TOPIC FOCUS: HOW DO WE ENSURE EQUAL ACCESS TO OPPORTUNITY FOR ALL?
What is Targeted Universalism?

“This is an approach that supports the needs of the particular while reminding us that we are all part of the same social fabric. Targeted universalism rejects a blanket universal which is likely to be indifferent to the reality that different groups are situated differently relative to the institutions and resources of society. It also rejects the claim of formal equality that would treat all people the same as a way of denying difference.”
Why Targeted Universalism

Some people ride the “Up” escalator to reach opportunity. Others have to run up the “Down” escalator to get there.
Targeted Universalism

- **Targeting within universalism** means setting universal goals and targeted means/processes

- This approach supports the needs of the particular while reminding us that we are all part of the same social fabric
  - Universal, yet captures how people are differently situated
  - Inclusive, yet targets those who are most marginalized
Structural inequity & othering is created by different groups and people having different pathways with structural roadblocks to reach a goal.

Targeted universalism directs attention to pathways different groups face & suggests structural changes to make those paths smoother.
Universal Goal with Targeted Strategy

Structural Inequity

VS.

Opportunity Structure
1. Articulate a particular goal based upon a robust understanding and analysis of the problem at hand.
2. Assess difference of general population from universal goal.
3. Assess particular geographies and population segments divergence from goal.
4. Assess barriers to achieving the goal for each group/geography.
5. Craft targeted processes to each group to reach universal goal.
In the first image, it is assumed that everyone will benefit from the same supports. They are being treated equally.

In the second image, individuals are given different supports to make it possible for them to have equal access to the game. They are being treated equitably.

In the third image, all three can see the game without any supports or accommodations because the cause of the inequity was addressed. The systemic barrier has been removed.

Image credit: Family Futures
Examples of Barriers

• Children experience different levels of parental interaction based on their parents ability to take unpaid leave
• Children have different access to health care based on the their family situation
• The access to education and the quality of the education varies for children based on their socioeconomic status
Fourth Graders Who Are Chronically Absent by Race:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Data Type</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian and Pacific Islander</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Hispanic White</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data from KIDS COUNT

Fourth Graders Who Scored Below Proficient Reading Level By Race:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Data Type</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Children In Poverty By Race And Ethnicity:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Data Type</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>268,000</td>
<td>259,000</td>
<td>254,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>233,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian and Pacific</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>473,000</td>
<td>501,000</td>
<td>473,000</td>
<td>459,000</td>
<td>455,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islander</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>4,082,000</td>
<td>4,093,000</td>
<td>4,008,000</td>
<td>3,933,000</td>
<td>3,719,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>5,814,000</td>
<td>5,832,000</td>
<td>5,717,000</td>
<td>5,659,000</td>
<td>5,446,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic White</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>5,225,000</td>
<td>5,206,000</td>
<td>5,108,000</td>
<td>4,854,000</td>
<td>4,645,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>976,000</td>
<td>979,000</td>
<td>977,000</td>
<td>978,000</td>
<td>941,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>races</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>16,387,000</td>
<td>16,397,000</td>
<td>16,087,000</td>
<td>15,686,000</td>
<td>15,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Children In Single-Parent Families By Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Data Type</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>355,000</td>
<td>345,000</td>
<td>329,000</td>
<td>341,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian and Pacific Islander</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>539,000</td>
<td>559,000</td>
<td>579,000</td>
<td>557,000</td>
<td>578,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>6,533,000</td>
<td>6,509,000</td>
<td>6,493,000</td>
<td>6,427,000</td>
<td>6,382,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>6,674,000</td>
<td>6,890,000</td>
<td>7,008,000</td>
<td>7,044,000</td>
<td>7,190,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Hispanic White</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>9,329,000</td>
<td>9,466,000</td>
<td>9,358,000</td>
<td>9,289,000</td>
<td>9,181,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>1,586,000</td>
<td>1,655,000</td>
<td>1,703,000</td>
<td>1,758,000</td>
<td>1,797,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>24,297,000</td>
<td>24,718,000</td>
<td>24,725,000</td>
<td>24,647,000</td>
<td>24,689,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Children Without Health Insurance By Race And Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Data Type</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>122,000</td>
<td>117,000</td>
<td>111,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>95,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian and Pacific Islander</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>261,000</td>
<td>255,000</td>
<td>253,000</td>
<td>197,000</td>
<td>149,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>676,000</td>
<td>641,000</td>
<td>631,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>422,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>2,231,000</td>
<td>2,118,000</td>
<td>2,036,000</td>
<td>1,738,000</td>
<td>1,360,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Hispanic White</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>2,110,000</td>
<td>2,009,000</td>
<td>2,066,000</td>
<td>1,745,000</td>
<td>1,415,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>253,000</td>
<td>245,000</td>
<td>246,000</td>
<td>210,000</td>
<td>166,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Universal goal: joyful and meaningful education for all children

