

AGRICULTURAL ISSUES ON THE BALLOT:
THE 2009 OHIO ISSUE 2 CAMPAIGN

HONORS PROJECT

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Bachelor of
Science in the College of Food, Agricultural, and Environmental Sciences at the Ohio
State University

By

Hannah M. Thompson

Advisor: Dr. Emily B. Rhoades

The Ohio State University

2011

ABSTRACT

An in-depth case study was conducted of the November 2009 ballot initiative that created the Ohio Livestock Care Standards board. Key individuals who were involved in communications campaigns dealing with the ballot initiative were interviewed and media coverage was closely analyzed. The interviews examined questions dealing with the origin of the initiative, the types of media used to promote it, the budget for the media campaign and which types of media were viewed as the most valuable and successful. The information obtained will reveal which types of media are most effective in reaching consumers about agricultural issues. By examining a successful agricultural communications campaign, insight will be gained about how other groups can best reach the public and persuade them to support legislation benefiting the agricultural industry.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	ii
LIST OF TABLES.....	iv
CHAPTER I	
INTRODUCTION	
Significance and Purpose of the Study.....	3
Objectives of the Study.....	4
CHAPTER II	
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	
History of the Animal Rights Movement in the U.S.....	5
Trends in Animal Care Legislative Policy.....	8
The Ballot Initiative Process and Campaign Spending.....	9
Cognitive Dissonance as a Theoretical Framework.....	12
CHAPTER III	
METHODOLOGY	
Research Design.....	14
Limitations of the Study.....	15
Data Collection.....	16
Analysis of Data.....	17
CHAPTER IV	
FINDINGS	
Campaign Spending.....	18
Central Messages and Key Personnel.....	20
Media Coverage.....	22
CHAPTER V	
SUMMARY, KEY FINDINGS AND IMPLICATIONS	
Summary.....	26
Key Findings.....	28
Implications.....	31
REFERENCES.....	34

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Top 10 Contributors to Ohioans for Livestock Care PAC.....	19
Table 2. 2009 Expenses for Ohioans for Livestock Care PAC.....	19
Table 3. Media Coverage of Issue 2.....	23
Table 4. Commentary an Editorial Pieces on Issue 2.....	25

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In the early months of 2009, the Humane Society of the United States called for a meeting with Ohio livestock organizations, including the Ohio Farm Bureau Federation, Ohio Pork Producers Council and the Ohio Cattleman's Association. During this 'meeting of the minds', HSUS president and chief executive officer Wayne Pacelle announced HSUS' intention to come to Ohio with a ballot initiative similar to "The Prevention of Farm Animal Cruelty Act", also known as Proposition 2, which had recently been passed in California. This legislation “requires that calves raised for veal, egg-laying hens and pregnant pigs be confined only in ways that allow these animals to lie down, stand up, fully extend their limbs and turn around freely” (Anti-Cruelty: Related Statutes, 2010, pg. 6).

To be proactive in the face of this future legislation, these agricultural groups formed the Ohioans for Livestock Care political action committee and formed the idea for the Ohio Livestock Care Standards Board, which would be an unbiased group of industry experts responsible for overseeing livestock care in Ohio.

The final language of the Ohio constitutional amendment creating the board, appearing on the November 2009 ballot as Issue 2, is as follows (Elections & Ballot Issues, 2009, pgs. 1-2):

“Section 1.

2(A) There is hereby created the Ohio Livestock Care Standards Board for the purpose of establishing standards governing the care and well-being of livestock and poultry in this state. In carrying out its purpose, the Board shall endeavor to maintain food safety, encourage locally grown and raised food, and protect Ohio farms and families. The Board shall be comprised of the following thirteen members:

(1) *The director of the state department that regulates agriculture who shall be the chairperson of the Board;*

(2) *Ten members appointed by the Governor with the advice and consent of the Senate. The ten members appointed by the Governor shall be residents of this state and shall include the following:*

(a) *One member representing family farms;*

(b) *One member who is knowledgeable about food safety in this state;*

(c) *Two members representing statewide organizations that represent farmers;*

(d) *One member who is a veterinarian who is licensed in this state;*

(e) *The State Veterinarian in the state department that regulates agriculture;*

(f) *The dean of the agriculture department of a college or university located in this state;*

(g) *Two members of the public representing Ohio consumers;*

(h) *One member representing a county humane society that is organized under state law.*

(3) *One member appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives who shall be a family farmer;*

(4) *One member appointed by the President of the Senate who shall be a family farmer.*

Not more than seven members appointed to the Board at any given time shall be of the same political party.

(B) *The Board shall have authority to establish standards governing the care and well-being of livestock and poultry in this state, subject to the authority of the General Assembly. In establishing those standards, the Board shall consider factors that include, but are not limited to, agricultural best management practices for such care and well-being, biosecurity, disease prevention, animal morbidity and mortality data, food safety practices, and the protection of local, affordable food supplies for consumers.*

(C) *The state department that regulates agriculture shall have the authority to administer and enforce the standards established by the Board.*

(D) *The General Assembly may enact laws that it deems necessary to carry out the purposes of this section, to facilitate the execution of the duties of the Board and the state department that regulates agriculture under this section, and to set the terms of office of the Board members and conditions for the Board members' service on the Board.*

(E) *If any part of this section is held invalid, the remainder of this section shall not be affected by that holding and shall continue in full force and effect."*

The measure resoundingly passed with 64% of the vote (Elections & Ballot Issues, 2009). Undoubtedly, the pro-Issue 2 media campaign can be categorized as a success. This study thus aims to explore the initiative from inception to passage, with the major focus on the media campaign conducted by the Ohio Farm Bureau Federation in its effort to promote the issue and other groups' campaigns to defeat the measure. This information would serve very useful to other state agricultural organizations as they look to pass similar legislation in their states, or to any group attempting to create a media campaign around an agricultural ballot initiative.

Significance and Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to analyze the pro-Issue 2 media campaign during the 2009 Ohio general election. The study will focus mainly on the activities of the Ohioans for Livestock Care political action committee, the only PAC registered with the Ohio Department of State as spending funds for an Issue 2 campaign (Ohio Department of State, 2011). Through this study, important strategies for ballot initiative campaigns will be revealed.

Agricultural issues are appearing on state ballots with increasing frequency, and this poses a challenge to agricultural organizations as they try to reach out to the voting public. These organizations must design and implement media campaigns to encourage a favorable outcome from the election. As agricultural organizations and commodity groups are not typically well funded, it is key for them to understand the most cost-effective media strategies to utilize.

