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This dissertation uses framing theory and the concepts of emic and etic to formulate
a culture frames model for identifying, describing and comparing mass media and
individual frames. This model also helps determine levels of culture affinity between
diverse frames and their sources. The results of this dissertation are a series of frames
regarding the issue of healthcare coverage in America used in public relations strategies
targeting Latinos in the state of Florida during the 2004 presidential election in the United
States. The referential frames used by Latino-subgroup members (Colombian, Cuban,
and Puerto Rican Americans) were also included in the results.

A content analysis of 125 political and communitarian campaign communications
using the culture frames model resulted in several key frames that were used in these
mobilization efforts. The major Bush/Cheney political campaign frames were for the
Bush Agenda for America, the Combative Frame: Bush Policy vs. Kerry Policy and the
Latino American Dream frames. The Kerry/Edwards political campaign frames included
the *Stronger America*, and the *Failure and Struggle* frames. Finally, the main LULAC/SVREP communitarian campaign frames were the *Healthcare Reform* and *Latino Plight* frames.

The Latino frames emerged from the content analysis of in-depth interviews with 21 Latinos of voting age in the state of Florida. The main Colombian American frames were the *Struggling Latino*, and the *Universal Healthcare Hybrid* frame. The main Cuban American frame identified was *Enforcement vs. Reform*. Finally, the Puerto Rican American frames were the *Struggling Latino Worker* and the *Progressive Government* frames.

The conclusions in this study highlight the importance of attending to cultural nuances as these may impact the effectiveness of public relations campaign strategies. These findings argue against treating minority groups as a monolith and recognize the differences that may exist between the frames of reference used by members of a minority group. These findings also suggest that public relations practitioners who rely on a culture frames model will be better equipped to design, implement and evaluated effective public relations campaign strategies in today’s multicultural society.
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE

Latino Mobilization Campaigns

Ever since results of the 2000 U.S. Census showed that Latinos had become the largest and fastest-growing minority group in America, Latinos received increased attention from government, mainstream and ethnic media organizations, and community organizations and corporations. Increasing interest in understanding Latino behavior is visible in the number of recent studies attempting to elucidate opinions, and in Latino consumer and political behavior. The Pew Hispanic Center (2004), for example, has conducted research investigating Latinos at the national, regional, and state levels as well as in major metropolitan areas. Zogby International (2000) has conducted a groundbreaking study investigating the major ethnic communities in America in recent years. The Zogby Culture Polls included a focus on the views, opinions, and consumer behavior of Latinos among other ethnic and racial groups. Also, many periodicals including newspapers, magazines, and industry newsletters (ethnic and mainstream publications alike) often include information about popular trends in the U.S. Latino population.

There is clearly an increased interest in understanding the Latino community today more than ever before. However, most if not all efforts, view and target the Latino community as a monolith. They ignore (perhaps because of a myopic view of this cultural group or because of scarce resources) the nuances that can exist among Latino subgroups. Similarities and differences among Latino subgroups, added up, amount to what we know
today as Latino culture in America. Providing a deeper understanding of Latino culture is one of the main objectives of this dissertation. The goal is to shed some light on the question of how different these minority subgroups can be from one another. However, the topic of this dissertation covers a very small portion of all the issues that this question can encompass. It focuses on the framing mechanisms utilized in public relations campaign strategies to define the issue of healthcare coverage in America as they sought to mobilize Latinos toward increased political involvement. This dissertation also examines the cultural frames of reference that Latinos, from diverse subgroups within this minority (i.e., Colombian, Cuban, and Puerto Rican Americans) use to define and communicate about the healthcare coverage issue.

This research attempts to provide a deeper understanding of the potential nuances that exist among the referential frames used by Latinos of diverse heritage in Latin America and Europe. It relies on thick description using framing theory and content analysis measures as well as the emic and etic perspectives to ascertain any distinctions in the meaning Latinos from various subgroups ascribe to the issue of healthcare coverage. This analysis takes place in the context of a U.S. presidential campaign. Additionally, this research represents the first attempt to compare and contrast the meaning/functionality of culture frames that were used by Latino subgroups with those used in publicity campaigns that targeted this population. This study represents a post-facto analysis of the level of frame affinity that exists between these two entities—political and communitarian campaigns and Latino subgroups. This research is intended to offer another useful model for public relations and communications practitioners in general, to
better understand the issue of cultural variability in the design and targeting of campaign messages to key publics.

**The Latino Population in the U.S.**

According to recent estimates by the U.S. Census Bureau (2004), the Latino population in the United States is nearing 40 million. The population of U.S. Latinos is equal to the population of Argentina (39 million). It is also larger than the entire population of the islands of Puerto Rico (4 million), Cuba (11 million), and the Dominican Republic (8.8 million) combined. Latinos represent roughly 12.5 percent of the U.S. population, making them a larger minority group than even African Americans. While growth in the African-American population has slowed, making Blacks the second largest minority group in America, the population of Latinos has experienced a surge (Central Intelligence Agency, 2004). Latinos are not only growing in numbers, they are also increasing in intracultural diversity. Today, America has representatives from every Latin American nation. Mexican Americans represent the majority of Latinos in the United States. They are followed by Puerto Rican, Cuban, and Dominican Americans as well as Latinos from other nations (Garcia, 2003).

The size of the Latino population as well as the commonalities and diversity within this minority group support the idea of a nation within a nation. Latinos in the U.S. represent a complex community of nationals from all over Latin America. However, they share many aspects of their cultural heritage. They share a common language (Spanish), a history of colonization by the French and Spaniards and a long-lasting religious tradition (most Latinos are Catholic) that can be traced back to their nations of origin (Nash, 1996; Nepstad, 1996; Zogby International, 2000). The Latino community in the U.S. also relies, to some extent, on ethnic communications networks such as Spanish-language television,
radio stations, cable programming, and print publications. But despite their strong cultural heritage, large numbers, and increasing purchasing power, Latinos still are not proportionally represented in American politics. In fact, they have only recently been viewed as playing a potentially impacting role in elections. Two recent elections—the 2004 U.S. presidential election and the 2005 Los Angeles mayoral race—seem to demonstrate the increasingly accepted view that Latinos are the next powerful emerging voting bloc in America. But recent research and election polls still point out their very low voting rates vis a vis other ethnic groups such as Blacks and Asian Americans and their low rates of participation in other forms of political behavior.

Low voter-turnout rates among Latinos and low participation rates in other forms of political life have not stymied interest in the potential Latino voter bloc. The increasing interest in Latinos in America that has resulted from the release of 2000 U.S. Census figures has not only been evident in the number of academic, marketing and public opinion studies about this population mentioned earlier. The major political parties in the United States have also sponsored increasingly ambitious efforts to recruit Latinos for their parties and to get them registered to vote. Though these party efforts have been present for some time, they have especially intensified since the 2000 Census figures highlighted the rapid growth among members of this community (Velazquez & Cobble, 2004; Stevenson, 2004; Lambro, 2003). Both the Democratic and Republican parties have seen a great opportunity to solidify their support base among Latinos. Recent appeals by the Kerry/Edwards Democratic Presidential Campaign and the Bush/Cheney Republican Presidential Campaign in 2004 show the important role they believed the Latino vote would play in deciding the winner of the election.
Democrats and Republicans used television and radio advertising, and local registration drives, and relied heavily on their Web sites to aggressively win support among Latinos during the 2004 presidential election (Segal, 2004). In an effort to sway Latino voters, the candidates positioned themselves as advocates of Latino issues and as bearers of Latino values during the 2004 presidential election (Balz, & Morin, 2004). A quick look at campaign media and newspaper headlines clearly shows both major political parties’ increased interest in recruiting Latino voters. The growing consensus among many opinion leaders leading up to the presidential elections was that in order to win in 2004, the presidential candidates would have to win the support of this prized swing voter bloc—Latino voters (Barnett, 2004; Stevenson, 2004; Velazquez, & Cobble, 2004).

In addition to Democrat and Republican efforts to influence Latino voters, a series of nonpartisan mobilization campaigns headed by community organizations targeted the Latino community in the United States. These organizations relied on a combination of mass media and interpersonal public relations strategies in their communication for development efforts that targeted Latinos (A. Fernandez, personal communication, November 11, 2004). The League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC) and the Southwest Voter Registration Education Project (SVREP) and several other egalitarian and communitarian Latino organizations also undertook large-scale efforts to mobilize the Latino community in the state of Florida. Their goal was to encourage higher voter registration and voting rates in the 2004 presidential elections—to empower Latinos.

The SVREP’s “Latino Vote 2004” was a “nonpartisan” effort to get Latinos out to vote in specific Florida and U.S. cities and regions where Latinos are heavily
concentrated. The SVREP efforts relied heavily on local ethnic community centers such as the Dominican Coalition VREP, the Orlando-Haitians VREP and Vox for the Vote VREP (New West Palm Beach) for their registration and Get Out the Vote (GOTV) efforts. They used local ethnic media such as Latin music radio stations and television networks to spread the word about registration drives and transportation for voters to election polls on Election Day (Southwest Voter Registration Education Project [SVREP], 2004). Groups like SVREP also used public relations tactics such as fliers, brochures, empowerment trainings, talks, and special events to recruit volunteers for their drives (A. Fernandez, personal communication, November 11, 2004).

The mass media also played a crucial role in these efforts to empower Latinos through enhanced political participation. Univision, the leading Spanish language television network in America, employed public relations strategies, such as the use of credible television personalities, to encourage higher voter registration and participation among their Latino audience. Maria Elenas Salinas, the network’s anchorwoman, provided a number of stories in the months leading up to the elections. These stories were made available on the cable news network’s Web site and on some of its news and informational programming that especially targets the Latino population. Their goal was to give Latino audiences sufficient reasons to get involved in the 2004 presidential election—to volunteer, register to vote and get out and vote on Election Day (Salinas, 2004).

Other communications organizations in the state of Florida were also involved in these efforts, albeit at a smaller scale, to remind Latinos of the important role they could play in the 2004 presidential election. Voz Latina, a small Spanish language newspaper
targeting North Central Florida, carried numerous full-page ads reminding Latinos of their “responsibility to vote and make their voice heard.” This bi-weekly publication also provided the two major parties with “equal time, equal space” to make their pitch to Spanish speaking voters in Alachua and Marion counties. According to Fausto Pazmine, the publisher of this Spanish language paper, it was publishers’ duty as a communication outlet in the Latino community to do so (F. Pazmine, personal communication, May 25, 2005). Larger-scale Spanish-language publications in Florida such as the Miami Herald also offered candidate profiles and party platforms to their readers as well as nonpartisan or party neutral messages to encourage Latinos to vote (Mordecate, 2004).

The increased media coverage involving the Latino population that followed the release of the 2000 U.S. Census report also raised a series of questions about key characteristics of this minority group. Their cultural identity, consumer trends, and the important issues affecting this community are subjects being explored by academics, the business sector, and politicians. As knowledge about the cultural differences among subgroups in this minority group increases, so do the voices calling for a departure from the view of Latinos as a monolithic cultural group. The surge in funding for Latino-specific research projects and specific organizations investigating Latino culture and politics (such as Zogby International, The Pew Hispanic Center, and the Hispanic Voter Project at John Hopkins University) indicate both the recognition that Latinos are an increasingly important part of American life and that sufficient nuances exist among this population to warrant investing important resources (Zogby International, 2000; Pew Hispanic Center, 2002, 2004; Segal, 2004).
Many of the recent projects targeting Latinos are driven by the idea that sufficient differences exist among subgroups of Latinos to warrant research investigating Latinos not as a monolith, but instead by looking at the larger subgroups. These voices argue that the booming Latino population in the U.S. demands that greater attention be paid to the nuances among Latino subgroups. Growth within the Latino population has amplified important differences in public opinion regarding political issues, greater social issues, political orientation, and behavior and cultural heritage. These voices include businesses looking to market their products and services to an increasingly diverse Latino population, electoral efforts seeking to galvanize support, and nonprofits aiming to provide this ethnic group with the needed assistance to develop into a viable and audible segment of American society. Unfortunately, there is not much academic or professional research available that compares and contrasts Latino subgroups today. This dissertation attempts to help address this need and focuses on within-group diversity in the Latino population.

**Purpose**

This dissertation examines the frames surrounding the issue of healthcare coverage in America that were incorporated into public relations strategies that sought to empower the Latino community vis a vis increased political participation. The focus of this study is on public relations strategies, which are part of communication for development initiatives that targeted Latinos in Florida during the 2004 U.S. presidential elections. The primary objective of these campaigns was to mobilize Latinos to register and vote. Media content used by public relations strategies is examined in this dissertation to better understand the culture frames employed to appeal to Latino voters and persuade them to become active participants in political life. In addition to the media frames used in public
relations efforts by organizations, this dissertation attempts to identify, discern, and
describe the referential frames used by Latinos to describe the issue of healthcare
coverage in America and what it means to them as voters. The role of cultural differences
among Latino subgroups in providing meaning/functionality to the democratic process in
America and the important issue of healthcare coverage are also explored in this
dissertation.

This dissertation departs from previous efforts that investigated the role of culture
in public relations strategies for nation building by focusing on subgroups within Latino
culture. This perspective differs from the inter-ethnic approach that examines two distinct
ethnic groups such as Taylor’s (2000a) study of relations between Chinese Malays and
Malay Malays. The research by Taylor is typical of studies in public relations that have
culture as one primary focus. Studies of that kind usually focus on just one ethnic or
racial group, or examine a phenomenon within an inter-ethnic milieu.

The overall purpose of this dissertation is to identify and explain the major culture
frames used by Latinos to identify and describe the key issue of healthcare coverage in
America. This issue was recorded by major public opinion polls of Latinos as one of the
most important issues on their minds during the 2004 U.S. presidential election season
and in previous years (Zogby International, 2000; Pew Hispanic Center, 2004). This
dissertation is also comparative in nature. It juxtaposes the culture frames used by Latino-
subgroup members regarding healthcare coverage with those present in public relations
campaign materials that targeted Latinos. This comparison of different frames from
diverse frames sources provides interesting insights into the different levels of frames and
affinity among them. Such a comparative analysis will hopefully reveal how well these
campaign frames reflect the frames of reference relied on by Latino voters to define this key election issue.

To properly and accurately assess the similarities and divergences between the public relations and individual Latino-subgroup frames, this study first identified these Latino-subgroup frames regarding the issue of healthcare coverage. To identify these subgroup frames, an analysis of within-Latino-subgroup members was conducted. Similarities as well as differences regarding the issue were then defined, discussed, and assessed through framing analysis. These subgroup frames were then used to identify each subgroup’s major referential frame regarding the healthcare coverage issue. Once these referential frames were identified and defined, this study moved to a second type of heuristic involving a form of between-Latino-subgroup framing analysis to determine the level of frame affinity among Latino subgroups and identify the major frames that represent the monolithic view of these subgroups.

Why study public relations strategies used in mobilization campaigns that target Latinos? This study of Latinos offers the opportunity to investigate, at a micro level, the dynamics of larger-scale nation-building campaigns that target multicultural segments of society. Multicultural contexts have traditionally presented public relations practitioners with a set of new challenges that are usually not found in less-culturally-diverse contexts. The occurrence of various cultural dynamics has implications for research, campaign implementation, and evaluation in public relations communications. Brislin (1993) describes the dilemmas faced by researchers and professionals performing their duties in a multicultural environment:

Frustration and excitement are also possible reactions among researchers who engage in cross-cultural and intercultural studies. Consider researchers in the fields
of psychology, education or communication who are deciding among various interesting and important topics to which to attach their analytical skills. Several possibilities might present themselves, and one could involve the career development of young executives in the researchers’ hometown. Another might involve the adjustment of some of those same executives who decide to accept international assignments at the branch offices of their organizations. If the researchers decide to attach their talents to the second study area, they (hopefully after careful thought) are accepting a set of burdens above and beyond those of the first study. (Brislin, 1993, p. 60)

Pointdexter and McCombs (2000) also suggest that the job of the communication practitioner and researcher is further complicated when designing or researching communication strategies that involve a foreign race or ethnicity. This type of research influences decisions about measurement and meaning. Multicultural research presents challenges regarding the validity and reliability of measures used and how well these gauge and reflect the phenomena being explored. It also raises serious problems about sampling and highlights the difficulty of making generalizations about the research findings that are focused on minority groups. This heightened level of sensitivity to culture is especially necessary in studies that attempt to measure the effectiveness of messages that target multicultural audiences. This is often the case of marketing, advertising and public relations campaigns in the U.S. and globally that target ethnically or racially diverse groups. It is imperative, these scholars suggest, that the researcher and the practitioner be aware of the need for accuracy in their instrumentation and precision of their messages before implementing a campaign or a research heuristic. This dissertation explores the impact culture can have on communication and on meaning. It also investigates the appropriate methodologies that can be used to measure communication in diverse cultural contexts. The way culture influences meaning is one of the main topics in this dissertation.
This dissertation seeks to make a contribution to the field of public relations at three distinct levels. First, it attempts to make a methodological contribution by offering the use of framing theory as an interpretive approach to measure levels of affinity or meaning equivalence between campaign frames and individual referential frames held by the public(s) targeted by these campaigns. The idea is that this framing approach can serve as a pre-implementation evaluation measure that can be used to evaluate the quality of messages of a campaign to assess potential impact. Recent surveys of the scholarly literature in public relations (Sallot, Lyon, Acosta-Alzuru, & Ogata Jones, 2003) identified quantitative methods such as surveys and opinion polls, and more traditional qualitative methods such as focus groups and in-depth interviews as the preferred methods used in evaluation efforts in the public relations field. However, most of these qualitative methods lack the depth provided by an interpretative framework such as framing. The more quantitative oriented methods that are used do not even attempt to answer critical cultural questions about the what, how and why of communication and behavior (Gaskell, 1994). The evaluation methods listed by Sallot and her colleagues (2003) are typically used in post-implementation studies. Put differently, these evaluation methods are used to measure impact and output effectiveness of public relations campaigns in a post-campaign environment. Public relations researchers evaluate these campaigns through the use of case studies, which they conduct after the campaigns have been implemented. The framing approach forwarded in this dissertation is recommended as a pre-campaign analysis tool to evaluate the frames used in media messages part of communication for development, to determine how well they reflect the referential frames held by target publics, which they use to define issues, organizations, and
individuals; and to make evaluations and judgment calls, and prescribe solutions to problems (Bateson, 1955; Goffman, 1974; Entman, 1993; Reese, 2001).

This dissertation also makes an important theoretical contribution to the field of public relations. Public relations scholars have effectively argued that theory development is an area where most contributions are needed in the field. Cutlip, Center, and Broom (2000) explain that one sign of an invigorated discipline is an increased demand for research and theory by practitioners, as well as “the critical examination of the conventional wisdom guiding the practice” (p. 152). Although, the study by Sallot et al. (2003) points out that significant theoretical developments in areas such as excellence theory, public relationships, and crisis-response theory have taken place in the past 20 years, important areas of research have yet to be developed. Introducing a culture-centered approach to the study of public relations campaign strategies evaluation can potentially provide scholarship in the field with a much needed heuristic. A culture-centered approach to discerning between media frames used in public relations tactics and the frames held by target audiences can highlight and discern the complexity of human experience by helping practitioners sharpen their campaigns to match the worldview of their targeted publics (Gaskell, 1994).

The survey of public relations research and theory building by Sallot et al. (2003) shows no indication of current usage of a similar cultural paradigm to the one used in this dissertation. In fact, the results from their study suggest that most of the cultural-centered research being performed in the field has employed a traditional approach, which relies on typologies such as Hofstede’s (1980) cultural dimensions. Other public relations research has focused on preparing practitioners to perform their professional duties in
foreign cultures. The survey of research in public relations conducted by Sallot and her colleagues (2003) also suggested that most research that focuses on minority and/or ethnic participants in public relations has either investigated women’s issues or is primarily concerned with professional development opportunities for minorities in the field.

A third contribution to research in public relations that this dissertation makes is that it stimulates the area of international and multicultural public relations research and theory development. It accomplishes this by building on previous work by scholars in the area of nation building and communication for development effort either at an international or community level. This research conceptualizes a new model for evaluating public relations campaign messages that are part of community/nation development efforts. The model proposed here comprises mass media and public opinion analysis. Additionally, this model uses a triangulation method to identify, describe and compare the culture frames used in media messages as well as those held by message receivers and interpreters. Furthermore, the model encompasses a culture-centered approach, which is explained in detail in the theoretical section of this dissertation. This cultural approach attempts to differentiate between culture-general frames and culture-specific frames. This general quality or specificity of a particular frame is determined vis a vis its meaning and functionality among members of a cultural group.

This new model for the study of media content used in communication for development efforts is offered as a way to reinforce ongoing developments in the field of public relations. These recent developments are encouraging that increased attention be paid to cultural nuances among public/audience members targeted by mass media.
campaigns and that a greater role be given to these audiences in the development of these empowerment campaigns. Very few public relations scholars have focused their attention on the issue of public relations strategies for nation building, including research by Keenan (2003), Lawniczak, Rydak, and Tębecki. (2003), Molleda, Athaydes and Hirsch (2003), Pratt (2003), Rensburg (2003), Spicer (2000) and Taylor (2000a, 2000b).

This dissertation represents a departure from current trends in communication for development evaluation in that it evaluates public relations campaign messages and compares the frames these incorporate with the relevant frames of reference relied upon by target publics. The pre-implementation emphasis of this approach also sets it apart from recent efforts used by public relations scholars. The recommendation is to establish levels of affinity between the media frames and the public frames before the campaign is implemented. This approach can be useful in providing researchers and practitioners in the field of public relations and other communication related fields with a powerful tool for measuring the quality of campaign messages based on levels of cultural affinity between media content frames and those frames used by the targeted public(s) prior to implementation.
CHAPTER 2
LATINO POLITICS IN AMERICA

History of Latino Involvement in U.S. Politics

Before Latinos became a sought after demographic in the United States and before it became common knowledge that they were the new emerging minority in American politics, one of the facts known about this population was their representation in political life was between very little to non-existent. In fact, it was not until recently that “Latino Politics” was recognized as a genuine field of research by political scientists, and to-date there has only been a handful of important studies that have sought to identify and understand this phenomenon. Few studies and texts cover Latinos’ involvement in politics in the United States as well as past and current trends within this minority group (Vigil, 1987; Regalado, 1988; Calvo, & Rosenstone, 1989; Meier, & Stewart, 1991; Hero, 1992; Wilson, 1999; Betancur, & Gills, 2000; Rodriguez, 2002; Garcia, 2003; Roberts, & Martinez, 2004).

There are several factors that have been identified as potential contributors to the low political participation rates among Latinos in the United States by the current literature in the field of political science. Some of these factors are directly linked to the historic experience of Latinos in the U.S. For example, the historic relations between Latin Americans and the U.S. as well as the immigration experience of Latinos when they arrived in the U.S. have been identified as factors that can influence Latinos’ level of participation in civic life in America. In addition to these historical factors, there are also certain socio-demographic factors such as education, political ideology, geographics,
psychographic, and cultural identity, which impact their socio-economic status and in turn their participation rates in U.S. political activity (Hero, 1992).

