



The **Opportunity** Agenda

*Building the National Will
to Expand Opportunity in America*

Public Opinion Research
*How to Discuss Specific
Social Justice Issues
Within A Human Rights
Framework*

How to Discuss Specific Social Justice Issues within a Human Rights Framework: Public Opinion Research Findings

Project Overview, Findings, and Acknowledgments

Overview and Findings

The Opportunity Agenda completed in-depth public opinion research in spring 2009 to help advocates build understanding and support for human rights at home. Through a series of focus group discussions, we examine attitudes toward human rights, and how to discuss a range of social justice issues within the context of human rights. Specifically, we looked at:

- Attitudes and effective messages on human rights in the U.S. and international treaties;
- the potential for utilizing a human rights framework in communicating on health care, due process, immigration, racial profiling, and life without parole for young people; and
- latent barriers to such communications, including U.S. exceptionalism, confusion about treaties, and the role of government.

This project builds upon 2007 benchmark research on Americans' attitudes toward human rights. The audiences for these focus groups were identified from the 2007 project as being the most receptive to human rights messaging and likely targets for communications. For this latest round of research, we again contracted with Belden Russonello & Stewart and conducted 16 focus group discussions in eight locations to examine these audiences' attitudes toward five social justice issues—immigration, health care, due process, life without parole for young people, and racial justice—within the context of human rights. The goal of the project was to examine the potential for using a human rights framework in communicating on these issues.

The research indicates that these audiences generally see human rights as the rights you have by virtue of being born. However, as the discussions move from initial reactions to the phrase “human rights” to more in-depth discussions of applying human rights to a range of social justice issues in the United States, participants' views of human rights become more complex. In particular, when members of the key audiences begin to distinguish between rights which are *protected*—freedom from torture, freedom of speech, etc.—from rights which are *provided*—health care, education, etc.—we begin to see some hesitation about calling the latter human rights.

Many of the participants also held a conditional view of who should have certain human rights. For example, undocumented immigrants, in the minds of most of the key audience

members, have forfeited some of their human rights because they have broken the law to be in the United States. Therefore, many question, and even object to, undocumented immigrants receiving health care. There are some human rights, however, that most of the members of the key audiences believe should be guaranteed to *all*, including due process rights, freedom from discrimination, and freedom from mistreatment.

Overall, the American public believes in the general concept of human rights and agrees that protecting human rights begins at home, here in the United States. However, some social justice issues are better understood through a human rights lens than others, so messaging should be crafted with care.

Finally, opportunity requires a national commitment to protecting and promoting human rights. These rights are the guarantee of dignity and fairness we all deserve by virtue of our humanity, and which the world's governments have recognized as universally essential. Because the human rights of many Americans continue to be denied, it is essential that we work to build understanding and support for those rights here at home. We hope that the findings and recommendations contained in this report are a crucial contribution to the movement's collective knowledge and ultimate success.

Acknowledgments

This report was made possible in part by a grant from the Oak Foundation. Project support from the U.S. Human Rights Fund at Public Interest Projects (PIP), The Overbrook Foundation, and The Libra Foundation also helped support this research and collateral communications materials. Earlier support from Tides Foundation, The American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), *The Nation* Magazine, and the Mertz Gilmore Foundation helped lay the foundation for this public opinion research project. The statements made and views expressed are solely the responsibility of the authors.

We would also like to thank the individuals who served on the Advisory Committee for this project.

Kate Stewart of Belden Russonello & Stewart (BRS) oversaw the research project and the writing of the report. We wish to thank all the staff at BRS who contributed to the development and completion of this project.

About The Opportunity Agenda

The Opportunity Agenda was founded in 2004 with the mission of building the national will to expand opportunity in America. Focused on moving hearts, minds and policy over time, the organization works with social justice groups, leaders, and movements to advance solutions that expand opportunity for everyone. Through active partnerships, The Opportunity Agenda synthesizes and translates research on barriers to opportunity and corresponding solutions; uses communications and media to understand and influence public opinion; and identifies and advocates for policies that improve people's lives. To learn more about The Opportunity Agenda, go to our website at <http://www.opportunityagenda.org>.

