An application of the Hayakawa-Lowry News Bias Categories to identify news bias when reporting on a contemporary agricultural issue in Ohio
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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to apply the Hayakawa-Lowry News Bias Categories to identify news bias when reporting on a contemporary agricultural issue in Ohio by agriculture and mainstream newspaper. This study specifically examined Ohio’s Issue 2 that was passed in November 2009. A total of nine agriculture newspaper articles and eight mainstream newspaper articles were analyzed for bias. This analysis occurred by categorizing 145 sentences in agriculture newspapers and 228 sentences in mainstream newspapers, according to Hayakawa-Lowry News Bias Categories. Ten frames were developed prior to analysis and researchers coded the articles for a primary and secondary frame. The researchers then compared the difference in how Issue 2 coverage differed between agriculture and mainstream newspapers.
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CHAPTER 1

Introduction

Journalists carry the responsibility to deliver objective, nonbiased information to their readers. Unfortunately, during political issues, this is not always the case. The public are often reading an article with a specific opinion on an issue and then forming their beliefs. At times, these issues are on topics unfamiliar to voters, such as the welfare of livestock animals. As of 2010, the State of Ohio had a population of 11.5 million, with 81% of its residents being classified as living in an urban area (Economic Research Department, 2012). Urbanization has resulted in fewer ties to the farm (Doerfert, 2011), and in a culture that is growing further in its separation from the farm, unbiased news on “farm life” is more important than ever. “Impartiality is one of the most important values in a reporter’s life” (Broder, 1987, p. 336). Taking that into account, agricultural and mainstream news sources are expected to be impartial and deliver both sides of the story to the public.

Importance of Agriculture Coverage

Americans rely on agriculture to provide them with food, clothes and a variety of other products (Doerfert, 2011). There are approximately 2.2 million farms in the United States that sell over $2.9 billion in agriculture products (United States Department of Agriculture, 2012).
Agriculture, 2007). The impact that agriculture has on the daily lives of Americans should not be minimized and cannot be ignored. It is important that the public understands scientific issues, with agriculture being a facet of science, especially in controversial topics that are a part of our everyday lives (Lundy, Ruth, Telg & Irani, 2006).

Legislators and the public are continuously making decisions on complex agriculture issues that will impact the future of the industry (Doerfert, 2011), and the agriculture industry is not the only entity that will be affected. Controversial agriculture issues that are communicated to the public and voted upon have an impact on even those Americans that have no direct association with the agriculture community (Lundy, Ruth, Telg & Irani, 2006). Overall, the American economy is affected by the changes in the agriculture community and it is important to create an agriculturally literate public (Lundy, Ruth, Telg & Irani, 2006). For example, with the passage of Proposition 2 in California, production costs of egg laying hens has the potential to raise by more than 20% and a loss of about 5,750 jobs (Tweeten, 2009).

“Agriculture literacy describes the understanding and possession of knowledge needed to synthesize, analyze, and communicate basic information about agriculture” (Frick, Kahler, & Miller, 1991, p. 49). To improve agriculture literacy, we must communicate the issues and needs effectively (Frick, Kahler, & Miller, 1991). Public support of agriculture becomes more critical the further removed people are from agriculture, and agriculturally literate people make informed decisions about agriculture issues (Doerfert, 2011). The knowledge gap of those who produce agriculture and those
who consume agricultural products can lead to differing opinions (Goodwin, Chiarelli, & Irani, 2011).

Even with the public’s distrust of the news media surrounding a science issue, they still expect their news to come from a reliable and unbiased source (Steiner & Bird, 2008). As the gatekeeper, the reporter’s knowledge of a subject is the focus of what they will report (Steiner & Bird, 2008). With controversial issues, journalists rely on official sources, and those sources have the ability to frame an issue (Steiner & Bird, 2008).

In a study that surveyed 21 Arkansas daily editors, 86% stated that they had an “average” to “somewhat high” level of knowledge about agriculture (Cartmell II, Dyer, Birkenholz, & Sitton, 2003). “Editors indicated that their perceptions of the most important topics related to agriculture were water quality, animal health, and human health” (Cartmell II, Dyer, Birkenholz, & Sitton, 2003, p. 14). They also indicated that agriculture is a part of their community and ever changing. Their reader’s views coincided with their own and their opinion about agriculture was overall positive (Cartmell II, Dyer, Birkenholz, & Sitton, 2003). While the reporting of agriculture issues may be minimal, it has the potential to change the public’s views about agriculture (Lundy, Ruth, Telg & Irani, 2006).

In a 2003, study of 198 agricultural producers, 35% believed that the agriculture press is bound to agri-business industry and 17% believed that it is the most controlled media in America (Banning & Evans, 2004). In some cases, 70.6% believed there was biased reporting due to difficulty of getting both sides of the story (Banning & Evans, 2004). More than 59% saw a problem in biased reporting due to inherent difficulties of
being objective (Banning & Evans, 2004). While the study determined that producers are discerning in what they read, producers still rely on an unbiased agriculture news source, and they are concerned about the influences on the agriculture press (Banning & Evans, 2004).

When looking at mainstream media, a 2004 study examined two of the largest newspapers in Oklahoma to determine the bias and agriculture literacy of reporters in the issue of swine production (Sitton, Terry, Jr., Cartmell, III, & Keys, 2004). Out of the 1,091 sentences, 17.7% of the sentences were judgments (p. 27) and 69.4% of those sentences were unfavorable to agriculture (p. 28). The suggestion to the public after the study was to continue to look toward newspapers as their source for information, but to not believe that every sentence is objective (Sitton, Terry, Jr., Cartmell, III, & Keys, 2004).

**Statement of the Problem**

Agricultural production, processing, and distribution is the number one industry for the State of Ohio (Ohio Department of Agriculture, 2009). In the 2009 annual report, Ohio’s agriculture industry was valued at $98 billion (Ohio Department of Agriculture, 2009). Though most of Ohio resident’s live in large cities, they still feel the impact of any major legislative decision targeted at agriculture, through the change in cost at the grocery store. Ohio currently ranks 1st in Swiss cheese production, 2nd in egg production, and 9th in pork production nationally (National Agricultural Statistics Services, 2010). The value of Ohio’s livestock production accounts for 34.7% of income generated by Ohio’s agriculture industry (National Agricultural Statistics Services, 2010). Farming in
Ohio is important; in fact Ohio had approximately 74,900 farms in 2009 with an average of 184 acres per farm (Ohio Department of Agriculture, 2009).

Typically, groups that oppose controversial topics in agriculture look to science as being the problem and not the authority on the issues (Doerfert, 2011). However, the numbers do not lie. The loss of animal agriculture would have a detrimental impact on Ohio’s economy. Therefore, news bias concerning agriculture cannot be ignored when reporting on controversial agriculture issues.

In 2009, the loss of animal agriculture became imminent. With the potential impact on Ohio’s economy, various key legislative figures and Ohio Farm Bureau Federation proposed a public referendum, called Ohio’s Issue 2, a joint resolution, to create a Livestock Care Board to protect Ohio’s animal agriculture.

Research Questions

The purpose of this study was to examine news articles from agriculture and mainstream newspapers from June 2009 (when first proposed) to November 2009 (when passed) on the coverage of Ohio’s Issue 2. This issue’s purpose was to implement a Livestock Care Standards Board that would make decisions on the standards governing animal agriculture in Ohio. Articles were examined for news bias, and reporting assessed on how agriculture newspapers and mainstream newspapers framed Issue 2. The following questions guided the study:

1. Are agriculture newspapers biased when reporting about Issue 2?
2. Are mainstream newspapers biased when reporting about Issue 2?
3. What are the dominant frames of Ohio’s Issue 2 coverage by agriculture newspapers?

