



International Nutrition Perceptions Surveys' Results:
How U.S. Political, Religious, Social Conservatives (PRSCs) and the General Population (GP) Respond to Global Nutrition, and How to Shape Messaging for Successful Advocacy

Key Takeaways

Do!

Domestically focused rationale

- PRSCs are most compelled by domestically-focused rationales –tie international health to issues like national security and citizens' health.

Moral responsibility

- PRSCs find honoring moral responsibilities a compelling rationale for international health and development efforts – do tie nutrition and “feeding the hungry” to ethical commitments.

Attitudes

- Many people believe it is important for the U.S. to have a positive image in countries worldwide – tie global health efforts to a positive impression.

Urgent issues

- Water pollution, Infectious/Communicable Diseases, and Malnutrition ranked in that order as urgent global health priorities for PRSCs and the GP. The public seems more knowledgeable and more willing to respond to these seemingly non-provocative, bipartisan issues.

Mothers and children

- Respondents find messaging focusing on mothers and children to be the most compelling –use language such as “mothers,” “children,” “pregnant mothers,” “unborn children,” and “babies.”

Gender differences

- Women find the language of mothers and children more compelling than men do – be aware of what audiences respond most to what language.

Don't!

Familiarity with nutrition issues

- Don't lead with terminology that many people are unfamiliar with, like “child wasting” and “child stunting.”

Economic and financial interests

- Don't focus on economic development possibilities or US financial interests as rationales for action – people find these rationales less compelling.

Attitudes

- Don't assume similarities across the population – PRSCs are much more likely than the GP to believe that faith-based organizations should take an active role in international health efforts.