The Opportunity Agenda is a project of Tides Center.

BELDEN RUSSONELLO & STEWART
RESEARCH AND COMMUNICATIONS

**Moving Forward:
How to Discuss Specific Social
Justice Issues within a Human Rights
Framework**

**Findings from sixteen focus groups
among key audiences**

**By Belden Russonello & Stewart
for The Opportunity Agenda**

May 2009

Table of Contents

- I. Introduction..... 1**
- II. Executive Summary 4**
- III. Detailed Findings..... 16**
 - Chapter One: Context for Human Rights in General and Making the Case for International Treaties..... 16
 - Chapter Two: Health Care25
 - Chapter Three: Juvenile Life Without Parole (JLWOP)44
 - Chapter Four: Racial Profiling61
 - Chapter Five: Due Process.77
 - Chapter Six: Immigration Issues.....96
- Appendix A: Composition Tables
- Appendix B: 2007 Cluster Analysis Chart

I. Introduction

Belden Russonello & Stewart, at the request of The Opportunity Agenda, conducted focus group discussions in February and March 2009 to examine key audiences' attitudes toward five social justice issues – immigration, health care, due process, life without parole for young people, and racial justice – within the context of human rights. The goal of the project is to examine the potential for using a human rights framework in communicating on these issues. The research is designed to gauge key audiences' willingness and ability to discuss these topics using human rights language, to discover potential barriers to engaging them in such a discussion, and to test strategies for overcoming those barriers.

This project builds upon BRS' 2007 benchmark research for The Opportunity Agenda on Americans' attitudes toward human rights. The current focus groups look in-depth into how to communicate about specific issues among key audiences. The audiences were identified from the 2007 project as being the most receptive to human rights messaging and likely targets for communications. The make-up of these key groups is described below and more details can be found in the BRS report, "Human Rights in the United States."

BRS conducted 16 focus groups across the country among the key audiences. The groups were held in Chicago, Atlanta, Santa Monica, South San Francisco, Houston, Columbus and New York City.

Reading this report

The following report contains an executive summary with highlights from the focus groups followed by the detailed findings. The first chapter of the detailed findings examines key audiences' attitudes toward human rights in general and international treaties. Following this analysis, each chapter provides an analysis of one of the five areas with communications recommendations.

Readers of this report should keep in mind that this is an analysis of *qualitative* research, designed to learn about the attitudes and concerns of these key audiences and to generate messages for The Opportunity Agenda and its partners to use in communications. These results do not project the opinions of the entire population in these geographical locations.

Past Research

Before examining how to use a human rights message to communicate with key audiences on specific social justice issues, a brief review of what we have learned in earlier public opinion research on human rights in the United States for The Opportunity Agenda and other organizations helps set the stage.

- The 2007 benchmark research found that the public is already open to placing many social justice issues in a human rights framework. Issues such as equal opportunity, freedom from discrimination, freedom from torture, and access to health care all are viewed as human rights by large majorities.
- Americans see a recognition of human rights as a sign that the United States has not forgotten its founding principles. Americans value human rights because they believe in treating individuals with fairness, but they also tell us that respecting human rights contributes to a better society for all – a sentiment that suggests that honoring human rights for others makes life better for oneself.
- Perceptions of the role of government, however, complicate views on human rights. Many Americans believe that the government should function as the provider of human rights and expand government assistance programs to ensure that all people have these rights. However, a strong belief in personal responsibility leads others to argue that government should only be expected to protect human rights but not to provide services that ensure those rights are fulfilled.
- The public is poorly informed and holds ambivalent views on the relevance of international treaties for U.S. policy making.
- In another project of in-depth interviews with 50 policy makers in Illinois and California, BRS found some social justice issues, including racial equality and due process, are already considered human rights by these leaders. On the other hand, areas such as freedom from poverty and access to health care are harder places to find agreement. The policy leaders in the BRS study are wary of framing many social justice issues as human rights, because of the potentially far-reaching implications of calling something a human right and of their own limitations in fulfilling the promise of that designation. Many believe they *cannot* protect and fulfill all the needs that are suggested by an expansive view of human rights; and some do not *want* to fulfill all of them.

