

C L O S E D D O O R S

SEXUAL ORIENTATION BIAS IN THE ANCHORAGE HOUSING AND EMPLOYMENT MARKETS

JAY K. BRAUSE

Summary. This paper examines the attitudes and behaviors of 191 employers and 178 landlords in Anchorage toward gay and lesbian employees and tenants. Data for this paper were collected using two 24-question, self-administered survey instruments in the winter of 1987-88. Analysis of these data shows that 31% of the employers and 20% of the landlords would discriminate against Anchorage's gay and lesbian population in work or rental-housing, respectively. A strong relationship exists between those who do not have personal association with a gay man or lesbian and those who would discriminate against gay and lesbian residents of Anchorage. The inverse of this relationship exists among those employers and landlords who have personal association with a gay man or lesbian. Appendices B, C, D, and E (in the back of Identity Reports) contain a full record of all survey questions and responses, as well as a sampling of respondent comments.

CLOSED DOORS

SEXUAL ORIENTATION BIAS IN THE ANCHORAGE HOUSING AND EMPLOYMENT MARKETS

JAY K. BRAUSE

Harris [Polls], in a [United States] survey conducted in July 1977, asked which of a number of different groups were considered to be discriminated against. Homosexuals headed the list. When asked whether discrimination against the same groups should be prohibited by law, however, homosexuals appeared at the bottom of the list; in other words, homosexuals were seen to be discriminated against more than other groups, but it was not felt necessary to do something about it.

— Connie de Boers, University of Amsterdam

INTRODUCTION

Evidently, a situation similar to the one described by de Boers exists in Anchorage today. In a survey conducted for the Anchorage Equal Rights Commission (Dusenbury, 1981), 92% of Anchorage residents supported the anti-discrimination laws in the municipality. However, in another survey conducted at the University of Alaska Anchorage (Holt, 1986), only 52% of the 207 Anchorage participants supported anti-discrimination protection for the estimated 7,000 to 9,000 gay and lesbian residents of Anchorage.¹

In Alaska today, there is no community which prohibits sexual orientation discrimination; yet in a statewide survey of Alaska's lesbian and gay population in 1985, 37%² of the respondents reported that they had experienced employment or housing discrimination because of their sexual orientation while living in Alaska (Identity, 1986). All together, the respondents cited at least 585 cases of such discrimination against them.

To investigate the conditions discussed in these earlier reports, research was undertaken by Identity Inc. with the cosponsorship of the Municipality of Anchorage Equal Rights Commission to explore the attitudes of employers and landlords in Anchorage toward homosexual employees and tenants. This report reviews the major findings of that exploration.

BACKGROUND

At the time this research was being conducted in the fall of 1987, the Anchorage area had already been in a major recession for over a year. The impact of the recession on the subjects of this research is not known; it is, however, important to know what those conditions were. By the fall of 1987, Anchorage population had fallen from an all-time high of 248,263 in June, 1986 to roughly 220,000 (Fischer, 1988, p. 16). 1987 Alaska federal income tax revenue had fallen 43.2% in relation to the 1986 revenue level (Schmid, 1988). Demographers with the Municipality of Anchorage (MOA) estimated that Anchorage had lost 21,000 jobs since 1986 (1987 Anchorage Population Profile), or almost 24% of all available jobs (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1987).

During the same period, the housing market was doing no better. New construction starts had fallen 92% from an industry high of \$870 million in 1983 to less than \$31 million in 1987 (Fischer, p. 38). Out of 91,298 housing units in Anchorage, 14,000 were vacant in July, 1987 (Yoshimura, 1987). Fourth-quarter vacancy rates in mid-range priced apartments had gone from 1.2% in 1981 to 17.2% in 1987 (Fischer, p. 27). As a result, average monthly rental prices fell 25% to 40% during 1986-88.

METHODS

Two self-administered questionnaires were developed for a mailed survey: one for employers and the other for landlords. The questionnaires were designed with identical questions except for issues unique to employment and rental-housing situations. Questions and format were taken from questionnaires of the Norman, Oklahoma Human Rights Commission, the National Institutes of Mental Health, and the City of Tulsa Community Relations Commission.

The employer sample was randomly selected from a print-out of the Anchorage Telephone Utility's (ATU) directory of business billing accounts after excluding federal, military, coin-operated, and computer/telex telephone numbers. From the remaining 10,202 business accounts, 237 employers were systematically selected and verified. These employers were mailed their first questionnaire in early November, 1987, with a cover letter on the stationery of the Anchorage Equal Rights Commission. In Display 1, the percentage of surveyed businesses is compared to the actual percentage of businesses in Anchorage by standard industry codes (Alaska Department of Labor, 1987, pp. 24-26).

Display 1. Anchorage Business Type by Percentage

Sample (<i>Closed Doors</i> survey)	Actual (Alaska Dept. of Labor records)
1.0 % mining & oil	1.2 % mining & oil
15.2 construction	15.1 construction
3.1 manufacturing	2.2 manufacturing
6.3 transportation, communication	5.8 transportation, communication
29.8 wholesale & retail trade	24.8 wholesale & retail trade
7.9 finance, insurance, and real estate	8.0 finance, insurance, and real estate
35.6 professional, personal, and services	41.1 professional, personal, and services
.5 agriculture, forestry, and fishing	1.2 agriculture, forestry, and fishing
.5 local and state government	.6 local and state government

Landlords were selected by using a 1987 MOA Community Planning Department housing sample that excluded trailers, condominiums, O-lot line homes, and single-family residences. Using a cluster-sampling technique to obtain proportional samples from each area of Anchorage, 245 apartment building locations were selected. Landlords were located for each selected apartment building through additional records research. The first landlord questionnaire, like its employer counterpart, went out on Anchorage Equal Rights Commission stationery in November, 1987. In Display 2 below, the percentage of surveyed apartments is compared to the actual percentage of apartments in Anchorage by structure type.

Display 2. Anchorage Apartment Building Type by Percentage

Sample (<i>Closed Doors</i> survey)	Actual (MOA Community Planning records)
20.8 % 1 - 2 Unit apartments	24.2 % 1 - 2 Unit apartments
27.0 3 - 4 Unit apartments	27.6 3 - 4 Unit apartments
24.7 5 - 19 Unit apartments	26.2 5 - 19 Unit apartments
27.5 20 + Unit apartments	22.0 20 + Unit apartments

Both landlords and employers were sent three additional mailings, including a replacement questionnaire. In early January, 1988, project staff made calls to the remaining respondents who had not returned their mailed questionnaires. By the middle of January, all respondents had been contacted. In total, 191 employers completed their questionnaires (81% of the total sample), and 178 landlords completed their questionnaires (73% of the total sample).

All returned questionnaires were respondent-verified by referencing code numbers on the returned surveys and checked for inconsistencies. When this verification was finished, the code-number master sheet was destroyed. Both surveys have a $\pm 7.5\%$ margin of error with a 95% level of confidence that they represent the entire Anchorage landlord or employer population. For this report, all "don't know" responses were excluded from analysis unless specifically mentioned in the discussion or tables.

