

12-21-2006

## **An Evaluation of San Francisco's Public Policy to Prohibit Weight Discrimination**

Catherine M. Wippel

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.law.ggu.edu/capstones>



Part of the [Business Administration, Management, and Operations Commons](#)

---

**SAN FRANCISCO ADMINISTRATIVE CODE  
CHAPTERS 12A, 12B AND 12C  
AND  
SAN FRANCISCO MUNICIPAL/POLICE  
CODE ARTICLE 33**

**An Evaluation of San Francisco's Public Policy to  
Prohibit Weight Discrimination**

**By**

**Catherine M. Wippel**

**Golden Gate University  
San Francisco, California**

**December 21, 2006**

LD  
2001  
.G43

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	3
EVALUATING SAN FRANCISCO'S PUBLIC POLICY TO PROHIBIT WEIGHT BASED DISCRIMINATION .....	4
Hypothesis and Variables .....	4
Delimitations.....	4
Assumptions.....	4
LITERATURE REVIEW .....	5
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY.....	7
Data Collection – General.....	7
Qualitative Interviews.....	7
Survey on Weight Bias and Knowledge of Public Policy Prohibiting Weight Based Discrimination.....	7
ANALYSIS.....	9
Interviews.....	9
Survey Data.....	12
SUMMARY.....	14
POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS .....	16
<i>Recommendation One</i> .....	16
<i>Recommendation Two</i> .....	16
<i>Recommendation Three</i> .....	17
CONCLUSION.....	18
REFERENCES .....	19
APPENDIX A Definitions.....	20
APPENDIX B Interview questions for Larry Brinkin of the San Francisco Human Rights Commission .....	21
APPENDIX C Interview questions for Carole Cullum and Marilyn Wann .....	22
APPENDIX D Survey on Weight Bias and Knowledge of Public Policy Prohibiting Weight Based Discrimination .....	23
APPENDIX E Raw Data .....	27

**ABSTRACT**

There are only a few municipalities within the United States that employ laws to prohibit weight based discrimination, including the state of Michigan, the District of Columbia, and the cities of Santa Cruz and San Francisco, California.

However, even with local laws to protect against weight based discrimination, it still exists to a large extent, and there appears to be little knowledge that such laws exist. Further, some jurisdictions are limited to the enforceability of the local law, and therefore, are unable to prevent weight based discrimination to the fullest extent of the law.

## **EVALUATING SAN FRANCISCO'S PUBLIC POLICY TO PROHIBIT WEIGHT BASED DISCRIMINATION**

### **Hypothesis and Variables**

The city and county of San Francisco's public policy to prohibit weight discrimination is not effective in preventing weight based discrimination.

*Independent Variable – San Francisco's public policy to prohibit weight discrimination.*

*Dependent Variable – The prevention of weight based discrimination in San Francisco.*

### **Delimitations**

The study will measure the perception and attitudes of the general public that live or work within the city and county of San Francisco regarding weight bias, specifically to the perception of fatness, and knowledge of laws, other than the Americans with Disability Act, that prohibit weight based discrimination. While San Francisco's public policy to prohibit weight discrimination encompasses any weight or height based discrimination, including fatness or thinness, in employment or housing, this study will focus on the perception of fatness and fat based discrimination in employment when analyzing the public policy.

### **Assumptions**

1. Respondents to the internet based survey live or work within the city or county of San Francisco and did not use a fraudulent zip code.
2. Respondents to the survey did not use multiple internet locations to bypass the survey tool limitation to one response per internet protocol address.
3. Of the survey respondents who stated they were aware of laws prohibiting weight based discrimination, it was assumed those respondents' knowledge was that of San Francisco's public policy to prohibit weight based discrimination.

## **LITERATURE REVIEW**

There are few jurisdictions or municipalities within the United States that employ laws to prohibit weight based discrimination. The states of Michigan and the District of Columbia both have state laws prohibiting weight based discrimination, as well as the cities of Santa Cruz and San Francisco, both within the state of California.