Key Audiences Determined from the 2007 Research

The 2007 benchmark survey analysis used a technique called cluster analysis to identify types of people based on their attitudes to three main themes: views on human rights; the application of human rights in the United States; and attitudes toward the United Nations. The focus groups consisted of participants of the three clusters of American viewpoints that are targets for communications on human rights. Together, they represent 69% of the U.S. population. (See Appendix B for cluster chart.)

- The first group, **Human Rights Champions**, comprises 29% of the population and is the most likely to believe that every person has basic rights that are common to all human beings and the most likely to say the United States needs to move “aggressively” to put human rights at the top of its agenda. Members of this cluster are more likely to be professional, educated women who live in cities. Politically, this group is liberal and Democratic.
- The next group is also a target for outreach but members of this cluster are more hesitant to move forward on a domestic human rights agenda. Members of the **Young Cautious Human Rights Supporters** are 19% of the population. Members of this cluster believe we need to move “cautiously” when it comes to human rights in the United States. This cluster is the youngest group, tends to be lower income, and has a relatively high proportion of moderate single women who listen to NPR and perform volunteer work.
- A third cluster, **U.S. Human Rights Supporters**, includes a relatively high percentage of African Americans and Hispanics. This cluster makes up 21% of the population. The distinguishing characteristic of this group is that its members are among the least likely to believe the United States should sign international human rights treaties and the most likely to believe that because of different cultures and values it is impossible to have rights that apply to everyone in the world.

II. Executive Summary

“Where, after all, do human rights begin? In small places, close to home.” – Eleanor Roosevelt

The American public believes in the general concept of human rights and agrees that protecting human rights begins at home, here in the United States. As we have found in the prior research, advocates are on solid ground engaging the American public in a general conversation about human rights.

Moving forward, the current research uncovers new avenues to communicate with key audiences about individual social justice issues, such as health care, due process violations, and racial profiling within a human rights framework. And, while there are some objections to certain applications of human rights, more often than not, members of the key audiences embrace a human rights framework to talk about social justice issues in the United States.

A. Key audiences discuss human rights generally and international treaties

1. General views on human rights in the United States

Human rights are the rights you have by virtue of being born, according to most of the members of the key audiences. Participants frequently volunteer a number of examples of human rights: equality, freedom from discrimination, freedom from torture, and life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Initially, participants say human rights should be universally respected and that all human beings are entitled to human rights.

As the discussions move from initial reactions to the phrase “human rights” to more in-depth discussions of applying human rights to a range of social justice issues in the United States, participants’ views of human rights become more complex. In particular, when members of the key audiences begin to distinguish between rights which are *protected* – freedom from torture, freedom of speech,

etc. – from rights which are *provided* – health care, education, etc. – we begin to see some hesitation about calling the latter human rights. Participants begin to worry about the appropriateness and feasibility of government providing these rights to everyone in the country.

Related to these concerns is the role of *personal responsibility*. If we classify something as a human right, participants question whether the right should be upheld for all people, even those who they believe do not contribute to society or who have broken society's rules. Many of the participants hold a conditional view of who should have certain human rights. For example, undocumented immigrants, in the minds of most of the key audience members, have forfeited some of their human rights because they have broken the law to be in the United States. Therefore, many question, and even object to, undocumented immigrants receiving health care. There are some human rights, however, that most of the members of the key audiences believe should be guaranteed to *all*, including due process rights, freedom from discrimination, and freedom from mistreatment.

As we apply the human rights framework to specific social justice issues in this report, we will encounter the different lenses through which members of the key audiences view human rights and the implications for communications on these specific issues.

2. Talking to key audiences about international human rights treaties

The focus group discussions examined the reactions of members of the key audiences to international treaties from two different perspectives. First, we looked at whether communications about human rights are helped by referencing international treaties; and second, we examined the best ways in which to begin educating members of the key audiences about the importance of international treaties.