4. What are the dominant frames of Ohio’s Issue 2 coverage by mainstream newspapers?

5. Was there any difference in how Ohio’s Issue 2 was reported by agriculture and mainstream newspapers?

Definition of Terms

Framing Theory: Scheufele and Tewksbury (2007) defined framing theory as “how an issue is characterized in news reports can have an influence on how it is understood by audiences” (p. 11). The following frames were developed by the researchers prior to the analysis of articles:

1. **Explanation of Issue 2**: the focus of this frame was an overview of Issue 2 and the different components. Articles may have described who would be on the Livestock Care Standards Board or the purpose of the Board.

2. **Blaming Farmers**: articles with this frame would blame farmers for inhumane treatment of animals.

3. **Blaming HSUS**: articles using this frame would “point fingers” at HSUS and blame them for trying to control Ohio’s agriculture.

4. **Support from Key Figures**: this frame would have articles discussing government officials and major cooperation that support Issue 2.

5. **Other State Legislation**: articles with this frame would be focused on what legislation other States have recently or will pass (i.e. California’s Prop 2).
6. **Protection of Ohio’s Agriculture:** articles with this frame would focus on the need to protect Ohio’s agriculture. This ranged from food safety topics to keeping outside interests out of Ohio’s agriculture.

7. **Factory/Mega/Big Farms:** this frame focuses on how large farms are the cause behind more regulation on the humane treatment of animals.

8. **Finance of Campaign:** articles using this frame would focus on the fundraising and finance surrounding the support of Issue 2.

9. **General Campaign:** articles focus on the general aspects of the campaign of Issue 2.

10. **Addition to the Constitution:** articles focusing on this frame discussed the significance of adding the amendment to the Constitution.

**Hayakawa-Lowry News Bias Categories:** A classification system used to categorize sentences based on news bias.

**Ohio’s Issue 2:** An Ohio public referendum that was proposed in June 2009 to create a Livestock Care Standards Board by amending the State Constitution. This proposed board would be authorized to make decisions on how animal agriculture is managed and regulated in the State of Ohio. A complete annotation of Issue 2 can be reviewed in Appendix A.

**News Bias:** The lack of fairness and balance in a news story.

**Tone:** How a reader may perceive information covered in an article. The following tones were hypothesized by the researchers:
1. **Positive/Favorable:** the reader may perceive the article as being positive toward Issue 2 and in favor of Issue 2.

2. **Neutral:** the reader could perceive the article as being neither for Issue 2 or against Issue 2.

3. **Negative/Unfavorable:** the reader may perceive the article as being negative toward Issue 2 and unfavorable of Issue 2.

**Assumptions**

In the construction of this study, it was assumed that agriculture and mainstream newspapers will be biased concerning Issue 2. The researcher also assumed that the articles found for the study represented the overall tone of how agriculture and mainstream newspapers reported about Issue 2 in Ohio between June and November, 2009.

**Limitations**

The newspaper articles the researcher used for this study was only print material. This study was conducted three years after the passage of Issue 2. For that reason, it was challenging to find newspaper articles archived on the Internet, and therefore, some articles could have been overlooked. Researchers used various search terms to find articles from July 2009 to November 2009. It should also be noted that the results were derived from collaboration between two researchers.
CHAPTER 2

Animal Rights as a Contemporary Agriculture Issue

The American Society for the Protection of Animals was the first organization formed after American cities expressed their outrage over the treatment of animals in 1866 (Garner, 1996). Several hundred groups have formed since the turn of the century, and the animal rights movement has become one of the United States’ “most visible protest movement of the 1980s” (Garner, 1996, p. 130). With their continued efforts, People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA) efforts resulted in the first arrest and criminal conviction for animal cruelty concerning abused laboratory animals in 1981 (People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals, 2012). The animal right’s movement then peaked in June 1990 when almost 30,000 activist went to Washington, D.C. for a “March for Animals.” Through the years PETA has grown to become one of the largest animal rights organizations (Garner, 1996).

Recently, The Humane Society of the United States (HSUS), which was formed in 1954, garnered popularity with its legislative efforts (The Humane Society of the United States, 2012). HSUS seeks to “create a meaningful social change for animals by advocating for sensible public policies, investigating cruelty and working to enforce existing laws, educating the public about animal issues, joining with corporations on
behalf of animal-friendly policies, and conducting hands-on programs that make ours a more humane world” (The Humane Society of the United States, 2012, p. 3). Currently HSUS has 11 million American members and promotes itself as the “most effective animal protection organization” (The Humane Society of the United States, 2012, p. 3).

**Political History**

Animal Rights groups have become influential in creating and passing laws concerning animal agriculture. In Dennis T. Avery’s article *Why Chickens Need Cages*, he summarized the purpose of these groups:

“Across the affluent world, bans on caged laying hens are being pushed by People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals and the Humane Society of the U.S. HSUS is not your local Humane Society that accepts pets for adoption but a radical anti-pet group—that wants to eliminate all domestic livestock and poultry, along with all pets and circus animals” (Avery, 2009, p. 5).

In 2002, Florida was the first state to pass legislation to prevent confinement of farms animals (Hall, 2009). Since then there has been five other attempts. Legislation has been passed in Arizona, Oregon, Colorado, and California, with Nebraska being the only state to reject the proposal (Hall, 2009).

Over 63% of California voters approved Prop 2, the Prevention of Farm Animal Cruelty Act, in the fall of 2008 (Hall, 2009). Prop 2 mandates any person who confines pregnant sows, calves raised for veal, or egg-laying hens in an area that does not allow them to stand, turn around or fully extend its limbs, will be charged with a misdemeanor (Hall, 2009 and Tweeten, 2009). The punishment of a successful conviction is up to $1,000 in fines and 180 days in jail (Hall, 2009). Prop 2 is an example of legislation that HSUS helped write to change the way poultry and livestock producers operate (Tweeten, 2009).
Ohio’s Issue 2

HSUS stated in spring 2009 that its effort to bring a farm animal cruelty law to Ohio would occur soon (Hall, 2009), and would be similar to Prop 2 for California (Tweeten, 2009). Since conditions in Ohio are similar to California, it provided a “. . . strong basis to begin assessing the situation in Ohio” (Tweeten, 2009, p. 3).