**Historical Factors in Latino Politics**

Latinos have a historical relationship with the United States that represents a mixed bag of benefits and drawbacks including employment opportunities for “voluntary” and needs-based migrants. This relationship has also been characterized by the difficult experience of colonization. That is especially the case for Latin American nations acquired from Spain as a result of the Spanish-American War of 1898 and the Annexation of Mexico. The historical relationship between the U.S. and Latin America has taken on many different shapes. These include war (Mexico), colonization (Puerto Rico and Cuba), commonwealth status (Puerto Rico), annexation (Mexico), support for contras (Salvador and Nicaragua), and battles for independence (Cuba and Dominican Republic). This history of mixed relations has often influenced the way Latinos have immigrated to the U.S., the role they have played in American society, the way they have chosen to be identified, the issues they identify with, and the way they have been perceived by the general public (Hero, 1992; Garcia, 2003; Nepstad, 1996; Nash, 1996).

Mexican Americans, for example, with their mixed history of experiences with the U.S., are the largest Latino minority group in America today representing over 65 percent of Latinos. The conquest of some of their original lands (most of current day Southwest U.S.) included territory occupied by many Mexican families, and although the U.S. government tried to make provisions for them in the form of land guarantees and other benefits, these were consistently violated by local governments, relegating Mexican Americans to a lower socio-economic enclave over time. Economic hardships and injustices sparked the emergence of social movements in the Mexican American
community from the 1920s through the 1950s and 1960s. They were led by groups such as the “gorras blancas” or white hats, as well as the mutualistas. These groups were communitarian oriented. Hero (1992) describes the communitarian groups as those which seek to strengthen and protect the cultural heritage of the Mexican-American community. They were very assertive and protective of their language, religious practices, cultural traditions and family values. It was from this broad movement that later emerged the “Chicano Movement” of the 1970s, which sought to further cement the identity of the Mexican-American community in a basic philosophy that they called “Cultural Pride.” These movements brought about widespread support for protest activities such as those led by Cesar Chaves, the leader of the Farm Workers United (FWU), a workers union movement that fought for the rights of Mexican American and Latin American workers in the West and Southwest United States.

In addition to the communitarian groups, there were also what Hero labels as egalitarian groups. For the most part, these groups sought not so much to focus on cultural pride issues as they tried to work toward equality for Mexican Americans. Equal pay, equal voting rights, equal employment rights, and equal rights to own homes or businesses were the primary goals of organizations such as National Council on La Raza (NCLR) and the League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC). These groups, both the communitarian and the egalitarian, had an enormous effect both on the way Mexican Americans were perceived by non-Hispanics in the United States and on the way that Mexican Americans viewed themselves in terms of their Mexican or Latino pride. They also had an effect on the issues with which Mexican Americans identified themselves and on their access to critical factors in the formation of social movements—
motive, resources, and opportunity (Wald, Silverman, & Fridy, 2003). Current day Latino interest organizations such as LULAC, NCLR, and others represent in some ways both the communitarian and egalitarian character of the Latino struggle for an identity and fair access to power and wealth in America.

Latino groups such as Puerto Rican, Cuban, Dominican, and Colombian Americans, share experiences that are in some ways similar and in others different from those that Mexican Americans have had in the United States. The case of Puerto Rican Americans illustrates this point well. Although both of these groups, Mexican and Puerto Rican Americans, have experienced voluntary migrations to the U.S., there have also been differences in U.S. foreign policy decisions toward their countries. One of these differences is evident in that Puerto Rico did not lose any of its land to the United States as did Mexico through the annexation of Mexican territories in their Northeastern regions. Most Puerto Rican Americans have immigrated to the U.S. as a result of voluntary and government arranged (Barcero Agreement 1979) migrations. Entire Mexican families became part of the United States along with their homes when the current day Southwestern U.S. territories were annexed. Ironically, however, this difference in migration experience has made very little difference in public perceptions of Puerto Rican Americans by non-Hispanics. Puerto Rican Americans are as much victims of discrimination as are many Mexicans. Some argue that perhaps they are discriminated against even more due to their smaller population size and heavy concentration in urban areas.

The different experiences with U.S. foreign policy by Mexicans and Puerto Rican Americans have also had an impact on the way they perceive themselves and their levels
of interest in their nations of origin. This is an area where Puerto Rican Americans differ from Mexicans and share more similarities with Cuban Americans living in the U.S. Mexicans have not shown much interest in the political situation back in Mexico, as recorded by various surveys (Hero, 1992). Puerto Rican Americans living in the U.S., however, have been very actively involved in political activities in Puerto Rico. Evidence of this can be seen in “Young Lords” movement in New York City in the 1960s, in which Puerto Rican Americans fought for the independence of the island, rather than it being a commonwealth of the U.S. Similarly, Cuban Americans are very concerned with the fate of their country, which has been ruled by a socialist government since 1959, and since the failure of the Bay of Pigs invasion of 1961 they have focused primarily on U.S. foreign policy. The high level of interest in the current status of their nations of origin is an issue that distinguishes the Cuban and Puerto Rican Americans from other large Latino subgroups.

Cuban Americans have also had a unique migration experience to the U.S. Because of efforts by the U.S. to discredit the Castro regime in Cuba, the experience of Cuban Americans as migrants in the U.S. has been much more pleasant than that of other Latino immigrants. Cuban Americans perhaps have received the most support (monetary and legal) from the U.S. government of all Latino subgroups. This preference for Cuban Americans is perhaps true, with the exception of Puerto Rican Americans who are considered U.S. citizens at birth on the island since the passage of the Jones Act in 1970. Cuban Americans, especially those who are immigrants to the U.S. as well as first generation Cuban Americans, continue to feel great nostalgia for their homeland, longing to someday have the ability to return. Mexican Americans can travel back and forth to
Mexico as they wish, as can Puerto Rican Americans. This makes a big difference in the policy orientation of these groups, the issues they are concerned about and how active they can become in political life in America.

In summary, although most Latino subgroups are usually viewed and described in terms of their membership in the larger group denominated “Latino” or “Hispanic,” the truth is that this group is made up of many subgroups that represent people from countries all over Latin America. There are differences in the length of time that these communities have been in the U.S., and the nature of their migration differs from group to group. The organizations that have represented their interests here in the U.S., historically and currently, have often differed by subgroup as well. Furthermore, their historic relationship with the U.S. has created a different set of foreign policy and domestic issues with which these each subgroup usually identifies. Consequently, in many respects, this group we label “Latinos” and “Hispanic” cannot be considered as a monolith. There are enough differences among subgroups to refer to it as a multicultural segment of American society.

But there are also many similarities among Latinos, which encourage the Latino identity and cultural heritage in America. Latinos share a common language (Spanish). They share a common history with Spain as well as a group or ethnic identity here in the United States as Latinos or Hispanics. The cultural labels “Latino” and “Hispanic” will be used interchangeably in this dissertation. Both Hero (1992) and Garcia (2003) state that the label Hispanic was created by the U.S. Census Bureau to facilitate data collection and processing. But research also suggests that there is evidence that Latino subgroups prefer these labels because of the sense of empowerment it provides them. Latinos are
also united by common political and social issues that often impact most subgroups if not
al community members. For example, socio-economic issues such as education, jobs,
wealth, and access to healthcare and immigration are usually issues that most Latino
subgroups have in common. Therefore, although they are different in some respects, as
argued previously, researchers suggest that there is evidence that what is referred to as
“Latino Politics” might very well be a reality. Evidence is found in that what makes these
subgroups similar to one another seems to be a greater determinant of their political
ideology and involvement than are those that distinguish them. Regardless of their
historic experience with the U.S., their migration experience, and views on foreign
policy, research suggests that there is a common bond among Latinos that tends to arise
when certain issues come to the forefront (Hero, 1992; Wilson, 1999; Betancur, & Gills,
2000; Rodriguez, 2002; Garcia, 2003; Roberts, & Martinez, 2004).

Cultural identity is one of those uniting factors that bring the Latino community
together in America. The cultural pride movement of the 1960s and 1970s may not have
gotten Latinos equal status in U.S. society, but it clearly made these communities aware
of one another. It made Latinos of all Latin American nations aware of their shared
language, their shared religion (over 70 percent Roman Catholic), family values and
traditions, and overall shared needs and problems. Latinos in general, despite subgroup
membership, agree that they are concerned about issues such as crime, the rights of
undocumented workers, healthcare, employment opportunities, education, and many
other of what are considered “bread and butter” issues (Zogby International, 2000; Pew
Hispanic Center, 2002, 2004). This “bread and butter” orientation suggests that Latinos
would align primarily with the Democratic Party (DP) in the U.S., which is viewed as the
bearer of these issues more so than the Republican Party (RP). This is often true, as many
Latinos (especially Puerto Rican Americans) say they are registered with the DP and
usually vote for the DP. But there is also an outlier in this regard—Cuban Americans.

In the mid to late 1980s the Cuban-Americans’ vote began to change from leaning
toward the DP in 1974 to a shift toward the RP. One of the main reasons given for this
shift is the reorientation toward the conservative, elitist, and Republican values these
particular Cuban Americans had exhibited in Cuba. This movement was energized by the
“Reagan Revolution.” But ironically the same revolution that led to the political
realignment of Cuban Americans also resulted in a series of legislations that had a
detrimental effect on the rest of Latinos in America and cemented the support of other
Latino subgroups with the DP. Despite the Cuban anomaly, to date, the DP has enjoyed
majority support among Latinos in presidential as well as state and local politics. The
results of the most recent presidential election of 2004 show that the DP candidate had 10
percent more support than his RP rival.

The question still remains: if Latinos are united under a cultural pride theme and
bread and butter issues, with a few exceptions (Cuban-Americans’ Republican tilt) then
why is political participation among Latinos so low and why can’t they influence the
outcome of presidential, state, and local politics to a greater extent? So far this question
has been addressed mostly relying on a historical context. A more comprehensive
exploration for the low participation rates in civic life in America on the part of Latinos
must also incorporate present-day factors. The following section provides an overview of
current factors that have recently been highlighted by scholars, activists, and researchers
as contributing to this deficit in political involvement among Latinos.
Present-Day Factors in Latino Politics

Many explanations are offered for the low present-day participation rates among Latinos. One of these is language. It is in many ways ironic that one of the very factors that unite Latinos also serves as an impediment to their involvement in civic life in the U.S. Even with the advent of high-tech information technology and the emergence of ethnic media outlets, some degree of knowledge of the English language is still required if Latinos are to communicate and participate in politics. Some exceptions are perhaps areas where there are very large concentrations of Latinos. Usually highly populated communities offer Latinos more support with language issues and facilitate their involvement in politics, especially voting in presidential elections. And even with the passage of legislation guaranteeing their right to vote and promising services (including language services) and support for Latinos during elections, many districts ignore these rules unless Latinos are a group that is both large and organized enough to claim their rights. This is a problem that is more prevalent among new immigrants who, unless they are citizens (usually Puerto Rican Americans), cannot vote anyway. But with the Latino population becoming less concentrated in urban centers and more diffused as it expands into rural areas throughout the U.S., this problem may prove to be a persistent one. This is due to the fact that Latinos begin to represent smaller pockets throughout the U.S. without the knowledge or means to protect their voting rights.

The problem of language is directly linked to another problem that has been identified by political behavior researchers as having an impact on Latino participation in political life: their understanding of the U.S. political process. Younger Latinos may not have enough knowledge of the role politics plays in the way funds are allocated by the government and how federal programs are run. This knowledge gap serves both to limit
the interest of Latinos in the political process and aids those who seek to intimidate them and keep them from becoming more involved. It requires more than just language skills to participate in politics whether that participation is in the form of voting in a presidential election, writing to a representative or attending a rally. It requires an understanding of the nature of political activity and of the importance of political events to one’s personal life and community, as well as an understanding of the processes that are involved such as registering to vote.

Another reason for low political involvement among Latinos is because political participation increases as resources increase, and that is what Latinos lack the most in America. Political involvement in the form of voting in a national, state or local election is free. But it requires resources and knowledge to attend rallies, write letters to elected officials and make donations to candidates and political parties. But research shows that as the costs associated with this type of participation for Latinos increases, the rates of participation among this group decrease. The deficits in participation between Latinos and non-Hispanic groups are substantial in electoral participation and they only become greater when greater cost is involved. Therefore, lack of resources can influence participation among Latinos in a negative way. This is different of course among affluent Latinos. The elite Latino population has access to important resources and opportunity structures that are crucial for the civic involvement of the Latino population. Unfortunately, however, members of the Latino elite lack the motive “grievances” that social movement theory suggests is also necessary for increased political involvement among minority groups (Wald et al., 2003).
Prejudice is another factor that can negatively influence participation rates among minorities in general. Latinos have been subjected to both direct and institutionalized discrimination. The more conspicuous type of discrimination to which Latinos have been subjected has included road-blocks set up in minority communities (Black and Hispanic) to prevent them from reaching voting polls. English-only forms and unfair requirements for participation in committees and councils that have a direct impact on minority communities represent the institutionalized form of discrimination to which Latinos are often subjected. Usually their lower levels of education and lack of competency in the English language prevent them from participating in these types of activities (Hero, 1992).

The migration experience of Latinos is also a factor in low participation rates. With the exception of Puerto Rican Americans, most Latinos enter the U.S. either legally by way of some kind of amnesty, refugee status or visa, or they enter illegally. Those who enter illegally, most of who are undocumented workers, are banned from any kind of involvement in political deliberation and are often denied basic services such as healthcare and education for their children. Also, those who are documented but are not citizens and cannot vote suffer from the same type of discrimination. Recent immigrants are usually in the U.S. under temporary or permanent residency status, and this does not allow them to vote either. They depend on, benefit from or have a stake in the way the nation, state or local community is run, but do not necessarily have a say in it. Recent voter registration officials and programs have requested increased efforts to assist legal residents of the U.S. in becoming naturalized citizens (Villareal, & Hernandez, 1991).
Ties to the homeland and the desire to someday return has been identified by some studies as a psychological factor that decreases participation rate in political life among Latinos as well. For example, the present status of Cuba and Puerto Rico (socialist government and commonwealth respectively) may cause Cuban and Puerto Rican Americans to place so much focus on the policies impacting their homelands that they are prevented from developing roots in the U.S. and becoming more involved. This phenomenon has been described by scholars as a sense of nostalgia, which can produce politically inactive U.S. citizens. Dominican Americans have been described by Garcia (2003) as identifying with this homeland nostalgia dilemma even though their island, Dominican Republic (DR), is an independent republic and Dominican Americans are free to travel back and forth. However, in recognition of this phenomenon, and in order to facilitate involvement by the Dominican-American population in the U.S. political process, the government of the DR recently passed legislation making it possible for Dominican Americans to hold dual citizenship both on the island and in the U.S., allowing for what Garcia refers to as a “political duality” (2003, p. 70). This action on the part of the Dominican government prevents Dominican Americans’ detachment from U.S. politics, which often results from nationalistic sentiments towards the island and a refusal to renege their Dominican citizenship. In Colombia, Central America, and several other Latin American nations, the governments have also taken steps to facilitate involvement in U.S. politics by their nationals.

The exception to the rule when it comes to low participation rates among Latinos is the case of Cuban Americans. Recent studies have showed some evidence that suggests that Cuban Americans participate in political activity in U.S. at equal rates and in some
cases higher rates than non-Hispanic groups. That is particularly the case for Cuban Americans in the Miami Dade County area in the state of Florida. Other Cuban Americans in locations such as the Central and Northern regions of the state of Florida and the states of New Jersey and New York have exhibited political participation levels that are more consistent with that of other Latino subgroups. Other subgroups within the general Latino community that show higher rates of participation than the rest include those with higher education and economic status. Also, Latino subgroups with a longer history in the U.S., such as Mexican Americans, show some evidence of participating at higher rates than newcomers such as Dominican Americans.

Therefore, in addition to the external forces (prejudice, disregard for supportive legislation, and gerrymandering) that often impact negatively the ability of Latinos to participate in political activity, there are internal forces (their education and economic levels, knowledge gaps, language, citizenship, ties to the homeland, and disconnect between regular Latino citizens and Latino elites) that work against Latinos in increasing participation rates and having a greater impact on the outcome of elections as a minority group. As a result questions remain about the future of Latinos as an emerging voter bloc in American politics.

**Florida Latino Issues**

Why target Latinos in the state of Florida in this dissertation? There are three main reasons why this dissertation focuses on the strategies used in campaigns targeting Florida Latinos. The first reason is expediency. To conduct a study of the scope of this dissertation at the national level would require more resources than are currently available. However, it is unnecessary to conduct a national scale investigation since the Latino population in the state of Florida is as diverse in terms of their national origins,
political ideology, party affiliation, and voting trends as that of any other part of the United States. Florida Latino communities have both shared and divergent experiences and viewpoints. While these groups may have certain electoral issues in common, such as the economy, education, and immigration, the degree to which they share these issues and their specific views on *how* these issues should be addressed by elected officials may differ from subgroup to subgroup. For example, the immigration experience of Cuban Americans is different from that of Colombian Americans or Dominican Americans. Cuban Americans are offered asylum status when they arrive from Cuba. Dominican and Colombian Americans are considered illegal aliens unless they entered the country with the appropriate visas and documentation. Distinctions such as this one that can be made among Latino subgroups may offer insights into the differences that exist among Latinos in America on very important electoral issues such as immigration, education, and healthcare (Barnett, 2004; Botelho, 2004; Ridgeway, 2004).

Another reason why Florida was chosen as the site for data collection is due to the influential role that the state of Florida played in the 2000 and 2004 presidential elections. An August 24th 2004 *CNN.com* story described the current situation in the state of Florida as very similar to the one it played in 2000—“too close to call” (“Poll,” 2004). In 2000 Bush won Florida’s 27 electoral votes by only 537 votes. Most Florida polls showed President George W. Bush and Senator John F. Kerry in a dead heat in the state despite millions of dollars allocated by the Bush administration for the clean-up efforts after Hurricanes Charley and Frances and constant visits to the state by both candidates. By Election Day 2004 Florida was the state most visited by both President George W. Bush, who visited the state 18 times, and by Senator John F. Kerry, who visited the state
28 times (Balz, & Morin, 2004). In the end, Florida went to President Bush by slightly over 300,000 votes. This victory was far greater than the razor thin advantage that gave Bush the 27 electoral votes in 2000. However, the anticipation of the race being “too-close to call” in Florida encouraged the expenditure of valuable resources to mobilize voters by presidential candidates, the major political parties, community organizations and mass media organizations alike. Florida was considered by most accounts one of the key swing states of 2004 after its major role in the 2000 election debacle.

All of these facts discussed as of yet point to several important factors. Latinos are a very important minority group, and they are becoming increasingly important as their numbers grow and as they become more politically active. Despite the challenges that they face, most research investigating developments among Latinos and other minority groups highlights the progress that is being made among these ethnic communities in terms of their increased political competencies and participation (Hero, 1992). Furthermore, Latino immigrants bring with them a heritage of political involvement from their countries of origin. Strong identity and cultural movements among Blacks and Latinos have resulted in more politically active constituencies, as diverse studies have found a strong relationship between racial identification and political participation (Tate, 1994). Additionally, the growth of a minority middle and upper class has produced more concerned and therefore more politically active minorities; there is greater ideological diversity among minorities today than ever before, Tate suggests (p. 65). As mentioned earlier, recent anti-immigration initiatives have also forced more Latino immigrants to become citizens and more politically active (Villareal, & Hernandez, 1991).
Recent studies have also indicated that Latinos are becoming increasingly aware of public perceptions that they are an important voter bloc, and as a result they are beginning to position themselves as accessible to both political parties (Lambro, 2003, 2004; Pew Hispanic Center, 2004; Roberts, & Martinez, 2004; Stevenson, 2004). Consequently, a final conclusion that can be arrived at posits that public relations strategies targeting Latinos, which aim to persuade, educate or instruct this population to become more politically active, will have to take into account the different views that exist among members of this group regarding important issues and values that rule their decisions about who to vote for and whether or not to vote. What may be an enticing issue for one group may represent a latent issue or fallout issue for others. In other words, Latino subgroups with their new and increasingly complex dynamics may define issues differently from one another. That is one of the major premises in this dissertation.

The pursuit of the Latino vote by both political parties during the 2004 presidential elections was in some ways counterintuitive. Minorities in America have traditionally been supporters of the Democratic Party, with the exception of a few typically affluent minorities. That has been the case for Latinos, African Americans, Jewish Americans, and most recently Arab Americans (Tate, 1994; Pew Hispanic Center, 2002, 2004; Zogby International, 2000). Why did the Republican Party in 2004 choose to target Latinos while paying much less attention to African-American voters? One possible explanation is that although Latinos have traditionally registered with the Democratic Party, they are still viewed by both parties as a voting bloc loyal only to the issues that affect their communities (Jutkowitz, 2004; Lambro, 2004; Pew Hispanic Center, 2004; Zogby International, 2000). The candidate who best represents Latino issues will ultimately get
their votes. The May 2004 edition of *Florida Trends* included an article describing Latino voters as the key swing constituency in the I-4 corridor in Central Florida. The article says of Latino voters that this constituency is “by no means monolithic.” Latinos in general, the story describes, have been courted by both Democrats and Republicans seeking to position themselves as advocates of relevant issues to this community (p. 75). Roberts and Martinez’ (2004) findings in the framing study of Latino media coverage of the 2000 Republican Convention season suggests that the “Quid Pro Quo frame” they identified supports the *Florida Trends* assessments:

Latinos in this frame are depicted as a bloc of swing voters with no allegiance to Democrats or Republicans. Furthermore, it attempted to position Latino voters at a reaching distance from Republicans if they were to make the right decisions on relevant policy, and not so close to Democrats that they would assume that Latinos are in their camp and run the risk of being taken for granted. (2004, p. 14)

But what are these issues that are so important to Latinos that they will consider departing from past voting patterns and vote for either party in an election? According to the Zogby International *Culture Polls* (2000), Latinos are strong supporters of bread butter issues such as strict regulations and fines on polluters imposed by government (95.5 percent), an increase in the minimum wage (92.5 percent), strengthening social security (95 percent), allowing patients to sue HMOs (89.5 percent), school vouchers and active U.S. participation in global trade (83 percent), and new gun control laws (82 percent). Latinos are less supportive of school boards placing restrictions on the subjects taught at local schools (26 percent), racial preferences when hiring or in college admissions (26 percent), and a flat tax (47.5 percent).

On value-laden issues such as the question of abortion, the Zogby *Culture Polls* showed only 23.5 percent of Latinos as being pro-choice in all instances, but only 16 percent were pro-life in all instances. Overall, Latinos were more likely to be pro-life
than pro-choice (64.5 versus 34 percent respectively), but there was also support for making exceptions for a mother whose life was at risk as a result of the pregnancy (35 percent). When offered an option for a ban on abortion except in cases where the mother’s life was in danger, more than 60 percent said they would support such a ban.