Communications on treaties do not help build support for individual social justice issues: For the purpose of promoting social justice issues within a human rights framework, highlighting international treaties is not effective. Initially, the treaties are seen as ineffective and unenforceable. Only after an in-depth conversation about the potential importance of the treaties do members of the key audiences begin to see their worth. Communications on the specific social justice issues are much more successful when they focus on the values members bring to the specific issues, rather than emphasizing the international treaties.

When educating about the importance of international treaties, keep focus on values: If the goal of the communications is to educate members of the key audiences about the role and importance of the treaties, awareness of the treaties alone is not enough and can result in disillusionment. The biggest barrier to illustrating the worth of international treaties is the view that the treaties are unenforceable. Communications need to focus on what key audiences value about the treaties and illustrate the worth of international treaties through examples of how the treaties are or can be used in the United States.

The essential components of communicating on international treaties include:

- **First, connect with values:** When introducing the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and international treaties, focus on providing something to aspire to and the belief that it is “better for everyone to live in a society that pays attention to human rights, rather than one that ignores human rights.”

“Over the last sixty years, countries around the world have come together to document the human rights that we need to uphold and aspire to.”

“Human rights treaties provide us with the common understanding and tools by which the basic rights of all people can be upheld because it is better for everyone to live in a society that pays attention to human rights, rather than one that ignores human rights.”

- **Second, highlight the coming together of diverse cultures and countries:** To address concern about “forcing” human rights on those with different cultural values, advocates should inform audiences that many countries have agreed on common human rights shared by different cultures. For example:

“These treaties provide an opportunity for countries with very different cultures and governments to come together and declare the common rights for all human beings around the world.”

- **Third, illustrate how the treaties can be used to uphold human rights:** Most important is providing tangible examples to illustrate how the treaties can be enforced and make a difference to combat the belief that they are unenforceable. Successful examples illustrate how state governments are adopting the language of international treaties in their own laws and how advocates are using the treaties to pressure a state government to change its policies.

General language that can be used to introduce a specific example:

“By signing these treaties, countries promise to uphold the human rights of their people and the treaties provide individuals with the tools to help stand up for their human rights in the face of violations.”

B. Communicating about social justice issues using a human rights framework

The 16 focus groups examined key audiences’ reactions to five social justice issues – health care, due process, life without parole for young people, racial profiling, and immigration issues. Two of these, due process violations and racial profiling, are easily placed within a human rights framework by members of the key audiences. Also, to a great extent, health care can be talked about as a human right, but members of the key audiences are hesitant to extend health care to all people in the United States and, in particular, to undocumented immigrants.

Talking about juvenile life without parole for young people convicted of a crime as a human rights violation and discussing immigrant issues, other than due process for immigrants, in terms of human rights can be more difficult and complex.

1. Health care within a human rights framework

Of the five issues examined in the research, health care is among those that fit into a human rights framework for members of the key audiences. Many members of the key audiences already view health care, including a range of health services, as a basic human right needed for survival and to fulfill the human right to the pursuit of happiness. However, concerns about cost, personal responsibility, and the role of government in providing health care can come together to potentially dampen enthusiasm for calling health care a human right, especially when certain segments of the population are discussed, such as undocumented immigrants.

As advocates move forward talking about health care as a human right, communications should include the following three elements:

The core message – Present health care being as essential to life as food and shelter:

Health care is as essential to a productive and fulfilling life as food and shelter, and in the U.S. no one should have to go without this basic human right.

Acknowledge the problem – Make a connection with individuals’ personal fears and emotions by highlighting the problem with not fulfilling health care as a human right:

Today, in America, we have a system where millions of people live in fear that one accident or illness will leave them unable to care for themselves or their families because they lack quality health care.

