

Animal Rights vs. Animal Welfare: Is Society able to distinguish the Difference and make Informed Decisions on Animal Care Legislation?

Research Paper

Joy Goodwin

Graduate Student, Agricultural Communications
The Ohio State University
208 Ag Admin Bldg.
2120 Fyffe Rd
Columbus, OH 43210
614-292-4937
Fax 614-292-7007
goodwin.130@osu.edu

Emily Rhoades

Assistant Professor, Agriculture Communications
The Ohio State University
208 Ag Admin Bldg.
2120 Fyffe Rd
Columbus, OH 43210
614-292-4937
Fax 614-292-7007
rhoades.100@osu.edu

Animal Rights vs. Animal Welfare: Is Society able to distinguish the Difference and make Informed Decisions on Animal Care Legislation?

Abstract

United States citizens have increasingly become concerned with the treatment and care of animals. In correlation with their concerns, legislation aimed at improving animal protection has been more prevalent on the political agenda. Most of the items on the political agenda claim to be supporting animal welfare; however most are developed and lobbied for by animal rights organizations such as the Humane Society of the United States (HSUS). A concern among agriculturalists has emerged saying that citizens do not understand the difference between animal rights and animal welfare, which could negatively result in legislation that may adversely affect important economic industries, such as the agriculture industry. For this study researchers conducted a directly administered questionnaire of Ohio citizens to determine their understanding and beliefs of animal rights and animal welfare. Through voluntary participation of citizens visiting the Agriculture/Horticulture Building at the Ohio State Fair, 508 citizens completed questionnaires. Results indicate that the citizens who completed questionnaires do not have a direct understanding of animal rights and animal welfare. In addition, the results indicate that citizen's beliefs of current legislation are not accurate. In order to protect the agriculture industry, agriculture advocates must improve their ability to educate and communicate with general public about the difference between animal rights and animal welfare, as well as other pertinent topics concerning animal agriculture and the industry as a whole.

Keywords: Animal Rights, Animal Welfare, Agricultural Legislation, Issue 2, Social Learning Theory, Cognitive Dissonance Theory

Introduction

The History of Animal Protection and Legislation

There is evidence that humans were thinking about the cognition of animals in the 17th century when Rene Descartes philosophized that animals had no thought (Regan, 2004). Since then more theories have been made about the cognition of animals. Many people now believe that animals possess “conscious awareness” (Regan, 2004, pg. 2). This in return suggests that animals can feel pain, think, plan, and possibly have feelings. When animals are given these human like characteristics many people identify with them and become concerned with the way in which they are treated and cared for, thus resulting in a push for animal protection.

The European Union has led the way in animal protection standards. In 1822, Great Britain implemented their first animal protection legislation (Radford, 1996). Animal protection laws have continued to progress in the European Union, and treatment regulations have been placed on calves and egg laying hens. Additionally, politicians have banned veal crates as well as any other action determined to be inhumane (Sullivan et al., 2008). With the success these acts have had, similar legislation has begun spilling over into other countries, including the United States.

Prior to the movement toward animal protection, which has surfaced and intensified within the last 30 years, two primary federal regulations were in place in the United States concerning animals. These included the Humane Methods of Slaughter Act of 1901 and the Federal Meat Inspection Act of 1906 (Becker, 2009; Garner, 1996). The Humane Methods Slaughter Act included that “...livestock must be slaughtered in a humane manner to prevent needless suffering, research methods on humane methods of slaughter, the non-applicability of these statues to religious or ritual slaughter, and the investigation into the care of non-ambulatory livestock” (“Humane Methods,” 2009). In addition, the Federal Meat Inspection Act provides

regulations on: ante mortem and post mortem inspections, humane methods of slaughter, meat inspectors, marks of inspection, labeling, packaging, sanitation, export inspections, import inspections, storage, handling, and record keeping among other things (Food Safety Inspection Service, 2009). In 1966, the Animal Welfare Act became a federal law in the United States (United States Department of Agriculture, 2009e). Since then the Animal Welfare Act has been amended six times, the most current amendment being in 2007 (United States Department of Agriculture, 2009e). The Animal Welfare Act originally set legislation 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 expanded to include: all warm blooded animals being used for experimentation or exhibition, has set restrictions on animal fighting, set requirements of health certifications by a veterinarian, established that an Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee must be in place at institutions of animal experimentation in order to insure the most humane care, and created holding periods for shelter animals (United States Department of Agriculture, 2009f; United States Department of Agriculture, 2009b; United States Department of Agriculture, 2009c; United States Department of Agriculture, 2009d).