FINDINGS

Respondent Profile

Of the 191 employers who participated in *CLOSED DOORS*, 64% were men and 36% were women. Eight percent of the employers were racial minorities. Compared to the general Anchorage population data for ages 18 and over (adjusted to total 100% without those under 18 years old), women and racial minorities are then under-represented among the employers in Anchorage since women comprise 50% of the general population over 18 and racial minorities represent 15% of the total population over 18 (MOA, 1987 *Anchorage Population Profile*).

As for the 178 landlords who responded, 53% were men and 47% were women. Women are then represented comparable to their numbers in the general Anchorage population 18 years and older. But again, racial minorities are not represented in relation to their numbers in Anchorage—only 8% of the surveyed landlords were racial minorities.

The employers were 20 to 74 years old, with a mean age of 41 years. Their household income ranged from \$10,000 to \$1,000,000 per year with a mean income of \$67,400. They employed 0-1,500 (mean of 25.6, median of 4) full-time employees and had 0-200 (mean of 6, median of 2) part-time employees. The landlords were 24 to 76 years old, with a mean age of 43.6 years. Their household income ranged from \$3,000 to \$300,000 per year with a mean income of \$53,000. They managed 1-384 (mean of 25, median of 6) apartments and had 1-307 (mean of 20.7, median of 4.5) apartments occupied at the time of the survey.

Nearly a quarter of the employers (23%) said their company had a written policy or regulation prohibiting discrimination against homosexual employees, and 8% had at least one employee they were aware was homosexual. Eight percent of the landlords said they had a written policy or regulation prohibiting discrimination against homosexual tenants; about one-fifth (18%) of the landlords reported that they had homosexual tenants. Not one of the employers said they had discriminated against a homosexual employee known to them; only one landlord said they had.³

In the first table shown below, five attitudinal questions from the questionnaires are reviewed. Three questions were asked only of employers and two questions were asked only of landlords. All five questions asked employers or landlords if they would take action against an employee or tenant if they had “reason to believe” that an employee or tenant may be homosexual. The answers to these five questions are the central finding of this report: 27% of employers were not willing to hire a gay men or lesbian, and 20% of landlords were not willing to rent to a gay man or lesbian.

Table 1. Bias Toward Homosexual Employees and Tenants

<i>Employers:</i>	<i>Agree</i>		<i>Disagree</i>		<i>Don't Know</i>	
^a Would not Hire	52	27.2 %	115	60.2 %	24	12.6 %
^b Would not Promote	50	26.2	126	66.0	15	7.8
^c Would Fire	35	18.3	142	74.4	14	7.3
<i>Landlords:</i>	<i>Agree</i>		<i>Disagree</i>		<i>Don't Know</i>	
^d Would not Rent	35	19.8 %	131	74.0 %	11	5.2 %
^e Would Evict	16	9.1	147	83.5	13	7.4

Note. All row percentages total 100%. a. χ^2 (2, N=191) = 68.24, $p < .001$ b. χ^2 (2, N=191) = 101.15, $p < .001$ c. χ^2 (2, N=191) = 148.02, $p < .001$ d. χ^2 (2, N=177) = 136.67, $p < .001$ e. χ^2 (2, N=176) = 199.57, $p < .001$

Grouping the statistics from Table 1 results in a comprehensive measure of the discrimination attitudes expressed by employers and landlords: 31% of employers would either not hire, not promote, or would fire someone they thought to be a homosexual; 20% of landlords would either not rent to or would evict someone they thought to be homosexual.

Personal Association

The next two questions assessed how many employers and landlords have a friend or family member who is homosexual. Of the 190 employers responding, 41.6% said they had a friend or family member who is homosexual while 41.0% said they did not. The remaining portion (17.4%) didn't know. Landlords had similar responses. 176 landlords answered this question, with 38.6% saying they had a homosexual friend or family member and 48.3% saying they did not. A much smaller portion (13.1%) didn't know if they had a homosexual family member or friend.

In Table 2 below, answers of the landlords or employers who did or did not have a homosexual friend or family member are cross-tabulated with the five questions dealing with employment or rental discrimination attitudes. Please note that the findings in Tables 2 and 3 are associations and do not necessarily establish a causal relationship.

Of the 67 employers in Table 2 who did not know a homosexual person, 57% would not hire someone they thought to be homosexual. Among the 73 employers who did have personal association with a homosexual person, only 14% would not hire one. Of the 77 landlords who did not know a homosexual person, 34% would not rent to one. Only 9% of the 66 landlords who had a homosexual friend or family member would not rent to someone they thought to be homosexual.

Table 2. Personal Association and Bias Toward Homosexuals

<i>Employers:</i>	<i>Have No Homosexual Friend</i>			<i>Have Homosexual Friend</i>		
	Agree	Disagree		Agree	Disagree	
^a Would not Hire	56.7 %	43.3 %	(n = 67)	13.7 %	86.3 %	(n = 73)
^b Would not Promote	52.1	47.9	(n = 71)	12.2	87.8	(n = 74)
^c Would Fire	40.3	59.7	(n = 72)	5.4	94.6	(n = 74)
<i>Landlords:</i>	<i>Have No Homosexual Friend</i>			<i>Have Homosexual Friend</i>		
	Agree	Disagree		Agree	Disagree	
^d Would not Rent	33.8 %	66.2 %	(n = 77)	9.0 %	91.0 %	(n = 66)
^e Would Evict	14.9	85.1	(n = 74)	6.0	94.0	(n = 66)

Note. "Don't know" responses were deleted. All row percentages total 100%. (n = the combined sample number of agree/disagree responses for each row.)
a. $z = 5.36, p < .01$ b. $z = 5.17, p < .01$ c. $z = 5.04, p < .01$ d. $z = 3.53, p < .01$ e. $z = 1.68, p < .05$

Moral and Political Belief

A question dealing with moral beliefs about homosexuality elicited a strong anti-homosexual bias from many of the surveyed employers and landlords. Among the employers, 61.1% agreed with the statement that homosexuality is morally wrong; 26.3% disagreed and said it is not morally wrong, while 12.6% didn't know. Among the landlords in the sample, 61.3% agreed with the statement that homosexuality is morally wrong; 28.9% disagreed, and 9.8% didn't know.

When these responses were cross-tabulated to personal association with a homosexual person, a large shift occurred. Ninety-three percent of the employers who did not have a homosexual friend or family member believed homosexuality is morally wrong, while 54% of those employers who had such a friend or family member believed homosexuality is not morally wrong. Eighty-five percent of the landlords who did not have a homosexual friend or family member believed homosexuality is morally wrong, while 51% of the landlords who had a homosexual friend or family member believed homosexuality is not morally wrong. The question of moral belief, although helpful for understanding anti-homosexual bias, was not as uniformly significant as personal association and political viewpoint when applied to other variables.

As shown by Araji & Smoke (1989), the political viewpoint of the employers and landlords proved to be an important variable. In a 1986 survey of Anchorage residents (Holt), 29.6% of the sampled respondents said they were political conservatives, 46.6% said they were moderates, and 23.8% said they were liberals. In this study's sample, 37% of the employers identified themselves as political conservatives, 50.5% as moderates, and 12.5% as liberals. Among the landlords, 36.8% identified themselves as conservatives, 44.4% as moderates, and 18.7% as liberals.