More recent results from a survey published in *Poder Magazine’s* December/January edition of 2004 showed a similar trend, but this time in relation to the 2004 presidential elections. The issue Latinos showed the strongest support for was universal health care, 81 percent. The most important issue facing the nation was the economy, with 40 percent support among Latinos. It was especially important to those aged 55 and over (Jutkowitz, 2004). A more extensive study by the Pew Hispanic Center and the Kaiser Family Foundation conducted in 2004 found that 54 percent of Latinos surveyed said that education was extremely important to them when choosing a president in the 2004 presidential elections. The issues of the economy, jobs, healthcare, and Medicare followed education, with 51 percent selecting these issues as extremely important to them when making a decision in the presidential elections. The U.S. campaign against terror followed with 45 percent support. The war in Iraq, crime, and Social Security came in at about 40 percent each. Moral values followed with 36 percent of Latino voters saying it was an extremely important issue they would consider when choosing their next president in 2004 (Pew Hispanic Center, 2004).
CHAPTER 3
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Media Framing Theory

Origins of Framing Paradigm

This study will utilize an interpretive method—framing analysis—to measure and interpret both the frames used by the campaigns, as well as those used by target publics in order to measure levels—of frames affinity. The concept of framing was first introduced by the linguist and sociologist Erving Goffman (1974) and by anthropologist Gregory Bateson (1955). Goffman credits Bateson as having coined the term “frame” in the sense of a frame of interpretation about what is going on in a particular social situation. However, Goffman later introduces the framing concept as a heuristic for the analysis of face-to-face interactions. Goffman (1974) defines a frame as a “schemata of interpretation” used by individuals in their sense-making efforts of information or events (p. 21). Reese (1997) describes frames as “organizing principles that are socially shared and persistent over time, that work symbolically to meaningfully structure the social world” (p. 5).

Goffman (1974) used the framing metaphor in his explication of the way individuals make sense of the world in their dyadic and triadic interactions with one another. According to Goffman, in order to make sense of the verbal and visual codes (language) used by individuals as well as the patterns of these codes, individuals must resort to “schemata of interpretation” or “frames of reference,” which serve to make sense of the world. These frames of reference are socially constructed (a constructivist
view derived from his association with the social interactionist school of thought) and then shared in these social situations. Therefore, according to Goffman, frames are what individuals use in order to communicate. Without frames, the world would be unintelligible, and communication would be impossible.

Goffman introduced framing and the concept of a frame of reference, the metaphor he used being that of a window of interpretation. The picture frame metaphor used by Goffman introduced one of the key tenets of the framing paradigm and one that persists until this day—the idea that frames are inclusionary and exclusionary devices or heuristics. They include objects or characteristics of an object or information within the frame and in so doing also leave objects, characteristics of objects, and information out of the frame. According to Goffman, this is both a conscious and unconscious decision that individuals make. Framing did not remain an obscure perspective in the field of interpersonal communication, however. Shortly after Goffman’s conceptualization of the idea, it was picked up by researchers in mass communication who sought to understand and describe the way that the mass media present (framing) the world to their audiences and the potential influence these representations of reality (frames) can have on individual audience members’ conception of the world around them.

One of the seminal pieces, which applied the framing perspective, was the study by Kahneman and Tversky (1984) which demonstrated that the way the media framed an issue could have a direct impact on their interpretation of the issue and on the solutions they prescribed for it. They used an experimental design to present their subjects with stories about a disease crisis which framed the issue or topic from the point of view of “lives saved” and of “lives lost.” When the subjects were presented with the story which
said that by using an anti-virus solution there was a one-third chance of saving 200 lives versus not using the solution and risking a two-thirds chance of loosing 600 lives, over 70 percent of the subjects chose to apply the anti-virus and save lives. Conversely, when presented with the opposite frame, which framed the issue in terms of loosing lives, the subjects were less inclined (over 70 percent chose not to take the risk) to choose the life saving decision. This seminal study demonstrated that at least in a laboratory setting, and with certain topics, there was some indication that the way a story is framed by the media can have an effect on the audience’s perceptions and solutions prescriptions.

The study by Kahneman and Tversky was followed by a number of research studies that explored the framing paradigm, applying it to political communication, journalism, the framing of government policies by policy makers, framing by activist groups, the framing of health issues, and many others. However, the ‘80s and early ‘90s were characterized by a framing literature that provided various theoretical and operational concepts for framing and that focused mostly on news media as its unit of analysis. These studies endeavored to identify frames by focusing primarily on news media frames as observed by Ghanem (1997) and also made exploratory statements about the effects of news media frames on audience/individual frames, says Scheufele (1999). Most of these studies focused on what Reese (1997) and Gamson (2001) refer to as the mid-point of the framing paradigm or the second step: the way media frames interact with audience frames. However, as Scheufele points out, most of the evidence of these effects was unclear and at best scanty. Nevertheless, it is important to point out that most of the research on framing in the 80s and 90s focused on the framing process by media agents and sought to make statements of potential effects on audiences exposed to these frames.
These frames used many different conceptualizations for frames and the framing process. They used different methods to study frames and in doing so operationalized the framing process and the frames themselves in different ways. These studies investigated media frames as both dependent and independent variables. Many also varied in the way they defined the audience frames as dependent and independent variables, observes Scheufele (1999). They looked at the effects of media frames on audience frames for the most part, and several looked at media frames as being potentially impacted by audience frames and other factors. Currently, there still remains a broad discussion pertaining to the correct way to define and study framing.

This leads to the next point, the suggestion of several different locations for the investigation of framing. Gamson (2001) recommends three areas where the study of frames can focus. These include the framing process—the process by which the media agents (news organizations and journalists) go about creating frames for news media content. The second point of observation and analysis is the intersection where media frames and audience members come together and interact with one another—the dialogic process where meaning is negotiated and influence can occur. The third area involves how audience members engage in framing themselves—how these frames are formed and used by individuals to negotiate meaning. This view of the location of frames is similar to that suggested earlier by Entman (1993) who conceptualized the framing metaphor as a fractured paradigm. He noted the diversity of studies produced by the framing paradigm over the years and asserts that the evidence of such fragmentation is visible in the vast number of studies investigating the framing heuristic that result in no common conceptualization of the framing paradigm. In Entman’s view, the field of
communication would benefit from a shared understanding of the way framing should be conceptualized and operationalized. Sharing an understanding of the type of framing that is investigated and the way the framing process is described for empirical investigation of media effects will strengthen the field of communication. This is what Kuhn suggests is the process of normalization of science (normal science stage), which is characterized by a shared view of the topic of study, methods to research the phenomenon, and an understanding of what the dominant hypotheses and research questions ought to be. To facilitate this “normalization” process of the study of framing, Entman suggests a conceptualization of the framing perspective.

The exclusionary and inclusionary characteristics of frames are denoted by Entman (1993) as he explains that “frames select and call attention to particular aspects of the reality described, which logically means that frames simultaneously direct attention away from other aspects” (p. 54). The metaphor suggested here is that of a window view or window frame. Those who create a message have the ability to make decisions about what information is made available and what information is left out. According to Entman (1993), frames have four main functions: 1) They define problems, or “determine what a causal agent is doing with what costs and benefits,” 2) they diagnose causes or identify what is causing the problem, 3) they make moral judgments about the situation causing the problem, and 4) they suggest remedies or “offer and justify treatments for the problems” (p. 52). Entman also identifies four locations where frames can occur or be situated in the communication process: the communicator, the receiver, the text, and the cultural framework. This study focuses on the first and third locations for frames. It suggests an emphasis on the process of framing executed by the *communicator*, which in
this case consists of the campaigns strategies targeting Latinos as well as the Latino voters themselves. The text or media messages are created with the purpose of convincing Latinos to register to vote and participate in the presidential elections. The issue of healthcare coverage in America is used a vehicle to justify such action on the part of potential Latino voters. The interpretive frames used by the receiver or audience/public are also examined as part of this heuristic effort. A cultural framework is recommended to understand underlying values, issues, cultural orientations, idiosyncrasies, and histories used to define the meaning of frames. Such a cultural perspective is also necessary in order to interact with these frames.

Entman (1993) argues that this conceptualization of the approach of framing will help researchers better operationalize the concept and further build research in the field. However, by doing so, Entman proposed framing as a perspective that would fit with the mass media tradition of media effects. Scheufele (1999) contributed to Entman’s efforts and presented a model of framing as a theory of media effects. He proposed a model that also identifies different types of framing processes and ways of operationalizing the concept. He proposed several processes which include frame-building or the process of developing frames, frame-setting or the process of influencing audiences with particular frames (synchronous with agenda-setting), and individual/audience framing or the process whereby individuals and audiences resort to their frames of reference and interact with media frames. Scheufele, however, makes what some scholars have referred to as attempts to colonize the framing perspective into the agenda-setting paradigm (Maher, 2001; Gamson, 2001) even though later on he dispels the idea of making framing a part of agenda-setting (Scheufele, 2000).
Ghanem (1997), McCombs, M., Llamas, J., Lopez-Escobar, E., and Rey, F. (1997), and McCombs and Ghanem (2001) have suggested that framing and attribute agenda-setting or the second level of agenda-setting are one and the same. In their conceptualization of attribute agenda-setting they have said that this concept and framing intersect, as they both try to identify the elements of an object (issue, candidate). Media attribute agenda-setting’s premise as the transfer of salience of attributes about an object from the media to an audience. These attributes can both be affective and cognitive. They argue that these attributes constitute frames since frames are the characteristics of media stories, which are the direct result of inclusion and exclusion decisions on the part of journalists—the decision of what attributes to use or not use in writing a story. They argue that both framing and attribute agenda setting will benefit from this coalescence of models. Frames will benefit from agenda-setting’s strong tradition of focus on establishing correlations between the media agenda and the audience agenda—the potential impact of media frames. Agenda-setting will benefit from framing’s focus on the process of frame-building (Scheufele, 1999) as it would heed to Takeshita’s (1997) call for and focus on problems as a starting point and would contextualize the agenda-setting paradigm in the bigger picture.

Scheufele (2000) disagrees with this inclusion of framing in the agenda-setting model and argues that the difference in premise and outcome of both of these models is significant enough to keep them separate. Agenda-setting’s focus on salience and framing’s focus on causal attribution make these models distinct, he argues. Reese (1997) agrees with Scheufele (2000) and disagrees with Ghanem (1997) and McCombs et al., (1997). He believes that framing should remain a separate paradigm that is primarily
focused on more than just identification of attributes of issues or topics. Reese agrees with Maher (2001), Durham (2001), and Gamson, (2001) who suggest that the framing paradigm is about much more than just measuring correlations of relationships between media and audience frames. Framing is about highlighting the power structures of society and how dominant forces can and often will impose their view (frame) of the world or of a particular issue on audiences. An understanding of the way journalists contend with their personal ideologies and those of their organizations as they make decisions about how to present news is needed to create and study frames. Also necessary is an understanding of the decisions that audiences make when interacting with media content as well as how audience frames are formed. Durham (2001) contends that frames assign meaning to events, recognize a voice, and also make a statement about power, dominance, hegemony, and exclusion of other voices. His grounding in Jameson’s “Empirical Realism” (1984, 1991) suggests a departure from the bipolar-type reasoning encouraged by empiricism. Durham (2001) believes in a holistic (postmodern) approach to the study of the meaning embedded in media frames. Such an approach raises questions about inequities and the location of power in society (hegemony). It also discourages framing analysis that simply counts the number of times specific frames are used without addressing the relevant political economic issues implicit in these frames. Durham (2001) maintains that framing efforts should be first qualitative and then quantitative in nature. He advocates for a media framing analysis that focuses on the ideologies guiding construction of social meaning and the exclusionary decisions made regarding other potential meaning from the dominant discourse. This last thought provides a good transition into the role of the media in frames production. Ultimately,
framing is about the way frames that are produced by the media can potentially influence audiences.

**Framing Operationalized**

Maher (2001) suggests that agenda setting and framing are finding their way into a shared field of research as more and more practitioners are using these two paradigms together in their studies. He also suggests along with Reese (2001) that perhaps the reason why framing has been such a “fractured paradigm” is because of the very nature of the phenomenon it investigates.

Most recently, D’Angelo (2002) has rejected the calls by Entman (1993) and Scheufele (1999, 2000) to incorporate framing into a single research paradigm with a shared set of principles that guides theoretical conceptualization and operationalization as well as outcome. He has argued for a more etymologically sound approach to dealing with framing. He asserts that framing, as it has been investigated so far, will be much more productive in answering the questions that are currently threatening mass media concepts such as agenda-setting and priming—the need to understand the way that media messages are formed and communicated as well as the way these are interacted with by multiple players in the communication process (media and audiences). D’Angelo (2002) suggests that arguing for a single paradigm instead of a multi-paradigmatic approach in framing studies will only reduce the framing heuristic to a measure of correlations and overlooks the broad scope of this heuristic.

D’Angelo’s (2002) call for diversity in research using the framing paradigm is alive and well in the field. The literature on framing research points toward some common ground on general tenets and propositions of the framing paradigm, but also highlights that there is still a great deal of diversity regarding operationalization of the framework.
As visible in this review of the framing paradigm, frames can be defined in many different ways based on the type of information they organize, and there is still no consensus on how it should be defined as many options are offered—organizing devices for news content, media content, political positions, social movements, and events. The review also demonstrates that frames can be identified in several distinct places in the communication process: communicator, text, audience culture (Entman, 1993), frames production, audience frames interaction and audience frames production (Gamson, 2001; Reese, 1997), process of frames-building, frame-setting, and media/individual frames interaction (Scheufele, 1999). Frames serve many purposes. They provide a referential point for an audience’s individual players (Goffman, 1974; Gamson, & Modigliani, 1989; Huang, 1996), attribute causal responsibility (Entman, 1993; Scheufele, 1999, 2000; McCombs, & Ghanem, 2001) and identify sources of power and power relations (Maher, 2001; Durham, 2001). The outcome of framing can be to predict or measure effects (Most framing literature is of this nature, but specially studies by Scheufele in 1999 and 2000 and McCombs and Ghanem in 2001), or it can be a process-oriented perspective for understanding the production of media messages and the way they create and are created by meaning systems (Reese, 1997; Durham, 2001; Gamson, 1996). Frames can also be measured in many different ways using qualitative and quantitative methods as well as mixed methods.

**Role of Framing in Public Relations Research and Practice**

Framing has many applications for the field of public relations. Framing can guide evaluation efforts that take place before communications campaigns are implemented to analyze the components of a frame and determine the effectiveness of these frames. Such framing could adopt the content analysis method to determine if frames used in PR
campaign content are using an episodic or thematic frame or to determine if the frames included in the content match that of the audience members, as was found by the research conducted by Huang (1996). Framing analysis can also be used in environmental scanning efforts, which are a central component of the public relations practice of issues management. Here framing can aid the practitioner and go beyond the simple collection of newspaper clippings that mention an organization, client or issue, and take it further by allowing the practitioner to measure the orientation or the framing of the story. Framing would allow the practitioner to determine the causal attributions that are being made and the solutions being proposed in these stories. This is more than just content analysis since some key characteristics of a story can be highlighted using framing theory. A practitioner using framing theory could determine the key players in a story and if the conflict frame was used as suggested by Hallahan (1999). Framing would also help determine if the media is carrying the frames intended by the public relations practitioner as suggested by information subsidy theory (Zoch, & Molleda, 2005). Framing can help practitioners determine what frames of reference are being used by key publics on key issues as is the topic of this dissertation. This type of framing analysis can help measure the referential frames that publics usually resort to when thinking or making decisions about an issue. This would help the practitioner decide what frames or counter-frames to use in their campaign strategies. Finally, framing can also help practitioners be more strategic in their creation of information subsidies for the media and ensure that their content is ideologically aligned with the media they target to ensure better reception by journalists and to avoid loss of control over the frames they prefer (Jamieson, 1984; Durham, 2001; Zoch, & Molleda, 2005).
In the current research, framing is concerned with public relations practitioners’ possession of an understanding of how framing analysis can be used to make strategic decisions about media content and key messages for campaigns. This approach is supported by Zoch and Molloeda (2005) as they focus on the definition forwarded by Entman (1993) regarding the functionality of framing, suggesting that this same four step problem/solution approach applies to the practice of public relations. They agree with Hallahan (1999) that public relations practitioners must identify common frames of reference that are representative of topics or issues that are of mutual concern to both parties. Both Hallahan and Zoch and Molloeda agree that understanding what the relevant frames are and what function they serve is critical for the building and maintenance of relationships between an organization and its publics. It is also important that practitioners understand how these frames are played out by the media and interpreted by constituencies in a political environment. Therefore, more influential in this stream of thought is the research and theorizing on framing analysis that highlights the process of constructing culturally relevant frames, the history of frames, and their pervasiveness throughout society. Furthermore, this research attempts to gain understanding into the community shaping character of frames, the recognizability of frames, the power of frames to elicit deeply rooted emotions and experiences and the ability of frames to shed light on diverse power structures in society. The research by Goffman (1974), Gitlin, (1980), Gamson and Modigliani (1989), Durham (2001), Hertog and McLeod (2001), and Reese (2001) encourages such a focus.

This dissertation also puts forth the idea of public relations practitioners serving as co-constructors and providers of frames. It advances public relations practitioners from
the mere function of users of frames to the level of architects, who make the decisions about inclusion and exclusion of characteristic components of these communicative devices. These frames are used by public relations practitioners to shed light on the aspects of an issue they choose and to achieve specific outcomes. The multifunctionality of frames facilitates this process. But as mentioned already this dissertation only puts forth that idea and does not attempt to investigate it specifically. The starting point in this inquiry is the text, as suggested by Entman (1993), as these are already incorporating culture frames about the issue of healthcare coverage. This dissertation makes no efforts to determine the process by which practitioners developed the culture frames used in their communication materials. That topic is relegated to future heuristics.

One of the main theses regarding framing analysis in this dissertation is that it can provide an output-based evaluation measure that is useful in determining the potential effectiveness of public relations materials prior to implementing a public relations campaign. Used in conjunction with quantitative public opinion polls and qualitative interviewing techniques such as focus groups and in-depth interviews, framing analysis can provide a useful perspective for public relations message evaluation efforts. This approach can accomplish this by helping determine levels of affinity between the frames used by public(s) to define/interpret a problem, issue, opportunity or condition, as well as those used by public relations practitioners in campaign messages targeting those same audience members. The following scholars offer some insight into this topic: Entman (1993), Pan and Kosicki (1993), Durham (2001), and Gitlin (1980).

In this study, framing analysis is not suggested as a substitute for traditional quantitative-based output evaluation methods. Instead, this dissertation seeks to
complement those quantitative techniques, by providing additional access to symbols of meaning, through framing analysis, which are not easily measurable vis a vis a quantitative approach as well as most qualitative methods. Mass media scholars have suggested that these symbols are often responsible for the informative, educational, and persuasive strength of media content (Gamson, & Modigliani, 1989; Durham, 2001; Hertog, & McLeod, 2001).

**Role of Media and Audience Framing Analysis in this Dissertation**

Frames allow media practitioners to work with large amounts of information quickly; they assign information to its place in the scheme of the story, and package it for the audience so that they too can see where the information fits into the issue (Gitlin, 1980). Media framing analysis thus takes into account not just the topic chosen by a particular public relations media campaign, but how the practitioner or media in general cover and package that particular issue. In other words, the decisions about inclusion and exclusion are observed vis-à-vis the underlying beliefs held by the practitioners that make these decisions about content and meaning.

The idea of media practitioners as producers of frames is also supported by Pan and Kosicki (1993) who suggest that the media can influence the way issues are framed through the journalists who cover a story and their sources. However, Durham (2001) argues against adopting the notion of journalists, public relations practitioners, and other media professionals as objective “gatekeepers” who simply control the flow of unbiased information without being guided by personal preferences and orientations. Durham suggests that media professionals should be viewed more as “co-constructors” of the frames presented by the media, even if the process of creating these frames was initiated
by another source. Adopting Durham’s view changes the role of the media from that of “gatekeeper” or moderator of information, to that of “co-constructor” of realities.

Framing analysis for the purpose of this dissertation is defined using Reese’s (2001) description as “the way interests, communicators, sources, and culture combine to yield coherent ways of understanding the world, which are developed using all of the available verbal and visual symbolic resources” (p. 11). Frames are defined also using Reese’s definition which defines frames as “organizing principles that are socially shared and persistent over time, that work symbolically to meaningfully structure the social world” (p. 12) and suggests what the issue is through the use of selection, emphasis, exclusion, and elaboration (Tankard, Henderickson, Silberman, Bliss, & Ghanem, 1991). Additionally, Gamson and Modigliani’s (1989) definition is useful in the current endeavor as it states that “a frame is a central organizing idea for making sense of relevant events and suggesting what is at issue.” This research is influenced by the “List of Frames” approach as set by Tankard et al. (1991). To assist researchers with content analysis, these scholars devised a list of 11 framing mechanisms or focal points for identifying frames was developed by Tankard and his colleagues. These framing mechanisms were: 1) headlines and kickers (small headlines over the main headline); 2) subheads; 3) photographs; 4) photo captions; 5) leads (the beginning of news stories); 6) selection of sources or affiliations; 7) selection of quotes; 8) pull quotes (quotes that are blown up in size for emphasis); 9) logos (graphic identification of the particular series to which an article belongs); 10) statistics, charts, and graphs; and 11) concluding statements or paragraphs of articles (p. 101).
The conceptualization of the “List of Frames” was influenced by the research on agenda-setting’s list of issues (McCombs, & Shaw, 1972; Shaw, & McCombs, 1977). Tankard (2001) wrote, “There were differences in the overall goals, though. While agenda setting had focused primarily on which issues were covered, we conceptualized framing research as dealing more with how an issue or event is portrayed in the news” (p. 101). Tankard observed that the “List of Frames” approach is not a radical departure from the thinking of Hackett (1984) and Lang and Lang (1983), but attempts “to be more precise about the definitions of frames and more systematic about the procedures to be followed in identifying them” (p. 102).

The empirical focus of Tankard’s “List of Frames” influences this dissertation by emphasizing the importance of reaching validity and reliability measures that are conducive to theory building in communication studies. The framing perspective used in the data collection and analysis process, however, will consist of the dimensions suggested by Hertog and McLeod (2001). Their multi-tiered framing approach provides the study with a reasonable degree of empirical grounding as advised by Tankard et al. (1991), while remaining committed to the more post-modernist tradition advanced by Durham (2001) and Gamson and Modigliani (1989).

Hertog and McLeod (2001) advance the notion of frames as having their own content rather than organizing content that exists within the environment where frames operate. They argue that frames are cultural as opposed to cognitive phenomena. Their meaning is conveyed through the use of culturally significant symbols. Additionally, frames have tremendous symbolic power; they carry extensive meaning, and have widespread recognition. They suggest that frames are pervasive throughout society in
advertising, popular music, and e-mail among other media (p. 142). Hertog and McLeod (2001) also describe the way frames structure human understanding. They argue that frames accomplish this by determining 1) what content is considered relevant or not; 2) what is excluded or included in the frame; 3) what kinds of roles are defined and how; 4) what values encouraged/discouraged and form the core; and 5) what language, word structure, code words, and modifiers influence the frame. By asking these questions the researcher can identify the power structures, value system, and language (ideology) that have helped in organizing such frames and determine what are to be assigned as the core concepts of each frame as well as the peripheral concepts. Hertog and McLeod (2001) argue that while ideology may be a concept that is difficult to operationalize, it must be a consideration in any form of framing analysis. This cultural and ideological approach will explain how frames “tie content together within culturally constructed ‘topics’ such as environmentalism, the economy, politics, and religion” (p. 144).