Within the last few years the focus has shifted from federal legislation to a focus on individual states for animal protection legislation. In 2002, Florida became the first state to ban gestation crates for housing sows (The Humane Society of the United States, 2009b). Similar legislation has now passed in seven states, some of which also include a ban on veal crates and cages for egg laying hens (The Humane Society of the United States, 2009b). This single state legislation concerning livestock housing is expected to continue as states like Ohio and Indiana have been targeted (White, 2009; Truitt, 2009). In addition to livestock housing legislation, other

individual state focused legislation includes the Prevention of Equine Cruelty Act, also known as the “Horse Slaughter ban,” which was originally implemented in Texas and Illinois in 2007 (Becker, 2009). As animal protection regulations have increasingly become part of the United States political agenda the question has arose regarding whether the regulations are fulfilling an animal rights or animal welfare agenda.

Animal Rights vs. Animal Welfare

The difference between animal rights and animal welfare generally appears to be a gray area. Many people confuse the terms, and it is unknown if the general population really understands the difference between the two. In addition, different groups of people will provide diverse definitions for the two terms. According to the American College of Animal Welfare Organizing Committee, animal welfare is defined as the ethical responsibility to care for the well being of animals, ensuring good health, the ability to cope effectively with their environment and the ability express a diversity of behaviors specific to the individual species (American Veterinary Medical Association, 2009). Animal Rights is often defined as giving basic rights to animals and all sentient beings (The Vegetarian Resource Group, 2009). Gary Francione an animal rights extremist explains the animal rights position similarly, “...the rights position maintains that at least some animals are rightholders and that treating animals solely as means to human ends violates those rights. (1996, pg. 42)” However, Francione’s explanation of animal welfare is far removed from the animal welfare definition stated above. According to Francione “The welfare position maintains that animal interests may be ignored if the consequences for humans justify it. (1996, pg. 42)”. It is evident that there are many ideas about the correct definitions of animal rights and animal welfare.

Issue 2

In response to threats of HSUS legislation and proposed negotiations with HSUS, Ohio became the first state to take a proactive approach to creating their own livestock care legislation (White, 2009). This legislation was given the title of “Issue 2” and was decided by voters on November 3, 2009. Issue 2 proposed an amendment to the Ohio Constitution that will create a Livestock Care Standards Board (The Ohio Ballot Board, 2009). The Board will set standards for the care and well being of livestock, maintain food safety, support locally grown food, and protect Ohio farmers and families (The Ohio Ballot Board, 2009). Thirteen members will sit on the Board; these members will be appointed by the Governor, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives (The Ohio Ballot Board, 2009). Members appointed to the Board must be Ohio citizens and both political parties must be represented. A diverse array of expertise will make up the 13 member board which will include the following: 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 is an animal welfare proposal; however, organizations in favor of animal welfare, such as HSUS, oppose the issue (The Humane Society of the United States, 2009a).

Deleted: has been

Deleted: is to be

Deleted: proposes

Theoretical Framework

To better understand how such issues resonate with the citizens this study is guided by the cognitive dissonance and social learning theories.

Cognitive Dissonance Theory

Dissonance occurs when conflict exists in an individual’s mind between two cognitions (Aronson, 1969). Leon Festinger developed the theory of cognitive dissonance in 1957; he

concluded that cognitive dissonance was present when cognitive information was inconsistent with ones' perceived personal attributes (as cited in Hunt, 2004). Three assumptions concerning human cognition lay the foundation for Cognitive Dissonance Theory. These assumptions include the following:“(1) people have a need for cognitive consistency; (2) when cognitive inconsistency exists, people experience psychological discomfort; and (3) psychological discomfort motivates people to resolve the inconsistency and restore cognitive balance. (Hunt, 2004, p. 147)” In instances of dissonance one may change one or both of the conflicting cognitive thoughts in order to add consonance, allowing the cognitions to come in line with one another and restore cognitive balance (Aronson, 1969).

Dissonance becomes very prevalent in decision making, especially decisions of a complex nature. If there is considerable conflict before a decision, the dissonance that follows the decision is also expected to be significant (Festinger, 1964). Thus one would validate their decision rather quickly to reduce dissonance (Festinger, 1964). However, Cognitive Dissonance Theory does not imply that the right decision will be made; it simply suggests that one would rationalize their decision in order to feel confident and secure with themselves as well as appear rational to others (Aronson, 1969).

