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Numerous health campaigns designed to educate and motivate individuals towards positive nutritional behavior change to mitigate the obesity epidemic in the United States may prove ineffective since national health policy does not contribute to a healthy nutritional environment. National agricultural policies in particular have led to an environment in which unhealthy food items such as grain are overproduced, and fruits and vegetables are underproduced, thereby influencing consumer purchasing behaviors and the obesity epidemic. Many organizations interested in public health have thus disseminated promotional messages designed to persuade readers that agricultural policies negatively impact food related topics, including the obesity epidemic, the local food movement, and food aid in order to decrease voter support for renewal of these policies. While these messages may intend to persuade readers, little evidence exists suggesting the use of persuasion theories in their design. Language Expectancy Theory (LET) provides a useful framework to do so.

Formative research was used to identify pre-existing 2012 Farm Bill promotional messages, to analyze them based on theoretical components derived from LET, and to construct theoretical variations of the stimulus messages. A pilot study was conducted with undergraduate students to further derive the messages. A 4 x 4 x 2 between-subjects posttest design was used to empirically test the persuasive outcomes of theoretically derived versions of messages related to the Farm Bill and food topics.

Preliminary data analysis found that the manipulations of the theoretical message components based on LET were successful. Results revealed marginal support for the expectations of language use posited by LET, and data on perceptions of actual language used suggested that participants perceived that females were using more intense language whether the language they actually used was more intense or not. Some support was obtained for LET derived hypotheses. There were no significant findings suggesting LET components play a role in messages with more than one author; however, some support was found for the role of organizational credibility.

These results suggest marginal support for the enduring expectations of language use posited by LET, yet many of the LET derived hypotheses were unsupported. The lack of support for the sociological expectations and violations in the theory may stem from the fact that this study provides one of the first examinations of LET in the textual setting or that expectations of language use have change since the theory’s inception. This study did not find support for results on LET and messages with multiple authors; however, initial results suggest that LET may be expanded to include propositions based on organizational credibility. Implications of these findings for communication theory and for strategic message design in the health policy context are discussed, as well as limitations of the study and directions for future research.
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Chapter 1

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

The growth of the obesity epidemic in the United States has led to a plethora of health campaigns designed to educate and motivate individuals towards positive nutritional behavior changes. Long-term adoption of these behaviors, however, is contingent upon environmental and economic opportunities that enable an individual to do so (French, Story, Jeffery, Snyder, Eisenberg, Sidebottom, & Murray, 1997; McLeroy, Bibeau, Steckler, & Glanz, 1988). National health policy plays a large role in shaping the nutritional environment through agricultural policies. These policies influence the crops that United States farmers produce, the price of those crops, and the subsequent food products made available to consumers (Weiss & Smith, 2004). Farm policy that favors the overproduction of certain crops such as commodity grain has created an environment in which farmers produce less fruits and vegetables, thus pushing consumers to consume more grain-based foods, including the fats and sweeteners derived from these grains, which cost less (Drewnoski, Darmon, & Briend, 2004; Drewnoski & Spector, 2004; Weiss & Smith, 2004). This consumption of grain-based foods in lieu of fresh, canned, or frozen fruits and vegetables is more likely to contribute to obesity (Weiss & Smith, 2004).

The primary agriculture and food policy in the United States is the Farm Bill. Originally created in 1933 as part of Roosevelt’s Agricultural Adjustment Act during the Great Depression, the Farm Bill has since expanded a great deal during its renewal periods, which occur approximately every four to five years. The 2008 Farm Bill included fifteen titles, or overarching categories related to food and farming in the United States, including commodity programs (Title I), conservation (Title II), agricultural trade and food aid (Title III), nutrition
(Title IV), farm credit (Title V), rural development (Title VI), research (Title VII), forestry (Title VIII), energy (Title IX), horticulture and organic agriculture (Title X), livestock (Title XI), crop insurance and disaster insurance (Title XII), commodity futures (Title XIII), miscellaneous (Title XIV), and trade and taxes (Title XV). This 2008 Farm Bill was set to expire on September 30, 2012, thus instigating much congressional discussion in the later half of 2012. In June 2012, the Senate passed a new version of the farm bill; however, the House failed to bring its version to vote over disagreements pertaining to funding cuts to nutrition programs, halting the passage of a renewed Farm Bill. If a new version of the Farm Bill were not passed by January 1, 2013, farm policy would revert back to the 1949 “permanent law.” Senate and House leaders therefore successfully worked towards extending the current 2008 Farm Bill legislation through September 30, 2013.

Of particular interest to the present study pertaining to the Farm Bill’s impact on the obesity epidemic is Title 1, which provides income support to farmers of specific commodity crops, including wheat, corn, and other feed grains, cotton, rice, oilseeds, peanuts, sugar, and dairy products. As mentioned previously, these crop subsidies influence the food environment in the United States such that cheap grain-based foods are overproduced, whereas healthier foods are produced less and cost more, thus influencing purchasing behaviors and the obesity epidemic (Drewnoski, Darmon, & Briend, 2004; Drewnoski & Specter, 2004; Weiss & Smith, 2004). Several theories exist that emphasize this role of the environment on human behavior, including social cognitive theory (Bandura, 1986) and the ecological model (Bronfenbrenner, 1979). According to these theories, the unhealthy food environment created by these crop subsidies influences individual behavior, thus creating a need to alter the environment in order to make possible positive individual health behavior changes.
As with any national policy, trade organizations, farm lobbyists, and civil society organizations all have special interests in the contents of the Farm Bill. Organizations interested in public health acknowledge this role the food environment plays in unhealthy eating behaviors and are thus interested in various means used to incite change. There are numerous avenues through which these organizations may attempt to influence public policy. One such avenue is through gaining voter support for or against aspects of a particular policy because voters, through their impact on policymakers, ultimately have the ability to shape health and social policy (Bartels, Heclo, Hero, & Jacobs, 2005). Inciting grassroots support for policy changes to reduce obesity through voters, then, is crucial for gaining policy makers’ support (Brescoll, Kersh, & Brownell, 2008). These organizations therefore disseminate promotional materials to the public during periods of renewal concerning these crop subsidies in attempts to persuade voters that agricultural policies contribute to the obesity epidemic in order to increase voter awareness of the negative public health impact of Title I of the Farm Bill. These messages, then, are attempting to persuade readers to accept the notion that current agricultural policies influence the obesity epidemic. This in turn will increase voter awareness during renewal periods of these policies, thus working towards the creation of a healthier food environment more conducive to preventing and reversing the obesity epidemic.

While these organizations may be attempting to pursue these goals, it is important to understand these promotional messages in terms of their theoretical persuasive content to assess their potential persuasive impact, in terms of message acceptance, or potential unintended consequences, in terms of message rejection. Persuasion theorists seek to produce theory that can guide the planning, implementation, and evaluation of various persuasive messages. In other words, they are engaged in efforts to maximize the persuasive strength of messages in a
particular text, presumably to promote the desired response, message acceptance, in readers. One such persuasion theory, Language Expectancy Theory (Burgoon, 1990; Burgoon, Jones, & Stewart, 1975; Burgoon & Miller, 1985), provides a useful insight into understanding various message components that promote or inhibit persuasion.

**Theoretical Framework: Language Expectancy Theory**

Language Expectancy Theory (LET; Burgoon, 1990; Burgoon, Jones, & Stewart, 1975; Burgoon & Miller, 1985) is a message-centered theory of persuasion that explains why certain linguistic formats in persuasive messages influence persuasive outcomes. The theory rests on two assumptions about human nature: one, that language is a rule-governed system through which individuals develop macro-sociological expectations with regards to the persuasive language and message strategies employed by others, and two, that cultural and sociological forces shape human patterns of ordinary language use and subsequent normative and non-normative language styles.

Burgoon, Denning, and Roberts (2002) walk through seventeen propositions that stem from LET to explain how these assumptions about human nature and language use affect the outcomes of persuasive messages. Proposition one states that people develop cultural and sociological expectations about language that affect the acceptance or rejection of a persuasive message. Proposition two and three explore the effects incurred by violations of these expectations in persuasive attempts by positing that negative violations result in no attitude or behavior change, or change in the opposite direction to that advocated by the communicator (proposition two), whereas positive violations elicit attitude or behavior changes in the desired direction (proposition three). Propositions four through six explore the normative impact of the
credibility of communicators and language strategies; proposition seven articulates gender differences of language use expectations.

**Source Characteristics**

Initial research on the first three propositions therefore explored the combined effects of source characteristics, including sex of the source and source credibility, and language intensity, defined as “the quality of language which indicates the degree to which the speaker’s attitude toward a concept deviates from neutrality” (Bowers, 1963, p. 345). Intense versus neutral language strategies differ with respect to the adjectives, adverbs and graphic language used. For example, high intensity adjectives include words such as “excellent” or “wonderful,” with neutral counterparts as “ok” and “average,” respectively (Burgoon & Miller, 1971). Additionally, in some cases the neutral counterpart for intense adjective or adverb such as “very bad” or “incredibly bad” is simply an omission of an adjective or adverb prior to the noun it describes (Burgoon & Miller, 1971). Intense language often contains graphic or extreme wording, whereas neutral language does not.

In the first of a series of three studies, Burgoon, Jones, and Stewart (1975) found an interaction between language intensity and sex of the source such that a female source is most persuasive with low-intense language and a male source is least effective with low-intense language. From this empirical data, LET posits that female communicators are expected to use low-intensity language in their persuasive messages. To the extent that females deviate from and negatively violate these expectations with high-intensity language, message acceptance (or persuasion) is inhibited. On the other hand, males sources are expected to engage in high-intensity language, and to the extent that they do not violate these expectations, are effectively persuasive. Later explorations of LET focus on verbal aggressiveness as an expansion on
language intensity (Burgoon, Dillard, & Doran, 1983). Similar results were found such that males are expected to use aggressive persuasive strategies, and attitude change is inhibited if they do not conform to such expectations (Burgoon, Dillard, & Doran, 1983). Females are not expected to use aggressive persuasive strategies, and persuasion is less effective if they do (Burgoon, Dillard, & Doran, 1983).

Source credibility is a much-explored phenomenon within the persuasion literature. Hovland and Weiss’ (1951) early research on credibility found that the “trustworthiness” of a source was important in whether message recipients accepted the information in the message and changed opinions accordingly. Additionally, a highly credible source positively alters persuasive outcomes by increasing a reader’s message-relevant thinking (Heesacker, Petty, & Cacioppo, 1983). More recent work that examined empirical data on source credibility during the period between the 1950s and 2000 concludes “a highly credible source is commonly found to induce more persuasion toward the advocacy than a low-credibility one” (Pornpitakpan, 2004, p. 244). LET posits, however, that qualifiers such as language intensity affect these persuasive outcomes.

Burgoon, Jones, and Stewart (1975) found in their third initial study examining LET that source credibility and language intensity interact such that a low credible speaker is more persuasive using low-intense language, whereas a high credible speaker is more persuasive with highly intense language. This initial empirical work on the theory, as well as additional work that found that language intensity enhances persuasiveness for a high-credibility source and inhibits persuasiveness for a low-credibility source (Hamilton, Hunter, & Burgoon, 1990), suggests that to the extent that low-credible sources deviate from, and negatively violate, these expectations with high-intensity language, message acceptance (or persuasion) is inhibited.
High-credible sources, however, are expected to engage in high-intensity language, and to the extent that they do not violate these expectations, are effectively persuasive.

The consistent positive effect of high source credibility in persuasive messages led later explorations of LET to maintain high source credibility constant, while continuing to examine the relationship between sex of the source and language intensity. Burgoon, Birk, and Hall (1991) examined the interaction between sex of the message source and verbal aggression strategies in the physician-patient dyad. High credibility as a physician, then, is held constant across biological sex. The results conform to predictions that stem from LET such that male physicians using either more or less aggressive strategies positively violated expectations and increased mean compliance scores when compared to neutral strategies, whereas female physicians were viewed as negatively violating expectations with any deviations from neutral language to more aggressive strategies, therefore decreasing reported compliance. The findings of Burgoon, Jones, and Stewart (1975) suggesting females have a restricted bandwidth of acceptable communication behaviors in 1974, then, are replicated 15 years later using female physicians, who enjoyed relatively high status and high credibility perceptions (Burgoon, Birk, & Hall, 1991).

These results may be surprising in that societal norms and expectations had changed very little for the communicative behavior of females in the 15 years between the inception of LET and the project conducted in 1989. The theoretical assumptions of LET, therefore, appear to be supported by empirical data that extends through the later half of the 20th century. It seems pertinent to revisit these findings in a new context and new century to determine the enduring nature of the underlying expectations within LET.
If the expectations in LET are to be upheld, the theory posits that a credible male source should be expected to use more intense language strategies and a credible female source should be expected to use neutral language strategies. If a male source uses neutral language strategies and a female source uses intense language strategies, LET would suggest that an expectation has been violated. Therefore, it is predicted that:

H1a: There are perceived differences in expected communication behaviors such that a credible male source is expected to use more intense language than credible females, while a credible female source is expected to use more neutral language strategies than do credible male sources.

H1b: Violations of communicative expectations will occur if a male source uses neutral language strategies and a female source uses intense language strategies.

Failure to support these hypotheses would indicate that the expectations for language use have evolved from the inception of LET, not that the theory itself is obsolete. LET has operationalized rules for language use in past research, and failure to find the same expectations in the present day would indicate that these expectations are outdated. The theory itself, however, could remain valid.

In order to extend these expectations into the propositions of message acceptance or rejection, this study examines the effects of language use in promotional materials designed to persuade voters that agricultural policies contribute to the obesity epidemic in order to increase voter awareness of the negative public health impact of Title I of the Farm Bill. Such influence will be considered in terms of two message outcomes--perceived evidence quality and perceived message effectiveness, and one conative outcome—behavioral intentions.
Perceived evidence quality is a judgment made by a message recipient concerning the quality of evidence in a message by whether they find that evidence comprehensible, or whether they understand the evidence “based on the integration of the ideas with related frameworks of meaning” (Parrott, Silk, Dorgan, Condit, & Harris, 2005, p. 425). In this manner, comprehension in the form of perceived evidence quality underscores perceivers’ subjective construction of meaning associated with the evidence in a message, which is related to both the communicative strategies in a message and the individual comprehension based on these strategies (Parrott et al., 2005). A perception of message effectiveness on the other hand is a function of “the extent to which the appeal demonstrates the severity of the problem and/or the audience’s susceptibility to it” (Dillard, Shen, & Vrail, 2007, p. 468). This perceived message effectiveness is theorized to be an immediate precursor to attitude change (Hullet, 2004; Lavine & Snyder, 2006), and additional research has found a causal link from perceived message effectiveness to actual effectiveness, which includes postmessage attitude and behavioral intentions (Dillard, Shen, & Vrail, 2007). These three outcomes, perceived evidence quality, perceived message effectiveness, and behavioral intentions, are then based in part on the strategies used to communicate ideas in a message and the individual’s perception of those strategies. LET as a theoretical framework suggests that communicative strategies in a message in conjunction with individual expectations for those strategies will influence the persuasive outcome of a message, thus it is reasonable to determine the influence of theoretical constructs in LET using perceived evidence quality, perceived message effectiveness, and behavioral intentions.

Since the Farm Bill is so expansive, a wide variety of organizations have distributed promotional messages not only on the Farm Bill and its impact on the obesity epidemic, but also
the influence the Farm Bill has on other issues, both domestic and abroad. For instance, organizations have disseminated messages that attempt to convince readers that the Farm Bill’s current policies have an impact on both local food and food aid. When considering these three Farm Bill topics in conjunction, obesity, local food, and food aid all deal with somewhat similar issues in that they are related to food and food production, yet the three topics are distinct enough to produce three very different core messages. This message variation on topic will therefore be used in the present study to more broadly test the theoretical assumptions of LET with the subsequent ability to speak in a more generalizable fashion to the theory’s propositions.

The project specifically focuses on sex of the source and language condition as intense or neutral, by once again maintaining high source credibility constant. Thus, it is predicted that:

H2: A female source will be more effective in increasing: (a) perceived evidence quality, (b) perceived message effectiveness, and (c) behavioral intentions to comply with a message when using neutral as compared to intense language in messages related to the Farm Bill and food.

H3: A male source will be less effective in increasing: (a) perceived evidence quality, (b) perceived message effectiveness, and (c) behavioral intentions to comply with a message when using neutral as compared to intense language in messages related to the Farm Bill and food.

As noted previously, failure to support these hypotheses does not mean the theory itself is no longer valid in the present day. It is possible that the sociological expectations for language use have evolved such that the expectations driving work on LET in the later half of the 20th century are outdated today. The overall theory may then be upheld with respect to the effect of
violations of expectations on persuasive outcomes, yet expectations for language use may have changed.

LET and the subsequent empirical work stemming from the theory focuses very specifically on the interaction between source characteristics and persuasive outcomes in messages with one single author. LET, therefore, provides no propositional framework to derive predictions associated with messages that stem from multiple authors. Promotional messages often contain more than one author, suggesting the need to understand the interaction between sex of the source when both a male and female author name are present in order to improve upon the ecological validity of the theory’s assumptions. The following research questions are proposed:

RQ1: What effect does sex of the message source and language intensity have in (a) perceived evidence quality, (b) perceived message effectiveness, and (c) behavioral intentions to comply with the message when a male author is listed as the first author and a female as second in messages related to the Farm Bill and food?

RQ2: What effect does sex of the message source and language intensity have in (a) perceived evidence quality, (b) perceived message effectiveness, and (c) behavioral intentions to comply with the message when a female author is listed as the first author and a male as second in messages related to the Farm Bill and food?

With respect to perceptions of author credibility, LET posits that when a negative expectation violation occurs, the message source will be perceived as less credible, regardless of whether credibility statements, including education and experience, are held constant. Thus, when considering messages on the Farm Bill and food, including obesity, local food, and food aid, the following hypothesis is proposed:
H4: A female source will be perceived as more credible and a male source will be perceived as less credible when using neutral language as compared to intense language in messages related to the Farm Bill and food.

LET also very specifically focuses on credibility of the source in reference to the author of a message, yet fails to make predictions concerning how perceptions of credibility of an organization may impact persuasive outcomes. The messages disseminated to voters surrounding issues related to the Farm Bill and food are often distributed through organizational means, with prominent organization names and logos featured on the materials. Previous research regarding organizational credibility in the communication discipline is scare; however, marketing researchers provide interesting insight into this phenomenon. For example, research has determined that individual buyers distinguish between trust in sales representatives and trust in vendor organizations (Ganeson & Hess, 1997), suggesting that perceptions of source credibility of the author of a message is distinct from perceptions of credibility of the originating organization. Additionally, these perceptions of trust are crucial predictors of an individual’s commitment to that organization (Ganeson & Hess, 1997). This previous research clearly distinguishes between the trust and credibility individuals hold towards another individual versus the trust individuals place in an organization, which warrants further consideration in the field of persuasion. While LET provides a theoretical framework through which to make predictions about how language intensity interacts with the sex of the source to produce perceptions of source credibility of the individual producing the message, it is not possible to derive organization-based hypotheses through its extant propositions. Thus, the following research question is proposed:
RQ3: What effect does sex of the source(s) and language intensity have on perceived organizational credibility in messages related to the Farm Bill and food?

**Target Population**

While these organizations interested in public health may attempt to influence the public at large, it may be helpful to more fully understand the persuasive impact of these messages on particular subsets of the population to determine the potential impact if persuasion does occur. College students in particular may provide a unique subset of the voting population with increasing potential to generate change in health and social policies. The percentage of young adults voting in the presidential elections has increased in recent years. In the 2008 election, 22 million young Americans under the age of 30 voted (an estimated 2 million more voters than in the 2004 election; Kirby & Kawashima-Ginsberg, 2009). 51% of young adults voted, marking an increase of two percentage points from 2004, and eleven percentage points from 2000 (Kirby & Kawahima-Ginsberg, 2009). More specifically, however, in 2008, 62% of young adults with college experience voted, whereas only 36% of young adults without college experience voted (Kirby & Kawashima-Ginsberg, 2009), suggesting the stronger potential impact of the college population of young adults in voting for/against various health and social policies. It may also be particularly useful to study this population based on previous research indicating this demographic group (approximately 18 years old and higher socioeconomic status) is less likely to support obesity-related health policies (Oliver & Lee, 2005), suggesting the need for effectively persuasive messages to increase their involvement in this issue. The following study will therefore examine the persuasive impact of theoretical message components derived from LET in promotional messages designed to persuade voters that the Farm Bill impacts the obesity epidemic, the local food movement, and food aid in an undergraduate college population.
Chapter 2

METHOD

Overview of Methods

This project was conducted in three phases: (a) a formative research endeavor including the identification of pre-existing 2012 Farm Bill promotional messages, an analysis of these message based on theoretical components derived from LET, and construction of stimulus messages, (b) a pilot study conducted with undergraduate college students to further derive the experimental messages, and (c) a 4 x 4 x 2 (topic [Farm Bill Obesity, Farm Bill Local Food, Farm Bill Food Aid, Attention-Control] by sex of the source(s) [male, female, male/female, female/male] by language condition [intense, neutral]) randomized trial of theoretically derived versions of Farm Bill promotional messages on outcomes with undergraduate college students. Institutional Review Board approval was obtained prior to each study.

Part 1: Formative Research

The purpose of the formative research was threefold: one, to select messages used by organizations during the 2012 renewal period of the Farm Bill that attempted to convince readers of the relationship between the Farm Bill and three food related topics: obesity, local food, and food aid, two, to analyze these messages for their theoretical content derived from LET, and three, to construct 32 theoretical variations of the messages.

Message Selection

Purposive sampling (Patton, 2002) was used to select four promotional messages distributed by two separate organizations with content pertaining to the 2012 renewal of the Farm Bill based on predetermined inclusion criteria. A Google search was conducted through entering the phrases “corn subsidies and obesity,” “farm bill and obesity,” and “agricultural
policy and obesity” into the search bar. This search generated a list of websites, newspaper articles, scholarly articles, and organizational webpages surrounding the Farm Bill and its impact on obesity.

After sifting through this information, the two organizations that appeared to have the widest reach and dissemination of information based on amount of coverage and publicity surrounding their supports were chosen for this investigation. The first organization chosen was the U.S. PIRG (Public Interest Research Group) Education Fund. The U.S. PIRG, which is the federation of all State PIRGS, released a document entitled “Apples to Twinkies: Comparing Taxpayer Subsidies for Fresh Produce and Junk Food,” in July of 2012, two months prior to the 2012 renewal of the Farm Bill. The second organization chosen was the Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy, or IATP. In 2006 and 2007 the IATP released two documents centered on the Farm Bill and obesity debate, entitled “Food Without Thought: How U.S. Farm Policy Contributes to Obesity” and “A Fair Farm Bill for Public Health,” respectively. For the most recent renewal in 2012, however, the IATP released a series of fact sheets entitled “What’s at stake in the 2012 Farm Bill?” addressing issues such as local foods and food aid as they relate to the Farm Bill. Three of the most recent documents were collected from each of these organizations: the U.S. PIRG message on the Farm Bill and obesity, the IATP message on the Farm Bill and local food, and the IATP message on the Farm Bill and food aid. These three messages were chosen for their release prior to the 2012 renewal period with three distinct topics related to the Farm Bill and food in order to more fully explicate theoretical assumptions underlying LET. These original messages are available in Appendix A (obesity), Appendix B (local food), and Appendix C (food aid).
**Ethical Considerations.** The ethical guidelines for research online (Bruckman, 2002) state that information may be freely used without consent if (i) it is publicly archived, (ii) the archives are not password protected or no registration is needed, (iii) the site policy does not prohibit it, and (iv) the topic is not highly sensitive. If the website is cited as any other literature and potentially harmful details are excluded from publication, researchers may use statements made in publicly accessible websites (Ess & Committee, 2002; Haigh & Jones, 2005; Haigh & Jones 2007; Wilson & Peterson, 2002). Promotional messages on the Farm Bill made available through an organization’s online website may therefore be used in research without consent. The original sources, including both organization and authors, were credited for the information.

**Message Analysis**

After the messages were selected, they were analyzed for their theoretical content based on the aforementioned message components articulated in LET, including sex of the source, language intensity, and source credibility. Information on sex of the source was obtained from author names provided on the promotional material fact sheet. Using these names it was possible to determine the sex of the source(s) as male and/or female. An analysis of language intensity included examining adverbs, adjectives, and graphic language included in the promotional messages. Source credibility can be assessed through a variety of factors, including age, education, and reliance of the medium that presents the message (Greenberg, 1966; Johnson & Kaye, 1998; Wanta & Hu, 1994). These types of credentials were gathered on the authors of all messages via a search of author’s biography on each respective organization’s website. This search revealed information on the authors’ age, education, and experience.
32 messages were constructed varying the topic (Farm Bill Obesity, Farm Bill Local Food, Farm Bill Food Aid, Attention Control), sex of the source(s) (male, female, male/female, female/male), and language condition (intense, neutral). The message in the first topic attempts to persuade readers that agricultural policies contribute to the obesity epidemic in order to decrease voter support for Title I of the Farm Bill. The message in the second topic attempts to persuade readers that the Farm Bill impacts the local food movement, and the message in the third topic connects local and global food aid to the Farm Bill. The attention control message is based on previous use of attention control about interviewing skills necessary for jobs (Volkman & Parrott, 2012). The original attention control message is available in Appendix D.

The single-author male message conditions contain a clearly masculine author name at the beginning of the message, whereas the single-author female message condition contains a clearly feminine author name. The two-author male/female condition contains two authors: the first listed is a clearly masculine name, and the second is a clearly feminine name. The two-author female/male condition contains two authors: the first listed is a clearly feminine name, and the second is a clearly masculine name. The obesity message was originally authored by one male and one female, and the original author names were used and varied according to the conditions as described. The local foods message was originally authored by one male and one female, and the original author names were used and varied according to the conditions as described. The food aid message was originally authored by a sole female author; in order to construct the male and two author conditions, the male author name from the local foods message was used as these two messages originated from the same organization.
The intense language conditions were constructed to contain elements of high language intensity including intense adjectives, adverbs and graphic language, whereas the neutral language conditions were constructed to contain neutral words or descriptors in their place. The number of intense words ranged from 86 to 103 intense words across topics. The obesity message contained 103 intense words, the local foods message contained 89 intense words, the food aid message contained 93 intense words, and the attention control message contained 86 intense words. To maintain ecological validity, the messages were kept close to their original form, making it difficult to utilize the exact same intense words across topics; however, an intense word bank was created to control as much variability as possible. Table 1 contains example statements by topic and language condition (statements did not differ by author condition); all 32 theoretically constructed messages are available in Appendix E (obesity), Appendix F (local food), Appendix G (food aid), and Appendix H (attention control). Full lists of the intense words and their neutral counterparts are available in Appendix I (obesity), Appendix J (local food), Appendix K (food aid), and Appendix L (attention control).

High source credibility was kept constant in all messages through author credentials regarding their experience per aforementioned research that this minimally defines credibility based on author education and experience. The following statement was used and adapted to each message:

“NAME is an Expert Policy Advocate for ORGANIZATION. S/he has been actively involved in working around the country on policy issues including public policies related to TOPIC for the past 10 years. NAME has authored and co-authored numerous reports on public policy for ORGANIZATION since beginning his/her work for them in 2003.”

Except for these manipulated variables of interest, the message conditions were equivalent on all micro-level structural and stylistic characteristics. The stylistic choices mimicked those of Parrott et al. (2005) by including the use of Times New Roman as the font
style and font size of 18 point for titles and authorship, 14 point for the message content, and 12 point for the references. Using the Flesh-Kincaid index, and excluding the title, authorship, and references, readability levels were maintained in the range of 11.0 to 12.0. While high, these reading levels reflect the actual message content and therefore provide ecologically valid readability levels for these promotional messages. The length for the messages ranged within a 4.1% difference, ranging from 1,077 to 1,123 between topics. Within topics, the length of the messages varying by intense and neutral language ranged within a 2% difference, ranging from 1,100 to 1,110 in the obesity message, 1,071 to 1,084 in the local foods message, 1,077 to 1,098 in the food aid message, and 1,104 to 1,123 in the attention control message.
Table 1

*Example Statements by Topic and Language Condition*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Intense</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obesity</td>
<td>The fact is that even as nutrition researchers tell us to cut down on junk food in order to significantly combat the severe childhood obesity epidemic, irresponsible federal agricultural policy is substantially underwriting the devastating obesity crisis.</td>
<td>The fact is that even as nutrition researchers tell us to cut down on unhealthy food in order to be able to combat the childhood obesity problem, federal agricultural policy is right now underwriting the obesity problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Food</td>
<td>Still other consumers are greatly concerned about the enormous carbon footprint left by food produced on gigantic, industrial-scale farms, processed by large multi-national food businesses and transported around the globe.</td>
<td>Still other consumers are slightly concerned about the carbon footprint left by food produced on these industrial-scale farms, processed by these multi-national food businesses and transported around the globe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Aid</td>
<td>At a staggering $2.3 billion in 2010, the U.S. provides just over half of the necessary emergency food aid deliveries to millions of beneficiaries around the world suffering from the devastating effects of famine, natural disaster, and conflict.</td>
<td>At a total of $2.3 billion in 2010, the U.S. provides just over half of the emergency food aid deliveries to millions of beneficiaries around the world suffering from the effects of famine, natural disaster, and conflict.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attention-Control</td>
<td>The interview is one of the most incredibly important steps in the intense job search process, and significant preparation is incredibly essential.</td>
<td>The interview is one of the important first steps in the job search process, and some preparation is somewhat essential.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part 2: Pilot Study

The purpose of the pilot study was two fold: one, to assess whether the intended audience perceived the constructed messages as varying on the theoretical components indicated by LET in a manipulation check, and two, to further derive the experimental messages based on these manipulation check results.

Participants

Participants included 88 undergraduate students recruited from the research participant pool in the Communication Arts and Sciences department ranging in age from 18 to 48 (\(M=20.72, SD=3.21\)). The sample was roughly equally comprised of both males (55.68%, \(n=49\)) and females (44.31%, \(n=39\)). The respondents self-identified as Caucasian (79.54%, \(n=70\)), Asian (6.81%, \(n=6\)), African American (5.68%, \(n=5\)), Latino (3.41%, \(n=3\)), Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander (1.14%, \(n=1\)), and Other (2.27%, \(n=2\)).

Procedures

Data was collected through an online survey questionnaire sent to participants via their university email address. After agreeing to the informed consent, participants were asked a series of introductory questions. In order to avoid interactions by participants’ gender and source’s gender, participants were then asked to indicate whether they were male or female, and were then stratified and randomly assignment to view 1 of the 32 message conditions. This stratification was used to ensure the conditions were gender balanced.

Measures

Manipulation check measures. After reading 1 of 32 messages that was randomly assigned, participants were asked several questions to examine the manipulation of the message components related to topic, sex of the source(s), and language condition. Message topic was
assessed via a single-item question asking participants to indicate if the message they read focused on (a) The Farm Bill and Obesity, (b) The Farm Bill and Food Aid, (c) The Farm Bill and Local Foods, (d) Job Interview, or (e) Unknown. Sex of the source(s) was assessed via a single-item question asking respondents to indicate if the author of the message is (a) one author, male, (b) one author, female, (c) two authors (male first, female second), (d) two authors (female first, male second), (e) ambiguous, or (f) unknown. Language condition was assessed via nine 7-point semantic differential scales with the stem “The language in the message you just read was,” followed by: (a) neutral[not neutral], (b) intense[not intense], (c) aggressive[not aggressive], (d) dramatic[not dramatic], (e) extreme[not extreme], (f) passionate[not passionate], (g) forceful[not forceful], (h) powerful[not powerful], and (i) strong[not strong] (see Appendix N).

**Author education.** Three questions were asked to gauge participant perceptions of author educational degrees and institutions that would be perceived as high source credibility in order to update the author credentials for the experimental messages to improve participant perceptions of high source credibility. The three items asked participants to indicate (a) which college or university they would perceive a highly educated author of the message to have a degree in, (b) the area of specialty/major of the degree they would expect a highly educated author to obtain, and (c) which level of degree they would expect a highly educated author to obtain. The multiple-choice options for these items originated from the author biographies obtained during the formative research (see Appendix O).

**Additional.** Additional measures in the pilot study were used as an author name gender assessment. The author name gender assessment was used as an additional way to gather participant perception of the sex of the authors of the Farm Bill messages. Each author name gender (n=5) was assessed via a single-item measure with the stem “I think that the name
NAME” is (a) much more likely to be a male, (b) a little more likely to be a male, (c) equally likely to be a male or female, (d) a little more likely to be a female, or (e) much more likely to be a female (see Appendix P).

Results

Manipulation check. A chi square test for association was used to assess the manipulation check for the topic of the message. The significant chi square value, $\chi^2 (1, N=292)=137.00$, $p=0.00$ indicated that participants were significantly more likely to correctly identify the topic of the message they received than one of the other message topics.

A chi square test for association was used to assess the manipulation check item for sex of the source(s). The significant chi square value, $\chi^2 (1, N=292)=144.82$, $p=0.00$ indicated that participants were significantly more likely to correctly identify the sex of the source(s) of the message they received than one of the other sex of the source(s) options.

The language condition items were not analyzed as a scale, but rather with using independent sample t-tests for each of the nine items comparing intense messages to neutral messages when collapsed across topic and authorship. The results of these independent t-tests revealed a lack of significant differences between neutral and intense messages.

The items on author educational degrees and institutions revealed that the majority of participants expected a highly educated author to obtain their degree from Harvard University (48.86%, $n=43$) and the University of Colorado (18.18%, $n=16$). The majority of respondents also indicated that they would expect a highly educated author to have a degree in public policy (31.81%, $n=28$), agricultural sciences (22.72%, $n=20$), and healthy policy and administration (21.59%, $n=19$). Participants expected a highly educated author to have obtained a Ph.D. (53.41%, $n=47$) or a Master’s degree (39.77%, $n=35$).
**Message reconstruction.** Based on these manipulation check results, the messages were modified to improve upon participant perception of the intended variable manipulations. The manipulations of topic and sex of the source(s) were successful in the pilot study, such that no additional changes were made to these portions of the messages.

Several changes were made with respect to the failure to produce statistically significant differences in the manipulation check pertaining to the language in the messages as intense or neutral. Three additional 7-point semantic differential items were added to the intense/neutral manipulation check items, including matter-of-fact[embellished], calm[emotional], and sensible[irrational]. These items were added to include more items as synonyms for neutral as opposed to operationalizing neutral as merely the opposite of intense. In addition, a compliance-gaining statement adapted from Burgoon, Birk, and Hall (1991) was added to the end of each message to attempt to increase participant perceptions of intense or neutral language by including an intense/aggressive compliance gaining strategy in the intense conditions and a neutral/unaggressive compliance gaining strategy in the neutral conditions. The template for the intense compliance-gaining statement is as follows:

Note from the author, AUTHOR: If you don’t follow my advice and take action to help alleviate the overwhelming TOPIC issue in the United States by visiting the ORGANIZATION website to learn how you can make a difference, then you have only yourself to blame for the deadly problems.

The template for the neutral compliance-gaining statement is as follows:

Note from the author, AUTHOR: I like my readers very much and want each of you to help alleviate the TOPIC issue in the United States, so please make sure you take the time to visit the ORGANIZATION website to learn how you can make a difference.

The template for the intense compliance-gaining statement contained 49 words and the template for the neutral compliance-gaining statement contained 47 words. Table 2 contains the actual compliance gaining strategies across topic and language condition.
**Author education.** The items on a highly educated authors institution, major, and degree level were used to construct statements that were added to the biography of each author in each message. To mesh the information, it was determined that the authors’ education would be fabricated to have obtained a Masters degree in Agricultural Science from the University of Colorado and a Ph.D. in Public Health Policy and Administration from Harvard University. The inclusion of these additional qualifications in author biographies in the experimental conditions was intended to increase respondent perceptions of high source credibility. To assess these changes, a manipulation check was included in the randomized trial of Part 3.

**Additional.** Results indicated that the female names were much more likely to be perceived as a female name and the male names were much more likely to be perceived as a male name. The majority of participants (95.45%, n=84) indicated that the female name in the obesity message was much more likely to be female, and likewise, the majority of the participants (92.05%, n=81) indicated that the male name in the obesity message was much more likely to be male. The majority of participants (94.32%, n=83) indicated the female name in the local foods message was much more likely to be female, and the majority of participants (87.50%, n=77) also indicated the female name in the food aid message was much more likely to be female. The majority of the participants (95.45%, n=84) also indicated that the male name used in both the local foods and food aid message was much more likely to be male. The attention control message used the same names as the obesity message.
Table 2

*Compliance-Gaining Statements by Topic and Language Condition*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>High intensity</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obesity</td>
<td>Note from the author(s), NAME: If you don’t follow my advice and take action to help alleviate the overwhelming obesity issue in the United States by visiting the U.S. PIRG website to learn how you can make a different, then you have only yourself to blame for the deadly problems.</td>
<td>Not from the author(s), NAME: I like my readers very much and want each of you to help alleviate the obesity issue in the United States, so please make sure you take the time to visit the U.S. PIRG website to learn how you can make a difference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Food</td>
<td>Note from the author(s), NAME: If you don’t follow my advice and take action to help alleviate the overwhelming local food issue in the United States by visiting the Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy website to learn how you can make a different, then you have only yourself to blame for the deadly problems.</td>
<td>Not from the author(s), NAME: I like my readers very much and want each of you to help alleviate the local food issue in the United States so please make sure you take the time to visit the Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy website to learn how you can make a difference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Aid</td>
<td>Note from the author(s), NAME: If you don’t follow my advice and take action to help alleviate the overwhelming food aid issue in the United States by visiting the Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy website to learn how you can make a different, then you have only yourself to blame for the deadly problems.</td>
<td>Not from the author(s), NAME: I like my readers very much and want each of you to help alleviate the food aid issue in the United States so please make sure you take the time to visit the Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy website to learn how you can make a difference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attention</td>
<td>Note from the author(s), NAME: If you don’t follow my advice and take action to help alleviate the overwhelming interview issue in the United States by visiting the Penn State Career Services website to learn how you can make a different, then you have only yourself to blame for the interview problems.</td>
<td>Note from the author(s), NAME: I like my readers very much and want each of you to help alleviate the interview issue in the United States so please make sure you take the time to visit the Penn State Career Services website to learn how you can prepare.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part 3: Randomized Trial

The randomized trial consisted of a 4 x 4 x 2 (topic [Farm Bill Obesity, Farm Bill Local Food, Farm Bill Food Aid, Attention Control] by sex of the source(s) [male, female, male/female, female/male] by language condition [intense, neutral]) randomized trial of theoretically derived versions of Farm Bill promotional messages on outcomes with undergraduate college students.