Provide a solution – Define what you mean by health care as a human right, introducing the concept of the public good:

It’s time we acknowledged that health care is a basic human right for all. This means that the government must organize the health care system to make quality health care services available to everyone. These services include preventive care, reproductive services, mental health, geriatric care, and substance abuse treatment. We must make it clear that health care is not a commodity to be bought and sold, but a human right shared by all. It is time in the United States to uphold the human right to health care because no one should have to go without their basic human rights.

2. Juvenile life without parole within a human rights framework

The discussion groups uncovered a potential opening in communicating to key audiences about ensuring the “human right to the opportunity for rehabilitation” for young people who commit crimes when talking about the sentence of juvenile life without parole. However, framing JLWOP as a human rights violation does not resonate with most members of the key audiences and in some cases results in alienating potential opponents of JLWOP. Communications are much more likely to make inroads among key audiences if messages focus on making sure young offenders have a chance for rehabilitation, rather than on eradicating a form of punishment for young people who commit crimes. For members of the key audiences, it is the denial of the opportunity for rehabilitation that is the human rights violation rather than the imposition of life

without parole. Many members of the key audiences believe that life without parole can be an appropriate punishment depending on the circumstances.

As advocates move forward on JLWOP, communications should include the following three elements:

The core message - Assert the need to uphold human rights generally and introduce the human right to the opportunity for rehabilitation:

It benefits all of us to rehabilitate young people who commit serious crimes. Providing the opportunity for this rehabilitation is a human right we should strive to uphold because it is better for everyone to live in a society that upholds human rights, rather than one that ignores human rights.

Acknowledge the problem - JLWOP takes away the young person's second chance:

Right now our system of justice does not give many young people who commit terrible crimes the opportunity for a second chance. Instead, young people who commit serious crimes are being sentenced to life without parole, which means that they will spend the next thirty, forty, or fifty years in prison with no chance of release. Life without parole for young people is life without the opportunity for rehabilitation and that is wrong.

Provide a solution - Talk about the need to hold young people accountable for their crimes but in a way that allows for rehabilitation:

When young people commit serious crimes, they should be held accountable, but in a way that reflects their capacity for rehabilitation. Young people are still developing mentally and emotionally. Their punishment needs to be focused on rehabilitation and reintegration into society. We can do better by [IF POSSIBLE PROVIDE ALTERNATIVES TO LWOP] that are in the best interest of the young person and society.

3. Racial profiling and racial justice within a human rights framework

Almost all the members of key audiences in our discussions quickly recognize racial profiling as a human rights violation. They believe racial profiling violates the right to fair treatment, equality, freedom from discrimination, freedom of movement, and freedom from living in fear of the police or the government. However, the term, “racial profiling,” itself needs clarification for some members of the key audiences. The racial profiling label is stronger if it includes a short explanation that profiling is not evidenced-based, but that it means law enforcement stereotyping.

Racial profiling is also an effective introduction into a discussion of broader racial disparities in the criminal justice system. Most in the key audiences agree that there are systemic racial disparities in the justice system and are willing to accept broader racial disparities in the system as human rights violations. While the discussions on this topic were very brief, and more work should be done to explore the best ways to discuss general racial disparities within a human rights framework, these groups suggest that communications about racial disparities in the wider criminal justice system could follow the same message formulation we recommend for racial profiling.

Communications on racial profiling as a human rights violation should include the following elements:

The core message – Begin by stating what you are for, not what you are against – an affirmation of American ideals:

As Americans, we believe in the human right of fair treatment under the law. Racial profiling, that is targeting individuals just because of their skin color, religion, or country of origin, violates our American values of fairness and justice.

Acknowledge the problem – Describe the realities of an America that does not live up to this ideal:

Unfortunately, too many law enforcement departments across the country are tolerating racial profiling. This practice divides our society and makes our justice system unfair. And, racial profiling violates an individual’s human rights to fair treatment and freedom from discrimination.

Provide a solution – An affirmation of American ideals:

We need to make it clear that it is unacceptable for those who enforce our laws to stereotype people based on the color of their skin, religion, or nation of origin. We must outlaw racial profiling to make it clear that law enforcement should act on facts and evidence and not racial bias. If one group can be singled out based on race or ethnicity or religion, none of us will be safe to enjoy the rights that the United States stands for.