Social Learning Theory

Individuals often learn through the interactions of their daily environment; this may include observing other's behaviors and using or participating in forms of mass media (Bandura, 1969; Perry, 2004; Klapper, 1960). The knowledge gained through observation is then cognitively stored and later used to influence future behaviors (Klapper, 1960). Social Learning Theory can be identified through indentificatory events (Bandura, 1969). An indentificatory event is defined as “...the occurrence of similarity between the behavior of a model and another

person under conditions where the model's behavior has served as the determinative cue for matching responses (Bandura, 1969, p. 217).” However, pseudo-identification can also occur. This is when different situations or observations generate comparable behaviors in different individuals (Bandura, 1969). Although one may be able to identify the source of an individual's behavior, it is difficult to specify the specific influence of the social behavior (Bandura, 1969).

Social learning is said to be one of the many effects of mass media (Klapper, 1960). The ideas present in mass media are often reflected by individuals in the general public (Klapper, 1960). For example, fashion, nutrition, popular home products, how to interact with others, and much more is disseminated through mass media outlets (Klapper, 1960). This notion ties closely to the ideas presented in the Social Cognitive Theory. Social Cognitive Theory takes these ideas one step further by suggesting that social influences develop an individual's beliefs, emotions, and cognition (Bandura, 1986). Standard emotional reactions of individuals can be mapped through modeling, instruction, and social persuasion (Bandura, 1986). When social cognitive theory is applied to media, it can be implied that attractive images and ideas catch the attention of individuals which later may be reflected in their behavior (Nabi & Oliver, in press).

Purpose

Due to the increasing concern for animal well being in the public sphere, as well as the increasing presence of animal protection legislation, it is important that communicators are adequately disseminating information; in addition, it is important that communicators possess an awareness of the general public's knowledge on the topic. The goal of this study is to assess the perception of agricultural practices and legislation that is held by a sample of citizens attending the Ohio State Fair. Having an understanding of such perception is important to

agricultural communicators and educators; this information will allow them to understand what information citizens currently possesses as well as indicate the means of effectively targeting their legislative campaigns. Agricultural professionals will be able to analyze their current uses of messaging and establish improvements to their information dissemination processes in order to increase citizen's knowledge of agriculture through the use of this information. Understanding current perceptions will allow the agriculture industry to correct misunderstandings about agriculture and combat competing organizations with anti-agricultural values.

The following objectives directed this study:

1. To determine the demographics of Ohio citizens visiting the State Fair.
2. To evaluate the knowledge of animal rights and animal welfare held by Ohio citizens visiting the Ohio State Fair.
3. To determine the understanding and beliefs of agricultural legislation held by Ohio citizens visiting the Ohio State Fair.

Methods

Researchers used directly administered questionnaire methods to determine the knowledge and perceptions of agriculture amongst a sample of Ohio State fair attendees. Directly administered questionnaires are a research tool that enables researchers to obtain information from individuals who have gathered at common place for a common purpose (Ary, Jacobs, Razavieh & Sorensen, 2006). A benefit to directly administered questionnaires includes that researchers are able to guide participants through the questionnaire (Ary et. al., 2006).

The study sample was obtained at the 2009 Ohio State Fair. The data was collected at a booth in the Agriculture and Horticulture building. Participants voluntarily participated in the study. Subject recruitment was obtained by the use of a sign above the research booth which read “Are you 18 year or older? Are you an Ohio resident? Do you want Free Ice Cream?” Six individuals administered questionnaires over a period of eight days. Each participant was given a coupon for a free single-dip ice cream cone from the Ohio Dairy Producers booth at the fair. A sample of 508 questionnaires were collected, 502 questionnaires were deemed usable and were evaluated as a part of this study. The six questionnaires dismissed from the research were deemed unusable due to lack of responses or Ohio citizenship. In addition to the 508 subjects who participated in the study, 57 other individuals inquired about the study and then declined participation.

Questionnaire administrators underwent a training prior to data collection. This allowed the administrators to practice and become familiar with the questions, learn how to listen carefully and pick out important details, as well as eliminate personal bias when talking with participants. The questionnaire began with two prescreening questions which established that the participants were adults and Ohio citizens. Additional information that was collected throughout the questionnaire included: demographics; knowledge of the difference between animal rights and animal welfare; rank of perceived treatment of animals by farmers; rank of the importance of humane treatment to food animals; awareness of individual state legislation banning conventional livestock housing methods; knowledge of the difference between HSUS and local humane societies; and knowledge of the constitutional amendment to Ohio’s constitution to create a livestock care standards board to be voted on in the November 2009 election. A panel of researchers and Farm

Bureau staff closely associated with the amendment evaluated the questionnaire instrument to ensure validity.