Participants

Participants included 292 undergraduate students recruited from the research participant pool in the Communication Arts and Sciences department. Based on Volkman and Parrott (2012) and Parrot et al. (2005), it was determined that the expected effect size for the present investigation was 0.30. A power analysis using g*power was conducted and it was determined that for 32 groups, $\alpha = 0.05$ and $1-\beta = 0.95$, $n=288$ participants would be needed; thus, a sufficient sample size was obtained to achieve enough power to find differences in message conditions.

The participants in the sample ranged in age from 18 to 65 ($M=20.46$, $SD=3.09$) and were roughly equally comprised of both males (53.42%, $n=156$) and females (46.58%, $n=136$). The respondents self-identified as Caucasian (81.51%, $n=238$), Asian (7.86%, $n=23$), African American (3.08%, $n=9$), Latino (3.08%, $n=9$), American Indian or Alaska Native (0.68%, $n=2$) and Other (3.77%, $n=11$).

Procedures

Data was collected through an online survey questionnaire sent to participants via their university email address. After providing informed consent, all participants completed pre-test questionnaires concerning their previous involvement and knowledge of the issue. In order to
avoid interactions by participants’ gender and source’s gender, stratified random assignment was used to ensure all experimental conditions are gender balanced. Each participant indicated their gender as male or female and was then was stratified and randomized to view 1 of 32 message conditions. After exposure to the message, all participants completed post-test measures and provided demographic information. The following section contains the procedures of the manipulation check, the remaining procedures for operationalizing the outcomes of interest, and the data analysis plan. The results are included in the results section.

**Manipulation Check**

The manipulation check measures were used to examine the 32 experimental message conditions across topic, sex of the source(s), language condition, and source credibility to assess the changes made after the pilot study (see Appendix S).

**Message topic.** Message topic was assessed via a single-item question asking participants to indicate if the message they read focused on (a) The Farm Bill and Obesity, (b) The Farm Bill and Food Aid, (c) The Farm Bill and Local Foods, (d) Job Interview or (e) Unknown.

**Sex of the source.** Sex of the source(s) was assessed via a single-item question asking respondents to indicate if the author of the message is (a) one author, male, (b) one author, female, (c) two authors (male first, female second), (d) two authors (female first, male second), or (e) unknown.

**Language condition.** Language condition was assessed via twelve 7-point semantic differential scales with the stem “The language in the message you just read was,” followed by: (a) neutral[not neutral], (b) matter-of-fact[embellished], (c) calm[emotional], (d) sensible[irrational], (e) intense[not intense], (f) aggressive[not aggressive], (g) dramatic[not
dramatic], (h) extreme[not extreme], (i) passionate[not passionate], (j) forceful[not forceful], (j) powerful[not powerful], and (l) strong[not strong].

**Message organization.** Message organization was assessed via a single-item question asking participants to indicate if the organization of the message they read came from (a) U.S. PIRG Education Fund, (b) Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy (IATP), (c) Penn State Career Services, or (d) Unknown.

**Source credibility.** Source credibility was assessed to ensure high source credibility was held constant in all conditions through a scale established by McCroskey and Young (1981) that examines several theoretical dimensions of the construct, including competence, character, and intention. The item consisted of twelve 7-point semantic differential scales with the stem “I think the author(s) of the message is/are,” followed by: (a) intelligent[unintelligent], (b) untrained[trained], (c) expert[inexpert/novice], (d) uninformed[informed], (e) competent[incompetent], (f) stupid[bright], (g) sinful[virtuous], (h) dishonest[honest], (i) unselfish[selfish], (j) sympathetic[unsympathetic], (k) high character[low character], (l) untrustworthy[trustworthy]. The items were reverse coded such that higher numbers would reflect perceptions of high credibility and lower numbers would reflect perceptions of low credibility. When examining the items for skewness and kurtosis, it was found that several of the items lacked variance; however, since high source credibility was maintained constant throughout conditions this was to be expected. The scale was highly reliable ($M=5.43$, $SD=0.80$, $\alpha = 0.90$).

**Expectations and Violations Assessment**

Expectations of language use by males and females and violations of those expectations were assessed via a series of items loosely based on the procedures used by Kelley and Burgoon
(1991). Participants were asked to indicate what type of language they expect a particular source to use prior to viewing the message, the actual language used after viewing the message, the occurrence of a violation of expectations, and the valence of that violation as positive or negative if it occurred (see Appendix T).

**Expected language use.** Participants first indicated what type of language they expect the particular source (highly credible, sex of the source(s) of their message condition) to use based on twelve 7-point semantic differential scales with the stem “Sometimes different types of authors are expected to use different types of language when attempting to persuade a reader. On the following scale, please indicate what type of language you would expect a highly credible female author to use when attempting to persuade readers about a public policy issue,” followed by: (a) neutral[not neutral], (b) matter-of-fact[embellished], (c) calm[emotional], (d) sensible[irrational], (e) intense[not intense], (f) aggressive[not aggressive], (g) dramatic[not dramatic], (h) extreme[not extreme], (i) passionate[not passionate], (j) forceful[not forceful], (j) powerful[not powerful], and (l) strong[not strong]. This item matches to the Kelley and Burgoon (1991) item in which respondents rated their expectations for a marital partner. This item was asked prior to exposure to the message to avoid priming the respondents.

**Actual language use.** The next item asked respondents to assess the actual linguistic uses of the highly credible source(s) through the item used as a verbal intensity manipulation check. This was again assessed via the same twelve 7-point semantic differential scales with the stem “The language in the message you just read was,” followed by: (a) neutral[not neutral], (b) matter-of-fact[embellished], (c) calm[emotional], (d) sensible[irrational], (e) intense[not intense], (f) aggressive[not aggressive], (g) dramatic[not dramatic], (h) extreme[not extreme], (i) passionate[not passionate], (j) forceful[not forceful], (j) powerful[not powerful], and (l)
strong[not strong]. This item resembles the item used by Kelley and Burgoon (1991) in which they had respondents assess the actual behavior of a marital partner. This item was asked immediately following the manipulation check items on sex of the source(s) and source credibility such that those source features were salient.

Violation assessment. The final item of the procedures used by Kelley and Burgoon (1991) had participants indicate their evaluation of their partner’s behavior based on their expectations for behavior by rating the behavior as positive (+) or negative (-). In a similar manner, participants in this study were asked to indicate whether they perceived the actual language used to violate their expectations for language use by the highly credible source(s) in the message they read, and if so, to rate those violations as positive (+) or negative (-).

Measures

Perceived evidence quality. Following Parrott et al. (2005), perceived evidence was assessed via four 7-point semantic differential scales with the stem “I think the information in the message is,” followed by: (a) inaccurate[accurate], (b) unclear[well-explained], (c) confusing[understandable], and (d) unsupported[supported] \((M=5.48, SD=0.97, \alpha=0.79)\) (see Appendix U).

Perceived message effectiveness. Measures from Parrott et al. (2005) and Dillard, Shen, and Vrail (2007) were combined into five 7-point semantic differential scales. The items began with the stem “I think the information in this message is” and include: (a) not persuasive[persuasive], (b) not convincing[convincing], (c) not useful[useful], (d) not effective[effective], and (e) not compelling[compelling] \((M=3.01, SD=1.08, \alpha=0.89)\) (see Appendix V).
Behavioral intentions. A single-item measure was used to assess participant behavioral intentions towards complying with the final compliance-gaining statement at the end of each message. Participants indicated on a 7-point scale ranging from very likely to very unlikely what the likelihood was that they will visit the website for additional information ($M=5.09$, $SD=1.73$) (see Appendix W).

Organizational credibility. Participants were asked to respond to a series of 16 randomly ordered statements concerning the credibility of the organization that disseminated the promotional messages. Specifically, the items measure perceived fairness, depth, goodwill, trust/expertise, and reliance of an organization. The items originated from the measure used by Hong (2006), who derived the items from Hovland, Janis, and Kelley (1953) for trustworthiness and expertise, Gaziano and McGrath (1986) for fairness and depth, and McCroskey and Teven (1999) for goodwill. The measure was adapted to pertain to an organization’s credibility for the present study, as opposed to the credibility of a website. One item in the measure, “This organization appears to have experts on the topic,” revealed a lack of variance, however, as high source credibility was maintained throughout all conditions, this was to be expected and the item was included in the scale ($M=4.48$, $SD=0.66$, $\alpha = 0.83$) (see Appendix X).

Data Analysis

Hypothesis 1a was analyzed using independent t-tests of the expected language use adjectives based on gender as male or female. Hypothesis 1b was analyzed by creating a scale for actual language use and a scale for perception of a violation followed by two separate two-way ANOVAs to examine the effect of gender and language condition on each dependent variable scale. Hypotheses 2 and 3 and research question 1 and 2 were analyzed using the same three separate one-way ANOVA tests followed by LSD post-hoc analyses. Hypothesis 4 was
analyzed using a one-way ANOVA of message condition on perceived author credibility, and research question 3 was analyzed using a one-way ANOVA of message condition on organizational credibility.

**Hypothesis 1a.** Hypothesis 1a predicted that there are perceived differences in expected communication behaviors such that a credible male source is expected to use more intense language than credible females, while a credible female source is expected to use neutral language strategies than do credible male sources. Independent t-tests were performed for each set of adjectives in the expected language use scale based on gender as male or female.

**Hypothesis 1b.** Hypothesis 1b predicted that violations of communicative expectations would occur if a male source uses neutral language strategies and a female source uses intense language strategies. Independent t-tests were performed for each set of adjectives in the actual language used scale based on gender as male or female. A scale for actual language use was then created based on the items with variance. A two-way ANOVA of sex of the source (male, female) by language condition (intense, neutral) on actual language use was conducted. A perception of violation scale was created based on the two items used to assess whether a violation occurred, and a two-way ANOVA of sex of the source (male, female) by language condition (intense, neutral) was performed on perception of a violation. The item assessing the violation of an expectation as positive or negative was analyzed for descriptive information.

**Hypothesis 2 and 3, research question 1 and 2.** The hypotheses and research questions were tested using three separate one-way ANOVAs with behavioral intentions, perceived evidence quality, and perceived message effectiveness as the outcome variables and message condition as the predictor. LSD post-hoc tests were used to examine the particular message conditions of interest to each hypothesis.
Hypothesis 2. The second hypothesis predicted that a female source would be more effective in increasing: (a) perceived evidence quality, (b) perceived message effectiveness, and (c) behavioral intentions to comply with a message when using neutral as compared to intense language in messages related to the Farm Bill and food. An LSD post hoc test was used to examine the mean differences in message conditions based on topic [Farm Bill Obesity, Farm Bill Local Food, Farm Bill Food Aid, Attention Control], sex of the source as one author female, and language condition [intense, neutral].

Hypothesis 3. The third hypothesis predicted that a male source would be less effective in increasing: (a) perceived evidence quality, (b) perceived message effectiveness, and (c) behavioral intentions to comply with a message when using neutral as compared to intense language in messages related to the Farm Bill and food. An LSD post hoc test was used to examine the mean differences in message conditions based on topic [Farm Bill Obesity, Farm Bill Local Food, Farm Bill Food Aid, Attention Control], sex of the source as one author male, and language condition [intense, neutral].

Research question 1. The first research question asked what effect does sex of the message source and language intensity have in (a) perceived evidence quality, (b) perceived message effectiveness, and (c) behavioral intentions to comply with the message when a male author is listed as the first author and a female as second in messages related to the Farm Bill and food. An LSD post hoc test was used to examine the mean differences in message conditions based on topic [Farm Bill Obesity, Farm Bill Local Food, Farm Bill Food Aid, Attention Control], sex of the source as two authors with male first and female second, and language condition [intense, neutral].
**Research question 2.** The second research question asked what effect does sex of the message source and language intensity have in (a) perceived evidence quality, (b) perceived message effectiveness, and (c) behavioral intentions to comply with the message when a female author is listed as the first author and a male as second in messages related to the Farm Bill and food. An LSD post hoc test was used to examine the mean differences in message conditions based on topic [Farm Bill Obesity, Farm Bill Local Food, Farm Bill Food Aid, Attention Control], sex of the source as two authors with female first and male second, and language condition [intense, neutral].

**Hypothesis 4.** The fourth hypothesis predicted that a female source would be perceived as more credible and a male source would be perceived as less credible when using neutral language as compared to intense language in messages related to the Farm Bill and food. The hypothesis was tested using a one-way ANOVA with perceived author credibility as the outcome variable and message condition as the predictor. An LSD post hoc test was used to examine the mean differences in message conditions based on topic [Farm Bill Obesity, Farm Bill Local Food, Farm Bill Food Aid, Attention Control], sex of the sources as one author male or one author female, and language condition [intense, neutral]. A two-way ANOVA was used to examine the effect of sex of the source (male, female) and language condition (intense, neutral) on perceived author credibility. A three-way ANOVA with perceived author credibility as the outcome variable and topic (Farm Bill messages, control) by sex of the source (male, female) by language condition (intense, neutral) as the predictors was also conducted.

**Research question 3.** The third research question asked what effect does sex of the source(s) and language intensity have on perceived organizational credibility in messages related to the Farm Bill and food. The research question was tested using a one-way ANOVA with
organizational credibility as the outcome variable and message condition (topic [Farm Bill Obesity, Farm Bill Local Food, Farm Bill Food Aid, Attention-Control] by sex of the source(s) [male, female, male/female, female/male] by language condition [intense, neutral]) as the predictor. An additional one-way ANOVA was used to test only those individuals who correctly identified the organization of the message that they received.
Chapter 3

RESULTS

The formative research and pilot study contributed to a 32-message condition between subjects study. Preliminary data analysis was conducted to test for the manipulations of the theoretical message components based on LET followed by hypothesis tests. All analyses were conducted using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). The significance level for all statistical tests was set at $p=0.05$.

**Manipulation Check**

**Message Topic**

The message topic manipulation check item was assessed via a chi square test of association. The significant chi square value, $\chi^2 (1, N=292)=538.16, p=0.00$ indicated that participants were significantly more likely to correctly identify the message topic they received than another message topic. Table 3 displays a crosstabulation table of accurate and inaccurate message topic identification by message topic received.

**Table 3**

*Crosstabulation of Message Topic Identified by Message Topic Received*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic Received</th>
<th>Topic Identified</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Obesity</td>
<td>Food Aid</td>
<td>Local Foods</td>
<td>Job Interview</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obesity</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Aid</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Foods</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Interview</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sex of the Source

The sex of the source manipulation check item was assessed via a chi square test of association. The significant chi square value, $\chi^2 (1, N=292)=569.64, p=0.00$ indicated that participants were significantly more likely to correctly identify the sex of the source(s) in the message they received than an incorrect sex of the source(s) option. Table 4 displays a crosstabulation table of message authorship identification by message authorship received.

Table 4

*Crosstabulation Table of Message Authorship Identified by Message Authorship Received*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authorship Received</th>
<th>Authorship Identified</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male/Female</th>
<th>Female/Male</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male/Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female/Male</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Language Condition

The language condition manipulation item was assessed via twelve independent t-tests comparing the intense and neutral messages against each set of adjectives as opposed to treating the items as a scale. After reverse coding the necessary items, lower numbers indicate more neutral language and higher numbers indicate more intense language. Table 5 displays a summary table of these items after reverse coding.
Table 5

*Summary of Language Condition Manipulation Check Items*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neutral[Not Neutral]</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matter-of-Fact[Embellished]</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calm[Emotional]</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>0.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensible[Irrational]</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Intense[Intense]</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>0.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Aggressive[Aggressive]</td>
<td>5.87</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>0.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Dramatic[Dramatic]</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>0.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Extreme[Extreme]</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>0.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Passionate[Passionate]</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Forceful[Forceful]</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>0.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Powerful[Powerful]</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Strong[Strong]</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level, p <0.05

As the table shows, there was a significant effect for calm[emotional] with neutral messages ($M=3.02$, $SD=1.46$) receiving lower scores than intense messages ($M=3.92$, $SD=1.49$), a significant effect for not intense[intense] with neutral messages ($M=3.82$, $SD=1.46$) receiving lower scores than intense messages ($M=4.58$, $SD=1.26$), a significant effect for not aggressive[aggressive] with neutral messages ($M=3.46$, $SD=1.38$) receiving lower scores than intense messages ($M=4.39$, $SD=1.31$), a significant effect for not dramatic[dramatic] with neutral
messages ($M=3.50$, $SD=1.42$) receiving lower scores than intense messages ($M=4.26$, $SD=1.30$), a significant effect for not extreme[extreme] with neutral messages ($M=3.38$, $SD=1.25$) receiving lower scores than intense messages ($M=4.04$, $SD=1.35$), and a significant effect for not forceful[forceful] with neutral messages ($M=3.84$, $SD=1.32$) receiving lower scores than intense messages ($M=4.41$, $SD=1.19$).

There was not a significant effect for neutral[not neutral] such that neutral messages ($M=3.82$, $SD=1.66$) did not differ from intense messages ($M=4.03$, $SD=1.74$), not a significant effect for matter-of-fact[embellished] such that neutral messages ($M=2.81$, $SD=1.38$) did not differ from intense messages ($M=3.06$, $SD=1.59$), not a significant effect for sensible[irrational] such that neutral messages ($M=2.42$, $SD=1.10$) did not differ from intense messages ($M=2.66$, $SD=1.09$), not a significant effect for not passionate[passionate] such that neutral messages ($M=4.95$, $SD=1.33$) did not differ from intense messages ($M=5.20$, $SD=1.33$), not a significant effect for not powerful[powerful] such that neutral messages ($M=4.57$, $SD=1.17$) did not differ from intense messages ($M=4.82$, $SD=1.23$), and not a significant effect for not strong[strong] such that neutral messages ($M=4.73$, $SD=1.17$) did not differ from intense messages ($M=4.99$, $SD=1.29$). Since the half of the items in the manipulation check were significant, it was concluded that the participants accurately perceived the messages as differing on language condition as either intense or neutral in the intended direction.

**Message Organization**

The message organization manipulation check item was assessed via a chi square test of association. The significant chi square value, $\chi^2 (1, N=292)=254.55$, $p=0.00$ indicated that participants were significantly more likely to correctly identify the organization of the message
they received than an incorrect organization. Table 6 displays a crosstabulation table of message organization identification by message organization received.

Table 6

*Crosstabulation Table of Message Organization Identified by Message Organization Received*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization Identified</th>
<th>U.S. PIRG</th>
<th>IATP</th>
<th>Career Services</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S. PIRG</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IATP</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Services</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source Credibility**

In order to assess whether the source was perceived as credible across all conditions, source credibility was collapsed across sex of the source and message topic ($M=5.43, SD=0.80$). A one-tailed one-sample t-test was then used to test the mean of the source credibility across all conditions against a test value of 4 (the neutral point in the 7-point credibility scale items). The test was statistically significant, $t(291) = 30.60, p = 0.00$, suggesting that the source credibility mean of 5.43 is statistically significantly greater than 4. These results suggest that participants did perceive that high source credibility was maintained throughout all conditions.

**Hypothesis Tests**

**Hypothesis 1a**

Hypothesis 1a predicted that there are perceived differences in expected communication behaviors such that a credible male source is expected to use more intense language than credible females, while a credible female source is expected to use more neutral language strategies than
credible male sources. Independent t-tests were performed for each set of adjectives in the expected language use scale based on gender as male or female (see Table 7). After reverse coding the necessary items lower numbers indicate more neutral language and higher numbers indicate more intense language. The neutral[not neutral] item was significant in the expected direction with males ($M=4.28$, $SD=1.94$) expected to use more intense language than females ($M=3.49$, $SD=1.92$). This single item result suggests that there are perceived differences in expectations for language use between males and females, but very marginally.

Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neutral[Not Neutral]</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>0.02*</td>
<td>$M=3.49$, $SD=1.92$</td>
<td>$M=4.28$, $SD=1.94$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matter-of-Fact[Embellished]</td>
<td>-1.76</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>$M=3.15$, $SD=1.71$</td>
<td>$M=2.68$, $SD=1.50$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calm[Emotional]</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>$M=3.77$, $SD=1.98$</td>
<td>$M=3.65$, $SD=1.68$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensible[Irrational]</td>
<td>-1.22</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>$M=2.20$, $SD=1.38$</td>
<td>$M=1.94$, $SD=1.15$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Intense[Intense]</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>$M=4.77$, $SD=1.47$</td>
<td>$M=4.80$, $SD=1.36$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Aggressive[Aggressive]</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>$M=3.85$, $SD=1.48$</td>
<td>$M=4.09$, $SD=1.33$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Dramatic[Dramatic]</td>
<td>-1.26</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>$M=4.23$, $SD=1.60$</td>
<td>$M=3.90$, $SD=1.50$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Extreme[Extreme]</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>$M=3.89$, $SD=1.46$</td>
<td>$M=3.97$, $SD=1.10$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Passionate[Passionate]</td>
<td>-1.92</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>$M=5.95$, $SD=1.11$</td>
<td>$M=5.54$, $SD=1.41$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Forceful[Forceful]</td>
<td>-1.93</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>$M=4.52$, $SD=1.32$</td>
<td>$M=4.08$, $SD=1.43$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Powerful[Powerful]</td>
<td>-0.69</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>$M=5.63$, $SD=1.04$</td>
<td>$M=5.49$, $SD=1.30$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Strong[Strong]</td>
<td>-1.38</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>$M=5.91$, $SD=0.93$</td>
<td>$M=5.65$, $SD=1.31$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level, $p <0.05$

df: male and female conditions only
Hypothesis 1b

Hypothesis 1b predicted that violations of communicative expectations would occur if a male source uses neutral language strategies and a female source uses intense language strategies. Independent t-tests were performed for each set of adjectives in the actual language used scale based on gender as male or female (see Table 8). After reverse coding the necessary items lower numbers indicate more neutral language and higher numbers indicate more intense language. Two of the items, not powerful[powerful] and not strong[strong] were significant, suggesting variance in these items between males and females. A scale of actual language used was created from these items (\(M=4.96, SD=1.11, \alpha=0.85\)).

A two-way ANOVA yielded a main effect for gender, \(F(1, 142)=9.00, p=0.00\), such that actual language use was significantly more intense for females (\(M=5.22, SD=0.99\)) than for males (\(M=4.69, SD=1.17\)). There was also a significant main effect for language condition, \(F(1, 142)=4.76, p=0.03\), such that actual language use was significantly more intense for intense messages (\(M=5.16, SD=1.15\)) than for neutral messages (\(M=4.77, SD=1.04\)). The interaction effect, however, was insignificant, \(F(1, 142)=0.41, p=0.52\). These results suggest that participants perceived that females were using more intense language whether the language they actually used was more intense or not.

In order to examine the perception of a violation, two items were combined into a perception of violation scale (\(M=4.85, SD=1.19, \alpha=0.87\)). A two-way ANOVA determined that there was no main effect for gender, \(F(1, 141)=1.27, p=0.26\), with males (\(M=4.74, SD=1.37\)) not significantly different than females (\(M=4.96, SD=0.98\)). The main effect for language condition was also insignificant, \(F(1, 141)=0.30, p=0.59\), with intense messages (\(M=4.91, SD=1.19\)) not
significantly different than neutral messages ($M=4.79, SD=1.19$). The interaction effect was insignificant as well, $F(1, 141)=2.30, p=0.13$.

Only 29 participants who received either a male or female sex of the source condition indicated on a yes or no item that their expectations were violated. These 29 participants then indicated whether the violation of their expectation was very positive, positive, somewhat positive, neither positive or negative, somewhat negative, negative, or very negative. These responses were recoded into positive, neither positive or negative, and negative. A chi square test of association of gender (male, female) by language condition (intense, neutral) on perceptions of a violation revealed an insignificant chi square value, $\chi^2 (1, N=29)=6.94, p=0.33$, which indicated that participants were not significantly more likely to indicate the perception of a violation as positive, neither positive or negative, or negative based on the gender and language condition message they received (see Table 9).

An additional chi square test of association of gender (male, female) by language condition (intense, neutral) by ethnicity on perceptions of a violation was conducted. The insignificant chi square value, $\chi^2 (1, N=29)=24.38, p=0.33$, indicated that participants were not significantly more likely to indicate the perception of a violation as positive, neither positive or negative, or negative based on the gender and language condition of the message they received and their ethnicity. It is important to note that because of the small, relatively homogenous sample for this test many of the ethnicity groups contained only one or two participants, thus making it difficult to truly test these associations.
Table 8

*Summary of Actual Language Use in Males and Females*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neutral[Not Neutral]</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>M=3.76, SD=1.74</td>
<td>M=4.00, SD=1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matter-of-Fact[Embellished]</td>
<td>-0.59</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>M=2.93, SD=1.42</td>
<td>M=2.79, SD=1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calm[Emotional]</td>
<td>-0.51</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>M=3.40, SD=1.53</td>
<td>M=3.27, SD=1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensible[Irrational]</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>M=2.40, SD=1.05</td>
<td>M=2.39, SD=1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Intense[Intense]</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>M=4.13, SD=1.37</td>
<td>M=4.30, SD=1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Aggressive[Aggressive]</td>
<td>-0.67</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>M=4.07, SD=1.43</td>
<td>M=3.90, SD=1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Dramatic[Dramatic]</td>
<td>-0.89</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>M=3.89, SD=1.30</td>
<td>M=3.69, SD=1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Extreme[Extreme]</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>M=3.73, SD=1.26</td>
<td>M=3.85, SD=1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Passionate[Passionate]</td>
<td>-0.74</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>M=5.17, SD=1.32</td>
<td>M=5.00, SD=1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Forceful[Forceful]</td>
<td>-1.09</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>M=4.33, SD=1.34</td>
<td>M=4.10, SD=1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Powerful[Powerful]</td>
<td>-2.92</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>0.00*</td>
<td>M=5.12, SD=1.08</td>
<td>M=4.56, SD=1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Strong[Strong]</td>
<td>-2.60</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>0.01*</td>
<td>M=5.32, SD=1.08</td>
<td>M=4.82, SD=1.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level, p <0.05

df: male and female conditions only
Table 9

*Crosstabulation of Gender by Language Condition on Perceived Violations*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender/Language Condition</th>
<th>Violation Positive</th>
<th>Neither Positive/Negative</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male, Intense</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male, Neutral</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female, Intense</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female, Neutral</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hypothesis 2 and 3, Research Question 1 and 2**

Three separate one-way ANOVAs determined that there were no statistically significant differences in the mean differences between groups based on the three outcome variables of perceived evidence quality (PEQ), perceived message effectiveness (PME), and behavioral intentions to comply with the message (BI) (see Table 10).

Table 10

*ANOVA Table for Hypothesis 2 and 3 and Research Question 1 and 2*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Variable</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>η²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PEQ</td>
<td>31, 260</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PME</td>
<td>31, 260</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BI</td>
<td>31, 260</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypothesis 2. The second hypothesis predicted that a female source would be more effective in increasing: (a) perceived evidence quality, (b) perceived message effectiveness, and (c) behavioral intentions to comply with a message when using neutral as compared to intense language in messages related to the Farm Bill and food. An LSD post-hoc test revealed that, with one exception, there were no statistical differences in the one author female conditions in perceived evidence quality, perceived message effectiveness, or behavioral intentions varying by language condition across all four topics (obesity, local foods, food aid, attention control) (see Table 11). There was a statistical difference in the expected direction in the one author female conditions in the local foods topic, with the local foods, intense, one author female condition ($M=2.68$, $SD=0.94$) lower than the local foods, neutral, one author female condition ($M=3.84$, $SD=1.08$), $p=0.02$ in perceived message effectiveness. The low sample sizes and therefore low power in these comparisons makes it such that any significant results are all the more meaningful.

In addition to examining statistically significant differences using the p-value statistic, effect sizes ($r^2$) were calculated to determine the amount of variance in the persuasive outcomes explained by the theoretical variations in the message conditions. The comparison between the local foods, intense, one author female condition and the local foods, neutral, one author female condition had a large effect size, with 25% of the variance in perceived message effectiveness explained by the theoretical message conditions. There were also several medium effect sizes, such that 20% of the variance in perceived evidence quality was explained by the message conditions in the obesity, one author female conditions, 13% of the variance in perceived message effectiveness was explained in the obesity, one author female conditions, 13% of the
variance in behavioral intentions was explained in the local foods, one author female conditions, and 15% of the variance was explained in the attention control, one author female conditions.

Table 11

LSD Post-Hoc Table for Hypothesis 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Variable</th>
<th>Intense, Female (n=37)</th>
<th>Neutral, Female (n=38)</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>r²</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PEQ</td>
<td>M=5.97, SD=0.52</td>
<td>M=5.28, SD=0.81</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>9/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obesity (n = 18)</td>
<td>PME M=5.60, SD=0.60</td>
<td>M=4.87, SD=1.20</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BI M=4.89, SD=2.15</td>
<td>M=5.78, SD=1.09</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEQ</td>
<td>M=5.38, SD=0.95</td>
<td>M=5.19, SD=0.89</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>10/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Food (n = 19)</td>
<td>PME M=5.32, SD=0.94</td>
<td>M=4.16, SD=1.08</td>
<td>0.02*</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BI M=4.70, SD=1.70</td>
<td>M=5.89, SD=1.36</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEQ</td>
<td>M=5.78, SD=0.91</td>
<td>M=5.40, SD=0.97</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>9/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Aid (n = 19)</td>
<td>PME M=5.47, SD=0.77</td>
<td>M=4.94, SD=0.95</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BI M=5.11, SD=1.76</td>
<td>M=6.00, SD=1.83</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEQ</td>
<td>M=5.56, SD=0.69</td>
<td>M=5.68, SD=0.66</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>9/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control (n = 19)</td>
<td>PME M=5.27, SD=0.88</td>
<td>M=5.20, SD=0.48</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BI M=3.78, SD=1.56</td>
<td>M=4.90, SD=1.10</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level, p <0.05

**Hypothesis 3.** The third hypothesis predicted that a male source would be less effective in increasing: (a) perceived evidence quality, (b) perceived message effectiveness, and (c) behavioral intentions to comply with a message when using neutral as compared to intense
language in messages related to the Farm Bill and food. An LSD post-hoc test revealed that there were no statistical differences in the one author male conditions in perceived evidence quality, perceived message effectiveness, or behavioral intentions varying by language condition across all four topics (obesity, local foods, food aid, attention control) (see Table 12).

Effect sizes ($r^2$) were calculated to determine the amount of variance in the persuasive outcomes explained by the theoretical variations in the message conditions. The comparison between the obesity, intense, one author male condition and the obesity, neutral, one author male condition had a medium effect size, with 17% of the variance in perceived evidence quality explained by the theoretical message conditions.
Table 12

LSD Post-Hoc Table for Hypothesis 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Variable</th>
<th>Intense, Male (n=35)</th>
<th>Neutral, Male (n=36)</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>r²</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PEQ</td>
<td>M=5.89, SD=1.10</td>
<td>M=5.03, SD=0.74</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>9/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obesity (n = 17)</td>
<td>PME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M=5.44, SD=1.35</td>
<td>M=4.83, SD=1.14</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M=5.00, SD=1.66</td>
<td>M=5.38, SD=2.07</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEQ</td>
<td>M=5.78, SD=1.06</td>
<td>M=5.28, SD=0.99</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>9/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Food (n = 17)</td>
<td>PME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M=5.08, SD=1.04</td>
<td>M=4.76, SD=0.93</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M=5.25, SD=0.89</td>
<td>M=4.89, SD=1.62</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEQ</td>
<td>M=5.17, SD=1.47</td>
<td>M=5.97, SD=1.30</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>9/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Aid (n = 18)</td>
<td>PME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M=4.82, SD=1.76</td>
<td>M=4.56, SD=1.27</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M=5.22, SD=2.17</td>
<td>M=5.89, SD=1.36</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEQ</td>
<td>M=5.39, SD=1.14</td>
<td>M=5.95, SD=0.76</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>9/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control (n = 19)</td>
<td>PME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M=5.33, SD=0.91</td>
<td>M=5.62, SD=0.92</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M=5.11, SD=2.09</td>
<td>M=4.30, SD=2.16</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level, p <0.05

**Research question 1.** The first research question asked what effect does sex of the message source and language intensity have in (a) perceived evidence quality, (b) perceived message effectiveness, and (c) behavioral intentions to comply with the message when a male author is listed as the first author and a female as second in messages related to the Farm Bill and food. An LSD post-hoc test revealed that there were no statistical differences in the male author first, female author second conditions in perceived evidence quality, perceived message
effectiveness, or behavioral intentions varying by language condition across all four topics (obesity, local foods, food aid, attention control) (see Table 13).

Effect sizes ($r^2$) were calculated to determine the amount of variance in the persuasive outcomes explained by the theoretical variations in the message conditions. There was one medium effect size such that 12% of the variance in behavioral intentions was explained in the attention control, male/female message conditions.

Table 13

LSD Post-Hoc Table for Research Question 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Variable</th>
<th>Intense,Male/Female (n=37)</th>
<th>Neutral,Male/Female (n=37)</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>$r^2$</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PEQ</td>
<td>$M=5.00, SD=1.01$</td>
<td>$M=5.58, SD=0.97$</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>10/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obesity (n = 20)</td>
<td>PME $M=4.68, SD=0.85$</td>
<td>$M=5.14, SD=0.81$</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BI $M=5.40, SD=1.96$</td>
<td>$M=4.80, SD=1.40$</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEQ</td>
<td>$M=5.18, SD=0.94$</td>
<td>$M=5.36, SD=0.77$</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>10/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Food (n = 19) PME $M=5.12, SD=0.88$</td>
<td>$M=4.71, SD=0.83$</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BI $M=5.00, SD=1.56$</td>
<td>$M=4.56, SD=2.07$</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEQ</td>
<td>$M=5.50, SD=0.77$</td>
<td>$M=5.00, SD=0.59$</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>8/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Aid (n = 17) PME $M=5.00, SD=1.16$</td>
<td>$M=4.27, SD=1.12$</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BI $M=5.25, SD=1.49$</td>
<td>$M=5.56, SD=1.01$</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEQ</td>
<td>$M=6.08, SD=0.78$</td>
<td>$M=5.53, SD=1.18$</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>9/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control (n = 18)  PME $M=5.47, SD=1.04$</td>
<td>$M=5.02, SD=1.62$</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BI $M=5.33, SD=1.87$</td>
<td>$M=3.89, SD=2.15$</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level, $p < 0.05$
**Research question 2.** The second research question asked what effect does sex of the message source and language intensity have in (a) perceived evidence quality, (b) perceived message effectiveness, and (c) behavioral intentions to comply with the message when a female author is listed as the first author and a male as second in messages related to the Farm Bill and food. An LSD post-hoc test revealed that there were no statistical differences in the female author first, male author second conditions in perceived evidence quality, perceived message effectiveness, or behavioral intentions varying by language condition across all four topics (obesity, local foods, food aid, attention control) (see Table 14).

Effect sizes ($r^2$) were calculated to determine the amount of variance in the persuasive outcomes explained by the theoretical variations in the message conditions. There were several medium effect sizes such that 9% of the variance in perceived message effectiveness was explained in the obesity, female/male conditions, 12% of the variance in behavioral intentions was explained in the obesity, female/male conditions, 19% of the variance in perceived evidence quality was explained in the local foods, female/male conditions, and 14% of the variance was explained in behavioral intentions in the attention control, female/male conditions.
### Table 14

**LSD Post-Hoc Table for Research Question 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Variable</th>
<th>Intense, Female/Male (n=36)</th>
<th>Neutral, Female/Male (n=36)</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>$r^2$</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PEQ</td>
<td>$M=5.16, SD=1.08$</td>
<td>$M=5.50, SD=0.96$</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>8/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obesity (n = 18)</td>
<td>PME $M=4.40, SD=1.23$</td>
<td>$M=5.14, SD=1.15$</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BI $M=6.00, SD=1.41$</td>
<td>$M=4.90, SD=1.60$</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEQ</td>
<td>$M=5.94, SD=0.99$</td>
<td>$M=5.17, SD=0.47$</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>9/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Food (n = 18)</td>
<td>PME $M=4.64, SD=0.97$</td>
<td>$M=4.83, SD=0.91$</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BI $M=5.44, SD=1.51$</td>
<td>$M=5.11, SD=1.76$</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEQ</td>
<td>$M=4.98, SD=1.18$</td>
<td>$M=5.38, SD=0.91$</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>10/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Aid (n = 18)</td>
<td>PME $M=5.00, SD=0.92$</td>
<td>$M=4.63, SD=0.78$</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BI $M=5.30, SD=1.70$</td>
<td>$M=4.75, SD=2.12$</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEQ</td>
<td>$M=5.86, SD=0.89$</td>
<td>$M=5.39, SD=1.52$</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>9/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control (n = 18)</td>
<td>PME $M=5.42, SD=0.98$</td>
<td>$M=4.62, SD=1.85$</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BI $M=4.00, SD=2.25$</td>
<td>$M=5.56, SD=1.59$</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level, $p < 0.05$

**Post-hoc analysis for hypothesis 2 and 3, research question 1 and 2.** It is possible that some of the participants in this study did not actually read the message they received and instead clicked through the online survey without focusing on the messages or the questions that were asked. These nonreaders may therefore limit the ability to actually test the hypotheses. For this reason, three additional one-way ANOVA tests were performed to examine the mean differences between groups based on the three outcome variables of perceived evidence quality (PEQ),
perceived message effectiveness (PME), and behavioral intentions to comply with the message (BI) in only those individuals who correctly identified the message topic and message sex of the source in the manipulation check. There were no statistically significant differences (see Table 15). An LSD post-hoc test was again performed for each hypothesis. The results are displayed in Table 16 (Hypothesis 2), Table 17 (Hypothesis 3), Table 18 (Research Question 1), and Table 19 (Research Question 2). Effect sizes ($r^2$) were again calculated and included in each table.