Hertog and McLeod (2001) recommend a series of first steps that researchers should engage in when studying frames. First, he/she must “identify the central concepts that make up varied frames” (p. 147). These core concepts can sometimes be available in the form of a basic conflict, which in turn can be indicated by the actors presenting the information. They also suggest that when conducting framing analysis one should seek a “master narrative.” These are “powerful organizing devices (sic), and most frames will have ideal narratives that organize a large amount of disparate ideas and information” (p. 148).

They also recommend that attention be paid to myths that may be closely related to narratives. Myths, they explain, are usually closely related to culture. In addition, they
encourage researchers to locate the production and dialogic processes of frames in various locations such as the producers of frames or “frame sponsors” who in this case are the political parties, grassroots organizations, and the media. Finally, the authors suggest that researchers doing framing analysis identify the vocabulary used. The repetition of adjectives, adverbs, verbs, and nouns may assist in determining the boundaries among frames, since “each frame has its own vocabulary” (p. 148). However, Hertog and McLeod discourage using such a strategy for simply quantitative purposes. They warn against drawing frame boundaries purely on a quantitative basis and ignoring the ideological foundation of frames. These authors also mention that at times frames will have overlapping concepts, although they have their own distinct vocabulary.

In summary, Hertog and McLeod (2001) suggest that researchers, when conducting framing analysis make sure to 1) specify central and peripheral concepts 2) assign boundaries circumstances, and histories (when possible), 3) develop a list of symbols, language, usage, narratives, categories, and concepts to be evaluated, 4) not avoid subjectivity in their analysis of frames, 5) use a mixed methods approach, and 6) look at framing in various locations of the framing process.

**Communication for Development**

This dissertation is also guided by a series of concepts from and attempts to make a contribution to the field of communication for development. The literature in this field describes the important role that public relations campaign strategies play in nation and community building. This section will provide an explication of the history of the communication for development field and of the main concepts guiding research and application in the field. The important role public relations has played in nation building efforts as well as an overview of a recent nation building research involving specific
public relations campaigns will also be provided here to help illustrate the relevance of
communication for development and nation/community building in the study of
community mobilization campaigns. The overlap that exists between key concepts in the
communication for development/nation building and public relations field will be
explored in the context of how these may impact efforts targeting Latino communities in
America.

Since the end of the Cold War, communication for development strategies have
played a central role in nation building efforts around the world (Cambridge, 2002). Most
of these nation building efforts have occurred in the developing world under the auspices
of governments and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) alike, and public relations
strategies have often played a key role (see for example Keenan, 2003; Lawniczak et al.,
2003; Molleda et al., 2003; Pratt, 2003; Rensburg, 2003). These public relations
campaigns are different from those development campaigns involved in fundraising
efforts by not-for-profit organizations. They are part of a series of strategic
communication efforts that are aimed at improving the condition of a segment of society
by increasing their level of awareness about their condition, producing changes in their
cognitions and attitudes, and often influencing their behavior. Public relations strategies
have been a component of communication for development efforts to address health
crises, communication needs, and democratization (Snyder, 2002).

Fraser and Restrepo (1998) define communication for development in the
following manner:

The use of communication process, techniques, and media to help people toward a
full awareness of their situation and their options for change, to resolve conflicts, to
work toward consensus, to help people plan actions for change and sustainable
development, to help people acquire the knowledge and skills they need to improve
their condition and their society, and to improve the effectiveness of institutions. (p. 63)

According to Cambridge (2002), some of the dominant strategies being used to promote communication for development efforts include community mobilization, folk music, social marketing, entertainment-education, and advocacy. These strategies are utilized to “promote, support, and sustain projects aimed at agriculture, education, the environment, family planning, and reproductive health,” says Cambridge. They are also valuable for “increasing political participation practices and processes … facilitating community participation in the public discourses that nourish democratic systems of governance” (p. 142). Despite the important role public relations strategies play in these community development efforts, very little research has been conducted by public relations scholars in this area of communication studies (Sallot et al., 2003).

The concepts infusing the literature on communication for development and nation building are appropriate for the topic of this dissertation. This investigation of the political mobilizing efforts that targeted Latinos in the United States fits well within the parameters outlined by recent developments in public relations theory and communication for development.

Before proceeding with this discussion it will be necessary to offer some clarification regarding the use of certain key terms in the communication for development field as well as in this dissertation. To start, the labels communication for development, development communication, and nation building are being used interchangeably here as suggested by Melkote and Steeves (2001). They assert that all of these labels refer to the same post WWII efforts by the U.S. Another necessary clarification is that involving the use of the terms “developed” and “developing” nation in this dissertation, which is
guided by a rationale pointed out by Melkote and Steeves about the historical debate over their use. Melkote and Steeves (2001) suggest that the debate over which way to refer to nations that are the subjects of nation building efforts has been a controversial debate charged with highly emotional responses by target nations and a degree of disregard on the part of the targeting nations. The use of labels such as “developing nations,” “less developed countries” (LDCs), “Third World,” and the “South” all carry negative connotations and are insulting to these nations in some way. The authors use these terms interchangeably in their text on development communication in the Third World. A point they make that is relevant to this particular question is that the use of any of these labels carries a certain level of naivety since it implies that other nations either are more developed, have been already developed or that they are First World nations at all levels in society. The main point to be taken here is that in all nations, “developed” or not, there are communities of people who have been disenfranchised, disempowered, and have been left wanting by the dominant forces of our days (globalization, transportation/information, and technology).

Tehranian (1994) described the nation of India as a Third-First World nation. India is composed of a large middle class of over 400 million (one of the 10 largest of the world), a semi-urban working class of 350 million struggling to overcome poverty and a burgeoning industrialized class of 100 million. If one considers factors such as literacy levels, access to and distribution of wealth, access to healthcare, political involvement, and voice in government decisions instead of just level of industrialization, then one will have to conclude that even countries such as the United States with its high level of industrialization include communities that fit the profile of a developing nation or
community. Melkote and Steeves (2001) say that every nation has a community of socially displaced and rural disadvantaged people that can benefit from development communication efforts.

Regarding the adaptability of the concepts and assumptions guiding the literature in nation building and communication for development, these concepts are very adaptable to the Hispanic community in the United States. Some of the concepts that permeate this literature are empowerment, communication, development, sustainable development, and partnerships.

The concept of *empowerment* is based on the idea of power as a key element of progress. *Power over*, refers to the power of the self—a direct criticism of the modernization approach to early development efforts worldwide. It refers to an individual’s ability to have control over her history, culture, and progress. There is also the idea of *power to*. This refers to the idea that if individuals are equipped with the necessary tools, they can be proactive and develop strategies to overcome adversity and create progress in their communities. Finally, the concept of empowerment is based on the idea of *power with*; this type of power refers to the important role that community and not only the individual play in progress building. In other words, it is together that members can pursue the better of the entire community.

Melkote and Steeves (2001) also define empowerment as consisting of three types of empowerment: 1) individual empowerment, 2) relational empowerment, and 3) community empowerment. Tilson and Alozie (2004) describe how some of the challenges faced by both nation and community development efforts include not just economic progress, as the modernity perspective suggests, but also access to equitable
media, better jobs, higher education rates, and access to political capital. This conceptualization of empowerment fits well with the case of political empowerment of Latinos in the United States, which is the subject of this dissertation. This dissertation attempts to explore one of these areas—the political realm—as it surveys the quality of messages that are diffused in the Latino community to try to mobilize them to register and vote in the 2004 presidential election in the United States. The concept of empowerment, as defined in the development communication literature, is congruent with some of the key purposes behind political empowerment efforts targeting Latinos in the state of Florida. Similar economic empowerment efforts have targeted traditionally disenfranchised segments of society such as the African-American, White-poor, and Hispanic populations in the United States. Tate (1994) referred specifically to Latina women, for example, as the most politically alienated and disenfranchised group in the U.S. This population would provide a perfect target for communication for development efforts that seek to empower people in this way—politically.

Another concept that guides the nation building and communication for development literature is the concept of development. It is important at this point to provide an explication of the origins of this concept and how it has been applied in development efforts targeting Third World nations. Development efforts are the direct result of the U.S. response to the challenges it faced during the Cold War (Melkote, & Steeves, 2001; Cambridge, 2002; Snyder, 2002). The U.S. rationalized that the best way to diminish the potential influence of the USSR over countries in the European hemisphere was by making investments in these countries’ infrastructures. The U.S. believed that this would result in higher levels of “development” and would force them to
re-consider the implications of adopting the opposing ideology to Western capitalism—socialism. The ideological underpinnings guiding these efforts have become known as modernization. According to Melkote and Steeves, this was the dominant perspective in development efforts in the 1950s and 1960s. Modernity suggests that the expansion of the capitalistic system of the Western nations would bring the LDCs to a better level of societal standards—a Darwinian evolutionary view. The modernization perspective is characterized by linear thinking and processes of communication and a belief that developing nations have deficiencies that the modernity can help them resolve.

After the failure of many development projects that sought to “empower” the people of these nations primarily by developing their economic systems, and after the devastating effects of this approach became more evident, new perspectives for development began to emerge. Tilson and Alozie (2004) mention the different devastating effects of modernity. They describe how modernity has diminished the faith in democratic systems in Latin America, with over 70 percent believing that democracy does not work. They refer to the devastating environmental effects that modernity has had on nations in the Middle East and Africa, especially in Sub-Saharan Africa (for more on this see Pratt, 2003). This was the case of Britain’s Shell and the devastation of the environment in Nigeria. They also describe how economic initiatives such as privatization, de-regulation, and liberalization of economies and state-run industries have resulted in a greater distance between the haves and have nots in Latin America and Eastern Europe. Modernity with its disregard for local culture, lack of a sense of responsibility (especially U.S. and multinational corporations) and its reliance on linear
communication initiatives, has had a very negative effect and in many ways has failed to
develop these nations in an equitable fashion.

Responses to modernity include the critical perspective, which rejects the idea that
expansionism and imperialism of the capitalistic Western world will improve the
condition of all members of developing societies. The critical perspective has not been as
good at proposing alternative approaches as it has been at criticizing modernity, however.
Nonetheless, this new perspective has produced major changes in the way development
efforts use communication. Another perspective is liberation, which has its roots in
liberation theology and states that individuals are capable of improving their own
condition if given the right tools. Although liberation is primarily concerned with the
spiritual character of men, it does not negate the importance of the material and the way it
can help society. The women in development (WID) perspective criticizes modernity for
having ignored the role of women in society and the important role that they play in the
economy, health, and nutrition as well as key issues that affect families. A final
perspective in development is the basic needs perspective, which does not subscribe to
the trickle-down effect of modernity and suggests that the needs of all the people should
be the top priority for all development efforts.

As these perspectives suggest, the field of development communication building is
moving in the right direction and the concept of development can also infuse efforts
targeting disadvantaged populations in the United States such as Latinos. All of these
perspectives have something to bring to the table. The critical perspective can inform
development communication efforts by encouraging the incorporation of alternative or
ethnic media that is often used by Hispanics in community building campaigns. It also
encourages a departure from linear, effects-based communication and instead encourages
the adoption of interpersonal components that have been found to enhance learning and
retention of information and behavior. The liberation perspective can help by focusing on
the endogenous needs of each Hispanic as well as their communities by sponsoring
efforts that encourage them to look for resources that are already available to them. This
practice is known as self-empowerment. The WID perspective addresses issues such as
the one raised by Tate (1994) that recognizes that women and men alike should be
important beneficiaries in this process. Women also should take part in the decision
making process when developing these strategies. The basic needs perspective would be
critical for any development efforts targeting Latinos in the U.S. since the needs of this
group cannot be targeted at the macro level of American society. They must be dealt with
directly by targeting these communities and assessing their needs.

Finally, the fields of communication for development and nation building are
guided by the concept of communication. Here communication can mean two things: the
approach used in the modernity perspective, which was influenced by powerful media
effects scholars such as Schramm, Rogers, Lerner, and Lasswell, and that relied on
communication as a one-way, linear strategy to persuade and inform target audiences
who were assumed to be passive and receptive. Communication can also mean the more
critical-cultural type of communication mode, which views communication as a
dialogical process and originates in a more critical communication paradigm (Rogers,
1997). This perspective or approach confers with members of communities to define the
meaning of messages and symbols and does not assume the universality of meaning as
does the linear approach. This type of communication incorporates interpersonal relations
and interactions as well as community building through the use of alternative means of communication and makes decisions about channel use, message structure, and outcome evaluations by consulting with members of the populations it targets. This approach factors in societal elements such as multiculturalism and multiple realities. Clearly, this concept is very applicable to the Latino experience in the United States, as well as to multicultural societies around the world. The Hispanic population is not a monolith of passive receivers of information. A communication approach that is more critical-cultural will work much better with the Hispanic community in the United States as they are targeted by communication for development and nation building efforts to increase their awareness of their conditions and present them with options for improvements while respecting their free will and cultural orientations (Fraser, & Restrepo, 1998).

The study by Taylor (2000a) represents one of the few examinations in the public relations field that have focused on the role of public relations campaigns in communication for development efforts. Her study consisted of an evaluation of The Neighborliness Campaigns (TNC) in Malaysia. The Neighborliness Campaigns (1985 to present) involved a set of mass media and interpersonal strategies and tactics aimed at improving relationships among Malaysians of different ethnic groups living in the same communities.

An increase in employment opportunities in major Malaysian cities experienced in the 1970s and the 1980s resulted in an influx of Malays (Malaysia’s native ethnic group), who had previously been farmers, from the countryside to the cities. As a result, the government responded to the growing need for housing by establishing housing units for these new city-dwellers. Large housing blocks were created to provide residences for the
newcomers. But this type of housing was impersonal and in sharp contrast with the small communities to which the new workers were accustomed. Both Malays and Chinese Malaysians lived together in these housing units.

To avoid a repeat of the 1969 ethnic killings, which ended in the deaths of hundreds of Malaysians (mostly of Chinese origin), the government used public relations strategies to bring together the communities living in these housing units. First, international and mass mediated tactics were used to create a sense of community by bringing ethnic groups together in service to celebrate their united communities. Second, the campaign aimed to build on that sense of community by bringing people of the same ethnic origins together for cultural activities. The two-fold campaign encouraged inter-ethnic collaboration and acceptance and fostered intra-ethnic traditions.

Taylor’s evaluation of this campaign revealed some interesting results. Her analysis of survey respondents found that participants from the housing units (treatment group) where the campaign was taking place were “significantly more likely … than participants from the overall community (control group) to agree to cooperate with the other races at work, in the community, and in pursuit of national unity” (p. 195). She also found that race, the second explanatory variable, did not have a significant effect on agreement to cooperate. Therefore, the first goal was accomplished, but could only be explained by distinctions in location of residence (housing units vs. overall community).

A second goal of the campaign was to improve inter-ethnic attitudes between Malays and Chinese residents. The analysis showed that there was no significant difference between Malay respondents living in the neighborhoods and those living in the
regular community. Conversely, the attitudes of Chinese residents living in the neighborhoods were significantly less favorable than those in the control group.

Although both mass mediated and interpersonal tactics were used, the campaign was unsuccessful in achieving its second objective. This could be indicative of a public relations approach to nation building that lacks theoretical grounding. This campaign may have been negatively impacted by of a researcher/practitioner-centered approach to campaign implementation. By researcher/practitioner-centered, what is meant is a perspective that relies solely on the previous experience of public relations professionals as the final arbiter of meaning and strategy, rather than being guided by sound theory. Taylor offers an explanation for the failure of the campaign to produce attitudinal change among the Chinese residents:

There could be many possible reasons for such a counterproductive outcome. There is the possibility that the campaign is seen in the Chinese community as a Malay tactic to advance the interest of Malays. This attribution may arouse suspicions—possibly even the anger—of the Chinese who participate, whereas not so antagonizing those who do not participate in the campaign. (p. 198)

Taylor’s assessment is consistent with findings from political and mass communication studies, which suggest a heightened sense of cynicism of government institutions among audiences has a negative effect on credibility of such institutions. Taylor blamed the decisions to only target neighborhoods with existing ethnic tensions for the campaign, Chinese dissatisfaction with national policies regarding employment and education favoring Malay citizens, and government influence in neighboring areas for failed inter-ethnic relations and the failure of the campaign (p. 199). Taylor further explained that because communication campaigns do not take place in a “social vacuum,” the national policies favoring the Malay over the Chinese residents may have diminished the campaign’s effects. A more eclectic theoretical approach for this campaign may have
anticipated this outcome and prevented it. Taylor’s assessment of The Neighborliness Campaigns provides a useful case study of how public relations can be integrated in communication for development efforts. More research in this area was needed.

The fields of public relations and communication for development and nation building include many concepts that are in a great deal of agreement. Both of these fields inform each other by way of their theories and advice for applying them in the practice. I will first describe how these two fields inform each other and then describe how PR can advance development communication where the aim is to be effective by gaining the public’s trust.

Public relations inform development communication in many ways. One of the ways that this occurs is through the adoption by development communication of the idea of relying on relationship management and stewardship as principle guidelines for future efforts. In doing so, development communication will be adopting a less modernization-type approach and will acquire more critical, liberation, WID, and basic needs views in its practices around the world. Since Ferguson (1984) suggested that the public relations field in its research should adopt relationship management as its own area of research and theoretical development, much focus in the field has been on the relationship management function of public relations. Numerous studies have been published which describe the way this approach can be incorporated into the practice. The relationship management approach will inform development communication by emphasizing a departure or at least diminishing reliance by public relations practitioners involved in nation building efforts, on the press agentry, public information, and the mixed (two-way asymmetrical combined with two-way symmetrical) models of doing public relations.
(Grunig et al., 1992). It will encourage more emphasis on two-way communication and equal participation by both the organization and the public in the negotiation process. The relationship paradigm believes that two-way communication that attempts to accommodate both parties, while not abandoning the objectives of the initiative, will result in a much greater understanding of the needs and resources available to target publics. This will result in better designed programs for development that will be much more well-received by the population. This approach will encourage the building of trust, which has been identified as a major component in both public relations practices as well as development efforts. The use of two-way symmetrical communication will assist organizations as they try to set up mutually beneficial partnerships with nation states and communities (Enz, Inman, & Lankau, 2000).

This approach to public relations and nation building is consistent with other theoretical developments in public relations that can also inform better development efforts. For example, the postmodern perspective in public relations proposed by Holtzhausen (2000) and Holtzhausen and Voto (2002) suggests that public relations practitioners should play the role of change agents and as part of the organizational conscience in order to get organizations, and in this case development efforts, to be more reflective of the needs and views of key publics. The postmodern view encourages public relations practitioners to be mediators and to use two-way communication as opposed to traditional communications to approach and attend to their publics. This perspective also seeks to incorporate the multiple voices that are often marginalized and left in the periphery of public discourse. The two-way symmetrical and postmodern approach to public relations will definitely have an impact on development communications by
making these initiatives more consistent with the critical, liberation, WID, and basic needs perspectives that seek to empower the poor in diverse nations and communities of the world.

Other scholarly developments that have sought to build on the idea of focusing on relationship management stewardship include Hallahan’s (2000) suggestion that another category of publics should be added to those suggested by research such as that of Grunig (1997) in his situational theory of publics. Hallahan is critical of Grunig’s approach, because it only focuses on publics that are somehow “active.” Hallahan suggests a new approach to defining and making decisions about publics by including the new category of “inactive publics.” These are members of society who are characterized by very low levels of knowledge about the issue and levels of involvement. Hallahan’s inclusion of what were considered before as “non-publics” in the form of “inactive publics” represents a key development both for the progress of the relational approach in public relations and for development efforts around the world. As Cambridge (2002) highlighted in his definition of communication for development, one of the key purposes of these communication efforts is to make the target audience “aware of their condition and their options for change.” This speaks directly to the need to include non-publics or inactive publics in development communication plans. These are usually the key groups that are targeted by these plans, suggest Enz et al. (2001). Often these constituencies are not aware of their condition as is the case most of the time when it comes to the benefits of increased participation in the political life of the nation as well as the case of health crisis such as HIV and AIDS (Tilson, & Alozie, 2004). Starck and Kruckeberg (2001) describe that in many cases it is these inactive publics who are the least likely to benefit from
multinational corporations’ (MNC) participation in foreign economies and from programs aimed to increase participation in the social contract suggested by Enz et al. (2001). The relationship management and stewardship approach to public relationship can benefit from adopting Hallahan’s suggestion and in turn it can benefit development efforts by making them more inclusive (postmodern). The inclusion of inactive publics addresses the questions raised by stakeholder theory about the need for a normative approach to determine which publics are most relevant by making sure that all members of a community are included and that they all benefit from these development efforts as opposed to including only active or informed members of the public (Starck, & Kruckeberg, 2001).

Achieving such a level of two-way communication and multiculturalism in public relations practices that can then advance developmental communications efforts is by no means an easy task. As indicated by the study conducted by Plowman (1998), the requirement that the public relations practitioner be a member of the “dominant coalition” set forth by Grunig (1997) as a contributor to Excellent practices in public relations (two-way symmetrical) is not always possible. Plowman found that his hypothesis, which suggested that knowledge of conflict resolution skills increased education might facilitate entrance into the dominant coalition did not hold true. In the end, it was up to the coalition itself, the CEO and whether or not the practitioner looked out of the organization first (not necessarily two-way or postmodern) that determined his or her entrance into the dominant coalition. This demonstrates that many of the new developments in the field of public relations that encourage adoption of a two-way symmetrical and relationship management model may be difficult to implement at times.
That should be kept in mind by those in charge of development communication efforts. However, the changes that are most difficult to achieve are those that attempt to change the role of the practitioner and define it as Holtzhausen and Voto (2002) and others have to that of an advocate, change agent, and arbiter in the organization. In many parts of the world, this has not been the role of the practitioner (Tilson, & Alozie, 2004), and it will be challenged as suggested by Plowman (1998).

Other ways of achieving this relationship management and two-way approach in development communication are suggested by Holmström (2003) and Enz et al. (2001). They suggest that what needs to occur is a change in the way the organization views itself and its place in the world. Holmström, in her description of the reflective paradigm, mentions that organizations, as they take on a reflective (self-examination) approach to understanding the role they play and should play in society, will redefine themselves and in doing so will make it easier to achieve these relationships with publics and keep their interest present in the decision making process. Enz et al. (2001) in their suggestion of the social contracts that can occur between organizations and the communities within which they operate, also set up a new system of visualizing the way that developed nations and development organizations such as the UN and IDG develop partnerships with the people they seek to help. Snyder (2002) and Wilkins (2002) also assert that by having better relationships with the target populations, one can make development efforts more targeted and effective at all levels: formative research, evaluation, implementation and evaluation. Snyder suggests that by conferring with members of the society through enhanced relationships, one can ensure that the frames used in mass media efforts are congruent with those of the target public. Wilkins advises that a departure from modernist
approaches to doing formative research that treats all communities and publics in the same manner will be necessary for practitioners to avoid using a “cookie cutter” approach based on the belief that one size fits all in terms of media messages, channels, and objectives.