Objectives of the Study

The initial purpose of this study was to determine the most effective techniques in a media plan surrounding an agricultural ballot initiative. After reviewing relevant literature, additional, specific goals were outlined. These objectives, listed below, helped guide the aim of the study and the collection and analysis of data. These objectives are:

1. To examine the financial report of the Ohioans for Livestock Care PAC, including contributions and expenditures;
2. To determine the key messages of the media campaign and how key personnel rate their effectiveness;
3. To review media coverage of the campaign and examine shifts in tone.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Prior to beginning the study, a review of relevant literature was conducted in order to ensure a thorough understanding of the following key subject areas: History of the Animal Rights Movement in the United States; Trends in Animal Care Legislative Policy, Campaign Spending and Ballot Initiatives, and Cognitive Dissonance as a Theoretical Framework. These topics serve as an outline for the review of literature.

History of the Animal Rights Movement in the United States

The origins of the animal rights movement are apparent even earlier than the United States itself. The 1641 “Body of Liberties” of the Massachusetts Bay Colony included two tenants relating to the care of animals: “92. No man shall exercise any Tirranny or Crueltie towards any brute Creature which are usuallie kept for man’s use. 93. If any man shall have occasion to leade or drive Cattel from place to place that is far of, so that they be weary, or hungry, or fall sick, or lambe, it shall be lawful to rest or refresh them, for a competent time, in any open place that is not Corne, meadow, or inclosed for some peculiar use” (Beers, 2006). This was the earliest known law in this section of the world that dealt with the treatment of livestock (Beers, 2006). In England, articles appeared in newspapers denouncing cockfights and other bloodsports as early as 1749 (Beers, 2006).

Europe has been at the forefront of animal protection legislation, with the first law passing in 1822 (Radford, 1996). This legislation, titled ‘An Act to Prevent the Cruel and Improper Treatment of Cattle,’ later becoming known as Martin’s Act, protected cattle, horses, sheep and mules from excessive cruelty (Beers, 2006). The roots of the animal

protection movement in Europe can be seen in the writings of Jeremy Bentham, whose 1789 *An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation* directly applied the concept of rights to animals, in conflict with the traditional view of animals as lacking feeling or thought (Beers, 2006). Rene Descartes first espoused this view of animals as possessing “conscious awareness” in the 17th century (Regan, 2004).

The legal protection of animals in Europe has continued to increase over time with the 1957 Treaty of Rome, which dealt with concerns for animal protections and the 1997 Treaty of Amsterdam, which provided revisions to the Treaty of Rome, including expanded animal protection measures (Sullivan, Vietzke, & Coyne, 2008). Other animal protection legislation included the Wild Mammals (Protection) Act, Animal Health Act, and Welfare of Animals (Slaughter or Killing) Regulations (Radford, 1996). More recently, politicians have banned veal crates (Sullivan et al., 2008). The success of animal care legislation in Europe has inspired similar movements around the world.

In 1828, New York passed legislation defining wanton cruelty toward a domesticated animal as a misdemeanor, and in 1835 Massachusetts followed suit (Beers, 2006). Throughout the 1830s-1850s, newspapers published an increasing number of articles reporting acts of cruelty and editorials denouncing them (Beers, 2006). The growing issues of animal welfare in the United States became organized in 1866 with the formation of the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, modeled after the British Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (Jasper, 1996).

The two early primary federal regulations in place in the United States regarding animals were the Humane Methods of Slaughter Act of 1901 and the Federal Meat Inspection Act of 1906 (Becker, 2009). The Humane Methods of Slaughter Act regulated

that “...livestock must be slaughtered in a humane manner to prevent needless suffering” and called for “research of humane methods of slaughter, the non-applicability of these statutes to religious or ritual slaughter, and the investigation into the care of non-ambulatory livestock” (“Humane Methods,” 2009, pg. 1-3). The Federal Meat Inspection Act provided regulations dealing with ante mortem and post mortem inspections, humane methods of slaughter, meat inspections, labeling and other topics (Food Safety Inspection Service, 2009). Most of these early organizations and legislation focused on animal welfare, not animal rights (Francione, 1996).

The animal welfare view assumes that animals can be treated as a means to a human end, provided that standards of care are upheld, while the rights view demands the end of the use of animals for human benefit (Francione, 1996). In the past 30 years, the animal rights movement has come to the forefront and gained strength in American Society (Garner, 1996). People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA), an animal rights organization, formed in the early 1980s (Jasper, 1996). PETA and fellow animal activist group the Animal Liberation Front (ALF) released videos and photographs from animal research laboratories to the news media throughout the 1980s (Jasper, 1996).

The current organization at the center of the animal rights movement is the Humane Society of the United States (HSUS), formed in 1954 (The Humane Society of the United States, 2009). HSUS, which claims to be backed by 11 million Americans, spent a combined total of almost \$40 million on “strategic communications” and “advocacy and public policy” in 2009 (The Humane Society of the United States, 2009).

Trends in Animal Care Legislative Policy

In a parallel to the escalating nature of the animal rights movement, legislation regarding animal care has increased in number and scope. The Animal Welfare Act, passed originally in 1966, was intended to “...regulate the transportation, sale and handling of dogs, cats and certain other animals intended to be used for purposes of research or experimentation, and for other purposes” (United States Department of Agriculture, 2009a). The Act has been amended six times, most recently in 2007, and has been expanded to: include all warm-blooded animals being used for experimentation or exhibition, set restrictions on animal righting, establish that an Institutional Care and Use Committee must be in place at institutions of animal experimentation to ensure humane care, set requirements of health certifications by a veterinarian and created holding periods for shelter animals (United States Department of Agriculture, 2009a; United States Department of Agriculture, 2009b; United States Department of Agriculture, 2009d; United States Department of Agriculture, 2009f).

In recent years, federal legislation regarding the treatment of animals has given way to a trend of state legislation for animal protection. Many of these state laws have been proposed and supported by the HSUS and other animal rights organizations. HSUS supported 121 successful pieces of state legislation in the year 2009 (The Humane Society of the United States, 2010). Recent pieces of legislation dealing with the treatment of animals include the Prevention of Equine Cruelty Act (“Horse Slaughter Ban”), passed in Texas and Illinois in 2007 (Becker, 2009).

A trend in policy is legislation controlling livestock housing, which has become widespread in recent years. Florida legislation banning gestation crates for sows passed

in 2006, followed by similar laws in Arizona in 2006, Oregon in 2007, Colorado in 2008, California in 2008, and Maine and Michigan in 2009 (The Humane Society of the United States, 2009). California's "Proposition 2" was especially impactful, due to the size and scope of California's agricultural industry (Goodwin, 2010).