Consequently, this sample is slightly more conservative and slightly less liberal than the general population sample of Anchorage. These differences in political viewpoint within the employer/landlord sample help explain the variance in the support for, or opposition to, legal protections for gay men and lesbians in Anchorage. Of particular importance to the issues examined in this study is the finding that those with a conservative viewpoint were also the least likely to support anti-discrimination protections for lesbians and gay men. This is discussed in the next section.

Ordinance Support

Combining employer and landlord response to survey questions pertaining to anti-discrimination laws gave the following results: 71% supported local legal protections against discrimination on the basis of sex (29% opposed); 72% supported local protections on the basis of age; 72% because of race; 61% because of one's religion; and 57% on the basis of someone's marital status. Less than half (43%) of Anchorage's landlords and employers supported anti-discrimination laws to protect lesbians and gay men.

Table 3 examines how support for an anti-discrimination law for lesbians and gay men varies—and possibly, why it differs as it does—through cross-tabulation of the responses to three central queries of this study:

1. Does the employer or landlord support or oppose a local ordinance to protect lesbians and gay men from discrimination.

2. Does the employer or landlord have or not have a homosexual friend or family member.
3. Does the employer or landlord have a conservative, moderate, or liberal political viewpoint.

The results shown in Table 3 are particularly significant because of the wide shifts in support for, or opposition to, an anti-discrimination ordinance as expressed in the three political viewpoints. For instance, among the combined employers and landlords who consider themselves conservative ($n=104$), 75% oppose and 25% support such an ordinance. Liberals ($n=41$), on the other hand, support adoption of an anti-discrimination ordinance 76% to 24%. Moderates ($n=114$) support the ordinance 54% to 46%.

Nevertheless, by combining the three political viewpoints of the employers and landlords who know lesbians or gay men personally ($n=124$), the findings show that 64% of this group support an ordinance prohibiting sexual orientation discrimination. In contrast, when the three political viewpoints are combined for the employers and landlords who do not know lesbians or gay men personally ($n=135$), only 29% of this group support such an ordinance.

Table 3. Ordinance Support, Personal Association and Political Viewpoint

<i>Employers:</i>	<i>Support Ordinance</i>		<i>Oppose Ordinance</i>	
^a Have Homosexual Friend				
<i>Conservative</i>	9	42.9%	12	57.1%
<i>Moderate</i>	21	70.0	9	30.0
<i>Liberal</i>	14	93.3	1	6.7
<i>Employers:</i>	<i>Support Ordinance</i>		<i>Oppose Ordinance</i>	
^b Have No Homosexual Friend				
<i>Conservative</i>	3	10.3	26	89.7
<i>Moderate</i>	12	40.0	18	60.0
<i>Liberal</i>	1	25.0	3	75.0
<i>Landlords:</i>	<i>Support Ordinance</i>		<i>Oppose Ordinance</i>	
^c Have Homosexual Friend				
<i>Conservative</i>	8	42.1%	11	57.9%
<i>Moderate</i>	17	65.4	9	34.6
<i>Liberal</i>	10	76.9	3	23.1
^d Have No Homosexual Friend				
<i>Conservative</i>	6	17.1	29	82.9
<i>Moderate</i>	11	39.3	17	60.7
<i>Liberal</i>	6	66.7	3	33.3

Note. "Don't know" responses were deleted. All row percentages total 100%. a. $\chi^2 (2, n=66) = 10.307, p < .01$ b. $\chi^2 (2, n=63) = 6.845, p < .05$ c. $\chi^2 (2, n=58) = 4.410, p > 0.1$ d. $\chi^2 (2, n=72) = 9.212, p < .01$

This paper focused on variables dealing with moral belief, political viewpoint, and personal association because of their importance in analyzing data for this subject (Beatty & Walter, 1984; Gallup Organization, 1977, 1982, 1987; Schneider & Lewis, 1984; Araj & Smoke, 1989). Particular emphasis was placed on analyzing the effect of personal association because of its relation to attitudinal change (Lance, 1987; Black & Stevenson, 1986; Hansen, 1982). Analysis of other variables would be valuable, also, particularly those of religious affiliation, education, age and sex. This is work which will be continued in a future paper.

DISCUSSION

"Evidence shows that 'Gay Rights' laws are unnecessary and establishes that homosexuals have not been injured by pervasive societal discrimination."

— Roger Magnuson, 1985⁴

Mr. Magnuson's position is widely-held; it is also incorrect. In 1987 alone, there were 7,008 reported incidents of anti-gay/lesbian violence in the United States, an increase of 30% over 1986 (National Gay and Lesbian Task Force). Twenty-four states and the District of Columbia criminalize private sexual behavior between consenting adults of the same sex (Greenhouse, 1986). In two separate studies by Bell and Weinberg (1978, p. 246) and Joseph Harry (1982, p. 550), the researchers found that 15 to 16% of the gay men they interviewed had been threatened with exposure of their homosexuality to extract payment for silence. In Alaska, 37% of the lesbian and gay population surveyed in 1985 suffered from discrimination in the workplace or home; 108 of them had been physically assaulted, and 73 had property damaged by people intent on harming them because of their sexual orientation (Identity, p. 39).

These figures do not reflect the full impact of such discrimination—many gay and lesbian Alaskans live in fear of losing their jobs or housing—23% believe their current employer would fire them if they found out about their homosexuality. Their fear is not unwarranted: 18% of the employers in this study said they would fire an employee they thought to be homosexual and 9% of the landlords said they would evict a tenant they thought to be homosexual. Furthermore, research by McKirnan and Peterson (1986) found that "discrimination is substantially more common among those [homosexual] people who are out to more people." As a protective response, at least 53% of Alaska's lesbians and gay men hide their sexual orientation from their employer (Identity, 1986). Unfortunately, keeping one's sexual orientation private cannot assure freedom from discrimination. In an Anchorage tenant survey ($n=43$) conducted for the Anchorage Community Housing Resources Board by Robert McKnight (1987, p. 11), McKnight found:

Seven out of ten persons sampled [who had suffered housing discrimination] claimed they were asked an excessive amount of "personal" information while trying to rent. . . . Sexual preference or sexual orientation was the third excessive question. This inquiry [by landlords of prospective tenants] was recalled by almost 1 in every 4 persons.

Contrasted with this environment of discrimination and need for secrecy, is what potentially happens as people get to know gay men and lesbians personally. The employers and landlords in this study who had a friend or family member who was homosexual were approximately four times less likely to discriminate against a homosexual person than those who did not have a homosexual friend or family member (Table 2). Moreover, employers and landlords who had a homosexual friend or family member also supported local legal protections against sexual orientation discrimination by greater than a two-to-one margin (64% to 29%) over those who did not have a homosexual friend or family member. This difference in attitude is documented in national research as well. William Schneider and I. A. Lewis (1984, p. 18) write:

Among Americans nationwide who personally know an open homosexual, 35 percent were 'negative' [toward homosexuals] on our index. Among those who did not know an open homosexual, the figure was much higher — 61 percent. . . . What counted was knowing someone who was *openly* homosexual.