4. Due process within a human rights framework

Members of the key audiences strongly affirm that due process in the legal system is a human right, and believe denying due process violates the human rights to security, fair treatment, and freedom from government persecution. Most commonly, these audiences recognize due process as giving someone a fair trial, but many also believe due process refers to following a set of standardized rules and procedures to protect individuals from being unfairly treated or imprisoned. Timeliness in granting due process is key to participants in our discussions.

When asked specifically about the due process rights of terrorism suspects, most members of the key audiences believe it is important to uphold the human right to due process for terrorism suspects because doing so reflects the country's values, as well as the credibility of our justice system and general health of due process protections. Compelling messages on this issue focus on the goal of ensuring that the United States upholds human rights and due process, not the goal of giving rights to terrorism suspects. Also strong is the message that highlights that once we start denying rights for one individual or type of people, it puts all individuals' rights at risk. Communications on due process as a human right should include the following elements:

The core message – State that the United States stands for upholding the human right to due process and the values of fairness and justice:

Due process is a human right central to the American justice system. Our values of justice and fairness only stand strong when we uphold this human right.

Acknowledge the problem – For too long our government has failed to live up to its values in how it treats terrorism suspects:

The United States was founded on the belief in the right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. But, when we deny due process to any group we violate the values of fairness and justice our country was founded upon. [INSERT SPECIFIC ISSUE ADDRESSING: PREVENTIVE DETENTION, GITMO, ETC.] If we let the government deny due process to one group, the government can deny due process to any group. And none of us will be safe to enjoy the rights that the United States stands for.

Provide a solution – Ensure that our country lives up to its values and upholds the human rights of all:

We should not deny due process, for terrorism suspects or anyone else. We must move forward and that means [INSERT SPECIFIC SOLUTIONS, SUCH AS OPPOSE PREVENTIVE DETENTION, HOLD TRIALS FOR GITMO DETAINEES, ETC.]

5. Immigration issues within a human rights framework

Like most Americans, members of the key human rights audiences hold complicated and sometimes conflicting views about immigrants and immigration. Advocates should proceed cautiously using a human rights framework to communicate to key audiences about immigrants, particularly undocumented immigrants. The research finds that for certain circumstances, such as due process violations, advocates should feel comfortable adopting the human rights framework. However, we also uncovered areas where a human rights framework does not help but hurts advocates' efforts to advance their objectives.

As we have found in prior research on immigration issues, we recommend keeping messages on due process and other human rights violations separate. Due process violations speak to who we are as a country and U.S. values. Communications on other immigration topics should focus on the need to find a solution to the current immigration situation, address concerns about personal responsibility, and focus on the need to uphold the values the country was founded upon.

Due process message for immigrants

Communications on protecting the human right of due process for immigrants should include three elements:

The core message - State that the United States stands for upholding the human right to due process and the values of fairness and justice:

Due process is a human right central to the American justice system. Our values of justice and fairness only stand strong when we uphold this human right.

Acknowledge the problem - Mention some examples of due process violations - the public is largely unaware of them:

The United States was founded on the belief in the right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. But, when we deny due process to any group we violate the values of fairness and justice our country was founded upon. [INSERT SPECIFIC ISSUE ADDRESSING] If we let the government deny due process to one group, the government can deny due process to any group. And none of us will be safe to enjoy the rights that the United States stands for.

Provide a solution - Ensure that our country lives up to its values and upholds the human rights of all:

We should not deny due process, for undocumented immigrants or anyone else. We must move forward and that means [INSERT SPECIFIC SOLUTIONS]. Because if one group can be denied due process, any one of us could be singled out and have our rights violated.

General human rights protection message for immigrants

Communications on general human rights protection for undocumented immigrants, messages should include three elements:

The core message - Focus on values-based language that promotes solutions and “fixing the system,” as well as addressing concerns about personal responsibility:

When it comes to immigration, we need workable solutions that uphold our nation’s values, and move us forward together. We need to fix our system so that individuals who contribute and participate can live in the United States legally.