With a threat of proposed legislation eminent, in June 2009 a proposed amendment to Ohio’s constitution was developed to establish a 13-member Livestock Care Standards Board (Farm Futures Staff, 2009). The proposed amendment was supported by Governor Ted Strickland, House Speaker Armond Budish, Senate President Bill Harris, House Minority Leader Bill Batchelder, and Senate Minority Leader Capri Carafo. It also was supported by the Ohio Farm Bureau Federation, the state Pork Producers Council, and the Poultry Association (AgWeb.com Editors, 2009). As the amendment gained momentum, it also garnered discussion from both sides. Wayne Pacelle, president and CEO of HSUS, stated that the amendment would create an industry-dominated council and as a “. . . blatant attempt to stall efforts to halt inhumane confinement practices” (The Humane Society of the United States, 2009, p. 5). Ohio Farm Bureau Federation stated that “. . . the best regulations for animal care will be achieved when all interested parties join together” (Ohio Farm Bureau Federation, 2009, p. 4). The Ohio Farm Bureau Federation also stated that the out-of-state activist groups would create inflexible and impractical rules that would lead to higher costs for consumers, cause farmers to go out of business, and endanger Ohio’s livestock industry (Ohio Farm Bureau Federation, 2009).
News Bias

Reporters have a need to be seen as credible when reporting information. “Impartiality is one of the most important values in a reporter’s life” (Broder, 1987, p. 336). Reporters are continually judged by their performance and ability to remain fair and balanced in their stories (Broder, 1987). Dan Broder, a columnist for the Washington Post, called for reporters to be vigilant in uncovering the truth because the public has a right to hear answers to their questions (Broder, 1990). Regardless of the media source, news should be presented in a factual manner, to allow its audience to form their own opinion concerning an issue and all topics should be written objectively (Sitton, Terry Jr., Cartmell II, & Keys, 2004). The public can view a story as being slanted if it is told in a manner that they dislike (Hayakawa and Hayakawa, 1990). Those writers that do not advocate a side can avoid slanting except in literary effects (Hayakawa and Hayakawa, 1990). Hayakawa and Hayakawa further explain the importance of a reporter remaining impartial:

“The avoidance of slanting is not only a matter of being impartial; it is even more importantly a matter of making good maps of the territory of experience. The profoundly biased individual cannot make good maps because she can see an enemy only as an enemy and a friend only as a friend.” (Hayakawa and Hayakawa, 1990, p. 31)

Concerning issues about agriculture, it is important for editors to have discernment and be accurate when publishing agriculture news (Cartmell II, Dyer, Birkenholz, & Sitton, 2003). The attitudes that are expressed about agriculture in mass media should not be underestimated because it has a direct effect on consumers and what the consumer perceives (Haygood, Hagins, Akers, & Kieth, 2002).
Hayakawa-Lowry News Bias Categories

Hayakawa originally found three types of sentences that categorize how a person communicates with another person: report, inference, and judgment sentences (Lowry, 1985). Report sentences are verifiable and while very dull to read, we could not survive without them (Hayakawa and Hayakawa, 1990). Inference sentences are a “... statement about the unknown based on the known” (Hayakawa and Hayakawa, 1990, p. 24). Judgment sentences express a persons’ approval or disapproval of what the reporter is describing (Hayakawa and Hayakawa, 1990). The three categories were then expanded by Lowry to a total of nine categories: Report Sentence/Attributed, Report Sentence/Unattributed, Inference Sentence/Labeled, Inference Sentence/Unlabeled, Judgment Sentence/Attributed/Favorable, Judgment Sentence/Attributed/Unfavorable, Judgment Sentence/Unattributed/Favorable, Judgment Sentence/Unattributed/Unfavorable, and all Other Sentences (Lowry, 1985). The rationale is that Report Sentences are most likely to be seen by the reader as being objective, as well as Inference Sentences, although they contain the reporter’s opinion (Lowry, 1985). It was also believed that a reporter would be seen as unbiased if a Judgment Sentence was attributed or if the reporter makes labeled inferences (Lowry, 1985).

The Hayakawa-Lowry category system was tested in three studies by Lowry to construct validity (Lowry, 1985). Lowry found that the perception of the untrained audience is changed by judgments and inferences in a news report (Lowry, 1985).
Application of Hayakawa-Lowry News Bias Categories by Others

Many academic agricultural communication professionals have used the Hayakawa-Lowry News Bias Categories to test for news bias concerning controversial agricultural topics.

When examining agricultural reporters for agriculture publications, the majority of sentences were factual statements, while only 19.17% of the sentences were Judgment Sentences (Akers, Doerfert, Casabonne, Fraze, & Davis, 2005). Overall Judgment Sentences were evenly distributed between favorable and unfavorable (p. 29). King, Cartmell, II, and Sitton found that information provided to the public during the Bovine Spongiform Encephalopathy Outbreak (Mad Cow) in 2003, most newspapers remained more objective than judgmental (2006). However, whom encouraged reporters to be trained to recognize Judgment Sentences, and they should include attribution from both sides of the issue (King, Cartmell, II, and Sitton, 2006).

Concerning swine production issues, researchers coded 40 articles for news bias and favorability toward agriculture (Sitton, Terry Jr., Cartmell II, & Keys, 2004). While most articles analyzed were objective, Judgment Sentences used portrayed swine concentrated animal feeding operations as negative (Sitton, Terry Jr., Cartmell II, & Keys, 2004).

Vinyard, Akers, Doerfert, Davis, and Oskam examined how an agriculture media resource tool directly affected news bias of reporting on cotton production (2005). While they found that there are biases from reporters when reporting on cotton, the media resource tool may have had an influence on reducing bias (Vinyard, Akers, Doerfert,
Davis, and Oskam, 2005). Although Judgments Sentences made up 9.69% of the sentences, Report Sentences accounted for 64.23% of the sentences categorized (Vinyard, Akers, Doerfert, Davis, and Oskam, 2005.).

Concerning news stories published about corn-based ethanol, 34.3% of sentences were categorized as Report/Unattributed, and 17.4% were Report/Attributed (Hall and Rhoades, 2007). Judgment Sentences comprised 26.1% of the sentences categorized and the researchers suggested reporters attribute any judgment statements to help build credibility (Hall and Rhoades, 2007).

When observing the comparison of news stories in 1997 and 2000, there was an increase of articles published in the Associated Press wire service concerning agriculture (Haygood, Hagins, Akers, and Kieth, 2002). With the increase of agriculture coverage, there was also an increase of Report and Inference sentences. The amount of Judgment/Unattributed/Favorable sentences tripled and Judgment/Unattributed/Unfavorable sentences doubled (Haygood, Hagins, Akers, and Kieth, 2002). The researchers suggested that reporters need to be aware of their bias statements and encouraged reporters to find factual information in order to increase an accurate view of agriculture (Haygood, Hagins, Akers, and Kieth, 2002).

**Framing**

“Framing refers to the process by which people develop a particular conceptualization of an issue or reorient their thinking about an issue,” (Chong & Druckman, 2007, p. 104). Framing is “based on the assumption that how an issue is
characterized in news reports can have an influence on how it is understood by audiences” (Scheufele & Tewksbury, 2007, p. 11).

A major foundation for the framing theory is that messages can be interpreted differently from a variety of perspectives (Chong & Druckman, 2007), and has the ability to affect their audience’s behaviors and attitudes about a topic, according to Scheufele and Tewksbury (2007).

Framing involves two elements: selection and salience (Entman, 1993). “To frame is to select some aspects of a perceived reality and make them more salient in a communicating text, in such a way as to promote a particular problem. . . ” (Entman, 1993, p. 52). Framing effects “. . . occur when (often small) changes in the presentation of an issue or events produce (sometimes large) changes of opinion” (Chong & Druckman, 2007). The job of frames is to define the problem, diagnose its cause, make moral judgments, and then suggest remedies, but any particular job may not include all four functions (Entman, 1993). People who are communicating topics, make judgments based on the frames of how they organize their beliefs (Entman, 1993). Frames can work at different levels. First, they highlight information that is the subject of what is being communicated and making them salient (Entman, 1993,). Subjects that are salient are more memorable or noticeable to the public (Entman, 1993). The recipient of the frame then interprets the information based on their belief system (Entman, 1993).