Targeted Strategies

Group: middle-class children of all races

- Students ready for school and school ready for students
- **Strategy**: resources and support to cultivate, retain, and nurture good teachers and administrators
Universal goal: joyful and meaningful education for all children

Targeted Strategies

Group: low socio-economic status children

• **Strategy:** resources and support to cultivate, retain, and nurture good teachers and administrators
• **Provide nutritious meals, stable housing, and medical care**
Universal goal: joyful and meaningful education for all children

Targeted Strategies

Group: African-American children

• **Strategy:** resources and support to cultivate, retain, and nurture good teachers and administrators
• Provide Nutritious meals, stable housing, and medical care
• **Curriculum and pedagogical approaches for teachers, administrators, and students that counter unconscious impact of pervasive negative stereotypes**
Universal goal: joyful and meaningful education for all children

Targeted Strategies

Group: recent immigrant children

• **Strategy:** resources and support to cultivate, retain, and nurture good teachers and administrators
• Nutritious meals, stable housing, and medical care
• Curriculum and pedagogical approaches for teachers, administrators, and students that counter unconscious impact of pervasive negative stereotypes
• *English language supports, first language supports, interpretation and outreach in parent’s first language*
Targeted Universalism at the State Level

Policies would...

1. Recognize the nature of our interconnected and relational structures within the larger, inequitable, institutional framework

2. Pay attention to situatedness: they account for the fact that students are situated differently in the economic and social landscape of society
   1. Difference can be internal or external system/network

3. Develop and fund a participatory/democratic planning and implement processes at the grassroots level
   • Include people of color in the process: their input is vital including identifying the universal

4. Protect the most vulnerable
Example of TU in work:

**Issue**

In 2013, Bill de Blasio, during his campaign for the mayor of New York promised the end of the “tale of two cities,” aiming to bridge divides between “haves and have-nots”.

Widening the access to pre-school education was a major component of this.

**Why focus on this?**

- Universal pre-K brings together children of different socioeconomic backgrounds together in the same classrooms
- Sets a basis for increased cross cultural understanding
- Diversity is a key measure of education quality
“New York’s approach is a model for how to collect and analyze data to inform practice, to bring the system to the highest quality,”

Only 2 years after New York dramatically increased the number of free preschools and targeted advertising at low socioeconomic families **65,000 new children have enrolled in preschool.**
Historically, preschool expansion policies only providing more access for low-income children, based on the argument that these students have the most to gain from preschool.

However, the data shows a different picture. Economist Tim Bartik of the Upjohn Institute calculates substantial lifetime earnings gains from quality pre-K programs for middle-class children that are nearly as large as those for low-income children.
Further considering a targeted universalism approach...

- Some ways to further increase the diversity in this program, within a TU framework include:
  - Subsidize transportation.
  - Revise enrollment priorities for district school UPK programs.
  - Provide support to pre-k programs in poor and working-class neighborhoods to rent or renovate building space, allowing them to expand classrooms serving 4 year-olds.
Targeted universalism to **belonging**: being a part of something greater than yourself

The term connotes something fundamental about both how groups are **structurally positioned** within society as well as how they are **perceived and regarded**.
In the United States...
The problem of “Othering” is the problem of the 21st century.