This difference in perspective has likely consequences in public policy and law: 42% of the employers and 39% of the landlords in this study know a gay man or lesbian personally; interestingly, only 43% of the sampled employers and landlords support laws to protect homosexual people from discrimination (57% oppose such laws). Perhaps, if more Alaskans knew gay men and lesbians personally, a majority, rather than a minority of Alaskans, would support laws prohibiting sexual orientation discrimination.

CONCLUSION

The public policy of Anchorage is declared to be equal opportunity for all persons. The Assembly finds that invidious discrimination in employment, housing, public accommodations, education and financing practices based upon race, religion, age, sex, color, national origin, marital status, or physical handicap adversely affects the welfare of the community. Accordingly, such discrimination is prohibited.

— Anchorage Municipal Code 5.10.010

In 1966, a housing study prepared by students at Alaska Methodist University (Selkregg, Elsasser, Christensen, & Nash, 1966) for the Alaska State Commission for Human Rights reported that, "Discrimination against Negroes [sic] and Natives does exist in the Anchorage area in relation to the availability of home and apartment rentals." Brooke Marston, who was chairman of the committee for the Citizens' Council for Community Improvements which requested the survey, responded in the *Anchorage Daily News* of March 3, 1966, "We are truthfully shocked by the results of the survey," particularly, he added, when it is considered that 86 cases of the 150 contacted "could have lead [sic] to court action and indictments."

The release of the housing study and the resultant community reaction to the discrimination faced by racial minorities in Anchorage helped establish the Human Relations Commission in the City of Anchorage in 1966.⁵ In 1975 Anchorage residents approved a unified city and borough government charter that also created the Anchorage Equal Rights Commission as the Human Relations Commission's successor. In that charter, a specific section (AMC 5.20.01) defined what discrimination was and what groups were to be protected from that discrimination:

'Discrimination' means any direct or indirect act or practice of exclusion, distinction, segregation, limitation, refusal, denial or any other act or practice of differentiation or preference in the treatment of a person or persons because of race, religion, age, sex, color, national origin, marital status, or physical handicap, or the aiding, abetting, inciting, coercing or compelling thereof.

This definition, of course, recognized many of the groups who had suffered from prejudice and discrimination historically. However, if the evidence available in 1976 proved that certain groups needed legal protection from discrimination in Anchorage, then the evidence today proves that gay and lesbian people, as a group, need protection from discrimination, also. Charles Royer, Mayor of Seattle, stated the need for such laws well when he said:

[T]here remains much evidence of outright discrimination throughout the nation [against gay and lesbian people]. The overall effect of such open, unchecked bigotry is to render a large segment of the country's citizenry unable to obtain employment, housing, and respect in the vital atmosphere of freedom. This oppression bridges every religious, economic, ethnic and social affiliation and, as a result, affects the quality of life for all our citizens. —Testimony before the Subcommittee on Employment Opportunities, Committee on Education and Labor, U.S. House of Representatives. January 27, 1982.

The effort to protect the civil rights of gay and lesbian citizens has only just begun. As of the summer of 1988, 91 cities, states, or counties throughout the United States have adopted laws or policies to lessen discrimination against gay men and lesbians (NGLTF, 1988). Perhaps Anchorage will soon join them. In Holt's 1986 poll of Anchorage residents, 72% agreed with the statement "A homosexual man or woman should be treated the same as any other person." By agreeing with this statement, a majority said they will treat their homosexual neighbors, friends, and family members the same as any other person; by disagreeing with this statement, a minority said they will not. This is the problem we face: Equal opportunity cannot fully exist for a people where there is opposition to that people receiving equal treatment.

In 1966 residents of Anchorage discovered that racial minorities were not always treated as others were. Together, citizens and officials acted to ensure that equal treatment was a matter of public policy in Anchorage and that racial discrimination was confronted. In 1989 we have the facts to know that gay and lesbian people are not always treated as others are. How we choose to respond to the discrimination faced by lesbians and gay men will affect lesbian and gay people and our relations with them for years to come.

Notes:

1. Conservatively figured as 3 - 4% of the total 1988 Anchorage population (Fay, et al, 1989; U.S. Public Health Service, 1986).
2. This figure and the figure for incidents of discrimination were calculated for this report from the original data of *ONE IN TEN*.
3. Only two of the fifteen employers who said they had homosexual employees said they would discriminate against homosexuals, and only four of the 31 landlords who said they had homosexual tenants said they would discriminate against homosexuals.
4. Roger Magnuson is an attorney who wrote *Are Gay Rights Right?* for the Berean League, a Minneapolis-based organization which addresses important issues of the day from a conservative religious perspective.
5. In the 1966 Annual Report of the Alaska State Commission for Human Rights (pp. 4 - 5), the formation of the Anchorage Human Relations Commission (which later became the Anchorage Equal Rights Commission) was discussed:

On March 22, 1966, [State] Commission Chairman Fred Selkregg, and the director gave testimony before the [City] Council of the obvious need for the [Anchorage] commission. Many others appeared also in favor of it. After due deliberation, the City Council passed the ordinance which created the [Anchorage Human Relations] commission [on June 14, 1966]. On September 30, 1966, the Mayor named the nine members to the [AHR] commission.

References:

- Anchorage Daily News*. "Human Relations Commission Is Urged for the Anchorage Area." March 3, 1966: p. 2.
- Anchorage Times*. "As jobs decrease, so does city population." Sept. 29, 1987: p. B-1.