Frames become invaluable tools for presenting complex issues by helping to make them accessible to audiences by acting on their existing cognitive schemas (Scheufele & Tewksbury, 2007). Strong frames should be compelling and strike opinion
leaders and audience as the best alternative to other arguments (Chong & Druckman, 2007), but they have the ability to be constructed around exaggerations to play on the fears of the public (Chong & Druckman, 2007). The political strategy of strong frames is to connect the public with a positive idea or value, but they do not work for every issue (Chong & Druckman, 2007).

Framing is useful in examining the media coverage of news, and frames are sometimes defined by those in power (Severin & Tankard, 2001). Journalist process large amounts of information and use frames to interpret the information they are to relay to their audience, making frames unavoidable (Giltin, 1980, p. 7). Framing could also help us understand how a person processes the news (Severin & Tankard, 2001). The dominant perspective of an object, or opinion, defines the central theme of the frame (McCombs, 2005).

The public is more susceptible to framing at the beginning stages of an issue, when the public’s knowledge on an issue is less, and tends to be more open to arguments and information (Chong & Druckman, 2007). In issues that are new to the voting public, creating a formative stage where opposing sides can compete by positioning themselves as having the same core values as the voters (Chong & Druckman, 2007). Framing helps provide simplification of complex issues (Goodwin, Chiarelli, and Irani, 2011). In controversial topics, frames in news have an impact on audience’s interpretation of issues and have the potential to shape their opinions (Meyers and Abrams, 2010). Newspapers have a variety of information that needs to be delivered objectively, so the public can create their own opinion about a subject (Ashlock, Cartmell, II, & Kelemen, 2006).
Frames should be used as an abstract tool that uses media texts to construct a social meaning and are principles of organizing information (Reese, Gandy, & Grant, 2001). Frames that highlight some facets of a political issue, but obscure other facets, have the potential to mislead the public (Entman, 1993).

Abrams and Meyers (2012) analyzed websites of two opposing animal welfare groups: HSUS and Animal Agriculture Alliance, a non-profit organization that acts as a voice for the agriculture industry. The researchers coded the 156 pages based on six frames that were previously identified by Fraser in 2005: animal welfare, healthiness, profit vs. animal care, environment impacts, agribusiness owners, and food supply (Abrams & Meyers, 2012). The animal welfare was the most prominent at 62%, with healthiness being the second most prominent at 28%, when discussing animal agriculture. They also found that agriculture and science organizations try to educate the public by addressing negative messages. Frames help understand social phenomena by organizing them into cultural structures (Meyers & Abrams, 2010).

Meyers and Abrams (2010) studied how newspapers framed organic farming, a controversial agriculture issue. Of the 59 articles analyzed, the overarching frame was ethical issues. The ethical frame described organic farming as “eco-friendly” and a social responsibility, leading to the increase in consumer demand for organic foods. The articles in this study tended to slant favorably to organic farming and did not balance the coverage with other views or scientific evidence (Meyer & Abrams, 2010).

In 2006, researchers studied how the Mad Cow disease crisis was framed by three major newspapers in December 2003 to February 2004 (Ashlock, Cartmell, II, &
Kelemen, 2006). Of the 149 articles analyzed, 36.24% of the frames focused on industry crisis (p. 36). Statements made on the industry crisis frame, seemed to make the fear of Mad Cow disease as being a national issue and not isolated to one state (p. 37). The second frame was economic calamity and it focused on the effects on the stock markets and rising costs of beef (p. 37). Overall, the researchers discovered that the tone toward the beef industry were negative (p. 40) and suggested that newspapers should remain unbiased and “not prematurely frame an issue” (p. 44).

Summary

This chapter presented the literature review for the history of contemporary agriculture issues concerning animal agriculture in the United States. It also outlined the genesis of Ohio’s Issue 2. This chapter sought to lay the theoretical grounding of the research concerning news bias, the Hayakawa-Lowry News Bias Category, and framing theory.
CHAPTER 3

Design of Study

The study was designed to analyze agriculture and mainstream newspapers for news bias in reporting on Ohio’s Issue 2 by using the Hayakawa-Lowry News Bias Categories. It was also designed to evaluate how each article was framed to gain an understanding of the overall message the viewer would receive. The research is descriptive in nature. No attempt or interpretation has been made to show causality. The study only describes the presence and type of bias revealed using the Hayakawa-Lowry News Bias Categories. Conjecture as to source or cause of any bias in news reporting would be speculative and inappropriate for this study. The coders of this study are both involved in agriculture and also campaigned for Ohio’s Issue 2. One coder is a faculty member, while the other is a graduate student.

Article Selection

The researchers limited their reviewed to articles that specifically discussed Ohio’s Issue 2, although there were several other, non-agricultural Issues on the ballot that election year. The timeline of the articles chosen were from the conception of the Issue, approximately June 15, 2008, to the date of the general election date, November 2, 2008. The articles used for this study were selected by choosing the two of the largest
agriculture newspapers in Ohio, the Ohio Farmer and Farm and Dairy and two of the large daily papers serving a significant portion of the Ohio population, the Columbus Dispatch, and the Dayton Daily News. The researchers then used keywords such as Issue 2, Livestock Care Board, and HSUS to search the websites of each newspaper for articles relevant to the study. They then made the decision to also include the Toledo Blade due to the few number of mainstream articles the researchers were able to find. The Toledo Blade also serves a significant part of the truck-crop farming region of northwest Ohio. The researchers found a total of 21 articles addressing Issue 2, but eliminated four because they did not discuss Ohio’s Issue 2 completely, or they were editorials. In total the researchers analyzed nine agriculture articles and eight mainstream articles. For an annotation of each article, see Appendix B.

Instrumentation

Prior to the study, the researcher created a coding guide to record the data of each article. This coding GUIDE, as seen in Appendix C, included the title of the article, month and date it was published, first and secondary frame, and the Hayakawa-Lowry News Bias Categories. Before reading the articles, the researchers hypothesized that the articles could contain the 10 possible frames: (1) explanation of Issue 2, (2) blaming farmers, (3) blaming HSUS, (4) support from key figures, (5) other State legislation, (6) protection of Ohio’s agriculture, (7) factory/mega/big farms, (8) finance of campaign, (9) general campaign, or (10) the addition to the Constitution. The researchers hypothesized these frames off of the experience they had surrounding Ohio’s Issue 2.
The two researchers first analyzed three articles individually. Three articles were chosen originally as a training and calibration process. They then reviewed each other’s coding sheet to determine inter-rater reliability. After the review, they made the decision to review 10 more articles together to remain consistent, and then have the lead researcher review the last four individually. The four articles the lead researcher analyzed individually were chosen at random. Each article was analyzed by reading each sentence and then categorizing the sentence based off the Hayakawa-Lowry News Bias categories. The categories are as follows:

1. **Report Sentence/Attributed (RA):** factual information that can be verified and is attributed to a source.

2. **Report Sentence/Unattributed (RU):** factual information that can be verified and is not attributed to a source.

3. **Inference Sentence/Labeled (IL):** statements about the unknown based on the known. Uses certain key phrases such as may, could, and possibly.

4. **Inference Sentence/Unlabeled (IU):** Statements about the unknown based on the known. Does not use key phrases to signify the inference.

5. **Judgment Sentence/Attributed/Favorable (JAF):** statements made by the writer or speaker that are attributed to the source and in favor of the subject.

6. **Judgment Sentence/Attributed/Unfavorable (JAU):** statements made by the writer or speaker that are attributed to the source, but not in favor of the subject.

