 40.9%)
- For LGBTQ+ respondents, they are 5.8% less likely to agree active allies have positively impacted their sense of inclusion, and 6.5% less likely to agree that executive endorsement of LGBTQ+ Initiatives has been positive.

They are also:

- 71.2% more likely to feel they have experienced discrimination in the past due to their diverse sexuality and/or gender here. (All: 18.6% vs. Mining: 31.8%)
- 36.1% more likely to spend time editing conversations (All: 30.8% vs. Mining: 41.9%)

LGBTQ+ inclusivity

19.5% of respondents within the mining industry are LGBTQ+ (of diverse sexuality, diverse gender and/or trans experience).

Mining respondents are 20.0% less likely to advise being 'out' regarding their diverse sexuality and 4.5% less likely to be 'open' regarding their diverse gender and/or trans experience.

For Mining employees with diverse sexuality, those 'out' at work are less likely by:

- 8.9% to agree inclusion initiatives for people of diverse sexuality have had a positive impact on how they feel about their own sexuality. (All: 69.0% vs. Mining: 62.9%)
- 35.1% less likely to think there are visible out role models within the organisation that have the same, or similar, sexuality (All: 66.1% vs. Mining: 42.9%)
- 12.4% less likely to think they do not believe their sexuality would have any impact on career progression here. (All: 78.2% vs. Mining: 68.6%)
- 11.9% less likely to have not encountered any exclusion based on their sexuality here. (All: 82.7% vs. Mining: 72.9%)
- 9.1% less likely to feel comfortable and safe discussing workplace issues related to my diverse sexuality with my manager. (All: 81.7% vs. Mining: 74.3%)

Those 'not out' at work, they are more likely to agree with all available statements, most significantly by:
- 62.1% to fearing being the target of discrimination due to their diverse sexuality. (All: 24.7 % vs. Mining: 40.0%)
- 61.5% to being concerned they would become the target of sexualised jokes/innuendo. (All: 24.8% vs. Mining: 40.0%)
- 56.8% to feeling it would negatively impact their career progression. (All: 24.7% vs. Mining: 38.7%)
- 30.3% that they do not want to be labelled because of their diverse sexuality. (All: 60.6% vs. Mining: 78.9%) and
- 19.7% to feeling the negative social media commentary and mainstream news media reporting targeting LGBTQ+ people has impacted their willingness to be out (All: 27.8% vs. Mining: 33.3%)
- 21.6% to avoiding inclusion initiatives because they don't want people to know

that they are of diverse sexuality. (All: 24.1% vs. Mining: 29.3%)
- 15.3% that some members of their team would not accept them. (All: 27.8% vs. Mining: 32.0%)

75.8% more mining industry respondents advised that they had been the target of workplace incivility behaviours (All: 8.8% vs. Mining: 15.5%), and 79.9% more agreed they were the target of serious bullying and harassment (All: 2.6% vs. Mining: 4.7%).

Of the trans and gender diverse respondents, 5.2% fewer have affirmed their gender within their workplace. For those that have, they are 71.1% more likely to be happy with the process (All: 56.1% vs. Mining: 77.3%).

On the positive side, mining industry respondents 'open' at work are:
- 32.3% more likely to feel people make an effort to use my personal pronouns. (All: 66.2% vs. Mining: 87.5%) &
- 43.5% less likely to feel they have been deliberately misgendered within the last year. (All: 22.1% vs. Mining: 12.5%)
- 9.3% more likely to agree that they have not experienced any exclusion based on their gender diversity within their organisation (All: 68.6% vs. Mining: 75.0%)
- 12.0% more likely to feel inclined to stay (All: 67.0% vs. Mining: 75.0%)
- 47.4% more likely to feel their performance is positively impacted by being 'open'. (All: 59.4% vs. Mining: 87.5%)

Conversely, they are:
- 31.7% less likely to feel their LGBTQ+ Employee Network is fully inclusive of employees of diverse gender and/or trans experience. (All: 73.3% vs. Mining: 50.0%)
- 17.1% less likely to feel inclusion initiatives for people of diverse gender have had a

positive impact on how they feel about their own gender diversity (All: 60.3% vs. Mining: 50.0%)

- 47.4% less likely to feel their performance is positively impacted by being 'out'. (All: 59.4% vs. Mining: 78.5%)
- 16.6% less likely to feel comfortable and safe discussing workplace issues related to their gender diversity with their managers. (All: 74.9% vs. Mining: 62.5%)
- 11.9% less likely to feel fully supported by my team in terms of their gender diversity. (All: 70.9% vs. Mining: 62.5%)

No Respondents in the mining industry agreed that they were able to identify an open role model within their organisation (All: 37.2%)

The reasons for not being open at work also significantly vary from the whole population. Those 'not open' at work in the mining industry are:

- 90.8% more likely to agree they are not comfortable enough within themselves to be open here. (All: 45.9% vs. Mining: 87.5%)
- 66.9% more likely to avoid inclusion initiatives because they don't want people to know that they are of diverse genders. (All: 30.0% vs. Mining: 50.0%)
- 47.3% more likely to be concerned they would become the target of jokes/innuendo around their gender. (All: 42.4% vs. Mining: 62.5%)
- 13.9% more likely to agree they do not want to be labelled because of their diverse gender. (All: 65.8% vs. Mining: 75.0%)
- 17.2% more likely to feel they do roat feel to be accepted by some members of their team. (All: 53.3% vs. Mining: 62.5%)
- 34.9% less likely to feel being open at work would negatively impact their career progression. (All: 43.9% vs. Mining: 28.6%)

- 6.3% less likely to fear being the target of discrimination due to their diverse gender. (All: 45.7% vs. Mining: 42.9%)
- 20.7% less likely to feel the negative social media commentary and mainstream news media reporting targeting LGBTQ people has impacted their willingness to be open here. (All: 63.1% vs. Mining: 50.0%)
- 14.8% more respondents advised they had been the target of workplace incivility (All: 15.8% vs. Mining: 18.2%); however, no respondent advised being the target of serious bullying and harassment (All: 3.8% vs. Mining: 0.0%).

Regional experience

Due to the significant number of respondents in regional areas, comparing these responses is beneficial.

Mining industry respondents were more likely to agree by:

- 32.9% that they know a local person/champion to help drive LGBTQ+ initiatives (All: 39.6% vs. Mining: 52.6%)
- 32.6% that their local office/site had held inclusion-related activities or events to reinforce this area of diversity & inclusion. (All: 48.9% vs. Mining: 64.8%)
- 20.7% that their local management/leadership had communicated support for LGBTQ+ people or work in this area. (All: 55.2% vs. Mining: 66.7%)
- 9.0% the organisation's diversity initiatives for the inclusion of LGBTQ+ people had been adequately communicated within their site/office. (All: 63.2% vs. Mining: 68.8%)
- 10.9% that they are able to easily connect into head office activities for LGBTQ+ diversity & inclusion. (All: 50.9% vs. Mining: 56.5%)