The field of development communication informs public relations by also providing some very important concepts and theories—the concepts of empowerment, communication, development, and power. However, there are a few other ideas that are being discussed in the field that merit some consideration in the way that they can inform public relations. One of these concepts is that of a social contract introduced by Enz et al. (2001). The social contract is described as the last of four levels of relationships that can be developed between multinational corporations (MNCs) that are doing business in a foreign nation and the members of that society. This fourth level is achieved by those relationships that include an investment on the part of the MNC in the form of training, good human resources practices, community education, and attention to the environment and participation, investment, and taking a stake on the part of the nations and its citizens. This is an arrangement that is characterized by coordination rather than cooperation. Coordination is preferred because it alludes to the mutual participation in the decision making process and not solely in the benefits. Enz et al. (2001) use the case study of Costa Rica to illustrate how this country and its businesses with MNCs have transitioned from being first level “contractual agreements” characterized by the “banana republic” to second level “limited partnerships,” which are characterized by the maquiladora industry. From this point they describe the move to the third level “social partnerships” where MNCs have established businesses that protect the environment and provide
education for the people of Costa Rica while still managing to make a profit. Finally, the “social contract” describes that arrangement where Costa Rica relies on MNCs simply for their technical expertise and has a greater stake in their own development. They do this by putting forth most or all the capital required for business development. This is the case in the example of the hospitality training provided by Marriott Hotel to Costa Rican hotel industry leaders. This typology of relationship that emerges from the development field illustrates for public relations the different levels of involvement, commitment, and investment that may be required by different relationships and with different publics.

Another key concept emerging from the development communication field is the concept of sustainable development. Tilson and Alozie (2004) define development as primarily environmental. This means that development efforts in the post-modern era must make sure that MNCs when doing business in developing nations pay attention to the environmental implications of their strategies there. The experiences of nations when it comes to sustainable development can be devastating as in the case of the state of Ohio in the post industrialization era or pleasant as in the case of Costa Rica and the hotel industry and the eco-tourism industry. Sustainable development is also defined by Melkote and Steeves (2001) as having three main components, the first being a biological component that says that all genetic species must be protected to ensure their continuation (this is manifested in the environment to ensure that resources key to that nations sustenance continue to be available over the years). There is also a sociological component that suggests that there should be protections put in place for cultural minorities and the preservation of language as well as respect for different systems in society. Finally, Melkote and Steeves (2001) offer an economic component that
encourages the eradication of poverty, unemployment, and inequality in the distribution of wealth; this ensures that all members of a society benefit from the relationship between the MNCs and the nation or community and not just a few elites. This concept can infuse public relations with key directions to look toward when attempting to assess needs of publics and to help its organization transform in a reflective way (Holström, 2002) rather than have to react to government legislation and regulation or react to backfire from activist groups or protesters (Tilson, & Alozie, 2004).

These concepts along with those emerging from the very field of public relations can help public relations practitioners heed to the call made by van Ruler and Verčič (2002) in their Bled Manifesto for a universal discussion of the role this profession should play in the world as well as an understanding that the practice may differ by hemisphere and from nation to nation. It appears from this brief analysis that there is a great deal of overlap among these two fields. Clearly they are both moving toward a post-modernity view of the world that rejects the devastation and selfishness characteristic of corporate dealings and development efforts of the Cold War era and embraces a new paradigm that instead values individuals and endorses a dialogue with these individuals that can help nations, communities, and organizations adopt a reflexive posture.

Public relations strategies that are used to target publics in Latino communities in the state of Florida will be the focus of this dissertation. Focusing only on Latinos and specific campaigns within the state of Florida makes this project more manageable and facilitates closer examination than if it were conducted on a national scale. Voter mobilization campaigns are among many different efforts involving communication for development that have targeted ethnic communities in the United States. Latino
registration and voter mobilization efforts took place during the 2004 presidential elections. These efforts were spearheaded by political parties, ethnic media, and not-for-profit organizations alike (Velazquez, & Cobble, 2004). These registration efforts were numerous and were concentrated in areas in the United States that are heavily populated by Latino residents (Fessenden, 2004).

**Emic and Etic Approach**

A central idea of this dissertation is the use of a culture-centered approach to identify, describe, and analyze the different frames of reference used by audiences. A major contribution of this dissertation to the development of theory and research in the broader field of mass communication and in particular to public relations consists of the introduction of the concepts of emic and etic into an analytical model for examining mass and interpersonal communication content. These concepts, it is argued in this endeavor, can facilitate the understanding of frames in communication for development efforts by focusing the researcher on both the physical and functional attributes of the communicative behavior. This behavior can be texts, symbols or the spoken word. This dissertation looks at the messages used by political and communitarian campaigns targeting the Latino community in the state of Florida to mobilize them to register and vote in the 2004 presidential election. It also examines the texts of in-depth interviews conducted with members of three Latino subgroups in the state of Florida (Colombian, Cuban, and Puerto Rican Americans). This dissertation offers a new emic and etic approach that can be useful for content-based research in evaluation studies of public relations campaigns for nation or community building in multicultural societies.

Gudykunst (1997) in his explication of the topic of cultural variability in the study of communication describes what he calls the “two basic approaches to the study of
culture and communication: etic and emic.” According to Gudykunst, the emic approach to understanding human behavior focuses on an insider view or member-centered view of the culture to gain understanding. The etic approach uses an outsider perspective and focuses on predetermined characteristics of human behavior that are used to make cross-cultural comparisons. Etic has also been described as representing the physicality of a piece of behavior, while emic is representative of the meaning this behavior carries for the members of such cultures. These cultural dimensions have been the topic of numerous studies (Kluckhohn, & Strodtbeck, 1961; Gudykunst, & Ting-Toomey, 1988, and Gudykunst, & Kim, 1997). The concept of emic can be ascertained as the group-specific meaning of such symbols and behavior. The concept of etic for purposes of this study can be interpreted as the general meaning that a cultural symbol or behavior carries across cultures. The meaning here is that which it carries for a specific ethnic group. Cultural research in communication suggests that these symbols and behaviors can often be unique to a specific ethnic group, but at times the same behavior or symbols are found across cultural groups. The level of affinity between public and practitioner cultural frames can serve as a final arbiter when making decisions about the utility and effectiveness of public relations campaign messages.

The concepts of emic and etic were first conceived by linguist Kenneth Pike in 1954. Pike formed his definitions from a linguistic perspective, emic deriving from phonemic and “pertaining to or being a significant unit that functions in contrast with other units in a language or other system of behavior,” and etic originating from phonetic, and “pertaining to or being the raw data of a language or other area of behavior without considering the data as significant units functioning within a system” (Headland, Pike, &
Harris, 1990). Marvin Harris was another scholar who contributed a great deal to the development of the concepts of emic and etic. Harris first used these terms in 1964, altering slightly both their meaning and usage. Whereas Pike intended the terms emic and etic to represent different perspectives within the same language, Harris instead used these terms to refer to the viewpoints of an insider and an outsider of a particular cultural milieu (Gil-White, 2001). Since these terms’ creation, they have come to be used in many areas of social science and have taken on a multitude of meanings, varying in complexity and in degree of similarity to Pike’s original definitions.

A recent sample of 10 studies from the areas of anthropology, medicine, marketing, business, education, and sociology which employ emic and etic in some part of their research demonstrates the wide ranges of uses and definitions of these concepts. Of the 10 studies, diverse methodology was employed, five using in-depth interviews (Wallendorf, & Arnould, 1991; Manwar, Johnson, & Dunlap, 1994; Godina, & McCoy, 2000; Falk, Sobal, Bisogni, Connors, & Divine, 2001; Weiss, 2001), two using observation (Wallendorf, & Arnould, 1991; Manwar et al., 1994), one using a focus group (Bradford, Meyers, & Kane, 1999), four incorporating statistical analysis (Herche, Swenson, & Verbeke, 1996; Bradford et al., 1999; Higgins, & Bhatt, 2001; Weiss, 2001), and two using a survey (Herche et al., 1996; Higgins, & Bhatt, 2001). Eight of the studies subscribed to a very loose definition of the concepts, emic meaning a specific or local perspective and etic, a universal standpoint. Only studies by Gil-White (2001) and Sigman (1981) delved further into the complexities of the topic and attempted to fit their definitions more closely to Pike’s original meanings. Pike was credited in four of the 10 studies, the remaining six simply using the terms without discussing their origins.
(Sigman, 1981; Godina, & McCoy, 2000; Gil-White, 2001; Weiss, 2001). This variation with respect to meaning and usage has grown as emic and etic have spread through the social sciences and become the source of much confusion and debate among scholars.

In their study, Wallendorf and Arnould (1991), explore the meanings of the Thanksgiving holiday from a consumer-centered perspective. They assert that their collection of data from actual groups of people as they celebrate the Thanksgiving holiday represents an emic approach to consumer behavior research.

This study relied on qualitative interviewing techniques and participant observation to discern the meaning of the Thanksgiving holiday to participants in the study. Thanksgiving celebrations were observed using various families and groups over a five year period. The Thanksgiving gatherings were recorded, photographed, and later analyzed after conferring with actual participants regarding details and their perception of the significance of the event. This study is of particular interest because it imports the concept of emic behavior into the field of consumer research.

Wallendorf and Arnould use the term emic very loosely to refer to member-centered analysis of data gathered vis a vis participant observation and qualitative interviewing. This particular study does not describe the history of the emic concept, and only very brief and vague mention of the etic concept is shared in this study. No definition is offered for either emic or etic. Clearly, the term emic in this study is used in the most loose fashion and could be very easily substituted with the term member-centered borrowed from the qualitative research paradigm without much impact at all. This study does not truly represent the qualities that are necessary in communication research that relies on the emic and etic paradigm suggested by Gudykunst (1997).
More functional but equally simplistic definitions of emic and etic are given and employed in Herche, Swenson, and Verbeke’s 1996 study of effectiveness of sales techniques cross-culturally. In this study researchers assert that in order to cater to an increasingly global sales market, research on sales strategies must be conducted internationally and in cross-cultural environments. In the study, two well-known sales techniques, adaptive selling—alteration of sales strategy based on perception of the situation during the sale—and customer-oriented selling—assisting customers in making a purchase based on customer needs—were used. These tactics were tested cross-nationally to measure and compare their impact in the U.S. and in the Netherlands.

Researchers used quantitative methods, conducting surveys of 400 salespeople in the U.S. and 245 salespeople from the Netherlands. The results were statistically analyzed, and it was determined that adaptive selling was a much stronger technique cross-nationally and cross-culturally than consumer-oriented selling.

As previously mentioned, specific definitions for both emic and etic are given in this study. Emic measures are defined as “those that the culture considers meaningful” and etic as “an approach that attempts to make generalizations across cultures or assumes the same global meaningful interpretation” (Herche et al., 1996). Emic and etic are used throughout the study specifically to aid in formulating research questions and the methodology. The study uses specific examples, stating that sales strategies for countries with more developed economies will show similar success rates, showing etic qualities, etic meaning nothing more than common across cultures or countries. The origin of the concepts of emic and etic is not discussed and neither Pike nor Harris is mentioned in this study.
The use of emic and etic has become widespread and now reaches into numerous disciplines, including the field of medicine. In Weiss’s 2001 paper, he describes the need for and development of connections between anthropology and epidemiology. These connections have resulted in the field of cultural epidemiology, an area which aims to reveal the ways in which different populations view disease and illness based on their varying cultural, religious, and ideological perspectives.

The framework used in Weiss’ study is named EMIC, Explanatory Model Interview Catalogue. EMIC claims to use emic strategies by asking open-ended questions for members of various cultural groups and tailoring research objectives specifically to local populations. These EMIC interviews compiled quantitative data comparing and contrasting variables relating to illness and determining frequencies of certain responses, and qualitative data taken from the interview responses. Their purpose was to assess three aspects of illnesses: experience, meaning, and behavior, to learn more about culturally specific interpretations of certain illnesses to specific groups of people. The goal of future research in this field is to better understand local nuances regarding conceptualization of illness and use this information to more effectively treat populations.

Weiss uses emic and etic in his explanation of frameworks used in cultural epidemiology research, defining emic simply as an “insiders’ perspective” and “local” and etic as “outsiders’ perspective” and “professional.” Weiss credits Pike for the creation of these terms and explains their linguistic origins. He goes on to make an analogy between the dichotomy of emic and etic and that of illness and disease, illness being comparable to emic, as people’s perceptions of illness are influenced their own
cultures, and disease being analogous to etic, as it is a more universal concept based on professional medical diagnosis.

Higgins and Bhatt’s 2001 study compared the causes stated as attributing to life events described by members of a collectivist—Indian—culture and an individualistic—Canadian—culture. Data for this study was collected from 195 undergraduate students in India and 162 undergraduate students in Canada. These students were administered a survey in which positive and negative life events, all categorized as either interpersonal or achievement related, were listed. Students were asked to rate the level that they attributed the cause of the event to themselves or some type of internal phenomenon, or to external sources on a seven point scale. This quantitative data was then compiled to analyze their responses. Higgins and Bhatt assert that his study revealed etic findings, that is, that both groups thought achievement related events were more controllable than interpersonal events, as well as emic qualities such as collectivists attributing more life events to uncontrollable, external forces than individualistic participants.

Throughout their research, Higgins and Bhatt (2001) refer to the findings of the study as having both etic, universal, and emic, culture-specific, qualities. In both his predictions and results, Higgins and Bhatt state that causal attributions to the life events would be both emic and etic, that is they would differ depending on the culture of the respondent and share universal attributes. Credit is not given to either Pike or Harris, and emic and etic are not discussed in any depth; their use remains restricted to description of causal explanations in the study.

A 1994 study by Manwar, Johnson, and Dunlap probed into the world of crack dealers in New York City to create an ethnography of this culture which is seldom
observed by outsiders. Of particular importance to the researchers was the methodology involved in storing, retrieving, and analyzing the large quantities of qualitative data generated when collecting material to write ethnographies. Data for this research was collected through multi-session open-ended interviews concentrating on personal background and selling activity of more than 100 cocaine and crack dealers. Researchers also kept extensive field notes containing information on dealing networks, neighborhoods and dealers’ relationships with friends and family. Folio Views software was used to manage and analyze the data retrieved through these interviews and compilation of field notes.

The terms emic and etic are mentioned frequently in this study, particularly in data analysis. Again, emic is defined as the “viewpoint of the subject population” and etic as the “outsiders’ point of view” (Manwar et al., 1994). These definitions are applied to the methods of data collection, which are labeled as emic (in-depth interviews) and etic (field notes from researcher’s perspective). When analyzing transcripts of interviews in attempt to answer research questions, the authors explain the importance of using the emic perspective rather than the etic perspective, stating that “in etic analysis, the analyst wants to trace patterns of cognition, behavior, and feeling among the subject population similar to or explainable by another set of concepts, his own” (Manwar et al., 1994). Although this etic perspective can be useful, in the case of in-depth interviews, use of emic analysis is essential. The authors give the example of answering research questions regarding the income of crack dealers. From the etic perspective, the words “salary” and “earning” would be unsuccessfully searched for in transcripts while those using an emic
perspective would look for a word like “hustled,” thus, aiding in accomplishing their goal of finding information about drug dealers’ salaries.

A study carried out in 2001 by Falk et al. colleagues aims to examine how people’s beliefs about and background regarding health influence their behavior and attitudes with respect to food and healthy eating habits. These researchers conducted 79 open ended interviews focusing on concepts such as the importance of nutrition in the family, factors considered when choosing food and health and its relationship to illness. Participants in the study varied in gender, age, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, and education. Interviews were audio tape-recorded, transcribed, and analyzed qualitatively. Researchers identified predominant themes associated with healthy eating such as balance, weight control, and fat content that they later used to draw similarities and differences and their possible correlation with other factors.

This study only briefly mentions the term emic when describing its findings but fails to give any definition. It could easily be replaced with “member-centered.” Furthermore, the authors never make any mention of the concept of etic. Emic and etic are by no means central to this research and the brief mention of emic is irrelevant to the conclusions.

Godina and McCoy, in their 2000 study of the use of Chicano literature in classrooms with American students, claim to employ the concepts of emic and etic to bridge a cultural gap of opposing viewpoints. This paper reviews the stereotypes often associated with Chicanos and mentions famous Chicano authors whose works are used in classrooms.
To collect their data, these researchers assembled a diverse group of teachers, including both non-Latinos and Latinos with varying degrees of familiarity with Chicano culture. The topic of using Chicano literature in American classrooms was then discussed among these teachers in order to determine differing perspectives about its usefulness and the reaction this literature might receive from teachers and students.

Although in their research Godina and McCoy (2000) credit Pike with coining the terms emic and etic and even quote his definitions, the researchers quickly follow up with their own simplified definitions of “insider” and “outsider,” respectively. Godina and McCoy also credit Harris for his contribution to the concepts of emic and etic, stating that while the terms appear to be in opposition, they allow for communication between contrasting viewpoints. But although the authors have recognized both Pike and Harris, they subscribe to an extremely loose definition of emic and etic throughout their research. Emic represents the views and opinions of the Chicanos, the particular ethnic group being studied, and etic, of the white outsiders. Throughout the study, phrases such as “an etic white perspective” are used (Godina, & McCoy, 2000). These definitions are comparable to those seen in studies previously mentioned.

In their 1999 study, Bradford, Meyers, and Kane make use of emic and etic in their discussion of intercultural communication and its importance between Latinos and non-Latinos in the United States. They argue that the substantial growth of the Latino community in the U.S. has made it an important minority group in many aspects of the government and policy. Because of this, it has become essential to understand similarities and differences in the communication practices of Latinos and non-Latinos in the U.S. in order to facilitate intercultural communication.
Using focus group interviews and statistical analysis, as well as research from previous studies regarding Latino intercultural communication, these authors sought to expose relevant information about culture-specific (emic), or common across cultures (etic) communication techniques or beliefs. A total of 18 Latinos were divided into five focus groups, and their interviews were recorded on videotape.

Emic and etic are mentioned several times in this research, in the methodology, data analysis, and discussion, although neither Pike nor Harris is mentioned. Emic and etic are defined as “culture-specific” and “common across cultures,” respectively, and are not defined or discussed in any more depth.

The studies discussed thus far share a pattern of loose definitions of the terms emic and etic, leading usage of the concepts in research that many scholars view as problematic. In a 2001 study by Francisco J. Gil-White, Gil-White asserts that through Harris’ misinterpretation and misuse of Pike’s original concepts of emic and etic, his research has generated premature and possibly incorrect conclusions. In Gil-White’s paper, he refers to Harris’ use of emic and etic in his study of race and its conceptualization by Brazilians, which concludes that Brazilians have an ambiguous racial categorization system.

In Harris’ research, he uses emic viewpoints to refer to perspectives of insiders, Brazilians and etic when speaking about the observations of outsiders, scientists. By using the terms emic and etic in this manner, Gil-White believes that Harris is defining them as contrasting, unrelated positions. Gil-White declares this view of emic and etic as opposing one another is completely contrary to Pike’s original intent. According to Pike’s definitions, he says, emic and etic are dependent on one another. The insider’s
view that Harris labels as emic, Pike would regard simply as etic variation, and the categories in which a native divides this etic variation, are to be labeled as emic components.

Harris is guilty of using of emic and etic in a manner which strays from Pike’s original intent, “while at the same time expecting them to do the same work that, with the original meanings, they did for Pike in terms of addressing the work that needs to be done to understand an alien category system” (Gil-White, 2001). This, Gil-White declares, is a source of much confusion and possible errors in the research and conclusions drawn by Harris in his study of Brazilians and race. These simplistic definitions of emic as an insider perspective and etic as an outsider’s viewpoint are, however, commonplace in many fields today, as seen in this survey of research.

In his paper presented to the Eastern Communication Association, Stuart Sigman (1981) gives a much more sophisticated meaning to the terms emic and etic than the cursory definitions previously discussed. Sigman strives to elucidate the complexities of emic and etic in his paper, emphasizing the importance of an accurate understanding of these concepts when conducting structural analysis. He begins his discussion by crediting Pike for the creation of the concepts of emic and etic, and cites Pike’s definitions: “Two units are differently etically when instrumental measurements can show them to be so. Units are different emically only when they elicit different responses from people acting within the system” (Sigman, 1981). Sigman goes on to link his own usage and definitions of emic and etic to those of Pike, thus demonstrating that his own explanations of these concepts are more in keeping with the intentions of their originator and maintaining a great deal of integrity in his research. Sigman asserts that etic qualities
are based on physicality and that emic depends not on the physical but on function and meaning.

Sigman uses the concepts of a “minimal pair” and a “final arbiter” in order to establish emic status of units, a minimal pair being two sets of conditions differing in only one etic quality, and a final arbiter being the difference in meaning or behavior used to establish emicity. He looks down upon Harris’ narrow method of assigning emicity based mainly on informants’ verbal responses, and states that the use of nonlexical cues can be used to establish emicity as well. To prove his point, Sigman gives the example of a posh restaurant where observations are made of treatment of customers using two different pronunciations of tomato, “tomato” and “tomahto.” Although the customers using both pronunciations are served, the customer using “tomahto” is treated more graciously, and thus without asking the informant about his experience, an emic distinction can be made through researcher observation alone. Sigman’s approach to the concepts of emic and etic is not only much more in keeping with the origins of these terms, it offers a much more thorough and functional definition, particularly when used in the field of communication.

This dissertation will rely primarily on the original definition intended for the concepts of emic and etic as created by Pike and revisited by Sigman in the previous paragraphs. Although practical implications were considered for integrating these two concepts as part of the instrumentation used in this analysis, due to time constraints the use of these the concepts of emic and etic will be restricted to an analytical component in this dissertation. The emic and etic qualities of Latino-subgroup frames regarding the issue of healthcare coverage in America will be analyzed vis a vis these concepts to reach
an additional layer of understating into to the cultural intricacies among referential frames used by Cuban, Colombian, and Puerto Rican Americans in this study. A closer look at the emerging healthcare frames for each subgroup using this perspective can potentially provides a reasonable impression of the level of meaning and functional equivalence (affinity) of this issue among these subgroups. A detailed discussion of the emic and etic differences between Latino-subgroup frames will help understand the cultural nuances existent among the Latino population.
CHAPTER 4
METHODOLOGY

General Guidelines

This dissertation uses a triangulation method to examine the level of affinity between the frames used to target Latino voters and those used by members of the Latino community. The methodological approach used in this dissertation relies on qualitative content analysis techniques to gauge the strategic frames that targeted Latinos in the state of Florida. This technique is guided by framing theory. This dissertation also uses qualitative in-depth interviewing as a mechanism to measure Latino-subgroup referential frames. Both framing theory and an emic/etic approach were used to interpret the results of the in-depth interviews and to distinguish between the frames used by Cuban, Colombian, and Puerto Rican-American respondents.

This study was guided by four main research questions:

• What were the major frames used by the political and communitarian campaigns to define the issue of healthcare coverage in their voter mobilization efforts targeting Florida Latinos during the 2004 presidential election?

• What were the major frames used by Latino subgroups (Colombian, Cuban, and Puerto Rican Americans) to define the issue of healthcare coverage during the 2004 presidential elections?

• What were the differences and/or similarities between the political and communitarian campaign frames and those used by Latino voters?

• What level of cultural affinity (emic and etic differences) can be ascertained from the Latino-subgroup frames?