7. **Judgment Sentence/Unattributed/Favorable (JUF):** statements made by the writer or speaker that are not attributed to the source and in favor of the subject.
8. **Judgment Sentence/Unattributed/Unfavorable (JUU):** statements made by the writer or speaker that are not attributed to a source and not in favor of the subject.

9. **Other Sentences:** rhetorical questions, introductory sentences, or incomplete sentences. (Lowry, 1985).

The researchers then discussed each article to find the first and secondary frame of each article, using the ten frames that they originally developed prior to analysis.

The researchers also examined overall tone of each article. Tone is referred to as how the article might be perceived by the reader. The researchers theorized that an article could have the tone of: positive/favorable, which means it conveyed favorability to Ohio’s Issue 2; a neutral tone meant that the article could be perceived as neither for or against Issue 2; negative/unfavorable was an article that had an overall tone of being against Ohio Issue’s 2.
CHAPTER 4

The purpose of this chapter is to outline and answer each of the research questions. The research questions are as follows:

1. Are agriculture newspapers biased when reporting about Issue 2?
2. Are mainstream newspapers biased when reporting about Issue 2?
3. What are the dominant frames of Ohio’s Issue 2 coverage by agriculture newspapers?
4. What are the dominant frames of Ohio’s Issue 2 coverage by mainstream newspapers?
5. Was there any difference in how Ohio’s Issue 2 was reported by agriculture and mainstream newspapers?

Bias of Issue 2 in Agriculture Newspapers

To answer research question one, nine agriculture articles were reviewed, comprised of a total of 145 sentences. These sentences were analyzed using the Hayakawa-Lowry News Bias Category. As seen in Table 1, the majority of the sentences were classified as Report Sentence/Unattributed and comprised of 40.00% of all the sentences analyzed. Examples are:

“Proponents of Issue 2 are encouraging voters to pass the measure on November 3.”
and “Earlier this month, Michigan approved new legislation known as H.B. 5127, a compromise agreement between Michigan producers and The Humane Society of the United States, to restrict caging practices.”

The second highest category was Judgment Sentence/Attributed/Favorable, with a percentage of 24.14. Examples of Judgment Sentence/Attributed/Favorable are: “It seems logical that as an agricultural lender, we would get behind the Farm Bureau’s initiative.” and “Passing Issue 2 is ‘the right thing to do,’ according to Lisa Hamler-Fugitt, executive director of the Ohio Association of Second Harvest Food Banks.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentence Category</th>
<th>No. of Sentences</th>
<th>% Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Report Sentence/Unattributed</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judgment Sentence/Attributed/Favorable</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>24.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Sentence/Attributed</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>23.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judgment Sentence/Attributed/Unfavorable</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judgment Sentence/Unattributed/Favorable</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Sentences</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inference Sentence/Unlabeled</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judgment Sentence/Unattributed/Unfavorable</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inference Sentence/Labeled</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Number of sentences in each Hayakawa-Lowry News Bias Categories for agriculture news articles.
Report Sentence/Attributed was the third highest accounting for 23.44% of the sentences categorized. Followed by Judgment Sentence/Attributed/Unfavorable consisting of 4.14%, Judgment Sentence/Unattributed/Favorable for 3.45%, Other Sentences for 2.07%, Inference Sentence/Unlabeled and Judgment Sentence/Unattributed/Unfavorable for 1.38%, and Inference Sentence/Labeled for 0.00%.

Table 2 presents the data into the three main categories that Hayakawa originally developed. Report sentences comprised 92 of the sentences, while Judgment sentences accounted for 48 sentences. Other sentence category only had three sentences and Inference sentence category only had two sentences and the.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentence Category</th>
<th>No. of Sentences</th>
<th>% Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Report Sentence</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>63.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judgment Sentence</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>33.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Sentences</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inference Sentence</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>145</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Number of sentences in each Hayakawa sentence category for agriculture news articles.
When observing the overall tone of each of the articles, out of the nine articles, seven had a positive/favorable tone. The remaining two articles were perceived as being neutral. The outline of the findings can be found in Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tone of Article</th>
<th>No. of Articles</th>
<th>% Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive/Favorable</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>77.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative/Unfavorable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Overall tone in agriculture news articles.

Bias of Issue 2 in Mainstream Newspapers

For research question two, a total of 228 sentences were analyzed from mainstream newspapers using the Hayakawa-Lowry News Bias Categories. As seen in Table 4, the majority of the sentences were classified as Report Sentence/Unattributed with a total of 43.86% of sentences. Examples of a Report Sentence/Unattributed are:

“But even within the farming community, there are fissures over Issue 2.” and “In setting the standards, the panel would consider best farm-management practices, animal death and illness rates, food safety, and local food availability and prices.”

Judgment Sentence/Attributed/Unfavorable and Report Sentence/Attributed accounted for 15.78% of the sentences analyzed. Examples of Judgment Sentence/Attributed/Unfavorable are: “It’s another layer of bureaucracy, which is ridiculous.” and “The fox is guarding the henhouse,’ he said.”
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Judgment Sentence/Attributed/Favorable consisted of 14.04% of the sentences, Judgment Sentence/Unattributed/Unfavorable had 3.95%, the Inference Sentence/Unlabeled category consisted of 2.63% of sentences, Inference sentence/Labeled accounted for 2.20%, the Other Sentence category had 1.32%, and Judgment Sentence/Unattributed/Favorable comprised 0.44% of the sentences analyzed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentence Category</th>
<th>No. of Sentences</th>
<th>% Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Report Sentence/Unattributed</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>43.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Sentence/Attributed</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>15.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judgment Sentence/Attributed/Unfavorable</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>15.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judgment Sentence/Attributed/Favorable</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>14.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judgment Sentence/Unattributed/Unfavorable</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inference Sentence/Unlabeled</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inference Sentence/Labeled</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Sentences</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judgment Sentence/Unattributed/Favorable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>228</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Number of sentences in each Hayakawa-Lowry News Bias Categories for mainstream news articles.
Table 5 reports how each sentence was categorized using Hayakawa’s original categories. The Report Sentence category had 59.64%, Judgment Sentence category accounted for 34.22%, Inference Sentence category consisted of 4.82%, and Other Sentences category had 1.32% of the sentences analyzed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentence Category</th>
<th>No. of Sentences</th>
<th>% Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Report Sentence</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>59.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judgment Sentence</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>34.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inference Sentence</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Sentences</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>228</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Number of sentences in each Hayakawa sentence category for mainstream news articles.

Table 6 outlines the perceived tone of each article. Out of the eight articles, five had neutral tone while the remaining three articles were perceived as being negative/unfavorable.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tone of Article</th>
<th>No. of Articles</th>
<th>% Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>62.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative/Unfavorable</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive/Favorable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Overall tone in mainstream news articles.

**Frames of Issue 2 in Agriculture Newspapers**

Research question three considered the dominant frames in agriculture newspapers. Using the ten frames that the researchers hypothesized, the agriculture articles were assigned a primary and secondary frame. A total of seven frames were used out of the 10 frames hypothesized by the researchers. Out of the 10 frames, only five were used as a primary frame. Explanation of Issue 2 and Finance of Campaign each had three articles as its primary frame. Articles with a dominant frame of finance of campaign reported about the organizations contributing financially to the campaign efforts. Support from Key Figures, Other State Legislation, and Protection of Ohio’s Agriculture each had one article as their primary frame. For a secondary frame, Protection of Ohio’s Agriculture consisted of three articles, with Other State Legislation having two articles as its secondary frame. Explanation of Issue 2, Factory/Mega/Big Farms, General Campaign and Addition to the Constitution each had one article as its secondary frame.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possible Frames</th>
<th>Primary Frame</th>
<th>Secondary Frame</th>
<th>Overall Frame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Explanation of Issue 2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Blaming Farmers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Blaming HSUS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Support from Key Figures</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Other State Legislation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Protection of Ohio’s Agriculture</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Factory/Mega/Big Farms</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) Finance of Campaign</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) General Campaign</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10) Addition to the Constitution</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Primary and Secondary frames found in agriculture news articles.