Table 15

*Post-Hoc Analysis ANOVA Table for Hypothesis 2 and 3 and Research Question 1 and 2*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Variable</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>$\eta^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PEQ</td>
<td>31, 171</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PME</td>
<td>31, 171</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BI</td>
<td>31, 171</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 16

**Post-Hoc Analysis LSD Post-Hoc Table for Hypothesis 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Variable</th>
<th>Intense, Female (n=24)</th>
<th>Neutral, Female (n=28)</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>$r^2$</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PEQ</td>
<td>$M=6.04, SD=0.62$</td>
<td>$M=5.43, SD=0.87$</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>6/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obesity (n = 13)</td>
<td>PME</td>
<td>$M=5.67, SD=0.55$</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BI</td>
<td>$M=4.67, SD=2.34$</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PEQ</td>
<td>$M=5.54, SD=1.08$</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>7/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Food (n = 14)</td>
<td>PME</td>
<td>$M=5.49, SD=0.90$</td>
<td>0.01*</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BI</td>
<td>$M=4.43, SD=1.62$</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PEQ</td>
<td>$M=6.20, SD=0.69$</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>5/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Aid (n = 12)</td>
<td>PME</td>
<td>$M=5.76, SD=0.46$</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BI</td>
<td>$M=5.20, SD=2.39$</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PEQ</td>
<td>$M=5.54, SD=0.71$</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>6/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control (n = 13)</td>
<td>PME</td>
<td>$M=5.30, SD=0.73$</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BI</td>
<td>$M=3.50, SD=1.23$</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level, $p < 0.05$
Table 17

Post-Hoc Analysis LSD Post-Hoc Table for Hypothesis 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Variable</th>
<th>Intense, Male (n=25)</th>
<th>Neutral, Male (n=28)</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>$r^2$</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PEQ</td>
<td>$M=6.00, SD=1.25$</td>
<td>$M=5.25, SD=0.72$</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>7/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obesity (n = 13)</td>
<td>PME $M=5.63, SD=1.46$</td>
<td>$M=5.37, SD=0.59$</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BI $M=5.43, SD=1.40$</td>
<td>$M=4.83, SD=2.14$</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Food (n = 11)</td>
<td>PME $M=5.47, SD=0.86$</td>
<td>$M=4.76, SD=1.24$</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BI $M=5.50, SD=0.84$</td>
<td>$M=4.80, SD=1.92$</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Aid (n = 14)</td>
<td>PME $M=4.67, SD=2.12$</td>
<td>$M=4.38, SD=1.23$</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BI $M=5.00, SD=2.28$</td>
<td>$M=6.25, SD=0.89$</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control (n = 16)</td>
<td>PME $M=5.51, SD=0.94$</td>
<td>$M=5.58, SD=0.97$</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BI $M=5.29, SD=2.22$</td>
<td>$M=4.56, SD=2.13$</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level, $p < 0.05$
Table 18

*Post-Hoc Analysis LSD Post-Hoc Table for Research Question 1*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Variable</th>
<th>Intense,Male/Female (n=25)</th>
<th>Neutral,Male/Female (n=29)</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>$r^2$</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PEQ</td>
<td>$M=4.89, SD=0.97$</td>
<td>$M=5.78, SD=0.76$</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>6/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obesity (n = 15)</td>
<td>PME $M=4.67, SD=0.97$</td>
<td>$M=5.20, SD=0.84$</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BI</td>
<td>$M=6.00, SD=1.55$</td>
<td>$M=4.78, SD=1.48$</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Food (n = 12)</td>
<td>PME $M=5.11, SD=0.47$</td>
<td>$M=5.20, SD=0.40$</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BI</td>
<td>$M=5.43, SD=1.72$</td>
<td>$M=3.60, SD=1.82$</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Aid (n = 14)</td>
<td>PME $M=5.33, SD=1.09$</td>
<td>$M=4.48, SD=0.99$</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BI</td>
<td>$M=5.17, SD=1.47$</td>
<td>$M=5.38, SD=0.92$</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control (n = 14)</td>
<td>PME $M=5.37, SD=0.96$</td>
<td>$M=5.31, SD=1.75$</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BI</td>
<td>$M=5.00, SD=2.00$</td>
<td>$M=4.29, SD=2.29$</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level, $p <0.05$
Table 19

*Post-Hoc Analysis LSD Post-Hoc Table for Research Question 2*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Variable</th>
<th>Intense, Female/Male (n=22)</th>
<th>Neutral, Female/Male (n=20)</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>r²</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PEQ</td>
<td>M=5.83, SD=1.04</td>
<td>M=5.75, SD=1.00</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obesity (n = 6)</td>
<td>PME M=4.07, SD=1.94</td>
<td>M=5.53, SD=1.14</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BI  M=6.33, SD=1.16</td>
<td>M=4.00, SD=1.00</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEQ</td>
<td>M=6.00, SD=1.11</td>
<td>M=5.26, SD=0.43</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>7/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Food (n = 15)</td>
<td>PME M=4.83, SD=0.98</td>
<td>M=4.80, SD=0.97</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BI  M=5.29, SD=1.60</td>
<td>M=4.88, SD=1.73</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEQ</td>
<td>M=5.18, SD=1.29</td>
<td>M=5.20, SD=1.12</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>7/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Aid (n = 12)</td>
<td>PME M=4.89, SD=0.95</td>
<td>M=4.64, SD=0.86</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BI  M=5.71, SD=1.80</td>
<td>M=4.20, SD=2.39</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEQ</td>
<td>M=6.10, SD=0.74</td>
<td>M=5.69, SD=1.52</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>5/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control (n = 9)</td>
<td>PME M=5.56, SD=0.86</td>
<td>M=4.80, SD=2.32</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BI  M=2.80, SD=1.64</td>
<td>M=4.75, SD=2.06</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level, p < 0.05

**Hypothesis 4**

The fourth hypothesis predicted that a female source would be perceived as more credible and a male source would be perceived as less credible when using neutral language as compared to intense language in messages related to the Farm Bill and food.

There was not a statistically significant difference in perceived author credibility between message conditions as determined by one-way ANOVA ($F(31, 260)=0.78, p=0.80; \eta^2 = 0.08$).
An LSD post-hoc test revealed that there were no statistical differences in the female author conditions or the male author conditions in perceived author credibility (PAC) varying by language condition across all four topics (obesity, local foods, food aid, attention control) (see Table 20). An examination of effect sizes revealed two medium effect sizes such that 18% of the variance in perceived author credibility was explained in the local food, single author male conditions, and 12% of the variance in perceived author credibility was explained in the attention control, single author male conditions.

A two-way ANOVA was conducted that examined the effect of authorship [male, female] and language intensity [intense, neutral] on perceived author credibility. There was not a significant interaction between the effects of authorship and language condition on perceived author credibility, $F(1, 142)=0.15, p=0.70$. Table 21 displays the means and standard deviations from the two-way ANOVA test.

An additional 2 x 2 x 2 ANOVA was conducted that examined the effect of authorship [male, female], language condition [intense, neutral], and message topic [Farm Bill message, control message] on perceived author credibility. There was not a significant interaction between the effects of authorship, language intensity, and message topic as Farm Bill or control on perceived author credibility, $F(1, 138)=0.14, p=0.71$. Table 22 displays the means and standard deviations from the 2 x 2 x 2 ANOVA test.
Table 20

**LSD Post-Hoc Table for Hypothesis 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Variable</th>
<th>Intense</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>r^2</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obesity</td>
<td>Female, PAC</td>
<td>M=5.53, SD=0.73</td>
<td>M=5.49, SD=0.85</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male, PAC</td>
<td>M=5.78, SD=1.02</td>
<td>M=5.33, SD=0.83</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Food</td>
<td>Female, PAC</td>
<td>M=5.53, SD=0.75</td>
<td>M=5.27, SD=0.84</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male, PAC</td>
<td>M=5.48, SD=1.14</td>
<td>M=5.25, SD=0.87</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Aid</td>
<td>Female, PAC</td>
<td>M=5.58, SD=0.76</td>
<td>M=5.55, SD=1.05</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male, PAC</td>
<td>M=5.15, SD=1.12</td>
<td>M=5.61, SD=0.26</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Female, PAC</td>
<td>M=5.21, SD=0.68</td>
<td>M=5.50, SD=0.85</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male, PAC</td>
<td>M=5.15, SD=0.83</td>
<td>M=5.71, SD=0.67</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level, p <0.05

Table 21

**2 x 2 ANOVA Table for Hypothesis 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Variable</th>
<th>Intense (n = 72)</th>
<th>Neutral (n = 74)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Author Credibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female (n = 75)</td>
<td>M=5.46, SD=0.72</td>
<td>M=5.46, SD=0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male (n = 71)</td>
<td>M=5.39, SD=1.02</td>
<td>M=5.49, SD=0.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 22

2 x 2 x 2 ANOVA Table for Hypothesis 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Variable</th>
<th>Intense (n = 72)</th>
<th>Neutral (n = 74)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Farm Bill Message (n = 108)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female, PAC</td>
<td>$M=5.54$, $SD=0.72$</td>
<td>$M=5.44$, $SD=0.90$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male, PAC</td>
<td>$M=5.47$, $SD=1.08$</td>
<td>$M=5.40$, $SD=0.70$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control (n = 71)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female, PAC</td>
<td>$M=5.21$, $SD=0.68$</td>
<td>$M=5.50$, $SD=0.85$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male, PAC</td>
<td>$M=5.15$, $SD=0.83$</td>
<td>$M=5.71$, $SD=0.67$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question 3

The third research question asked what effect does sex of the source(s) and language intensity have on perceived organizational credibility in messages related to the Farm Bill and food. A one-way ANOVA tested the mean differences in organizational credibility scores across all message conditions. There was not a statistically significant difference between groups as determined by one-way ANOVA ($F(31, 260)=0.92$, $p=0.60$; $\eta^2 = 0.10$). An LSD post-hoc test was used to examine the differences in each message condition (see Table 23). The calculation of effect sizes revealed several medium to large effect sizes, such that 12% of the variance in perceived organizational credibility was explained in the obesity, single author male conditions, 55% of the variance in perceived organizational credibility was explained in the local foods, single author female conditions, 16% of the variance in perceived organizational credibility was explained in the food aid, male/female conditions, and 14% of the variance in perceived organizational credibility was explained in the attention control, single author female conditions.

An additional one-way ANOVA was used to test the mean differences in organizational credibility scores across all message conditions in only those respondents who correctly
identified the organization from which their particular message came. There was not a statistically significant difference between groups ($F(31, 159) = 1.25, p=0.19; \eta^2 = 0.20$), however, an LSD post-hoc test revealed that there was a statistically significant difference in one condition such that the obesity, intense, male/female condition ($M=3.81, SD=1.13$) was significantly lower than the obesity, neutral, male/female condition ($M=4.77, SD=0.50$; see Table 24). The calculation of effect sizes revealed several medium to large effect sizes, such that 14% of the variance in perceived organizational credibility was explained in the obesity, single author male conditions, 46% of the variance in perceived organizational credibility was explained in the obesity, single author female conditions, 29% of the variance in perceived organizational credibility was explained in the obesity, male/female conditions, 16% of the variance in perceived organizational credibility was explained in the food aid, male/female conditions, and 14% of the variance in perceived organizational credibility was explain in the attention control, single author female conditions.
Table 23

ANOVA Table for Research Question 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Intense</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>$r^2$</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Obesity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>$M=4.78$, $SD=0.61$</td>
<td>$M=4.38$, $SD=0.44$</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>9/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>$M=4.57$, $SD=0.35$</td>
<td>$M=4.38$, $SD=0.53$</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>9/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male, Female</td>
<td>$M=4.25$, $SD=0.82$</td>
<td>$M=4.67$, $SD=0.50$</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>10/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female, Male</td>
<td>$M=4.25$, $SD=0.76$</td>
<td>$M=4.37$, $SD=0.49$</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>8/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Food</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>$M=4.42$, $SD=0.44$</td>
<td>$M=4.14$, $SD=0.59$</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>9/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>$M=4.35$, $SD=0.36$</td>
<td>$M=5.53$, $SD=0.69$</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>10/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male, Female</td>
<td>$M=4.38$, $SD=0.80$</td>
<td>$M=4.38$, $SD=0.42$</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>10/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female, Male</td>
<td>$M=4.56$, $SD=0.53$</td>
<td>$M=4.47$, $SD=0.50$</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>9/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Food Aid</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>$M=4.40$, $SD=1.02$</td>
<td>$M=4.32$, $SD=0.72$</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>9/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>$M=4.51$, $SD=0.59$</td>
<td>$M=4.60$, $SD=0.55$</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>9/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male, Female</td>
<td>$M=4.70$, $SD=0.71$</td>
<td>$M=4.22$, $SD=0.36$</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>8/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female, Male</td>
<td>$M=4.36$, $SD=0.49$</td>
<td>$M=4.21$, $SD=0.43$</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>10/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>$M=4.76$, $SD=0.87$</td>
<td>$M=5.13$, $SD=0.65$</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>9/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>$M=4.25$, $SD=0.44$</td>
<td>$M=4.62$, $SD=0.46$</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>9/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male, Female</td>
<td>$M=4.72$, $SD=0.82$</td>
<td>$M=4.56$, $SD=1.26$</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>9/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female, Male</td>
<td>$M=4.64$, $SD=0.64$</td>
<td>$M=4.58$, $SD=1.88$</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>9/9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level, p <0.05
Table 24

**Correct Identifications ANOVA Table for Research Question 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Intense</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>$r^2$</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Obesity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>$M=4.94$, $SD=0.53$</td>
<td>$M=4.53$, $SD=0.31$</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>7/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>$M=4.61$, $SD=0.40$</td>
<td>$M=3.94$, $SD=0.00$</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>6/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male, Female</td>
<td>$M=3.81$, $SD=1.13$</td>
<td>$M=4.77$, $SD=0.50$</td>
<td>0.03*</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>4/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female, Male</td>
<td>$M=4.38$, $SD=0.53$</td>
<td>$M=4.34$, $SD=0.56$</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Food</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>$M=4.32$, $SD=0.46$</td>
<td>$M=4.19$, $SD=0.67$</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>7/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>$M=4.41$, $SD=0.38$</td>
<td>$M=4.54$, $SD=0.74$</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>8/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male, Female</td>
<td>$M=4.59$, $SD=0.80$</td>
<td>$M=4.29$, $SD=0.56$</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>7/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female, Male</td>
<td>$M=4.59$, $SD=0.55$</td>
<td>$M=4.41$, $SD=0.40$</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>8/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Food Aid</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>$M=4.58$, $SD=1.37$</td>
<td>$M=4.54$, $SD=0.74$</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>$M=4.69$, $SD=0.52$</td>
<td>$M=4.89$, $SD=0.52$</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>7/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male, Female</td>
<td>$M=4.78$, $SD=0.81$</td>
<td>$M=4.22$, $SD=0.40$</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>6/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female, Male</td>
<td>$M=4.41$, $SD=0.47$</td>
<td>$M=4.28$, $SD=0.33$</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>6/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>$M=5.06$, $SD=0.93$</td>
<td>$M=5.25$, $SD=0.54$</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>6/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>$M=4.39$, $SD=0.35$</td>
<td>$M=4.72$, $SD=0.51$</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>7/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male, Female</td>
<td>$M=5.33$, $SD=0.51$</td>
<td>$M=4.76$, $SD=1.52$</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>5/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female, Male</td>
<td>$M=4.84$, $SD=0.71$</td>
<td>$M=4.75$, $SD=1.31$</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>6/7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level, $p < 0.05$
Post-Hoc Tests

Post-hoc analyses were performed on the data to examine mean differences in groups when collapsed across various conditions. Three separate one-way ANOVAs were performed with behavioral intentions to comply, perceived evidence quality, and perceived message effectiveness as the three separate outcome variables with a factor splitting the groups by intense or neutral messages. In this way, the messages were collapsed across topic and authorship. There was no statistical difference between intense and neutral messages in either perceived evidence quality ($F(1,290)=0.78, p=0.38; \eta^2 = 0.00$) or behavioral intentions to comply ($F(1,290)=0.19, p=0.67; \eta^2 = 0.00$). There was a statistically significant difference between intense messages ($M=5.13, SD=1.04$) and neutral messages ($M=4.84, SD=1.11$) in perceived message effectiveness ($F(1, 290)=5.257, p=0.023; \eta^2 = 0.02$) such that intense messages were perceived as more effective than neutral messages.

Three separate one-way ANOVAs were performed with behavioral intentions to comply, perceived evidence quality, and perceived message effectiveness as the three separate outcome variables with message topic as the factor. In this way, the messages were collapsed across authorship and language condition. There was a statistically significant difference in the message topics on behavioral intentions to comply with the message ($F(3, 288)=2.76, p=0.04; \eta^2 = 0.03$). The job interview topic ($M=4.61, SD=1.92$) was significantly less likely to elicit behavioral intentions to comply than the obesity topic ($M=5.25, SD=1.67$), $p=0.03$ and the food aid topic ($M=5.36, SD=1.71$), $p=0.01$. There was not a statistically significant difference in the message topics on perceived message effectiveness ($F(3, 288)=2.438, p=0.07; \eta^2 = 0.02$); however, post-hoc analyses revealed that the job interview topic ($M=5.25, SD=1.13$) was significantly higher in perceived message effectiveness than the food aid topic ($M=4.84$,
There were no statistical differences in perceived evidence quality ($F(3, 288)=1.51, p=0.21; \eta^2 = 0.02$).

Three separate one-way ANOVAs were performed with behavioral intentions to comply, perceived evidence quality, and perceived message effectiveness as the three separate outcome variables with organization as the factor. In this way, the messages were collapsed across topic, authorship, and language intensity and mean differences were examined with respect to the organization from which the message originated. There was a statistically significant difference between organizations on behavioral intentions to comply with the message ($F(2, 289)=4.33, p=0.01; \eta^2 = 0.03$). The organization Penn State Career Services ($M=4.58, SD=1.91$) was significantly less likely to elicit behavioral intentions to comply than the U.S. PIRG ($M=5.25, SD=1.67$), $p=0.02$, and the IATP ($M=5.26, SD=1.63$), $p=0.01$. There was not a statistically significant difference between organizations on perceived evidence quality ($F(2, 289)=2.53, p=0.08; \eta^2 = 0.02$); however, post-hoc analyses revealed that Penn State Career Services ($M=5.70, SD=0.97$) was perceived to have significantly higher evidence quality than the IATP ($M=5.39, SD=0.97$), $p=0.03$. There was a statistically significant difference between organizations on perceived message effectiveness ($F(2, 289)=4.63, p=0.01; \eta^2 = 0.03$). Penn State Career Services ($M=5.28, SD=1.09$) was perceived to have significantly higher message effectiveness than the IATP ($M=4.82, SD=1.06$), $p=0.00$.

Several additional post-hoc analyses were used to examine the theoretical constructs in LET more broadly. A correlation matrix was conducted to examine correlations among variables pertaining to the whether the actual language use either met or failed to meet expectations of language use (Expectations Met), perceived author credibility (PAC), and the three persuasive outcomes of perceived evidence quality (PEQ), perceived message effectiveness (PME), and
behavioral intentions (BI) (see Table 25). The scale for met or failed to meet expectations was created by combining the two items that measured this construct items ($M=4.36, SD=1.17, \alpha=0.85$). All correlations were significant at the 0.01 level, $p < 0.01$; however, the directions of the correlation as positive or negative varied, suggesting the potential for psychological reactance and backfiring, particularly with respect to operationalizing and attempting to measure whether an expectation of language use has been met or not in the actual language used.

A two-way ANOVA was conducted that examined the effect of authorship and language condition on perceived evidence quality. There was not a significant interaction between the effects of authorship and language intensity on perceived evidence quality, $F(1, 142)=0.88$, $p=0.35$.

A two-way ANOVA was conducted that examined the effect of authorship and language condition on perceived message effectiveness. There was not a significant interaction between the effects of authorship and language intensity on perceived message effectiveness, $F(1, 142)=1.28$, $p=0.26$.

A two-way ANOVA was conducted that examined the effect of authorship and language condition on behavioral intentions to comply with the message. There was not a significant interaction between the effects of authorship and language intensity on behavioral intentions to comply with the message, $F(1, 142)=3.61$, $p=0.06$. 
Table 25

*Correlations Among Study Variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Expectations Met</th>
<th>PAC</th>
<th>PEQ</th>
<th>PME</th>
<th>BI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expectations Met</td>
<td>______</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAC</td>
<td>0.33*</td>
<td>______</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEQ</td>
<td>0.33*</td>
<td>0.62*</td>
<td>______</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PME</td>
<td>-0.47*</td>
<td>-0.53*</td>
<td>-0.67*</td>
<td>______</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BI</td>
<td>-0.18*</td>
<td>-0.19*</td>
<td>-0.22*</td>
<td>0.38*</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The correlation is significant at the 0.01 level, p < 0.01*
Chapter 4

DISCUSSION

Improving health by increasing public knowledge of the role public policy plays in the nutritional environment through promotional messages is an important goal of many health communication campaigns and public health organizations. Pursuing this goal requires an understanding of the linguistic features of these messages that promote the desired response, message acceptance, in readers. Thus, such promotional messages must be closely examined through a message-centered theoretical lens to examine linguistic features of messages that are effectively persuasive. LET is one such message-centered theory of persuasion that provides useful insight into understanding the interaction of various message components that promote or inhibit persuasion. Much of the empirical work on LET, however, was performed in the later half of the 20th century, which warrants further investigation into the theory’s propositions at the present time.

The purpose of this study was to investigate the theoretical propositions of LET in promotional messages designed to influence readers of the impact of public health policy, specifically the Farm Bill, on food related issues in the United States. Formative research was conducted to identify messages used by organizations during the 2012 renewal period of the Farm Bill that attempted to convince readers of the relationships between the Farm Bill and three food related topics (obesity, local food, food aid) and to analyze these messages for their theoretical content. Based on this formative research, 32 theoretical variations of these messages were constructed. A pilot study was used to assess whether the intended audience perceived the constructed messages to vary on the theoretical components indicated by LET, and the 32 message conditions were further derived based on these results. A randomized trial was
designed using these message conditions to assess participant expectations regarding male and female use of intense or neutral language strategies and to examine persuasive outcomes associated with the interactions of sex of the source(s) and language intensity.

The overall goals of the research project were to advance theoretical knowledge in the area of strategic message design in the context of health policy in three important ways. First, this study revisited linguistic features of messages articulated by LET in messages related to the Farm Bill and food in the present day. Second, this study expanded its exploration of LET by examining the interaction of multiple sources and language intensity on persuasion, a previously unexplored phenomenon. Third, it examined the effect of sex of the source(s) and language intensity on perceived organizational credibility, another unexplored phenomenon with potential to increase the scope of LET. This section will elaborate on the implications of this research for each of these three areas, followed by a discussion on the contributions of the present research to communication theory as well as pragmatic contributions to public health communication. The section then concludes with a discussion on the limitations of the present study and directions for future research.

**LET in the Present Day**

LET assumes that language is a rule-governed system through which individuals develop macro-sociological expectations with regards to the persuasive language and message strategies employed by others and that cultural and sociological forces shape human patterns of ordinary language use and subsequent normative and non-normative language styles (Burgoon, 1990; Burgoon, Jones, & Stewart, 1975; Burgoon & Miller, 1985). Through these assumptions, LET posits that these cultural and sociological expectations about language use impact the acceptance or rejection of a persuasive message such that a positive expectation violation results in message
acceptance, whereas a negative expectation violation results in message rejection. The theory predicts interactions between sex of the source and language intensity such that a male is expected to use intense language strategies and a female is expected to use neutral language strategies, and to the extent that a male or female does not adhere to these expectations, a violation of an expectation occurs. LET further predicts that through these expectation violations a female source will be more effective in producing persuasive outcomes when using neutral as compared to intense language strategies, and a male will be less effective in producing persuasive outcomes when using neutral as compared to intense language strategies.

This thesis project aimed to examine the enduring qualities of these sociological expectations from the initial empirical research on LET. In this investigation it was found that there are perceived differences in expectations for language use between males and females such that males are expected to use more intense language strategies and females are expected to use more neutral language strategies, although these differences in expectations were marginal. Interestingly enough, in examining perceptions of the actual language used by male and female sources, an interaction effect suggested that participants perceived that females were using more intense language strategies than males whether the language they actually used was more intense or not. These results in conjunction would, according to LET, suggest that a male using neutral language strategies and a female using intense language strategies would violate an expectation of language use. The results of the current study, however, did not find a significant interaction effect of gender and language condition on perceptions of a violation, such that a male using neutral strategies and a female using intense strategies did not result in an expectation violation.

The participants were also not significantly more likely to indicate the perception of a violation as positive, neither positive or negative, or negative based on the gender and language
condition message they received, as LET would have expected. This finding in conjunction with the finding that females are perceived to be using more intense language across the board, regardless of which language condition the text contained, suggests the potential for participant social desirability in their responses to be impacting the results.

The initial empirical work on LET in the 1970s was performed during a time when most people accorded the two sexes vastly different roles in the social structure (Bem, 1975; Bem & Lenny, 1976). Through these perceptions of proper sex roles, expectations or generalizations about appropriate and inappropriate behaviors for the two sexes emerged. The socialization process therefore reinforced the notion that females are complementary to rather than independent of males, submissive rather than dominant, domestic rather than business- or scientific-minded, and less knowledgeable than males (Bem & Bem, 1970). This view of females as submissive and dependent likely led to differing expectations on certain communicative behaviors between females and males (Burgoon & Miller, 1985). In the 21st century, the roles of men and women in society and the workplace have undergone dramatic change (Gere & Helwig, 2012). Even if the underlying expectations for language use have endured into the present day, the emergence and change of the roles of men and women in society may impact responses such that participants are not likely to indicate that females are expected to use more neutral language for social desirability reasons.

Additionally, the items attempting to measure expectations and violations of those expectations may have produced psychological reactance in the participants. The correlations between the scale measuring whether actual language use had met or failed expectations for language use and the persuasive outcomes revealed positive correlations in one persuasive outcome (perceived evidence quality), yet negative correlations in the other two persuasive
outcomes (perceived message effectiveness and behavioral intentions). These results indicating that the correlations between met or failed expectations and the persuasive outcomes are not all in the same direction suggest that there may have been backfiring or reactance by the participants in response to the items measuring their expectations of language use for differing genders and authors. This reaction lends further to the idea of social desirability influencing participant responses.

In examining the persuasive outcomes of the messages with respect to the interaction between sex of the source and language intensity, the results of the present study do not conform to LET predictions of sociological expectations and persuasive outcomes, with one exception. The persuasive outcomes of the male conditions did not differ based on language condition as intense or neutral across any of the three experimental topics or the attention control. Additionally, the persuasive outcomes of the female conditions in general did not differ based on language condition as intense or neutral across any of the three experimental topics or the attention control; however, as hypothesized, the female, neutral, local foods message was perceived as significantly more effective than the female, intense, local foods message. Further analyses examined these message components on persuasive outcomes in only those individuals who correctly identified the message topic and message sex of the source of their message condition in the manipulation check. The results again in general did not conform to the hypotheses made by the sociological expectations within LET, with the one exception of the female, neutral, local foods message perceived as significantly more effective than the female, intense, local foods message. This particular significant finding may be due to the specific topic of the message, which related to the local food movement. The emergence of support for local foods may be considered a social movement, with sufficient interest in the college student
population (Starr, 2010). Previous knowledge of local foods or involvement in these issues by the sample in this project may have therefore impacted the results.

LET also predicts that a female will be perceived as more credible and a male will be perceived as less credible when using neutral as compared to intense language strategies. The results of the present study did not find support for this prediction in that there were no significant differences in perceptions of author credibility in the male or female author conditions varying by language condition in any of the three experimental topics or the attention control.

One potential explanation for the differences between the findings of the present study and previous investigations of LET may be due to the failure of this study to effectively violate the participants’ expectations regarding male and female use of intense or neutral language strategies. The various outcomes predicted by LET with respect to message acceptance or rejection and perceptions of source credibility are dependent upon not only expectations for language use, but also violations of those expectations. Only marginal support for the expectations of male and female language use in the extant version LET was found, suggesting the expectations themselves may have changed since the inception of LET. By ineffectively violating the expectations of language use in the present day, further predictions based on LET were generally not supported.

Although these hypotheses were generally not supported with respect to the statistical significance of the p-values, many of the effect sizes indicated that a medium to high amount of variance in the persuasive outcomes were indeed explained by the theoretical variations in the message conditions. Additionally, the initial power analysis conducted for the study suggested that an adequate sample size was achieved for the overall statistical tests; however, in the post-
hoc tests analyzing mean differences in groups with 8 to 10 participants, the study lacked sufficient power to detect any significant effects even if they exist in reality. These effect sizes and the lack of sufficient power in some tests suggest another possible explanation for the differences in this project’s findings and previous examinations of LET, and in addition, serve to solidify any significant findings as all the more meaningful.

An additional potential explanation lies in the fact that LET has traditionally been used with respect to language expectations about language use in oral discourse, yet the current study provides one of the first examinations of the theory in a textual discourse setting. In this sense, hearing a female be verbally intense may violate an expectation with respect to language use that reading a text authored by a female that includes intense language does not. Similarly, hearing a male be verbally neutral may violate an expectation with respect to language use that reading a text authored by a male that includes neutral language does not. Additionally, the textual messages themselves were of high literacy levels, with Flesh-Kincaid readability levels between 11.0 and 12.0. Although this provided ecological validity in that the messages were kept as close as possible to their original form, this high level of reading complexity may have impacted the results.

One potential interesting avenue to explore the results lies in the fact that the online survey for the randomized trial was administered to undergraduate students during the final week of classes, immediately prior to the final exam period. Burgoon, Jones, and Stewart (1975) found that when individuals were already in a high state of arousal, such as anxiety unrelated to the message itself or irrelevant fear, messages with intense language strategies were generally ineffective. A more recent investigation by Hamilton and colleagues (1990) found that message recipients experiencing irrelevant fear were more persuaded by male sources using low-intensity
language, whereas message recipients who were not experiencing irrelevant fear were more persuaded by male sources using high-intensity language. These findings led to proposition nine of LET, stating that “fear arousal that is irrelevant to the content of the message of the harmful consequences of failure to comply with the advocated position mediates receptivity to different levels of language intensity and compliance-gaining strategies varying in instrumental verbal aggression” (Burgoon, Denning, & Roberts, 2002, p. 125).

The online survey was administered during a stressful time for undergraduate students; therefore, it is possible that a state of high anxiety, or irrelevant fear, affected the persuasive outcomes. Interestingly, the present study found that intense messages were perceived as more effective than neutral messages regardless of authorship or topic. This finding seems to contradict the notion that intense language strategies in a state of high arousal or high anxiety fail to elicit message acceptance. In this instance, it appears that intense language strategies are more effective than neutral language strategies. This could again be the result of a distinction between verbally intense discourse and textually intense language, such that hearing verbally intense language while under a state of high anxiety may inhibit persuasion, whereas reading a text with intense language strategies may not. Additionally, although Hamilton and colleagues (1990) provide one of the more recent investigations of LET, this investigation still occurred 23 years ago, thus it is possible that these propositions no longer apply to the present day.

LET and Multiple Sources

It is not uncommon for a message designed to persuade voters that a particular policy impacts public health to be authored by more than one author. Indeed, two of the three original messages related to the Farm Bill and food selected for use in this project were written by more than one author. LET has traditionally been used to study language intensity in verbal discourse,
such that theoretical predictions related to more than one author were unnecessary; however, in using this theory to examine the interaction between sex of the source and language intensity in the textual language of these persuasive messages, the present thesis project therefore examined the effect of multiple authors.

There was not a significant interaction between male as first author and female as second author and language condition on persuasive outcomes, nor was there a significant interaction between female as first author and male and second author and language condition on persuasive outcomes. Further analyses revealed that even when including only those individuals who correctly identified the message topic and message sex of the source in the manipulation check in the analysis, results were insignificant. The insignificant results may be due to a lack of distinct language use expectations for multiple authors when this includes both male and female individuals. Although the predictions of LET were marginally supported in the present day, that males are expected to use more intense language strategies whereas females are expected to use more neutral language strategies, it may be that the inclusion of both genders in the authorship portion of the message fails to elicit a combination of these minimally enduring sociological expectations.

**LET and Organizational Credibility**

Messages designed to persuade voters that a particular public policy, such as the Farm Bill, negatively impacts public health are generally distributed through an organization. It seems important to understand the role that perceptions of these organizations play in contributing to message acceptance or message rejection. Although source credibility of an author is a much-explored phenomenon within the communication discipline with clear implications on persuasive outcomes (Heesacker, Petty, & Cacioppo, 1983; Hovland & Weiss, 1951; McCroskey & Young,
1981; Pornpitakpan, 2004), research on organizational credibility in the persuasive literature is scare. Extant marketing research suggests not only a distinction between perceived credibility of an individual and perceived credibility of an organization, but also suggests that these two distinct perceptions of trust impact commitment to an organization (Ganeson & Hess, 1997). This study therefore sought to begin to explore this construct within the communication discipline, and more specifically within the persuasion domain under LET.

The initial results suggest that sex of the source(s) and language condition as intense or neutral did not interact with respect to perceptions of organizational credibility. It is important to note, however, that a large number of participants incorrectly identified the organization from which their message condition originated. Further analyses revealed that when including only those individuals who correctly identified the organization the majority of the message conditions were insignificant; however, in one instance in the obesity, male/female conditions, organizational credibility was significantly higher in neutral language condition than in the intense language condition. In addition to this significant result, limiting the test to only those who correctly identified the organization also increased the effect sizes, or the amount of variance in perceived organizational credibility explained by the theoretical message conditions. Important to note again the lack of sufficient power for detecting differences if they exist in reality, again making any significant result all the more meaningful.

While it is difficult to interpret these results in light of the fact that LET does not currently hold propositions concerning messages with multiple authors, the significant finding does suggest that examinations of LET should expand to include analyses of organizational credibility. Especially when considering the fact that the significant item resulted in only those individuals who correctly identified the organization in their message condition, it seems
important to more strongly highlight this type of information. Although the organization name was prominently displayed at the beginning of each message, the organization itself was not emphasized, and no additional information on the organization was provided.

**Contribution to Communication Theory**

This section will provide a brief summary of the overall contributions of this research study to the field of communication. Specifically, the findings will be reviewed with respect to how this thesis project advanced knowledge with regard to LET as a message-centered theory of persuasion in the context of health policy, specifically agricultural policies such as the Farm Bill in the United States.

It has now been over a decade since scholars explored LET in any depth, suggesting the need to analyze the application of the theory’s propositions to the present day. This thesis project provides an initial investigation into the enduring nature of the expectations of language use articulated by LET by examining linguistic use expectations of males and females in an undergraduate sample in the present day. Additionally, the present investigation improves upon past criticisms of the theory by providing a more in depth examination of expectations and perceptions of an expectation violation. Only minimal support was found for the enduring nature of the language use expectations articulated by LET, which led to no support found for the theory’s predictions of violations of these expectations, and insignificant findings for the majority of the LET derived hypotheses. Additionally, there were no interaction effects of sex of the source and language condition on the persuasive outcomes. Taken together, these results suggest a need for further investigation of the sociological expectations articulated by LET in the present day. While the propositions of LET based on a violation of an expectation may still
provide a useful framework for strategic message design, further examination of sociological expectations of today is necessary.

While continued investigation of LET in the present day seems warranted, it also seems necessary to expand the propositions of the theory to examine additional message components prevalent in persuasive messages today. Much of the empirical work on LET focused on language use in verbal discourse; however, many persuasive messages today are delivered in textual form, suggesting the need to understand LET in textual messages. This thesis project has attempted to do just that, in using LET as a message-centered theory of persuasion in textual messages. These initial results in that area suggest that LET may need to be revised with respect to the language use expectations held and interactions between sex of the source and language intensity in the context of textual messages.

Additionally, many persuasive messages contain more than one author. While LET provides predictions on persuasive linguistic features in single-authored messages, the present study explored the propositions of LET in messages authored by both a male and a female. No support was found for the inclusion of LET based interactions when two authors are present suggesting minimal advancement of the theory in this regard; however, continued explorations of LET in this area should incorporate expectation-based predictions for multiple authors to more adequately apply to persuasion in health communication today.

Finally, persuasive messages are oftentimes disseminated through organizational means. This project therefore examined the impact of sex of the source(s) and linguistic features of messages on perceptions of organizational credibility. In one instance, a significant result was found in those individuals who correctly identified their message condition organization. The
present study therefore provides initial evidence that LET should be studied in more depth with respect to organizational credibility and the scope of the theory expanded accordingly.

**Contribution to Public Health Communication**

Pragmatically speaking, a message-centered theory of persuasion in the health communication field should enable public health advocates and researchers to effectively manipulate linguistic features of a message to promote message acceptance, and inhibit message rejection, in readers. The iatrogenic effects of large federal policies, such as the Farm Bill, on obesity in the United States have led to health communication campaigns and public health organizations to disseminate promotional messages to voters to attempt to sway voter opinion in favor of policy changes that would mitigate these unintended negative impacts. While theories of persuasion generally attempt to broadly speak to the relationship of concepts across all contexts, situating LET within messages related to health policy enables more specific conclusions related to this context to be drawn. Several of the theoretically based predictions made through LET were marginally supported, and LET may need to be revised to be more applicable to language use expectations at the present time; however, the finding that suggests that intense messages are perceived as more effective than neutral messages regardless of topic or authorship may prove to have the most practical implication for messages related to the Farm Bill and food related topics. This finding has the potential improve strategic message design in health communication campaigns in this area for more effective persuasion.

**Limitations and Future Research**

Every research study is met with its own inherent challenges. One of the primary challenges of this thesis project pertains to the limitations associated with the data collection method. The participants in the sample were drawn from a research pool of undergraduate
students in an introductory communication course who received credit for participating. Although this demographic was of interest to the present study because of the ability of college-aged individuals to enact change through their ability to vote, the sample itself was still a convenient sample. Additionally, the response rate for both the pilot study (88 participants out of 100 emailed) and the experimental study (292 participants out of 329 emailed) leaves questions of potential selectivity bias.

An additional limitation, related to measurement, was the manipulation check items. Although all manipulation check items provided significant values to suggest that participants were significantly more likely to indicate they received the various message components in their message condition, a number of respondents did not accurately indicate the theoretical message components in their message condition. While this may be due to a failure in the experimental manipulation of the message components, the participants who incorrectly answered these items may have simply not read or paid attention to the message they received. This is turn could negatively impact the ability of the present study to test the hypotheses.

Another limitation in measurement was in the dependent measures in which a single item measure was used to assess behavioral intentions to comply with the message. By failing to include multiple items to assess this dependent outcome, it is possible that the full range of dimensions in behavioral intentions were not captured. Additionally, it is possible that the reliability and the validity of the measure were compromised because it was a single item.

A final limitation regarding measurement pertains to the items associated with the expectations assessment and the violation of an expectation assessment. The procedures used mimic those of Kelly and Burgoon (1991), who designed the procedures to examine expectancy violations in marital couples. In transferring these procedures for use in this study examining
expectancy violations in language use, it was difficult to construct items in which the undergraduate students were accurately able to understand what the question was asking. Several undergraduate students were consulted during the process in attempts to clarify the nature of the items, however, it is possible that the difficulty in transferring these procedures to a new context impacted the results.

While limited in several areas, this thesis project provides several interesting avenues for future research. Many of the previous criticisms of LET stem from the fact that the theory assumes the persuasive outcomes of message acceptance or rejection result from expectations that have been violated, yet much of the empirical work fails to adequately measure the existence of these expectations or the occurrence of a violation of these expectations. This thesis project attempted to emulate the procedures of Kelley and Burgoon (1991) to more accurately capture expectations and violations. While this method improved upon previous examinations of LET, future research should focus on pursuing additional methods to capture participant perceptions of expectations of language use, actual language use, violations, and the valence of those violations.

Marginal support was found for the predictions of LET based on expectations of male and female use of intense or neutral linguistic features as well as in one situation in which the female, neutral message in the Farm Bill and local food topic was more effective than the female, intense message. The majority of the findings, however, did not conform to predictions made by LET. It seems pertinent to therefore continue to investigate the propositions of LET in the present day to determine the enduring nature empirical findings of the initial work on the theory and the subsequent theoretical propositions.

