

Freedom of Religion and Belief in the 21st Century

Meta-Analysis of Submissions

1. BACKGROUND TO THE RESEARCH

1.1 About the authors

This report was prepared by members of the **Challenging Racism Project** team (Challenging Racism: The Anti-Racism Research Project). The report authors were:

Professor Kevin Dunn (University of Western Sydney)

Ms Jacqueline Nelson (University of Western Sydney)

The Challenging Racism Project brings together many of the *leading Australian researchers in the field of racism and anti-racism*. The focus of the team's research has been on the public attitudes towards cultural diversity and experiences of racism in Australia. Details on the Team, the project history and detailed findings are available at: www.uws.edu.au/social_sciences/soss/research/challenging_racism

1.2 Background to the meta-analysis of submissions

The Australian Human Rights Commission received 2033 submissions to the Freedom of Religion and Belief in the 21st Century Inquiry. Professor Kevin Dunn and Jacqueline Nelson from the University of Western Sydney were tasked with analysing the submissions and, where possible, comparing the views and attitudes expressed in the submissions to those of the general Australian population. To this end a coding framework was developed, in conjunction with staff of the AHRC and the project team (see Appendix 1: Coding frame for submissions). Every submission was coded using this qualitative coding scheme by AHRC staff, all submissions were therefore part of the sample frame for this report. It is important to note that, in many cases, direct comparisons between the submissions and available data are not straight forward as this project was not anticipated when the public submissions were sought. As will be seen below, many of the submissions simply did not express an overt

opinion or attitude on some of the given areas of interest. Thus it was not possible to gauge the attitudes of many contributors. Nonetheless, this report summarises key discourses in the submissions, and how these relate to nationally representative data that are available (see Appendix 2: National data sets). Analysis of the substantive recommendations contained within the submissions was not an intention of this report. However, a Data Appendix with key frequencies for each variable can be made available upon request.

2. BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF SUBMISSIONS

2.1 *Background of submissions*

Overwhelmingly, most submissions came from individuals, couples or family groups (91.5%). Other contributions came from organisations, most commonly representative religious organisations or local religious organisations (6.1%).

Table 1: Background of submissions

Background	Number	%
Anonymous/unknown	12	0.6
Individual, couple or family group	1861	91.5
Group of individuals (e.g. petition)	11	0.5
Religious organisation (local)	48	2.4
Religious organisation (representative)	75	3.7
Non-religious organisation	23	1.1
Faith-based organisation*	3	0.1
TOTAL	2033	99.9

NB: Percentages may not add to exactly 100 per cent due to rounding

* Refers to organisations not classified as religious but faith-based, e.g. pagans

2.2 *Quantum of submissions*

The majority of responses were less than one page, with just over a third of submissions being 1-10 pages in length (see Table 2 overleaf).

Table 2: Quantum of comment

Quantum of comment	Number	%
Less than one page	1219	60.0
1-10 pages	701	34.5
More than 10 pages	103	5.1
Unknown/not recorded	10	0.5
TOTAL	2033	100.1

NB: Percentages may not add to exactly 100 per cent due to rounding

2.3 Use of the online questionnaire template

Most submissions (86%, n=1756) did not use the online questionnaire template.

About 14 per cent, or 277, of the contributors made their submission via the template provided online.

2.4 Evidence provided to support submissions

Fairly stringent assessment criteria on what was considered evidence were applied to the submissions. Using these criteria, some 27% of submissions were considered to back up their submission with evidence. Anecdotal evidence was most commonly used, with 12 per cent of submissions making reference to local or personal experiences. Political and empirical evidence were the next most relied upon forms of evidence with 11 and 10 per cent of submissions using these types of evidence respectively. Less commonly referred to were theological evidence (6%), reference to a legal case or precedent (4%) and, less so, theoretical evidence (2%).

2.5 Style of submissions

Sixty two per cent of submissions were deemed to be original, while 38 per cent were considered to be formulaic. While most submissions could not be classified as either emotive or reasoned (49%), almost one in four of the submissions were emotive in style. As can be seen below (Table 3), submissions were relatively evenly split

between those that dealt with a single issue only and those that addressed multiple issues. The majority of the submissions did not request confidentiality.