- Araji, Sharon K. & Gale Smoke. (1989, April). "Demographic Characteristics and Tolerance of Homosexuality" Paper presented at the Pacific Sociological Association, Reno, Nevada.
- Beatty, Kathleen Murphy, & Walter, Oliver. (1984). "Religious Preference and Practice: Reevaluating Their Impact on Political Tolerance." *Public Opinion Quarterly* v48: pp. 318-329.
- Bell, A., & Weinberg, M. (1978). *Homosexualities*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Black, K. N., & Stevenson, M. R. (1986). "Some factors which result in a more positive attitude toward homosexuality." Manuscript submitted for publication.
- de Boers, Connie. (1978). "The Polls: Attitudes toward Homosexuality." *Public Opinion Quarterly*. Summer v42: pp. 266-276.
- Dusenbury, Jr., Charles E. (1982). *The Anchorage Equal Rights Commission Public Survey*. Anchorage: Anchorage Equal Rights Commission.
- Fay, Robert E., Turner, Charles F., Klassen, Albert D. & Gagnon, John H. (1989). "Prevalence and Patterns of Same-Gender Sexual Contact Among Men." *Science* v243: pp. 338-348.
- Fischer, Victor. (1988). *Anchorage Recovery Program: Review of Economic Factors*. Anchorage: Municipal Printing Office.
- Gallup Organization. *Opinion Index for October 1977, October 1982, March 1987*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Opinion Press.
- Greenhouse, Linda. "Privacy Law and History." *New York Times*, July 1, 1986: pp. A1, 19.
- Hansen, Gary L. (1982). "Measuring Prejudice Against Homosexuality (Homosexism) Among College Students: A New Scale." *The Journal of Social Psychology* August 117: pp. 233-236.
- Harry, Joseph. (1982). "Derivative Deviance." *Criminology* v19/4: pp. 546-563.
- Holt, Doty. (1986). [Community Attitudes Toward Homosexuality] Unpublished data. University of Alaska Anchorage, Department of Sociology.
- Identity, Inc. (1986). *One In Ten: A Profile of Alaska's Lesbian & Gay Community*. Anchorage: Identity, Inc.
- Johnston, Kathy (1978). *Community Attitudes on Homosexuality and About Homosexuals*. Norman, Oklahoma: Norman Human Rights Commission.
- Lance, Larry M. (1987). "The Effects of Interaction with Gay Persons on Attitudes Toward Homosexuality." *Human Relations* v40/6: pp. 329-336.
- Levitt, Eugene E. & Klassen, Albert D. (1971). *Public Attitudes Toward Sexual Behaviors: The Latest Investigation of the Institute for Sex Research*. Unpublished manuscript. Rockville, MD: National Institute for Mental Health.
- Magnuson, Roger. (1985). *Are "Gay Rights" Right? A Report on Homosexuality and the Law*. Minneapolis: The Berean League.
- McKirnan, David J., & Peterson, Peggy L. (1986). "Gay & Lesbian Social Issues Survey." March 12, 1987. *Windy City Times*.
- McKnight, Robert (1987). *Unfair Rental Housing Practices reported by Prospective Tenants*. Anchorage: Community Housing Resources Board of Anchorage.
- Municipality of Anchorage, Department of Community Planning. *Anchorage Population Profile 1987*. Anchorage: Municipal Printing Office.
- Myers, Victoria A. (1976). *Sexual Preference Study*. Tulsa: City of Tulsa Community Relations Commission.
- National Gay and Lesbian Task Force. (1988). *Anti-Gay Violence, Victimization and Defamation in 1987*. Washington, DC: NGLTF.
- National Gay and Lesbian Task Force. (1988). *Gay Rights Ordinances in the United States*. Washington, DC: NGLTF.
- Schmid, Randolph E. "Alaska tops nation in tax revenue drop." (Associated Press) *Anchorage Times*. April 21, 1988: p. B-1.
- Schneider, William & Lewis, I. A. (1984). "The Straight Story on Homosexuality and Gay Rights." *Public Opinion* Feb/March: pp. 16-60.
- Selkregg, Alicia, Elsasser, D., Christensen, M., & Nash, J. (1966). *Housing Study of Anchorage Area*. Anchorage: Alaska Methodist University.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce. (1987). *County Business Patterns, 1985*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- U.S. Public Health Service. (1986). Public Health Report. No. 101, p. 341.
- Yoshimura, Connie. "Vacancy rate survey shows more bad news." *Anchorage Daily News*. Oct 10, 1987: p. B-5.

A SAMPLING OF EMPLOYER COMMENTS FROM CLOSED DOORS, AS WRITTEN.

22. **What, if any, are your objections to having a homosexual employee in your business?**

I have no objections. I feel a person should be judged on their work abilities. We are a service company and must adhere to the wishes of our customers. If our customers were adamant about a person on our staff which severely limited our ability to be profitable we would be forced to dismiss them.

It might cost us a job if our client has bad feeling towards gays.

I will never work with or knowingly associate with any homosexual.

Would probably catch AIDS — We bleed a lot around this shop & I don't want any AIDS infected blood here.

23. **In general, do you think laws prohibiting discrimination in employment on the basis of sexual orientation are necessary in Anchorage?**

I don't know how much of a problem there is in Anchorage. I'd want the facts first.

No. It is the choice of the owner to determine who works in their business and not the government.

Yes! If the person is qualified he or she should not be discriminated against.

I am not familiar enough with the issue to know if/how much discrimination takes place in Anchorage to know if laws are needed. If a lot of discrimination takes place then yes, it should be prohibited.

No and I would resent it. I would like to hire and fire freely based on ability and productivity. If I over step my bounds then take me to court. I believe there are laws that allow that to be done now. But NO MORE LAWS.

I have no personal knowledge of discrimination of this type, but I feel it is prudent to prevent it by law. I feel individuals have the right to express themselves as such without fear of prejudice, so long as there is no infringement on the rights of others.

Since employers are not heeding current anti-discrimination laws very well, why not? Maybe they will wake up and smell the coffee.

Yes — There free to work just like blacks. But I believe it depends on the person & how discreet they are.

Absolutely not!! As an employer, if I decide a person will not fit in my company, then that is my decision and there is no law that can make my decision different. If I do not like fags, and have trouble being around them, why should I be forced to hire one, or get sued if I don't? They have chosen their lifestyle, and should learn to live with the consequences.

No — there should be laws stating where they can work. They shouldn't work with kids.

24. **Please feel free to use the space below for any other comments you may want to make.**

Many of my personal feelings are uncertain about homosexuals. I am very uncomfortable around a man or woman who acts obviously gay. However, if the person doesn't act differently than the norm, I doubt it would be an issue.

I am uncomfortable with people who act differently from the norm whether they be gay, eccentric or mentally retarded, although I feel I should not be uncomfortable.

I feel we are all human beings and no one should be discriminated against because of age, race, religious preference or sexual orientation. We are all equal!

I certainly would not want to be forced by law to hire & work with a homosexual. This would infringe on my rights.

How comforting to know that in these hard economic times we still have money to waste on this.

Deviant sexual behavior, whether voluntary or involuntary must not be treated as being normal or desirable by society. Recognizing that sexual deviants are not suitable for all positions in society is not discrimination.

The homosexual community has until recent years managed to be successfully employed without government intervention and feel more laws would serve only to protect those that need laws to protect them because they cannot or will not keep their job on merit or production. In general laws and unions protect the screwups not the legitimate law abiding, hard working employee.

Shoot the bastards if this is all that will slow them down.

It should be the right of an employer to establish the style of his business thru discriminatory practices.

A good part of my life I studied and hold the views of a Naturalist. In a wolf pack which still lives as nature intended, any member of the group that cannot conform is eliminated. It works well.

Kill them all, (before they do us). Let God sort them out!

A SAMPLING OF LANDLORD COMMENTS FROM CLOSED DOORS, AS WRITTEN.

22. What, if any, are your objections to having a homosexual tenant in your building?

I have no objection to homosexuals renting my apartments. My experience has been with the three tenants I have classified as homosexuals that they pay rent on time and they are clean and tidy. My criteria for renters is that they are timely on their rent and keep the demised premises in an orderly manner.

... Homosexuality is a blight on society and every civilization that has allowed homosexuality to insidiously pervade it, has failed. Homosexuality is a crime against nature and should be identified as such and we as the trustees of this great country should actively remove it from our society.

My experience has been that the behavior of the homosexuals and the traffic attracted to the apartment building makes heterosexuals in the building very uncomfortable.

I've had them as tenants — were quieter — better tenants all around.