As previously mentioned, message recipient states, such as high anxiety, are predicted to affect the persuasive outcomes posited under LET. While it is possible to hypothesize that the
participants in this study were under a state of high anxiety during the finals week period in which the online survey was administered, this recipient state was not measured, and it is therefore difficult to draw any concrete conclusions. Future research in this area should measure various discrete emotions, including anxiety, to examine the impact these various recipient states have on persuasion with respect to the propositions of LET.

Persuasive messages authored by more than one individual are abundant in the realm of health communication. A message-centered theory of persuasion such as LET should expand to incorporate propositions based on the expectations individuals hold towards these messages, and the subsequent interaction of sex of the sources and language intensity on persuasion. Although the present investigation did not find any significant results in a message authored by a male and female with language intensity on persuasive outcomes, future research should explore this phenomenon in more depth with particular attention to establishing and understanding the expectations individuals may hold towards a text with two authors.

Organizational credibility seems to be an underexplored phenomenon with the potential to greatly impact persuasive outcomes. Messages that attempt to persuade voters that a particular federal policy, such as the Farm Bill, is related to a public health issue are generally distributed through an organization. Perceptions of an organization may play a large role in message acceptance or message rejection, such that understanding the role perceptions of credibility of that organization play seems to warrant further investigation. Indeed, future research should examine organizational credibility in the persuasive context in more depth, as well as expand LET as a message-centered theory of persuasion to include propositions related to this construct.
Additional research should also address the potential for LET to incorporate a lifespan view of expectations about male and female language use. The lifespan communication perspective suggests that the nature and function of communication changes throughout the lifespan (Nussbaum, in press). With this in mind, it is possible to place current theoretical frameworks in the communication discipline under the lifespan perspective by including age related change and the possible implications of that change within the theory (Nussbaum, in press). As it currently stands, LET posits that there are a particular set of sociological expectations and rules governing language use for all individuals; however, it may be that sociological expectations for language use are based on cohort effects, and thus differ for individuals in different cohorts or age groups. Future research should therefore address the potential for lifespan differences in sociological expectations to determine if a subsequent lifespan framework fits into extant propositions of LET.

In addition to lifespan influences, culture may also have an impact on expectations for language use, particularly when examining the interaction between sex of the source and use of intense or neutral language. For example, the relationship between gender and emotions differs between cultures in Western and non-Western countries, which may be a function of gender roles and gender role ideologies (Fischer & Manstead, 2000). Sociological expectations surrounding male and female use of intense or neutral language may therefore vary across different cultures, with potential implications for the LET framework. The current project provided little opportunity to examine how culture impacts language use expectations, and thus, future research should address the role of culture.

In conclusion, many health communication campaigns and public health organizations distribute messages to the public in attempts to increase public knowledge of the role public
policy plays in shaping the nutritional environment in the United States to increase support for policy changes. Pursuing this goal requires theoretical understanding of linguistic features of these messages that promote message acceptance, and inhibit message rejection, in readers. The communication discipline can provide interesting research into this area through examination of these messages using a message-centered theory of persuasion, such as LET.
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The U.S. is in the middle of a public health crisis. We face a steep rise in obesity across the country, which is having an impact on our health, especially the health of our children. Childhood obesity rates in the U.S. have more than tripled in the past 30 years. Almost one in five children aged 6 to 11 is now obese. The consequences are significant. Obese children have arteries so thick that they resemble those of 45-year-olds, putting them at greatly increased risk of heart disease. Seventy percent of obese 5- to 17-year-olds show one of the risk factors for heart disease.

Dollars don’t fully capture the scale of this crisis, but they can at least suggest its outlines: $150 billion a year is spent on obesity and its related co-morbidities, a value that has doubled over the last decade. And it’s going to get worse; without significant policy changes, projections suggest that by 2030, half of Americans will be obese, and we will be spending an additional $66 billion a year in medical costs as a result.

The obesity epidemic has many causes, but one of the simplest is also among the most significant: junk food. There are many reasons behind the increased production and consumption of junk food, some simply due to consumer taste and technological innovation. But our own government policy is also responsible for promoting obesity-fueling empty calories. The fact is that even as nutritionists and researchers tell us to cut down on junk food in order to end the childhood obesity epidemic, federal agricultural policy is busily underwriting the problem.

At a time when America is facing an obesity epidemic, crushing debt and a weak economy, billions of taxpayer dollars are subsidizing junk food ingredients.

In this report, we find that in 2011, over $1.28 billion in taxpayer subsidies went to junk food ingredients, bringing the total to a staggering $18.2 billion since 1995. To put that figure in perspective, $18.2 billion is enough to buy 2.9 billion Twinkies every year – 21 for every single American taxpayer.

In contrast, only $637 million has gone to subsidies for apples since 1995. That’s enough to buy 77 million apples per year on average – but just half of one apple per taxpayer.

At the same time, childhood obesity rates have tripled over the last three decades, with one in five kids aged 6 to 11 now obese. These increases in obesity rates will translate into kids who are at greater risk for heart disease and diabetes, undermining the health of our country and
driving up medical costs by hundreds of billions of dollars. The rise in obesity has many causes, but one of the most important is the increased prevalence of high-fat, heavily sweetened junk food.

Between 1995 and 2011, American taxpayers spent over $277 billion in agricultural subsidies. Most subsidies went to the country’s largest farming operations, mainly to grow just a few commodity crops, including corn and soybeans.

Most of these commodity crops are not simply eat as-is. Among other uses, food manufacturers process them into additives like high fructose corn syrup and vegetable oils that provide a cheap dose of sweetness and fat to a wide variety of junk food products. Thus, Americans’ tax dollars directly subsidize junk food ingredients.

Key Findings:
- Between 1995 and 2011, $18.2 billion in tax dollars subsidized four common junk food additives – corn syrup, high fructose corn syrup, corn starch, and soy oils (which are processed further into hydrogenated vegetable oils).
- Healthier agricultural products receive very little in federal subsidies. Since 1995, taxpayers spent only $637 million subsidizing apples, which is one of the few fresh fruits or vegetables that have a significant federal subsidy.
- If subsidies for junk food ingredients went directly to taxpayers to allow them to purchase food, each of America’s 141 million taxpayers would receive $7.58 to spend on junk food and 27 cents to spend on apples each year – enough to buy 21 Twinkies but just half of one Red Delicious apple.
- The $18.2 billion in subsidies for junk food ingredients that taxpayers have shelled out since 1995 is enough to buy 49 billion Twinkies. Placed end to end, they would circle the globe 125 times.
- Since 1995, the lion’s share of agricultural subsidies has gone to a very small number of large operations – 75% of subsidies go to just 3.8% of U.S. farmers.

The fact that so many tax dollars are being wasted on junk food demonstrates the need to reform federal agricultural subsidies and end this wasteful spending.

Billions of dollars in subsidies have been spent over the past decades to support junk food ingredients. This distressing practice doesn’t reflect an overall policy of massive support for the entire agricultural sector; instead, it’s the result of a conscious policy that directs subsidies to commodity crops that are more likely to be processed into food additives. USDA says fruits and vegetables should make up about half of the foods on our plates, yet as this report documents, this priority is not reflected in the way taxpayer dollars are spent through agricultural subsidies.

This wasteful spending not only squanders taxpayer dollars: by fueling the crisis of childhood obesity, the subsidies damage our country’s health and increase the medical costs that will ultimately need to be paid to treat the effects of the obesity epidemic. Taxpayers are paying for the privilege of making our country sick.

Subsidies to large agribusinesses are egregious enough on their own; the fact that the subsidies go to junk food adds insult to injury.
At a time when government spending is coming under increased scrutiny, policy-makers should take a hard look at what our agricultural policy says about our priorities. This is a golden opportunity to ensure our agricultural policy is aligned with our food policy, and take a stand against subsidies for junk food.

OUR TAX DOLLARS SHOULD ONLY GO TO SERVE THE PUBLIC FOOD. Yet we’re handing out taxpayer subsidies to profitable corporations including Cargill and Monsanto that are pocketing tens of billions in taxpayer dollars and turning subsidized crops like corn into junk good ingredients like high-fructose corn syrup. It’s all the more outrageous at a time when one-in-three kids is overweight or obese, and obesity-related diseases like diabetes are turning into an epidemic.

YOU CAN MAKE THE DIFFERENCE. No one in congress wants to be seen standing up for taxpayer giveaways for junk food. Given public concern about obesity and federal spending, your support can help us finally beat Big Ag and end subsidies for junk food.
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United States Farm Bill 2012: What’s At Stake?

Everyone at the Table: Local Foods and the Farm Bill

By JoAnne Berkenkamp and Bill Wenzel

The local foods movement in the United States has grown by leaps and bounds over the last decade, but still represents a small portion of the overall food system. How can local food systems continue to grow and remain sustainable?

Every five years, Congress revisits farm and food policy in the U.S. through debate and reauthorization of the Farm Bill. For much of the last 40 years, farm policy has focused on promoting on-farm efficiency, developing domestic and foreign markets and supporting efforts by agribusiness to gain dominance of the global food market. These policies succeeded in making the U.S. a global leader in the production of a handful of commodities, and have dramatically impacted farmers, rural communities, the foods we eat and the environment.

Escalated efficiency, specialization and technological advances have increased the average size of farms significantly but have left far fewer farmers on the land. Farm Bill programs, coupled with trade policies supportive of corporate-led globalization, have played a major role in industrializing agriculture and concentrating the food production and processing industries.

Dissatisfied with the heavy reliance on agricultural chemicals and pharmaceuticals utilized in large-scale, industrial agriculture, many people have turned to purchasing their food from local sources that they know and trust. Their reasons are many: Foods grown for nearby markets are often harvested at the peak of ripeness and delivered while fresh and flavorful. Buying locally builds relationships between growers and eaters that aren’t possible when food is run through complicated supply chains across long distances. Short supply chains allow for greater transparency about how food is grown and processed.

Still other consumers are concerned about the large carbon footprint left by food produced on industrial-scale farms, processed by multi-national food conglomerates and transported around the globe. Buying locally grown foods can support area farmers and rural economies while building a sense of place and community.

Existing Farm Bill programs are designed primarily for commodity production in the form of subsidies, research, crop insurance and other risk-management programs. Similar programs are not available to small and mid-sized growers of fruit and vegetables and other, so-called “specialty crops.” Given the enormous bias in federal policy toward industrial production of commodities for agribusiness, it is no wonder that most of our food system is not fostering a healthy population or a healthy environment.

The past two decades have seen an enormous increase in demand for locally grown foods.
According to the USDA, local food sales through all marketing channels reached $5 billion in 2007. Direct-to-consumer sales alone jumped from $551 million in 1997 to $1.2 billion in 2007 and the number of farmers markets has tripled—from 1,755 in 1994 to 5,274 in 2009. Additionally, there are now more than 2,500 community-supported agriculture (CSA) farming operations in the U.S. compared to 761 in 2001. Purchases of locally grown food by institutions such as K-12 schools, colleges and hospitals have also increased dramatically. Today, there are active Farm to School programs in all 50 states and locally grown foods are a key growth area in the retail grocery business.

While the marketplace is demanding more locally grown foods, local food systems receive only a tiny proportion of Farm Bill spending. Given rising consumer demand, this is the time for federal policy to step up to the plate and invest in local food systems development. Investing in our small and mid-size farmers and the distribution and processing infrastructure needed to connect “farm to fork” should be an integral part of the 2012 Farm Bill.

Policy changes in the Farm Bill could help level the playing field to bring much needed support to farmers, rural communities and urban consumers looking for sources of safe, nutritious food and a closer connection to producers who grow it. This should include leveraging new sources of capital and developing new farm insurance products that adequately manage the many risks faced by small and mid-size farmers and ranchers. Additionally, appropriately scaled processing, marketing and distribution infrastructure to aggregate and add value to locally grown foods is needed. Such businesses can create jobs and rebuild economic vitality in communities across the country.

Policy innovation that supports local food systems would have a significant impact in increasing the availability of healthy and nutritious food, improving farmer profitability and rural economic sustainability, while providing environmental benefits and reducing agriculture’s carbon footprint.

The 2008 Farm Bill made significant first steps in the right direction. The 2012 should build on those steps by:

- Increasing funding to the Community Food Projects (CFP) program and other vehicles that expand the access to healthy, nutritious food in minority and under-served communities;
- Providing increased flexibility to school districts and other institutions to purchase locally grown foods for school lunch and other meal programs;
- Expanding incentives for healthy eating through SNAP and other federal nutrition programs;
- Increasing funding to USDA Rural Development grant and loan programs to support the development of local food system infrastructure development;
- Ensuring that Farm Bill program benefits are made available to fruit and vegetable growers and other farmers who produce for local markets; and,
- Redirecting agricultural research and extension efforts to assist producers and rural businesses in meeting the challenges of local food system development.

There is increasing public support for including these provisions in the 2012 Farm Bill. The
Local Farms, Food and Jobs Act introduced in the House and Senate contains many of these provisions, with the intention of including them in the next 2012 Farm Bill. Adoption of these measures would be a big step toward expanding local food systems in this country.

For all its influence, the Farm Bill is a deeply flawed approach to developing a national food and farm policy. It has more than 12 titles, each with its own constituency—looking at issues like rural development, commodities and conservation separately rather than as part of a larger system. Health currently has no place within Farm Bill programs. To truly transform our food system to support fairness for farmers and farmworkers, enough healthy food for all, community empowerment and environmental sustainability, we need to think beyond the Farm Bill. We need new ideas and new policies—and everyone at the table.
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United States Farm Bill 2012: What’s At Stake?

Local Foods, Global: Food Aid and the Farm Bill

By Karen Hansen-Kuhn

The U.S. food aid program is hugely important at the global level. At $2.3 billion in 2010, the U.S. provides just over half of emergency food aid deliveries to millions of beneficiaries around the world suffering from famine, natural disaster and conflict.1 There is little doubt that food aid has saved countless lives, but with significant improvements, it could save countless more.

In the short run, when crops fail or catastrophe strikes, food aid is an essential last resort to help people make it through to the next planting season. Food aid itself, though, is just one of many tools for reducing hunger. In the long run, programs to prevent food shortages and increase rural incomes are even more important.

Food aid programs in the United States are administered by the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) and U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), either as part of bilateral programs or through the U.N.’s World Food Program. For the most part, the rules and spending limits for U.S. food aid programs are set under Title III of the Farm Bill (Agricultural Trade and Food Aid). USAID’s international disaster assistance program (which is set separately under the State Department authorization bill) has expanded in the last few years, but decisions on nearly 90 percent of food aid spending are still set under the Farm Bill.

Unlike other donor countries, the U.S. ships most of its food aid as in-kind donations sent around the globe rather than local purchases from farmers in the country or region in need. While there is a perception that these donations support American farmers, in fact the volume of food aid purchases are too small to affect farm prices. Food aid is purchased by U.S. agribusinesses, transported by American shippers, and delivered by U.S. NGOs or U.N. agencies. By law, at least 75 percent of our food donations must be purchased, processed and transported by American companies.2 Shipping food from the United States to countries in crisis costs much more than purchasing food locally. For example, shipping food aid to sub-Saharan Africa costs 35 percent more than local food purchases.3 Most of the money we spend doesn’t even go to food purchase—a full 65 percent of our food aid budget is consumed by shipping costs.4 Furthermore, food shipped from the United States takes two to three months longer to arrive than food purchased regionally.5 For people facing a famine or other crisis, additional waiting time for a food delivery can be a matter of life or death.

In the 2008 Farm Bill, Congress authorized a four-year, $60 million pilot program for local and regional purchases of food aid. An initial survey of some of the results from the test cases found that the average cost of providing grains was 54 percent lower, and the delivery time was cut 62 percent (nearly 14 weeks).6 USAID has also expanded local and regional purchases even more through separate funds set aside for disaster assistance. These innovations, which include food
vouchers, could strengthen local markets and should inform the broader programs authorized under the Farm Bill.

The 2008 Farm Bill also expanded programs to pre-position food aid in six locations around the world (Kenya, Sri Lanka, South Africa, Togo, Djibouti and San Jacinto, Texas). This is still in-kind aid, but it is shipped and stored in warehouses much closer to the location of food emergencies. This could cut the time needed to deliver food aid to recipient countries from several months to several weeks.7

These modest improvements are encouraging, but much more could be done to make food aid more efficient in terms of cost, and more effective at reducing hunger. This is especially important in the current era of tight budgets, increasing demand for grains and continued food shortages around the world

Strengthening food aid programs to respond to new realities

• **Buy more food aid locally and regionally:** Decisions on where food aid is purchased should respond to current conditions, not the inertia of past programs. Purchases made closer to areas of need can be distributed much more quickly and at much lower cost, feeding many more with the same amount of spending. Most importantly, it would go beyond the emergency response in helping local farmers in developing countries grow their production capacity. There will still be times when regional shortages or transportation problems make shipping U.S. foods more logical, but that should be determined on a case-by-case basis.

• **Fund food security programs directly:** In addition to shifting away from donating food in-kind, the U.S. government should make it a priority to reduce and reform the practice of monetization, in which the government donates food to U.S. development organizations who then sell the food in-country to raise money for their programs (about $300 million in FY 2010). Many of these programs support excellent work, but it’s a convoluted way to generate development funding. The costs entailed in monetization can absorb nearly 30 percent of the potential revenues, and in many cases distort local markets.8 Such reforms would ensure that local farmers are not competing with food donations in their own markets and move countries closer to self-sustaining food security.

Food aid is an essential last resort in times of crisis, but it is imperative that all U.S. aid support developing countries to become self-reliant by investing in local agriculture. Strengthening the production capacity, infrastructure and markets for farmers at the local level will allow for long-term food security in developing countries while also providing more options for fast and cost-effective local purchase of food aid when regional food crises arise.

With the continuing global economic downturn, and rising rates of global hunger, we need to get the most out of every dollar spent on foreign aid. Reforming the food aid system would make it more effective while empowering farmers in the developing world. The Farm Bill debate provides an important opportunity for a comprehensive review of existing food aid programs and the enactment of new programs that respond to new realities.

Many of the arguments for increasing local and regional purchases of food aid and decreasing monetization have been debated for years. The issue is not a lack of knowledge but insufficient
political will for a different kind of food aid and agricultural development that helps to rebuild local food systems. Fears that criticism of food aid will lead to its elimination have held back change in previous farm bills and in debates at the World Trade Organization. Similar reforms in Canada gained ground when Canadian farmers got behind a shift to local and regional purchases. Perhaps it’s time for a new debate, within the Farm Bill and beyond, on how to support strong and resilient food systems in the U.S. and in developing countries, and how aid programs can support that goal.
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Original Attention Control Message

The interview is one of the most important steps in the job search process, and thorough preparation is essential. To interview effectively you need to know what you have to offer, what the employer is like, and the kind of position you want. Being able to answer questions with relevant details and in a conversational manner is very important.

As such, they will be asking a variety of questions to determine if you match their needs. There are many types of interview styles or formats. Described below are some of the most common. You may encounter any or all of these, sometimes in the same interview.

Traditional Interview Questions
Traditionally employers have asked questions designed to help them gain a feel for who you are and what makes you unique: your motivation level, your background and strong points, your interest in the position, and the aspects of your personality that may affect how you perform on the job, such as organization, interpersonal skills, decision making, teamwork, etc. The questions asked might be seeking expansion of information presented on your resume, or focus on the qualities and skills that you can bring to the table.

Behavioral Interview Questions
Based on the premise that the best way to predict future behavior is to examine past behavior, behavioral interviewing is now widespread among recruiters. The technique involves asking a series of questions designed to get the candidate to talk about how he or she handled certain situations in the past. Interviewers feel that they can make more accurate hiring decisions by focusing on an applicant’s past actions and behaviors, rather than subjective impressions of a candidate’s self-proclaimed qualities.

Here’s how it goes: Typically, the interviewer will have determined several behavioral characteristics that would be most important for on-the-job success and will base questions on the characteristics identified. You will be asked to share situations in which you may or may not have exhibited these behaviors. You won’t be able to theorize or generalize about events, rather, you will be asked to provide details. The interview will be a more structured process that will concentrate on areas identified by the interviewer, rather than on areas that you may feel are important.

Follow-up questions will test for consistency and determine if you exhibited the desired behavior in that situation: Can you give me an example? What did you do? What did you say? What were you thinking? How did you feel? What was your role? What was the result? You will notice an absence of such inquiries as, “Tell me about your strengths and weaknesses.”

One of the supposed benefits of this technique for employers is that candidates cannot prepare for these questions in advance. However, you can help yourself by anticipating the types of questions you might receive and dredging your memory for examples of past behavior. You may be able to guess at some of the questions by analyzing the job requirements beforehand.
Case Interview Questions
Another common interview format, especially for consulting firms, is the case interview. It is also probably one of the most difficult and feared formats around. In it, you’ll be asked to analyze a hypothetical business problem and come up with solutions on the spot. Case interview questions are designed to test your ability to think analytically under stress, with incomplete information.

How Can I Best Prepare for Interviews?
Know yourself, first. Know what kind of job you want and what makes you feel qualified. Think about what information you want to include in your responses. Don’t go in “cold” and expect to do well, but don’t memorize, either.

Research the employer. First get the basics, including the company’s size, location(s), product(s), or service(s). Then look for details relevant to the position you seek: job description, training, advancement paths, etc. You may need to look several places to get this information, including:
1. The company’s information session, if they are holding one. You can find a list of information sessions under the “Events” tab in Nittany Lion Career Network.
2. The Career Information Center in the Bank of America Career Services Center or online at studentaffairs.psu.edu/career/cic
3. Company websites, many of which can be found from links in Nittany Lion Career Network.
4. The Business Library online at www.libraries.psu.edu/psul/business.html. You can link to Hoover’s Online, Factiva, Standard and Poor’s Net Advantage, and more.
5. Contacting the local chamber of commerce or the company’s public relations or personnel department.
6. Talking with someone in the company or agency in the type of position of interest to you.
7. Search online news sites to review any recent articles regarding the company.

What Is the Best Approach to Answering Questions?
Recruiters are surprisingly accurate in sensing “canned” answers. These canned responses don’t give interesting or reliable information about you. When you answer, remember these guidelines:
1. There is no single right answer. It’s often how you answer that is more important than the exact content.
2. Be honest. Don’t pretend, for example, that you were sure about your major from the very start if, in fact, you weren’t. The details about how you chose your major may be much more interesting and communicate some very positive things about how you make decisions.
3. Don’t look for ulterior motives. Some questions are asked purely out of curiosity or to help you relax. Recruiters are not going to conclude that you lack sufficient interest in the field if your favorite course was not related to your major. A genuine answer is almost always more interesting.
4. Give details and examples. General responses become boring and don’t help the recruiter get to know you. You need to be specific. Details illustrate your points and make answers more vivid and memorable. Therefore, when discussing one of your strengths, give an example or two illustrating that strong point. When mentioning the course you liked most, give some details to illustrate what you liked and why. Remember to use the STAR
method outlined on page 50.

5. Stay focused and don’t ramble. Give details that are relevant but don’t start telling long stories that include unnecessary details. Some candidates make the mistake of repeating themselves when they haven’t thought of how to wrap up the answer. Respond directly and succinctly.

6. Keep the position in mind. What details can you give that are relevant to the type of job you are interested in? When you think of some, try to remember to include them. For example, if you worked at a summer camp and are now looking for a sales position, you can mention how you were successful at persuading the participants to enjoy your programs.
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The U.S. is in the middle of a devastating public health crisis. We face a significant rise in obesity across the country, which is having a detrimental impact on our health, especially the health of our children.

Childhood obesity rates in the U.S. have more than tripled in the past 30 years. Almost one in five children aged 6 to 11 is now obese. There are enormous consequences. Obese children have dangerous arteries that resemble those of 45-year-olds, putting them at a greatly increased risk of devastating diseases like heart disease. Seventy percent of obese 5- to 17-year-olds show one of the dangerous risk factors for heart disease.

Dollars don’t fully capture the scale of this enormous problem, but they can at least suggest its outlines: $150 billion a year is spent on obesity and its related co-morbidities, a value that has doubled over the last decade. And it’s going to get substantially worse; without significant policy changes, projections suggest that by 2030, half of Americans will be obese, and we will be spending a staggering $66 billion a year in unnecessary medical costs as a result.
The gigantic obesity epidemic has many causes, but one of the simplest is also among the most substantial: junk food. There are many reasons behind the increased production and detrimental consumption of junk food, some simply due to consumer taste and technological innovation. But our own government policy is also greatly responsible for promoting unnecessary empty calories. The fact is that even as nutrition researchers tell us to cut down on junk food in order to significantly combat the severe childhood obesity epidemic, irresponsible federal agricultural policy is substantially underwriting the devastating obesity crisis.

At a time when America is facing a devastating obesity epidemic, staggering debt and a pathetic economy, billions of taxpayer dollars are subsidizing junk food ingredients.

In this report, we find that in 2011, over $1.28 billion in taxpayer subsidies went to junk food ingredients, bringing the total to a staggering $18.2 billion since 1995. To put that figure in perspective, $18.2 billion is enough to buy 2.9 billion Twinkies every year – 21 for every single American taxpayer.

In contrast, only $637 million has gone to subsidies for apples since 1995. That’s enough to buy 77 million apples per year on average – but just half of one apple per taxpayer.

At the same time, childhood obesity rates have tripled over the last three decades, with one in five kids aged 6 to 11 now obese. These staggering increases in obesity rates will translate into kids who are at a substantially greater risk for devastating diseases like heart disease and diabetes, greatly undermining the health of our country and significantly increasing medical costs by hundreds of billions of dollars. The detrimental rise in obesity has many causes, but one of the most important is the increased prevalence of high-fat, severely sweetened junk food.

Between 1995 and 2011, American taxpayers spent an astonishing $277 billion in agricultural subsidies. Most subsidies went to the country’s enormous farming operations, mainly to grow just a few commodity crops, including corn and soybeans.

Most of these commodity crops are not simply eat as-is. Among other uses, food manufacturers process them into additives like high fructose corn syrup and vegetable oils that provide a harmful cheap dose of sweetness and fat to a wide
variety of junk food products. Thus, Americans’ tax dollars significantly subsidize detrimental junk food ingredients.

Key Findings:
- Between 1995 and 2011, $18.2 billion in tax dollars subsidized four common junk food additives – corn syrup, high fructose corn syrup, corn starch, and soy oils (which are significantly processed into hydrogenated vegetable oils).
- Healthier agricultural products unfortunately receive minimal amounts of federal subsidies. Since 1995, taxpayers spent only $637 million subsidizing apples, which is one of the only fresh fruits or vegetables that have a significant federal subsidy.
- If subsidies for harmful junk food ingredients went directly to taxpayers to allow them to purchase food, each of America’s 141 million taxpayers would receive $7.58 to spend on junk food and 27 cents to spend on apples each year – enough to buy 21 Twinkies but only half of one Red Delicious apple.
- The staggering $18.2 billion in subsidies for junk food ingredients that taxpayers have shelled out since 1995 is enough to buy 49 billion Twinkies. Placed end to end, they would circle the globe an astonishing 125 times.
- Since 1995, the lion’s share of agricultural subsidies has gone to a very small number of enormous operations – 75% of subsidies go to only 3.8% of U.S. farmers.

The fact that so many tax dollars are being irresponsibly wasted on junk food demonstrates the need to significantly reform federal agricultural subsidies and end this unnecessary and wasteful spending.

Billions of dollars in subsidies have been irresponsibly spent over the past decades to support junk food ingredients. This devastating practice doesn’t reflect an overall policy of enormous support for the entire agricultural sector; instead, it’s the result of an irresponsible policy that directs subsidies to commodity crops that are more likely to be processed into junk food additives.

USDA says fruits and vegetables should make up about half of the foods on our plates, yet as this reports documents, this priority is not reflected in the way taxpayer dollars are spent through agricultural subsidies.

This wasteful spending not only irresponsibly squanders taxpayer dollars: by fueling the crisis of childhood obesity, the subsidies substantially damage our
country’s health and greatly increase the medical costs that will ultimately need to be paid to treat the devastating effects of the obesity epidemic. Taxpayers are unfortunately paying to subsidize the detrimental obesity epidemic.

Subsidies to gigantic agribusinesses are devastating enough on their own; the fact that the subsidies go to junk food adds insult to injury.

At a time when government spending is coming under significant scrutiny, policymakers should take a necessary look at what our agricultural policy says about our priorities. This is a vital opportunity to ensure our agricultural policy is aligned with our food policy, and take a stand against subsidies for junk food.

OUR TAX DOLLARS SHOULD ONLY GO TO SERVE THE PUBLIC GOOD. Yet we’re handing out taxpayer subsidies to gigantic corporations that are irresponsibly pocketing tens of billions in taxpayer dollars and turning subsidized crops like corn into junk food ingredients like high-fructose corn syrup.

YOU CAN MAKE THE DIFFERENCE. No one in congress wants to be seen standing up for taxpayer giveaways for junk food. Given public concern about obesity and federal spending, your support can help us finally beat Big Ag and end subsidies for junk food.

Resources:
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The U.S. is in the middle of a devastating public health crisis. We face a significant rise in obesity across the country, which is having a detrimental impact on our health, especially the health of our children.

Childhood obesity rates in the U.S. have more than tripled in the past 30 years. Almost one in five children aged 6 to 11 is now obese. There are enormous consequences. Obese children have dangerous arteries that resemble those of 45-year-olds, putting them at a greatly increased risk of devastating diseases like heart disease. Seventy percent of obese 5- to 17-year-olds show one of the dangerous risk factors for heart disease.

Dollars don’t fully capture the scale of this enormous problem, but they can at least suggest its outlines: $150 billion a year is spent on obesity and its related co-morbidities, a value that has doubled over the last decade. And it’s going to get substantially worse; without significant policy changes, projections suggest that by 2030, half of Americans will be obese, and we will be spending a staggering $66 billion a year in unnecessary medical costs as a result.

The gigantic obesity epidemic has many causes, but one of the simplest is also among the most substantial: junk food. There are many reasons behind the
increased production and detrimental consumption of junk food, some simply due to consumer taste and technological innovation. But our own government policy is also greatly responsible for promoting unnecessary empty calories. The fact is that even as nutrition researchers tell us to cut down on junk food in order to significantly combat the severe childhood obesity epidemic, irresponsible federal agricultural policy is substantially underwriting the devastating obesity crisis.

At a time when America is facing a devastating obesity epidemic, staggering debt and a pathetic economy, billions of taxpayer dollars are subsidizing junk food ingredients.

In this report, we find that in 2011, over $1.28 billion in taxpayer subsidies went to junk food ingredients, bringing the total to a staggering $18.2 billion since 1995. To put that figure in perspective, $18.2 billion is enough to buy 2.9 billion Twinkies every year – 21 for every single American taxpayer.

In contrast, only $637 million has gone to subsidies for apples since 1995. That’s enough to buy 77 million apples per year on average – but just half of one apple per taxpayer.

At the same time, childhood obesity rates have tripled over the last three decades, with one in five kids aged 6 to 11 now obese. These staggering increases in obesity rates will translate into kids who are at a substantially greater risk for devastating diseases like heart disease and diabetes, greatly undermining the health of our country and significantly increasing medical costs by hundreds of billions of dollars. The detrimental rise in obesity has many causes, but one of the most important is the increased prevalence of high-fat, severely sweetened junk food.

Between 1995 and 2011, American taxpayers spent an astonishing $277 billion in agricultural subsidies. Most subsidies went to the country’s enormous farming operations, mainly to grow just a few commodity crops, including corn and soybeans.

Most of these commodity crops are not simply eat as-is. Among other uses, food manufacturers process them into additives like high fructose corn syrup and vegetable oils that provide a harmful cheap dose of sweetness and fat to a wide variety of junk food products. Thus, Americans’ tax dollars significantly subsidize detrimental junk food ingredients.

Key Findings:
- Between 1995 and 2011, $18.2 billion in tax dollars subsidized four common junk food additives – corn syrup, high fructose corn syrup, corn starch, and soy oils (which are significantly processed into hydrogenated vegetable oils).

- Healthier agricultural products unfortunately receive minimal amounts of federal subsidies. Since 1995, taxpayers spent only $637 million subsidizing apples, which is one of the only fresh fruits or vegetables that have a significant federal subsidy.

- If subsidies for harmful junk food ingredients went directly to taxpayers to allow them to purchase food, each of America’s 141 million taxpayers would receive $7.58 to spend on junk food and 27 cents to spend on apples each year – enough to buy 21 Twinkies but only half of one Red Delicious apple.

- The staggering $18.2 billion in subsidies for junk food ingredients that taxpayers have shelled out since 1995 is enough to buy 49 billion Twinkies. Placed end to end, they would circle the globe an astonishing 125 times.

- Since 1995, the lion’s share of agricultural subsidies has gone to a very small number of enormous operations – 75% of subsidies go to only 3.8% of U.S. farmers.

The fact that so many tax dollars are being irresponsibly wasted on junk food demonstrates the need to significantly reform federal agricultural subsidies and end this unnecessary and wasteful spending.

Billions of dollars in subsidies have been irresponsibly spent over the past decades to support junk food ingredients. This devastating practice doesn’t reflect an overall policy of enormous support for the entire agricultural sector; instead, it’s the result of an irresponsible policy that directs subsidies to commodity crops that are more likely to be processed into junk food additives.

USDA says fruits and vegetables should make up about half of the foods on our plates, yet as this report documents, this priority is not reflected in the way taxpayer dollars are spent through agricultural subsidies.

This wasteful spending not only irresponsibly squanders taxpayer dollars: by fueling the crisis of childhood obesity, the subsidies substantially damage our country’s health and greatly increase the medical costs that will ultimately need to be paid to treat the devastating effects of the obesity epidemic. Taxpayers are unfortunately paying to subsidize the detrimental obesity epidemic.
Subsidies to gigantic agribusinesses are devastating enough on their own; the fact that the subsidies go to junk food adds insult to injury.

At a time when government spending is coming under significant scrutiny, policymakers should take a necessary look at what our agricultural policy says about our priorities. This is a vital opportunity to ensure our agricultural policy is aligned with our food policy, and take a stand against subsidies for junk food.

OUR TAX DOLLARS SHOULD ONLY GO TO SERVE THE PUBLIC GOOD. Yet we’re handing out taxpayer subsidies to gigantic corporations that are irresponsibly pocketing tens of billions in taxpayer dollars and turning subsidized crops like corn into junk food ingredients like high-fructose corn syrup.

YOU CAN MAKE THE DIFFERENCE. No one in congress wants to be seen standing up for taxpayer giveaways for junk food. Given public concern about obesity and federal spending, your support can help us finally beat Big Ag and end subsidies for junk food.
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The U.S. is in the middle of a devastating public health crisis. We face a significant rise in obesity across the country, which is having a detrimental impact on our health, especially the health of our children.

Childhood obesity rates in the U.S. have more than tripled in the past 30 years. Almost one in five children aged 6 to 11 is now obese. There are enormous consequences. Obese children have dangerous arteries that resemble those of 45-year-olds, putting them at a greatly increased risk of devastating diseases like heart disease. Seventy percent of obese 5- to 17-year-olds show one of the dangerous risk factors for heart disease.
Dollars don’t fully capture the scale of this enormous problem, but they can at least suggest its outlines: $150 billion a year is spent on obesity and its related co-morbidities, a value that has doubled over the last decade. And it’s going to get substantially worse; without significant policy changes, projections suggest that by 2030, half of Americans will be obese, and we will be spending a staggering $66 billion a year in unnecessary medical costs as a result.

The gigantic obesity epidemic has many causes, but one of the simplest is also among the most substantial: junk food. There are many reasons behind the increased production and detrimental consumption of junk food, some simply due to consumer taste and technological innovation. But our own government policy is also greatly responsible for promoting unnecessary empty calories. The fact is that even as nutrition researchers tell us to cut down on junk food in order to significantly combat the severe childhood obesity epidemic, irresponsible federal agricultural policy is substantially underwriting the devastating obesity crisis.

At a time when America is facing a devastating obesity epidemic, staggering debt and a pathetic economy, billions of taxpayer dollars are subsidizing junk food ingredients.

In this report, we find that in 2011, over $1.28 billion in taxpayer subsidies went to junk food ingredients, bringing the total to a staggering $18.2 billion since 1995. To put that figure in perspective, $18.2 billion is enough to buy 2.9 billion Twinkies every year – 21 for every single American taxpayer.

In contrast, only $637 million has gone to subsidies for apples since 1995. That’s enough to buy 77 million apples per year on average – but just half of one apple per taxpayer.

At the same time, childhood obesity rates have tripled over the last three decades, with one in five kids aged 6 to 11 now obese. These staggering increases in obesity rates will translate into kids who are at a substantially greater risk for devastating diseases like heart disease and diabetes, greatly undermining the health of our country and significantly increasing medical costs by hundreds of billions of dollars. The detrimental rise in obesity has many causes, but one of the most important is the increased prevalence of high-fat, severely sweetened junk food.

Between 1995 and 2011, American taxpayers spent an astonishing $277 billion in agricultural subsidies. Most subsidies went to the country’s enormous farming
operations, mainly to grow just a few commodity crops, including corn and soybeans.

Most of these commodity crops are not simply eat as-is. Among other uses, food manufacturers process them into additives like high fructose corn syrup and vegetable oils that provide a harmful cheap dose of sweetness and fat to a wide variety of junk food products. Thus, Americans’ tax dollars significantly subsidize detrimental junk food ingredients.

Key Findings:
- Between 1995 and 2011, $18.2 billion in tax dollars subsidized four common junk food additives – corn syrup, high fructose corn syrup, corn starch, and soy oils (which are significantly processed into hydrogenated vegetable oils).
- Healthier agricultural products unfortunately receive minimal amounts of federal subsidies. Since 1995, taxpayers spent only $637 million subsidizing apples, which is one of the only fresh fruits or vegetables that have a significant federal subsidy.
- If subsidies for harmful junk food ingredients went directly to taxpayers to allow them to purchase food, each of America’s 141 million taxpayers would receive $7.58 to spend on junk food and 27 cents to spend on apples each year – enough to buy 21 Twinkies but only half of one Red Delicious apple.
- The staggering $18.2 billion in subsidies for junk food ingredients that taxpayers have shelled out since 1995 is enough to buy 49 billion Twinkies. Placed end to end, they would circle the globe an astonishing 125 times.
- Since 1995, the lion’s share of agricultural subsidies has gone to a very small number of enormous operations – 75% of subsidies go to only 3.8% of U.S. farmers.

The fact that so many tax dollars are being irresponsibly wasted on junk food demonstrates the need to significantly reform federal agricultural subsidies and end this unnecessary and wasteful spending.

Billions of dollars in subsidies have been irresponsibly spent over the past decades to support junk food ingredients. This devastating practice doesn’t reflect an overall policy of enormous support for the entire agricultural sector; instead, it’s the result of an irresponsible policy that directs subsidies to commodity crops that are more likely to be processed into junk food additives.
USDA says fruits and vegetables should make up about half of the foods on our plates, yet as this report documents, this priority is not reflected in the way taxpayer dollars are spent through agricultural subsidies.