However, there is little recourse for persons who are not protected by these jurisdictions and many have relied on laws such as the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). However, remedies under the ADA have varied greatly, as most persons who have sought protection under the ADA have only been able to do so, "...by showing that they were "morbidly obese" (defined as being in excess of 100 lbs. or 100% over maximum recommended weight and that this qualified them as "disabled" (Brownell, Puhl, Schwartz, and Rudd, 2005, p. 23). Further, judiciary and legislative measures at the state and federal levels have failed to protect persons who do not fall within the "morbidly obese" category, yet still face weight based discrimination. This failure has prompted laws at a local level, and in July 2001, the San Francisco Human Rights Commission issued compliance guidelines to prohibit weight based discrimination.

These compliance guidelines defined weight as "...total body weight, the ratio of a person's weight in relation to height or an individual's unique physical composition of weight through body size, shape, and proportions." However, it further defined weight as the "...impression of a person as fat or thin, regardless of the numerical measurement" (City and County of San Francisco, 2001, p. 3). Additionally, these guidelines mandate that:

*An Evaluation of San Francisco's Public Policy to  
Prohibit Weight Discrimination*

An individual, employer, agency, landlord, or business establishment must prevent the use of disrespectful language or behavior related to weight or height by its staff, including managers, or by customers and clients at their place of business or while under their control. The person in charge must take corrective action to assure compliance such as telling the person making an offensive remark that the behavior is not allowed.

(City and County of San Francisco, 2001, p. 4).

However, the question remains at how effective the city and county of San Francisco's public policy performs at preventing weight based discrimination. While there is evidence of enforcement of the policy, through mediations handled by the San Francisco Human Rights Commission, there is little knowledge of how effective the policy performs at preventing weight based discrimination. This research seeks to answer this question by analyzing:

1. How the city and county of San Francisco defines, enforces, and evaluates weight based discrimination.
2. What is the public's perception and opinion regarding weight, and discrimination?
3. What is the public's knowledge of laws and regulations, other than the Americans with Disabilities Act, that prohibit weight based discrimination?

## **RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

### **Data Collection – General**

This study utilized a mixture of quantitative and qualitative methods to arrive at the findings including interviews, surveys, and review of secondary literary sources.

### **Qualitative Interviews**

The cooperation of key stakeholders was sought for the study. Three key stakeholders were interviewed (see appendix B and C), including a staff member of the San Francisco Human Rights Commission and two key stakeholders who were heavily involved in the manuscripting of San Francisco's policy to prohibit weight based discrimination. Larry Brinkin of the San Francisco Human Rights Commission was questioned on the formulation, implementation, and evaluation of the policy. Carole Cullum and Marilyn Wann were questioned on their roles in the manuscripting and passage of the public policy. All were able to provide varying degrees of quantitative data about their roles in the formulation of the public policy.

### **Survey on Weight Bias and Knowledge of Public Policy Prohibiting Weight Based Discrimination**

A survey of individual's attitudes regarding weight bias and knowledge of anti-discrimination policy was conducted, using the Internet for participation. Survey tool software developed by Survey Monkey ([www.surveymonkey.com](http://www.surveymonkey.com)) was utilized to create a 14 question survey which was delivered in an online format via email invitation. The survey invitation was emailed to a list of colleagues and friends, with the request to "forward to a friend." However, colleagues and friends were specifically requested to



avoid taking the survey as they may have had knowledge of the researcher's information and be biased in their answers. Solicited responses were also sought via internet bulletin boards on [www.craigslist.org](http://www.craigslist.org) which included "General Discussion," "Local News and Views," and "Rants and Raves." The survey included questions (Appendix D) that measured respondents' perception of fatness, weight bias, and knowledge of laws, other than the Americans with Disabilities Act, that prohibit weight based discrimination.

In an effort to isolate respondents to the geographical area of the city and county of San Francisco, of which the policy being studied applies, respondents were requested to supply their work or home zip code. Any survey responses that included a zip code that was not associated with the city or county of San Francisco were deleted from the data. Further, the internet based survey required respondents to answer all questions and limited each respondent to one response only.