Upon the completion of the data collection, data was entered into SPSS© and quantitative statistics were calculated. Qualitative information was explored using open-coding and themes were pulled from the data.

Results

The first objective of the research was to determine the demographics of Ohio citizens visiting the State Fair. Researchers collected demographic information on age, ethnicity, gender, highest level of education, voting status, area of residence, and agriculture experience. The age of participants had a range of 18 to 88. The mean age was 44.35, with a median of 46, and a mode of 50. When divided into age groups of 18-29, 30-39, 40-49, 50-59, 60-69, 70-79, and 80-89, the forties aged group had the most participants with 124 (24.7%). Eleven participants declined to answer this question.

Various ethnicities were represented among the participants. The Caucasian ethnicity was most prevalent with 412 (82.1%) of participants. African American's were represented by 41 (8.2%) individuals. Ethnicity was not reported by 13 (2.6%) respondents.

Gender was not asked, but was identified by the researchers. A gender was not specified for ten of the questionnaires. Females contributed to 62.7% (n= 315) of the sample, while 35.5% (n= 177) of the sample was made up of males. (See Table 1)

A Bachelor's degree was the most frequent response as the highest level of education, as it was indicated by 181 (36.1%) of the respondents. The category of "some college" which

included any college experience below the bachelors level, followed with 122 (24.3%) responses. A high school diploma was the highest level of education for 99 (19.7%) of the participants.

Table 1
Demographics of participants

Demographic	<i>f</i>	%
Age		
40-49	124	24.7
50-59	114	22.7
18-29	106	21.1
60-69	64	12.8
30-39	52	10.4
70-79	24	4.8
80-89	7	1.4
Ethnicity		
Caucasian	412	82.1
African American	41	8.2
Other	21	4.2
Asian	6	1.2
Hispanic	9	1.8
Gender		
Female	315	62.7

Male	177	35.3
Education		
Bachelors	181	36.1
Some College	122	24.3
High School	99	19.7
Masters	75	14.9
Professional	13	2.6
Did Not Finish High School	8	1.6
GED	1	.2

Three questions were asked about the respondents voting status. One question asked if the participants were registered to vote, followed by asking if they voted in the last election and the last three elections. The majority of respondents were registered to vote, with 95% (n= 477) indicating so. Similarly, 90.4% (n= 454) of participants indicated that they voted in the last election, while 9.2% (n= 46) did not. When looking at the distribution of voters in the last three elections, 79.5% (n= 399) of respondents voted and 19.9% (n= 100) did not. Of the 502 participants, one did not indicate if they were registered to vote, two did not specify if they voted in the last election, and three declined to identify if they voted in the last three elections. When specifying the area of residence, 202 (40.2%) participants indicated that they resided in a suburban area. The number of urban and rural residing participants was very similar; urban residence was identified by 128 (25.5%) of respondents, while rural residence was identified by

126 (25.1 %) of respondents. A farm residence was indicated by 45 (9.5%) participants. Only one participant declined to answer this question.

Participants were asked to rank their experience with agriculture on a scale of 1 to 5, with one indicating no experience and 5 indicating that they have lived on a farm. Ranking their experience with agriculture as a 5 was 132 (26.3%) respondents. Similarly, on the other end of the scale 128 (25.5%) respondents indicated that they had no experience with agriculture. (See Table 2)

Table 2
Experience with Agriculture

Rank	<i>f</i>	%
5- Lived on a Farm	132	26.3
4	53	10.6
3	101	20.1
2	87	17.3
1- No Experience	128	25.5

The second objective of the research was to evaluate the knowledge of animal rights and animal welfare held by Ohio citizens attending the Ohio State Fair. The distribution of individuals indicating that they knew the difference between animal rights and animal welfare was closely distributed. Those indicating that they did not know the difference was and 50.4% (253) of participants.

When participants were asked to describe the difference between animal rights and animal welfare several themes arose. Four common explanations of animal rights arose. These included that animal rights are rules and legislation; animals have the same rights as humans and cannot be used for human benefit; animals do not have rights; and animal rights included proper treatment and items animals are entitled to. Three common definitions of animal welfare were given. They included animal welfare was the rescuing of strays and protection of animals; that

welfare was the proper treatment and care for an animal’s well being; and welfare is the idea of humane treatment while using animals for human benefit.