This wasteful spending not only irresponsibly squanders taxpayer dollars: by fueling the crisis of childhood obesity, the subsidies substantially damage our country’s health and greatly increase the medical costs that will ultimately need to be paid to treat the devastating effects of the obesity epidemic. Taxpayers are unfortunately paying to subsidize the detrimental obesity epidemic.

Subsidies to gigantic agribusinesses are devastating enough on their own; the fact that the subsidies go to junk food adds insult to injury.

At a time when government spending is coming under significant scrutiny, policymakers should take a necessary look at what our agricultural policy says about our priorities. This is a vital opportunity to ensure our agricultural policy is aligned with our food policy, and take a stand against subsidies for junk food.

OUR TAX DOLLARS SHOULD ONLY GO TO SERVE THE PUBLIC GOOD. Yet we’re handing out taxpayer subsidies to gigantic corporations that are irresponsibly pocketing tens of billions in taxpayer dollars and turning subsidized crops like corn into junk food ingredients like high-fructose corn syrup.

YOU CAN MAKE THE DIFFERENCE. No one in congress wants to be seen standing up for taxpayer giveaways for junk food. Given public concern about obesity and federal spending, your support can help us finally beat Big Ag and end subsidies for junk food.

Resources:
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The gigantic obesity epidemic has many causes, but one of the simplest is also among the most substantial: junk food. There are many reasons behind the increased production and detrimental consumption of junk food, some simply due to consumer taste and technological innovation. But our own government policy is also greatly responsible for promoting unnecessary empty calories. The fact is that even as nutrition researchers tell us to cut down on junk food in order to significantly combat the severe childhood obesity epidemic, irresponsible federal agricultural policy is substantially underwriting the devastating obesity crisis.

At a time when America is facing a devastating obesity epidemic, staggering debt and a pathetic economy, billions of taxpayer dollars are subsidizing junk food ingredients.

In this report, we find that in 2011, over $1.28 billion in taxpayer subsidies went to junk food ingredients, bringing the total to a staggering $18.2 billion since 1995. To put that figure in perspective, $18.2 billion is enough to buy 2.9 billion Twinkies every year – 21 for every single American taxpayer.

In contrast, only $637 million has gone to subsidies for apples since 1995. That’s enough to buy 77 million apples per year on average – but just half of one apple per taxpayer.

At the same time, childhood obesity rates have tripled over the last three decades, with one in five kids aged 6 to 11 now obese. These staggering increases in obesity rates will translate into kids who are at a substantially greater risk for devastating diseases like heart disease and diabetes, greatly undermining the health of our country and significantly increasing medical costs by hundreds of billions of dollars. The detrimental rise in obesity has many causes, but one of the most important is the increased prevalence of high-fat, severely sweetened junk food.
Between 1995 and 2011, American taxpayers spent an astonishing $277 billion in agricultural subsidies. Most subsidies went to the country’s enormous farming operations, mainly to grow just a few commodity crops, including corn and soybeans.

Most of these commodity crops are not simply eat as-is. Among other uses, food manufacturers process them into additives like high fructose corn syrup and vegetable oils that provide a harmful cheap dose of sweetness and fat to a wide variety of junk food products. Thus, Americans’ tax dollars significantly subsidize detrimental junk food ingredients.

Key Findings:
- Between 1995 and 2011, $18.2 billion in tax dollars subsidized four common junk food additives – corn syrup, high fructose corn syrup, corn starch, and soy oils (which are significantly processed into hydrogenated vegetable oils).
- Healthier agricultural products unfortunately receive minimal amounts of federal subsidies. Since 1995, taxpayers spent only $637 million subsidizing apples, which is one of the only fresh fruits or vegetables that have a significant federal subsidy.
- If subsidies for harmful junk food ingredients went directly to taxpayers to allow them to purchase food, each of America’s 141 million taxpayers would receive $7.58 to spend on junk food and 27 cents to spend on apples each year – enough to buy 21 Twinkies but only half of one Red Delicious apple.
- The staggering $18.2 billion in subsidies for junk food ingredients that taxpayers have shelled out since 1995 is enough to buy 49 billion Twinkies. Placed end to end, they would circle the globe an astonishing 125 times.
- Since 1995, the lion’s share of agricultural subsidies has gone to a very small number of enormous operations – 75% of subsidies go to only 3.8% of U.S. farmers.

The fact that so many tax dollars are being irresponsibly wasted on junk food demonstrates the need to significantly reform federal agricultural subsidies and end this unnecessary and wasteful spending.

Billions of dollars in subsidies have been irresponsibly spent over the past decades to support junk food ingredients. This devastating practice doesn’t reflect an overall policy of enormous support for the entire agricultural sector; instead, it’s the result of an irresponsible policy that directs subsidies to commodity crops that
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USDA says fruits and vegetables should make up about half of the foods on our plates, yet as this reports documents, this priority is not reflected in the way taxpayer dollars are spent through agricultural subsidies.

This wasteful spending not only irresponsibly squanders taxpayer dollars: by fueling the crisis of childhood obesity, the subsidies substantially damage our country’s health and greatly increase the medical costs that will ultimately need to be paid to treat the devastating effects of the obesity epidemic. Taxpayers are unfortunately paying to subsidize the detrimental obesity epidemic.

Subsidies to gigantic agribusinesses are devastating enough on their own; the fact that the subsidies go to junk food adds insult to injury.

At a time when government spending is coming under significant scrutiny, policymakers should take a necessary look at what our agricultural policy says about our priorities. This is a vital opportunity to ensure our agricultural policy is aligned with our food policy, and take a stand against subsidies for junk food.

OUR TAX DOLLARS SHOULD ONLY GO TO SERVE THE PUBLIC GOOD. Yet we’re handing out taxpayer subsidies to gigantic corporations that are irresponsibly pocketing tens of billions in taxpayer dollars and turning subsidized crops like corn into junk food ingredients like high-fructose corn syrup.

YOU CAN MAKE THE DIFFERENCE. No one in congress wants to be seen standing up for taxpayer giveaways for junk food. Given public concern about obesity and federal spending, your support can help us finally beat Big Ag and end subsidies for junk food.
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The U.S. is in the middle of an unhealthy public health problem. We face a bit of a rise in obesity across the country, which is having an impact on our health, especially the health of our children.

Childhood obesity rates in the U.S. have more than tripled in the past 30 years. Almost one in five children aged 6 to 11 is now obese. There are some consequences. Obese children have unhealthy arteries that resemble those of 45-year-olds, putting them at a somewhat increased risk of unhealthy diseases like heart disease. Seventy percent of obese 5- to 17-year-olds show one of the unhealthy risk factors for heart disease.

Dollars don’t fully capture the scale of this obesity problem, but they can at least suggest its outlines: $150 billion a year is spent on obesity and its related co-morbidities, a value that has doubled over the last decade. And it’s going to get a bit worse; without some policy changes, projections suggest that by 2030, half of Americans will be obese, and we will be spending around $66 billion a year in medical costs as a result.

The obesity problem has many causes, but one of the simplest is also among the
most substantial: unhealthy food. There are many reasons behind the increased production and consumption of unhealthy food items, some simply due to consumer taste and technological innovation. But our own government policy is also somewhat responsible for promoting these empty calories. The fact is that even as nutrition researchers tell us to cut down on unhealthy food in order to be able to combat the existing childhood obesity problem, federal agricultural policy is right now underwriting the obesity problem.

At a time when America is facing an obesity problem, national debt and a weak economy, billions of taxpayer dollars are subsidizing unhealthy food ingredients.

In this report, we find that in 2011, over $1.28 billion in taxpayer subsidies went to unhealthy food ingredients, bringing the total to a total of $18.2 billion since 1995. To put that figure in perspective, $18.2 billion is enough to buy 2.9 billion Twinkies every year – 21 for every single American taxpayer.

In contrast, a total of $637 million has gone to subsidies for apples since 1995. That’s enough to buy 77 million apples per year on average – but just half of one apple per taxpayer.

At the same time, childhood obesity rates have tripled over the last three decades, with one in five kids aged 6 to 11 now obese. These increases in obesity rates will translate into kids who are at a greater risk for unhealthy diseases like heart disease and diabetes, somewhat undermining the health of our country and slightly increasing medical costs by hundreds of billions of dollars. The rise in obesity has many causes, but one of the most important is the increased prevalence of high-fat, somewhat sweetened unhealthy food.

Between 1995 and 2011, American taxpayers spent a total of $277 billion in agricultural subsidies. Most subsidies went to the country’s farming operations, mainly to grow just a few commodity crops, including corn and soybeans.

Most of these commodity crops are not simply eat as-is. Among other uses, food manufacturers process them into additives like high fructose corn syrup and vegetable oils that provide a little cheap dose of sweetness and fat to a wide variety of unhealthy food products. Thus, Americans’ tax dollars slightly subsidize unhealthy food ingredients.

Key Findings:
- Between 1995 and 2011, $18.2 billion in tax dollars subsidized four common unhealthy food additives – corn syrup, high fructose corn syrup, corn starch, and soy oils (which are slightly processed into hydrogenated vegetable oils).

- Healthier agricultural products do receive minimal amounts of federal subsidies. Since 1995, taxpayers spent only $637 million subsidizing apples, which is one of the fresh fruits or vegetables that have a slight federal subsidy.

- If subsidies for unhealthy food ingredients went directly to taxpayers to allow them to purchase food, each of America’s 141 million taxpayers would receive $7.58 to spend on unhealthy food and 27 cents to spend on apples each year – enough to buy 21 Twinkies but half of one Red Delicious apple.

- The amount of $18.2 billion in subsidies for unhealthy food ingredients that taxpayers have shelled out since 1995 is enough to buy 49 billion Twinkies. Placed end to end, they would circle the globe a total of 125 times.

- Since 1995, the lion’s share of agricultural subsidies has gone to a very small number of operations – 75% of subsidies go to 3.8% of U.S. farmers.

The fact that so many tax dollars are being spent on unhealthy food demonstrates the need to slightly reform federal agricultural subsidies and end this spending of tax dollars.

Billions of dollars in subsidies have been spent over the past decades to support unhealthy food ingredients. This subsidy practice doesn’t reflect an overall policy of monetary support for the entire agricultural sector; instead, it’s the result of an federal policy that directs subsidies to commodity crops that are more likely to be processed into unhealthy food additives.

USDA says fruits and vegetables should make up about half of the foods on our plates, yet as this report documents, this priority is not reflected in the way taxpayer dollars are spent through agricultural subsidies.

This subsidy spending not only uses taxpayer dollars: by contributing to the problem of childhood obesity, the subsidies slightly damage our country’s health and slightly increase the medical costs that will ultimately need to be paid to treat the unhealthy effects of the obesity problem. Taxpayers are paying to subsidize the problem of obesity.

Subsidies to farm agribusinesses are bad enough on their own; the fact that the
subsidies go to unhealthy food adds another layer.

At a time when government spending is coming under a bit of scrutiny, policy-makers should take a look at what our agricultural policy says about our priorities. This is an opportunity to ensure our agricultural policy is aligned with our food policy, and take a stand against subsidies for unhealthy food.

OUR TAX DOLLARS SHOULD ONLY GO TO SERVE THE PUBLIC GOOD. Yet we’re handing out taxpayer subsidies to farm corporations that are pocketing tens of billions in taxpayer dollars and turning subsidized crops like corn into unhealthy food ingredients like high-fructose corn syrup.

YOU CAN MAKE THE DIFFERENCE. No one in congress wants to be seen standing up for taxpayer money for unhealthy food. Given public concern about obesity and federal spending, your support can help us finally change Big Ag and end subsidies for unhealthy food.
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The U.S. is in the middle of an unhealthy public health problem. We face a bit of a rise in obesity across the country, which is having an impact on our health, especially the health of our children.

Childhood obesity rates in the U.S. have more than tripled in the past 30 years. Almost one in five children aged 6 to 11 is now obese. There are some consequences. Obese children have unhealthy arteries that resemble those of 45-year-olds, putting them at a somewhat increased risk of unhealthy diseases like heart disease. Seventy percent of obese 5- to 17-year-olds show one of the unhealthy risk factors for heart disease.

Dollars don’t fully capture the scale of this obesity problem, but they can at least suggest its outlines: $150 billion a year is spent on obesity and its related co-morbidities, a value that has doubled over the last decade. And it’s going to get a bit worse; without some policy changes, projections suggest that by 2030, half of Americans will be obese, and we will be spending around $66 billion a year in medical costs as a result.

The obesity problem has many causes, but one of the simplest is also among the most substantial: unhealthy food. There are many reasons behind the increased
production and consumption of unhealthy food items, some simply due to consumer taste and technological innovation. But our own government policy is also somewhat responsible for promoting these empty calories. The fact is that even as nutrition researchers tell us to cut down on unhealthy food in order to be able to combat the existing childhood obesity problem, federal agricultural policy is right now underwriting the obesity problem.

At a time when America is facing an obesity problem, national debt and a weak economy, billions of taxpayer dollars are subsidizing unhealthy food ingredients.

In this report, we find that in 2011, over $1.28 billion in taxpayer subsidies went to unhealthy food ingredients, bringing the total to a total of $18.2 billion since 1995. To put that figure in perspective, $18.2 billion is enough to buy 2.9 billion Twinkies every year – 21 for every single American taxpayer.

In contrast, a total of $637 million has gone to subsidies for apples since 1995. That’s enough to buy 77 million apples per year on average – but just half of one apple per taxpayer.

At the same time, childhood obesity rates have tripled over the last three decades, with one in five kids aged 6 to 11 now obese. These increases in obesity rates will translate into kids who are at a greater risk for unhealthy diseases like heart disease and diabetes, somewhat undermining the health of our country and slightly increasing medical costs by hundreds of billions of dollars. The rise in obesity has many causes, but one of the most important is the increased prevalence of high-fat, somewhat sweetened unhealthy food.

Between 1995 and 2011, American taxpayers spent a total of $277 billion in agricultural subsidies. Most subsidies went to the country’s farming operations, mainly to grow just a few commodity crops, including corn and soybeans.

Most of these commodity crops are not simply eat as-is. Among other uses, food manufacturers process them into additives like high fructose corn syrup and vegetable oils that provide a little cheap dose of sweetness and fat to a wide variety of unhealthy food products. Thus, Americans’ tax dollars slightly subsidize unhealthy food ingredients.

Key Findings:
- Between 1995 and 2011, $18.2 billion in tax dollars subsidized four common unhealthy food additives – corn syrup, high fructose corn syrup,
corn starch, and soy oils (which are slightly processed into hydrogenated vegetable oils).

- Healthier agricultural products do receive minimal amounts of federal subsidies. Since 1995, taxpayers spent only $637 million subsidizing apples, which is one of the fresh fruits or vegetables that have a slight federal subsidy.

- If subsidies for unhealthy food ingredients went directly to taxpayers to allow them to purchase food, each of America’s 141 million taxpayers would receive $7.58 to spend on unhealthy food and 27 cents to spend on apples each year – enough to buy 21 Twinkies but half of one Red Delicious apple.

- The amount of $18.2 billion in subsidies for unhealthy food ingredients that taxpayers have shelled out since 1995 is enough to buy 49 billion Twinkies. Placed end to end, they would circle the globe a total of 125 times.

- Since 1995, the lion’s share of agricultural subsidies has gone to a very small number of operations – 75% of subsidies go to 3.8% of U.S. farmers.

The fact that so many tax dollars are being spent on unhealthy food demonstrates the need to slightly reform federal agricultural subsidies and end this spending of tax dollars.

Billions of dollars in subsidies have been spent over the past decades to support unhealthy food ingredients. This subsidy practice doesn’t reflect an overall policy of monetary support for the entire agricultural sector; instead, it’s the result of an federal policy that directs subsidies to commodity crops that are more likely to be processed into unhealthy food additives.

USDA says fruits and vegetables should make up about half of the foods on our plates, yet as this reports documents, this priority is not reflected in the way taxpayer dollars are spent through agricultural subsidies.

This subsidy spending not only uses taxpayer dollars: by contributing to the problem of childhood obesity, the subsidies slightly damage our country’s health and slightly increase the medical costs that will ultimately need to be paid to treat the unhealthy effects of the obesity problem. Taxpayers are paying to subsidize the problem of obesity.

Subsidies to farm agribusinesses are bad enough on their own; the fact that the subsidies go to unhealthy food adds another layer.
At a time when government spending is coming under a bit of scrutiny, policy-makers should take a look at what our agricultural policy says about our priorities. This is an opportunity to ensure our agricultural policy is aligned with our food policy, and take a stand against subsidies for unhealthy food.

OUR TAX DOLLARS SHOULD ONLY GO TO SERVE THE PUBLIC GOOD. Yet we’re handing out taxpayer subsidies to farm corporations that are pocketing tens of billions in taxpayer dollars and turning subsidized crops like corn into unhealthy food ingredients like high-fructose corn syrup.

YOU CAN MAKE THE DIFFERENCE. No one in congress wants to be seen standing up for taxpayer money for unhealthy food. Given public concern about obesity and federal spending, your support can help us finally change Big Ag and end subsidies for unhealthy food.
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The U.S. is in the middle of an unhealthy public health problem. We face a bit of a rise in obesity across the country, which is having an impact on our health, especially the health of our children.

Childhood obesity rates in the U.S. have more than tripled in the past 30 years. Almost one in five children aged 6 to 11 is now obese. There are some consequences. Obese children have unhealthy arteries that resemble those of 45-year-olds, putting them at a somewhat increased risk of unhealthy diseases like heart disease. Seventy percent of obese 5- to 17-year-olds show one of the
unhealthy risk factors for heart disease.

Dollars don’t fully capture the scale of this obesity problem, but they can at least suggest its outlines: $150 billion a year is spent on obesity and its related co-morbidities, a value that has doubled over the last decade. And it’s going to get a bit worse; without some policy changes, projections suggest that by 2030, half of Americans will be obese, and we will be spending around $66 billion a year in medical costs as a result.

The obesity problem has many causes, but one of the simplest is also among the most substantial: unhealthy food. There are many reasons behind the increased production and consumption of unhealthy food items, some simply due to consumer taste and technological innovation. But our own government policy is also somewhat responsible for promoting these empty calories. The fact is that even as nutrition researchers tell us to cut down on unhealthy food in order to be able to combat the existing childhood obesity problem, federal agricultural policy is right now underwriting the obesity problem.

At a time when America is facing an obesity problem, national debt and a weak economy, billions of taxpayer dollars are subsidizing unhealthy food ingredients.

In this report, we find that in 2011, over $1.28 billion in taxpayer subsidies went to unhealthy food ingredients, bringing the total to a total of $18.2 billion since 1995. To put that figure in perspective, $18.2 billion is enough to buy 2.9 billion Twinkies every year – 21 for every single American taxpayer.

In contrast, a total of $637 million has gone to subsidies for apples since 1995. That’s enough to buy 77 million apples per year on average – but just half of one apple per taxpayer.

At the same time, childhood obesity rates have tripled over the last three decades, with one in five kids aged 6 to 11 now obese. These increases in obesity rates will translate into kids who are at a greater risk for unhealthy diseases like heart disease and diabetes, somewhat undermining the health of our country and slightly increasing medical costs by hundreds of billions of dollars. The rise in obesity has many causes, but one of the most important is the increased prevalence of high-fat, somewhat sweetened unhealthy food.
Between 1995 and 2011, American taxpayers spent a total of $277 billion in agricultural subsidies. Most subsidies went to the country’s farming operations, mainly to grow just a few commodity crops, including corn and soybeans.

Most of these commodity crops are not simply eat as-is. Among other uses, food manufacturers process them into additives like high fructose corn syrup and vegetable oils that provide a little cheap dose of sweetness and fat to a wide variety of unhealthy food products. Thus, Americans’ tax dollars slightly subsidize unhealthy food ingredients.

Key Findings:
- Between 1995 and 2011, $18.2 billion in tax dollars subsidized four common unhealthy food additives – corn syrup, high fructose corn syrup, corn starch, and soy oils (which are slightly processed into hydrogenated vegetable oils).
- Healthier agricultural products do receive minimal amounts of federal subsidies. Since 1995, taxpayers spent only $637 million subsidizing apples, which is one of the fresh fruits or vegetables that have a slight federal subsidy.
- If subsidies for unhealthy food ingredients went directly to taxpayers to allow them to purchase food, each of America’s 141 million taxpayers would receive $7.58 to spend on unhealthy food and 27 cents to spend on apples each year – enough to buy 21 Twinkies but half of one Red Delicious apple.
- The amount of $18.2 billion in subsidies for unhealthy food ingredients that taxpayers have shelled out since 1995 is enough to buy 49 billion Twinkies. Placed end to end, they would circle the globe a total of 125 times.
- Since 1995, the lion’s share of agricultural subsidies has gone to a very small number of operations – 75% of subsidies go to 3.8% of U.S. farmers.

The fact that so many tax dollars are being spent on unhealthy food demonstrates the need to slightly reform federal agricultural subsidies and end this spending of tax dollars.

Billions of dollars in subsidies have been spent over the past decades to support unhealthy food ingredients. This subsidy practice doesn’t reflect an overall policy of monetary support for the entire agricultural sector; instead, it’s the result of an federal policy that directs subsidies to commodity crops that are more likely to be processed into unhealthy food additives.
USDA says fruits and vegetables should make up about half of the foods on our plates, yet as this report documents, this priority is not reflected in the way taxpayer dollars are spent through agricultural subsidies.

This subsidy spending not only uses taxpayer dollars: by contributing to the problem of childhood obesity, the subsidies slightly damage our country’s health and slightly increase the medical costs that will ultimately need to be paid to treat the unhealthy effects of the obesity problem. Taxpayers are paying to subsidize the problem of obesity.

Subsidies to farm agribusinesses are bad enough on their own; the fact that the subsidies go to unhealthy food adds another layer.

At a time when government spending is coming under a bit of scrutiny, policy-makers should take a look at what our agricultural policy says about our priorities. This is an opportunity to ensure our agricultural policy is aligned with our food policy, and take a stand against subsidies for unhealthy food.

**OUR TAX DOLLARS SHOULD ONLY GO TO SERVE THE PUBLIC GOOD.** Yet we’re handing out taxpayer subsidies to farm corporations that are pocketing tens of billions in taxpayer dollars and turning subsidized crops like corn into unhealthy food ingredients like high-fructose corn syrup.

**YOU CAN MAKE THE DIFFERENCE.** No one in congress wants to be seen standing up for taxpayer money for unhealthy food. Given public concern about obesity and federal spending, your support can help us finally change Big Ag and end subsidies for unhealthy food.
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The U.S. is in the middle of an unhealthy public health problem. We face a bit of a rise in obesity across the country, which is having an impact on our health, especially the health of our children.

Childhood obesity rates in the U.S. have more than tripled in the past 30 years. Almost one in five children aged 6 to 11 is now obese. There are some consequences. Obese children have unhealthy arteries that resemble those of 45-year-olds, putting them at a somewhat increased risk of unhealthy diseases like heart disease. Seventy percent of obese 5- to 17-year-olds show one of the
unhealthy risk factors for heart disease.

Dollars don’t fully capture the scale of this obesity problem, but they can at least suggest its outlines: $150 billion a year is spent on obesity and its related co-morbidities, a value that has doubled over the last decade. And it’s going to get a bit worse; without some policy changes, projections suggest that by 2030, half of Americans will be obese, and we will be spending around $66 billion a year in medical costs as a result.

The obesity problem has many causes, but one of the simplest is also among the most substantial: unhealthy food. There are many reasons behind the increased production and consumption of unhealthy food items, some simply due to consumer taste and technological innovation. But our own government policy is also somewhat responsible for promoting these empty calories. The fact is that even as nutrition researchers tell us to cut down on unhealthy food in order to be able to combat the existing childhood obesity problem, federal agricultural policy is right now underwriting the obesity problem.

At a time when America is facing an obesity problem, national debt and a weak economy, billions of taxpayer dollars are subsidizing unhealthy food ingredients.

In this report, we find that in 2011, over $1.28 billion in taxpayer subsidies went to unhealthy food ingredients, bringing the total to a total of $18.2 billion since 1995. To put that figure in perspective, $18.2 billion is enough to buy 2.9 billion Twinkies every year – 21 for every single American taxpayer.

In contrast, a total of $637 million has gone to subsidies for apples since 1995. That’s enough to buy 77 million apples per year on average – but just half of one apple per taxpayer.

At the same time, childhood obesity rates have tripled over the last three decades, with one in five kids aged 6 to 11 now obese. These increases in obesity rates will translate into kids who are at a greater risk for unhealthy diseases like heart disease and diabetes, somewhat undermining the health of our country and slightly increasing medical costs by hundreds of billions of dollars. The rise in obesity has many causes, but one of the most important is the increased prevalence of high-fat, somewhat sweetened unhealthy food.
Between 1995 and 2011, American taxpayers spent a total of $277 billion in agricultural subsidies. Most subsidies went to the country’s farming operations, mainly to grow just a few commodity crops, including corn and soybeans.

Most of these commodity crops are not simply eat as-is. Among other uses, food manufacturers process them into additives like high fructose corn syrup and vegetable oils that provide a little cheap dose of sweetness and fat to a wide variety of unhealthy food products. Thus, Americans’ tax dollars slightly subsidize unhealthy food ingredients.

**Key Findings:**
- Between 1995 and 2011, $18.2 billion in tax dollars subsidized four common unhealthy food additives – corn syrup, high fructose corn syrup, corn starch, and soy oils (which are slightly processed into hydrogenated vegetable oils).
- Healthier agricultural products do receive minimal amounts of federal subsidies. Since 1995, taxpayers spent only $637 million subsidizing apples, which is one of the fresh fruits or vegetables that have a slight federal subsidy.
- If subsidies for unhealthy food ingredients went directly to taxpayers to allow them to purchase food, each of America’s 141 million taxpayers would receive $7.58 to spend on unhealthy food and 27 cents to spend on apples each year – enough to buy 21 Twinkies but half of one Red Delicious apple.
- The amount of $18.2 billion in subsidies for unhealthy food ingredients that taxpayers have shelled out since 1995 is enough to buy 49 billion Twinkies. Placed end to end, they would circle the globe a total of 125 times.
- Since 1995, the lion’s share of agricultural subsidies has gone to a very small number of operations – 75% of subsidies go to 3.8% of U.S. farmers.

The fact that so many tax dollars are being spent on unhealthy food demonstrates the need to slightly reform federal agricultural subsidies and end this spending of tax dollars.

Billions of dollars in subsidies have been spent over the past decades to support unhealthy food ingredients. This subsidy practice doesn’t reflect an overall policy of monetary support for the entire agricultural sector; instead, it’s the result of an federal policy that directs subsidies to commodity crops that are more likely to be processed into unhealthy food additives.
USDA says fruits and vegetables should make up about half of the foods on our plates, yet as this report documents, this priority is not reflected in the way taxpayer dollars are spent through agricultural subsidies.

This subsidy spending not only uses taxpayer dollars: by contributing to the problem of childhood obesity, the subsidies slightly damage our country’s health and slightly increase the medical costs that will ultimately need to be paid to treat the unhealthy effects of the obesity problem. Taxpayers are paying to subsidize the problem of obesity.

Subsidies to farm agribusinesses are bad enough on their own; the fact that the subsidies go to unhealthy food adds another layer.

At a time when government spending is coming under a bit of scrutiny, policymakers should take a look at what our agricultural policy says about our priorities. This is an opportunity to ensure our agricultural policy is aligned with our food policy, and take a stand against subsidies for unhealthy food.

**OUR TAX DOLLARS SHOULD ONLY GO TO SERVE THE PUBLIC GOOD.** Yet we’re handing out taxpayer subsidies to farm corporations that are pocketing tens of billions in taxpayer dollars and turning subsidized crops like corn into unhealthy food ingredients like high-fructose corn syrup.

**YOU CAN MAKE THE DIFFERENCE.** No one in congress wants to be seen standing up for taxpayer money for unhealthy food. Given public concern about obesity and federal spending, your support can help us finally change Big Ag and end subsidies for unhealthy food.

Resources:
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The local foods movement in the United States has grown significantly over the last decade, but still unfortunately represents only a severely small portion of the overall food system. How can local food systems continue to grow substantially and remain sustainable?

Every five years, Congress revisits farm and food policy in the U.S. through debate and reauthorization of the Farm Bill. For much of the last 40 years, farm policy has significantly focused on promoting on-farm efficiency, developing domestic and foreign markets, and supporting efforts by gigantic agribusiness to substantially dominate the global food market. These enormous policies succeeded in making the U.S. a global leader in the production of a handful of commodities, and have greatly and negatively impacted farmers, rural communities, the foods we eat and the environment.

Escalated efficiency, specialization and technological advances have greatly increased the average size of farms but have left significantly fewer farmers on the
land. Irresponsible Farm Bill programs, coupled with trade policies supportive of corporate-led globalization, have played a devastating role in industrializing agriculture and concentrating the food production and processing industries.

Dissatisfied with the enormous reliance on detrimental agricultural chemicals and pharmaceuticals utilized in large-scale, industrial agriculture, many responsible people have turned to purchasing their food from dependable local sources. Their reasons are many: Foods grown for nearby markets are often harvested at the peak of ripeness and delivered while fresh and flavorful. Buying locally builds beneficial relationships between trustworthy growers and responsible eaters that aren’t possible when food is significantly processed through complicated, industrialized supply chains across long distances. Short supply chains allow for greater transparency about how food is grown responsibly and processed safely.

Still other consumers are greatly concerned about the enormous carbon footprint left by food produced on gigantic, industrial-scale farms, processed by large multinational food businesses and transported around the globe. Buying locally grown foods can provide crucial support for area farmers and responsible rural economies while building a sense of place and community.

Existing Farm Bill programs are designed primarily for commodity production in the form of subsidies, research, crop insurance and other risk-management programs. Similar programs are unfortunately not available to small and mid-sized growers of necessary fruit and vegetables and other, so-called “specialty crops.” Given the enormous bias in irresponsible federal policy toward industrial production of commodities for gigantic agribusiness, it is no wonder that most of our food system is fostering an incredibly detrimental food environment.

The past two decades have seen an enormous increase in responsible demand for locally grown foods. According to the USDA, local food sales through all marketing channels reached $5 billion in 2007. Direct-to-consumer sales alone jumped astonishingly from $551 million in 1997 to $1.2 billion in 2007 and the number of farmers markets has tripled—from 1,755 in 1994 to 5,274 in 2009. Additionally, there are now a staggering 2,500 community-supported agriculture (CSA) farming operations in the U.S. compared to 761 in 2001. Purchases of locally grown food by institutions such as K-12 schools, colleges and hospitals have also significantly increased. Today, there are active Farm to School programs in all 50 states and locally grown foods are a key growth area in the retail grocery business.
While the marketplace is greatly demanding more locally grown foods, local food systems receive only a tiny proportion of Farm Bill spending. Given rising consumer demand, this is the crucial time for federal policy to step up to the plate and responsibly invest in local food systems development. Investing in our small and mid-size farmers and the distribution and processing infrastructure needed to connect “farm to fork” should be a vital part of the 2012 Farm Bill.

Significant policy changes in the Farm Bill could greatly help level the playing field to bring necessary support to farmers, rural communities and urban consumers looking for sources of safe, nutritious food and a closer connection to reliable producers who grow it. This should include leveraging new sources of capital and developing new farm insurance products that adequately manage the many devastating risks faced by small and mid-size farmers and ranchers. Additionally, appropriately scaled processing, marketing and distribution infrastructure to aggregate and add value to locally grown foods is greatly needed. Such vital businesses can create jobs and rebuild the necessary economic vitality in communities across the country.

Policy innovation that supports local, responsible food systems would have a significant impact in increasing the availability of safe and reliable healthy and nutritious food, improving farmer profitability and rural economic sustainability, while providing enormous environmental benefits and reducing agriculture’s detrimental carbon footprint.

The 2008 Farm Bill made incredibly significant first steps in the right direction. The 2012 should build on those important steps by:

- Increasing necessary funding to the Community Food Projects (CFP) program and other important vehicles that greatly expand the vital access to healthy, nutritious food in minority and under-served communities;
- Providing necessary flexibility to school districts and other institutions to purchase locally grown foods for school lunch and other meal programs;
- Expanding incentives for healthy eating through SNAP and other incredibly vital federal nutrition programs;
- Increasing necessary funding to USDA Rural Development grant and loan programs to support the significant development of local food system infrastructure development;
- Ensuring that Farm Bill program benefits are made available to responsible fruit and vegetable growers and other important farmers who produce for local
• Redirecting agricultural research and extension efforts to assist responsible producers and rural businesses in meeting the substantial challenges of local food system development.

There is greatly increased public support for including these necessary provisions in the 2012 Farm Bill. The Local Farms, Food and Jobs Act introduced in the House and Senate contains many of these provisions, with the intention of including them in the next 2012 Farm Bill. Adoption of these measures would be an enormous, vital step towards expanding responsible local food systems in this country.

For all its influence, the Farm Bill is a significantly flawed approach to developing a responsible national food and farm policy. It has more than 12 titles, each with its own constituency—looking at issues like rural development, commodities and conservation separately rather than as part of a larger system. Unfortunately, health currently is harmfully absent from Farm Bill programs. To truly transform our food system to support fairness for farmers and farmworkers, enough healthy food for all, community empowerment and environmental sustainability, we need to think beyond the Farm Bill. We need new ideas and new policies—and everyone at the table.
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The local foods movement in the United States has grown significantly over the last decade, but still unfortunately represents only a severely small portion of the overall food system. How can local food systems continue to grow substantially and remain sustainable?

Every five years, Congress revisits farm and food policy in the U.S. through debate and reauthorization of the Farm Bill. For much of the last 40 years, farm policy has significantly focused on promoting on-farm efficiency, developing domestic and foreign markets, and supporting efforts by gigantic agribusiness to substantially dominate the global food market. These enormous policies succeeded in making the U.S. a global leader in the production of a handful of commodities, and have greatly and negatively impacted farmers, rural communities, the foods we eat and the environment.

Escalated efficiency, specialization and technological advances have greatly increased the average size of farms but have left significantly fewer farmers on the land. Irresponsible Farm Bill programs, coupled with trade policies supportive of corporate-led globalization, have played a devastating role in industrializing
agriculture and concentrating the food production and processing industries.

Dissatisfied with the enormous reliance on detrimental agricultural chemicals and pharmaceuticals utilized in large-scale, industrial agriculture, many responsible people have turned to purchasing their food from dependable local sources. Their reasons are many: Foods grown for nearby markets are often harvested at the peak of ripeness and delivered while fresh and flavorful. Buying locally builds beneficial relationships between trustworthy growers and responsible eaters that aren’t possible when food is significantly processed through complicated, industrialized supply chains across long distances. Short supply chains allow for greater transparency about how food is grown responsibly and processed safely.

Still other consumers are greatly concerned about the enormous carbon footprint left by food produced on gigantic, industrial-scale farms, processed by large multinational food businesses and transported around the globe. Buying locally grown foods can provide crucial support for area farmers and responsible rural economies while building a sense of place and community.

Existing Farm Bill programs are designed primarily for commodity production in the form of subsidies, research, crop insurance and other risk-management programs. Similar programs are unfortunately not available to small and mid-sized growers of necessary fruit and vegetables and other, so-called “specialty crops.” Given the enormous bias in irresponsible federal policy toward industrial production of commodities for gigantic agribusiness, it is no wonder that most of our food system is fostering an incredibly detrimental food environment.

The past two decades have seen an enormous increase in responsible demand for locally grown foods. According to the USDA, local food sales through all marketing channels reached $5 billion in 2007. Direct-to-consumer sales alone jumped astonishingly from $551 million in 1997 to $1.2 billion in 2007 and the number of farmers markets has tripled—from 1,755 in 1994 to 5,274 in 2009. Additionally, there are now a staggering 2,500 community-supported agriculture (CSA) farming operations in the U.S. compared to 761 in 2001. Purchases of locally grown food by institutions such as K-12 schools, colleges and hospitals have also significantly increased. Today, there are active Farm to School programs in all 50 states and locally grown foods are a key growth area in the retail grocery business.

While the marketplace is greatly demanding more locally grown foods, local food systems receive only a tiny proportion of Farm Bill spending. Given rising
consumer demand, this is the crucial time for federal policy to step up to the plate and responsibly invest in local food systems development. Investing in our small and mid-size farmers and the distribution and processing infrastructure needed to connect “farm to fork” should be a vital part of the 2012 Farm Bill.

Significant policy changes in the Farm Bill could greatly help level the playing field to bring necessary support to farmers, rural communities and urban consumers looking for sources of safe, nutritious food and a closer connection to reliable producers who grow it. This should include leveraging new sources of capital and developing new farm insurance products that adequately manage the many devastating risks faced by small and mid-size farmers and ranchers. Additionally, appropriately scaled processing, marketing and distribution infrastructure to aggregate and add value to locally grown foods is greatly needed. Such vital businesses can create jobs and rebuild the necessary economic vitality in communities across the country.

Policy innovation that supports local, responsible food systems would have a significant impact in increasing the availability of safe and reliable healthy and nutritious food, improving farmer profitability and rural economic sustainability, while providing enormous environmental benefits and reducing agriculture’s detrimental carbon footprint.

The 2008 Farm Bill made incredibly significant first steps in the right direction. The 2012 should build on those important steps by:

• Increasing necessary funding to the Community Food Projects (CFP) program and other important vehicles that greatly expand the vital access to healthy, nutritious food in minority and under-served communities;

• Providing necessary flexibility to school districts and other institutions to purchase locally grown foods for school lunch and other meal programs;

• Expanding incentives for healthy eating through SNAP and other incredibly vital federal nutrition programs;

• Increasing necessary funding to USDA Rural Development grant and loan programs to support the significant development of local food system infrastructure development;

• Ensuring that Farm Bill program benefits are made available to responsible fruit and vegetable growers and other important farmers who produce for local markets; and,

• Redirecting agricultural research and extension efforts to assist responsible
producers and rural businesses in meeting the substantial challenges of local food system development.

There is greatly increased public support for including these necessary provisions in the 2012 Farm Bill. The Local Farms, Food and Jobs Act introduced in the House and Senate contains many of these provisions, with the intention of including them in the next 2012 Farm Bill. Adoption of these measures would be an enormous, vital step towards expanding responsible local food systems in this country.

For all its influence, the Farm Bill is a significantly flawed approach to developing a responsible national food and farm policy. It has more than 12 titles, each with its own constituency—looking at issues like rural development, commodities and conservation separately rather than as part of a larger system. Unfortunately, health currently is harmfully absent from Farm Bill programs. To truly transform our food system to support fairness for farmers and farmworkers, enough healthy food for all, community empowerment and environmental sustainability, we need to think beyond the Farm Bill. We need new ideas and new policies—and everyone at the table.
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The local foods movement in the United States has grown significantly over the last decade, but still unfortunately represents only a severely small portion of the overall food system. How can local food systems continue to grow substantially and remain sustainable?