## ANALYSIS

### *Interviews*

In the interview with Larry Brinkin of the San Francisco Human Rights Commission, it was discovered that the triggering mechanism, or "...critical event (or set of events) that converts a routine problem into a widely shared, negative public response" (Gerston, 2004, p. 23) that prompted the city and county of San Francisco to manuscript a public policy to prohibit weight discrimination was a billboard that stated, "When they come, they'll eat the fat ones first." This billboard, as shown below, was purchased by fitness club 24 Hour Fitness®, and depicted an alien's face, suggesting that when alien's invade the earth, fat people will meet their demise first, unless they lose weight.



Source: "Persons of heft protest health club's ad" [www.sfgate.com](http://www.sfgate.com) February 16, 1999

Key stakeholders included fat activists; victims of weight based discrimination, the Board of Supervisors, and any individual, employer, agency, landlord, or business establishment within the city or county of San Francisco. Additionally, any contractor or

sub-contractor that contracts with the city or county of San Francisco must abide by the public policy, regardless of their place of domicile, while they are completing a contract for the city or county of San Francisco.

Upon implementation of the policy, weight and height were added to San Francisco's Administrative Code Chapters 12A, 12B and 12C as well as the San Francisco Municipal/Police Code Article 33, thereby adding height and weight as protected classes with race, color, ancestry, national origin, place of birth, sex, age, religion, creed, disability, sexual orientation, and gender identity. Further, the Human Rights Commission manuscripted the *Compliance Guidelines to Prohibit Weight and Height Discrimination* to apply to the Administrative Code and the Municipal Policy Code.

There was very little, if any, opposition to the manuscripting and implementation of the city ordinance. The San Francisco Chamber of Commerce was invited to testify at hearings and they declined to attend. The absence of the Chamber of Commerce was a surprise to the Human Rights Commission, as Larry Brinkin stated, "Any discrimination law can affect business...in fact does affect business. We expected that they might object, but they didn't. They didn't say were for it either, but they just decided not to comment."

Further, the policy window for the city ordinance was open for success and, "When a window opens, advocates of proposals sense their opportunity and rush to take advantage of it" (Kingdon, 2003, p. 175). In this case, as Carole Cullum recognized, "...the time seemed right...the political mood...who was on the Board of Supervisors..." for a city ordinance to prohibit weight based discrimination to succeed in passage.

The Board of Supervisors unanimously passed the ordinance and the public was formally notified through the media, memos to current businesses and vendors doing

business with the city or county of San Francisco, and updated language on city and county purchase orders and contracts. When asked how favorably companies doing business within the city or county of San Francisco responded to the new policy, Larry Brinkin stated, "...there was almost no response, which we took as a good sign."

The Human Rights Commission has had very few cases in which they have had to enforce the policy and in the cases where they have been sought for assistance, the policy has worked effectively. In one case, aerobics instructor Jennifer Portnick was denied employment with Jazzercise® because of her size. Weighing in at 240 pounds, Ms. Portnick worked out six days a week and had, "...sufficient stamina to lead back-to-back aerobics classes" (Fernandez, 2002). However, Jazzercise® employed a policy that their aerobics instructors look fit and informed Ms. Portnick that she did not fit that category, stating, "Jazzercise sells fitness...a jazzercise applicant must have a higher muscle-fat ratio and look leaner than the public. People must believe Jazzercise will help them improve, not just maintain their level of fitness" (Brownell, Puhl, Schwartz, and Rudd, 2005, p. 217). After mediation through the San Francisco Human Rights Commission, Jazzercise® agreed to change its hiring policy regarding body size and, "...the evaluations of applicants will be based on their skill" (Fernandez, 2002).

However, there is also the concern that there is a lack of knowledge of the law that is contributing to the low incidence of cases. The Human Rights Commission has lost several positions due to budget deficits and has not had the resources to devote to more publicity of the city ordinance. Additionally, these staff shortages and budget cuts have made it difficult for the Human Rights Commission to spend time and resources on evaluating policy performance. Larry Brinkin, Carole Cullum, and Marilyn Wann all

shared a concern for this lack of knowledge and a desire to publicize the ordinance to the general public who might benefit from its existence.