**Frames of Issue 2 in Mainstream Newspapers**

To answer research question four, the researchers reviewed the dominant frames of mainstream newspapers. A total of six frames were used out of the original 10 the researchers hypothesized. Protection of Ohio’s Agriculture and Addition to the Constitution each accounted for 2 articles as its primary frame. Explanation of Issue 2, Other State Legislation, Finance of Campaign, and General Campaign was the primary frame for one article each. For secondary frames, Protection of Ohio’s Agriculture and Factory/Mega/Big Farms each consisted as the main frame for two articles. While
Explanation of Issue 2, Other State Legislation, Finance of Campaign, and Addition to the Constitution was the secondary frame for one article each.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possible Frames</th>
<th>Primary Frame</th>
<th>Secondary Frame</th>
<th>Overall Frame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Explanation of Issue 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Blaming Farmers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Blaming HSUS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Support from Key Figures</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Other State Legislation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Protection of Ohio’s Agriculture</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Factory/Mega/Big Farms</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) Finance of Campaign</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) General Campaign</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10) Addition to the Constitution</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: Primary and Secondary frames found in mainstream news articles.

**Difference in News Coverage of Issue 2 in Agriculture and Mainstream Newspapers**

Research question five assessed the difference in news coverage of Issue 2 in agriculture and mainstream newspapers. When analyzing the breakdown of agriculture and mainstream newspaper, there is a similarity. The majority of sentences in both agriculture and mainstream newspapers were Report Sentence/Unattributed. When
looking at the categories Hayakawa originally developed, agriculture and mainstream newspapers heavily used the Report Sentence category, but each had approximately one-third of their sentences categorized as Judgment Sentences. The overall tone of agriculture newspapers remained positive/favorable and neutral, while mainstream newspapers were mainly neutral and negative/unfavorable.

Frames of agriculture and mainstream newspapers varied. They shared four primary frames, which are: Explanation of Issue 2, Other State Legislation, Protection of Ohio’s Agriculture, and Finance of Campaign. Their shared secondary frames were: Explanation of Issue 2, Other State Legislation, Protection of Ohio’s Agriculture, and Factory/Mega/Big Farms.

A review of the data for agriculture newspapers can be seen in Table 9, while a review of mainstream newspapers data can be viewed on Table 10.
## Agriculture Newspapers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article #</th>
<th>Sentence Length</th>
<th># of Sources</th>
<th>Overall Tone</th>
<th>Primary Frame</th>
<th>Secondary Frame</th>
<th>RA</th>
<th>RU</th>
<th>IL</th>
<th>IU</th>
<th>JAF</th>
<th>JAU</th>
<th>JUF</th>
<th>JUU</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>positive/support</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>positive/support</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>positive/support</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>positive/support</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>positive/support</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>positive/support</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>positive/support</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL:** 145 | 34 | 58 | 0 | 2 | 35 | 6 | 5 | 2 | 3

*Report Sentence/Attributed (RA), Report Sentence/Unattributed (RU), Inference Sentence/Labeled (IL), Inference Sentence/Unlabeled (IU), Judgment Sentence/Attributed/Favorable (JAF), Judgment Sentence/Attributed/Unfavorable (JAU), Judgment Sentence/Unattributed/Favorable (JUF), Judgment Sentence/Unattributed/Unfavorable (JUU), and all Other Sentences.*

Table 9: A review of each agriculture newspaper article.
### Mainstream Newspapers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article #</th>
<th>Sentence Length</th>
<th># of Sources</th>
<th>Overall Tone</th>
<th>Primary Frame</th>
<th>Secondary Frame</th>
<th>RA</th>
<th>RU</th>
<th>IL</th>
<th>IU</th>
<th>JAF</th>
<th>JAU</th>
<th>JUF</th>
<th>JUU</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>negative/ unfavorable</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>negative/ unfavorable</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>negative/ unfavorable neutral</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL:</strong></td>
<td><strong>228</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>32</strong></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Report Sentence/Attributed (RA), Report Sentence/Unattributed (RU), Inference Sentence/Labeled (IL), Inference Sentence/Unlabeled (IU), Judgment Sentence/Attributed/Favorable (JAF), Judgment Sentence/Attributed/Unfavorable (JAU), Judgment Sentence/Unattributed/Favorable (JUF), Judgment Sentence/Unattributed/Unfavorable (JUU), and all Other Sentences.*

Table 10: A review of each mainstream newspaper article.
CHAPTER 5

Summary

The purpose of this study was to apply the Hayakawa-Lowry News Bias Categories to identify news bias and frames when reporting on a contemporary agricultural issue in Ohio by agriculture and mainstream newspaper. The following research questions were developed to guide the study:

1. Are agriculture newspapers biased when reporting about Issue 2?
2. Are mainstream newspapers biased when reporting about Issue 2?
3. What are the dominant frames of Ohio’s Issue 2 coverage by agriculture newspapers?
4. What are the dominant frames of Ohio’s Issue 2 coverage by mainstream newspapers?
5. Was there any difference in how Ohio’s Issue 2 was reported by agriculture and mainstream newspapers?

This study was conducted by analyzing nine agriculture news articles and eight mainstream news articles that covered Ohio’s Issue 2 in 2009. The researchers then analyzed and categorized a total of 145 sentences in the agriculture articles and 228 sentences in the mainstream articles according to the Hayakawa-Lowry News Bias
Categories. These categories are: Report Sentence/Attributed, Report Sentence/Unattributed, Inference Sentence/Labeled, Inference Sentence/Unlabeled, Judgment Sentence/Attributed/
Favorable, Judgment Sentence/Attributed/Unfavorable, Judgment Sentence/
Unattributed/Favorable, Judgment Sentence/Unattributed/Unfavorable, and all Other Sentences. The researchers also examined the tone each article conveyed and categorized it as being positive/favorable, neutral, or negative/unfavorable toward Issue 2.

After reading each article, the researchers then coded for a primary and secondary frame. These frames were hypothesized before reading the articles. The possible ten frames are: (1) explanation of Issue 2, (2) blaming farmers, (3) blaming HSUS, (4) support from key figures, (5) other State legislation, (6) protection of Ohio’s agriculture, (7) factory/mega/big farms, (8) finance of campaign, (9) general campaign, or (10) the addition to the Constitution.

**Conclusions Related to Research Question One**

Research question one examined bias in agriculture newspapers. While the greatest proportion of the 145 sentences analyzed were categorized as Report Sentence/Unattributed (40.00%), there was still a large number categorized as Judgment Sentence/Attributed/Favorable (24.14%). This gives the allusion that the article is overall factual, but you cannot ignore the use of Judgment Sentences. Judgment Sentences as a whole attributed to 33.11% of sentences categorized and the majority of Judgment Sentences were favorable to Ohio’s Issue 2. There was not an even balance of
unfavorable Judgment Sentences. Inference Sentence/Unlabeled made up 1.38% of the sentences categorized.