Acknowledge the problem - Mention some examples of violations - the public is largely unaware of them:

Most undocumented immigrants want to be here legally and contribute to society, but our current system just makes that almost impossible. In fact, right now we are... [INSERT EXAMPLES OF HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS, I.E. RISE IN HATE CRIMES, UNFAIR AND UNSAFE WORKING CONDITIONS]

Provide a solution - Incorporate the idea that we need to strive to uphold the values our country was founded upon:

We need to fix our broken system at the national level, while protecting the human rights of everyone who lives here, wherever they were born. Ensuring the human rights of all people who live in the United States is a goal we need to strive for and denying human rights to any group violates the values our country was founded upon.

Key Social Justice Issues and Human Rights at a Glance

Issues	Human Rights Framework
Health Care	Health care, as a public good, is as essential as food and water and no one should have to go without this basic human right.
JLWOP	The opportunity for rehabilitation is a human right that should be upheld for young people who commit crimes.
Racial Profiling	Violates the human rights to fair treatment and freedom from discrimination, and violates American values of fairness and justice.
Due Process	A human right central to the American justice system. American values of justice and fairness only stand strong when we uphold the human right to due process.
Immigrant Issues General (framework should be used cautiously with selected issues)	We need workable solutions to immigration issues that uphold our nation's values and allow people who contribute and participate to live in the country legally with their human rights protected.

Appendix A: Composition Tables

Health Care & Immigration Composition Table

Topic Cluster ¹	Atlanta		Chicago		Santa Monica		S. San Francisco	
	Immigration US HR	Health Care US HR	Immigration HRC	Health Care Combo	Immigration CHRS	Health Care Combo	Immigration CHRS	Health Care US HR
Men	--	--	--	8	8	--	--	--
Women	8	8	8	--	--	8	8	8
18-34	5	1	3	3	3	5	2	2
35-44	3	4	1	2	1	1	2	1
45-55	--	3	4	3	4	2	4	5
White	--	--	8	8	8	8	--	--
Black	--	8	--	--	--	--	--	--
Hispanic	8	--	--	--	--	--	8	8
Some college	6	6	--	--	3	--	2	8
4-year college	2	2	7	6	4	6	5	--
Post grad	--	--	1	2	1	2	1	--
Less than \$29K	3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
\$30-\$49K	5	8	2	--	2	2	1	2
\$50-\$74K	--	--	3	2	1	4	3	6
\$75-\$100K	--	--	1	3	4	2	1	--
\$100K+	--	--	2	3	1	--	3	--
Very liberal	3	3	3	2	1	3	1	1
Smwt. liberal	5	1	5	4	7	4	5	5
Moderate	--	1	--	2	--	1	2	2
Smwt. conserv.	--	3	--	--	--	--	--	--
Very conserv.	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Democrat	6	5	8	6	4	7	5	6
Republican	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Independent	2	3	--	2	4	1	3	2

¹ HRC = Human Rights Champions; CHRS = Cautious Human Rights Supporters; US HR = United States Human Rights Supporters; and Combo = Human Rights Champions and Cautious Human Rights Supporters

Racial Justice & Due Process Composition Table

Topic Cluster	New York City		Houston		Columbus		Columbus	
	Due Process Combo	Due Process US HR	Racial Justice US HR	Racial Justice US HR	Racial Justice Combo	Racial Justice Combo	Due Process Combo	Due Process US HR
Men	8	4	4	3	8	--	--	8
Women	--	4	4	5	--	9	8	--
18-34	2	3	4	4	2	3	2	4
35-44	2	2	2	1	3	3	3	2
45-55	4	3	2	3	3	3	3	2
White	8	--	--	--	8	9	8	8
Black	--	8	--	8	--	--	--	--
Hispanic	--	--	8	--	--	--	--	--
Some college	--	6	5	8	--	--	--	5
4-year college	3	2	3	--	6	6	3	3
Post grad	5	--	--	--	2	3	5	--
Less than \$29K	--	--	5	3	--	3	1	1
\$30-\$49K	--	8	3	5	1	2	--	3
\$50-\$74K	3	--	--	--	3	1	3	3
\$75-\$100K	1	--	--	--	3	2	2	1
\$100K+	4	--	--	--	1	1	2	--
Very liberal	3	1	--	--	1	3	3	--
Smwt. liberal	5	3	4	4	7	5	4	5
Moderate	--	1	2	1	--	1	1	1
Smwt. conserv.	--	3	2	3	--	--	--	2
Very conserve.	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Democrat	6	6	6	5	6	6	6	5
Republican	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Independent	2	2	2	3	2	3	2	3