Table 3: Style and format of submissions

Style of Submission		Number	%
Emotive/Reasoned	Emotive	476	23.5
	Reasoned	298	14.7
	Mixed	254	12.5
	Neither	996	49.2
Single/Multiple	Single issue	952	47.2
	Multiple issues	1067	52.8
Confidential/Non-confidential	Confidential	77	3.8
	Non-confidential	1916	94.6
	Name withheld	32	1.6

NB: Numbers here exclude missing/unknown data, thus may not total N=2033

3. MULTICULTURALISM, DIVERSITY AND DIFFERENCE

About one in ten of the submissions to the Freedom of Religion and Belief inquiry expressed support for Australia as a multicultural country that values diversity and accepts difference within the law. It is important to note that the remaining 90 per cent of submissions simply did not make reference to multiculturalism in their submission. This is perhaps unsurprising, as the submission process did not directly address multiculturalism. It does indicate, however, that in many cases Australians do not equate religious diversity with multiculturalism, as it tends to be cultural and linguistic diversity that are most commonly emphasised. Attitudes toward multiculturalism amongst the 90 per cent who did not refer to multiculturalism are therefore unknown.

Fifty nine submissions (2.9%) expressed the view that it was a good thing for society to have religious diversity. A larger portion of the submissions, 186 or 9.1 per cent felt that religious diversity in Australia was *not* a good thing. The remaining 88 per cent of submissions did not address this issue. Of those 245 submissions that expressed an opinion on religious diversity, 75.9 per cent were negative.¹

¹ Negative attitudes towards religious diversity may be related to the Christian-centric views of some submissions – see Section 8 of this report for more details.

Support for multiculturalism and diversity is high in the Australian population. National data collected by the Challenging Racism Project demonstrates that Australians are very supportive of multiculturalism, with 88 per cent agreeing that it is a good thing for society to be made up of people from different cultures (see Table 4). Only 6.2 per cent of respondents disagreed with the proposition that cultural diversity is good. From the available evidence, contributors to the Freedom of Religion and Belief Inquiry are less supportive of diversity than the general population, with nine per cent taking the opportunity to express concern about diversity (compared to only six per cent of respondents to the Challenging Racism survey). More-over of those that overtly revealed a view on religious diversity (245 submissions) the proportion that were negative (76%) was much higher than is apparent in the Australian population.

Table 4: Attitudes to diversity, the Challenging Racism Project

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither disagree nor agree	Agree	Strongly agree	TOTAL
Good thing for society to be made up of people from different cultures	1.8% (221)	4.4% (540)	5.8% (724)	47.1% (5846)	40.9% (5082)	100.0% (12413)

NB: Excludes missing values (don't know, refused)

There were 284 (14%) submissions that expressed pro-assimilation viewpoints. And some 19 per cent of submissions expressed feelings of threat or insecurity about religious diversity/difference in Australia. In their nationwide survey, the Challenging Racism Project asked Australians whether they felt secure with people of different ethnic backgrounds. Only about nine per cent of respondents disagreed, indicating they felt threatened or insecure. While this question has a more personal orientation than the submissions and deals with ethnic, rather than religious, difference, it nonetheless indicates that contributors making submissions were relatively more worried about difference and diversity than is the general population.

Table 5: Attitudes to diversity & assimilation, the Challenging Racism Project

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither disagree nor agree	Agree	Strongly agree	TOTAL
You feel secure when you are with people of different ethnic backgrounds	2.0% (251)	7.2% (879)	10.5% (1294)	49.3% (6051)	31.0% (3809)	100.0% (12284)

NB: Excludes missing values (don't know, refused)

4. EQUALITY OF 'RACE', RELIGION AND ETHNICITY

Only a minority of submissions directly addressed equality across race, religion or ethnicity, with 78 (3.9%) submissions putting forward the view that all persons are equal and 53 (2.6%) arguing that all persons are *not* equal. This means that of the 131 submissions that discussed the equality of race, religion or ethnicity, about 40 per cent made an argument that all persons are not equal.

Many more submissions implied that a racial or religious hierarchy exists, giving an indication that many contributors believe that all 'races', religions or ethnic groups are not equal. Almost one in three of the submissions (n=643, 31.6%) implied that there is a racial or religious hierarchy in which some faiths and cultures are superior and others inferior.