They have vicious fights, loud, strange hours and their perspective is sometimes clouded.

I would not have them as a tenant knowingly because I don't think my other tenants would like it, and they would move.

The same reason I would not rent to an unmarried couple living together or a known drug user. I turned down some of these when my sons were at home, to show that I would not turn my back on what's wrong just to make a dollar. This has more validity today when it is so hard to find tenants.

I believe homosexuality is morally wrong. I probably would never evict someone who was, but I may not rent to someone who is. Their sexual orientation is their own business — just as long as they don't push their beliefs on others.

No objections if they confine their behavior to their apartment.

Other tenants would move out, given my tenants.

It is not morally correct. I've had to move homosexuals on occasion because of other tenant objections.

23. In general, do you think laws prohibiting discrimination in housing on the basis of sexual orientation are necessary in Anchorage?

No — Is there a problem? Its hard to imagine how it would be done. Are people really resorting to asking sexual preference questions on leases?

No, the general public has a greater right to protect themselves from people who chose a homosexual lifestyle. By passing a law which protects the homosexual, the heterosexuals will be discriminated against. And the city will have put a stamp of approval on a "so called" alternate lifestyle which is the cause of the plague of the century. AIDS! 100% Mortality Rate Can't Be Wrong.

No, because every one needs a place to live and call home. As a manager I feel I have a responsibility to others to rent my apartments regardless of his or her sexual orientation.

No, because as far as I'm aware of there is very little discrimination in this area because you don't always know who is gay.

I believe there should be a law against discrimination in any way. You rent according to a persons ability to pay and abide by the general rules.

No — the industry is already overregulated. The rights of the owner should be considered above all others.

I don't know — I have never encountered anyone who has been discriminated against because of sexual preference. I personally have not been guilty of discrimination — nor have I discriminated against others — but because I know of people that have been discriminated against and the potential for such acts — there should be a law. There should be a law to allow discrimination against homosexuals.

If there is discrimination, then there should be laws against it.

I don't think they are necessary because people can work it out without legal remedy.

24. Please feel free to use the space below for any other comments you may want to make.

I am as concerned as anyone can be about the health problems associated with homosexuality at this time. I have noticed that over the past few months, people do not tend to make so many jokes about "gays." I think this has to do with the fact that we now realize that we must work together and live together and we are not totally separated from the problems just because we may not be gay. I see a more concerned group of people my age who take this seriously, but definitely do not discriminate because of it. If anything, they are more caring, sensitive to homosexuals.

There is no need for these laws if someone is unwelcome they will not want to live in that residence obviously.

I don't believe there is a problem with homosexual discrimination in Anchorage. We as a management co. might even tend to prefer them as tenants. Our experience has been that they generally exhibit characteristics that we prefer to see in tenants — i.e. pay rent timely, neat, clean non-destructive. There is, however, a racial prejudice that is sometimes hard to overcome and seems to be borne out in fact and experience. Unsettling, but seemingly true.

This question booklet is a waste of money. No landlord is going to evict a decent tenant. Especially in these times!

The one time I rented to 2 homosexual men, I received lots of comments from other tenants. The other tenants seemed to perceive the presence as a sign that the atmosphere of the apartment complex was deteriorating. A few tenants indicated they didn't feel comfortable living around these two men.

CLOSED DOORS EMPLOYER QUESTIONNAIRE AND RESPONSES

YOU & YOUR COMMUNITY

1. For this question, assume that there are no federal, state, or local laws prohibiting discrimination. Given your own experience and observations, which, if any, of the following personal characteristics do you believe should have specific legal protection against discrimination in Anchorage? (Answering "Yes" means you feel it should be protected; answering "No" means you feel it should not be protected)

	YES		NO	
a. Sex	138	74.2 %	48	25.8 %
b. Age	139	75.5	45	24.5
c. Race	141	75.4	46	24.6
d. Color	136	72.7	51	27.3
e. Religion	116	63.7	66	36.3
f. National Origin	118	64.8	64	35.2
g. Marital Status	107	59.1	74	40.9
h. Physical Handicap	131	71.6	52	28.4
i. Mental Impairment	113	63.5	65	36.5
j. Parental Status	110	60.4	72	39.6
k. Sexual Orientation	78	44.1	99	55.9

2. Do you think homosexual men and women should, or should not be allowed to work in the following occupations: a "Yes" answer means they should; a "No" answer means they should not. Please circle "Yes" or "No" in each category for men and women.)

	MEN-YES		MEN - NO		WOMEN - YES		WOMEN - NO	
a. Physician	122	65.2 %	65	34.8 %	124	66.7 %	62	33.3 %
b. Hairstylist	164	86.8	25	13.2	166	87.8	23	12.2
c. Court Judge	117	62.6	70	37.4	118	63.1	69	36.9
d. Janitor	164	87.7	23	12.3	165	87.8	23	12.2
e. High School Teacher	95	50.5	93	49.5	97	51.3	92	48.7
f. Elected Official	133	71.1	54	28.9	135	72.2	52	27.8
g. Bank Teller	165	87.3	24	12.7	166	87.8	23	12.2
h. Personnel Manager	131	70.4	55	29.6	134	72.4	51	27.6
i. Nurse	120	64.5	66	35.5	122	65.6	64	34.4
j. Police Officer	127	67.9	60	32.1	129	68.6	59	31.4
k. Secretary	166	88.8	21	11.2	166	88.8	21	11.2
l. Airline Pilot	151	80.3	37	19.7	152	81.3	35	18.7
m. Carpenter	166	88.3	22	11.7	167	89.3	20	10.7
n. Social Worker	116	62.0	71	38.0	121	64.0	68	36.0
o. Newspaper Editor	141	75.4	46	24.6	142	76.3	44	23.7

3. The following questions are designed to let you express your own beliefs. The responses are as follows: strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree, and don't know. For each statement, circle the number in the column that best reflects your feelings.

	AGREE		DISAGREE		DON'T KNOW	
a. Homosexuality is morally wrong	116	61.1 %	50	26.3 %	24	12.6 %
b. I can tell who is homosexual by how they look and act	48	25.4	122	64.6	19	10.0
c. Anchorage employers should have the right to discharge an employee that they have reason to believe is homosexual	59	31.0	117	60.6	14	7.4
d. Given a choice, I would not associate with someone I had reason to believe was homosexual	68	34.6	103	53.9	20	10.5
e. I would not hire a person I had reason to believe was homosexual	52	27.2	115	60.2	24	12.6

	AGREE		DISAGREE		DON'T KNOW	
f. I would not promote an employee I had reason to believe was homosexual to a supervisory or management position in my company	50	26.2 %	126	66.0 %	15	7.8 %
g. I would discharge an employee that I had reason to believe was homosexual	35	18.3	142	74.4	14	7.3

YOU & YOUR WORKPLACE

In this section, we want to find out some things about the business you work in.