In response to this trend of policy, Ohio took a step to be proactive in creating the Ohio Livestock Care Standards Board (The Ohio Ballot Board, 2009). The Board sets standards for the care of livestock, maintenance of farm safety, supports local food and protects Ohio farmers and families from out-of-state interest groups (The Ohio Ballot Board, 2009). The thirteen members of the board, which are appointed by the Governor, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, must include the director of the Ohio Department of Agriculture, three family farmers, a food safety expert, two members from a statewide farming organization, two veterinarians, a dean of an Ohio college of agriculture, two consumers and one local humane society representative (The Ohio Ballot Board, 2009). "Issue 2", the legislation to establish the OLCSB, appeared on the November 2009 Ohio ballot. Issue 2 passed with 63.66% (n=1,959,669) of voters in favor and 36.4% (n=1,118,805) opposed (Ohio Secretary of State, 2009).

The Ballot Initiative Process and Campaign Spending

Ballot initiatives are a permanent part of the legislative process in 24 states, including Ohio (Ballot Initiative Strategy Center, 2011). In Ohio, initiatives exist in two forms: initiated statutes and initiated constitutional amendments, such as the establishment of the OLCSB (Ohio Secretary of State). To place a constitutional amendment on the ballot, a strict process must be followed. First, petitioners must create

a committee of 3 to 5 individuals to represent them in all matters (Ohio Revised Code Section 3519.02). Second, an initial petition, signed by 1,000 qualified Ohio voters, must be filed with the Ohio Attorney General and Secretary of State (Ohio Revised Code Sections 3501.05; 3519.01; 3519.05; 3505.062). Once the Ballot Board has certified the petition, the petitioners may begin to collect signatures for the initiated constitutional amendment (Ohio Constitution: Article II, Section 1g). The number of valid signatures on the petition must equal at least 10% of the total number of votes cast for the office of governor at the last gubernatorial election, the signatures must have been obtained from at least 44 of the 88 counties in Ohio and each signer must be a qualified Ohio voter (Ohio Constitution, Article II Section 1a; Ohio Constitution, Article II, Section 1g). Once signatures have been filed and verified, the initiated constitutional amendment will proceed to the ballot (Ohio Constitution, Article II, Section 1g).

Although HSUS and other outside groups would likely use the signature-gathering process to place an initiative on the ballot, Issue 2 was instead initiated by the Ohio General Assembly. To begin this process, the people behind Issue 2 had to gain the support of members of the General Assembly to sponsor resolutions that would place the constitutional amendment to create the OLCSB on the ballot. House Joint Resolution 2 was sponsored by Representative Allan Sayre (D-Dover) and co-sponsored by Representative Margaret Ruhl (R-Mt. Vernon) and Senate Joint Resolution 6 was sponsored by Senator Bob Gibbs (R-Lakeville) and co-sponsored by Senator Jason Wilson (D-Columbiana). The resolutions were introduced on June 18, 2009 in both chambers. A three-fifths vote in the General Assembly is required for passage of a joint resolution. HJR 2 passed with 84 yeas and 13 nays on June 24, 2009, and SJR 6 passed

with 31 yeas and 1 nay on July 6, 2009 (129th General Assembly of the State of Ohio, 2009).

Ballot initiatives are frequently costly affairs, with both supporting and opposing sides spending large amounts on their campaigns. In 2006, over \$325 million was spent by both sides of the 12 most expensive ballot initiatives in the United States, dealing with issues from renewable energy to cigarette taxes (Ballot Initiative Strategy Center, 2011). The amount of money spent during campaigns is also on the rise, as in 1992, \$117 million was spent in 21 states on campaigns supporting or opposing ballot measures, and in 1998 that figure jumped to \$400 million in 44 states (Stratmann, 2005). An increase in spending is predicted to result in a favorable election outcome, as an additional \$1,000,000 spent in favor of a ballot initiative is predicted to increase its chances of passing by 1.43 percent; and an increase of \$1,000,000 spent in opposition to a ballot initiative decreases its likelihood of passage by 1.90 percent (Figueiredo, 2010).

A recent study in California revealed a large disparity in spending on legislative propositions from 1982-2006, which must pass through both houses of the state Congress to make it onto the ballot, and initiatives, which are placed on the ballot through a signature gathering process (Figueiredo, 2010). An average of \$478,406 was spent in support of propositions and \$220,273 in opposition; in contrast to an average of \$3.6 million in support of initiatives and \$2.4 million in opposition (adjusted for inflation, in 1982-1984 dollars) (Figueiredo, 2010).

Much of this spending is on mass media advertising, which has been proven to impact the passage of an issue. Research has demonstrated that 100 extra advocacy advertisements increase the probability of the passage of an initiative by 1.2%, and 100

extra opposition advertisements decrease the probability of the passage by 1.8% (Stratmann, 2005). Trends are also apparent in the types of advertising which are effective in political campaigns. Almost half of all adults used the internet, email or phone text messaging for political purposes during the 2008 campaign cycle (Smith & Lee, 2008). The two fastest-growing sources for political information are social media sites and online videos (Smith & Lee, 2008).

Cognitive Dissonance as a Theoretical Framework

The cognitive dissonance theory states that when one is faced with conflicting ideas, one will be driven to complete cognitive work that will reduce the inconsistency (Dillard, 2002). Four research paradigms have repeatedly appeared in the research of dissonance processes: Free Choice Paradigm, Induced Compliance Paradigm, Belief Disconfirmation Paradigm and the Hypocrisy Paradigm (Dillard, 2002). These four paradigms drive the logic behind persuasion attempts. The Free Choice Paradigm assumes that once a decision is made, dissonance may arise (Dillard, 2002). Dissonance can be lessened by viewing the selected alternative as more desirable and the rejected alternative as less desirable, an effect called spreading of the alternatives (Dillard, 2002). The Induced Compliance Paradigm assumes that dissonance arises when a person does or says something in contrast to a previously held belief or attitude (Dillard, 2002). The Belief Disconfirmation Paradigm assumes that dissonance arises when people are exposed to information which conflicts with their beliefs (Dillard, 2002). Finally, the Hypocrisy Paradigm states that when faced with dissonance, people will attempt to reduce it by acting in accord with their pro-attitudinal statement or changing their attitudes to be more consistent with their past behavior (Dillard, 2002). Research has

supported the notion that dissonance is a motivational theory and that it produces lasting attitude, belief and behavior changes (Dillard, 2002). Cognitive inconsistency arouses motivation to change behavior and thought processes, therefore the cognitive dissonance theory is key in persuasion and motivation efforts, such as the media campaign being examined in this study.