Additionally, it was discovered that even though weight and height have been added to the protected classes of the police code, the criminal penalty, §3308 of Article 33, is not enforceable, because California state law preempts city law, and does not include protection for weight or height discrimination. Therefore, the relief one can seek for weight discrimination through the Human Rights Commission is an investigation, and if it is found that the ordinance was violated, it becomes public record. This public record is can then be used as negative publicity for the violator as well as evidence should the victim seek civil remedies. Further, in the event that any agency that does economic business with the city or county of San Francisco violates the ordinance, that agency can suffer economic sanctions, as the city and county may choose not to continue business with that agency.

However, Marilyn Wann also points out that, "If fat people didn't take it, the whole discrimination thing would be over." Therefore, it is possible that there are individuals who are aware of the city ordinance to prohibit weight based discrimination, which would benefit from it, and simply are not utilizing it.

### *Survey Data*

Survey data indicated that of 111 respondents, 54.1% were female and 45.9% were male. While only 18% of respondents strongly agreed and 24.3% somewhat agreed, that a company should provide reasonable accommodations to fat employees, 42.3% of respondents strongly disagreed and 18% of respondents somewhat disagreed that weight should be included as a protected class in the same manner as race, religion, gender, etc.

*An Evaluation of San Francisco's Public Policy to  
Prohibit Weight Discrimination*

Survey results also indicated that 7.2% of respondents strongly agreed and 12.6% somewhat agreed that weight discrimination is more justifiable than racial or sexual discrimination.

Most significant, were the survey results regarding knowledge of public policy that prohibits weight based discrimination. Of the 111 respondents, 75.7% stated they were not aware, and 18% stated they were not sure, of any laws, other than the Americans with Disabilities Act, that prohibits weight based discrimination.

Further, 51.4% of respondents stated that the topic of weight based discrimination was not included in employee orientation and/or training at their current place of employment. Additionally, 24.32% of survey respondents reported that they have witnessed weight based discrimination at their current place of employment.

## **SUMMARY**

Interviews indicated that the city and county of San Francisco's public policy to prohibit weight based discrimination is effective when it is utilized. However, this utilization is dependent upon the knowledge of the ordinance and victims' desire to seek assistance.

Survey results indicated that weight based discrimination continues to exist, as 19.8% of the respondents stated that weight discrimination is more justifiable than racial or sexual discrimination, 26.13% of respondents reported they would prefer to work with a skinny person rather than an obese person, and 24.32% of survey respondents reported that they have witnessed weight based discrimination at their current place of employment. Additionally, in stark contrast the requirements of the public ordinance, 60.3% of respondents felt that weight should not be a protected class, such as race, gender, sexual orientation, etc.

Moreover, survey results indicated that 93.7% of respondents were unaware of laws, other than the American with Disabilities Act, that prohibit weight based discrimination. This data further validates the concern that the general public of the city and county of San Francisco is not adequately informed of the public policy and therefore, may be violating it.

Additionally, 51.4% of respondents stated that the topic of weight based discrimination was not included in employee orientation and/or training at their current place of employment. This finding suggests that employers within the city and county of San Francisco are not complying with the Human Rights Commission's recommendation that, "...agencies, business establishments, and organizations require all staff including

*An Evaluation of San Francisco's Public Policy to  
Prohibit Weight Discrimination*

managers to receive continuing education in weight and height related issues..." and that "...weight...be included in comprehensive diversity training programs."

Overall, these findings suggest that San Francisco's public policy to prohibit weight based discrimination is effective when it is utilized, it fails in educating the general public of its existence and preventing weight based discrimination.



## **POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS**

### ***Recommendation One***

The Human Rights Commission must increase the publicity of the city ordinance to prohibit weight based discrimination. There must be more publicity at the community level to increase the public knowledge that such an ordinance exists, not only for victims to seek remedy, but also for prevention.

The public's value in the city ordinance plays a large factor in its successful performance. Greater public knowledge of the ordinance would increase demand for its use and that increased demand would provide the Human Rights Commission with the justification for additional funding and resources to effectively enforce the policy.

### ***Recommendation Two***

The Human Rights Commission must take a more assertive role in the recommendation that agencies, businesses, employers, and organizations require all staff and managers to receive continuing education or comprehensive diversity training programs in weight related issues, and *require* them to do so. The survey data indicates that very few agencies, businesses, employers, and organizations are complying with this recommendation, and failure to provide this training further prevents the publicity of the city ordinance. Requiring agencies, businesses, employers, and organizations to require staff and managers to receive training programs in weight related issues not only helps to prevent violation of the ordinance, it educates the public about its existence.