The overall tone in agriculture articles was positive/favorable to Ohio’s Issue 2. Only two articles out of the nine remain neutral. With a combination of Judgment Sentences/Attributed/Favorable sentences and the positive/favorable tone of the articles, agriculture newspapers as a whole were biased when reporting on Ohio’s Issue 2.

Conclusions Related to Research Question Two

The second research question’s goal was to discover if there is news bias from mainstream newspapers when reporting on Ohio’s Issue 2. Similar to agriculture newspapers, of the 228 sentences analyzed in mainstream newspapers the majority of the sentences were categorized as Report Sentence/Unattributed (43.86%). Overall mainstream newspapers as a whole found a balance when reporting Judgment Sentences. Judgment Sentence/Attributed/Favorable accounted for 14.04% and Judgment Sentence/Attributed/Unfavorable consisted of 15.78% of the sentences categorized. However, mainstream newspapers still had a small percentage of Judgment Sentences that were unattributed (4.39%). These sentences are statements from the writer and are opinions, leading the article to seem biased.

When viewing the overall tone of mainstream newspapers, five out of the eight articles were perceived to be neutral by the researchers. Only three articles were perceived to be negative/unfavorable toward Ohio’s Issue 2.
Conclusions Related to Research Question Three

The purpose of research question three was to explore how agriculture newspapers framed Ohio’s Issue 2. Agriculture newspapers included a primary and secondary frame for all frame categories, except three. The article had a primary or secondary frame on the following frames: explanation of Issue 2, support from key figures, other State legislation, protection of Ohio’s agriculture, factory/mega/big farms, finance of campaign, and/or general campaign. Considering the presence of HSUS during the campaigning of Ohio’s Issue 2, the researcher found it surprising that articles did not frame toward blaming HSUS. Combining the total of the primary and secondary frame, explanation of Issue 2 and protection of Ohio’s agriculture were the top two frames found in the articles.

Conclusions Related to Research Question Four

Research question four uncovers how mainstream newspapers framed Ohio’s Issue 2. The primary and secondary frames found were: explanation of Issue 2, other State legislation, protection of Ohio’s agriculture, factory/mega/big farms, finance of campaign, general campaign, and the addition to the Constitution. When combining primary and secondary frame totals, protection of Ohio’s agriculture was the most prominent frame in mainstream newspapers. Taking into consideration the overall neutral tone of the articles, the researchers theorized the explanation of Issue 2 or general campaign would be the most prominent frames. In total, only two articles were framed around the explanation of Issue 2 and only one article framed as general campaign.
Conclusions Related to Research Question Five

The goal of research question five was to determine if there was a difference between agriculture and mainstream newspapers when reporting on Ohio’s Issue 2. According to the data, the majority of both agriculture and mainstream newspapers sentences were categorized as Report Sentence/Unattributed. These sentences are factual sentences that can be verified.

They also had a large number of sentences that were categorized as Judgment Sentences. Agriculture newspapers were categorized as mainly Judgment Sentences/Attributed/Favorable (24.14%). While mainstream newspapers balanced their Judgment Sentences between Judgment Sentences/Attributed/Favorable (14.04%) and Judgment Sentences/Unattributed/Unfavorable (15.78%).

The overall tone of agriculture and mainstream newspapers were also unalike. Agriculture newspapers tended to be positive/favorable to Issue 2, while mainstream newspapers were more neutral toward Issue 2.

Concerning the difference in frames between agriculture and mainstream newspapers, it is difficult to draw any conclusions. Protection of Ohio’s agriculture was a prominent frame in agriculture and mainstream newspapers. The researcher theorizes that because Ohio’s agriculture has such an impact on Ohio’s economy, newspapers felt protection of Ohio’s agriculture would be important to their readers. Agriculture newspapers seemed to frame their articles more around what would affect farmers and agriculture as a whole, whereas mainstream newspapers framed their articles around the
affect to people not involved directly with agriculture. Considering their audience, both newspapers tended to cater to their reader.

**Recommendations**

The researcher recommends that reporters be aware of the Hayakawa-Lowry News Bias Categories and have an understanding of how to categorize their sentences. Reporters should also strive to remain unbiased and consistently report on all sides of the issue. Agricultural communicators should be educated on the bias within their profession and remain unbiased when reporting on agriculture issues, even if the issue can be seen as a benefit to the agriculture community. It’s a matter of creditability. If agriculture newspaper reporters desire fairness in reporting, they need to identify their bias and continually try to write all sides of a news story.

Colleges should incorporate the Hayakawa-Lowry News Bias Categories into their curriculum. Teachers of agricultural communication need to educate students on the importance of remaining unbiased when reporting about controversial issues.

The researcher also recommends further research using the Hayakawa-Lowry News Bias Categories. Research should be conducted on a larger sample of news articles surrounding controversial issues. This study should also be replicated to examine other controversial agriculture issues. Further research should also explore how frames and tone can affect the perceptions of the reader.
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APPENDIX A: Ohio’s Issue 2
Text of Proposed Amendment:

(128th General Assembly)
(Amended Substitute Senate Joint Resolution Number 6)

JOINT RESOLUTION
Proposing to enact Section 1 of Article XIV of the Constitution of the State of Ohio to create the Ohio Livestock Care Standards Board.

Be it resolved by the General Assembly of the State of Ohio, three-fifths of the members elected to each house concurring herein, that there shall be submitted to the electors of the state, in the manner prescribed by law at the general election to be held on November 3, 2009, a proposal to enact Section 1 of Article XIV of the Constitution of the State of Ohio to read as follows:

ARTICLE XIV

Section 1. (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.

EFFECTIVE DATE

If adopted by a majority of the electors voting on this proposal at the general election held November 3, 2009, the enactment of Section 1 of Article XIV of the Constitution of the State of Ohio takes effect immediately.
Final Explanation of Issue 2:

Explanation

ISSUE # 2

PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

TO CREATE THE OHIO LIVESTOCK CARE STANDARDS BOARD

(Proposed by Joint Resolution of the General Assembly of Ohio)
To adopt Section 1 of Article XIV of the Constitution of the State of Ohio

Purpose: Amended Substitute Senate Joint Resolution Number 6 (SJR 6) would require the state to create the Livestock Care Standards Board to prescribe standards for animal care and well-being that endeavor to maintain food safety, encourage locally grown and raised food, and protect Ohio farms and families.

The Board would establish standards after considering agricultural best management practices, biosecurity, disease prevention, animal morbidity/mortality data, food safety practices, and the protection of local, affordable food supplies.

The bi-partisan Board would be comprised of thirteen members with expertise in farming, animal care, and food safety issues, and chaired by the director of the state department that regulates agriculture.

The Governor will appoint ten members of the Board, as follows:
• One representing family farmers
• One knowledgeable about food safety in Ohio
• Two representing Ohio farming organizations
• One who is a veterinarian
• The State Veterinarian
• The dean of the agriculture department of an Ohio college or university
• One representing a county humane society in Ohio
• Two representing Ohio’s consumers

The Leaders of the Ohio House of Representatives and the Ohio Senate will each appoint a family farmer to the Board.

Authority of General Assembly under SJR 6: Standards and rules developed by the Board would be subject to the authority of the General Assembly.