Because this study focuses on a media campaign aimed at persuasion, the cognitive dissonance theory is an important framework to consider. Voters were presented with information that may cause dissonance in their thought process, and were hopefully then motivated to resolve that dissonance by forming a new, positive opinion on the farming industry and casting a “yes” vote on the issue at hand. Based on prior research, the cognitive dissonance persuasion theory will cause lasting changes in behavior and thought processes, therefore the new perspective gained by voters will alter their mindset toward farmers and animal-rights interest groups

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Ballot initiatives impacting the agricultural industry have appeared on ballots across the nation with increasing frequency. The purpose of this study was to examine a successful marketing campaign focused on a ballot initiative, the “Yes on Issue 2” campaign in Ohio.

Research Design

Researchers used case study methodology to evaluate the communications campaigns surrounding Issue 2. Case studies, commonly used in the social sciences, involve studying all of the intricacies of a single case (Stake, 1995), such as the media campaign. In his book *The Art of Case Study Research*, Robert E. Stake defines a case study as “the study of the peculiarity and complexity of a single case, coming to understand its activity within important circumstances” (Stake, 1995, pg. xi). In this research, the case is the media campaigns, and the important circumstances are the current state of public affairs in agriculture.

Interviews were a key part of the research conducted. The researchers interviewed three individuals involved with the media campaign, including a consultant at CMA Consulting and two individuals in communications at Ohio Farm Bureau Federation who played large roles in selecting and overseeing the materials and tactics used. Through these interviews and secondary source research, researchers were able to study the timeline, budget and reasoning behind the campaign. Additionally, researchers were able to gauge how OFBF rates the success of their campaign, and changes they may make in

future campaigns.

Key areas examined were the impact of social media, as it is a “free” media to use, and grassroots/word of mouth communication. According to the Pew Institute, the two fastest growing sources for election information are social media sites and online videos (Smith & Lee, 2008). As these sources are free to create, it is interesting to determine how the advertisers would rate their effectiveness in terms of effort and money spent.

Limitations of the Study

The case study conducted focused on the campaign promoting a “Yes” vote on the issue, as there were no registered PACs in opposition. Although an opposition campaign did exist, the lack of organization and filed spending reports made it difficult to analyze. Additionally, the social media aspect of the study poses issues. As statistics regarding the Facebook and Twitter posts of the Issue 2 campaign were not logged, it is impossible to track how many times they were viewed or shared, and therefore gauge their effectiveness. It is also difficult to quantify the value of social media in the campaign, as it is a “free medium” to use and therefore does not have a fixed cost.

Another limitation to the study was the selection of keywords for the LexisNexis Academic database search to find articles relating to Issue 2. The use of different terminology may have revealed different articles, changing the nature of the results. Additionally, the choice to only consider articles that focused mainly on Issue 2 is a potential restriction on the study’s outcome, as this did not consider photographs, captions or sidebars, or articles that contained only a brief mention of the issue at hand.

Data Collection

Using a case study, the data collection process for this study was threefold: primary research through interviews, secondary research through news media analysis and secondary research through campaign finance reports. The subjects for the interviews were chosen based on their first-hand involvement in the campaign and intimate knowledge of the methodology of the decision-making process for media purchases.

The newspapers used, *Cincinnati Enquirer*, *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, *Toledo Blade*, *Dayton Daily News* and the *Columbus Dispatch*, represent the largest media markets in the state of Ohio, with paid circulations as follows: *The Cleveland Plain Dealer*, 267,888 (The Cleveland Plain Dealer, 2007); *The Columbus Dispatch*, 210,000 (The Columbus Dispatch, 2008); *The Toledo Blade*, 139,346 (The Toledo Blade, 2010); *The Cincinnati Enquirer*, 161,858 (The Cincinnati Enquirer, 2011); and *The Dayton Daily News*, 116,200 (Dayton Daily News, 2008). A search of the LexisNexis Academic database was conducted for each newspaper for the time frame of January 1-November 4, 2009. Search terms included “Issue 2 Ohio,” “Ohio Livestock Care Standards Board,” and “Livestock care”. Only articles that focused primarily on Issue 2 were considered in this study. Additionally, only news articles, not opinion editorial pieces or letters to the editor, were considered. Endorsements of the initiative were considered separately. A total of 27 news articles were collected, along with nine opinion editorial/endorsement pieces.

The Ohioans for Livestock Care PAC expenses for the year 2009 were analyzed. Only the income and expenses for 2009 were considered, as this was the year of the election. The expense report was accessed through the Ohio Secretary of State. The Top

10 Contributors were compared, along with their total contributions. The expense breakdown of the PAC was also considered.

Analysis of Data

Both qualitative and quantitative data was collected and analyzed during this study. The qualitative data, gathered through one-on-one interviews, was compared using summaries of recurrent themes and ideas. The quantitative data, collected through the campaign finance report and a tabulation of media reports, was compared numerically and statistically, by comparing percentages of contributions and expenses. A numerical comparison of the media coverage broken down by newspaper was also conducted.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

In this chapter, the author presents the findings of the recent study, which examined the 2009 Ohio Issue 2 campaign from start to finish. Utilizing an analysis of the campaign finance report for the Ohioans for Livestock Care Political Action Committee, the study broke down the top contributions and expenditures of the PAC. Secondly, the study used one-on-one interviews to compile key messages and strategies for the campaign. Lastly, the study analyzed media coverage of the ballot initiative to seek out shifts and changes in tone. The study sought to satisfy three objectives:

- To examine the financial report of the Ohioans for Livestock Care PAC, including contributions and expenditures;
- determine the central messages and strategies of the campaign and how key personnel rate their effectiveness;
- and to examine media coverage of the issue from May to November 2009 to find any trends or shifts in tone.

Objective 1. Campaign Spending

The campaign spending report filed by Ohioans for Livestock Care provided valuable information to the study. A total of \$5,448,226.08 was donated to the pro-Issue 2 campaign. The main source of funding was the Ohio Farm Bureau Federation, who donated \$606,930, or 11.15% of the total contributions. A considerable portion of the campaign funding came from outside of the state of Ohio, with the largest out of state contributors being the National Pork Producers Council (\$249,500) and United Egg

Producers (\$200,000). In total, \$1,793,359, or 33.0% of total contributions, came from outside of Ohio. The vast majority of campaign funding came from the agricultural industry. Within agriculture, the top donators came from the following industry segments: Farm Bureau (\$1,314,853), Poultry and Eggs (\$1,048,262), Livestock (\$910,559), Agricultural Services and Products (\$698,860) and Crop Production and Basic Processing (\$431,910) (See Table 1).