According to the Challenging Racism Project approximately 11 per cent of the general population disagree or strongly disagree with the statement, 'All races of people are equal' (see Table 6). This indicates that amongst the contributors who addressed this issue in their submission a higher proportion contest the equality of races, religions or ethnic groups than the general population. It is important to remember that many of the submissions did not indicate their view regarding the equality of persons, thus it is not possible to compare these contributors views to those of the general population. However, from those submissions where it was possible to discern the author's disposition on hierarchies, it emerges that contributors to the Freedom of Religion and Belief Inquiry are more likely to possess supremacist views on faiths, culture or 'races' than is the general population.

Table 6: Attitudes to the equality of ‘races’, the Challenging Racism Project

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither disagree nor agree	Agree	Strongly agree	TOTAL
All races of people are equal	3.1% (383)	7.8% (967)	4.0% (491)	39.2% (4857)	45.9% (5679)	100.0% (12377)

NB: Excludes missing values (don’t know, refused)

5. DISCOURSES CRITICISING SPECIFIC CULTURAL OR RELIGIOUS GROUPS

About one in five (n=415, 20.4%) of the submissions included criticism of specific cultural or religious groups. This compares to over 40 per cent of Australians (n=5225, 41.8%) who stated that there are cultural or ethnic groups that do not fit into Australian society, according to data collected by the Challenging Racism Project. It ought be bore in mind that people making submissions were not prompted on their disposition towards minority groups, whereas they were in the Challenging Racism Project surveys. This makes direct comparison difficult.

Of the criticism in the submissions, a substantial proportion was directed at Muslims and Muslim Australians. Some 17 per cent of submissions included critical commentary about Muslims. In the national data from the Challenging Racism Project, just over 20 per cent of respondents indicated they would be very or extremely concerned if a close friend or relative were to marry a person of Muslim faith. In addition, 1687 respondents to the national survey (13.5%) cited Muslims as a cultural/ethnic group that does not fit into Australian society. This indicates similar levels of antipathy toward Muslims among the submissions and the general population. However, the antipathy in submissions to the Freedom of Religion and Belief inquiry was not prompted, whereas respondents in the above-mentioned national surveys were. This means that the un-prompted anti-Muslim antipathy of the submissions rivalled the levels of prompted antipathy in the national survey. This could be interpreted as an inflated presence of anti-Muslim feelings among submission authors.

Table 7: Social distance towards Muslims, the Challenging Racism Project

	Not at all concerned	Slightly concerned	Somewhat concerned	Very concerned	Extremely concerned	TOTAL
Level of concern if a close friend or relative married a person of Muslim faith	50.0% (6144)	17.2% (2113)	12.0% (1470)	9.3% (1137)	11.5% (1417)	100.0% (12281)

NB: Excludes missing values (don't know, refused)

6. ANTI-HOMOSEXUALITY DISCOURSES

Anti-homosexuality sentiment was expressed in 278, or 13.7 per cent of submissions. Using data collected from 24,718 respondents across Australia aged 14 and over, Flood and Hamilton (2005) found that 35 per cent of the population believe homosexuality is immoral. Flood and Hamilton also examined homophobia by religion, and found that those identifying as Catholic, or affiliating with the Anglican or Uniting Churches, were least likely of those with a religious affiliation to indicate that homosexuality is immoral. Less than 40 per cent of adherents to these faiths feel homosexuality is immoral. This compares to 68 per cent amongst Baptists and 62 per cent amongst evangelical Christians. This being said, it is difficult to compare the prevalence of anti-homosexuality sentiment within the submissions to that among the general Australian population as most submissions (86.3%) did not touch on homosexuality. Nonetheless, there was a substantial minority of submissions that were rather adamantly anti-homosexuality, without being prompted to offer a view, and for an inquiry ostensibly concerned with religious belief and freedom, and not (homo)sexuality. We are unable to comment on whether the general population would be similarly predisposed to express intolerance of homosexuality and homosexuals if not specifically asked for a view and in the context of a discussion about religious belief. However, we doubt that 14 per cent of the general population would do so, but an empirically-based conclusion on this is not possible.

7. RELIGION AND THE STATE

About one quarter of the submissions made a comment on religion's relation with the state, and the rest made no comment on this topic (75%). The majority of submissions that discussed the relationship between religion and the state argued that their own religion should have more influence on the state (than it currently does or more than other religions have).