Respondents were asked if they felt farmers in Ohio raised their animals in a humane manner. Participants were asked to respond on a scale of 1-5. They were told that a ranking of 1 would indicate not humane and a 5 would indicate very humane. The ranking of very humane had the most responses with 174 (34.7%). The responses continued down the scale with 161 (32.1%) indicating a ranking of 4, and 112 (22.3%) identifying a neutral response. Two participants chose not to answer this question. (See Table 3)

Table 3
Do Farmers in Ohio raise their animals in a humane manner?

Rank	<i>f</i>	%
5 (very humane)	174	34.7
4	161	32.1
3 (neutral)	112	22.3
2	35	7.0
1 (not humane)	18	3.6

When participants were asked why they chose a particular ranking eight common responses arose. Three similar responses included the following: because I know, have seen, or heard that they treat their animals well; because I know, have seen, or heard that they do not treat their animals well; and some treat their animals well and some do not. Some respondents referenced media as being the reason for their ranking. In addition, some respondents indicated they chose their ranking because farming is the farmer’s livelihood and income and some chose a particular ranking because they were farmers or agriculture professionals themselves. The final common response was one of uncertainty; several people indicated that they were unsure of how animals were treated, hoped they were treated well, or would like to think that they were treated well. Positive views of treatment were displayed through comments such as “I know a lot of

farmers; they treat their animals better than themselves.” A negative comment was often demonstrated through comments similar to the following: “What I hear may not be representative, but what I hear is mostly bad news.”

After thinking about how they felt farmers treated animals, participants were then asked how important the humane treatment of food animals was to them. They were asked to rank the importance on a scale of 1-5, with 1 representing not important and 5 very important. Of the participants, 317 (63.1%) indicated that the humane production of food was very important. (See Table 4)

Table 4
How important is the humane production of food animals?

Rank	<i>f</i>	%
5 (very important)	317	63.1
4	116	23.1
3 (neutral)	56	11.2
2	11	2.2
1 (not important)	1	0.2

Several reasons evolved when the subjects were asked why they chose their ranking for the importance of the humane production of food. Two of the most popular reasons were that it is important to treat animals humanely because they will be our food, as well as that animals simply should not be mistreated. Health along with religious reasons, money and economic issues, and protection of family (mainly children) by insuring that they are provided with quality food were also common themes regarding the importance of humane treatment. In addition, some felt that although animals are used for human consumption they are still beings and can feel pain. Participants expressed their reasoning’s through explanations such as “they provide for us we should provide for them” and “I don’t want bruised meat.”

The last question asked to determine the fair attendees’ knowledge of animal rights and animal welfare was, if participants were familiar with HSUS or their local humane society. If

they answered yes, they were asked to specify which they were familiar with. A large number of participants, 408 (81.3%) indicated that they were either familiar with HSUS or their local humane society. Only 93 (18.5%) of the respondent indicated that they were not familiar with either one of the organizations. Of the participants who indicated they were familiar, 401 specified which organization they were familiar with. Local humane societies were the most common response as 245 (61.1%) of the individuals provided this answer. Indicating that they were familiar with both organizations was 130 (32.4%) of the participants. Lastly, 26 (6.5%) indicated that they were familiar with HSUS.

Participants were then asked if they could describe the difference between HSUS and their local humane society. Common responses were that local humane societies were at a local level and HSUS was at a national level and that there was no difference between the two. HSUS was also individually described as large scale and oversees all animals, a legislative lobbying organization with a policy agenda, and as extremist and activists with animal rights agendas. Local humane societies were individually described as a pet shelter where you can adopt pets, part of the state government, and an organization that provides animal welfare. Many people could describe one organization or the other correctly, but very few could describe both. Of the sample, 55 individuals described some aspect or had a correct idea about HSUS, while 106 of the participants described local humane societies accurately.

The third objective of the study was to determine the understanding and beliefs of agricultural legislation held by Ohio citizens visiting the Ohio State Fair. To gain a better understanding of the attendees' knowledge of agricultural legislation researchers asked the participants if they knew that conventional livestock housing methods had been outlawed in six states. In addition, researchers read a description of Ohio's proposed Livestock Care Amendment

and asked participants to rank the amendment's ability to improve the humane treatment of animals in Ohio as well as the safety and wholesomeness of food produced in Ohio on a scale of 1 to 5.