The top expenses for the campaign were in advertising. The most costly form of advertising utilized was television, costing \$1,633,158.57, or 36.90% of total spending. Other forms of advertising used were mailed advertisements, radio spots, billboards, automated calls and yard signs. Besides advertising, considerable expenses were consulting, website, legal and market research. In all, the PAC spent \$4,426,779.81 on the pro-Issue 2 campaign. (See Table 2).

Table 1. Top 10 Contributions to Ohioans for Livestock Care Political Action Committee

Contributor	Amount	Percent of Total
Ohio Farm Bureau Federation	\$606,930	11.15%
National Pork Producers Council	\$249,500	4.59%
United Egg Producers	\$200,000	3.68%
Cooper Farms Feed & Animal Prod.	\$144,495	2.66%
Ohio Fresh Eggs LLC	\$144,000	2.65%
Ohio Poultry Association	\$125,273	2.30%
Ohio Soybean Association	\$110,500	2.03%
Ohio Pork Producers Council	\$107,922	1.98%
Weaver Bros, Inc.	\$105,073	1.93%
Fort Recovery Equity Inc.	\$100,576	1.85%
Total Contributed to OLC	\$5,448,226.08	

Table 2. 2009 Expenses for OLC PAC

Expense	Amount	Percent of Total
Television Advertising	\$1,633,158.57	36.90%
Mailers (Printing/postage/design)	\$784,204.87	17.72%

Advertising (General)	\$682,953.59	15.43%
Consulting	\$449,763.97	10.16%
Automated Calls	\$250,875.25	5.67%
Radio Advertising	\$161,930.23	3.66%
Website	\$113,220.60	2.56%
Legal	\$108,741.48	2.46%
Billboard Advertising	\$76,245.07	1.72%
Market Research	\$62,594.24	1.41%
Yard Signs	\$55,925.87	1.26%
Misc.	\$47,166.07	1.07%
Total Spending	\$4,426,779.81	

Objective 2. Central Messages and Key Personnel

The key personnel interviewed were asked to provide insight on the central elements of the campaign and their effectiveness. Their responses can be summarized into three categories: social media, unity and proactivity.

Social media was a key tool used in the pro-Issue 2 campaign, especially by the Ohio Farm Bureau Federation. Subject 1 stated: “People aren’t going to OFBF.org, they aren’t going to OhioansForLivestockCare.com, they’re going to Facebook and Twitter to spend their time. That’s where they’re discovering news and information, that’s where like-minded people are sharing news and information, that’s where they trust people more than they trust messages.” Facebook, Twitter and YouTube were all used in the campaign. Facebook was used as a rallying point for campaign supporters, where they could post photographs, links and other content. Twitter was used to reach a broader audience and to broadcast events as they occur, such as the hearings in the Senate and the House about the ballot initiative, which were live-tweeted using a hash tag. “Our logic for using social media was to show who we are, to build trust in Ohio farmers and our

members, to build those connections and those relationships so that when we do need them, they're already established," said Subject 1.

Additionally, unity was a recurring topic during the interviews. Unifying to establish the Ohioans for Livestock Care organization allowed Ohio agriculture to present a united front and to pool their resources for the campaign. Subject 2 referenced unity as an important element to the campaign's success, stating, "One of the crucial decisions both on the political action side and the communications side was that this was going to be a collaborative effort. The Pork Producers weren't going to go out and fight this battle on their own, and the poultry people on their own, and the dairy people on their own and Farm Bureau separately. It was decided that agricultural unity was a must."

Unity was also crucial in the different elements of the campaign, as harmony had to exist between the paid forms of media and grassroots efforts. Subject 3 noted room for improvement in this area, stating, "We did a lot of farmer engagement, I think we could have started that sooner and made more tools available to them. Potentially, we could have focused on more local events, really trying to bring people out in local communities."

Lastly, the interviewees emphasized the importance of being proactive. Proactivity allowed the Ohio Livestock Care Standards Board to be invented and implemented. After the February meeting with HSUS, Ohio's agricultural leaders chose to be proactive by pursuing the establishment of the OLCSB instead of mounting a defensive campaign against an HSUS-supported ballot initiative. Being on the offensive allowed the Issue 2 campaign to focus on the positive aspects of both the OLCSB and Ohio agriculture, as opposed to being in a reactionary mode to statements made by

HSUS. Subject 3 stated, “As a general principle, animal care issues win, whether it’s our side bringing it or the activist side bringing it...which is part of why we won, which is part of why HSUS wins.”

Being proactive with establishing a social media presence was also a contributing factor to its success, as Subject 1 stated: “With Issue 2, we had already built up a really nice group of followers [on Twitter], we had a lot of fans on Facebook, there were a lot of people that we interacted with on a daily basis that enjoyed getting messages from Ohio Farm Bureau and talking with Ohio Farm Bureau...it was a natural thing for us to do.”

Objective 3. Media Coverage

Media coverage of Issue 2 appeared in each of the five newspapers included in the study: *The Cincinnati Enquirer*, *The Cleveland Plain Dealer*, *The Columbus Dispatch*, *The Dayton Daily News* and *The Toledo Blade*. *The Columbus Dispatch* printed the most articles on the subject, with a total of 10. *The Cincinnati Enquirer* and *Cleveland Plain Dealer* published the least, with each printing only two articles dealing with Issue 2 appearing during the study period (See Table 3). These articles were all straight news pieces dealing with the issue and arguments surrounding it; opinion-editorial pieces and letters to the editor were considered separately. Each newspaper that printed an editorial or endorsement on the issue, *The Cleveland Plain Dealer*, *The Columbus Dispatch*, *The Dayton Daily News* and *The Toledo Blade*, endorsed a “No” vote, usually citing opposition to board being included in the Ohio Constitution (See Table 4). A total of 27 news articles were collected, along with nine opinion editorial/endorsement pieces.