Table 8: Views on religion and the state, submissions to the Freedom of Religion and Belief in the 21st Century inquiry

	Number of submissions	%
Religion should not influence state	95	4.7
Religion should influence state	161	8.0
My religion should be more influential	251	12.4
No mention	1517	75.0
TOTAL	2024	100.1

NB: Percentages may not add to exactly 100 per cent due to rounding

When comparing the submissions to responses to a nationally representative survey on religion (International Social Survey Programme (ISSP) 1998; Religion II Module), albeit over ten years old, the submissions tend to be much more positive about close links between religion and the state than the population in general. For example, when asked in the nationwide survey, 'Do you think that churches and religious organisations in Australia have too much power or too little power?', the vast majority of respondents felt that churches and religious organisations had at least enough power (89.4%, N=1310). As can be seen in Table 9 (overleaf), almost one in three (31.7%) felt that churches and religious organisations had too much or far too much power. In comparison, of the 507 submissions that mentioned this issue, 81.3 per cent were in favour of close links between the state and religion, particularly their own religion. This compares to 10.7 per cent in the nationally representative survey who felt that churches and religious organisations should have more power. Authors of submissions are more likely to be supportive of church / religious influence on the state than are the general population.

8. AUSTRALIA, RELIGION AND SECULARISM

About six per cent of the submissions (n=119) asserted that Australia should see itself as a secular country (C37). However, a bigger minority of submissions were concerned that secularism presented a problem to religious belief and freedom in Australia. About 14 per cent of submissions (n=282) expressed the view that religion in Australia was currently being threatened by secularism (C46). In addition, almost 40 per cent of submissions (n=802) asserted the idea that Australia should see itself as a (Judeo-) Christian country. Taken together, this indicates that there was substantial antipathy towards secularism, apart from a small minority who asserted that Australia should see itself as a secular country.

In Table 9 below, questions V31 and V36 from the ISSP 98 provide points of comparison in terms of the general Australian populations' attitudes towards secularism. As noted above, according to the ISSP findings, only about one in ten Australians argue that churches and religious organisations need more power than they currently have. Table 9 indicates that 58 per cent of respondents were satisfied with current levels of influence among churches and religious organisations. This suggests that satisfaction with current arrangements is fairly widespread. A significant minority (31.7%), however, are concerned about churches and religious organisations having too much power. Looking at item V31, however, only 26.5 per cent of survey respondents assert that Australia would be a better country if religion had less influence. In the Australian Survey of Social Attitudes in 2003 just over 36 per cent of respondents said that being Christian is important or very important to being truly Australian. This indicates that Australians' feelings towards secularism and views on the role of religion in the state are somewhat ambivalent. Overall, it appears that the general population is somewhat more secular in orientation than the contributors to the Freedom of Religion and Belief Inquiry.

9. DISPOSITIONS TOWARD FAITH AND RELIGION

Most of the submissions did not express a general attitude towards religion. Of the just over five per cent who did, 73 (3.6%) felt religion is generally a positive thing. A smaller proportion of the submissions were negative about religion in general (n=36

or 1.8%). According to the ISSP, the Australian population is relatively pessimistic about religion, with over 70 per cent agreeing that religions bring more conflict than peace (see Table 9). The submissions to the Freedom of Religion and Belief inquiry were generally more positive about religion than is the Australian population.

Table 9: Attitudes to religion from ISSP 98 – Religion II (N=1310)

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
V29. Looking around the world, religions bring more conflict than peace	32.3%	38.3%	14.5%	12.5%	2.3%
V31. Australia would be a better country if religion had less influence	7.6%	18.9%	33.6%	28.7%	11.1%
	Far too much power	Too much power	About right amount of power	Too little power	Far too little power
V36. Churches & religious orgs have too much/too little power	6.2%	25.5%	57.7%	9.1%	1.6%

10. CONCLUDING COMMENTS

One striking difference between those making submissions to the Freedom of Religion and Belief inquiry and the general population is the average levels of interest in religion and their disposition towards it. Many Australians are indifferent to religion, whereas parties contributing to the inquiry obviously have a strong interest in the role of religion in society, and this gives them a different perspective to general population. Those making submissions, are also, somewhat expectedly parochial about the status and importance of their own faith. Hence they are less positive about religious diversity, more likely to see religions hierarchically – with some inferior to others, and they are more likely to independently express anti-Islamic sentiment. Belief in superior status of Christianity was stronger among the submissions than pertains in the general population.