Appendix B: 2007 Cluster Analysis Chart

	Human Rights Champions (29%)	Young Cautious HR Supporters (19%)	Human Rights Homebodies (21%)	Anti-U.N. ites (17%)	Anti-Gov't Bedrock Conservatives (14%)
Description	More women Younger High income Highest ed High prof Most liberal Most Dem More city	More women Youngest Most single Low inc Most moderate High Dem	More women Younger Most parents Highest Hisp and African Amer Lowest ed and inc High cons High Dem More city More south	More men Oldest High married Most retired High cons High Rep Most rural More South	More men Older Most married Highest inc High educ High prof Most cons Most Rep Most suburb High Midwest
Engagement	Among most likely national newspapers readers, blogs, NPR Donate and vol for charitable organ	High NPR listners Volunteers Least likely attend rel. services	High rel attenders High news consumers Least likely voters	Highest rel attenders Most political Most talk radio listeners	High voters and most pol and charitable donors High newspaper readers
Applications of Human Rights and Role of Gov't	Among most likely to agree w/applications of HR. 100% agree hr of illegal imm violated when denied med care 86% agree to expand gov't programs to uphold hr	Agree with HR but not all the applications. 100% disagree hr of illegal imm violated when denied med care 100% agree expand gov't programs to uphold hr	Agree w/HR; highest on eco-related rights 95% agree hr of illegal imm violated when denied med care 84% agree to expand gov't programs to uphold hr	Narrow view of hr. 96% disagree hr of illegal imm violated when denied med care 59% disagree expand gov't programs to uphold hr	Narrow view of hr. 90% disagree hr of illegal imm violated when denied med care 100% disagree expand gov't programs to uphold hr
Potential Barriers	95% disagree that the U.S. should NOT sign international treaties.	67% disagree that the U.S. should NOT sign international treaties. But: 57% agree bec of diff cultures and values it is imp to have rights that apply to everyone in the world.	97% agree that the U.S. should NOT sign international treaties. Most to say bec of diff cultures and values it is imp to have rights that apply to everyone in the world. (64%)	100% agree that the U.S. should NOT sign international treaties. Most negative opinions on U.N.	63% disagree that the U.S. should NOT sign international treaties.
Urgency	92% agree should strive to uphold hr in US 36% "aggressively"	86% agree should strive to uphold hr in US 28% "aggressively"; 57% "cautiously"	89% agree should strive to uphold hr in US 34% "aggressively"	70% agree should strive to uphold hr in US 41% "slowly" or "evolve"	60% agree should strive to uphold hr in US 36% "slowly" or "evolve"
Overall Framework	Imp to treat people fairly and w/dignity Better for everyone to live in a society that pays attention to hr, rather than one that ignore human rights	Imp to treat people fairly and w/dignity	Imp to treat people fairly and w/dignity Am founded on Jefferson's belief that we all have rights that no gov't should take away Respecting hr follows the will of God	Am founded on Jefferson's belief that we all have rights that no gov't should take away Imp to treat people fairly and w/dignity	Imp to treat people fairly and w/dignity



The **Opportunity** Agenda

*Building the National Will
to Expand Opportunity in America*

New York City
568 Broadway, Suite 302
New York, NY 10012
Tel: 212-334-5977
Fax: 212-334-2656

www.opportunityagenda.org

The Opportunity Agenda is a project of the Tides Center