Table 3. Media Coverage of Issue 2

Date of Publication	Publication	Title
May 26, 2009	The Columbus Dispatch	“Demands by humane society: Change policies, Ohio farms told”
June 23, 2009	Dayton Daily News	“Proposed farm animal care board under fire”
June 24, 2009	Toledo Blade	“Ohio lawmakers rush ballot issue to regulate livestock care”
June 25, 2009	The Columbus Dispatch	“House approves livestock board; Many hope to block Humane Society push for cage limits”
June 25, 2009	Toledo Blade	“House approves ballot issue on livestock treatment”
July 14, 2009	The Columbus Dispatch	“Voters to decide on livestock board”
July 19, 2009	The Plain Dealer	“Spurned Ohioans await enlightenment”
September 6, 2009	The Columbus Dispatch	“Fight over farms; Issue 2 would decide who regulates animal care in Ohio’s biggest business”
September 21, 2009	The Cincinnati Enquirer	“Animal rights fight heads to voters; Issue 2 would set up livestock care board”
October 9, 2009	The Cincinnati Enquirer	“Chickens, cows prompt heated battle”
October 9, 2009	The Columbus Dispatch	“As Ohio debates ballot issue on livestock care, Michigan agrees on new law”
October 11, 2009	The Toledo Blade	“As Ohio considers livestock treatment, Mich. crafts law”
October 15, 2009	Dayton Daily News	“State Issue 2: Livestock Care Standards Board”
October 15, 2009	Dayton Daily News	“Stickland stumps for Issue 2 at Columbus rally; Bipartisan effort shows support for a Livestock Care Standards Board”
October 15, 2009	The Columbus Dispatch	“Issue 2 is focus of rally, Proposed amendment would create board to set standards for livestock care”
October 20, 2009	The Columbus Dispatch	“Sides clash over livestock rules”
October 25, 2009	Dayton Daily News	“Farmers defend Issue 2; Controversial proposal is a battle over who should regulate Ohio’s agriculture industry”
October 25, 2009	Dayton Daily News	“Issue 2 vital for livelihood, most farmers say; Amendment would

		create a state livestock care standards board”
October 25, 2009	The Columbus Dispatch	“Livestock care is key in Issue 2 debate”
October 27, 2009	Toledo Blade	“Issue 2 opponents slow to mount campaign: Battle over treatment of livestock largely one-sided”
November 1, 2009	Toledo Blade	“Ballot question calls for board to regulate livestock”
November 1, 2009	Dayton Daily News	“Voters set to make decisions on casinos, veterans bonuses and livestock standards”
November 2, 2009	The Columbus Dispatch	“Issue 2 opponents spar in animal-rights debate”
November 4, 2009	Dayton Daily News	“Livestock, veteran amendments approved; Issue 1 will give bonuses to veterans; Issue 2 will set up an agriculture board”
November 4, 2009	Toledo Blade	“Ballot win creates state livestock board”
November 4, 2009	The Plain Dealer	“Voters back creation of livestock board, giving vets bonuses”
November 4, 2009	The Columbus Dispatch	“Livestock care board, help for veterans sail through”

Table 4: Commentary and Editorial Pieces on Issue 2

Date	Publication	Opinion
July 6, 2009	The Plain Dealer	Opposed, deemed the issue “farm fresh foolery”
October 1, 2009	Dayton Daily News	“Don’t believe propaganda, vote ‘no’ on 2”
October 15, 2009	The Plain Dealer	Endorsed a “No” vote, “Ohioans who vote “no” on Issue 2 on Nov. 3 should be prepared to vote “no” again, should the Humane Society seek its own ballot measure in a future election.”
October 18, 2009	The Plain Dealer	Endorsed a “No” vote
October 28, 2009	Toledo Blade	Editorial- “No on Issue 2”

November 1, 2009	The Columbus Dispatch	Opposed for constitutional issues, “Creating a well-balanced board to set standards for the care of livestock in Ohio is a good idea, but using the Ohio Constitution to do so is not. State Issue 2 would amend the constitution to create a 13-member Livestock Care Standards Board. Such a board could easily be created by legislation.”
November 1, 2009	The Columbus Dispatch	Commentary piece by Thomas Suddes: “State Issue 2 not about Joe Farmer; it’s about Megafarm Corp.”
November 1, 2009	The Plain Dealer	Commentary piece by Thomas Suddes: “Issue 2 would provide mega-farms mega-cover”
November 2, 2009	The Toledo Blade	Endorsed a “No” vote: “Is it too much to ask that pregnant sows, calves raised for veal, and egg-laying chickens have enough room in their cages to stand up, lie down, or turn around? Ohio’s industrial farms think so, and they want a constitutional amendment that will give them absolute control over the conditions under which the animals we eat are raised. Legislation, not the Ohio Constitution, is the appropriate place to regulate animal care. Vote NO on Issue Two.”

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, KEY FINDINGS AND IMPLICATIONS

The case study's data was collected using three techniques: primary research through one-on-one interviews with key personnel in the campaign, secondary research through an analysis of the Ohioans for Livestock Care Political Action Committee income and expenses from January-November 2009 and secondary research through examining articles published from May-November 2009 in the *Cincinnati Enquirer*, *The Cleveland Plain Dealer*, *The Columbus Dispatch*, *The Dayton Daily News* and *The Toledo Blade*.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to analyze the media campaign promoting a “Yes” vote on Issue 2. The study will focus mainly on the activities of the Ohioans for Livestock Care Political Action Committee, the only PAC registered with the Ohio Department of State as spending funds for an Issue 2 campaign.

Objectives

Several issues relating to agricultural issues on the ballot were uncovered through a review of literature. These issues were presented in the form of objectives, which were used as a framework when gathering data and helping to direct the aim of the study.

These objectives were:

1. To examine the financial report of the Ohioans for Livestock Care PAC, including contributions and expenditures;

2. To determine the key messages of the media campaign and how key personnel rate their effectiveness;
3. To review media coverage of the campaign and examine shifts in tone.

Limitations of the Study

The case study conducted focused on the campaign promoting a “Yes” vote on the issue, as there were no registered PACs in opposition. Although an opposition campaign did exist, the lack of organization and filed spending reports made it difficult to analyze. Additionally, the social media aspect of the study poses issues. As statistics regarding the Facebook and Twitter posts of the Issue 2 campaign were not logged, it is impossible to track how many times they were viewed or shared, and therefore gauge their effectiveness. It is also difficult to quantify the value of social media in the campaign, as it is a “free medium” to use and therefore does not have a fixed cost.

Another limitation to the study was the selection of keywords for the LexisNexis Academic database search to find articles relating to Issue 2. The use of different terminology may have revealed different articles, changing the nature of the results. Additionally, the choice to only consider articles that focused mainly on Issue 2 is a potential restriction on the study’s outcome, as this did not consider photographs, captions or sidebars, or articles that contained only a brief mention of the issue at hand.