4. What is the approximate number of Anchorage employees in the company you work in?

Full-time employees (range: 0 - 1,500)			Part-time Employees (range: 0 - 200)		
14	7.3 %	0 employees	66	34.6 %	0 employees
84	44.0	1 - 4 employees	87	45.5	1 - 4 employees
68	35.6	5 - 19 employees	24	12.6	5 - 19 employees
14	7.3	20 - 49 employees	5	2.6	20 - 49 employees
6	3.1	50 - 99 employees	7	3.7	50 - 99 employees
5	2.6	100 + employees	1	0.5	100 + employees

5. How would you describe the business you work in?

2	1.0 %	mining & oil
29	15.2	construction
6	3.1	manufacturing
12	6.3	transportation, communication
57	29.8	wholesale & retail trade
15	7.9	finance, insurance, and real estate
68	35.6	professional, personal, and services
1	.5	agriculture, forestry, and fishing
1	.5	local and state government

6. Does the company you work in have a written policy or regulation which prohibits discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation?

44	23.2 %	Yes
137	72.1	No
9	4.7	Don't know

7. Does the company you work in currently employ any homosexual men or women?

15	7.9 %	Yes
98	51.3	No
78	40.8	Don't know

8. To your knowledge, has the company you work in ever discharged an employee because he/she was homosexual?

0	0.0 %	Yes
182	95.8	No
8	4.2	Don't know

YOUR PERSPECTIVE

9. Which point of view do you most often agree with on political/social issues?
- | | | |
|----|--------|----------------------------|
| 68 | 37.0 % | Conservative point of view |
| 93 | 50.5 | Moderate point of view |
| 23 | 12.5 | Liberal point of view |
10. What is your formal religious affiliation at present?
- | | | |
|----|--------|---|
| 32 | 17.0 % | Catholic |
| 2 | 1.1 | Jewish |
| 96 | 51.0 | Protestant |
| 5 | 2.7 | Other |
| 53 | 28.2 | No formal religious affiliation (GO TO QUESTION 12) |
11. Did you take part in religious activities other than a religious service in the past 7 days such as prayer group meetings, Bible reading classes, or the like?
- | | | |
|----|--------|-----------------------|
| 49 | 26.1 % | Yes |
| 86 | 45.7 | No |
| 53 | 28.2 | Skipped this question |
12. Which response best describes your degree of support or opposition toward each of the following statements? For each statement, circle the number in the column that best reflects your feelings. (You may answer as follows: strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree, and don't know.)
- | | AGREE | | DISAGREE | | DON'T KNOW | |
|--|-------|--------|----------|--------|------------|-------|
| a. Classroom prayer should be permitted in public schools | 107 | 57.8 % | 62 | 33.5 % | 16 | 8.7 % |
| b. A woman should be able to have an abortion if she wants one | 137 | 72.5 | 43 | 22.8 | 9 | 4.7 |
| c. The federal government should increase funding for national defense and military programs | 64 | 34.0 | 100 | 53.2 | 24 | 12.8 |
| d. The sale and possession of hand-guns for private citizens should be prohibited by law | 30 | 15.9 | 146 | 77.2 | 13 | 6.9 |
| e. The death penalty should be abolished | 22 | 11.6 | 151 | 79.9 | 16 | 8.5 |
13. Do you have any friends or family members who are homosexual?
- | | | |
|----|--------|------------|
| 79 | 41.6 % | Yes |
| 78 | 41.0 | No |
| 33 | 17.4 | Don't know |
14. Would you favor the passage of an ordinance in Anchorage to prohibit discrimination on the basis of a person's sexual orientation?
- | | | |
|----|--------|------------|
| 69 | 36.3 % | Yes |
| 90 | 47.4 | No |
| 31 | 16.3 | Don't know |

YOUR BACKGROUND

Last, we would like to ask some questions about yourself to help us do the statistical analysis needed for this study.

15. What is your sex?

123	64.4 %	Male
68	35.6	Female

16. What was your age at your last birthday?

6	3.1 %	18 - 24
56	29.3	25 - 34
69	36.1	35 - 44
31	16.2	45 - 54
24	12.6	55 - 64
5	2.6	65 +

17. How long have you lived in Alaska? (range: 1- 48 years)

61	32.0 %	1 - 9 years
73	38.2	10 - 19
23	12.0	20 - 29
23	12.0	30 - 39
11	5.8	40 +

18. What is your marital status?

24	12.6 %	Never married
137	72.1	Married
4	2.1	Separated
21	11.1	Divorced
4	2.1	Widowed
0	0.0	Other

19. Which of the following categories best describes your racial/ethnic background?

5	2.6 %	Alaska Native/American Indian
6	3.2	Asian/Pacific Islander
1	.5	Black
3	1.6	Hispanic
175	92.1	White

20. What is the highest educational level you have completed?

5	2.6 %	Some high school
20	10.5	High school graduate
66	34.6	Some college/technical school but no degree
22	11.5	Two year college/Technical school graduate
38	19.9	Four year college graduate
22	11.5	Some graduate work
18	9.4	Graduate degree

21. What was your approximate household income before taxes in 1986? (range: \$10,000 to \$1,000,000)

8	4.7 %	under \$25,000
57	33.3	\$25,000 - \$49,999
58	33.9	\$50,000 - \$74,999
26	15.2	\$75,000 - \$99,999
22	12.9	over \$100,000

YOUR COMMENTS

We welcome you to use this final page to comment on the next two questions and any other concerns you may have. Please write as much as you would like.

22. What, if any, are your objections to having a homosexual employee in your business?
- | | | |
|----|--------|---------------------------------------|
| 88 | 55.0 % | No objections |
| 33 | 20.6 | Would have adverse impact on business |
| 28 | 17.5 | Morally wrong or undesirable |
| 11 | 6.9 | AIDS contagion fears |
23. In general, do you think laws prohibiting discrimination in employment on the basis of sexual orientation are necessary in Anchorage?
- | | | |
|----|--------|----------------------------|
| 37 | 21.9 % | Yes |
| 92 | 54.4 | No |
| 7 | 4.1 | Yes, if there is a problem |
| 8 | 4.7 | No, give employer a choice |
| 3 | 1.8 | No, no problem aware of |
| 9 | 5.3 | No, enough laws already |
| 13 | 7.7 | Don't know |
24. Please feel free to use the space below for any other comments you may want to make.

CLOSED DOORS LANDLORD QUESTIONNAIRE AND RESPONSES

YOU & YOUR COMMUNITY

1. For this question, assume that there are no federal, state, or local laws prohibiting discrimination. Given your own experience and observations, which, if any, of the following personal characteristics do you believe should have specific legal protection against discrimination in Anchorage? (Answering "Yes" means you feel it should be protected; answering "No" means you feel it should not be protected)

	YES		NO	
a. Sex	112	67.1 %	55	32.9 %
b. Age	118	69.0	53	31.0
c. Race	116	68.6	53	31.4
d. Color	112	66.7	56	33.3
e. Religion	97	57.7	71	42.3
f. National Origin	110	65.1	59	34.9
g. Marital Status	92	54.8	76	45.2
h. Physical Handicap	122	72.2	47	27.8
i. Mental Impairment	120	71.4	48	28.6
j. Parental Status	91	53.9	78	46.1
k. Sexual Orientation	72	43.1	95	56.9

2. The following questions are designed to let you express your own beliefs. The responses are strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree, and don't know. For each statement, circle the number in the column that best reflects your feelings.