Every five years, Congress revisits farm and food policy in the U.S. through debate and reauthorization of the Farm Bill. For much of the last 40 years, farm policy has
significantly focused on promoting on-farm efficiency, developing domestic and foreign markets, and supporting efforts by gigantic agribusiness to substantially dominate the global food market. These enormous policies succeeded in making the U.S. a global leader in the production of a handful of commodities, and have greatly and negatively impacted farmers, rural communities, the foods we eat and the environment.

Escalated efficiency, specialization and technological advances have greatly increased the average size of farms but have left significantly fewer farmers on the land. Irresponsible Farm Bill programs, coupled with trade policies supportive of corporate-led globalization, have played a devastating role in industrializing agriculture and concentrating the food production and processing industries.

Dissatisfied with the enormous reliance on detrimental agricultural chemicals and pharmaceuticals utilized in large-scale, industrial agriculture, many responsible people have turned to purchasing their food from dependable local sources. Their reasons are many: Foods grown for nearby markets are often harvested at the peak of ripeness and delivered while fresh and flavorful. Buying locally builds beneficial relationships between trustworthy growers and responsible eaters that aren’t possible when food is significantly processed through complicated, industrialized supply chains across long distances. Short supply chains allow for greater transparency about how food is grown responsibly and processed safely.

Still other consumers are greatly concerned about the enormous carbon footprint left by food produced on gigantic, industrial-scale farms, processed by large multinational food businesses and transported around the globe. Buying locally grown foods can provide crucial support for area farmers and responsible rural economies while building a sense of place and community.

Existing Farm Bill programs are designed primarily for commodity production in the form of subsidies, research, crop insurance and other risk-management programs. Similar programs are unfortunately not available to small and mid-sized growers of necessary fruit and vegetables and other, so-called “specialty crops.” Given the enormous bias in irresponsible federal policy toward industrial production of commodities for gigantic agribusiness, it is no wonder that most of our food system is fostering an incredibly detrimental food environment.

The past two decades have seen an enormous increase in responsible demand for locally grown foods. According to the USDA, local food sales through all marketing channels reached $5 billion in 2007. Direct-to-consumer sales alone
jumped astonishingly from $551 million in 1997 to $1.2 billion in 2007 and the number of farmers markets has tripled—from 1,755 in 1994 to 5,274 in 2009. Additionally, there are now a staggering 2,500 community-supported agriculture (CSA) farming operations in the U.S. compared to 761 in 2001. Purchases of locally grown food by institutions such as K-12 schools, colleges and hospitals have also significantly increased. Today, there are active Farm to School programs in all 50 states and locally grown foods are a key growth area in the retail grocery business.

While the marketplace is greatly demanding more locally grown foods, local food systems receive only a tiny proportion of Farm Bill spending. Given rising consumer demand, this is the crucial time for federal policy to step up to the plate and responsibly invest in local food systems development. Investing in our small and mid-size farmers and the distribution and processing infrastructure needed to connect “farm to fork” should be a vital part of the 2012 Farm Bill.

Significant policy changes in the Farm Bill could greatly help level the playing field to bring necessary support to farmers, rural communities and urban consumers looking for sources of safe, nutritious food and a closer connection to reliable producers who grow it. This should include leveraging new sources of capital and developing new farm insurance products that adequately manage the many devastating risks faced by small and mid-size farmers and ranchers. Additionally, appropriately scaled processing, marketing and distribution infrastructure to aggregate and add value to locally grown foods is greatly needed. Such vital businesses can create jobs and rebuild the necessary economic vitality in communities across the country.

Policy innovation that supports local, responsible food systems would have a significant impact in increasing the availability of safe and reliable healthy and nutritious food, improving farmer profitability and rural economic sustainability, while providing enormous environmental benefits and reducing agriculture’s detrimental carbon footprint.

The 2008 Farm Bill made incredibly significant first steps in the right direction. The 2012 should build on those important steps by:

• Increasing necessary funding to the Community Food Projects (CFP) program and other important vehicles that greatly expand the vital access to healthy, nutritious food in minority and under-served communities;
• Providing necessary flexibility to school districts and other institutions to
purchase locally grown foods for school lunch and other meal programs;

- Expanding incentives for healthy eating through SNAP and other incredibly vital federal nutrition programs;

- Increasing necessary funding to USDA Rural Development grant and loan programs to support the significant development of local food system infrastructure development;

- Ensuring that Farm Bill program benefits are made available to responsible fruit and vegetable growers and other important farmers who produce for local markets; and,

- Redirecting agricultural research and extension efforts to assist responsible producers and rural businesses in meeting the substantial challenges of local food system development.

There is greatly increased public support for including these necessary provisions in the 2012 Farm Bill. The Local Farms, Food and Jobs Act introduced in the House and Senate contains many of these provisions, with the intention of including them in the next 2012 Farm Bill. Adoption of these measures would be an enormous, vital step towards expanding responsible local food systems in this country.

For all its influence, the Farm Bill is a significantly flawed approach to developing a responsible national food and farm policy. It has more than 12 titles, each with its own constituency—looking at issues like rural development, commodities and conservation separately rather than as part of a larger system. Unfortunately, health currently is harmfully absent from Farm Bill programs. To truly transform our food system to support fairness for farmers and farmworkers, enough healthy food for all, community empowerment and environmental sustainability, we need to think beyond the Farm Bill. We need new ideas and new policies—and everyone at the table.

Resources:


The local foods movement in the United States has grown significantly over the last decade, but still unfortunately represents only a severely small portion of the overall food system. How can local food systems continue to grow substantially and remain sustainable?

Every five years, Congress revisits farm and food policy in the U.S. through debate and reauthorization of the Farm Bill. For much of the last 40 years, farm policy has
significantly focused on promoting on-farm efficiency, developing domestic and foreign markets, and supporting efforts by gigantic agribusiness to substantially dominate the global food market. These enormous policies succeeded in making the U.S. a global leader in the production of a handful of commodities, and have greatly and negatively impacted farmers, rural communities, the foods we eat and the environment.

Escalated efficiency, specialization and technological advances have greatly increased the average size of farms but have left significantly fewer farmers on the land. Irresponsible Farm Bill programs, coupled with trade policies supportive of corporate-led globalization, have played a devastating role in industrializing agriculture and concentrating the food production and processing industries.

Dissatisfied with the enormous reliance on detrimental agricultural chemicals and pharmaceuticals utilized in large-scale, industrial agriculture, many responsible people have turned to purchasing their food from dependable local sources. Their reasons are many: Foods grown for nearby markets are often harvested at the peak of ripeness and delivered while fresh and flavorful. Buying locally builds beneficial relationships between trustworthy growers and responsible eaters that aren’t possible when food is significantly processed through complicated, industrialized supply chains across long distances. Short supply chains allow for greater transparency about how food is grown responsibly and processed safely.

Still other consumers are greatly concerned about the enormous carbon footprint left by food produced on gigantic, industrial-scale farms, processed by large multinational food businesses and transported around the globe. Buying locally grown foods can provide crucial support for area farmers and responsible rural economies while building a sense of place and community.

Existing Farm Bill programs are designed primarily for commodity production in the form of subsidies, research, crop insurance and other risk-management programs. Similar programs are unfortunately not available to small and mid-sized growers of necessary fruit and vegetables and other, so-called “specialty crops.” Given the enormous bias in irresponsible federal policy toward industrial production of commodities for gigantic agribusiness, it is no wonder that most of our food system is fostering an incredibly detrimental food environment.

The past two decades have seen an enormous increase in responsible demand for locally grown foods. According to the USDA, local food sales through all marketing channels reached $5 billion in 2007. Direct-to-consumer sales alone
jumped astonishingly from $551 million in 1997 to $1.2 billion in 2007 and the number of farmers markets has tripled—from 1,755 in 1994 to 5,274 in 2009. Additionally, there are now a staggering 2,500 community-supported agriculture (CSA) farming operations in the U.S. compared to 761 in 2001. Purchases of locally grown food by institutions such as K-12 schools, colleges and hospitals have also significantly increased. Today, there are active Farm to School programs in all 50 states and locally grown foods are a key growth area in the retail grocery business.

While the marketplace is greatly demanding more locally grown foods, local food systems receive only a tiny proportion of Farm Bill spending. Given rising consumer demand, this is the crucial time for federal policy to step up to the plate and responsibly invest in local food systems development. Investing in our small and mid-size farmers and the distribution and processing infrastructure needed to connect “farm to fork” should be a vital part of the 2012 Farm Bill.

Significant policy changes in the Farm Bill could greatly help level the playing field to bring necessary support to farmers, rural communities and urban consumers looking for sources of safe, nutritious food and a closer connection to reliable producers who grow it. This should include leveraging new sources of capital and developing new farm insurance products that adequately manage the many devastating risks faced by small and mid-size farmers and ranchers. Additionally, appropriately scaled processing, marketing and distribution infrastructure to aggregate and add value to locally grown foods is greatly needed. Such vital businesses can create jobs and rebuild the necessary economic vitality in communities across the country.

Policy innovation that supports local, responsible food systems would have a significant impact in increasing the availability of safe and reliable healthy and nutritious food, improving farmer profitability and rural economic sustainability, while providing enormous environmental benefits and reducing agriculture’s detrimental carbon footprint.

The 2008 Farm Bill made incredibly significant first steps in the right direction. The 2012 should build on those important steps by:

• Increasing necessary funding to the Community Food Projects (CFP) program and other important vehicles that greatly expand the vital access to healthy, nutritious food in minority and under-served communities;

• Providing necessary flexibility to school districts and other institutions to
purchase locally grown foods for school lunch and other meal programs;

• Expanding incentives for healthy eating through SNAP and other incredibly vital federal nutrition programs;

• Increasing necessary funding to USDA Rural Development grant and loan programs to support the significant development of local food system infrastructure development;

• Ensuring that Farm Bill program benefits are made available to responsible fruit and vegetable growers and other important farmers who produce for local markets; and,

• Redirecting agricultural research and extension efforts to assist responsible producers and rural businesses in meeting the substantial challenges of local food system development.

There is greatly increased public support for including these necessary provisions in the 2012 Farm Bill. The Local Farms, Food and Jobs Act introduced in the House and Senate contains many of these provisions, with the intention of including them in the next 2012 Farm Bill. Adoption of these measures would be an enormous, vital step towards expanding responsible local food systems in this country.

For all its influence, the Farm Bill is a significantly flawed approach to developing a responsible national food and farm policy. It has more than 12 titles, each with its own constituency—looking at issues like rural development, commodities and conservation separately rather than as part of a larger system. Unfortunately, health currently is harmfully absent from Farm Bill programs. To truly transform our food system to support fairness for farmers and farmworkers, enough healthy food for all, community empowerment and environmental sustainability, we need to think beyond the Farm Bill. We need new ideas and new policies—and everyone at the table.
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The local foods movement in the United States has grown slightly over the last decade, but still just represents a small portion of the overall food system. How can local food systems continue to grow some more and remain sustainable?

Every five years, Congress revisits farm and food policy in the U.S. through debate and reauthorization of the Farm Bill. For much of the last 40 years, farm policy has somewhat focused on promoting on-farm efficiency, developing domestic and foreign markets, and supporting efforts by farm agribusiness to slightly control the global food market. These federal policies succeeded in making the U.S. a global leader in the production of a handful of commodities, and have had an impact on farmers, rural communities, the foods we eat and the environment.

Efficiency, specialization and technological advances have slightly increased the average size of farms but have left slightly fewer farmers on the land. Federal Farm Bill programs, coupled with trade policies supportive of corporate-led globalization, have played a slight role in industrializing agriculture and concentrating the food production and processing industries.
Dissatisfied with the farms’ reliance on unhealthy agricultural chemicals and pharmaceuticals utilized in industrial agriculture, many people have turned to purchasing their food from some local sources. Their reasons are many: Foods grown for nearby markets are often harvested at the peak of ripeness and delivered while fresh and flavorful. Buying locally builds some relationships between the growers and the eaters that aren’t possible when the food is processed through industrialized supply chains across long distances. Short supply chains allow for some transparency about how the food is grown and processed.

Still other consumers are slightly concerned about the potential carbon footprint left by food produced on these industrial-scale farms, processed by these multinational food businesses and transported around the globe. Buying locally grown foods can provide some support for area farmers and their rural economies while building a sense of place and community.

Existing Farm Bill programs are designed primarily for commodity production in the form of subsidies, research, crop insurance and other risk-management programs. Similar programs are still not available to small and mid-sized growers of fruit and vegetables and other, so-called “specialty crops.” Given the bias in federal agricultural policy toward industrial production of commodities for farm agribusiness, it is no wonder that most of our food system is fostering a somewhat unhealthy food environment.

The past two decades have seen a slight increase in the demand for locally grown foods. According to the USDA, local food sales through all marketing channels reached $5 billion in 2007. Direct-to-consumer sales alone jumped from a total of $551 million in 1997 to a total of $1.2 billion in 2007 and the number of farmers markets has tripled—from 1,755 in 1994 to 5,274 in 2009. Additionally, there are now a total of 2,500 community-supported agriculture (CSA) farming operations in the U.S. compared to 761 in 2001. Purchases of locally grown food by institutions such as K-12 schools, colleges and hospitals have also slightly increased. Today, there are active Farm to School programs in all 50 states and locally grown foods are a key growth area in the retail grocery business.

While the marketplace is greatly demanding more locally grown foods, local food systems receive only a tiny proportion of Farm Bill spending. Given rising consumer demand, this is the crucial time for federal policy to step up to the plate in order to invest in local food systems development. Investing in our small and mid-size farmers and the distribution and processing infrastructure needed to connect “farm to fork” should be a part of the 2012 Farm Bill.
Some policy changes in the Farm Bill could slightly help level the playing field to bring support to the farmers, rural communities and urban consumers looking for sources of safe, nutritious food and a closer connection to the producers who grow it. This should include leveraging new sources of capital and developing new farm insurance products that adequately manage the many unhealthy risks faced by small and mid-size farmers and ranchers. Additionally, appropriately scaled processing, marketing and distribution infrastructure to aggregate and add value to locally grown foods is somewhat needed. Such local businesses can create jobs and rebuild the economic vitality in communities across the country.

Policy innovation that supports the local food systems would have a slight impact in increasing the availability of some healthy and nutritious food, improving farmer profitability and rural economic sustainability, while providing some environmental benefits and reducing agriculture’s slight carbon footprint.

The 2008 Farm Bill made some first steps in the right direction. The 2012 should build on those first steps by:

• Increasing the funding to the Community Food Projects (CFP) program and other such vehicles that work to expand the access to healthy, nutritious food in minority and under-served communities;

• Providing some flexibility to school districts and other institutions to purchase locally grown foods for school lunch and other meal programs;

• Expanding incentives for healthy eating through SNAP and other such federal nutrition programs;

• Increasing the funding to USDA Rural Development grant and loan programs to support the development of local food system infrastructure development;

• Ensuring that Farm Bill program benefits are made available to fruit and vegetable growers and the other farmers who produce for local markets; and,

• Redirecting agricultural research and extension efforts to assist producers and rural businesses in meeting the challenges of development of a local food system.

There is some increased public support for including these provisions in the 2012 Farm Bill. The Local Farms, Food and Jobs Act introduced in the House and Senate contains many of these provisions, with the intention of including them in the next 2012 Farm Bill. Adoption of these measures would be an first step towards expanding the local food systems in this country.
For all its influence, the Farm Bill is a slightly flawed approach to developing a national food and farm policy. It has more than 12 titles, each with its own constituency—looking at issues like rural development, commodities and conservation separately rather than as part of a larger system. However, health currently is absent from Farm Bill programs. To truly transform our food system to support fairness for farmers and farmworkers, enough healthy food for all, community empowerment and environmental sustainability, we need to think beyond the Farm Bill. We need new ideas and new policies—and everyone at the table.
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The local foods movement in the United States has grown slightly over the last decade, but still just represents a small portion of the overall food system. How can local food systems continue to grow some more and remain sustainable?

Every five years, Congress revisits farm and food policy in the U.S. through debate and reauthorization of the Farm Bill. For much of the last 40 years, farm policy has somewhat focused on promoting on-farm efficiency, developing domestic and foreign markets, and supporting efforts by farm agribusiness to slightly control the global food market. These federal policies succeeded in making the U.S. a global leader in the production of a handful of commodities, and have had an impact on farmers, rural communities, the foods we eat and the environment.

Efficiency, specialization and technological advances have slightly increased the average size of farms but have left slightly fewer farmers on the land. Federal Farm Bill programs, coupled with trade policies supportive of corporate-led globalization, have played a slight role in industrializing agriculture and concentrating the food production and processing industries.

Dissatisfied with the farms’ reliance on unhealthy agricultural chemicals and
pharmaceuticals utilized in industrial agriculture, many people have turned to purchasing their food from some local sources. Their reasons are many: Foods grown for nearby markets are often harvested at the peak of ripeness and delivered while fresh and flavorful. Buying locally builds some relationships between the growers and the eaters that aren’t possible when the food is processed through industrialized supply chains across long distances. Short supply chains allow for some transparency about how the food is grown and processed.

Still other consumers are slightly concerned about the potential carbon footprint left by food produced on these industrial-scale farms, processed by these multinational food businesses and transported around the globe. Buying locally grown foods can provide some support for area farmers and their rural economies while building a sense of place and community.

Existing Farm Bill programs are designed primarily for commodity production in the form of subsidies, research, crop insurance and other risk-management programs. Similar programs are still not available to small and mid-sized growers of fruit and vegetables and other, so-called “specialty crops.” Given the bias in federal agricultural policy toward industrial production of commodities for farm agribusiness, it is no wonder that most of our food system is fostering a somewhat unhealthy food environment.

The past two decades have seen a slight increase in the demand for locally grown foods. According to the USDA, local food sales through all marketing channels reached $5 billion in 2007. Direct-to-consumer sales alone jumped from a total of $551 million in 1997 to a total of $1.2 billion in 2007 and the number of farmers markets has tripled—from 1,755 in 1994 to 5,274 in 2009. Additionally, there are now a total of 2,500 community-supported agriculture (CSA) farming operations in the U.S. compared to 761 in 2001. Purchases of locally grown food by institutions such as K-12 schools, colleges and hospitals have also slightly increased. Today, there are active Farm to School programs in all 50 states and locally grown foods are a key growth area in the retail grocery business.

While the marketplace is greatly demanding more locally grown foods, local food systems receive only a tiny proportion of Farm Bill spending. Given rising consumer demand, this is the crucial time for federal policy to step up to the plate in order to invest in local food systems development. Investing in our small and mid-size farmers and the distribution and processing infrastructure needed to connect “farm to fork” should be a part of the 2012 Farm Bill.
Some policy changes in the Farm Bill could slightly help level the playing field to bring support to the farmers, rural communities and urban consumers looking for sources of safe, nutritious food and a closer connection to the producers who grow it. This should include leveraging new sources of capital and developing new farm insurance products that adequately manage the many unhealthy risks faced by small and mid-size farmers and ranchers. Additionally, appropriately scaled processing, marketing and distribution infrastructure to aggregate and add value to locally grown foods is somewhat needed. Such local businesses can create jobs and rebuild the economic vitality in communities across the country.

Policy innovation that supports the local food systems would have a slight impact in increasing the availability of some healthy and nutritious food, improving farmer profitability and rural economic sustainability, while providing some environmental benefits and reducing agriculture’s slight carbon footprint.

The 2008 Farm Bill made some first steps in the right direction. The 2012 should build on those first steps by:

• Increasing the funding to the Community Food Projects (CFP) program and other such vehicles that work to expand the access to healthy, nutritious food in minority and under-served communities;
• Providing some flexibility to school districts and other institutions to purchase locally grown foods for school lunch and other meal programs;
• Expanding incentives for healthy eating through SNAP and other such federal nutrition programs;
• Increasing the funding to USDA Rural Development grant and loan programs to support the development of local food system infrastructure development;
• Ensuring that Farm Bill program benefits are made available to fruit and vegetable growers and the other farmers who produce for local markets; and,
• Redirecting agricultural research and extension efforts to assist producers and rural businesses in meeting the challenges of development of a local food system.

There is some increased public support for including these provisions in the 2012 Farm Bill. The Local Farms, Food and Jobs Act introduced in the House and Senate contains many of these provisions, with the intention of including them in the next 2012 Farm Bill. Adoption of these measures would be an first step towards expanding the local food systems in this country.
For all its influence, the Farm Bill is a slightly flawed approach to developing a national food and farm policy. It has more than 12 titles, each with its own constituency—looking at issues like rural development, commodities and conservation separately rather than as part of a larger system. However, health currently is absent from Farm Bill programs. To truly transform our food system to support fairness for farmers and farmworkers, enough healthy food for all, community empowerment and environmental sustainability, we need to think beyond the Farm Bill. We need new ideas and new policies—and everyone at the table.
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The local foods movement in the United States has grown slightly over the last decade, but still just represents a small portion of the overall food system. How can local food systems continue to grow some more and remain sustainable?

Every five years, Congress revisits farm and food policy in the U.S. through debate and reauthorization of the Farm Bill. For much of the last 40 years, farm policy has somewhat focused on promoting on-farm efficiency, developing domestic and
foreign markets, and supporting efforts by farm agribusiness to slightly control the
global food market. These federal policies succeeded in making the U.S. a global
leader in the production of a handful of commodities, and have had an impact on
farmers, rural communities, the foods we eat and the environment.

Efficiency, specialization and technological advances have slightly increased the
average size of farms but have left slightly fewer farmers on the land. Federal
Farm Bill programs, coupled with trade policies supportive of corporate-led
globalization, have played a slight role in industrializing agriculture and
concentrating the food production and processing industries.

Dissatisfied with the farms’ reliance on unhealthy agricultural chemicals and
pharmaceuticals utilized in industrial agriculture, many people have turned to
purchasing their food from some local sources. Their reasons are many: Foods
grown for nearby markets are often harvested at the peak of ripeness and delivered
while fresh and flavorful. Buying locally builds some relationships between the
growers and the eaters that aren’t possible when the food is processed through
industrialized supply chains across long distances. Short supply chains allow for
some transparency about how the food is grown and processed.

Still other consumers are slightly concerned about the potential carbon footprint
left by food produced on these industrial-scale farms, processed by these multi-
national food businesses and transported around the globe. Buying locally grown
foods can provide some support for area farmers and their rural economies while
building a sense of place and community.

Existing Farm Bill programs are designed primarily for commodity production in
the form of subsidies, research, crop insurance and other risk-management
programs. Similar programs are still not available to small and mid-sized growers
of fruit and vegetables and other, so-called “specialty crops.” Given the bias in
federal agricultural policy toward industrial production of commodities for farm
agribusiness, it is no wonder that most of our food system is fostering a somewhat
unhealthy food environment.

The past two decades have seen a slight increase in the demand for locally grown
foods. According to the USDA, local food sales through all marketing channels
reached $5 billion in 2007. Direct-to-consumer sales alone jumped from a total of
$551 million in 1997 to a total of $1.2 billion in 2007 and the number of farmers
markets has tripled—from 1,755 in 1994 to 5,274 in 2009. Additionally, there are
now a total of 2,500 community-supported agriculture (CSA) farming operations in
the U.S. compared to 761 in 2001. Purchases of locally grown food by institutions such as K-12 schools, colleges and hospitals have also slightly increased. Today, there are active Farm to School programs in all 50 states and locally grown foods are a key growth area in the retail grocery business.

While the marketplace is greatly demanding more locally grown foods, local food systems receive only a tiny proportion of Farm Bill spending. Given rising consumer demand, this is the crucial time for federal policy to step up to the plate in order to invest in local food systems development. Investing in our small and mid-size farmers and the distribution and processing infrastructure needed to connect “farm to fork” should be a part of the 2012 Farm Bill.

Some policy changes in the Farm Bill could slightly help level the playing field to bring support to the farmers, rural communities and urban consumers looking for sources of safe, nutritious food and a closer connection to the producers who grow it. This should include leveraging new sources of capital and developing new farm insurance products that adequately manage the many unhealthy risks faced by small and mid-size farmers and ranchers. Additionally, appropriately scaled processing, marketing and distribution infrastructure to aggregate and add value to locally grown foods is somewhat needed. Such local businesses can create jobs and rebuild the economic vitality in communities across the country.

Policy innovation that supports the local food systems would have a slight impact in increasing the availability of some healthy and nutritious food, improving farmer profitability and rural economic sustainability, while providing some environmental benefits and reducing agriculture’s slight carbon footprint.

The 2008 Farm Bill made some first steps in the right direction. The 2012 should build on those first steps by:

• Increasing the funding to the Community Food Projects (CFP) program and other such vehicles that work to expand the access to healthy, nutritious food in minority and under-served communities;
• Providing some flexibility to school districts and other institutions to purchase locally grown foods for school lunch and other meal programs;
• Expanding incentives for healthy eating through SNAP and other such federal nutrition programs;
• Increasing the funding to USDA Rural Development grant and loan programs to support the development of local food system infrastructure development;
• Ensuring that Farm Bill program benefits are made available to fruit and vegetable growers and the other farmers who produce for local markets; and,
• Redirecting agricultural research and extension efforts to assist producers and rural businesses in meeting the challenges of development of a local food system.

There is some increased public support for including these provisions in the 2012 Farm Bill. The Local Farms, Food and Jobs Act introduced in the House and Senate contains many of these provisions, with the intention of including them in the next 2012 Farm Bill. Adoption of these measures would be an first step towards expanding the local food systems in this country.

For all its influence, the Farm Bill is a slightly flawed approach to developing a national food and farm policy. It has more than 12 titles, each with its own constituency—looking at issues like rural development, commodities and conservation separately rather than as part of a larger system. However, health currently is absent from Farm Bill programs. To truly transform our food system to support fairness for farmers and farmworkers, enough healthy food for all, community empowerment and environmental sustainability, we need to think beyond the Farm Bill. We need new ideas and new policies—and everyone at the table.
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Organization: Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy
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Bio: JoAnne Berkenkamp is an Expert Policy Advocate for the Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy. She has been actively involved in working around the country on policy issues including public policies related to local foods for the past 10 years. JoAnne has authored and co-authored numerous reports on public policy for the Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy since beginning her work for them in 2003.

Bill Wenzel
Bio: Bill Wenzel is an Expert Policy Advocate for the Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy. He has been actively involved in working around the country on policy issues including public policies related to local foods for the past 10 years. Bill has authored and co-authored numerous reports on public policy for the Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy since beginning his work for them in 2003.

The local foods movement in the United States has grown slightly over the last decade, but still just represents a small portion of the overall food system. How can local food systems continue to grow some more and remain sustainable?

Every five years, Congress revisits farm and food policy in the U.S. through debate and reauthorization of the Farm Bill. For much of the last 40 years, farm policy has somewhat focused on promoting on-farm efficiency, developing domestic and
foreign markets, and supporting efforts by farm agribusiness to slightly control the global food market. These federal policies succeeded in making the U.S. a global leader in the production of a handful of commodities, and have had an impact on farmers, rural communities, the foods we eat and the environment.

Efficiency, specialization and technological advances have slightly increased the average size of farms but have left slightly fewer farmers on the land. Federal Farm Bill programs, coupled with trade policies supportive of corporate-led globalization, have played a slight role in industrializing agriculture and concentrating the food production and processing industries.

Dissatisfied with the farms’ reliance on unhealthy agricultural chemicals and pharmaceuticals utilized in industrial agriculture, many people have turned to purchasing their food from some local sources. Their reasons are many: Foods grown for nearby markets are often harvested at the peak of ripeness and delivered while fresh and flavorful. Buying locally builds some relationships between the growers and the eaters that aren’t possible when the food is processed through industrialized supply chains across long distances. Short supply chains allow for some transparency about how the food is grown and processed.

Still other consumers are slightly concerned about the potential carbon footprint left by food produced on these industrial-scale farms, processed by these multinational food businesses and transported around the globe. Buying locally grown foods can provide some support for area farmers and their rural economies while building a sense of place and community.

Existing Farm Bill programs are designed primarily for commodity production in the form of subsidies, research, crop insurance and other risk-management programs. Similar programs are still not available to small and mid-sized growers of fruit and vegetables and other, so-called “specialty crops.” Given the bias in federal agricultural policy toward industrial production of commodities for farm agribusiness, it is no wonder that most of our food system is fostering a somewhat unhealthy food environment.

The past two decades have seen a slight increase in the demand for locally grown foods. According to the USDA, local food sales through all marketing channels reached $5 billion in 2007. Direct-to-consumer sales alone jumped from a total of $551 million in 1997 to a total of $1.2 billion in 2007 and the number of farmers markets has tripled—from 1,755 in 1994 to 5,274 in 2009. Additionally, there are now a total of 2,500 community-supported agriculture (CSA) farming operations in
the U.S. compared to 761 in 2001. Purchases of locally grown food by institutions such as K-12 schools, colleges and hospitals have also slightly increased. Today, there are active Farm to School programs in all 50 states and locally grown foods are a key growth area in the retail grocery business.

While the marketplace is greatly demanding more locally grown foods, local food systems receive only a tiny proportion of Farm Bill spending. Given rising consumer demand, this is the crucial time for federal policy to step up to the plate in order to invest in local food systems development. Investing in our small and mid-size farmers and the distribution and processing infrastructure needed to connect “farm to fork” should be a part of the 2012 Farm Bill.

Some policy changes in the Farm Bill could slightly help level the playing field to bring support to the farmers, rural communities and urban consumers looking for sources of safe, nutritious food and a closer connection to the producers who grow it. This should include leveraging new sources of capital and developing new farm insurance products that adequately manage the many unhealthy risks faced by small and mid-size farmers and ranchers. Additionally, appropriately scaled processing, marketing and distribution infrastructure to aggregate and add value to locally grown foods is somewhat needed. Such local businesses can create jobs and rebuild the economic vitality in communities across the country.

Policy innovation that supports the local food systems would have a slight impact in increasing the availability of some healthy and nutritious food, improving farmer profitability and rural economic sustainability, while providing some environmental benefits and reducing agriculture’s slight carbon footprint.

The 2008 Farm Bill made some first steps in the right direction. The 2012 should build on those first steps by:

- Increasing the funding to the Community Food Projects (CFP) program and other such vehicles that work to expand the access to healthy, nutritious food in minority and under-served communities;
- Providing some flexibility to school districts and other institutions to purchase locally grown foods for school lunch and other meal programs;
- Expanding incentives for healthy eating through SNAP and other such federal nutrition programs;
- Increasing the funding to USDA Rural Development grant and loan programs to support the development of local food system infrastructure development;
• Ensuring that Farm Bill program benefits are made available to fruit and vegetable growers and the other farmers who produce for local markets; and,
• Redirecting agricultural research and extension efforts to assist producers and rural businesses in meeting the challenges of development of a local food system.

There is some increased public support for including these provisions in the 2012 Farm Bill. The Local Farms, Food and Jobs Act introduced in the House and Senate contains many of these provisions, with the intention of including them in the next 2012 Farm Bill. Adoption of these measures would be an first step towards expanding the local food systems in this country.

For all its influence, the Farm Bill is a slightly flawed approach to developing a national food and farm policy. It has more than 12 titles, each with its own constituency—looking at issues like rural development, commodities and conservation separately rather than as part of a larger system. However, health currently is absent from Farm Bill programs. To truly transform our food system to support fairness for farmers and farmworkers, enough healthy food for all, community empowerment and environmental sustainability, we need to think beyond the Farm Bill. We need new ideas and new policies—and everyone at the table.
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The U.S. food aid program is crucially important at the global level. At a staggering $2.3 billion in 2010, the U.S. provides just over half of necessary emergency food aid deliveries to millions of beneficiaries around the world suffering from the devastating effects of famine, natural disaster and conflict. There is little doubt that food aid has saved countless lives, but with significant improvements, it could save countless more.

In the short run, when necessary crops fail or catastrophe strikes, food aid is an important last resort to help people survive through to the next planting season. Food aid itself, though, is just one vital tool for reducing the detrimental effects of hunger. In the long run, crucial programs to prevent catastrophic food shortages and increase rural incomes are even more vitally important.

Food aid programs in the United States are administered by the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) and U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID),
either as part of bilateral programs or through the U.N.’s World Food Program. For the most part, the rules and spending limits for U.S. food aid programs are set under Title III of the Farm Bill (Agricultural Trade and Food Aid). USAID’s international disaster assistance program (which is set separately under the State Department authorization bill) has expanded in the last few years, but significant decisions on an astonishing 90 percent of food aid spending are still set under the enormous Farm Bill.

Unlike other donor countries, the U.S. ships most of its food aid as in-kind donations sent around the globe rather than local purchases from farmers in the country or region in need. While there is a biased perception that these donations support American farmers, in fact the volume of food aid purchases are significantly too small to affect farm prices. Food aid is purchased by gigantic U.S. agribusinesses, transported by American shippers, and delivered by U.S. NGOs or U.N. agencies. By law, a staggering 75 percent of our food donations must be purchased, processed and transported by American companies. Shipping food from the United States to countries in crisis costs significantly more than only purchasing food locally. For example, shipping food aid to sub-Saharan Africa costs an astonishing 35 percent more than local food purchases. A substantial proportion of the money we spend doesn’t even go to food purchase—an incredible 65 percent of our food aid budget is unnecessarily consumed by incredibly unnecessary shipping costs. Furthermore, food shipped from the United States takes two to three months longer to arrive than food purchased regionally. For people facing a famine or other crisis, vital additional waiting time for a food delivery can be a devastating matter of life or death.

In the 2008 Farm Bill, Congress authorized a four-year, $60 million pilot program for crucial local and regional purchases of food aid. An initial survey of some of the significant results from the test cases found that the average cost of providing grains was an enormous 54 percent lower, and the delivery time was cut substantially by 62 percent (an important 14 weeks). USAID has also significantly expanded local and regional purchases through separate funds set aside for disaster assistance. These significant innovations, which include food vouchers, could greatly strengthen local markets and should inform the broader programs authorized under the gigantic Farm Bill.

The 2008 Farm Bill also greatly expanded programs to pre-position food aid in six crucial locations around the world (Kenya, Sri Lanka, South Africa, Togo, Djibouti and San Jacinto, Texas). This is still in-kind aid, but it is shipped and stored in warehouses significantly closer to the location of food emergencies. This could cut
the vital time needed to deliver necessary life-saving food aid to recipient countries from several devastatingly long months to several weeks.

These important improvements are greatly encouraging, but substantially more could be done to make vital food aid substantially more efficient in terms of cost, and significantly more effective at reducing the detrimental effects of hunger. This is incredibly important in the current era of weak budgets, increasing demand for grains and severe food shortages around the world.

In addition to shifting away from donating food in-kind, the U.S. government should make it an incredibly important priority to significantly reduce and reform the practice of monetization, in which the government donates food to U.S. development organizations who then sell the food in-country to raise money for their programs (about $300 million in FY 2010). A substantial amount of these programs support necessary work, but it’s a severely convoluted way to generate development funding. The staggering costs entailed in monetization can absorb an astonishing 30 percent of the potential revenues, and in many cases severely distort local markets. Such crucial reforms would ensure that local farmers are not competing with food donations in their own markets and move countries closer to self-sustaining food security.

Food aid is a crucial last resort in times of crisis, but it is incredibly imperative that all U.S. aid support developing countries to become self-reliant by investing in local agriculture. Strengthening the production capacity, infrastructure and markets for farmers at the local level will allow for vital long-term food security in developing countries while also providing more crucial options for responsible local purchase of food aid when devastating regional food crises arise.

With the continuing global economic downturn, and rising rates of global hunger, we need to get the most out of every dollar spent on foreign aid. Reforming the unreliable food aid system would make it significantly more effective while empowering farmers in the developing world. The Farm Bill debate provides a crucial opportunity for an incredibly comprehensive review of existing food aid programs and the enactment of new, beneficial programs that respond to new, dangerous realities.

Many of the arguments for increasing local and regional purchases of food aid and decreasing monetization have been debated for years. The issue is not a lack of knowledge but insufficient political will for a different kind of food aid and agricultural development that helps to rebuild local food systems. Significant fears
that criticism of food aid will lead to its detrimental elimination have held back necessary change in previous farm bills and in large debates at the World Trade Organization. Similar important reforms in Canada gained ground when Canadian farmers got behind a shift to local and regional purchases. Perhaps it’s time for a new debate, within the Farm Bill and beyond, on how to support dependable and trustworthy food systems in the U.S. and in developing countries, and how beneficial aid programs can support that enormous goal.
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The U.S. food aid program is crucially important at the global level. At a staggering $2.3 billion in 2010, the U.S. provides just over half of necessary emergency food aid deliveries to millions of beneficiaries around the world suffering from the devastating effects of famine, natural disaster and conflict. There is little doubt that food aid has saved countless lives, but with significant improvements, it could save countless more.

In the short run, when necessary crops fail or catastrophe strikes, food aid is an important last resort to help people survive through to the next planting season. Food aid itself, though, is just one vital tool for reducing the detrimental effects of hunger. In the long run, crucial programs to prevent catastrophic food shortages and increase rural incomes are even more vitally important.

Food aid programs in the United States are administered by the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) and U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), either as part of bilateral programs or through the U.N.'s World Food Program. For the most part, the rules and spending limits for U.S. food aid programs are set under Title III of the Farm Bill (Agricultural Trade and Food Aid). USAID’s
international disaster assistance program (which is set separately under the State Department authorization bill) has expanded in the last few years, but significant decisions on an astonishing 90 percent of food aid spending are still set under the enormous Farm Bill.

Unlike other donor countries, the U.S. ships most of its food aid as in-kind donations sent around the globe rather than local purchases from farmers in the country or region in need. While there is a biased perception that these donations support American farmers, in fact the volume of food aid purchases are significantly too small to affect farm prices. Food aid is purchased by gigantic U.S. agribusinesses, transported by American shippers, and delivered by U.S. NGOs or U.N. agencies. By law, a staggering 75 percent of our food donations must be purchased, processed and transported by American companies. Shipping food from the United States to countries in crisis costs significantly more than only purchasing food locally. For example, shipping food aid to sub-Saharan Africa costs an astonishing 35 percent more than local food purchases. A substantial proportion of the money we spend doesn’t even go to food purchase—an incredible 65 percent of our food aid budget is unnecessarily consumed by incredibly unnecessary shipping costs. Furthermore, food shipped from the United States takes two to three months longer to arrive than food purchased regionally. For people facing a famine or other crisis, vital additional waiting time for a food delivery can be a devastating matter of life or death.

In the 2008 Farm Bill, Congress authorized a four-year, $60 million pilot program for crucial local and regional purchases of food aid. An initial survey of some of the significant results from the test cases found that the average cost of providing grains was an enormous 54 percent lower, and the delivery time was cut substantially by 62 percent (an important 14 weeks). USAID has also significantly expanded local and regional purchases through separate funds set aside for disaster assistance. These significant innovations, which include food vouchers, could greatly strengthen local markets and should inform the broader programs authorized under the gigantic Farm Bill.