Analysis of Data

Both qualitative and quantitative data was collected and analyzed during this study. The qualitative data, gathered through one-on-one interviews, was compared

using summaries of recurrent themes and ideas. The qualitative data, collected through the campaign finance report and a tabulation of media reports, was compared numerically and statistically.

Key Findings and Implications

Objective 1: Campaign Spending

A total of \$5,448,226.08 was donated to the pro-Issue 2 campaign. In total, \$1,793,359, or 33.0% of total contributions, came from outside of Ohio. This is interesting to note, as it emphasizes the importance of unity within the agricultural industry. The Issue 2 campaign in Ohio was very much a ‘trial run’ for other states with agricultural industries that may face a similar campaign in the future.

Within agriculture, the top donators came from the following industry segments: Farm Bureau (\$1,314,853), Poultry and Eggs (\$1,048,262), Livestock (\$910,559), Agricultural Services and Products (\$698,860) and Crop Production and Basic Processing (\$431,910). This is important to note, as industries outside of livestock production supported the issue, although it did not impact them directly. Industries outside of livestock, such as crops, insurance, and other services, must recognize that their futures go hand-in-hands with that of the livestock industry.

The top expenses for the campaign were in advertising. The most costly form of advertising utilized was television, costing \$1,633,158.57, or 36.90% of total spending. Other forms of advertising used were mailed advertisements, radio spots, billboards, automated calls and yard signs. Besides advertising, considerable expenses were consulting, website, legal and market research. In all, the PAC spent \$4,426,779.81 on

the pro-Issue 2 campaign. This seems to be a high amount for a campaign with little organized opposition, but it was crucial to spread a positive, unified face of Ohio agriculture, as supported by the cognitive dissonance theory of persuasion. If people are motivated to change their thought processes, the impact will be lasting and carry over to other decisions.

Objective 2: Central Messages and Key Personnel

According to campaign personnel, social media was a key tool used in the pro-Issue 2 campaign, especially by the Ohio Farm Bureau Federation. Facebook, Twitter and YouTube were all used in the campaign. Facebook was used as a rallying point for campaign supporters, as one must “Like” the page to view the information, while Twitter was used to reach a broader, more general audience, as posts are open to public view. Social media was an important component due to its low cost (free to use) and wide audience. Personnel indicated that in a future campaign, they would dedicate even more time and resources to their social media sites. This information implies that agricultural organizations should establish a presence online and familiarize themselves with social media websites and tools.

Unity was also a recurring topic during the interviews. Unifying to establish the Ohioans for Livestock Care organization allowed Ohio agriculture to present a united front and to pool their resources for the campaign. Additionally, those interviewed emphasized the notion that the portion of the industry with the most to lose should not be at the forefront of the campaign (i.e. the pork industry battling legislation regarding farrowing crates). This implies that agricultural groups must join together to display a united front in the face of outside threats, instead of dividing and avoiding issues that do

not directly impact them. Unity was also crucial in the different elements of the campaign, as harmony had to exist between the paid forms of media and grassroots efforts. It was suggested that in future campaigns, the personnel would work to strengthen this relationship by surveying grassroots campaign members about what materials they would find most effective, and then hiring paid media firms to create these materials.

Lastly, the interviewees emphasized the importance of being proactive. Proactivity allowed the Ohio Livestock Care Standards Board to be invented and implemented. Organizations should be proactive before faced with a crisis by becoming a trusted source of information and creating an open forum of discussion with the public. Having a well-established social media following made Ohio Farm Bureau's campaign much easier and successful, in contrast to opposition group Food and Water Watch, whose attempt to establish "Issue 2 Tuesdays" on Twitter was unsuccessful due to lack of followers. Agricultural organizations should establish a presence online and in public as soon as possible in order to become a familiar source for information for the public.

Objective 3: Media Coverage

The debate over Issue 2 was covered by the five major Ohio newspapers, The Cincinnati Enquirer, *The Cleveland Plain Dealer*, *The Columbus Dispatch*, *The Dayton Daily News* and the *Toledo Blade* with 27 total news stories between May 26, 2009 and November 4, 2009. Additionally, nine opinion editorial/endorsement pieces were published during this same time frame, with the four papers who offered an opinion supporting a "No" vote on the issue.

While the number of negative endorsements and editorials implies an uphill battle with the media, many of these pieces focused on the constitutional aspect of the issue rather than the Ohio Livestock Care Standards Board itself. *The Cleveland Plain Dealer*, who referred to the initiative as “Farm fresh foolery” in a July 6 editorial, shifted in tone by the end of the campaign to state: “Ohioans who vote “no” on Issue 2 on Nov. 3 should be prepared to vote “no” again, should the Humane Society seek its own ballot measure in a future election,” in their October 18th endorsement of a “no” vote. *The Columbus Dispatch* also cited constitutional issues in their opposition, stating “Creating a well-balanced board to set standards for the care of livestock in Ohio is a good idea, but using the Ohio Constitution to do so is not. State Issue 2 would amend the constitution to create a 13-member Livestock Care Standards Board. Such a board could easily be created by legislation,” in their November 2 editorial. This coverage implies that the agricultural community must maintain an open and honest dialogue with the media and constantly be available to provide information. The fact that the media’s criticism of the issue focused largely on constitutional issues as opposed to showing support for HSUS’ demands is promising for agriculture.

Implications

Other agricultural groups can benefit greatly from studying the successful model of the 2009 Ohio Issue 2 campaign. The campaign is an example of a piece of legislation that benefits agriculture successfully passing on the ballot, in contrast to the large numbers of initiatives that do not benefit the industries. It is apparent that agricultural organizations need to be proactive and communicate with the public at all times in order to be successful in the future if they ever present a ballot initiative similar to Issue 2.

One of the largest elements in the success of the pro-Issue 2 campaign was proactivity. By being proactive after the original meeting with HSUS, Ohio agricultural organizations were able to move swiftly to set the initiated constitutional amendment in motion that would create the Ohio Livestock Care Standards Board. Instead of mounting a defensive campaign against an HSUS-supported ballot initiative, Ohio agriculture was able to be on the offensive. Additionally, Ohio Farm Bureau was proactive in their social media efforts. Because they were already an established presence on Facebook and Twitter, less effort was needed to reach a broader audience. Other state and national agricultural organizations should begin to establish a credible presence online, so they can be viewed as a trusted source of information in the future when they attempt to communicate about key issues.