How far have we come?
Though the face of America is changing...
...we still see dramatic disparities.
In 2016

Wealth Gaps Along Racial, Ethnic Lines Have Grown Since Great Recession Ended

Median net worth of households, in 2013 dollars

Notes: Blacks and whites include only non-Hispanics. Hispanics are of any race. Chart scale is logarithmic; each gridline is ten times greater than the gridline below it.
Source: Pew Research Center tabulations of Survey of Consumer Finances public-use data
PEW RESEARCH CENTER
In 2016...

Perceptions of how blacks are treated in the U.S. vary widely by race

% saying blacks are treated less fairly than whites in the country

- In dealing with the police: Whites 50%, Blacks 84%
- In the courts: Whites 43%, Blacks 75%
- When applying for a loan or mortgage: Whites 25%, Blacks 66%
- In the workplace: Whites 22%, Blacks 64%
- In stores or restaurants: Whites 21%, Blacks 49%
- When voting in elections: Whites 20%, Blacks 43%

Note: Whites and blacks include only non-Hispanics.
"On Views of Race and Inequality, Blacks and Whites are Worlds Apart"
PEW RESEARCH CENTER
In 2016...

About a third of white Americans say Obama has made race relations worse.

Roughly six-in-ten white Republicans say too much attention is paid to race these days.

Note: All adults” includes adults of all races. Whites and blacks include only non-Hispanics. “Don’t know/Refused” responses not shown.


PEW RESEARCH CENTER
Blacks are about twice as likely as whites to point to discrimination as a major reason that some blacks have a harder time getting ahead.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Whites</th>
<th>Blacks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Racial discrimination</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower quality schools</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of jobs</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of motivation to work hard</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family instability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of good role models</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Whites and blacks include only non-Hispanics.
PEW RESEARCH CENTER
In 2016, race still matters.

More see individual, rather than institutional, racism as a bigger problem

% saying discrimination ___ is the bigger problem when it comes to discrimination against black people in the U.S. today

- Built into laws and institutions
- Based on the prejudice of individuals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All adults</th>
<th>Whites</th>
<th>Blacks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: “All adults” includes adults of all races. Whites and blacks include only non-Hispanics. Voluntary responses of “Both,” “Neither/There is no discrimination” and “Don’t know/Refused” not shown.


PEW RESEARCH CENTER

About half of blacks say they’ve been treated like they were suspicious or not smart

% saying each of the following happened to them in the past 12 months because of their race or ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Whites</th>
<th>Blacks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People acted as if they were suspicious of you</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People acted as if they thought you weren’t smart</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treated unfairly in hiring, pay or promotion</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfairly stopped by police</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Whites and blacks include only non-Hispanics.


PEW RESEARCH CENTER
What are the structures that affect our lives?
These structures are connected

They affect our identities and the world around us
We are all situated within structures but not evenly.

These structures interact in ways that produce a differential in outcomes.
We live in structures and structures live in us.
- Environment/neighborhood matters.
- Children in different neighborhood will be exposed to different allostatic load.

How do we become aware of this?
- With data and mapping.
TU and Structures:

- It is important that we focus on changing the structure that people are within, not the people within the structures.
Racial and ethnic minorities have health that is worse overall than the health of White Americans. Health disparities may stem from:

- Environmental Stress and Neighborhood Stressors
- Socioeconomic, Daily and Family Stress
- Perceived Discrimination

This has an impact on life expectancy.
Dramatic difference in life expectancy:
Saskia Sassen’s *Expulsions* (2014)