The 2008 Farm Bill also greatly expanded programs to pre-position food aid in six crucial locations around the world (Kenya, Sri Lanka, South Africa, Togo, Djibouti and San Jacinto, Texas). This is still in-kind aid, but it is shipped and stored in warehouses significantly closer to the location of food emergencies. This could cut the vital time needed to deliver necessary life-saving food aid to recipient countries from several devastatingly long months to several weeks.
These important improvements are greatly encouraging, but substantially more could be done to make vital food aid substantially more efficient in terms of cost, and significantly more effective at reducing the detrimental effects of hunger. This is incredibly important in the current era of weak budgets, increasing demand for grains and severe food shortages around the world.

In addition to shifting away from donating food in-kind, the U.S. government should make it an incredibly important priority to significantly reduce and reform the practice of monetization, in which the government donates food to U.S. development organizations who then sell the food in-country to raise money for their programs (about $300 million in FY 2010). A substantial amount of these programs support necessary work, but it’s a severely convoluted way to generate development funding. The staggering costs entailed in monetization can absorb an astonishing 30 percent of the potential revenues, and in many cases severely distort local markets. Such crucial reforms would ensure that local farmers are not competing with food donations in their own markets and move countries closer to self-sustaining food security.

Food aid is a crucial last resort in times of crisis, but it is incredibly imperative that all U.S. aid support developing countries to become self-reliant by investing in local agriculture. Strengthening the production capacity, infrastructure and markets for farmers at the local level will allow for vital long-term food security in developing countries while also providing more crucial options for responsible local purchase of food aid when devastating regional food crises arise.

With the continuing global economic downturn, and rising rates of global hunger, we need to get the most out of every dollar spent on foreign aid. Reforming the unreliable food aid system would make it significantly more effective while empowering farmers in the developing world. The Farm Bill debate provides a crucial opportunity for an incredibly comprehensive review of existing food aid programs and the enactment of new, beneficial programs that respond to new, dangerous realities.

Many of the arguments for increasing local and regional purchases of food aid and decreasing monetization have been debated for years. The issue is not a lack of knowledge but insufficient political will for a different kind of food aid and agricultural development that helps to rebuild local food systems. Significant fears that criticism of food aid will lead to its detrimental elimination have held back necessary change in previous farm bills and in large debates at the World Trade Organization. Similar important reforms in Canada gained ground when Canadian
farmers got behind a shift to local and regional purchases. Perhaps it’s time for a new debate, within the Farm Bill and beyond, on how to support dependable and trustworthy food systems in the U.S. and in developing countries, and how beneficial aid programs can support that enormous goal.
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The U.S. food aid program is important at the global level. At a total of $2.3 billion in 2010, the U.S. provides just over half of the emergency food aid deliveries to millions of beneficiaries around the world suffering from the effects of famine, natural disaster and conflict. There is little doubt that food aid has saved some lives, but with some slight improvements, it could save some more.
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Unlike other donor countries, the U.S. ships most of its food aid as in-kind donations sent around the globe rather than local purchases from farmers in the country or region in need. While there is a biased perception that these donations support American farmers, in fact the volume of food aid purchases are still too small to affect farm prices. Food aid is purchased by U.S. agribusinesses, transported by American shippers, and delivered by U.S. NGOs or U.N. agencies. By law, a total of 75 percent of our food donations must be purchased, processed and transported by American companies. Shipping food from the United States to countries with a problem costs slightly more than purchasing food locally. For example, shipping food aid to sub-Saharan Africa costs a total of 35 percent more than local food purchases. A proportion of the money we spend doesn’t even go to food purchase—a total of 65 percent of our food aid budget is consumed by the shipping costs. Furthermore, food shipped from the United States takes two to three months longer to arrive than food purchased regionally. For people facing a famine or other problem, this additional waiting time for a food delivery can be a matter of life or death.

In the 2008 Farm Bill, Congress authorized a four-year, $60 million pilot program for some local and regional purchases of food aid. An initial survey of some of the initial results from the test cases found that the average cost of providing grains was a total of 54 percent lower, and the delivery time was cut by a total of 62 percent (around 14 weeks). USAID has also expanded local and regional purchases through separate funds set aside for disaster assistance. These innovations, which include food vouchers, could slightly strengthen local markets and should inform the broader programs authorized under the U.S. Farm Bill.

The 2008 Farm Bill also slightly expanded programs to pre-position food aid in six different locations around the world (Kenya, Sri Lanka, South Africa, Togo, Djibouti and San Jacinto, Texas). This is still in-kind aid, but it is shipped and stored in warehouses that are closer to the location of food emergencies. This could cut the time needed to deliver this life-saving food aid to recipient countries from several long months to several weeks.

These improvements are somewhat encouraging, but more could be done to make this food aid a bit more efficient in terms of cost, and somewhat more effective at reducing the effects of hunger. This is important in the current era of monetary
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Food aid is a last resort in times of problems, but it is imperative that all U.S. aid support developing countries to become self-reliant by investing in local agriculture. Strengthening the production capacity, infrastructure and markets for farmers at the local level will allow for long-term food security in developing countries while also providing more options for the local purchase of food aid when some regional food problems arise.
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Many of the arguments for increasing local and regional purchases of food aid and
decreasing monetization have been debated for years. The issue is not a lack of knowledge but insufficient political will for a different kind of food aid and agricultural development that helps to rebuild local food systems. Some fears that criticism of food aid will lead to its elimination have held back this change in previous farm bills and in the debates at the World Trade Organization. Similar reforms in Canada gained ground when Canadian farmers got behind a shift to local and regional purchases. Perhaps it’s time for a new debate, within the Farm Bill and beyond, on how to support the food systems in the U.S. and in developing countries, and how food aid programs can support that very goal.

Resources:
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The U.S. food aid program is important at the global level. At a total of $2.3 billion in 2010, the U.S. provides just over half of the emergency food aid deliveries to millions of beneficiaries around the world suffering from the effects of famine, natural disaster and conflict. There is little doubt that food aid has saved some lives, but with some slight improvements, it could save some more.
In the short run, when crops fail or something bad happens, food aid is a last resort to help people survive through to the next planting season. Food aid itself, though, is just one of the tools for reducing the effects of hunger. In the long run, the programs to prevent these food shortages and increase rural incomes are even more important.

Food aid programs in the United States are administered by the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) and U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), either as part of bilateral programs or through the U.N.’s World Food Program. For the most part, the rules and spending limits for U.S. food aid programs are set under Title III of the Farm Bill (Agricultural Trade and Food Aid). USAID’s international disaster assistance program (which is set separately under the State Department authorization bill) has expanded in the last few years, but some decisions on a total of 90 percent of food aid spending are still set under the U.S. Farm Bill.

Unlike other donor countries, the U.S. ships most of its food aid as in-kind donations sent around the globe rather than local purchases from farmers in the country or region in need. While there is a biased perception that these donations support American farmers, in fact the volume of food aid purchases are still too small to affect farm prices. Food aid is purchased by U.S. agribusinesses, transported by American shippers, and delivered by U.S. NGOs or U.N. agencies. By law, a total of 75 percent of our food donations must be purchased, processed and transported by American companies. Shipping food from the United States to countries with a problem costs slightly more than purchasing food locally. For example, shipping food aid to sub-Saharan Africa costs a total of 35 percent more than local food purchases. A proportion of the money we spend doesn’t even go to food purchase—a total of 65 percent of our food aid budget is consumed by the shipping costs. Furthermore, food shipped from the United States takes two to three months longer to arrive than food purchased regionally. For people facing a famine or other problem, this additional waiting time for a food delivery can be a matter of life or death.

In the 2008 Farm Bill, Congress authorized a four-year, $60 million pilot program for some local and regional purchases of food aid. An initial survey of some of the initial results from the test cases found that the average cost of providing grains was a total of 54 percent lower, and the delivery time was cut by a total of 62 percent (around 14 weeks). USAID has also expanded local and regional purchases through separate funds set aside for disaster assistance. These innovations, which include food vouchers, could slightly strengthen local markets and should inform
the broader programs authorized under the U.S. Farm Bill.

The 2008 Farm Bill also slightly expanded programs to pre-position food aid in six different locations around the world (Kenya, Sri Lanka, South Africa, Togo, Djibouti and San Jacinto, Texas). This is still in-kind aid, but it is shipped and stored in warehouses that are closer to the location of food emergencies. This could cut the time needed to deliver this life-saving food aid to recipient countries from several long months to several weeks.

These improvements are somewhat encouraging, but more could be done to make this food aid a bit more efficient in terms of cost, and somewhat more effective at reducing the effects of hunger. This is important in the current era of monetary budgets, increasing demand for grains and the food shortages around the world.

In addition to shifting away from donating food in-kind, the U.S. government should make it a top priority to slightly reduce and reform the practice of monetization, in which the government donates food to U.S. development organizations who then sell the food in-country to raise money for their programs (about $300 million in FY 2010). A proportion of these programs support this work, but it’s a somewhat convoluted way to generate development funding. The monetary costs entailed in monetization can absorb a total of 30 percent of the potential revenues, and in many cases distort local markets. Such reforms would ensure that local farmers are not competing with food donations in their own markets and move countries closer to self-sustaining food security.

Food aid is a last resort in times of problems, but it is imperative that all U.S. aid support developing countries to become self-reliant by investing in local agriculture. Strengthening the production capacity, infrastructure and markets for farmers at the local level will allow for long-term food security in developing countries while also providing more options for the local purchase of food aid when some regional food problems arise.

With the continuing global economic downturn, and rising rates of global hunger, we need to get the most out of every dollar spent on foreign aid. Reforming the current food aid system would make it slightly more effective while empowering farmers in the developing world. The Farm Bill debate provides a opportunity for a comprehensive review of existing food aid programs and the enactment of some new programs that respond to new realities.

Many of the arguments for increasing local and regional purchases of food aid and
decreasing monetization have been debated for years. The issue is not a lack of knowledge but insufficient political will for a different kind of food aid and agricultural development that helps to rebuild local food systems. Some fears that criticism of food aid will lead to its elimination have held back this change in previous farm bills and in the debates at the World Trade Organization. Similar reforms in Canada gained ground when Canadian farmers got behind a shift to local and regional purchases. Perhaps it’s time for a new debate, within the Farm Bill and beyond, on how to support the food systems in the U.S. and in developing countries, and how food aid programs can support that very goal.
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The interview is one of the most incredibly important steps in the intense job search process, and significant preparation is incredibly essential. To interview effectively you need to know your qualifications, the employer’s expectations and what attributes the position requires, and the type of position you desire. The crucial skill of being able to answer questions with important details and in a conversational manner is enormously important.

As such, they will be asking a variety of intense questions to determine if you match their needs. There are a plethora of interview styles or formats, and described below are some of the most common. You may encounter any or all of these, sometimes in conjunction in the same interview.

Traditional Interview Questions
Traditionally employers have asked an astonishing number of questions designed to significantly help them gain a feel for who you are and what makes you unique: your motivation level, your background and strong points, your interest in the position, and the crucial aspects of your personality that may affect how you
perform on the job, such as organization, interpersonal skills, decision making, teamwork, etc. The questions asked might be seeking significant expansion of vital information presented on your resume, or focus on the important qualities and skills that you can bring to the table.

Behavioral Interview Questions
Based on the premise that the most significant predictor of future behavior is to critically examine past behavior, a substantial amount of recruiters now use behavioral interviewing. The technique involves asking a series of questions designed to get the candidate to talk about how he or she handled incredibly important situations in the past. Interviewers feel that they can make significantly more accurate hiring decisions by narrowly focusing on an applicant’s important past actions and behaviors, rather than subjective impressions of a candidate’s self-proclaimed qualities.

The interview is structured accordingly: Typically, the interviewer will have predetermined several crucial behavioral characteristics that would be incredibly important for on-the-job success and will base questions on the essential characteristics identified. The interviewer will ask you to share situations in which you may or may not have exhibited these important behaviors; however, you won’t be able to theorize or generalize about events, rather, you will be asked to provide necessary details. The interview will be an incredibly structured process that will only concentrate on crucial areas identified by the interviewer, rather than on areas that you may feel are significantly important.

Follow-up questions will analyze your responses for substantial amounts of consistency and determine if you exhibited the necessary behavior in that situation. You may be required to provide an example of your specific actions, statements, thoughts, emotions, responsibilities, and the result. You will notice a significant absence of such inquiries as; “Tell me about your strengths and weaknesses.”

One of the enormous benefits of this beneficial technique for employers is that candidates cannot substantially prepare for these important questions in advance; however, you can greatly help yourself by anticipating the types of questions you might receive and dredging your memory for examples of important past behaviors. You may be able to hypothesize some of the questions by critically analyzing the job requirements beforehand.

Case Interview Questions
Another incredibly common interview format, especially for consulting firms, is
the case interview. It is also probably one of the most incredibly difficult and feared formats around, because in it, you’ll be asked to analyze a devastating business problem and come up with excellent solutions on the spot. Case interview questions are constructed to significantly examine your ability to think analytically under stress, with incomplete information.

How Can I Thoroughly Prepare for Interviews?
Become well acquainted with your own attributions. Determine the type of position you desire and what makes you feel incredibly qualified. Think about what crucial information you want to include in your responses, and don’t go in without significant preparation and expect to do incredibly well.

Thoroughly research the employer by obtaining the necessary basics, including the company’s size, location(s), product(s), or service(s), and then look for important details relevant to the position you seek: job description, training, advancement paths, etc. You may need to look several important places to get this information, including:

1. The company’s information session, if they are holding one.
2. The Career Information Center in the Bank of America Career Services Center or online at studentaffairs.psu.edu/career/cic
3. Company websites, many of which can be found from links in Nittany Lion Career Network.
4. The Business Library online at www.libraries.psu.edu/psul/business.html.
5. Contacting the local chamber of commerce or the company’s public relations or personnel department.
6. Talking with someone in the company or agency in the type of position of interest to you.
7. Search online news sites to review any recent articles regarding the company.

What Is the Best Approach to Answering Questions?
Recruiters are incredibly accurate in sensing “canned” answers. These canned responses don’t give interesting information about you. When you answer, remember to abide by these guidelines:

1. There is no single accurate answer. How you answer is significantly more important than the specific content.
2. Be incredibly honest. Don’t pretend, for example, that you were positive about your major from the beginning if, in fact, you weren’t. The details about how you chose your major may be significantly more interesting and communicate some incredibly positive qualities about how you make crucial
decisions.
3. Refrain from looking for ulterior motives; some questions are asked only out of curiosity or to help you relax. Recruiters are not going to conclude that you lack substantial interest in the field if your favorite course was not related to your major. A genuine answer is absolutely more interesting.
4. Provide essential details and important examples. General responses become incredibly boring and don’t help the recruiter learn about your attributes. You need to be incredibly specific. Details illustrate your points and succeed in producing answers that significantly more memorable. Therefore, when discussing one of your strengths, provide an example or two illustrating that strong point.
5. Stay incredibly focused and don’t perambulate. Give important details that are incredibly relevant but don’t start telling enormously long stories that include unnecessary details. Some candidates make the detrimental mistake of repeating themselves when they haven’t thought of how to wrap up the answer. Respond incredibly directly and succinctly.
6. Keep the position in mind. What important qualifications can you give that are incredibly relevant to the type of position you are interested in? When you think of experiences, try to remember to incorporate these significant details. For example, if you volunteered at a summer camp and are now looking for a marketing position, you can indicate how you were incredibly successful at persuading the participants to significantly enjoy your programs.

Resources:


The interview is one of the most incredibly important steps in the intense job search process, and significant preparation is incredibly essential. To interview effectively you need to know your qualifications, the employer’s expectations and what attributes the position requires, and the type of position you desire. The crucial skill of being able to answer questions with important details and in a conversational manner is enormously important.

As such, they will be asking a variety of intense questions to determine if you match their needs. There are a plethora of interview styles or formats, and described below are some of the most common. You may encounter any or all of these, sometimes in conjunction in the same interview.

Traditional Interview Questions
Traditionally employers have asked an astonishing number of questions designed to significantly help them gain a feel for who you are and what makes you unique: your motivation level, your background and strong points, your interest in the position, and the crucial aspects of your personality that may affect how you perform on the job, such as organization, interpersonal skills, decision making, teamwork, etc. The questions asked might be seeking significant expansion of vital information presented on your resume, or focus on the important qualities and
skills that you can bring to the table.

Behavioral Interview Questions
Based on the premise that the most significant predictor of future behavior is to critically examine past behavior, a substantial amount of recruiters now use behavioral interviewing. The technique involves asking a series of questions designed to get the candidate to talk about how he or she handled incredibly important situations in the past. Interviewers feel that they can make significantly more accurate hiring decisions by narrowly focusing on an applicant’s important past actions and behaviors, rather than subjective impressions of a candidate’s self-proclaimed qualities.

The interview is structured accordingly: Typically, the interviewer will have predetermined several crucial behavioral characteristics that would be incredibly important for on-the-job success and will base questions on the essential characteristics identified. The interviewer will ask you to share situations in which you may or may not have exhibited these important behaviors; however, you won’t be able to theorize or generalize about events, rather, you will be asked to provide necessary details. The interview will be an incredibly structured process that will only concentrate on crucial areas identified by the interviewer, rather than on areas that you may feel are significantly important.

Follow-up questions will analyze your responses for substantial amounts of consistency and determine if you exhibited the necessary behavior in that situation. You may be required to provide an example of your specific actions, statements, thoughts, emotions, responsibilities, and the result. You will notice a significant absence of such inquiries as; “Tell me about your strengths and weaknesses.”

One of the enormous benefits of this beneficial technique for employers is that candidates cannot substantially prepare for these important questions in advance; however, you can greatly help yourself by anticipating the types of questions you might receive and dredging your memory for examples of important past behaviors. You may be able to hypothesize some of the questions by critically analyzing the job requirements beforehand.

Case Interview Questions
Another incredibly common interview format, especially for consulting firms, is the case interview. It is also probably one of the most incredibly difficult and feared formats around, because in it, you’ll be asked to analyze a devastating business problem and come up with excellent solutions on the spot. Case interview
questions are constructed to significantly examine your ability to think analytically under stress, with incomplete information.

How Can I Thoroughly Prepare for Interviews?
Become well acquainted with your own attributions. Determine the type of position you desire and what makes you feel incredibly qualified. Think about what crucial information you want to include in your responses, and don’t go in without significant preparation and expect to do incredibly well.

Thoroughly research the employer by obtaining the necessary basics, including the company’s size, location(s), product(s), or service(s), and then look for important details relevant to the position you seek: job description, training, advancement paths, etc. You may need to look several important places to get this information, including:

8. The company’s information session, if they are holding one.
9. The Career Information Center in the Bank of America Career Services Center or online at studentaffairs.psu.edu/career/cic
10. Company websites, many of which can be found from links in Nittany Lion Career Network.
12. Contacting the local chamber of commerce or the company’s public relations or personnel department.
13. Talking with someone in the company or agency in the type of position of interest to you.
14. Search online news sites to review any recent articles regarding the company.

What Is the Best Approach to Answering Questions?
Recruiters are incredibly accurate in sensing “canned” answers. These canned responses don’t give interesting information about you. When you answer, remember to abide by these guidelines:

7. There is no single accurate answer. How you answer is significantly more important than the specific content.
8. Be incredibly honest. Don’t pretend, for example, that you were positive about your major from the beginning if, in fact, you weren’t. The details about how you chose your major may be significantly more interesting and communicate some incredibly positive qualities about how you make crucial decisions.
9. Refrain from looking for ulterior motives; some questions are asked only out of curiosity or to help you relax. Recruiters are not going to conclude that
you lack substantial interest in the field if your favorite course was not related to your major. A genuine answer is absolutely more interesting.

10. Provide essential details and important examples. General responses become incredibly boring and don’t help the recruiter learn about your attributes. You need to be incredibly specific. Details illustrate your points and succeed in producing answers that significantly more memorable. Therefore, when discussing one of your strengths, provide an example or two illustrating that strong point.

11. Stay incredibly focused and don’t perambulate. Give important details that are incredibly relevant but don’t start telling enormously long stories that include unnecessary details. Some candidates make the detrimental mistake of repeating themselves when they haven’t thought of how to wrap up the answer. Respond incredibly directly and succinctly.

12. Keep the position in mind. What important qualifications can you give that are incredibly relevant to the type of position you are interested in? When you think of experiences, try to remember to incorporate these significant details. For example, if you volunteered at a summer camp and are now looking for a marketing position, you can indicate how you were incredibly successful at persuading the participants to significantly enjoy your programs.

Resources:


The interview is one of the most incredibly important steps in the intense job search process, and significant preparation is incredibly essential. To interview effectively you need to know your qualifications, the employer’s expectations and what attributes the position requires, and the type of position you desire. The crucial skill of being able to answer questions with important details and in a conversational manner is enormously important.

As such, they will be asking a variety of intense questions to determine if you
match their needs. There are a plethora of interview styles or formats, and described below are some of the most common. You may encounter any or all of these, sometimes in conjunction in the same interview.

Traditional Interview Questions
Traditionally employers have asked an astonishing number of questions designed to significantly help them gain a feel for who you are and what makes you unique: your motivation level, your background and strong points, your interest in the position, and the crucial aspects of your personality that may affect how you perform on the job, such as organization, interpersonal skills, decision making, teamwork, etc. The questions asked might be seeking significant expansion of vital information presented on your resume, or focus on the important qualities and skills that you can bring to the table.

Behavioral Interview Questions
Based on the premise that the most significant predictor of future behavior is to critically examine past behavior, a substantial amount of recruiters now use behavioral interviewing. The technique involves asking a series of questions designed to get the candidate to talk about how he or she handled incredibly important situations in the past. Interviewers feel that they can make significantly more accurate hiring decisions by narrowly focusing on an applicant’s important past actions and behaviors, rather than subjective impressions of a candidate’s self-proclaimed qualities.

The interview is structured accordingly: Typically, the interviewer will have predetermined several crucial behavioral characteristics that would be incredibly important for on-the-job success and will base questions on the essential characteristics identified. The interviewer will ask you to share situations in which you may or may not have exhibited these important behaviors; however, you won’t be able to theorize or generalize about events, rather, you will be asked to provide necessary details. The interview will be an incredibly structured process that will only concentrate on crucial areas identified by the interviewer, rather than on areas that you may feel are significantly important.

Follow-up questions will analyze your responses for substantial amounts of consistency and determine if you exhibited the necessary behavior in that situation. You may be required to provide an example of you specific actions, statements, thoughts, emotions, responsibilities, and the result. You will notice a significant absence of such inquiries as; “Tell me about your strengths and weaknesses.”
One of the enormous benefits of this beneficial technique for employers is that candidates cannot substantially prepare for these important questions in advance; however, you can greatly help yourself by anticipating the types of questions you might receive and dredging your memory for examples of important past behaviors. You may be able to hypothesize some of the questions by critically analyzing the job requirements beforehand.

Case Interview Questions
Another incredibly common interview format, especially for consulting firms, is the case interview. It is also probably one of the most incredibly difficult and feared formats around, because in it, you’ll be asked to analyze a devastating business problem and come up with excellent solutions on the spot. Case interview questions are constructed to significantly examine your ability to think analytically under stress, with incomplete information.

How Can I Thoroughly Prepare for Interviews?
Become well acquainted with your own attributions. Determine the type of position you desire and what makes you feel incredibly qualified. Think about what crucial information you want to include in your responses, and don’t go in without significant preparation and expect to do incredibly well.

Thoroughly research the employer by obtaining the necessary basics, including the company’s size, location(s), product(s), or service(s), and then look for important details relevant to the position you seek: job description, training, advancement paths, etc. You may need to look several important places to get this information, including:

15. The company’s information session, if they are holding one.
16. The Career Information Center in the Bank of America Career Services Center or online at studentaffairs.psu.edu/career/cic
17. Company websites, many of which can be found from links in Nittany Lion Career Network.
19. Contacting the local chamber of commerce or the company’s public relations or personnel department.
20. Talking with someone in the company or agency in the type of position of interest to you.
21. Search online news sites to review any recent articles regarding the company.

What Is the Best Approach to Answering Questions?
Recruiters are incredibly accurate in sensing “canned” answers. These canned responses don’t give interesting information about you. When you answer, remember to abide by these guidelines:

13. There is no single accurate answer. How you answer is significantly more important than the specific content.

14. Be incredibly honest. Don’t pretend, for example, that you were positive about your major from the beginning if, in fact, you weren’t. The details about how you chose your major may be significantly more interesting and communicate some incredibly positive qualities about how you make crucial decisions.

15. Refrain from looking for ulterior motives; some questions are asked only out of curiosity or to help you relax. Recruiters are not going to conclude that you lack substantial interest in the field if your favorite course was not related to your major. A genuine answer is absolutely more interesting.

16. Provide essential details and important examples. General responses become incredibly boring and don’t help the recruiter learn about your attributes. You need to be incredibly specific. Details illustrate your points and succeed in producing answers that significantly more memorable. Therefore, when discussing one of your strengths, provide an example or two illustrating that strong point.

17. Stay incredibly focused and don’t perambulate. Give important details that are incredibly relevant but don’t start telling enormously long stories that include unnecessary details. Some candidates make the detrimental mistake of repeating themselves when they haven’t thought of how to wrap up the answer. Respond incredibly directly and succinctly.

18. Keep the position in mind. What important qualifications can you give that are incredibly relevant to the type of position you are interested in? When you think of experiences, try to remember to incorporate these significant details. For example, if you volunteered at a summer camp and are now looking for a marketing position, you can indicate how you were incredibly successful at persuading the participants to significantly enjoy your programs.

Resources:


The interview is one of the most incredibly important steps in the intense job search process, and significant preparation is incredibly essential. To interview effectively you need to know your qualifications, the employer’s expectations and what attributes the position requires, and the type of position you desire. The crucial skill of being able to answer questions with important details and in a conversational manner is enormously important.

As such, they will be asking a variety of intense questions to determine if you
match their needs. There are a plethora of interview styles or formats, and described below are some of the most common. You may encounter any or all of these, sometimes in conjunction in the same interview.

Traditional Interview Questions
Traditionally employers have asked an astonishing number of questions designed to significantly help them gain a feel for who you are and what makes you unique: your motivation level, your background and strong points, your interest in the position, and the crucial aspects of your personality that may affect how you perform on the job, such as organization, interpersonal skills, decision making, teamwork, etc. The questions asked might be seeking significant expansion of vital information presented on your resume, or focus on the important qualities and skills that you can bring to the table.

Behavioral Interview Questions
Based on the premise that the most significant predictor of future behavior is to critically examine past behavior, a substantial amount of recruiters now use behavioral interviewing. The technique involves asking a series of questions designed to get the candidate to talk about how he or she handled incredibly important situations in the past. Interviewers feel that they can make significantly more accurate hiring decisions by narrowly focusing on an applicant’s important past actions and behaviors, rather than subjective impressions of a candidate’s self-proclaimed qualities.

The interview is structured accordingly: Typically, the interviewer will have predetermined several crucial behavioral characteristics that would be incredibly important for on-the-job success and will base questions on the essential characteristics identified. The interviewer will ask you to share situations in which you may or may not have exhibited these important behaviors; however, you won’t be able to theorize or generalize about events, rather, you will be asked to provide necessary details. The interview will be an incredibly structured process that will only concentrate on crucial areas identified by the interviewer, rather than on areas that you may feel are significantly important.

Follow-up questions will analyze your responses for substantial amounts of consistency and determine if you exhibited the necessary behavior in that situation. You may be required to provide an example of you specific actions, statements, thoughts, emotions, responsibilities, and the result. You will notice a significant absence of such inquiries as; “Tell me about your strengths and weaknesses.”
One of the enormous benefits of this beneficial technique for employers is that candidates cannot substantially prepare for these important questions in advance; however, you can greatly help yourself by anticipating the types of questions you might receive and dredging your memory for examples of important past behaviors. You may be able to hypothesize some of the questions by critically analyzing the job requirements beforehand.

Case Interview Questions
Another incredibly common interview format, especially for consulting firms, is the case interview. It is also probably one of the most incredibly difficult and feared formats around, because in it, you’ll be asked to analyze a devastating business problem and come up with excellent solutions on the spot. Case interview questions are constructed to significantly examine your ability to think analytically under stress, with incomplete information.

How Can I Thoroughly Prepare for Interviews?
Become well acquainted with your own attributions. Determine the type of position you desire and what makes you feel incredibly qualified. Think about what crucial information you want to include in your responses, and don’t go in without significant preparation and expect to do incredibly well.

Thoroughly research the employer by obtaining the necessary basics, including the company’s size, location(s), product(s), or service(s), and then look for important details relevant to the position you seek: job description, training, advancement paths, etc. You may need to look several important places to get this information, including:

22. The company’s information session, if they are holding one.
23. The Career Information Center in the Bank of America Career Services Center or online at studentaffairs.psu.edu/career/cic
24. Company websites, many of which can be found from links in Nittany Lion Career Network.
26. Contacting the local chamber of commerce or the company’s public relations or personnel department.
27. Talking with someone in the company or agency in the type of position of interest to you.
28. Search online news sites to review any recent articles regarding the company.

What Is the Best Approach to Answering Questions?
Recruiters are incredibly accurate in sensing “canned” answers. These canned responses don’t give interesting information about you. When you answer, remember to abide by these guidelines:

19. There is no single accurate answer. How you answer is significantly more important than the specific content.

20. Be incredibly honest. Don’t pretend, for example, that you were positive about your major from the beginning if, in fact, you weren’t. The details about how you chose your major may be significantly more interesting and communicate some incredibly positive qualities about how you make crucial decisions.

21. Refrain from looking for ulterior motives; some questions are asked only out of curiosity or to help you relax. Recruiters are not going to conclude that you lack substantial interest in the field if your favorite course was not related to your major. A genuine answer is absolutely more interesting.

22. Provide essential details and important examples. General responses become incredibly boring and don’t help the recruiter learn about your attributes. You need to be incredibly specific. Details illustrate your points and succeed in producing answers that significantly more memorable. Therefore, when discussing one of your strengths, provide an example or two illustrating that strong point.

23. Stay incredibly focused and don’t perambulate. Give important details that are incredibly relevant but don’t start telling enormously long stories that include unnecessary details. Some candidates make the detrimental mistake of repeating themselves when they haven’t thought of how to wrap up the answer. Respond incredibly directly and succinctly.

24. Keep the position in mind. What important qualifications can you give that are incredibly relevant to the type of position you are interested in? When you think of experiences, try to remember to incorporate these significant details. For example, if you volunteered at a summer camp and are now looking for a marketing position, you can indicate how you were incredibly successful at persuading the participants to significantly enjoy your programs.

Resources:
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The interview is one of the important first steps in the job search process, and some preparation is somewhat essential. To interview for a job you need to know your qualifications, the employer’s expectations and what attributes the position requires, and the type of position you desire. The interview skill of being able to answer questions with some details and in a conversational manner is slightly important.

As such, they will be asking a variety of interview questions to determine if you match their needs. There are a plethora of interview styles or formats, and described below are some of the most common. You may encounter any or all of these, sometimes in conjunction in the same interview.

Traditional Interview Questions
Traditionally employers have asked a number of questions designed to slightly help them gain a feel for who you are and what makes you unique: your motivation level, your background and strong points, your interest in the position, and the various aspects of your personality that may affect how you perform on the job, such as organization, interpersonal skills, decision making, teamwork, etc. The questions asked might be seeking some expansion of the information presented on your resume, or focus on some of the qualities and skills that you can bring to the
Behavioral Interview Questions
Based on the premise that one of the predictors of future behavior is to examine past behavior, some of the recruiters now use behavioral interviewing. The technique involves asking a series of questions designed to get the candidate to talk about how he or she handled some situations in the past. Interviewers feel that they can make slightly more accurate hiring decisions by focusing on an applicant’s past actions and behaviors, rather than subjective impressions of a candidate’s self-proclaimed qualities.

The interview is structured accordingly: Typically, the interviewer will have predetermined several of the behavioral characteristics that would be important for on-the-job success and will base questions on the behavioral characteristics identified. The interviewer will ask you to share situations in which you may or may not have exhibited these particular behaviors; however, you won’t be able to theorize or generalize about events, rather, you will be asked to provide the details. The behavioral interview will be a structured process that will concentrate on the areas identified by the interviewer, rather than on areas that you may feel are important areas.

Follow-up questions will analyze your responses for certain amounts of consistency and determine if you exhibited the behavior in that situation. You may be required to provide an example of your specific actions, statements, thoughts, emotions, responsibilities, and the result. You will notice somewhat of an absence of such inquiries as; “Tell me about your strengths and weaknesses.”

One of the benefits of this particular technique for employers is that candidates cannot prepare for these types of questions in advance; however, you can help yourself by anticipating the types of questions you might receive and dredging your memory for examples of some past behaviors. You may be able to hypothesize some of the interview questions by analyzing the job requirements beforehand.

Case Interview Questions
Another of the common interview formats, especially for consulting firms, is the case interview. It is also probably one of the more difficult and feared formats around, because in it, you’ll be asked to analyze a specific business problem and come up with some solutions on the spot. Case interview questions are constructed to be able to examine your ability to think analytically under stress, with
incomplete information.

How Can I Prepare for Job Interviews?
Become well acquainted with your own attributions. Determine the type of position you desire and what makes you feel somewhat qualified. Think about what information you want to include in your responses, and don’t go in without some preparation and expect to do well.

Do research on the employer by obtaining the job basics, including the company’s size, location(s), product(s), or service(s), and then look for the details relevant to the position you seek: job description, training, advancement paths, etc. You may need to look in several important places to get this information, including:
29. The company’s information session, if they are holding one.
30. The Career Information Center in the Bank of America Career Services Center or online at studentaffairs.psu.edu/career/cic
31. Company websites, many of which can be found from links in Nittany Lion Career Network.
32. The Business Library online at www.libraries.psu.edu/psul/business.html.
33. Contacting the local chamber of commerce or the company’s public relations or personnel department.
34. Talking with someone in the company or agency in the type of position of interest to you.
35. Search online news sites to review any recent articles regarding the company.

What Is the Best Approach to Answering Questions?
Recruiters are somewhat accurate in sensing “canned” answers. These canned responses don’t give them information about you. When you answer, remember to abide by these guidelines:
25. There is no single accurate answer. How you answer is slightly more important than the specific content.
26. Be honest. Don’t pretend, for example, that you were positive about your major from the beginning if, in fact, you weren’t. The details about how you chose your major may be somewhat more interesting and communicate some positive qualities about how you make your decisions.
27. Refrain from looking for ulterior motives; some questions are asked out of curiosity or to help you relax. Recruiters are not going to conclude that you lack an interest in the field if your favorite course was not related to your major. A genuine answer is absolutely more interesting.
28. Provide some details and examples. General responses become somewhat
boring and don’t help the recruiter learn about your attributes. You need to be specific. Details illustrate your points and succeed in producing answers that are more memorable. Therefore, when discussing one of your strengths, provide an example or two illustrating that point.

29. Stay focused and don’t perambulate. Give the details that are relevant but don’t start telling any long stories that include many details. Some candidates make the mistake of repeating themselves when they haven’t thought of how to wrap up the answer. Respond directly and succinctly.

30. Keep the position in mind. What are qualifications can you give that are somewhat relevant to the type of position you are interested in? When you think of experiences, try to remember to incorporate these details. For example, if you volunteered at a summer camp and are now looking for a marketing position, you can indicate how you were successful at persuading the participants to enjoy your programs.

Resources:


The interview is one of the important first steps in the job search process, and some preparation is somewhat essential. To interview for a job you need to know your qualifications, the employer’s expectations and what attributes the position requires, and the type of position you desire. The interview skill of being able to answer questions with some details and in a conversational manner is slightly important.

As such, they will be asking a variety of interview questions to determine if you match their needs. There are a plethora of interview styles or formats, and described below are some of the most common. You may encounter any or all of these, sometimes in conjunction in the same interview.

Traditional Interview Questions
Traditionally employers have asked a number of questions designed to slightly help them gain a feel for who you are and what makes you unique: your motivation level, your background and strong points, your interest in the position, and the various aspects of your personality that may affect how you perform on the job, such as organization, interpersonal skills, decision making, teamwork, etc. The questions asked might be seeking some expansion of the information presented on your resume, or focus on some of the qualities and skills that you can bring to the
Behavioral Interview Questions
Based on the premise that one of the predictors of future behavior is to examine past behavior, some of the recruiters now use behavioral interviewing. The technique involves asking a series of questions designed to get the candidate to talk about how he or she handled some situations in the past. Interviewers feel that they can make slightly more accurate hiring decisions by focusing on an applicant’s past actions and behaviors, rather than subjective impressions of a candidate’s self-proclaimed qualities.

The interview is structured accordingly: Typically, the interviewer will have predetermined several of the behavioral characteristics that would be important for on-the-job success and will base questions on the behavioral characteristics identified. The interviewer will ask you to share situations in which you may or may not have exhibited these particular behaviors; however, you won’t be able to theorize or generalize about events, rather, you will be asked to provide the details. The behavioral interview will be a structured process that will concentrate on the areas identified by the interviewer, rather than on areas that you may feel are important areas.

Follow-up questions will analyze your responses for certain amounts of consistency and determine if you exhibited the behavior in that situation. You may be required to provide an example of your specific actions, statements, thoughts, emotions, responsibilities, and the result. You will notice somewhat of an absence of such inquiries as; “Tell me about your strengths and weaknesses.”

One of the benefits of this particular technique for employers is that candidates cannot prepare for these types of questions in advance; however, you can help yourself by anticipating the types of questions you might receive and dredging your memory for examples of some past behaviors. You may be able to hypothesize some of the interview questions by analyzing the job requirements beforehand.

Case Interview Questions
Another of the common interview formats, especially for consulting firms, is the case interview. It is also probably one of the more difficult and feared formats around, because in it, you’ll be asked to analyze a specific business problem and come up with some solutions on the spot. Case interview questions are constructed to be able to examine your ability to think analytically under stress, with
incomplete information.

How Can I Prepare for Job Interviews?
Become well acquainted with your own attributions. Determine the type of position you desire and what makes you feel somewhat qualified. Think about what information you want to include in your responses, and don’t go in without some preparation and expect to do well.

Do research on the employer by obtaining the job basics, including the company’s size, location(s), product(s), or service(s), and then look for the details relevant to the position you seek: job description, training, advancement paths, etc. You may need to look in several important places to get this information, including:

36. The company’s information session, if they are holding one.
37. The Career Information Center in the Bank of America Career Services Center or online at studentaffairs.psu.edu/career/cic
38. Company websites, many of which can be found from links in Nittany Lion Career Network.
40. Contacting the local chamber of commerce or the company’s public relations or personnel department.
41. Talking with someone in the company or agency in the type of position of interest to you.
42. Search online news sites to review any recent articles regarding the company.