Of the 502 participant sample, 405 (80.7%) participants indicated that they were not aware that conventional livestock housing methods had been banned in six states. Only 96 (19.1%) of participants were aware of such legislation.

Although the livestock amendment to be on Ohio's ballot in November of 2009 had not been given an official issue number at the time the research was collected, the researchers described the amendment to the participants and asked them if they thought it would improve the humane treatment of livestock. Respondents provided their answers on a scale of 1-5 with 1 representing not improving and 5 improving greatly. Those who felt the creation of a livestock care board would improve the humane treatment of animals included 176 (35.1%) individuals. Designated by a ranking of 4 were 150 (29.9%) of the participants' answers. Eleven respondents declined participation for this question. (See Table 5)

Table 5
Improvement of care through livestock care amendment

Rank	<i>f</i>	%
5 Improving Greatly	176	35.1
4	150	29.9
3	113	22.5
2	22	4.4
1 No Improvement	30	6.0

Conclusion/Recommendations

Although the data collected in this study is not generalizable past those who attended the Ohio State Fair and visited this specific building, it has highlighted important information for communicators. The study found that the majority of the people who participate in this research

were either in their forties or fifties. It may be assumed that these age groups are likely to pay more attention to similar topics than others are or this age group might be the individuals most interested in the agriculture and horticultural exhibits in the building. Additionally, it could be assumed that these age groups were most prevalent because they are part of the baby boomer era. Therefore, agriculturalists should consider targeting their communication and campaigns toward this population. The abundance of women participants over men could be attributed to the fact that several of the women may have had children with them who wanted ice cream.

Based on this study it can be gathered from the data that the majority of individuals who completed questionnaires were registered to vote. The voting turn out in the last election indicated that more people voted than did not; however, looking at the past three elections, a decline in voters was seen. It must be remembered that 106 of the studies participants were in their twenties, indicating that some may not have been eligible to vote in the last three elections. The decline in voters across three years may be attributed to voter eligibility. It may also be attributed to the fact that the last large election was a presidential election, which tends to draw more voters than other election days.

The data suggests that participants did not have a clear understanding of the difference between animal rights and animal welfare, even though some may have thought so. When the question was asked if the participants thought Ohio farmers raised their animals in a humane manner, many individuals responded by specifically referencing things they had heard, seen, or read in the media. By making reference to the media and basing their answer off of what they observed through media, one could conclude that the participants gained their perception through observation of the media, cognitively stored their observations and now used their observations to influence their behavior, thus exhibiting implications of social learning theory (Klapper,

1960). Additionally, this finding supports the notion that social learning is an effect of mass media and that ideas presented in the mass media are often disseminated into the general public (Klapper, 1960). Agricultural communicators should be aware of mass media effects on social learning in order to produce effective communication campaigns and combat their competition.

Similarly, most respondents felt that the majority of animals were treated well due to what they had seen, heard or personally experienced, not specifically through the media. Further studies should be conducted to analyze how the general public responds to agriculture images and if the images effect their perceptions of agriculture in any way. Studies of aesthetics and semiotics of agricultural images paired with consumer's perceptions may enable agriculturalist to identify how to produce more effective, educational, and accurate advertisements.

Although many respondents were familiar with either their local humane society or HSUS, the majority were unable to accurately describe the difference. Many participants stated that there was no difference between the two, or that they were the same one was just local and the other was national. This common misconception could be attributed to the properties of the cognitive dissonance theory. Dissonance occurs when inconsistent information is present in one's mind, the dissonance causes the person to be uncomfortable and as a result they correct one of their thoughts in order to restore cognitive balance (Aronson, 1969). When researchers asked participants to describe the difference, cognitive dissonance occurred in the minds of many of the participants. The question was implying that there was a difference; however many of the respondents thought the two organizations were the same, likely because both have the words "humane society" in their title. In order to balance the conflicting information respondents would change their thought of "there could be a difference" to "there isn't a difference". It is important for agriculturalists to recognize items that might cause dissonance when educating the public;

this will allow them to prepare for the dissonance and produce effective educational methods to eliminate the dissonance without returning to prior misconceptions.

Agriculturalists in should use the information in this study to prepare an effective campaign for Issue 2 in Ohio and other similar future campaigns. The findings show that many participants are not familiar with livestock legislation. Therefore, the communicators should shape an educational campaign to inform voters about the legislation. In addition, respondents felt strongly that the livestock care amendment would improve the humane treatment of animals as well as the safety and wholesomeness of food produced in Ohio. By keeping a campaign focused on excellent animal care and food safety it is likely that voters will respond favorably. The results show that the proper treatment of animals is important to most of the participants. Enforcing this benefit of the livestock care amendment will allow voters to feel emotionally confident that they are doing what is best for animals.