APPENDIX 1: Coding Frame for Submissions

Freedom of Belief Project Coding Frame for Submissions

Nature of the submission

1. ID Code
2. When it was received
3. Background of those making the submission. Mutually exclusive categories:
 1. anonymous or unknown
 2. individual, couple or family group
 3. group of individuals (e.g. petition)
 4. religious organisation (local)
 5. religious organisation (representative group)
 6. non-religious organisation
 7. faith-based (but non-religious) organisation
4. DP question numbers overtly addressed
5. Quantum of comment. Mutually exclusive categories
 1. less than 1 page
 2. 1-10 pages
 3. more than 10 pages
6. Followed questionnaire template online (1=yes, otherwise 9)
7. Evidence provided (1=yes, otherwise 9)
8. If evidence provided, nature of evidence / supporting material presented. Multiple categories. [Relatively strict with what constitutes evidence]
 1. anecdotal (1/9) [reference to local or own experience]
 2. empirical (1/9) [with reference to who/where comes from, rather than bare statistic]
 3. theoretical (1/9)
 4. political (1/9)
 5. spiritual / clerical (1/9) [make explicit reference to religious text etc.]
 6. reference to legal case or precedent (other than Victorian RRTA or BOR) (1/9)
9. Style of response:
 - formulaic (1) vs original (2)
 - emotive (1), reasoned (2), mixed (3) or neither (4)
 - single issue (1) vs multiple issues (2)
 - confidential (1), non-confidential (2), name withheld (3)

Questions from the template online

10. The emergence of a multifaith Australia is a welcome historical development.
11. Some faith communities represent a threat to the long term cohesion of the Australian nation.
12. Some faith communities represent a threat to national security.

13. On balance, religious communities contribute to the social capital or social wealth of the Australian nation.
14. The nation state has the responsibility of curbing the activities of religious extremists when they contravene human rights by threatening the safety and/or wellbeing of those of different faiths or beliefs.
15. Consider – equality is a natural human right to be applied in all instances of religious practice.
16. Freedom to express and practice your faith or belief system is generally well-protected in Australian society.
17. The Australian Human Rights Commission plays a positive role in protecting freedom of religion and belief in Australia.
18. The outsourcing of government services to religious communities has been a welcome development in Australia.

NB: For most of the following if the submission makes a statement as described enter ‘1’, if there is nothing related to the statement or submission doesn’t address that issue enter ‘9’.

If submissions make clear argument against a particular statement enter ‘2’. This will only be necessary in some cases.

Where there are two options within a statement the options are to be coded ‘1’ and ‘2’ as written. If the submission makes no reference to the issue, give ‘9’.

Comments on the intentions of the project

19. Statement that the project (including Discussion Paper) is biased (1/9)
20. Statement that the Commission is biased (1/9)
21. Statement that the researchers are biased (1/9)
22. Statement that the project is designed to bring in religious vilification laws (1/9)
23. Statement that the project is designed to take away present exemptions for religious organisations (1/9)

Suggestions for policy / legislation

24. Comment on Catch the Fire Vs ICV Case
[positive (1), negative (2), no comment (9)]
25. Comment on RRTA in Victoria
[positive (1), negative (2), no comment (9)]
26. Supports religious vilification legislation in principle (1), opposes religious vilification legislation in principle (2), qualified support (3)
27. Perceives a need for additional protections (of religious freedom)
[yes (1), no (2), unclear/no comment (9)]
28. Support for a bill/charter of rights (1), opposition to a bill/charter of rights (2), qualified support (3)

29. Statement that rights legislation would give too much power to judges (1/9)
30. Statement that religious groups should (1) or should not (2) receive exemptions from anti-discrimination legislation
31. Statement that the state should foster and encourage all faiths/religions/worldviews equally (1), or not (2)
32. Statement that the state should stay out of all religious matters (1) / be involved in religious matters (2).
33. The state should not try to influence *my* religion/faith [refers to negative interference].
34. Statement that religion should not influence state (1), religion should influence state (2) or my religion should be more influential (3)
35. Statement that certain religious groups have too much influence
36. Statement that Australia should see itself as a (Judeo-)Christian country
37. Statement that Australia should see itself as a secular country
38. Statement that Australia should see itself as a multifaith country
39. Support for faith based schools (1), opposition to faith based schools (2), qualified support (3)
40. Statement proposing restrictive legislation/policy regarding Muslims