These research questions serve to guide this effort to identify, understand, and describe any emic or specific Latino-subgroup frames from etic or general Latino frames.
in this study. A second level of analysis in this study compares political and communitarian campaign frames with Latino-subgroups specific frames. A series of frames matrices in the form of tables are offered in the discussion section to compare and contrast these two sets of frames. This comparison of frames helps determine levels of affinity between the campaign frames used to target Latinos. It also facilitates comparison of frames within Latino subgroups. Comparison of public relations and Latino-subgroup frames are also offered. The implications of such affinity levels or lack of affinity are explored in the findings and discussion chapter of this dissertation.

The four main research questions were the primary focus of the study and helped distinguish between the frames used by the campaigns and among subgroups of Latinos to address the issue of healthcare coverage during the 2004 presidential election. The questionnaire used in the interviews (see sample questionnaire in appendix A) with Latino respondents included questions about their cultural identity and media preferences for gathering election news. There were also questions about their previous political behavior as well as their views on issues that have been identified by opinion polls as important to Latinos in America (Zogby International, 2000; Pew Hispanic Center, 2004).

Additional questions used when interviewing Latino respondents attempted to encourage respondents to talk about the issue of healthcare in the context of the presidential election in 2004. Certain questions asked respondents to consider the issue from a personal, family, and community as well as subgroup perspective. Other questions probed respondents as to their exposure to political and communitarian campaign messages about the healthcare issue before and during the election as well as their familiarity with candidate proposals about the healthcare issue. Finally, participants were
asked to respond to two hypothetical scenarios that encouraged them to frame the issue by defining the problem, make causal attributions, share moral judgments, and prescribe solutions as suggested by Entman (1993).

**Content Analysis**

The content analysis utilized a code sheet and a master codebook that were developed using Hertog and McLeod’s (2001) “Multiperspectival Approach.” The coding sheet incorporates the main ideas from Hertog and McLeod’s multi-perspectival framing approach (i.e. identifying core and peripheral concepts, key words, main narrative, and power relations). In addition, the code sheet included a section that was used to record relevant information about the communication content coded, the coder, and the major and peripheral issues addressed in the communication. A copy of the coding sheet and master codebook are included in this dissertation as Appendix B. The master codebook was used to operationalize the categories used in the coding sheet that required the most coder judgment. In addition to using a clear definition for each coding category in the coding sheet, the master codebook also included examples for each category from Hertog and McLeod’s (2001) approach.

The method of content analysis was chosen to identify, describe, and compare both public relations and Latino-subgroup frames because of the usefulness of this method in systematically identifying specified characteristics of media messages as well as interpersonal communications. Content analysis has been used in studies of mass media news coverage and public relations campaigns. According to Rogers (1997), Harold Lasswell “virtually created the communication research method of content analysis” (p. 203). This method has its origins in the cryptology used to classify library books by subject and for biblical concordances. Rogers (1997) defines content analysis as “the
investigation of communication messages by categorizing message content into classifications in order to measure certain variables” (p. 214).

Pointdexter and McCombs (2000) refer to the definition of content analysis offered by Berelson (1952)—a “research technique for the objective, systematic, and quantitative description of the manifest content of communication.” They stress that the focus on “manifest” or apparent content, as opposed to latent or hidden content of communication, is essential for “producing scientifically valid results” (p. 188). A focus on hidden meaning, they argue, can result in different results with different coders. However, as Babbie (1998) suggests, field researchers often choose depth of observation over specificity, which is the case of this dissertation (p. 311). He argues that researchers using content analysis have more of a choice in this matter as opposed to survey research or ethnography. The choice of depth over specificity often ends in lower levels of inter-coder reliability due to the many interpretations and judgments that have to be made by coders, however. The exploratory nature of this dissertation and the emphasis on identifying, describing, and comparing, rather than making causal attributions or quantifying the number of times that different frames were used justifies the choice of a qualitative approach to doing content analysis rather than using a quantitative one. Sacrificing validity over reliability is a reasonable decision given the nature of the current research. This decision to choose depth over specificity in this dissertation is also consistent with assertions by framing scholars such as Tankard and his colleagues (1991), Reese (2001), Durham (2001), and Maher (2001) suggesting that the future of framing research lies in studies that achieve a balance in their assessment of both latent and manifest content.
Ole Holsti’s 1969 definition of content analysis is more general and defines it as a “multipurpose research method developed specifically for investigating any problem in which the content of communication serves as the basis of inference” (p. 2). Harold Lasswell used content analysis to examine persuasive leaflets used to divide, demoralize, and accuse the enemy during the war. He eventually created a course about content analysis, which Rogers suggests might have been the first of its kind and which he later taught at the University of Chicago in 1926. Content analysis can be used to measure different types of messages and can include content from newspapers, magazines, memos, e-mails, speeches, press releases, songs, paintings, and constitutions (Babbie, 1998; Poindexter, & McCombs, 2000). This dissertation ads in-depth interview transcripts to the pool of communications that can be examined via content analysis.

One of Lasswell’s main content analysis studies was his dissertation topic: A content analysis of WWI propaganda. Lasswell’s study of propaganda in WWI defined main concepts, classified propaganda strategies, and elaborated on factors that limited or facilitated the effects of these strategies, says Rogers (1997). He used expert interviews and qualitative content analysis, and focused on the symbols used in WWI propaganda messages. His focus on symbols was said to have been inspired by George Herbert Mead, the father of symbolic interactionism.

During the war, Lasswell trained sixty staff members in the U.S. Department of Justice in how to conduct content analysis in order to monitor potential foreign propaganda in the United States. This work is known as his War-Time Communications Project. Later, in 1947, Lasswell content analyzed 20,000 editorials in the most prestigious papers in five nations to measure political discourse among elites. The study
traced key political concepts over a period of six decades. The study resulted in a book—
_The Prestige Papers_ (1952)—and later gave way to the Hoover Studies, which focused on three distinct units of analysis: 1) elites, 2) institutions, and 3) symbols. Lasswell was only a consultant, but the framework that had guided his research in the past became essential to the Hoover Studies. In sum, Lasswell is credited with inventing and developing both qualitative and quantitative content analysis techniques.

Content analysis has been used both for quantitative and qualitative purposes for the past 50 years. Lazarsfeld’s _The Authoritarian Personality_, which he collaborated on with Theodore Adorno, was an empirical study, but it was also qualitative as it used qualitative content analysis in a form of framing analysis. Adorno considered this type of research method as empirical, Rogers says (1997, p. 283). Perhaps this method has been used the most in a quantitative fashion in the many agenda-setting studies available today. In fact, Pointdexter and McCombs (2000) indicate that in mass media studies, content analysis is typically used in reference to quantitative research endeavors. Lasswell’s and Lazarsfeld’s historic studies compared content analysis results on certain topics with public opinion data in the form of public opinion polls and qualitative focus groups and in-depth interviews.

The agenda-setting tradition started by McCombs and Shaw (1972) has also relied on content analysis of newspaper coverage to determine the issues deemed most important by the media. This tradition of mass communication research has juxtaposed the findings of content analysis with that of public opinion data gathered through surveys of the general electorate. The emphasis placed on the need to make generalizations and to establish cause and effect relationships between media coverage and public perceptions
on important issues that has characterized agenda-setting research has required that representative data such as public opinion polls be used along-side the results of their content analysis efforts.

The current research does not attempt to establish such causal relationships or to make claims about the general Latino public. Therefore, the use of in-depth interviews, which is a primarily qualitative research approach, was a good technique to use for the public opinion component suggested here. This dissertation builds on this tradition started by Harold Lasswell and continued by Lazarsfeld and recent scholars by using content analysis—a qualitative approach—to both measure public opinion among Latinos in the state of Florida and analyze communication content used in public relations strategies targeting them.

**In-Depth Interviews**

Qualitative in-depth interviewing was selected because of its ability to provide depth and breadth of description about the opinions, feelings, and attitudes surrounding a particular phenomenon. These interviews are a great mechanism to achieve what Lincoln and Guba (1985) refer to as an enriching of accounts that provides a thick description. Gaskell (1994) offers the following reasons for using qualitative interviews:

> The understanding of the life worlds of respondents and specified social groupings is the sine qua non of qualitative interviewing…providing a thick description of a particular social milieu; it can be used as a basis for generating a framework for further research; it may provide empirical data to test expectation and hypotheses developed out of a particular theoretical perspective. (p. 39)

He also summarizes the objective of qualitative research as “to sample the range of views. Unlike the sample survey where the probability sample can be applied in most research situations, there is no one method for selecting respondents for qualitative inquiries” (p. 42).
Depth interviews, as they are also known, rely heavily on open-ended and probing questions for data gathering. While they rely on a topic guide or questionnaire, they can be largely unstructured interviews and can be conducted in person or via telephone (Lindenmann, 2003). Gaskell (1994) places qualitative interviews somewhere on a continuum between highly structured surveys on one end and ethnographic/participant observation type studies on the other. The implication here is that, while in-depth interviews are primarily member-centered—they rely on members’ interpretation of the meaning of the phenomena studied—they are more systematic than ethnographic type research and often include a priori categories, which are imported into the research situation. The function of this methodology is the production of a “fine-textured understanding of beliefs, attitudes, values, and motivations in relation to the behaviors of people in particular social contexts” (p. 39).

In-depth interviews are useful for the purpose of this dissertation because they aid the researcher in her understanding of new and difficult to grasp concepts and behaviors. As mentioned in the discussion about framing theory in chapter three, some of the core ideas involved in the more qualitative approaches implementing framing analysis can be difficult to grasp, and that has often resulted in a multiplicity of ideas regarding how to operationalize and measure frames. In-depth interviews are more useful to this kind of research than perhaps ethnography or participant observation in dealing with Latino respondents. This is mostly the case because the objective here is to gauge respondents’ views, attitudes, and opinions regarding the issue of healthcare coverage and not necessarily to see how they relate, for instance, to healthcare professionals or go about getting medical attention. If the latter were the purpose of this research, then participant
observation or ethnography would provide more valid and detailed data. However, the focus on endogenous phenomena rather than more physically accessible behavior encourages the use of an interviewing technique. Also, in-depth interviews are preferred over highly structured interviews (Berger, 2000) because the latter is more useful in studies that require that the data be collected at a higher precision level in order to make consistent claims and possibly generalize to a larger audience.

The primary goal of this dissertation is to achieve a general understanding of prominent frames used by key players. Understanding in the context of this study refers to identification, description and the comparing and contrasting of frames. In-depth interviewing provides a much more equitable research mechanism to achieve such goals than does the traditional highly structured interview that is characteristic of public opinion polls. In-depth interviews provide the type of contextual information that aids in identifying, describing, and comparing the frames investigated in this dissertation. Using this methodology serves as a basis to generate a framework for future framing analysis.

Even with its many advantages for this type of research, in-depth interviewing also comes with some limitations. First of all, similar to methods such as survey research and focus groups, it relies heavily on informant or respondent accounts. These can often be biased by voluntary and involuntary omissions and distortions of accounts of events, views, and attitudes. This method is subject to many of the sources of bias present in other respondent-based methods. This dissertation incorporated the use of an extensive enough questionnaire guide to compensate for these shortcomings of in-depth interviewing methodology. Relevant topics and issues were measured at different points throughout the interview process. A series of questions in the questionnaire guide probed
respondents’ reactions, views, definitions, and attitudes about the issue of healthcare coverage and the individuals and groups they considered to play a role in this issue. Also, probing techniques such as eliciting contextual information, using projective questions, going from specific to general and taking a naïve position were used to compensate for some of the shortcomings of this methodology.

**Unit of Analysis**

Two sets of units of analysis were used in this study. The first set consisted of several campaigns that targeted potential Latino voters in the state of Florida during the 2004 presidential election. These campaigns were the Bush/Cheney Presidential Campaign, Kerry/Edwards Presidential Campaign, and the League of United American Citizens (LULAC) and the Southwestern Voter Registration and Education Program (SVREP) communitarian campaigns. Samples of their communication messages were obtained from campaign and organizational Web sites as well as by contacting their state and regional offices. Web site content was downloaded in the month of November 2004, while presidential campaign Web sites were still active. Other materials used to target Latinos in Florida in the months prior to the 2004 presidential election were collected through May 2005.

Based on the definitions of communication for development and nation building efforts outlined in this dissertation, which emphasize the target, purpose, and strategies used in these campaigns (see chapter three section two on communication for development) and the reliance of these efforts on publicity, mass media, social marketing, and other public relations tactics, these political and communitarian campaigns (Bush/Cheney, Kerry/Edwards, LULAC/SVREP) were designated in this dissertation as community building campaigns that sought to empower (politically) Latinos living in the
state of Florida. Samples of political campaign ads can be found in appendix C and samples of communitarian campaign communications can be found in appendix D. Therefore, for purposes of operationalizing, these four campaigns that targeted Latinos are understood to represent distinct communication for development efforts.

The second set of units of analysis consisted of Latino subgroups (Colombian, Cuban, and Puerto Rican Americans), which were also targeted as sources of frames for purposes of this dissertation. Each subgroup included seven members who a shared cultural heritage from the same Latin American country (i.e. all members of the Colombian-American group considered themselves to be Colombians at least in part). The primary focus here was the collective frames used by each subgroup to refer to the issue of healthcare coverage in America.

**Unit of Observation**

The units of observation in this dissertation consist of individual communication messages (texts) that were used to motivate Latinos to register and/or vote in the 2004 presidential elections. Communications in the form of news releases, news stories, fliers, policy positions, campaign ads, public service announcements, and other public relations tactics were content analyzed using a coding sheet that incorporates media framing theory. A total of 125 such communications were coded using the content analysis scheme. This sample included political and communitarian campaign communications as well as in-depth interviews.

A coder reliability test of a random sample of 30 communications content analyzed yielded an intercoder reliability measure of 79 percent—a reasonable level of reliability given the study’s high qualitative and exploratory character. The reliability tests were conducted at the level of each individual frame component as suggested by Hertog &
McLeod (2001) and Entman (1993). In other words, the reliability check involved verifying the decision made regarding a list of components in the coding scheme each item at a time, and verifying with each individual coder if a correct coding decision had been made.

A per-group inventory of the source of the 125 communications content analyzed shows that 60 of the communications in the overall sample were from the Bush/Cheney Campaign, 47 were from the Kerry/Edward Campaign, 18 were from LULAC and SVREP. Of these 125 communications, 40 included the issue of healthcare coverage in America as their “main issue.” Other communications also discussed the issue of healthcare. These communications were coded as “other issue” as opposed to having healthcare coverage as their main issue.

To determine whether the issue of healthcare was considered to be the “main issue” or an “other issue” covered in a particular communication, the coder looked at the headlines and subheadings in a communication and the amount of copy that was dedicated to the healthcare issue. If the healthcare issue was listed in the headline and was covered in most of the communication then it was considered to be the “main issue.” If there was a different issue listed in the headline and the healthcare issue was only covered among other peripheral issues to the main issue, then it was considered to be in the category of “other issue.” A good example of a communication where healthcare was not the main issue is a news release dated Friday, February 6th 2004 by the Bush/Cheney campaign, which was titled “El presupuesto del Presidente beneficia a los Hispanos [The Presidents budget benefits Hispanics].” This six page news release covered all the different areas of the domestic economy that would be helped by the Bush budget for
2005 and the benefits this funding represented for the Latino community. Healthcare benefits were listed among funding that would improve/continue the war on terror, homeland security, strengthening the economy, job creation, education, and the president’s faith based initiatives.

Seven in-depth interviews were conducted with individual members of each of the three distinct Latino subgroups providing a total of 21 interviews. These Latino community members were selected using a convenience sampling method known as snowball effect. In a snowball effect recruitment strategy, interviewees were asked to refer other potential interviewees, who met the criteria set for this study, to the researcher. There was not a random selection of subjects involved in the methodology of this study. These interviews were conducted between April 13, 2005 and May 25, 2005. The geographic location of the Latinos interviewed varied, with seven residing in the South Florida area, six in the I-4 corridor Orlando/Tampa area and another seven in the North Central Florida region. The gender distribution of the Latinos interviewed was 11 male and 10 female. The interview respondents included young adults between the ages of 20 and 30, mature adults as well as senior citizens. Professionals, academicians, educators, communication executives, retirees, social workers, physicians, attorneys, engineers, and homemakers were also represented in the pool of Latinos interviewed.

Each interview lasted between one and two and half hours. Each interview was audio recorded and later transcribed using both micro-cassette and regular cassette tape recording technology. The verbatim transcriptions of the interviews were produced using a word processing program, Microsoft Word. The date, time, and location for each interview varied and were included in the transcript heading. Four out of 21 interviews
were conducted via telephone. All other interviews were conducted face-to-face with the respondents. All interviews started by thanking the respondent for their participation in the study. An introductory statement was read to the respondent describing the purpose of the study and the procedure that would follow, reminding them that they could withdraw from the study at any time and of the confidential character of the study. Sample interview transcripts are included in appendix E. The names of interviewees were omitted from these transcripts to ensure confidentiality was maintained. Each interviewee also read and signed an Institutional Review Board (IRB) approved and certified “Informed Consent Form” for this study. A sample informed consent form can also be found as appendix F. A reverse translation approach, as suggested by Brislin (1993) and Babbie (1998), was used to translate the questionnaire for the in-depth interviews from English to Spanish and then back to English. This was done to accommodate participants who preferred to be interviewed in Spanish.

Analysis

The analysis in this dissertation relied primarily on identifying the major frames used by the diverse sources of frames in this dissertation. Tables and matrices were used to compare and contrast the different Latino-subgroup frames and different campaign frames. These devices were later used to compare the more prominent frames used by each campaign to their counterparts among the referential frames used by the Latino subgroups in this dissertation. The analysis procedures advised by Hertog and McLeod (2001) for both empirical and multiperspectival framing analysis guided the analysis stage.

The concepts of emic and etic helped to establish distinctions between the Latino-subgroup frames and to identify emic (functional/meaning) and etic (physical)
characteristics of these frames. Both the framing and emic/etic approaches were used for within and between group level analysis. In other words, emic, etic, and framing approaches informed the process whereby the Colombian, Cuban, and Puerto Rican-American frames were determined (within group analysis). These heuristics also informed the process whereby the Colombian, Cuban, and Puerto Rican-American frames were compared to one another and the general Latino frames were identified (between group analysis). These concepts also helped describe and understand each of these frames. A similar process was involved in determining the frames within and between campaigns for purposes of this dissertation. The process used for the political and communitarian campaign frames did not include the emic and etic concepts. These frames were discerned strictly using the framing model proposed in this dissertation.
Qualitative Content Analysis Using Framing Theory

This chapter provides a summary of the findings of this dissertation. Both the results of the content analysis of the public relations strategies and those of the content analysis of the in-depth interviews are presented here. A detailed description of the different frames identified for each source will follow.

This dissertation relies on content analysis of political and communitarian campaign communications used to frame important issues for Latinos during the 2004 presidential election. The content analysis was guided by the conceptual framework for conducting framing analysis proposed by Hertog and McLeod (2001) and also focused on the four functions of frames suggested by Entman (1993). In keeping with the suggestions of Hertog and McLeod, this analysis was not limited to manifest content that is typical of empirical studies. Instead, it sought to “uncover” the power structures and meaning underlying the latent content of each communication and therefore of each frame. The analysis focused primarily on the text that carries the frame of a particular issue or event as advised by Reese (2001). By adopting this approach, this analysis also followed the recommendations of Entman (1993) who offered the “text” as one of the five locations where frames can be located previously mentioned in chapter three.

A total of 125 communications representing the three different campaigns that targeted Latinos in this study were content analyzed. A coder reliability test of a random sample of the communications content analyzed was conducted and it yielded an inter
coder reliability measure of 79 percent. These included a diversity of communication
tactics that are typically characteristic of public relations campaigns that seek to inform
and persuade an audience. The following Table 5-1 shows a break down of
communication by source and by type.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communications</th>
<th>Bush/Cheney</th>
<th>Kerry/Edwards</th>
<th>LULAC/SVREP</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>News Release</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Position</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Ad TV</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Ad Radio</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>60</strong></td>
<td><strong>47</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td><strong>125</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The issue of healthcare coverage in America was one of the primary issues
discussed by the campaigns as evident in Table 5-2 below. This table also shows a
number of other issues such as education, the economy and employment that featured
prominent in these communications targeting the Latino population. Healthcare was
among the top issues in the Bush/Cheney campaign communications targeting Latinos,
representing 16 cases. It was also the focus of 15 communications from the
Kerry/Edwards campaign and nine were sponsored by LULAC and SVREP. The issue of
healthcare was the main issue in 40 out of a total of 125 campaign communications
content analyzed. It was also discussed in other communications examined in this study,
but it was coded as “other issue” and not as the “main issue.”

As mentioned in chapter four, to determine whether the issue of healthcare was
considered to be the “main issue” or an “other issue” covered in a particular
communication the coder looked at the headlines, subheads in a communication and the
amount of copy that was dedicated to the healthcare issue. If the healthcare issue was
listed in the headline and was covered in most of the communication then it was
considered to be the “main issue.” If there was a different issue listed in the headline and
the healthcare issue was only covered among other peripheral issues to the main issue,
then it was considered to be in the category of “other issue.” An example was offered in
chapter four (methodology) that illustrates how the decision was made as to a
communication included the issue of healthcare as a “main issue” or as an “other issue.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Bush/Cheney</th>
<th>Kerry/Edwards</th>
<th>LULAC/SVREP</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Political and Communitarian Campaign Frames

The content analysis sought to identify, describe and understand the main frames
used to depict the issue of healthcare coverage in America. This analysis was divided into
an analysis of frames from public relations strategies and an examination of Latino-
subgroup frames. This approach was used in keeping with the suggestion by Entman
(1993) that framing analysis look at both the communicator and audience involved in the
framing process. In addition to aiding in the process of deciphering among sources and
their corresponding frames, this approach also facilitated the process whereby these
frames were later compared to one another in an analytical discussion attempting to
identify commonalities and differences. The distinction in range of commonality and/or
differences has been referred to so far in this dissertation as the level of affinity among
the diverse frames sources.

The primary sources of campaign frames came from Bush/Cheney and
Kerry/Edwards political campaign communications and from the League of United Latin
American Citizens (LULAC) and Southwestern Voter Registration and Education Program (SVREP) communitarian campaign communications. The audience referential frames examined in the current research originated from discussions, vis a vis in-depth interviews, with Latino-subgroup members about the healthcare coverage issue in America. This later source of frames—Latino-subgroup frames—consisted of specific referential frames used by Colombian, Cuban and Puerto Rican Americans living in the state of Florida at the time of the 2004 presidential campaign. The next few sections provide an overview of the findings of this framing analysis. They map out the specific characteristics of the public relations strategies (political and communitarian) frames that emerged from this analysis. The Latino-subgroup frames will be discussed in subsequent sections in this chapter.

**Bush/Cheney Campaign Frames**

A framing analysis of a total of 60 communications from the Bush/Cheney campaign targeting Latinos during the 2004 presidential election identified three major frames surrounding the issue of healthcare coverage in America. The frames are the *Bush Agenda for America* frame, the *Combative Frame: Bush Policy vs. Kerry Policy* and the *Latino American Dream* frame. The frames were different from one another in some respects and very similar in others. They shared some of the same core concepts that underpinned the values driving them and the core and peripheral actors that took part in the narrative. However, they differed in terms of the master narrative that held them together as well as the power relations implied or explicit in each frame. There were also key differences among them in terms of the problem definitions prescribed by each frame as well as the causal agents identified for each problem.
The analysis of the Bush/Cheney campaign communications indicated that a series of boundaries were set to give priority to different aspects of the issue of healthcare. The tone of these frames was mostly characteristic of typical campaign messages, which center on a conflict theme and tend to play on widely shared concepts and values such as honor, opportunity and justice in election politics in America.