It is important to note that the results of this study may have been influenced by individuals in the building, other participants or the exhibits in the building. This study should be replicated at a different venue in order to get a wider selection of the population. Further replication should also include sampling in a rural venue as well as an urban venue. A chi-square analysis of these geographical samples with the elements indicated as part of this questionnaire would provide valuable results in regards to the relationship between geographical region and knowledge and perceptions of agriculture. In addition, further analysis should be done to establish if those participants with an agricultural or rural background answered differently than those who did not have such background. (It should be noted that Issue 2 did pass in the state, and findings from this study were shared with campaign organizers.)

References

- American Veterinary Medical Association (2009). *Animal Welfare*. Retrieved October 7, 2009 from, http://www.avma.org/issues/animal_welfare/default.asp.
- Aronson, E. (1969). The Theory of Cognitive Dissonance: A Current Perspective. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* (Vol. 4) (pp.2-32). New York, New York: Academic Press, Inc.
- Ary, D, Jacobs L.C., Razavieh, A., & Sorensen C. (2006). *Introduction to Research in Education* (7th ed.). Canada: Thomson Wadsworth.
- Bandura, A. (1969). Social Learning Theory of Identificatory Processes. In D.A. Goslin (Ed.) *Handbook of Socialization Theory and Research* (pp. 213- 262). Rand McNally & Company.
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Becker, G.S. (2009). *Horse Slaughter Prevention Bills and Issues*. (Congressional Research Service N. RS21842). Retrieved October 6, 2009 from, <http://www.nationalaglawcenter.org/assets/crs/RS21842.pdf> Deleted: ,
- Festinger, L. (1964). *Conflict Decision and Dissonance*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
- Food Safety Inspection Service (2009). *Federal Meat Inspection Act*. Retrieved October 21, 2009 from, http://origin-www.fsis.usda.gov/Regulations_&_Policies/Federal_Meat_Inspection_Act/index.asp Deleted: ,
- 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.
- 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.
- Govtrack.us (2009). *S.727:Prevention of Equine Cruelty Act of 2009*. Retrieved October 6, 2009 from, <http://www.govtrack.us/congress/bill.xpd?bill=s111-727> Deleted: ,
- Hunt, S.K. (2004). Theories of Persuasion. In J.R. Baldwin, S.D. Perry & M.A. Moffitt (Eds.), *Communication Theories for Everyday Life* (pp. 138-155). Boston, Massachusetts: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Humane Methods of Livestock Slaughter*. (2009). Retrieved October 21, 2009 from, Michigan State University, College of Law Web site: <http://www.animallaw.info/statutes/stusfd7usca1901.htm> Deleted: Retrieved Deleted: ,

Humane Society Legislative Fund (2009). *Humane Scorecard*. Retrieved October 6, 2009 from, <http://www.fund.org/humanescorecard/>

Deleted: ,

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.

Klapper, J.T. (1960). *The effects of Mass Communication*. New York, New York: Free Press.

Nabi, R., & Oliver, M.B. (in press). Media effects. In C.R. Berger, M.E. Roloff, & D. Roskos-Ewoldsen, *Handbook of communication science* (2nd edition). Sage.

Formatted: Line spacing: Multiple 1.15 li

Perry, S.D (2004). Media: A Tool to Meet Our Needs. In J.R. Baldwin, S.D. Perry & M.A. Moffitt (Eds.), *Communication Theories for Everyday Life* (pp. 138-155). Boston, Massachusetts: Pearson Education, Inc.

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.

Sullivan, D.M., Vietzke, H., & Coyne, M.L. (2008, September 22). A modest proposal for advancing animal rights. *Albany Law Review*, 71, 1129.