***Recommendation Three***

Weight based discrimination must be recognized and prohibited on a state level. Grouping weight based discrimination with state and federally protected classes in the municipal Article 33 Police Code, only to exclude it from criminal enforcement, weakens the policy and is a disservice to the general public. Not every violator of the city ordinance is concerned with their behavior being recorded as public record or receiving bad publicity. Further, the failure to provide equal remedies to weight based discrimination to the general public, does little to encourage the promulgation and utilization of the city ordinance.

Moreover, if the city and county of San Francisco values the need for public policy to prohibit weight based discrimination, and chooses to classify weight as an equally protected class as other state and federally protected classes, it should be prepared to enforce it as such.

## **CONCLUSION**

While laws exist to protect against weight based discrimination, such laws are few and exist at the local level. Further, there is little knowledge of these laws and public perception indicates that weight based discrimination flourishes. Local laws to prohibit weight based discrimination do little to help educate the general public about the negative ramifications of such bias, if they are not enforced consistently or effectively.

Contributory to the lack of law awareness, there appears to be limited academic resources on weight based discrimination and fat based studies. However, the existence of such local laws have provoked interest in fat studies and provide promise that state and federal protection against weight based discrimination is a possibility.

## **REFERENCES**

- Brownell, K.D., Puhl, R.M., Schwartz, M.B., and Rudd, L. (2005). *Weight Bias: Nature, Consequences, and Remedies*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- City of San Francisco. *Police Code Article 33*.
- City and County of San Francisco. (July 26, 2001). *Compliance Guidelines to Prohibit Weight and Height Discrimination*.
- Discrimination. (n.d.). Dictionary.com Unabridged (v 1.1). Retrieved December 20, 2006, from Dictionary.com website:  
<http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/discrimination>
- Fernandez, E. (May 7, 2002). Exercising Her Right to Work: Fitness instructor wins weight-bias fight. Retrieved from [www.sfgate.com](http://www.sfgate.com) on December 11, 2006.
- Gerston, L.N. (2004). *Public Policy Making: Policy and Principles*. Armonk, New York: M.E. Sharpe.
- Kingdon, J. W. (2003). *Agendas, Alternatives, and Public Policies*. 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed. New York: Addison-Wesley.
- Torassa, U. (February 16, 1999). Persons of heft protest health club's ad. Retrieved from [www.sfgate.com](http://www.sfgate.com) on December 10, 2006.

## **Interviews**

Larry Brinkin, San Francisco Human Rights Commission

Carole Cullum, Cullum & Sena

Marilyn Wann, Activist and Author

## **Survey**

The perception of weight and bias, and the knowledge of existing law. Administered on [www.surveymonkey.com](http://www.surveymonkey.com) December, 2006.

## **APPENDIX A**

### **Definitions**

For the purposes of this study, **weight** is defined as the "...total body weight, the ratio of a person's weight in relation to height or an individual's unique physical composition of weight through body size, shape, and proportions" (City and County of San Francisco, 2001, p. 3).

**Discrimination** is defined as "Treatment or consideration of, or making a distinction in favor of or against, a person or thing based on the group, class, or category to which that person or thing belongs rather than on individual merit" (Dictionary.com) and in this instance, refers to weight based discrimination or bias.

**Public policy** is defined as "...the combination of basic decisions, commitments, and actions made by those who hold or affect government positions of authority" (Gerston, 2004, p. 7) and in this case, refers to laws, ordinances, or policies.

**General public** is defined as citizens who live or work within the city or county of San Francisco and in this case, are also subject to comply with city and county laws, ordinances, and guidelines.

**APPENDIX B**  
**Interview questions for Larry Brinkin of the  
San Francisco Human Rights Commission**

1. What was the triggering mechanism that prompted the policy formation?
2. Who were the stakeholders?
3. Was the public formally informed of the new policy and if so, how?
4. How favorably did businesses within the city and county limits receive the new policy?
5. Has San Francisco's public policy to prohibit weight based discrimination been used since its inception?
6. Do you find many cases where the policy has been violated?
7. How has policy effectiveness been evaluated?