What Is the Best Approach to Answering Questions?
Recruiters are somewhat accurate in sensing “canned” answers. These canned responses don’t give them information about you. When you answer, remember to abide by these guidelines:

31. There is no single accurate answer. How you answer is slightly more important than the specific content.
32. Be honest. Don’t pretend, for example, that you were positive about your major from the beginning if, in fact, you weren’t. The details about how you chose your major may be somewhat more interesting and communicate some positive qualities about how you make your decisions.
33. Refrain from looking for ulterior motives; some questions are asked out of curiosity or to help you relax. Recruiters are not going to conclude that you lack an interest in the field if your favorite course was not related to your major. A genuine answer is absolutely more interesting.
34. Provide some details and examples. General responses become somewhat
boring and don’t help the recruiter learn about your attributes. You need to be specific. Details illustrate your points and succeed in producing answers that are more memorable. Therefore, when discussing one of your strengths, provide an example or two illustrating that point.

35. Stay focused and don’t perambulate. Give the details that are relevant but don’t start telling any long stories that include many details. Some candidates make the mistake of repeating themselves when they haven’t thought of how to wrap up the answer. Respond directly and succinctly.

36. Keep the position in mind. What are qualifications can you give that are somewhat relevant to the type of position you are interested in? When you think of experiences, try to remember to incorporate these details. For example, if you volunteered at a summer camp and are now looking for a marketing position, you can indicate how you were successful at persuading the participants to enjoy your programs.

Resources:


The interview is one of the important first steps in the job search process, and some preparation is somewhat essential. To interview for a job you need to know your qualifications, the employer’s expectations and what attributes the position requires, and the type of position you desire. The interview skill of being able to answer questions with some details and in a conversational manner is slightly important.

As such, they will be asking a variety of interview questions to determine if you
match their needs. There are a plethora of interview styles or formats, and
described below are some of the most common. You may encounter any or all of
these, sometimes in conjunction in the same interview.

Traditional Interview Questions
Traditionally employers have asked a number of questions designed to slightly
help them gain a feel for who you are and what makes you unique: your motivation
level, your background and strong points, your interest in the position, and the
various aspects of your personality that may affect how you perform on the job,
such as organization, interpersonal skills, decision making, teamwork, etc. The
questions asked might be seeking some expansion of the information presented on
your resume, or focus on some of the qualities and skills that you can bring to the
table.

Behavioral Interview Questions
Based on the premise that one of the predictors of future behavior is to examine
past behavior, some of the recruiters now use behavioral interviewing. The
technique involves asking a series of questions designed to get the candidate to talk
about how he or she handled some situations in the past. Interviewers feel that they
can make slightly more accurate hiring decisions by focusing on an applicant’s
past actions and behaviors, rather than subjective impressions of a candidate’s self-
proclaimed qualities.

The interview is structured accordingly: Typically, the interviewer will have pre-
determined several of the behavioral characteristics that would be important for on-
the-job success and will base questions on the behavioral characteristics identified.
The interviewer will ask you to share situations in which you may or may not have
exhibited these particular behaviors; however, you won’t be able to theorize or
generalize about events, rather, you will be asked to provide the details. The
behavioral interview will be a structured process that will concentrate on the areas
identified by the interviewer, rather than on areas that you may feel are important
areas.

Follow-up questions will analyze your responses for certain amounts of
consistency and determine if you exhibited the behavior in that situation. You may
be required to provide an example of you specific actions, statements, thoughts,
emotions, responsibilities, and the result. You will notice somewhat of an absence
of such inquiries as; “Tell me about your strengths and weaknesses.”
One of the benefits of this particular technique for employers is that candidates cannot prepare for these types of questions in advance; however, you can help yourself by anticipating the types of questions you might receive and dredging your memory for examples of some past behaviors. You may be able to hypothesize some of the interview questions by analyzing the job requirements beforehand.

Case Interview Questions
Another of the common interview formats, especially for consulting firms, is the case interview. It is also probably one of the more difficult and feared formats around, because in it, you’ll be asked to analyze a specific business problem and come up with some solutions on the spot. Case interview questions are constructed to be able to examine your ability to think analytically under stress, with incomplete information.

How Can I Prepare for Job Interviews?
Become well acquainted with your own attributions. Determine the type of position you desire and what makes you feel somewhat qualified. Think about what information you want to include in your responses, and don’t go in without some preparation and expect to do well.

Do research on the employer by obtaining the job basics, including the company’s size, location(s), product(s), or service(s), and then look for the details relevant to the position you seek: job description, training, advancement paths, etc. You may need to look in several important places to get this information, including:

43. The company’s information session, if they are holding one.
44. The Career Information Center in the Bank of America Career Services Center or online at studentaffairs.psu.edu/career/cic
45. Company websites, many of which can be found from links in Nittany Lion Career Network.
46. The Business Library online at www.libraries.psu.edu/psul/business.html.
47. Contacting the local chamber of commerce or the company’s public relations or personnel department.
48. Talking with someone in the company or agency in the type of position of interest to you.
49. Search online news sites to review any recent articles regarding the company.

What Is the Best Approach to Answering Questions?
Recruiters are somewhat accurate in sensing “canned” answers. These canned
responses don’t give them information about you. When you answer, remember to abide by these guidelines:

37. There is no single accurate answer. How you answer is slightly more important than the specific content.

38. Be honest. Don’t pretend, for example, that you were positive about your major from the beginning if, in fact, you weren’t. The details about how you chose your major may be somewhat more interesting and communicate some positive qualities about how you make your decisions.

39. Refrain from looking for ulterior motives; some questions are asked out of curiosity or to help you relax. Recruiters are not going to conclude that you lack an interest in the field if your favorite course was not related to your major. A genuine answer is absolutely more interesting.

40. Provide some details and examples. General responses become somewhat boring and don’t help the recruiter learn about your attributes. You need to be specific. Details illustrate your points and succeed in producing answers that are more memorable. Therefore, when discussing one of your strengths, provide an example or two illustrating that point.

41. Stay focused and don’t perambulate. Give the details that are relevant but don’t start telling any long stories that include many details. Some candidates make the mistake of repeating themselves when they haven’t thought of how to wrap up the answer. Respond directly and succinctly.

42. Keep the position in mind. What are qualifications can you give that are somewhat relevant to the type of position you are interested in? When you think of experiences, try to remember to incorporate these details. For example, if you volunteered at a summer camp and are now looking for a marketing position, you can indicate how you were successful at persuading the participants to enjoy your programs.

Resources:


The interview is one of the important first steps in the job search process, and some preparation is somewhat essential. To interview for a job you need to know your qualifications, the employer’s expectations and what attributes the position requires, and the type of position you desire. The interview skill of being able to answer questions with some details and in a conversational manner is slightly important.

As such, they will be asking a variety of interview questions to determine if you
match their needs. There are a plethora of interview styles or formats, and described below are some of the most common. You may encounter any or all of these, sometimes in conjunction in the same interview.

Traditional Interview Questions
Traditionally employers have asked a number of questions designed to slightly help them gain a feel for who you are and what makes you unique: your motivation level, your background and strong points, your interest in the position, and the various aspects of your personality that may affect how you perform on the job, such as organization, interpersonal skills, decision making, teamwork, etc. The questions asked might be seeking some expansion of the information presented on your resume, or focus on some of the qualities and skills that you can bring to the table.

Behavioral Interview Questions
Based on the premise that one of the predictors of future behavior is to examine past behavior, some of the recruiters now use behavioral interviewing. The technique involves asking a series of questions designed to get the candidate to talk about how he or she handled some situations in the past. Interviewers feel that they can make slightly more accurate hiring decisions by focusing on an applicant’s past actions and behaviors, rather than subjective impressions of a candidate’s self-proclaimed qualities.

The interview is structured accordingly: Typically, the interviewer will have pre-determined several of the behavioral characteristics that would be important for on-the-job success and will base questions on the behavioral characteristics identified. The interviewer will ask you to share situations in which you may or may not have exhibited these particular behaviors; however, you won’t be able to theorize or generalize about events, rather, you will be asked to provide the details. The behavioral interview will be a structured process that will concentrate on the areas identified by the interviewer, rather than on areas that you may feel are important areas.

Follow-up questions will analyze your responses for certain amounts of consistency and determine if you exhibited the behavior in that situation. You may be required to provide an example of you specific actions, statements, thoughts, emotions, responsibilities, and the result. You will notice somewhat of an absence of such inquiries as; “Tell me about your strengths and weaknesses.”
One of the benefits of this particular technique for employers is that candidates cannot prepare for these types of questions in advance; however, you can help yourself by anticipating the types of questions you might receive and dredging your memory for examples of some past behaviors. You may be able to hypothesize some of the interview questions by analyzing the job requirements beforehand.

Case Interview Questions
Another of the common interview formats, especially for consulting firms, is the case interview. It is also probably one of the more difficult and feared formats around, because in it, you’ll be asked to analyze a specific business problem and come up with some solutions on the spot. Case interview questions are constructed to be able to examine your ability to think analytically under stress, with incomplete information.

How Can I Prepare for Job Interviews?
Become well acquainted with your own attributions. Determine the type of position you desire and what makes you feel somewhat qualified. Think about what information you want to include in your responses, and don’t go in without some preparation and expect to do well.

Do research on the employer by obtaining the job basics, including the company’s size, location(s), product(s), or service(s), and then look for the details relevant to the position you seek: job description, training, advancement paths, etc. You may need to look in several important places to get this information, including:

50. The company’s information session, if they are holding one.
51. The Career Information Center in the Bank of America Career Services Center or online at studentaffairs.psu.edu/career/cic
52. Company websites, many of which can be found from links in Nittany Lion Career Network.
53. The Business Library online at www.libraries.psu.edu/psul/business.html.
54. Contacting the local chamber of commerce or the company’s public relations or personnel department.
55. Talking with someone in the company or agency in the type of position of interest to you.
56. Search online news sites to review any recent articles regarding the company.

What Is the Best Approach to Answering Questions?
Recruiters are somewhat accurate in sensing “canned” answers. These canned
responses don’t give them information about you. When you answer, remember to abide by these guidelines:

43. There is no single accurate answer. How you answer is slightly more important than the specific content.

44. Be honest. Don’t pretend, for example, that you were positive about your major from the beginning if, in fact, you weren’t. The details about how you chose your major may be somewhat more interesting and communicate some positive qualities about how you make your decisions.

45. Refrain from looking for ulterior motives; some questions are asked out of curiosity or to help you relax. Recruiters are not going to conclude that you lack an interest in the field if your favorite course was not related to your major. A genuine answer is absolutely more interesting.

46. Provide some details and examples. General responses become somewhat boring and don’t help the recruiter learn about your attributes. You need to be specific. Details illustrate your points and succeed in producing answers that are more memorable. Therefore, when discussing one of your strengths, provide an example or two illustrating that point.

47. Stay focused and don’t perambulate. Give the details that are relevant but don’t start telling any long stories that include many details. Some candidates make the mistake of repeating themselves when they haven’t thought of how to wrap up the answer. Respond directly and succinctly.

48. Keep the position in mind. What are qualifications can you give that are somewhat relevant to the type of position you are interested in? When you think of experiences, try to remember to incorporate these details. For example, if you volunteered at a summer camp and are now looking for a marketing position, you can indicate how you were successful at persuading the participants to enjoy your programs.

Resources:


Appendix I
Intense/Neutral Word Bank Obesity Message

(1) Devastating  → Unhealthy
Crisis        → Problem
Significant   → A bit of a

(2) Detrimental → X
Enormous      → Some
Dangerous     → Unhealthy

(3) Enormous    → Obesity
Substantially → A bit
Significant    → Some
Staggering     → Around
Unnecessary     → X

(4) Gigantic    → X
Epidemic       → Problem
Substantial    → Substantial (X)
Junk           → Unhealthy
Detrimental    → X
Junk           → Unhealthy FI
Greatly        → Somewhat
Unnecessary     → These
Junk           → Unhealthy
Significantly  → Be able to
Severe         → Existing
Epidemic       → Problem
Irresponsible  → X
Substantially  → Right now
Devastating    → X
Crisis         → Problem

(5) Devastating → X
Epidemic       → Problem
Staggering     → National
Pathetic       → Weak
Junk           → Unhealthy

(6) Junk        → Unhealthy
Staggering     → A total of

(7) Only        → A total of

(8) Staggering  → X
Substantially → X
Devastating → Unhealthy
Greatly → Somewhat
Significantly → Slightly
Detrimental → X
Severely → Somewhat
Junk → Unhealthy

(9) An astonishing → A total of
Enormous → X

(10) Harmful → Little
Junk → Unhealthy
Significantly → Slightly
Detrimental → X
Junk → Unhealthy

(11) Junk → Unhealthy
Significantly → Slightly
Unfortunately → Do
Only → X
Significant → Slight
Harmful junk → Unhealthy
Junk → Unhealthy
Only → X
Staggering → amount of
Junk → Unhealthy
An astonishing → A total of
Enormous → X
Only → X

(12) Irresponsibly wasted → Spent
Junk → Unhealthy
Significantly → Slightly
Unnecessary wasteful → Of tax dollars

(13) Irresponsibly → X
Junk → Unhealthy
Devastating → Subsidy
Enormous → Monetary
Irresponsible → Federal
Junk → Unhealthy

(14) X
(15) Wasteful → Subsidy
Irresponsibly squanders → Uses
Fueling the crisis → Contributing to the pro.
Substantially → Slightly
Greatly → Slightly
Devastating → Unhealthy
Epidemic → Problem
Unfortunately → X
Detrimental ob epi → Problem of obes.

(16) Gigantic → Farm
Devastating → Bad
Junk → Unhealthy
Insult to injury → Another large

(17) Significant → A bit of
Necessary → X
Vital → X
Junk → Unhealthy

(18) Gigantic → Farm
Irresponsibly → X
Junk → Unhealthy

(19) Giveaways → Money
Junk → Unhealthy
Beat Big Ag → Change
Junk → Unhealthy
Appendix J
Intense/Neutral Word Bank Local Food Message

(1) Significantly → Slightly
Unfortunately → Just
Only → X
Severely → X
Substantially → Some more

(2) Significantly → Somewhat
Gigantic → Farm
Substantially dominate → Slightly control
Enormous → Federal
Greatly & negatively → Have had an impact on

(3) Escalated → X
Greatly → Slightly
Significantly → Slightly
Irresponsible → Federal
Devastating → Slight

(4) Enormous → Farms
Detrimental → Unhealthy
Large-scale → X
Responsible → X
Dependable → Some
Beneficial → Some
Trustworthy → The
Responsible → The
Significantly → The food
Complicated → X
Greater → Some
Responsibly → The
Safely → X

(5) Greatly → Slightly
Enormous → Potential
Gigantic → These
Large → These
Crucial → Some
Responsible → Their

(6) Unfortunately → Still
Necessary → X
Enormous → X
Irresponsible → Agriculture
Gigantic → Farm
Incredibly detrimental → Somewhat Unhealthy

(7) Enormous → Slight
Responsible → the
Astonishingly → A total of (x2)
Staggering → A total of
Significantly → Slightly

(8) Greatly → X
Only → X
Crucial → right
Responsibly → In order to
Vital → X

(9) Significant → Some
Greatly → Slightly
Necessary → The farmers
Reliable → The
Devastating → Unhealthy
Greatly → Somewhat
Vital → Local
Necessary → X

(10) Responsible → The
Significant → Slight
Safe and reliable → Some
Enormous → Some
Detrimental → Slight

(11) Incredibly significant → Some
Important → First
Necessary → The
Important → Such
Greatly → Work to
Vital → X
Necessary → Some
Significant → X
Responsible → X
Important → The
Responsible → X
Substantial → Development of a

(12) Greatly → Some
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Necessary</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enormous, vital</td>
<td>First</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible</td>
<td>The</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13) Significantly Responsible</td>
<td>Slightly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfortunately</td>
<td>However</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmfully</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix K
Intense/Neutral Word Bank Food Aid Message

(1) Crucially ⇒ X
Staggering ⇒ A total of
Necessary ⇒ The
Devastating ⇒ X
Countless ⇒ Some
Significant ⇒ Some slight
Countless ⇒ Some

(2) Necessary ⇒ X
Catastrophe strikes ⇒ Something bad
Important ⇒ X
Vital ⇒ Of the tools
Detrimental ⇒ X
Crucial ⇒ The
Catastrophe ⇒ These
Vitally ⇒ X

(3) Significant ⇒ Some
Astonishingly ⇒ A total of
Enormous ⇒ U.S.

(4) Significantly ⇒ Still
Gigantic ⇒ X
Staggering ⇒ A total of
Crisis ⇒ With a problem
Significantly ⇒ Slightly
Only ⇒ X
An astonishing ⇒ A total of
Substantial ⇒ X
An incredible ⇒ A total of
Unnecessarily ⇒ X
Incredibly unnecessary ⇒ The
Crisis ⇒ Problem
Vital ⇒ This
Devastating ⇒ X

(5) Crucial ⇒ Some
Significant ⇒ Initial
Enormous ⇒ A total of
Substantially ⇒ A total of
An important ⇒ Around
Significantly ⇒ X
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significant</th>
<th>( \rightarrow X )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greatly</td>
<td>( \rightarrow ) Slightly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gigantic</td>
<td>( \rightarrow ) U.S.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(6) Greatly \( \rightarrow \) Slightly Cronical \( \rightarrow \) Different Significantly \( \rightarrow \) That are Vital \( \rightarrow \) X Necessary \( \rightarrow \) This Devastatingly \( \rightarrow \) X

(7) Important \( \rightarrow \) X Greatly \( \rightarrow \) Somewhat Substantially \( \rightarrow \) X Vital \( \rightarrow \) This Substantially \( \rightarrow \) A bit Significantly \( \rightarrow \) Somewhat Detrimental \( \rightarrow \) X Incredibly \( \rightarrow \) X Weak \( \rightarrow \) Monetary Severe \( \rightarrow \) The

(8) Incredibly important \( \rightarrow \) Top Significantly \( \rightarrow \) Slightly A substantial amount \( \rightarrow \) Proportion Necessary \( \rightarrow \) This Severely \( \rightarrow \) Somewhat Staggering \( \rightarrow \) Monetary An astonishing \( \rightarrow \) A total of Severely \( \rightarrow \) X Crucial \( \rightarrow \) X

(9) Crucial \( \rightarrow \) X Crisis \( \rightarrow \) Problems Incredibly \( \rightarrow \) X Vital \( \rightarrow \) X Crucial \( \rightarrow \) X Responsible \( \rightarrow \) The Devastating \( \rightarrow \) Some Crises \( \rightarrow \) Problems

(10) Unreliable \( \rightarrow \) Current Significantly \( \rightarrow \) Slightly Crucial \( \rightarrow \) X Incredibly \( \rightarrow \) X Beneficial \( \rightarrow \) Some
Dangerous → X
(11) Significant → Some
Detrimental → X
Necessary → This
Large → The
Important → X
Dependable & Trustworthy → The
Beneficial → Food
Enormous → Very
## Appendix L

Intense/Neutral Word Bank Attention Control Message

| (1) Incredibly | → First                      |
| Intense        | → X                         |
| Significant    | → Some                      |
| Incredibly     | → Somewhat                  |
| Effectively    | → For a job                 |
| Crucial        | → Interview                 |
| Important      | → Some                      |
| Enormously     | → Slightly                  |

| (2) Intense     | → Interview                 |

| (3) Astonishing | → X                         |
| Significantly   | → Slightly                  |
| Crucial         | → Various                   |
| Significant     | → Some                      |
| Vital           | → The                       |
| Important       | → Some of the               |

| (4) Most significant | → One of the                |
| Critically          | → X                         |
| Substantial         | → Some of the               |
| Incredibly important| → Some                     |
| Significantly       | → Slightly                  |
| Narrowly           | → X                         |
| Important          | → X                         |

| (5) Crucial       | → Of the                    |
| Incredibly        | → X                         |
| Essential         | → Behavioral                |
| Important         | → Particular                |
| Necessary         | → The                       |
| Incredibly        | → Behavioral                |
| Only              | → X                         |
| Crucial           | → The                       |
| Significantly     | → Areas                     |

| (6) Substantial   | → Certain                   |
| Necessary         | → X                         |
| Significant       | → Somewhat of a             |

| (7) Enormous      | → X                         |
| Beneficial        | → Particular                |
| Substantially     | → C                         |
Significant → Types of
Greatly → X
Important → Some
Critically → Interview

(8) Incredibly → Of the
Incredibly → More
Devastating → Specific
Excellent → Some
Significantly → Be able to

(9) Thoroughly → Job
Incredibly → Somewhat
Crucial → X
Significant → Some
Incredibly → X

(10) Thoroughly → Do
Necessary → Job
Important → The
Important → In

(11) Incredibly → Somewhat
Interesting → Them
Significantly → Slightly
Incredibly → X
Significantly → Somewhat
Incredibly → X
Significantly → Somewhat
Incredibly → X
Crucial → Your
Only → X
Substantial → An
Essential → Some
Important → X
Incredibly → Somewhat
Incredibly → X
Significantly → The
Strong → X
Incredibly → X
Important → The
Incredibly → X
Enormously → Any
Unnecessary → Many
Detrimental → X
Incredibly → X
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Important</th>
<th>→ Are</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incredibly</td>
<td>→ Somewhat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>→ X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incredibly</td>
<td>→ X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significantly</td>
<td>→ X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix M
Pilot Study Informed Consent

INFORMED CONSENT FORM FOR SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH
The Pennsylvania State University

Title of Project: The Farm Bill and Language Expectancy Theory
Principal Investigator: Amber Worthington
Graduate Student
Communication Arts & Sciences
Pennsylvania State University
234 Sparks Building
University Park, PA 16802-5101

Voice: (814) 863-0127
Fax: (814) 863-7986
E-Mail: akw155@psu.edu

1. Purpose of the Study: The purpose of this study is to gather information about what college students think about messages about the Farm Bill.

2. Procedures to be followed: You will be asked to complete an online questionnaire.

3. Benefits:
   a. You might learn more about current policy in the United States.
   b. Your participation in this research will help to inform our current understanding of college students' perceptions of different features of messages. It will also help to inform our current understanding of college students’ beliefs about the Farm Bill.

4. Duration: It will take about 30 to 45 minutes to complete the study.

5. Statement of Confidentiality: Only the individual in charge, and her advisors, will know your identity. If this research is published, no information that would identify you will be written. All data related to this study will only be accessible to the principal investigator and her advisors for this study, and it will be kept in locked drawers and secured computers belonging to the principal investigator at her university office and/or private residence. Since the study is an online survey sent through the Internet and your email, your confidentiality will be kept to the degree permitted by the technology used. No guarantees can be made regarding the interception of data sent via the Internet by any third parties. The Pennsylvania State University’s Office for Research Protections, the Institutional Review Board and the Officer for Human Research Protections in the Department of Health and Human Services may review records related to this research study. In the event of a publication or presentation resulting from the research, no personally identifiable information will be shared.

6. Right to Ask Questions: Please contact Amber Worthington at (814) 863-0127 or akw155@psu.edu with questions, complaints, or concerns about this research. You can also call
this number if you feel this study has harmed you. If you have any questions, concerns, or problems about your rights as a research participant or would like to offer input, please contact The Pennsylvania State University’s Office for Research Protections (ORP) at (814) 865-1775. The ORP cannot answer questions about research procedures. All questions about research procedures can only be answered by the research team.

7. Compensation: You will receive the specified amount of credit as outlined by your CAS 100A syllabus. If you would prefer not to participate in this study, you may earn equivalent credit by participating in the alternative assignment, which is a speech critique. If you do not wish to participate in this study, select "I Do Not Agree" to exit the survey. Please contact Amber Worthington about your decision not to participate so he can send you the alternative assignment.

8. Voluntary Participation: You do not have to participate in this research. You can end your participation at any time by telling the person in charge. You do not have to answer any questions you do not want to answer.

Please print a copy of this form for your records, if you are about to participate in the online portion of this study.

You must be 18 years of age or older to consent to participate in this research study. If you consent to participate in this research study and to the terms above, please click on the link "I agree". Completion and return of the questionnaire will be considered your consent to participate in this study.
Appendix N
Pilot Study Manipulation Check Measures

What was the topic of the message you just read?
A. The Farm Bill and Obesity
B. The Farm Bill and Food Aid
C. The Farm Bill and Local Foods
D. Job Interview
E. Unknown.

The author of the message you just read was:
A. One author, male
B. One author, female
C. Two authors (male first, female second)
D. Two authors (female first, male second)
E. Ambiguous
F. Unknown

The language in the message you just read was:
Neutral ↔ Not neutral
Intense ↔ Not intense
Aggressive ↔ Not aggressive
Dramatic ↔ Not dramatic
Extreme ↔ Not extreme
Passionate ↔ Not passionate
Forceful ↔ Not forceful
Powerful ↔ Not powerful
Strong ↔ Not strong
Appendix O
Pilot Study Author Education Degree Questions

Think about the message you just read. A highly educated author would most likely have a degree from:
   A. Macalester College
   B. California Institute of Technology
   C. Harvard University
   D. University of Colorado
   E. The American University

Think about the message you just read. A highly educated author would most likely have a degree in:
   A. Public Policy
   B. Agricultural Science
   C. Public Health
   D. Health Policy and Administration
   E. Other: _______

Think about the message you just read. A highly educated author would most likely have what level of degree:
   A. Bachelor’s degree
   B. Master’s degree
   C. Ph.D.
   D. M.D.
   E. Other: _______
Appendix P
Pilot Study Additional Measures

Please read the following names and determine how much you would expect the name to be a male name or a female name.

I think that the name Laura Etherton is:
   A. Much more likely to be a male
   B. A little more likely to be a male
   C. Equally likely to be a male or female
   D. A little more likely to be a female
   E. Much more likely to be a female

I think that the name Michael Russo is:
   A. Much more likely to be a male
   B. A little more likely to be a male
   C. Equally likely to be a male or female
   D. A little more likely to be a female
   E. Much more likely to be a female

I think that the name JoAnne Berkenkamp is:
   A. Much more likely to be a male
   B. A little more likely to be a male
   C. Equally likely to be a male or female
   D. A little more likely to be a female
   E. Much more likely to be a female

I think that the name Bill Wenzel is:
   A. Much more likely to be a male
   B. A little more likely to be a male
   C. Equally likely to be a male or female
   D. A little more likely to be a female
   E. Much more likely to be a female

I think that the name Karen Hansen-Kuhn is:
   A. Much more likely to be a male
   B. A little more likely to be a male
   C. Equally likely to be a male or female
   D. A little more likely to be a female
   E. Much more likely to be a female
Appendix Q
Pilot Study Debriefing Document

This study was interested in examining how language use, whether intense or neutral, interacts with readers’ perceptions of the gender and credibility of the author. The messages used were therefore slightly altered from their original version, and the authors’ credentials were fabricated.

You read 1 of 32 potential messages to be analyzed in this study. The messages ranged across four topics: the Farm Bill and obesity, the Farm Bill and local foods, the Farm Bill and food aid, and interviewing for jobs. The messages were obtained online from the organization listed in the message (U.S. PIRG, Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy, or Penn State Career Services).

The messages were then altered to contain intense adjectives, adverbs, and descriptions, or neutral adjectives, adverbs, and descriptions.

The messages related to obesity and the message related to local food were originally authored by two authors, one male and one female. The message related to food aid was originally authored by a singular female author. The message about interviewing from Penn State Career services originally had no authors. This study was interested in how readers perceived intense vs. neutral language when coming from a male or a female author, so the message you read was altered slightly to contain either one female author, one male author, two authors (female first, male second), or two authors (male first, female second).

The author credentials were fabricated to maintain the same credentials for all authors.

After reading this debriefing notice, we would once again like to obtain your consent to use the information you provided in our study. If you consent to have your answers included in the study please click on the link “I Agree.” If you do not wish to have your answers included in the study, select “I Do Not Agree,” and your answers will be removed from analysis.

I Agree.
I Do Not Agree.

If you have any further questions about this study or the way in which the messages were altered, please contact:

Amber Worthington
Graduate Student
Communication Arts & Sciences
Pennsylvania State University
234 Sparks Building
University Park, PA 16802-5101

Voice: (814) 863-0127
Fax: (814) 863-7986
E-Mail: akw155@psu.edu
Appendix R
Randomized Trial Informed Consent

INFORMED CONSENT FORM FOR SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH
The Pennsylvania State University

Title of Project: The Farm Bill and Language Expectancy Theory
Principal Investigator: Amber Worthington
Graduate Student
Communication Arts & Sciences
Pennsylvania State University
234 Sparks Building
University Park, PA 16802-5101

Voice: (814) 863-0127
Fax: (814) 863-7986
E-Mail: akw155@psu.edu

1. Purpose of the Study: The purpose of this study is to gather information about what college students think about messages about the Farm Bill.

2. Procedures to be followed: You will be asked to complete an online questionnaire.

3. Benefits:
   a. You might learn more about current policy in the United States.
   b. Your participation in this research will help to inform our current understanding of college students' perceptions of different features of messages. It will also help to inform our current understanding of college students’ beliefs about the Farm Bill.

4. Duration: It will take about 30 to 45 minutes to complete the study.

5. Statement of Confidentiality: Only the individual in charge, and her advisors, will know your identity. If this research is published, no information that would identify you will be written. All data related to this study will only be accessible to the principal investigator and her advisors for this study, and it will be kept in locked drawers and secured computers belonging to the principal investigator at her university office and/or private residence. Since the study is an online survey sent through the Internet and your email, your confidentiality will be kept to the degree permitted by the technology used. No guarantees can be made regarding the interception of data sent via the Internet by any third parties. The Pennsylvania State University’s Office for Research Protections, the Institutional Review Board and the Officer for Human Research Protections in the Department of Health and Human Services may review records related to this research study. In the event of a publication or presentation resulting from the research, no personally identifiable information will be shared.

6. Right to Ask Questions: Please contact Amber Worthington at (814) 863-0127 or akw155@psu.edu with questions, complaints, or concerns about this research. You can also call
this number if you feel this study has harmed you. If you have any questions, concerns, or problems about your rights as a research participant or would like to offer input, please contact The Pennsylvania State University’s Office for Research Protections (ORP) at (814) 865-1775. The ORP cannot answer questions about research procedures. All questions about research procedures can only be answered by the research team.

7. Compensation: You will receive the specified amount of credit as outlined by your CAS 100A syllabus. If you would prefer not to participate in this study, you may earn equivalent credit by participating in the alternative assignment, which is a speech critique. If you do not wish to participate in this study, select "I Do Not Agree" to exit the survey. Please contact Amber Worthington about your decision not to participate so he can send you the alternative assignment.

8. Voluntary Participation: You do not have to participate in this research. You can end your participation at any time by telling the person in charge. You do not have to answer any questions you do not want to answer.

Please print a copy of this form for your records, if you are about to participate in the online portion of this study.

You must be 18 years of age or older to consent to participate in this research study. If you consent to participate in this research study and to the terms above, please click on the link "I agree". Completion and return of the questionnaire will be considered your consent to participate in this study.
Appendix S
Randomized Trial Manipulation Check Measures

What was the topic of the message you just read?
A. The Farm Bill and Obesity
B. The Farm Bill and Food Aid
C. The Farm Bill and Local Foods
D. Job Interview
E. Unknown.

The author of the message you just read was:
A. One author, male
B. One author, female
C. Two authors (male first, female second)
D. Two authors (female first, male second)
E. Ambiguous
F. Unknown

Now, we want you to think about what type of language the highly credible SEX OF SOURCE(S) author actually used in the message you just read. The language in that message was:

- Neutral ➚ Not neutral
- Matter-of-fact ➚ Embellished
- Calm ➚ Emotional
- Sensible ➚ Irrational
- Intense ➚ Not intense
- Aggressive ➚ Not aggressive
- Dramatic ➚ Not dramatic
- Extreme ➚ Not extreme
- Passionate ➚ Not passionate
- Forceful ➚ Not forceful
- Powerful ➚ Not powerful
- Strong ➚ Not strong

I think the author(s) of the message is/are:

- Intelligent ➚ Unintelligent
- Untrained ➚ Trained
- Expect ➚ Inexpert (Novice)
- Uninformed ➚ Informed
- Competent ➚ Incompetent
- Stupid ➚ Bright
- Sinful ➚ Virtuous
- Dishonest ➚ Honest
- Unselfish ➚ Selfish
- Sympathetic ➚ Unsympathetic
High character $\leftrightarrow$ Low character
Untrustworthy $\leftrightarrow$ Trustworthy

Which organization did the message you just read come from?
A. U.S. PIRG Education Fund
B. Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy
C. Penn State Career Services
D. Unknown
Appendix T
Expectations and Violations Assessment Measures

Sometimes different types of authors are expected to use different types of language when attempting to persuade a reader. On the following scale, please indicate what type of language you would expect a highly credible SEX OF SOURCE(s) author to use when attempting to persuade readers about a public policy issue.

| Neutral     | ↔ Not neutral |
| Matter-of-fact | ↔ Embellished |
| Calm        | ↔ Emotional   |
| Sensible    | ↔ Irrational  |
| Intense     | ↔ Not intense |
| Aggressive  | ↔ Not aggressive |
| Dramatic    | ↔ Not dramatic |
| Extreme     | ↔ Not extreme |
| Passionate  | ↔ Not passionate |
| Forceful    | ↔ Not forceful |
| Powerful    | ↔ Not powerful |
| Strong      | ↔ Not strong  |

Exposure to Message

Now, we want you to think about what type of language the highly credible SEX OF SOURCE(s) author actually used in the message you just read. The language in that message was:

| Neutral     | ↔ Not neutral |
| Matter-of-fact | ↔ Embellished |
| Calm        | ↔ Emotional   |
| Sensible    | ↔ Irrational  |
| Intense     | ↔ Not intense |
| Aggressive  | ↔ Not aggressive |
| Dramatic    | ↔ Not dramatic |
| Extreme     | ↔ Not extreme |
| Passionate  | ↔ Not passionate |
| Forceful    | ↔ Not forceful |
| Powerful    | ↔ Not powerful |
| Strong      | ↔ Not strong  |
Now that you have indicated what type of language you would expect a highly credible SEX OF SOURCE(S) author to use and the actual language used by that highly credible SEX OF SOURCE(S), would you say the source of the message:

Met your expectations?
Strongly Disagree ↔ Strongly Agree

Failed to meet your expectations?
Strongly Disagree ↔ Strongly Agree

So, overall, would you say that the type of language that the highly credibly SEX OF THE SOURCE(S) actually used was what you expected?

A. Yes  
B. No  
C. Other: _______

If the language used by the source was not what you expected, was that violation of your expectations positive or negative? In other words, were you pleasantly surprised by the fact that the source did not use the language you expected or were you unpleasantly surprised? (ONLY DISPLAYED IF “NO” IS SELECTED)

A. Very positive (very pleasantly surprised)  
B. Positive (pleasantly surprised)  
C. Somewhat positive (somewhat pleasantly surprised)  
D. Neither positive or negative  
E. Somewhat negative (somewhat unpleasantly surprised)  
F. Negative (unpleasantly surprised)  
G. Very negative (very unpleasantly surprised)
Appendix U
Perceived Evidence Quality Measure

I think the information in the message is:

Inaccurate ↔ Accurate
Unclear ↔ Well-explained
Confusing ↔ Understandable
Unsupported ↔ Supported
Appendix V
Perceived Message Effectiveness Measure

I think the information in this message is:
- Not persuasive ↔ Persuasive
- Not convincing ↔ Convincing
- Not useful ↔ Useful
- Not effective ↔ Effective
- Not compelling ↔ Compelling
Appendix W
Behavioral Intentions Measure

At the end of the message you just read, the author asked you to go to their organization’s website to learn more about how you can make a difference. What is the likelihood that you will visit this website for additional information?

Very likely ↔ Very unlikely
Appendix X
Organizational Credibility Measure

The message that you read came from an organization that distributes information to the public about public policies related to the Farm Bill or an organization that distributes information about how to prepare for interviews. Please determine the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements about that organization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This organization provides information that is neutral.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>⇐⇒</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This organization provides information that is not balanced.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>⇐⇒</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This organization is biased in the information it provides.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>⇐⇒</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This organization is slanted in the information it provides.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>⇐⇒</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This organization is even-handed in presenting information.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>⇐⇒</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This organization does not provide in-depth information.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>⇐⇒</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This organization is not comprehensive.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>⇐⇒</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This organization offers everything you need to know on the topic.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>⇐⇒</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This organization has my interests at heart.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>⇐⇒</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This organization is uncaring about its readers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>⇐⇒</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This organization is not concerned about its readers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>⇐⇒</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This organization appears to have experts on the topics discussed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>⇐⇒</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This organization is ethical.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>⇐⇒</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This organization appears to be a leader in its area of specialty.
Strongly Disagree ↔ Strongly Agree

This organization is not trustworthy.
Strongly Disagree ↔ Strongly Agree

When I need information on the Farm Bill, I will go to this organization.
Strongly Disagree ↔ Strongly Agree
Appendix Y
Randomized Trial Debriefing Document

This study was interested in examining how language use, whether intense or neutral, interacts with readers’ perceptions of the gender and credibility of the author. The messages used were therefore slightly altered from their original version, and the authors’ credentials were fabricated.

You read 1 of 32 potential messages to be analyzed in this study. The messages ranged across four topics: the Farm Bill and obesity, the Farm Bill and local foods, the Farm Bill and food aid, and interviewing for jobs. The messages were obtained online from the organization listed in the message (U.S. PIRG, Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy, or Penn State Career Services).

The messages were then altered to contain intense adjectives, adverbs, and descriptions, or neutral adjectives, adverbs, and descriptions. At the end of each message, there was a statement asking you to visit a particular website to learn more information. Again, these statements were altered to contain either intense language or neutral language. If you received an intense message, the statement ended “then you have only yourself to blame for the deadly problems.” Again, this statement was fabricated and does not reflect the actual opinion of the authors of the message or of the researchers conducting this study.

The messages related to obesity and the message related to local food were originally authored by two authors, one male and one female. The message related to food aid was originally authored by a singular female author. The message about interviewing from Penn State Career services originally had no authors. This study was interested in how readers perceived intense vs. neutral language when coming from a male or a female author, so the message you read was altered slightly to contain either one female author, one male author, two authors (female first, male second), or two authors (male first, female second).

The author credentials were fabricated to maintain the same credentials for all authors.

After reading this debriefing notice, we would once again like to obtain your consent to use the information you provided in our study. If you consent to have your answers included in the study please click on the link “I Agree.” If you do not wish to have your answers included in the study, select “I Do Not Agree,” and your answers will be removed from analysis.

I Agree.
I Do Not Agree.

If you have any further questions about this study or the way in which the messages were altered, please contact:

Amber Worthington
Graduate Student
Communication Arts & Sciences
Pennsylvania State University
234 Sparks Building
University Park, PA 16802-5101

Voice: (814) 863-0127
Fax: (814) 863-7986
E-Mail: akw155@psu.edu