The Humane Society of the United States (2009a, June 22). *The Humane Society of the United States Urges Ohio Lawmakers to Oppose Big Ag Constitutional Power Grab*. Retrieved June 27, 2009 from, http://www.hsus.org/press_and_publications/press_releases/hsus_urgues_ohio_leaders_to_oppose_big_ag_power_grab_062209.html

The Humane Society of the United States (2009b). *Think Outside the Crate Campaign*. Retrieved October 6, 2009 from, <http://www.hsus.org/farm/camp/totc/>

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 Vegetarian Resource Group (2009). *Primer on Animal Rights*. Retrieved October 29, 2009 from, <http://www.vrg.org/nutshell/animalrights.htm>

Truitt, Gary. (2009). The Battle Comes Home. *Hoosier Ag Today*. Retrieved January 22, 2009 from, <http://hatchat.net/index.php/2009/01/21/the-battle-comes-home/>

Formatted: Line spacing: Multiple 1.15 li

Deleted: ,

United States Department of Agriculture (2009a, April 22). *Public Law 89-554, Animal Welfare Act of August 24, 1966*. Retrieved October 21, 2009 from, http://awic.nal.usda.gov/nal_display/index.php?info_center=3&tax_level=4&tax_subject

Deleted: ,

=182&topic_id=1118&level3_id=6735&level4_id=11092&level5_id=0&placement_default=0

United States Department of Agriculture (2009b, April 22). *Public Law 94-279, Animal Welfare Act Amendments of 1976*. Retrieved October 21, 2009 from, http://awic.nal.usda.gov/nal_display/index.php?info_center=3%20&tax_level=4&tax_subject=182&topic_id=1118&level3_id=6735&level4_id=11094&level5_id=0&placement_default=0

United States Department of Agriculture (2009c, April 22). *Public Law 99-198, Food Security Act of 1985 Subtitle F – Animal Welfare*. Retrieved October 21, 2009 from, http://awic.nal.usda.gov/nal_display/index.php?info_center=3%20&tax_level=4&tax_subject=182&topic_id=1118&level3_id=6735&level4_id=11095&level5_id=0&placement_default=0

United States Department of Agriculture (2009d, April 22). *Public Law 101-624, Food, Agriculture, Conservation and Trade Act of 1990, Section 2503 – Protection of Pets*. Retrieved October 21, 2009 from, http://awic.nal.usda.gov/nal_display/index.php?info_center=3%20&tax_level=4&tax_subject=182&topic_id=1118&level3_id=6735&level4_id=11096&level5_id=0&placement_default=0

United States Department of Agriculture (2009e, May 6). *Animal Welfare Act*. Retrieved October 6, 2009, from, http://www.usda.gov/wps/portal/!ut/p/_s.7_0_A/7_0_1OB?navid=SEARCH&q=animal+welfare+act&site=usda.

United States Department of Agriculture (2009f, May 19). *Public Law 91-579, Animal Welfare Act Amendments of 1970*. Retrieved October 21, 2009 from, http://awic.nal.usda.gov/nal_display/index.php?info_center=3%20&tax_level=4&tax_subject=182&topic_id=1118&level3_id=6735&level4_id=11093&level5_id=0&placement_default=0

White, T. (2009, June 26). HSUS Considering a Referendum for Nov. 2010. *Buckeye Farm Beat*. Retrieved June 29, 2009 from, <http://www.ohiofarmer.com/blogs.aspx?fcb=14&fcbp=346&fcbpc=10&s=2009-04-28&e=2009-06-28>

"Animal welfare" is about general health conditions based upon experience and expectations. "Animal rights" is a politically energized concept based upon an agenda for acquiring power. Please see discussion area Most animal welfarists argue that the animal rights view goes too far, and do not advocate the elimination of all animal use or companionship. There isn't a cut-and-dried answer for the difference between the two because both movements have the same origin and they don't always fit into conveniently defined molds. In general, animal welfare accepts the humane use of animals and focuses on the general health, happiness and safety of an animal or a group. There are fundamental differences between the Animal Welfare viewpoint and the Animal Rights philosophy. Fueling the debate still further has been the emergence, particularly in the last three decades, of a small, but vociferous group of adherents to the philosophy of animal rights, which views humans and animals as essentially equal and condemns any and all use of animals for human benefit. Animal Welfare Viewpoint. The animal welfare philosophy is fundamentally different from the animal rights philosophy, since it endorses the responsible use of animals to satisfy certain human needs. These range from companionship and sport, to uses which involve the taking of life for food, clothing and medical research. The American Veterinary Medical Association Policy on Animal Welfare and Animal Rights describes animal welfare as: " a human responsibility that encompasses all aspects of animal well-being, including proper housing, management, nutrition, disease prevention and treatment, responsible care, humane handling, and, when necessary, humane euthanasia." "The AVMA's commitment to animal welfare is unsurpassed. However, animal welfare and animal rights are not the same. AVMA cannot endorse the philosophical views and personal values of animal rights advocates when they are incompatible with the responsible use of animals for human purposes, such as food and fiber, and for research conducted to benefit both humans and animals."