It is not surprising, given the electoral nature of the campaign, that one of the major frames identified in this analysis as central to the Bush/Cheney campaign is the *Bush Agenda for America* frame. This frame summarizes Bush’s administrative achievements, his platform for the 2004 campaign and his plans his next term if elected. The master narrative described the plans by Bush and the Republicans in Congress to provide the much needed healthcare benefits to American families and Latinos. The narrative usually detailed Bush’s 2005 budget proposals and funding decisions for important programs, which included increasing healthcare coverage for middle income Latinos and poor families as well as the elderly. The master narrative in this frame also made frequent mentions of the Bush Medicare Reform Act of 2004 and its prescription component to help reduce the price of medicine for the elderly in America. One Bush/Cheney campaign news release titled “Medicare discount cards help seniors to save on prescription drug prices” (Monday, June 14, 2004) described Bush’s improvements in Medicare policy:

Esta semana, el Presidente Bush viajó a Kansas city, Missouri para hablar con los ancianos sobre los beneficios de las nuevas targetas de descuento para medicamentos aprobadas por Medicare. Seis meses después de que el Presidente promulgase la histórica Ley de Medicamentos Recetados, Mejoras y Modernización de Medicare de 2003, los ancianos pueden ahorrar considerablemente con la compra de sus medicamentos recetados al inscribirse para recibir las tarjetas. [This week, President Bush traveled to Kansas City, Missouri to talk to senior citizens about the benefits of the new discount cards for prescription drugs approved by Medicare. Six months after the President signed this historical legislation for Medicare Prescription Drug, Improvement, and Modernization Act
of 2003, senior citizens can save considerably in their purchase of their prescription
drugs when they sign up to receive their cards]. (Bush/Cheney, 2004a)

Some of the key concepts underlying this frame included the core concepts of
honor, responsibility, opportunity, fairness, equality and freedom. These key concepts
pertained to typical conservative ideological principles that are manifested in peripheral
concepts such as equal access to healthcare for all eligible children and senior citizens
and offering employers the opportunity to provide more affordable healthcare coverage
for their employees. Government is therefore viewed as a fair agent providing equal
opportunities to all members of society, including Latino individuals and their families.
Another Spanish language news release by the Bush/Cheney campaign said, “Estamos
trabajando para fortalecer el sistema de salud para todos los estadounidenses y para
aprobar reformas al Medicare para que cubra las medicinas de los ancianos” [We are
working to strengthen the health system for all Americans and to pass Medicare reforms
so that it can cover the drugs senior citizens need] (2003a). However, the burden is
shared with individuals and their employers and not assumed solely by government. The
underlying idea in this frame suggests that a responsible government will make the right
decisions about healthcare coverage for the people it governs as explained in one 60
second Bush/Cheney radio ad:

Un plan para… fortalecer la economía, crear nuevos trabajos, entrenar a más
trabajadores, invertir en la educación, ayudar a pequeñas empresas a brindar seguro
médico a sus empleados, darle seguro médico a todos los niños elegibles, crear un
centro médico en todas las comunidades pobres. [A plan to….Strengthen the
economy, Create new jobs, Train more workers, Invest in education, Help small
businesses offer health insurance to their employees, Provide health insurance to all
eligible children, create a medical center in all poor communities.] (Bush/Cheney,
2004e)

The actors involved in this frame are usually the same. Bush is depicted as the
protagonist who provides a plan to help America with healthcare coverage related issues.
The solution consists of adequate funding for a fair budget to help Americans by reducing healthcare costs. Bush helps Latinos and senior citizens by supporting a compassionate agenda that results in lowering the price of prescription medicines and making healthcare coverage more accessible to all Americans. Vice president Dick Cheney and Republican Congressional Leaders also play an important role in ameliorating the healthcare needs of Latinos and the elderly. They support the Bush agenda, and they make it possible for these policies to get passed in Congress. Senator Kay Bailey Hutchinson of Texas, in a news release dated December 18, 2003 announcing her leadership of the Bush/Cheney campaign in the state of Texas said that “desde proveer a las personas de edad avanzada mejores opciones para el cuidado de la salud hasta mejorar la calidad del sistema de educación para los jovenes, el Presidente Bush ha transformado retos en oportunidades” [from providing the elderly with better options for their healthcare to improving the quality of the education system for young people, President Bush has transformed challenges into opportunities” (Bush/Cheney, 2003b).

Poor and middle class Latinos are portrayed as beneficiaries of the forward looking Bush healthcare agenda. Small businesses are part of the solution and proactive players in providing healthcare insurance to their employees. Bush tax cuts specifically targeting small businesses will defray the cost of healthcare and enable employers to provide better benefits to America’s workforce. Eligible Latino children are also beneficiaries from the Bush agenda for America with respect to healthcare coverage. Pharmaceutical companies are described as proactive participants in solving the healthcare coverage issue along with government. Private industry and government work together to solve the problems impacting the lives of Latinos, this frame suggests. The description of the new program in
one news release stated that “más y más farmacéuticas han acordado ofrecer sus productos por un precio nominal a los beneficiarios que han agotado sus subsidios de $600 para medicamentos recetados” [more and more pharmaceutical companies have agreed to offer their products at a reduced price to the Medicare card holders who use up their six hundred benefit for prescription drugs] (Bush/Cheney, 2004a).

Other peripheral actors in the resolving the healthcare situation in America include medical providers such as hospitals, physicians and insurance companies who are partners with the Bush administration in resolving the issue. Also, the sons and daughters of the elderly are indirectly benefited by the Bush agenda as a result of the peace of mind they get from knowing that government and private industry are working together to ensure that their parents are taken care of in terms of their medical needs.

The power relations explicit in this frame are the relationship between the American people and government as one characterized by trust and compassion. The idea that government can be trusted to care for its people is one of the subtexts in this frame. Also, government empowers small businesses to better serve their employees. Therefore, trust can also be extended toward private enterprises as they have been empowered by government to protect and attend to the needs of their workforce. Government is compassionate and is there to support and empower the people. When you have the right people in power you can trust them to do the right thing. Excerpts from a 30 second Bush/Cheney campaign television ad titled “Plan Más Trabajos”[Plan More Jobs] said, “Plan del Presidente Bush y el Congreso: 1. Crecer nuestra economía, 2. Expandir las pequeñas empresas, 3. Emplear a más trabajadores” [The Bush and Congressional plan: 1. Grow our economy, 2. Expand small businesses, 3. Employ more workers] (2004f).
A look at the language used in this frame may also help in elucidating the way ideology is incorporated into word selection and emphasis. The communications examined and identified with this frame discussed the establishment by government of “healthcare centers” in “poor communities.” Code words and catchphrases such as “family,” “to invest,” “create,” “train,” “Agenda for America,” “healthcare savings accounts,” “Association Health Plans” and “affordable healthcare” were all characteristic of messages categorized as belonging to this frame. This careful phraseology also highlights what was not said or left out from this frame—the negative and bickering tone that characterizes politics campaigns in America.

The overall tone used in this frame was positive—perhaps too positive and optimistic. There was little mention of antagonists or bad guys, and even those actors who are typically viewed as part of the problem, mainly private corporations and the pharmaceutical industry were included as part of the solution instead. This particular observation points out what is considered by some as one of the failings of the Republican Party—its close association and increasingly friendly relations with “big business.”

The discussion chapter in this dissertation will attempt to provide some clarity on the issue of how such relations (i.e. conservatives and big business) may have helped reduce the credibility of Bush/Cheney campaign frames targeting the Latino community. This particular matter highlights one of the biggest dilemmas facing public relations campaigns—the potentially negative impact of close partnerships with certain groups or industry on their credibility. This issue was discussed by Taylor (2000a) in her analysis
of the public relations campaign strategy that sought to improve Chinese/Malay relations in Malaysia in the late 1990s.

The notable absence of conflict in the previous frame comes to the foreground and dominates in the next frame associated with the Bush Campaign. The *Combative Frame: Bush Policy vs. Kerry Policy* centers around the preferred storyline of most journalists—conflict. This frame lays out Bush policy on healthcare and compares it to Kerry’s “wrong agenda of priorities.” The master narrative provides an explanation of how Kerry has voted to raise taxes on the middle class and poor over 98 times and how Bush’s tax cuts will make healthcare more affordable for all Americans. The narrative also describes how Kerry’s voting record shows his “out of touch” views on healthcare issues. As is typical of a conflict driven and negatively toned campaign, many of the communications analyzed that fit this description were also often completely dedicated to Kerry bashing and to undermining his credibility as a candidate and as a leader able to tackle the healthcare issue. As with the previous frame, the *Combative Frame* utilized the healthcare issue to make a case—the case of reelecting President Bush and rejecting the candidacy of Senator John Kerry. Many of the communications made vague mentions of the healthcare issue and focused primarily on diminishing the credibility of Kerry as a candidate. Most of the communications that fit this frame consisted of political ads aired on television and on the radio in key Latino markets. One Bush/Cheney TV ad titled “Diferencias”[Differences], attempted to discredit Kerry by demonstrating a lack of integrity in his voting record on healthcare policy. “El plan económico de John Kerry…preocupa. Kerry votó por aumentar los impuestos de los beneficios del Seguro Social. Se negó a ayudar a nuestras pequeñas empresas poder dar mejores beneficios médicos a
sus empleados. [John Kerry’s economic record: Troubling…Kerry voted to increase taxes on Social Security benefits. And he voted against giving small businesses tax credits to buy healthcare for employees]” (Bush/Cheney, 2004g)

There was overlap in terms of the core concepts that were central to this frame and the Bush Agenda for America frame. The core concepts of honor, responsibility, fairness and leadership were also characteristic of the Combative Frame. But the tone was different in this latter frame. The concept of honor was often invoked to refer to Kerry’s lack thereof as he either “voted 99 times” to raise taxes or “voted against” a tax cut for the middle class. The record suggests that there is very little honor in Kerry’s record. The negative tone also implies the lack of leadership exhibited by Kerry according the ads characteristic of this frame, which often highlighted Kerry’s “wrong priorities” and “missed votes” in the Senate. Among the poor decisions made by Kerry pointed out in this frame were his vote against a ban violent crimes against pregnant women and his absence during the vote to reduce the tax burden on small businesses so that they can provide the much needed healthcare insurance to Latino workers. There is no fairness toward the healthcare needs of Latinos visible in Kerry’s policies, votes and behavior as a Senator. This same lack of sensitivity would characterize Kerry as president if elected this frame argued. One radio ad spotlighted members of the Latinos Coalition voicing their opinions about Kerry’s lack of interest the needs of the Latino community:

John Kerry en 20 años en el congreso jamás ha presentado un proyecto de ley para reformar el sistema de inmigración y ni lo mencionó durante su discurso ante la convención demócrata….Kerry nunca ha propuesto legislación para ayudar a los trabajadores latinos a conseguir seguro médico y se opuso a la ley para ayudar a pagar las medicinas a los pacientes de Medicare. [In 20 years of Congress, John Kerry has never presented a bill to reform the immigration system and didn’t even mention it during his speech before the Democratic Convention….Kerry has never
proposed legislation to help Latino workers get health insurance and opposed a law to help Medicare patients pay for medicine. (Kerry/Edwards, 2004g).

In contrast to Kerry’s policies for poor and middle class Latino families, the Bush plan would suggest a tax policy that would be fair to all American families. Responsible and honorable leadership pays attention to the needs of the American people, including the needs of Latinos and families struggling with no healthcare, this frame suggests.

“George Bush ha propuesto darle $3,000 al año a las familias latinas sin seguro médico para que tengan acceso a mejores servicios de salud,”[George Bush has proposed giving $3,000 per year to Latino families without health insurance so that they can have access to better health services,] states a Latina woman in a Bush/Cheney radio ad (Kerry/Edwards, 2004g). The Bush plan would ensure that Americans keep more of their own money to pay for affordable healthcare coverage and would provide fairer prescription medicine prices.

Many actors are visible in this frame. Bush is depicted as the protagonist who proposed tax relief for Latino families to make healthcare coverage more affordable. Vice President Dick Cheney is another protagonist in this frame who is supportive of Bush’s “compassionate” agenda. Kerry, on the other hand, is part of the problem. The frame contrasts Kerry as a liberal who is out of touch with the common people’s needs—he raises taxes on the middle class and poor. Kerry is absent in the Senate and doesn’t show up to vote on important policy. When Kerry does vote he votes the wrong way on policy pertaining to healthcare coverage. Kerry is depicted as not caring about Latinos and their needs. Former Senator and Vice Presidential candidate John Edwards is part of the problem, according to this frame and is listed along with Kerry among the most liberal among liberals in Congress. The word “liberal” in this frame is synonymous with out of
touch with the common people. Many of the ideals that Kerry and Edwards share and wish to put into action while in office are not in the best interest of the American people, as stated in a speech given by Governor Marc Racicot, President of the Bush/Cheney campaign:

El Senador Edwards comparte la visión del Senador Kerry en muchos temas importantes, tales como su oposición al crédito tributario por hijo y al alivo tributario a las parejas casadas, su oposición al beneficio de medicinas recetadas para las personas de la tercera edad y su voto en contra de nuestras tropas en el frente de batalla en Afganistan e Irak. [Senator Edwards shares Senator Kerry’s vision on many important issues, such as his opposition to a child tax credit and tax relief for married couples, his objection to prescription medicine benefits for the elderly and his vote against our troops at the battle front in Afghanistan and Iraq]. (Bush/Cheney, 2004b)

Beneficiaries of Bush policies and victims of Kerry’s liberal agenda include senior citizens who need a reduction in the cost of their prescription medicines. Small business owners, many of which are Latino, are in need of tax relief to make healthcare costs available to their employees. Also included among the beneficiaries and victims of these divergent agendas are Latino parents and heads of household who are robbed of the opportunity to afford healthcare coverage. Middle income families and small business employees are also negatively impacted by Kerry’s unfair tax policies. Pregnant women suffer due to Kerry who voted against the violent crime policy inspired by the Laci Peterson story. Finally, physicians suffer under Kerry who refuses to support tort reform to protect them from frivolous lawsuits that are also contributing to the rising healthcare costs in America. According to one Bush/Cheney TV ad titled “Prioridades”[Priorities], Kerry “faltó a un voto para aliviar el costo de la salud a través de una reducción en las demandas legales innecesarias contra los médicos. Faltó a un voto para financiar a nuestras tropas en combate. Mientras tanto Kerry tuvo tiempo para votar en contra de la Laci Peterson para proteger a las mujeres embarazadas de los actos violentos.” [missed a
vote to lower health-care costs by reducing frivolous lawsuits against doctors. Missed a vote to fund our troops in combat. Yet, Kerry found time to vote against the Laci Peterson law that protects pregnant women from violence.] (Bush/Cheney, 2004h).

The power relations implied in this frame are also more negative in tone and remind Latino audiences of the grave implications of having the wrong individuals in power. Basically this frame tells the audience that government will be as good as the individuals that represent it. According to this frame, government empowers and protects people (Bush) but can also be irresponsible, out of touch and fail the people (Kerry). Government oppresses the people by taking resources away through unfair taxation that can make healthcare coverage less accessible (Kerry). Voters are not powerless before the threat of failed government according to this frame, however. They can fight back by keeping leaders like Kerry out of government. One radio ad from the Bush/Cheney campaign even uses the voice of a Latina woman encouraging Latinos to “call Senator Kerry at telephone number 202-224-4742 and ask him why we would believe his promises now when he has ignored the Latino community for more than 20 years?” (Kerry/Edwards, 2004g).

As with the previous frame, the choice of code words, catchphrases and slogans also highlight the characteristic of this frame. Kerry’s voting record was used to emphasize the idea that he had missed key votes on the healthcare issue or that he had voted the wrong way—“voted against,” “wrong priorities” and “missed votes” was pointed out continually. Emphasis was also on the problems plaguing the healthcare issue, at least from Bush’s point of view—“frivolous lawsuits,” “Laci Peterson” and “undocumented workers” were all phrases that were used to highlight the negative
aspects of the issue. Clearly, there was a change in tone in this frame to a more negative, combative and conflict oriented frame. This is not surprising, as mentioned earlier, due to the typical negative nature of political campaign events. Nevertheless, distinction between these two frames is quite noticeable given their differences in tone, set of core actors and corresponding power relations implied.

The third frame identified with the Bush campaign that targeted Latinos in an effort to mobilize them is labeled as the \textit{Latino American Dream} frame. This frame is characterized by a constant reference to the myth of the \textit{American Dream}. It is a more positive frame than the previous one described and depicts healthcare opportunities as being made available to Latino workers and their families as part of the \textit{American Dream} sought by most immigrants to this country. The main narrative characteristic of this frame recounts the satisfaction Latino families feel as they come to an America and are welcomed by a president who “knows them” and provides them with the healthcare coverage opportunities they need. The core concepts here are those of equality and opportunity. A television ad titled “Nuestro País, Nuestro Presidente” sponsored by the Bush/Cheney campaign tells of the benefits and opportunities that have been given to Latinos in the U.S., in particular while being governed by Bush:

No importa de donde venimos, o porque vinimos… en esta tierra encontramos oportunidad…una mejor educación para nuestros hijos…el cuidado médico que nuestras familias merecen. Vivimos en un país que nos ha abierto su corazón y nos ha dado una verdadera oportunidad. Los Estados Unidos – nuestro país. George W. Bush—nuestro Presidente. [No matter where we come from, or why we came here… in this nation we found opportunity… better education for our children…the healthcare that our families deserve. We live in a nation that has opened its heart to us and has given us real opportunity. The United States – our nation. George W. Bush—our President.] (Bush/Cheney, 2004c)

The campaign communications usually refer to the idea that Latinos should have equal access to the American Dream as have other ethnic groups when they migrated to
America. This egalitarian view is very common among Latinos who have been in
America for years. As mentioned in chapter two of this dissertation, this egalitarian and
communitarian spirit has inspired cultural revolutions such as the Puerto Rican-American
Gorras Blancas in New York City in the 1970s and the Mexican-American Chicano
Movement in the Southwestern states in the 1950s and ‘60s. Therefore, this frame plays to
some key sentiments among the Latino population in the United States.

The Latino American Dream frame relies primarily on purchasing and ownership
opportunities as a key component of the American Dream. This places access to
affordable healthcare as a central component of this frame. A core actor included in this
frame is Bush, the protagonist who helps Latinos reach the American Dream. Latino
families are portrayed as direct beneficiaries of the American Dream offered to them by
the Bush administration. Government is a proactive social agent who empowers Latinos
to reach their goals according to this frame. In a news release by the Bush/Cheney
campaign, Otto Merida, the Executive Director and Cofounder of Cámara de Comercio
Latina, states that “La agenda del Presidente Bush promueve una sociedad en donde
todos, incluyendo los hispanos, pueden ser dueños de algo. Gracias a las políticas del
Presidente, más hispanos, mujeres y otras minorías son dueños de una casa o de un
negocio” [President Bush’s agenda promotes a new society where all, including
Hispanics, can own something. Thanks to the President’s policies, more Hispanics,
women and other minorities own a home or a small business.] (Bush/Cheney, 2004d).
Latinos are not powerless, this frame suggests. They are in charge of their destinies and
they have the will. The government will provide the equal opportunity for them to
achieve their Latino American Dream. Some of the key words most visible in this frame
refer to the idea of ownership of their future and dreams as in “our country,” “our president,” “opportunity,” “ownership,” “more,” “small business,” and “better.”

In summary, classifying communications into single frames can be a complicated task despite the achievement of high intercoder reliability and the use of highly defined coding instruments. Recognizing the emergence of these Bush Campaign frames and assigning frames to each category was no simple exercise. As is visible from these frames described above, there is plenty that they have in common—overlap—as is expected in the difficult task of sorting ideology and culture. Many core concepts are mutually shared among frames as are peripheral concepts and core actors. However, there are also some boundaries that aided in making these distinctions from among these “organizing principles” (Reese, 2001) referred to as frames in this dissertation. The boundaries are set primarily by the master narrative providing the text and subtext for each frame. These boundaries are also made clearer by their assignment of actors to the category of protagonist or adversary in each frame. The functionality of each frame also helps to distinguish from among different frames. The first frame serves to highlight the Bush administration’s record of accomplishments as well as future plans regarding the healthcare issue. The second frame’s primary objective is to discredit Bush’s opponent, Kerry, in the presidential race and highlight his failing on the issue of healthcare coverage in America. The third frame appeals to key cultural values among Latinos and tie them directly to Bush and his healthcare agenda for America. Therefore, both the physical manifestation of these frames—catchphrases, keywords and codes—and the functionality of these frames can be used to make distinctions among one another.
Kerry/Edwards Campaign Frames

A framing analysis of a total of 47 communications from the Kerry/Edwards presidential campaign targeting Latinos during the 2004 presidential election suggests two frames that were regularly used. The frames are the *Stronger America* frame, and the *Failure and Struggle Frame*. As with the Bush/Cheney campaign frames, these two frames were different from one another and in some ways they were also very similar. Some of the core concepts that underpinned the values driving them were shared, and the core and peripheral actors that took part in the narrative were also often the same. The key differentiator between these frames was again the master narrative, which held them together as well as the power relation implied or explicit in each frame. Another key factor that set boundaries between these two frames was the language used to set the tone and identify benefits and risks, antagonists and protagonists and to define the problem as well as to offer solutions. There were key differences in terms of the problem definitions prescribed by each frame as well as the causal agents usually identified for each problem outlined. A close examination of the Kerry/Edwards Campaign communications revealed their framing of the issue of healthcare according to the way this campaign saw it. Again as with the Bush/Cheney campaign the tone in these frames was characterized by typical campaign messages centered on a conflict theme. Others played on key concepts and values such as honor, opportunity, and justice which are common in election politics in America (Patterson, 1994).

Once again the competitive nature of the event—a presidential election—impacted the type of frame that was used by the Kerry camp in framing the healthcare issue. His status as underdog and contender could be reasons behind the first frame identified here. The *Stronger America* frame summarizes Kerry’s promises regarding the issue of
healthcare coverage to the American people and Latinos if elected. It also plays on the dissatisfaction of potential Latino voters with the status quo regarding this same issue.