Unity was also a key to success in the campaign. The unified agricultural industry allowed the pro-Issue 2 campaign to receive considerable amounts of funding from both in and out of Ohio. Without this funding, the campaign would have been impossible to accomplish. Unity also allowed organizations to come together to establish the Ohioans for Livestock Care Political Action Committee to present a united front. Unity was also key between different elements of the campaign. Grassroots advocacy was an important part of the campaign, as it is low-cost and allows a personal connection between the farmer and the public. Other campaigns should heed the advice regarding ensuring a strong and cohesive connection between the paid media materials and the grassroots campaign efforts.

The cognitive dissonance model of persuasion was at use in the media campaign at the center of this study. Voters are presented with a barrage of information, which may

conflict with beliefs and values that they already hold. This dissonance motivates them to seek a resolution by altering their beliefs and actions to be in accordance with new ideas. Therefore, it was important for those involved in the campaign to present valid and convincing information to the public, as persuasion through dissonance has been shown to have lasting and profound effects. Although an opposition campaign was not visible, a large amount of time and financial resources were invested in the pro-Issue 2 campaign. This investment can be justified by the strength of the dissonance theory- if people are motivated to change their thought processes, the impact will be lasting and carry over to other decisions.

Based on the outcomes of this study, agricultural communication educators need to ensure that they are educating their students on the wide range of communication methods available during media campaigns. Students must be aware of every communication outlet, from paid television advertising to grassroots volunteers, and how they can function cohesively in a media campaign. Additionally, it is important for educators to pass on information about the legislative process. The next generation of agriculturalists must know how the government functions in relation to agriculture and how to use the legislative process to their greatest advantage.

REFERENCES

- 129th General Assembly of the State of Ohio. (2009, July 6). Retrieved May 16, 2011, from Laws, Acts, and Legislation:
http://www.legislature.state.oh.us/votes.cfm?ID=128_HJR_2
- Anreassen, A. R. (2006). *Social Marketing in the 21st Century*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.
- Anti-Cruelty: Related Statutes. (2010). Retrieved December 5, 2010, from Michigan State University College of Law Animal Legal & Historical Center:
<http://www.animallaw.info/statutes/topicstatutes/sttoac.htm>
- Ballot Initiative Strategy Center. (2006, November 6). Ballot Initiative Strategy Center. Retrieved May 16, 2011, from 2006 Initiative Spending: Twelve of the most expensive campaigns: http://bisc.3cdn.net/e49ecfb82e73b92f8_1am6bxsy5.pdf
- Becker, G. (2010, September 16). Horse slaughter prevention bills and issues. Retrieved May 16, 2011, from Congressional Research Service N. RS21842: (Figueiredo, 2010) (Figueiredo, 2010)<http://www.nationalaglawcenter.org/assets/crs/RS21842.pdf>
- Dayton Daily News. (2008, March). Dayton Daily News. Retrieved May 16, 2011, from Advertiser Resources:
<http://www.cmgoio.com/?x=products/daytondailynews&menuID=ddn>
- Dillard, J. P. (2002). *The Persuasion Handbook: Developments in Theory and Practice*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Elections & Ballot Issues. (n.d.). Retrieved November 28, 2010, from Ohio Secretary of State: <http://www.sos.state.oh.us/SOS/elections.aspx>
- Figueiredo, J. (2010, June 08). *Financing Direct Democracy: Revisiting the Research on Campaign Spending and Citizen Initiatives*. Duke Law Scholarship Repository, 50.
- Food Safety Inspection Service (2011). *Federal meat inspection act*. Retrieved May 16, 2011, from
http://www.fsis.usda.gov/Regulations_&_Policies/Federal_Meat_Inspection_Act/index.Asp
- Francione, G.L. (1996). Animal rights: An incremental approach. In R. Garner (Ed.), *Animal rights* (pp. 42-60). Washington Square, New York: New York University Press.
- Francione, G.L. (2000). *Introduction to animal rights: Your child or the dog?* Philadelphia: Temple University Press

- Garner, R. (1996). Introduction: The forward march of animals halted? In R. Garner (Ed.), *Animal rights* (pp. xi-xv). Washington Square, New York: New York University Press.
- Goodwin, J. (2009). Agricultural Legislation: The Presence of California's Proposition Two on YouTube. *American Association for Agricultural Education Research Conference*, (pp. 15-29). Louisville.
- Jasper, J.M. (1996). The American animal rights movement. In R. Garner (Ed.), *Animal rights* (pp. 129-142). Washington Square, New York: New York University Press.
- Johnson, A. (2009, September 6). Fight over farms: Issue 2 would decide who regulates animal care in Ohio's biggest business. *Columbus Dispatch*.
- Radford, M. (1996). Partial protection: Animal welfare and the law. In R. Garner (Ed.) *Animal rights* (pp. 67-91). Washington Square, New York: New York University Press.
- Regan, T. (2004). *The case for animal rights* (Rev. ed.). Los Angeles: University of California Press Berkeley.
- Stake, R. E. (1995). *The Art of Case Study Research*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- State Issue 2: November 3, 2009. (n.d.). Retrieved November 25, 2010, from Ohio Secretary of State:
<http://www.sos.state.oh.us/SOS/elections/electResultsMain/2009ElectionResults/20091103issue2.aspx>
- Stratmann, T. (2005). The Effectiveness of Money in Ballot Measure Campaigns. *Southern California Law Review* , 1041-1064.
- Sullivan, D.M., Vietzke, H., & Coyne, M.L. (2008, September 22). A modest proposal for advancing animal rights. *Albany Law Review*, 71, 1129.
- The Cincinnati Enquirer. (2011, March 27). The Cincinnati Enquirer. Retrieved May 16, 2011, from Newspaper Publisher's Statement :
<http://cincinnati.com/mediaguide/Attachments/ABCPubStatement3.27.11.pdf>
- The Cleveland Plain Dealer. (2007). The Plain Dealer. Retrieved May 16, 2011, from About Us: www.plaindealer.com/about_us/index.php
- The Columbus Dispatch. (2008, March). The Columbus Dispatch. Retrieved May 16, 2011, from Advertiser E-Services:
<http://www.dispatch.com/live/content/advertise/aboutus.html>

The Humane Society of the United States. (2009, September 30). The Humane Society of the United States. Retrieved May 16, 2011, from About Us: Overview: <http://www.humanesociety.org/about/overview/>

The Ohio Ballot Board (2009). *Issue 2: Text of proposed amendment*. Retrieved October 21, 2009 from, <http://www.sos.state.oh.us/SOS/elections/IssueProcBallotBd/BallotBoard.aspx#Issues>

The Toledo Blade. (2010, January). The Toledo Blade. Retrieved May 16, 2011, from Readership: <http://www.toledoblade.com/advertiser/readership>

Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.