If approved, this proposed amendment will be effective immediately.
Final Language of Issue 2 on Ballot:

2 PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

TO CREATE THE OHIO LIVESTOCK CARE STANDARDS BOARD TO ESTABLISH AND IMPLEMENT STANDARDS OF CARE FOR LIVESTOCK AND POULTRY

Proposed by Joint Resolution of the General Assembly

To adopt Section 1 of Article XIV of the Constitution of the State of Ohio

This proposed amendment would:

1. Require the state to create the Livestock Care Standards Board to prescribe standards for animal care and well-being that endeavor to maintain food safety, encourage locally grown and raised food, and protect Ohio farms and families.

2. Authorize this bipartisan board of thirteen members to 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 when establishing and implementing standards.

3. Provide that the board shall be comprised of thirteen Ohio residents including representatives of Ohio family farms, farming organizations, food safety experts, veterinarians, consumers, the dean of the agriculture department at an Ohio college or university and a county humane society representative.

4. Authorize the Ohio department that regulates agriculture to administer and enforce the standards established by the board, subject to the authority of the General Assembly.

If adopted, this amendment shall take effect immediately.

A “YES” vote means approval of the amendment.
A “NO” vote means disapproval of the amendment.

A majority YES vote is required for the amendment to be adopted.
APPENDIX B: Annotation of Articles
**Article 1**

Article Title: Issue 2 Vital for livelihood, most farmers say

Name of Newspaper: Dayton Daily News

Author: Ben Sutherly

Published: October 25, 2009

Sentence Length: 54

The article explained Issue 2, including a bulleted list of who would be on the Livestock Care Standards Board. It covered opinions on the protection of Ohio’s agriculture, what it would mean if Issue 2 was not passed, and how it would be a constitutional amendment.

**Article 2**

Article Title: Ballot question calls for board to regulate livestock operations

Name of Newspaper: Toledo Blade

Author: Jim Provance

Published: November 1, 2009

Sentence Length: 26

The article discussed food safety and the protection of agriculture. It also explained Issue 2 and discussed previous livestock legislation in Michigan. Key phrases: “fox in charge of the henhouse” and factory farms.
**Article 3**

Article Title: Issue 2 opponents slow to mount campaign

Name of Newspaper: Toledo Blade

Author: Jim Provance

Published: October 27, 2009

Sentence Length: 18

This article focused on finance of Issue 2, other States previous legislation and the campaign advertisements. It also talks about how other agriculture communities are looking to Ohio for guidance on how to handle future legislations concerning livestock.

**Article 5**

Article Title: Issue 2 proponents speak out on Town Hall Ohio

Name of Newspaper: Farm and Dairy

Author: Compiled by staff

Published: November 2, 2009

Sentence Length: 13

The article discusses the Town Hall Ohio and the key figures that support Issue 2. It also encourages voters to pass the measure to help protect Ohio’s farmers and families.
Article 6

Article Title: Ohio agriculture rallies support for Issue 2

Name of Newspaper: Farm and Dairy

Author: Compiled by staff

Published: October 16, 2009

Sentence Length: 7

The article informed the reader about Issue 2 and also discussed the recent legislation in California.

Article 7

Article Title: Ohio animal care campaign begins

Name of Newspaper: Ohio Farmer

Author: Compiled by staff

Published: September 28, 2009

Sentence Length: 6

The article informed the reader about Issue 2. It also discussed rallies that are building the support for Issue 2.
Article 8

Article Title: A news partner in animal rights battle

Name of Newspaper: Ohio Farmer

Author: Compiled by staff

Published: August 17, 2009

Sentence Length: 19

The article discusses the campaign of Issue 2 and the funds that are being raised in support of the issue. It also talks about the protection and safety of Ohio agriculture.

Article 9

Article Title: Ohio livestock care legislation ready for voters

Name of Newspaper: Farm and Dairy

Author: Compiled by staff

Published: July 13, 2009

Sentence Length: 8

The article informed the reader about the Livestock Care Standards Board and also discussed the recent legislation in California.
**Article 10**

Article Title: Center for Food and Animal Issues backed by Farm Credit Services

Name of Newspaper: Farm and Dairy

Author: Other News

Published: August 13, 2009

Sentence Length: 11

The article discussed finance surrounding Issue 2 and the protection of Ohio’s agriculture. It also discussed the legislation being placed on the November ballot.

**Article 12**

Article Title: Sides clash over livestock rules

Name of Newspaper: The Columbus Dispatch

Author: Alan Johnson

Published: October 20, 2009

Sentence Length: 24

The article discussed the amendment to the Constitution and the importance of Ohio’s agriculture. It also discussed Issue 2 as a “‘constitutional grab’ by powerful agribusiness interests.”
Article 13

Article Title: As Ohio debates ballot issue on livestock care, Michigan agrees on new law

Name of Newspaper: The Columbus Dispatch

Author: Alan Johnson

Published: October 9, 2009

Sentence Length: 29

The article focuses on the recent legislation in Michigan and the difference in Ohio’s approach toward HSUS’s livestock care requests.

Article 14

Article Title: Issue 2 opponents spar in animal-rights debate

Name of Newspaper: The Columbus Dispatch

Author: Alan Johnson

Published: November 3, 2009

Sentence Length: 18

The article focused on the recent debate between Ohio Farm Bureau Federation and HSUS executives. It also discusses the change to the Constitution and the protection of Ohio’s agriculture.
Article 15

Article Title: Issue 2 is focus of rally

Name of Newspaper: The Columbus Dispatch

Author: Alan Johnson

Published: October 15, 2009

Sentence Length: 19

The article talks about the rally with the presence of key support figures of Issue 2. It also discusses the amendment to the Constitution.

Article 16

Article Title: Issue 2 would decide who regulates animal care in Ohio’s biggest business

Name of Newspaper: The Columbus Dispatch

Author: Alan Johnson

Published: September 6, 2009

Sentence Length: 39

The article focuses on families that would be affected if Issue 2 was not passed. It also talks about the protection of Ohio’s agriculture, as well as, the opponents who are against large farms. It also discusses the development of Issue 2.
**Article 17**

Article Title: On our plates or in our hearts: Officials discuss animal welfare in Columbus

Name of Newspaper: Farm and Dairy

Author: Chris Kick

Published: October 22, 2009

Sentence Length: 38

This article talks about recent legislation in Michigan. It also talks about how the opponents of Issue 2 and how factory farms has “gone too far.”

**Article 19**

Article Title: Issue 2 rally: Ohio farmers can no longer just ‘preach to the choir’

Name of Newspaper: Farm and Dairy

Author: Chris Kick

Published: October 14, 2009

Sentence Length: 30

The article discussed the amendment to the Constitution and how Ohio is having to fight the outsiders. It also talked about protecting Ohio’s agriculture by putting the “power in the producer’s hands.”
The article focuses on the finance surrounding the support of Issue 2. It is also informational about what Issue 2 is and the purpose of the Livestock Care Standards Board.
APPENDIX C: Schema for Analysis of Articles
Comparison of Issue 2

Article # __________ Article Title: ________________________________

Name of Newspaper: ________________________________________________

Month Article was published: _________________________________________

Day Article was published: ___________________________________________

Section of Paper: ___________________________________________________

Type of article: _____________________________________________________

Word Length: __________ Sentence Length: _____________________________

Author: _____________________________________________________________

Overall Tone/Evidence: ______________________________________________

Frame: ____________________________________________________________

Secondary Frame: ____________________________________________________

How many sources: _________________________________________________

Hayakawa-Lowry:

RA __________
RU __________
IL __________
IU __________
JAF __________
JAU __________
JUF __________
JUU __________
Other __________