	AGREE		DISAGREE		DON'T KNOW	
a. Homosexuality is morally wrong	106	61.3 %	50	28.9 %	17	9.8 %
b. I can tell who is homosexual by how they look and act	27	15.4	129	73.7	19	10.9
c. Anchorage landlords should have the right to evict a tenant that they have reason to believe is homosexual	30	17.0	138	78.4	8	4.6
d. Given a choice, I would not associate with someone I had reason to believe was homosexual	64	36.2	99	55.9	14	7.9
e. I would not rent to a person I had reason to believe was homosexual	35	19.8	131	74.0	11	6.2
f. I would evict a tenant that I had reason to believe was homosexual	16	9.1	147	83.5	13	7.4

YOU & YOUR APARTMENTS

In this section, we want to find out some things about the apartments in the building you manage and/or own at the survey address written on the yellow card attached to this questionnaire.

3. In total, how many apartments, occupied or vacant, are in the building at the survey address? (Include manager or owner-occupied apartment)

Total apartments in building (range: 1 - 384) mean: 25 units per address

37	20.8 %	1 - 2 Unit apartments
48	27.0	3 - 4 Unit apartments
25	14.0	5 - 9 Unit apartments
19	10.7	10 - 19 Unit apartments
49	27.5	20 + Unit apartments

4. In total, how many apartments are currently occupied in the building at the survey address? (Include manager or owner-occupied apartment)

Total occupied apartments in building (range: 1 - 307) mean: 21 units per address

63 of 70	1 - 2 Unit apartments	10 % vacancy
154 of 175	3 - 4 Unit apartments	12 % vacancy
169 of 203	5 - 9 Unit apartments	17 % vacancy
171 of 212	10 - 19 Unit apartments	19 % vacancy
3,120 of 3,815	20 + Unit apartments	18 % vacancy

5. Including the apartments in the building at the survey address, what is the total number of apartments you personally manage in Anchorage?

Total apartments managed in Anchorage area (1 - 1,200) mean: 50 units

25	14.1 %	1 - 2 Unit apartments	30	17.0 %	20 - 49 Unit apartments
32	18.1	3 - 4 Unit apartments	14	7.9	50 - 99 Unit apartments
20	11.3	5 - 9 Unit apartments	20	11.3	100 - 249 Unit apartments
30	17.0	10 - 19 Unit apartments	6	3.4	250 + Unit apartments

6. As manager or owner of the building at the survey address, do you have a written policy or regulation which prohibits discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation?

15	8.4 %	Yes
158	88.8	No
5	2.8	Don't know

7. Do you currently have homosexual persons living in an apartment you manage or own?

31	17.5 %	Yes
60	33.9	No
86	48.6	Don't know

8. Has a tenant ever been evicted from an apartment you manage or own because he/she was homosexual?

1	0.6 %	Yes
175	98.3	No
2	1.1	Don't know

YOUR PERSPECTIVE

9. Which point of view do you most often agree with on political/social issues?

63	36.8 %	Conservative point of view
76	44.4	Moderate point of view
32	18.7	Liberal point of view

10. What is your formal religious affiliation at present?

19	11.0 %	Catholic
1	0.6	Jewish
91	52.9	Protestant
2	1.2	Other
59	34.3	No formal religious affiliation (GO TO QUESTION 12)

11. Did you take part in religious activities other than a religious service in the past 7 days such as prayer group meetings, Bible reading classes, or the like?

32	18.6 %	Yes
81	47.1	No
59	34.3	Skipped this question

12. Which response best describes your degree of support or opposition toward each of the following statements? For each statement, circle the number in the column that best reflects your feelings. (You may answer as follows: strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree, and don't know)

	AGREE		DISAGREE		DON'T KNOW	
a. Classroom prayer should be permitted in public schools	115	65.7 %	46	26.3 %	14	8.0 %
b. A woman should be able to have an abortion if she wants one	123	70.3	45	25.7	7	4.0
c. The federal government should increase funding for national defense and military programs	66	37.9	87	50.0	21	12.1
d. The sale and possession of hand-guns for private citizens should be prohibited by law	35	19.9	134	76.1	7	4.0
e. The death penalty should be abolished	24	13.7	134	76.6	17	9.7

13. Do you have any friends or family members who are homosexual?

68	38.6 %	Yes
85	48.3	No
23	13.1	Don't know

14. Would you favor the passage of an ordinance in Anchorage to prohibit discrimination on the basis of a person's sexual orientation?

67	38.3 %	Yes
85	48.6	No
23	13.1	Don't know

YOUR BACKGROUND

Last, we would like to ask some questions about yourself to help us do the statistical analysis needed for this study.

15. What is your sex?

93	52.8 %	Male
83	47.2	Female

16. What was your age at your last birthday?

3	1.7 %	18 - 24 years old
39	22.5	25 - 34 years old
59	34.1	35 - 44 years old
40	23.1	45 - 54 years old
20	11.6	55 - 64 years old
12	6.9	65 + years old

17. How long have you lived in Alaska? (range: 0 - 61 years)

54	31.0 %	1 - 9 years
51	29.3	10 - 19
32	18.4	20 - 29
28	16.1	30 - 39
9	5.2	40 +

18. What is your marital status?

22	12.6 %	Never married
121	69.5	Married
1	.6	Separated
26	14.9	Divorced
3	1.7	Widowed
1	.6	Other

19. Which of the following categories best describes your racial/ethnic background?

6	3.4 %	Alaska Native/American Indian
4	2.3	Asian/Pacific Islander
3	1.7	Black
1	.6	Hispanic
160	92.0	White
0	0.0	Other

20. What is the highest educational level you have completed?

5	2.9 %	Some high school
31	17.9	High school graduate
64	37.0	Some college/technical school but no degree
24	13.9	Two year college/Technical school graduate
24	13.9	Four year college graduate
12	6.9	Some graduate work
13	7.5	Graduate degree

21. What was your approximate household income before taxes in 1986? (range: \$3,000 - \$300,000)

28	19.7 %	under \$25,000
51	35.9	\$25,000 - \$49,999
31	21.8	\$50,000 - \$74,999
18	12.7	\$75,000 - \$99,999
14	9.9	\$100,000 +

YOUR COMMENTS

We welcome you to use this final page to comment on the next two questions and any other concerns you may have. Please write as much as you would like.

22. What, if any, are your objections to having a homosexual tenant in your building?

99	65.1 %	No objections
23	15.1	Would have adverse impact on tenants
23	15.1	Morally wrong or undesirable
7	4.6	AIDS contagion fears

23. In general, do you think laws prohibiting discrimination in housing on the basis of sexual orientation are necessary in Anchorage?

20	12.5 %	Yes
90	56.3	No
8	5.0	Yes, if there is a problem
6	3.8	No, give landlords the choice
11	6.9	No, there is no problem aware of
8	5.0	No, enough laws already
17	10.6	Don't know

24. Please feel free to use the space below for any other comments you may want to make.