“Inequality, if it keeps growing, can at some point be more accurately described as a type of expulsion. For those at the bottom or in the poor middle, this means expulsion from a life space; among those at the top; this appears to have meant exiting from the responsibilities of membership in society via self-removal, extreme concentration of the wealth available in a society, and no inclination to redistribute that wealth.”
Expulsions & Domains of Space

- Public
- Private
- Non-public/non-private
- Corporate
Addressing the Misalignment of Power

- The issue isn’t public/private, but public/corporate
- Expansion of corporate prerogative
- Corporate space diminishes public & private space
## Domains of Space: Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>Corporate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communal space</td>
<td>Individual space</td>
<td>Not your space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited Privacy</td>
<td>Maximum privacy</td>
<td>No public space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everyone is permitted</td>
<td>Ultimate freedom</td>
<td>Definitely not private space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules and regulations</td>
<td>Minimal government regulation</td>
<td>No freedom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minimal surveillance</td>
<td>It is neither private nor public space</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Non-public/non-private space

- This space is misleading for individuals who enjoyed neither public rights nor private freedom
- Today: immigrants, incarcerated, disabled, and other marginalized racial subjects
Historicizing non-public/non-private space

from the past…

Slaves
• *Dred Scott vs. Sandford* (1857)

to the present

Immigrants
• Arizona SB 1070
• Immigration Reform Bill
• *Melenderes vs. Arpaio* (2013)

Incarcerated/formerly incarcerated
Historicizing non-public/non-private space
Historic lineage of “spatial racism”
Implicit bias defined

Implicit bias refers to the brain’s automatic, instant association of stereotypes or attitudes toward particular groups, without our conscious awareness.
By any common definition, Trump’s statements and policies are racist. Yet we are researchers on implicit bias—largely unconscious, mostly automatic social biases that can affect people’s behavior even when they intend to treat others fairly regardless of their social group identity. Our concern with implicit bias might seem like a relic of a bygone, pre-Trump era, in which explicit bigotry was on the wane, at least in mainstream political speech.

Does implicit bias have anything to add to our understanding of our current political moment? Our answer, you won’t be surprised to hear, is yes.

— Jennifer Saul & Michael Brownstein (April 18, 2016)
Othering is a set of common processes that engender marginality and persistent inequality across any of the full range of human differences.
Othering & Political Polarization

Different Diversity Change → Anxiety → Narratives that give meaning → Bridging Restorative

Divisive Isolation Anger Fear
Dominant hierarchy of organizing our sense of self:
What happens when the hierarchy is reversed?
In-Group members: “more human”

Esteemed  Pitied  Envied  Despised

Examples of Inclusion & Belonging in U.S. Law


• **Women.** 19th Amendment Grants Women the Right to Vote (1920)

• **Persons with Disabilities.** Americans with Disabilities Act bans discrimination against individuals with disabilities in all areas of public life (1990)

We still live in structures and environments of hostility & coded messages

**Ben Carson**

Syrian refugees as “rabid dogs”

**Donald Trump**

There is a lot…
We can define opportunity through access to…
But even more importantly through membership and belonging

- education
- economic
- transportation
- food
- housing
- justice
- healthcare
- communications
SPATIAL, RACIAL, AND OPPORTUNITY SEGREGATION IMPACT A NUMBER OF LIFE OPPORTUNITIES

- Health
- School segregation
- Educational achievement
- Exposure to crime; arrest
- Transportation limitations and other inequitable public services
- Job segregation
- Racial stigma and other psychological issues
- Community power and individual assets
The term connotes something fundamental about both how groups are structurally positioned within society as well as how they are perceived and regarded.

On the other hand, **belonging** is to be a part of something greater than yourself.
What about the soil underneath & the air all around?
Social Determinants of belonging

- Violence and disorder
- Concentrated poverty
- School quality
- Housing quality
- Segregation
- Neighborhood blight
- Exposure to toxins
- Air and water quality
- Physical hazards
For more information, visit:
http://www.iupress.indiana.edu/catalog/806639

Like the Haas Institute on Facebook
www.facebook.com/haasinstitute