Comments on religion

41. Statement that religion and religious practice can suppress women
42. Statement that religion and religious practices can suppress sexual minorities
43. Statement that religions seek to impose their views and/or morality on the rest of society [anti-faith position – religion generates intolerance etc.]
44. Statement that religion and religious practices are generally positive (1) Vs statement that religion and religious practices are generally negative (2).
45. Statement that the mainstream media is generally opposed to religion.
46. Statement that religion is under threat in Australia from aggressive secularism
47. Statement that in Australia people should be free to be critical of any religion

Comments on Australia

48. Statement that Australia is a multicultural country that values diversity and accepts difference within the parameters of the legal system.
49. Statement that Australia is and should remain a democratic and free country with freedom to follow chosen religion/worldview.

Discourses of tolerance/intolerance

50. Statement of insecurity or threat perception from religious diversity / difference in Australia (risks to social cohesion, etc).

51. Statement that immigrants (including refugees) and their ethnic groups should assimilate (take on Australian ways, not stick to their own ways, etc).
52. Statement that all persons (regardless of race, religion or ethnicity) are equal (1) or not equal (2).
53. Statement that it is a good thing that society is made up of religious diversity.
54. Statement that contains 'othering' discourses of us and them.
55. Statement that implies a racial or religious hierarchy (e.g. that positions religious groups as lesser or lower relative to the self, or which contains in-group ethnocentrism).

Discourse on personal lifestyle, organizational ethos and ethical issues

56. Statement on the right to discriminate in issues of employment on the basis of sexual orientation (1) or do not have the right (2)
57. Statement on the right to discriminate to maintain ethos (1) vs statement that cannot discriminate to maintain ethos (2)
58. Statement expressing anti-homosexuality sentiment (e.g. immorality or deviancy)
59. Commentary re Victorian laws decriminalizing abortion but requiring physicians to declare whether they offer the service AND IF NOT to refer client to someone who does (1/9).

Comments on specific faiths

60. Statement criticising any specific cultural or religious groups (1/9).
61. Statement that includes any critical comment on Muslims/Islam (e.g. threat perception, criticism of Australian-Muslims actions, criticism of actions of Muslims elsewhere in world) (1/9).
62. Statement that includes any negative comment on other religious groups or worldviews (e.g. atheism, secular humanism)

APPENDIX 2: National Data Sets

Australian Survey Social Attitudes (2003)

Details available online at: <http://aussa.anu.edu.au/issp.php>

Challenging Racism Project

Final sample sizes and survey details

- “Attitudes on cultural diversity and racism”, Queensland and NSW, 2001 (n:5056) (ARC Large Grant Project).
- “Experiences of racism” (nation-wide), 2006 (n:4020) (ARC Discovery Project).
- “Attitudes on cultural diversity and racism”, Victoria, 2006 (n:4016) (Victorian Health Promotion Foundation).
- “Attitudes on cultural diversity and racism, and peoples’ awareness of the anti-racism legislation and agencies”, South Australia, 2007 (n:1484) (HREOC, EOCSA, UNSW).
- “Attitudes on cultural diversity and racism, and peoples’ awareness of the anti-racism legislation and agencies”, Australian Capital Territory, 2007 (n:454) (HREOC, HRC ACT, UNSW).
- “Attitudes on cultural diversity and racism”, Northern Territory, 2008 (n:300) (Department of Immigration and Citizenship).
- “Attitudes on cultural diversity and racism”, Tasmania, 2008 (n:351) (Department of Immigration and Citizenship).
- “Attitudes on cultural diversity and racism”, Perth, 2008 (n:851) (Department of Immigration and Citizenship).
- Total respondents – 5056, 4016, 1484, 454, 300, 351, 851 = 12512

Homophobia Data

Flood, M., & Hamilton, C. (2005). *Mapping Homophobia in Australia*. Australia Institute Webpaper. Available at:

www.glhv.org.au/files/aust_inst_homophobia_paper.pdf

International Social Survey Programme (1998); Religion II Module

Details available online at: www.issp.org/