**APPENDIX C**

**Interview questions for Carole Cullum and Marilyn Wann**

1. What was your role in the manuscripting and implementation of San Francisco's policy to prohibit weight based discrimination?
2. How much do you feel the Board of Supervisors valued the necessity of the ordinance?
3. After five to six years of implementation, how effective do you feel the policy has worked?
4. What changes would you recommend to the existing policy to make it more effective?

**APPENDIX D**  
**Survey on Weight Bias and Knowledge of Public Policy Prohibiting Weight Based  
Discrimination**

The researcher conducted an Internet survey utilizing SurveyMonkey survey tools ([www.surveymonkey.com](http://www.surveymonkey.com)). The survey invitation was emailed to a list of colleagues and friends, with the request to "forward to a friend," however, colleagues and friends were specifically requested to avoid taking the survey as they may have knowledge of the researcher's information and be biased in their answers. In addition, students in the EMPA program at Golden Gate University were invited to participate as well as the general public who visited bulletin boards included on [www.craigslist.org](http://www.craigslist.org), which included "General Discussion," "Local News and Views," and "Rants and Raves."

The survey included the following questions:

**In an effort to access the perception of weight and bias, and to utilize this information for a student research paper, please complete this survey only if you live or work in the city or county of San Francisco. Your anonymity is guaranteed. Thank you.**

**1. Please indicate your gender**

☐ Male

**2. Please enter your San Francisco work or home zip code**

**3. Fat people are viewed negatively and therefore, should not work in high profile assignments or jobs with exposure to the public, such as sales or public service.**

☐ Agree      Somewhat Agree      Neutral      Somewhat Disagree      Strongly Disagree



**4. Fat people lack the respect of their peers and therefore would not be successful managers.**

☐ Agree    ☐ Somewhat Agree    Neutral    ☐ Somewhat Disagree    ☐ Strongly Disagree

**5. A company should provide reasonable accommodations to fat employees as long as it doesn't change the job function or it's not too expensive.**

☐ Agree    ☐ Somewhat Agree    Neutral    ☐ Somewhat Disagree    ☐ Strongly Disagree

**6. Do you feel that a person's weight is indicative of their work habits?**

☐ No    ☐ Not Sure

**7. Would you prefer to work with a "skinny" person rather than someone who is obese?**

☐ No    ☐ Does Not Matter

**8. An individual's body size, shape, proportions, and composition may make them appear fat or thin regardless of their actual weight.**

☐ Agree    ☐ Somewhat Agree    Neutral    ☐ Somewhat Disagree    ☐ Strongly Disagree

**9. Weight should be included as a protected class in the same manner as race, gender, religion, sexual orientation, etc.**

☐ Agree    ☐ Somewhat Agree    Neutral    ☐ Somewhat Disagree    ☐ Strongly Disagree

**10. Weight discrimination is more justifiable than racial or sexual discrimination.**

☐ Agree    ☐ Somewhat Agree    Neutral    ☐ Somewhat Disagree    ☐ Strongly Disagree

**Please answer the following questions regarding your knowledge of weight and discrimination.**

**11. Other than the Americans with Disabilities Act, are you aware of any laws that protect against weight discrimination?**

☐ No    ☐ Not Sure

**12. Are there any guidelines at your current place of employment or school that prohibit weight discrimination?**

☐ No    ☐ Not Sure

**13. Is the topic of weight discrimination included in employee orientation and/or training at your current place of employment or school?**

☐ No    ☐ Not Sure

**14. Have you ever witnessed weight discrimination in your current place of employment or school?**

☐

No

Not  
Sure

**APPENDIX E  
Raw Data**

<b>Please indicate your gender</b>	<b>Response Total</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Female</b>	60	54.05%
<b>Male</b>	51	45.95%
<b>Total Respondents</b>	111	100.00%

**Fat people are viewed  
negatively and therefore  
should not work in high  
profile assignments or jobs  
with exposure to the public  
such as sales or public  
service.**

	<b>Response Total</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Strongly Agree</b>	6	5.41%
<b>Somewhat Agree</b>	16	14.41%
<b>Neutral</b>	9	8.11%
<b>Somewhat Disagree</b>	26	23.42%
<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	54	48.65%
<b>Total Respondents</b>	111	100.00%

**Fat people lack the respect  
of their peers and therefore  
would not be successful  
managers.**

	<b>Response Total</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Strongly Agree</b>	4	3.60%
<b>Somewhat Agree</b>	11	9.91%
<b>Neutral</b>	6	5.41%
<b>Somewhat Disagree</b>	26	23.42%
<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	64	57.66%
<b>Total Respondents</b>	111	100.00%

**A company should provide  
reasonable  
accommodations to fat  
employees as long as it  
doesn't change the job  
function or it's not too  
expensive.**

	<b>Response Total</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Strongly Agree</b>	20	18.02%
<b>Somewhat Agree</b>	27	24.32%
<b>Neutral</b>	26	23.42%
<b>Somewhat Disagree</b>	14	12.61%

*An Evaluation of San Francisco's Public Policy to  
Prohibit Weight Discrimination*

<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	24	21.62%
<b>Total Respondents</b>	111	100.00%

**Do you feel that a person's weight is indicative of their work habits?**

	<b>Response Total</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Yes</b>	15	13.51%
<b>No</b>	77	69.37%
<b>Not Sure</b>	19	17.12%
<b>Total Respondents</b>	111	100.00%

**Would you prefer to work with a "skinny" person rather than someone who is obese?**

	<b>Response Total</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Yes</b>	29	26.13%
<b>No</b>	10	9.01%
<b>Does Not Matter</b>	72	64.86%
<b>Total Respondents</b>	111	100.00%

**An individual's body size shape proportions and composition may make them appear fat or thin regardless of their actual weight.**

	<b>Response Total</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Strongly Agree</b>	18	16.22%
<b>Somewhat Agree</b>	54	48.65%
<b>Neutral</b>	19	17.12%
<b>Somewhat Disagree</b>	14	12.61%
<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	6	5.41%
<b>Total Respondents</b>	111	100.00%

**Weight should be included as a protected class in the same manner as race gender religion sexual orientation etc.**

	<b>Response Total</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Strongly Agree</b>	11	9.91%
<b>Somewhat Agree</b>	17	15.32%
<b>Neutral</b>	16	14.41%
<b>Somewhat Disagree</b>	20	18.02%
<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	47	42.34%
<b>Total Respondents</b>	111	100.00%

*An Evaluation of San Francisco's Public Policy to  
Prohibit Weight Discrimination*

**Weight discrimination is  
more justifiable than racial  
or sexual discrimination.**

	<b>Response Total</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Strongly Agree</b>	8	7.21%
<b>Somewhat Agree</b>	14	12.61%
<b>Neutral</b>	14	12.61%
<b>Somewhat Disagree</b>	25	22.52%
<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	50	45.05%
<b>Total Respondents</b>	111	100.00%

**Other than the Americans  
with Disabilities Act are  
you aware of any laws that  
protect against weight  
discrimination?**

	<b>Response Total</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Yes</b>	7	6.31%
<b>No</b>	84	75.68%
<b>Not Sure</b>	20	18.02%
<b>Total Respondents</b>	111	100.00%

**Are there any guidelines at  
your current place of  
employment or school that  
prohibit weight  
discrimination?**

	<b>Response Total</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Yes</b>	4	3.60%
<b>No</b>	57	51.35%
<b>Not Sure</b>	50	45.05%
<b>Total Respondents</b>	111	100.00%

**Is the topic of weight  
discrimination included in  
employee orientation  
and/or training at your  
current place of  
employment or school?**

	<b>Response Total</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Yes</b>	2	1.80%
<b>No</b>	86	77.48%
<b>Not Sure</b>	23	20.72%
<b>Total Respondents</b>	111	100.00%

*An Evaluation of San Francisco's Public Policy to  
Prohibit Weight Discrimination*

**Have you ever witnessed  
weight discrimination in  
your current place of  
employment or school?**

	<b>Response Total</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Yes</b>	27	24.32%
<b>No</b>	71	63.96%
<b>Not Sure</b>	13	11.71%
<b>Total Respondents</b>	111	100.00%