The master narrative described the proposals put forward by Kerry and Edwards to alleviate the difficult situation Latinos are facing with increasing healthcare costs. If elected president, Kerry would provide healthcare insurance for all children, expand Medicaid and grant more benefits to new legal immigrants to America. He also promises to promote disease prevention and public health and education. The message in this narrative is a message of hope. “Hope is on the way” for Latino families as Kerry will make access to healthcare coverage better and easier. This narrative relies on the accounts of Latinos who also assist in creating the hopeful, promising mood of this frame. A news release from the Kerry/Edwards campaign gives accounts by four Latinos of the positive impact that Kerry’s plan will have on their lives with respect to healthcare among other important services. Kerry’s plan will help patients of Dr. Laura Elías de la Torre, a family practice physician from Arizona, by “lowering family premiums by up to $1,000 a year…lowering the cost of prescription drugs to provide real relief to seniors, and using targeted tax cuts to extend affordable, high-quality coverage to 95 percent of Americans, including every child” (Kerry/Edwards, 2004a). Latino leaders from around the country also meet to discuss the optimism behind Kerry’s plan, which will offer Americans “the same healthcare plan that the president and Congress have.” The main narrative in this frame highlights the way Kerry plans to reward the Hispanics whose strong morals are helping to defend our country and make it a nation that offers better opportunities for healthcare coverage to immigrant children and pregnant women.
Key concepts fundamental in this frame include the core concepts of fairness, responsibility, humane treatment, equality, strength, work, progress, optimism, family, values, reform, nationalism, and power. These core concepts were used differently than in Bush/Cheney campaign frames to allude to liberal and “mainstream” ideological views. Noticeable in peripheral concepts characteristic of this frame are the responsibility of the president to protect Latinos, the idea that providing healthcare to all children, the elderly and the poor is the humane thing to do and references to the power of citizens to change their situation through voting and activism. While government is presented as a fair agent that provides equal opportunities to all members of society, as in the Bush Agenda for America frame, the main difference here is that the burden is carried mostly by the government and not made the responsibility of employers and individuals. The role of Latinos is to become politically active and vote the right government into office and then these elected leaders will make the right decisions regarding healthcare that are much needed. In a statement on Hispanic Heritage Month, John Kerry stressed the importance of the role Hispanics play in the nation’s fate, explaining that “the Hispanic vote is critical. Within the next six weeks, you will have the power to make the fundamental choice to move our country forward in a new direction. My friends, I need your vote. I need your help” (Kerry/Edwards, 2004b).

The actors involved in this frame are mostly beneficiaries of the Kerry plan for healthcare reform. Poor and middle class Latinos are portrayed as beneficiaries of the forward looking Kerry healthcare agenda. In a statement to Latinos, Kerry recognizes the sacrifices that the Hispanic population has made for the country in the past and the present and acknowledges the important role Latinos will play in the future of the nation,
saying “Hispanics fought in the Civil War, fought in Teddy Roosevelt’s Rough Riders, and stormed the beaches of Normandy. I served with many Hispanics in Vietnam, and many others represent our country valiantly today in the deserts of Afghanistan and Iraq” (Kerry/Edwards, 2004b). All children will have healthcare benefits under the Kerry plan. Immigrants will receive certain healthcare benefits under Kerry that they lack under Bush. The elderly will also have better options for prescription medicines and healthcare coverage under Kerry than they do with Bush in the White house. Senator Kerry and his wife Teresa Heinz Kerry are depicted as the protagonist who empower Latinos and want the opportunity to enact policies to help Latinos get better healthcare. The solution suggested in this frame to the healthcare crisis consists or a complete reform of the industry in America to make it fairer to middle income and poor Latinos. Teresa Heinz Kerry explains her husband’s vision for improving healthcare for Latinos in a statement made by radio. “El tiene un plan para ampliar el cuidado médico para todos, particularmente para los niños, y protegerá Medicare para que nuestros padres y abuelos tengan medicamentos con receta económicas” [He has a plan to expand healthcare for all Americans, particularly for children and will protect Medicare so that our parents and grand parents will have drugs with low cost prescriptions] (Kerry/Edwards, 2004c). Latino elected officials recognize the merits of the Kerry plan as do regular Americans included in these campaign messages and that’s why they are endorsing Kerry’s agenda that will result in lower prices for prescription medicine and in making healthcare coverage more accessible to all Americans. Prominent figures popular with the Latino electorate such as Bill Clinton were also featured in this frame supporting Kerry’s vision of a Stronger America. In a policy position released by the Kerry/Edwards campaign, Bill
Clinton verbalized his strong support for Kerry’s Health Insurance for Five Million More Children bill (SCHIP), saying that it is “the biggest increase in healthcare investment for children since Medicaid passed in 1965” (Kerry/Edwards, 2004h).

Notable in this frame is the exclusion of the role small businesses and private corporations might play in resolving the crisis. Under the Bush/Cheney campaign frames these two actors played a major role in the solution and were proactive players in providing healthcare insurance to America’s workers. This is not a coincidence since the second frame identified for the Kerry/Edwards Campaign would later list some of these Bush allies as part of the problem with the healthcare crisis in America. Pharmaceutical companies, healthcare insurance companies, and other medical providers such as hospitals, and physicians are identified as antagonist in the next frame.

The power relations implied in the Stronger America frame include the potentially empowering relations that can exist between government and the people when these latter elect the right leaders. In a grassroots campaign video titled “Un Futuro Mejor,” A Better Future, Kerry attempts to explain the empowering relationship that Latinos could potentially have with the U.S. government, stating that, “We can bring back our mighty dream again. We can make American all that it can become. Let American be America again” (Kerry/Edwards, 2004i). The frame also depicts the likely oppressive relationship that can exist between poor and middle class American when the leaders they elect to office are out of touch with the needs of the American people. Kerry empowers Latinos by helping them become healthier and prevent disease. On the other hand, Bush oppresses Latinos, children and pregnant women by denying them access to much needed healthcare benefits. A policy position published by the Kerry/Edwards campaign
condemns Bush, saying that he “stood in the way of providing medical care to legal immigrant children and pregnant women,” and praises Kerry’s support of “restoring benefits for all legal immigrant children because healthcare should be a right, not a privilege” (Kerry/Edwards, 2004j). This frame reminds Latinos of the potential risks involved in electing the wrong leader and plays on the practical nature of decision making among Latinos during elections (Roberts, & Martinez, 2004). Latinos are depicted as powerful insofar as they exercise their right to vote and elect the right leaders into office.

The language used in this frame highlights the positive tone of these messages. Many references were made to “children born in the US,” “pregnant women” as beneficiaries of the Kerry platform for healthcare. Reinforcing current healthcare programs was also a constant theme in this frame as denoted by the following catchphrases “Medicaid,” “Medicare for our parents and grandparents,” “strengthening Medicare,” “stability,” “expanding coverage,” and “reducing cost.” The main idea was to provide a picture of a “Stronger America” as that which takes care of its most “vulnerable citizens,” opens “doors of opportunity,” “securities families.” This government also provides “stability,” “expanding coverage,” works on “reducing cost.” Finally, the Kerry plan for America embraces the cultural heritage of the Hispanic population. It does this by “embracing diversity,” recognizing important celebrations such as “Hispanic Heritage,” and their “deep faith.” The vision is that of “One America,” “The ideal America” with many “doors of opportunity” and “Strong families.”

The second frame identified in this study is the Failure and Struggle frame. This particular frame was more characteristic of the typical conflict struggle between parties
that the public is accustomed to during presidential elections. The master narrative describes the plight of middle class Latinos who struggle to pay for healthcare while Bush protects the rich insurance and pharmaceutical companies. It also recounts Bush’s history of broken promises to Latinos that has led to their poor healthcare coverage situation. It blasts the failed approach to governance (domestic/foreign) of the Bush administration as well as Bush’s failed promises as he under funded key programs that are important to Latino families. One of the communications classified under this frame featured two women who describe their dissatisfaction with Bush policies toward Latinos and the negative campaign messages they use to criticize Kerry. Hard working Latinos are being cheated through with low-paying jobs that are not enough to provide for their families. The narrative describes Bush as hurting Hispanics through his bad policy decisions, by dodging important questions about the issues and instead slandering Kerry through his negative ads. Hispanics come out and call Bush on it and tell him they can do better—they deserve better. In a TV ad from the Kerry/Edwards campaign titled “Hay Esperanza,” There’s Hope, the tragic healthcare situation that Bush has created for Latinos is outlined as well as their hope for a better future:

> It’s incredible that with Bush and the Republicans, one in three Latinos lives without health insurance. And they prefer to protect insurance and pharmaceutical companies while we struggle to pay our bills. And if you do have insurance, we pay too much every month. But with John Kerry and the Democrats there’s hope. They have a plan so that all of us have access to healthcare. (Kerry/Edwards, 2004d)

Again core concepts underlying this frame included many similar concepts from other frames in this analysis. However, in this frame they were used to highlights Bush’s failings and Kerry’s strength. Some of the key core concepts that are fundamental to this frame include the concepts of fairness, responsibility, equality, greed, honesty,
competence, opportunity, strength, president as protector and the concept of trust. These concepts were used to link key ideological views with the heart and soul of Latino and mainstream American culture. This frames relied on these core concepts to allude to peripheral ideas such as equal access to healthcare for Latinos and all income classes. They were also used to point out the corrupt nature of greedy pharmaceutical companies and government officials. A central message was that Bush could not be trusted nor could Latinos trust the pharmaceutical corporations, insurance companies and corrupt providers favored by Bush policies. Anti Patriot Act groups were targeted in this frame by a call for the humane treatment of all immigrants and American citizens. The protection of children and the elderly were also characteristic of this frame. A press release announcing the new Kerry/Edwards ad campaign targeting Latinos struggling with healthcare costs outlines Kerry’s plan for healthcare reform:

John Kerry and John Edwards also support restoring health benefits for all legal immigrant children, and their plan will deal with the alarming increases in healthcare costs and the growing number of uninsured. As for the 1.5 million Hispanics who rely on Medicare, the Kerry-Edwards plan will protect and modernize Medicare, including making prescription drugs more affordable. In contrast, the Bush Administration just announced it was raising Medicare premiums by 17 percent—the largest increase in the program’s history. (Kerry/Edwards, 2004e)

The selection of core actors in this frame serves to make a clear distinction between the good guys and the bad guys. The bad guys were usually “Bush and the Republicans,” the “Pharmaceutical Industry,” the “Insurance Companies,” and anyone associated in some way with “Halliburton.” Bush and the Republicans were the prototypical antagonists. They were the central source of problem and were responsible for neglecting Latinos and their issues. Republicans were described as hurting Latinos that were already struggling. Bush and his friends instead fund corporations, make healthcare coverage
harder to obtain and have only delivered broken promises to Latinos. Average Latinos like Mari and Susana—who are featured in a television ad—can reach their goals if they vote for the right leadership. In the ad Susana expresses her frustration with the Bush administration, saying that “Bush y los Republicanos atacan, distorsionan y mienten. Kerry y los Demócratas dicen la verdad” [Bush and the Republicans attack, distort and lie. Kerry and the Democrats tell the truth.” Mari also agrees that Democrats will provide more opportunity for Latinos, and states that Kerry’s administration “van a crear más empleos, mejorar nuestras escuelas… y reducir los costos médicos” [They will create more jobs, improve our schools… and reduce cost of healthcare] (Kerry/Edwards, 2004f). This frame portrays poor and middle class Latinos as struggling with no healthcare benefits or high healthcare costs. Under Bush they have no insurance, but they will receive better healthcare under Kerry, the frame suggests. The “real needs” of the elderly are ignored by the Bush agenda and immigrant children are virtually ignored. In this frame insurance and pharmaceutical companies are protected by the Bush administration and oil companies, and special interest benefit from Bush’s wrong priorities while healthcare costs rise uncontrollably under the Bush Administration. A press release gives the startling figures of the rising costs:

The Kaiser Family Foundation’s revealed that family healthcare premiums have increased by more than $3,512 since Bush took office. The study further showed that the amount families are paying increased by 64 percent from 2000 to 2004, which is the fastest increase in healthcare premiums on record. (Kerry/Edwards, 2004e).

The language used in this frame also includes key words used to highlight the misgivings of the Bush leadership in America. Constant references to the “wrong direction” the nation is headed towards and to Bush’s hypocritical claims about a “compassionate conservatism” characterize the “smears and lies” used by Bush and his
friends. There is a call to action to “fight” in order to end Bush’s “cycle of limited options” that in the end only benefit “his own interests.” In a radio ad, a Latina woman states that Bush would help the Latino community if it “was made up of millionaires and companies like Halliburton. But George Bush has demonstrated that his values are based on his own interests, not in doing what’s best for our community” (Kerry/Edwards, 2004k).

Regarding the power relations implied in this frame, the role of government differed depending on who was in the White House. If Bush was the leader then government oppressed Latino families and their children through its narrow healthcare policies. Government in the cynical view protects pharmaceutical and insurance companies; it has one-sided policies and makes sure that poor Latinos remain poor. With Kerry in the White House, however, government becomes responsive to the healthcare, educational and employment needs of Latinos. Kerry empowers Latinos to fight for their right as Americans. Furthermore, the Kerry/Edwards ticket offers Latinos greater opportunities for living better lives in their new home. In this frame Latinos are not portrayed as powerless. Instead, they are capable of changing their current healthcare situation by voting for Kerry. Political involvement and activism are offered as solutions to the current healthcare crisis they are experiencing. Through increased participation Latinos can defeat Bush and his oppressive policies.

**Latino Communitarian Organization Campaign Frames**

In addition to the political campaign frames identified and described in this dissertation, a framing analysis of communications from the LULAC/SVREP voter mobilization campaigns targeting Latinos in the months leading up to the 2004 presidential election were also examined. The content analysis of a total of 18
communications, mostly policy positions and public service announcements that were
used in battleground states such as the state of Florida, classified these communications
into two main frames that were used when communicating with Latinos about the issue of
healthcare coverage in America. These frames are the *Healthcare Reform* frame and the
*Latino Plight* frame.

The most important difference between these LULAC/SVREP frames and those of
the two presidential campaigns that were described earlier was the more technical tone of
the LULAC/SVREP frames as well as their lighter tone and avoidance of singling out
antagonists to blame for the failed and broken system. Whereas the presidential
campaigns had specific healthcare frames designed to attack their opponent, these
LULAC/SVREP or communitarian frames were primarily concerned with identifying the
specific problems plaguing the system and calling for an immediate correction. In fact,
the main difference between the two LULAC/SVREP frames is the level of technical
information available in the *Healthcare Reform* frame, which targets specific programs
and suggests specific changes to the current healthcare system in America. The *Latino
Plight* frame focuses more on the specific troubles that Latinos face when dealing with
healthcare issues in America and on the discrimination they face. Another chief
difference among these communitarian frames and the political campaign frames is that
the former are not limited to calling for greater access by Latinos to healthcare coverage
and reduced drug prices. The communitarian frames go beyond that and also call for a
new approach to identifying and defining diseases and health crisis in the Latino
community. They call for new health related education, detection and prevention
mechanisms that are more compatible with the cultural orientations of Latinos. LULAC
and SVREP argue that Latino health issues are ignored in major campaigns in the United States and that this decreased attention to Latino health needs often results in unnecessary healthcare crises. These communitarian frames do not only conjure up key Latino values such as family, work and freedom, but they also provide important technical information about medical risks and suggest specific reforms that need to take place to accommodate the experiences of Latinos with health related problems they face every day in America. These two frames transport their audiences from the world of the abstract ideas and symbolism to the world of real people facing real problems concerning healthcare and much needed treatment.

The Healthcare Reform frame is characterized by a main narrative that describes the inherent problems and inequities in the current Medicare interim payment system. The problems with the Interim Payment System in Medicare prevent those most in need from receiving care and dependable providers from receiving payment. In response to the negative impact of the Interim Payment System on “the most frail and most vulnerable of Medicare beneficiaries” LULAC’s “Resolution 21: Health Care” urged “Congress to repeal or make fundamental changes to restore fairness and equity to the new Interim Payment System for home health care…” (League of United Latin American Citizens [LULAC], 1998). This and other needed reforms are creating a healthcare crisis among Latinos that is resulting in diminished health and in the creation of organizations such as the Hispanic Community Development (HCD), LULAC suggests. In response to this crisis, HCD has set-up the Buena Salud [Good Health] program, which focuses natural attention on healthcare crises that are affecting Latinos. LULAC’s healthcare resolution states their support for HCD in the following statement “BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED,
LULAC supports HCD in the establishing of the National Latino Health Center at UCLA and either UTSA or UT Health Science Center in San Antonio...” (LULAC, 2001).

The core concepts underlying the *Healthcare Reform* frame include equality, fairness, humane treatment and prevention. These concepts can be linked to peripheral concepts such as equal access to healthcare for all Latinos and Medicare beneficiaries and fair treatment for Medicare providers and patients. Also, much emphasis is placed in this frame on the dilemma faced by documented and undocumented Latinos who are treated unfairly and discriminated against at hospitals especially during emergency room visits. Finally, prevention refers in this frame to a call for greater efforts to avert disease and healthcare disaster from impacting Latinos.

The core actors in this frame include both LULAC and SVREP as the protagonists who encourage healthcare reforms beneficial to Latinos, support organizations such as HCD and want reform of Medicare’s Interim Payment System. HCD is hailed as a program prototype to be imitated around the country and supported by government. Pharmaceutical manufacturers and distributors, pharmacy retailers and hospitals are described as part of the problem, but also as part of the solution. These organizations need to develop systems and procedures that accommodate the different health issues that impact the Latino community as well as their different cultural orientation from the mainstream. Another health related LULAC resolution called upon “companies involved in delivering Healthcare to Latinos including pharmaceutical manufacturers and distributors; pharmacy retailers, hospitals, and other related business entities to dialogue with HCD and LULAC, to seek ways to improve their systems and procedures”
(LULAC, 2001). As indicated earlier, Congress is also called on as an actor who needs to provide solutions to the Medicare payment problem.

Who is loosing in this frame? Medicare patients and individual Latinos are the big losers. Medicare patients are being victimized by an outdated and discriminating healthcare system that is resulting in their not getting equal access to care. Latinos in general are watching simple healthcare problems turn into unnecessary illness and experiences with discrimination. And finally, Medicare providers are not receiving equal payment for the services they provide.

The language used in communications classified under this frame is also indicative of the technical tone incorporated. Code words and catchphrases such as “limited access,” “alarming medication errors,” and “reduced access” are often used in these communications to refer to the emergency character of the problem. Some of these key terms used to emphasize the tone in the frame also refer to the “limited access,” “intensive care needs” and “alarming” “emergency situation” of “vulnerable” and “frail” “intensive care beneficiaries” and “home care providers” who are either not getting paid on time or are not being cared for.

The power relations explicit or conspicuous in this frame describe a series of organizations that at best ignore the needs of Latinos and at their worse oppress them. Hospitals, pharmaceutical and other health related corporations are described mostly as oppressing Latinos. It should be noted, however, that not much emphasis was placed on their status as oppressors here as there was in the Kerry/Edwards campaign messages. In this frame, an invitation is extended to provider organizations to be part of the solution and accommodate Latino healthcare needs. The tone of the rhetoric is more subdued with
regards to Medicare and its Interim Payment System in this frame. The system is described as disempowering patients and preventing them from receiving care from important providers at times, but there is a notable difference in the tone in references to Medicare compared to hospitals, pharmaceutical companies and other related corporations.

LULAC, SVREP, and HCDs empower Latinos and remind them of the power they have over corporations and providers and encourage them to write them and claim their rights. Latinos are not totally powerless in this frame. They simply need to be made aware of their rights and assisted through this battle for quality healthcare. Providers such as home care attendants are also called on to fight for their rights and call on more reform of the current system that is failing them and their patients.

The second frame identified among communications used by LULAC and SVREP to target Latinos is the *Latino Plight* frame. The narrative in this frame describes the difficulties that Latinos face with the healthcare system. Although many are employed, Latinos cannot get access to healthcare, and when they do, they become victims of discrimination and unequal treatment. Latinos have diminishing access to healthcare and what they have is substandard. Because of limited access to healthcare they are at risk for many diseases and health conditions they otherwise would not be. Latinos are being left without many opportunities, this frame suggests. It invites major players in the decision making about healthcare to come together and solve this problem. A *Health Corner* story on LULAC’s Web site cites a March 2004 *Survey Brief* conducted by the Pew Hispanic Center and The Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation, which describes the problems that Latino workers face getting access to healthcare:
There are those who assume that Hispanic are uninsured because they are not employed, which is incorrect. Two-thirds of Hispanics who report being uninsured are employed (63%). Many are employed by small businesses or are self-employed and do not have access to affordable health insurance. (www.lulac.org)

Prominent in this frame are the core concepts of equality, humane treatment, human rights and fairness. These concepts can also be linked to peripheral concepts such as equal access to healthcare and medicine, equal inclusion in health related research and equal access to key treatment by all Latinos. The frame also uses these core concepts to raise peripheral notions such as the need for more humane treatment of Latinos at hospitals regardless of their legal status. Additionally, fairness in handling the immigration issue and its relation to healthcare is called for in this frame. Healthcare is one of the “top ten issues” important to the Latino community, according to their publication titled The 2004 LULAC Challenge: A Latino Public Policy Agenda for Electoral Candidates. In this communication LULAC refers to the unfair treatment that Latino workers and undocumented workers face with healthcare in America:

Latinos are less likely to have health insurance because their low wage jobs do not include health benefits. Latinos accounted for about 35 percent of the 44 million people without insurance. Although many Latinos live below the poverty line, they are not all entitled to Medicaid coverage because they are undocumented. Confusion regarding the 1996 immigration reform created problems for legal residents and their children, as well by making it unclear who was entitled to benefits. (LULAC, 2004a, p.21)

The core actors in this frame are Latinos, healthcare providers and government officials. The idea of a partnership between government, small businesses and other employers in order to provide more access to healthcare insurance is one that is refuted in this frame. This partnership idea was central to the Bush/Cheney agenda for tackling healthcare costs and access to quality coverage. However, in this frame employers in general are described as not offering insurance for many low waged Latinos. Healthcare
opportunities are directly linked instead to other Latino core issues such as education and employment in this frame. Employers are at the times part of the problem this frame suggests, but they can also be part of the solution. Healthcare providers are lambasted for refusing medical care to powerless Latinos, pharmaceutical companies are rebuked for ripping off this vulnerable population with their over inflated drug prices. Latinos are described as powerless, not receiving adequate healthcare coverage and at risk for disease. Many of them are completely uninsured and are constantly subjected to discriminatory treatment by facilities and providers as they are denied key treatment by Health Maintenance Organizations (HMO) and hospitals.

Regarding the power relations, this frame calls for all parties involved; providers, government and elected officials to come together and work to ameliorate the growing healthcare needs of Latinos in America. Healthcare providers are depicted as discriminating against and disempowering Latinos. Employers do not aid Latinos in getting healthcare insurance. The LULAC and SVREP empower Latinos by encouraging them to stand up for their rights and the rights of less fortunate undocumented workers. But ultimately it is up to elected officials and the United States government to implement the reforms and encourage, health facilities, pharmaceutical companies and physicians to provide fair coverage to Latinos. Without government intervention this frame suggests, Latinos are left powerless before discrimination and harassment as well as vulnerable to health crises and preventable diseases.

The call in this frame is a strong call for a universal healthcare system that treats all groups equally in America. This is evident in some of the key phrases and code words used in these communications. There were constant references to the ideal coverage as
“universal healthcare coverage” and as “equitable.” When criticizing the current healthcare system or the precarious healthcare situation Latinos live in words and phrases such as “poor quality of care,” “poorer care,” “emergency room bias” and “stereotyping” were used. The government was called on to “advocate” for Latinos and to end the “inconsistent relationships with primary healthcare providers.” The healthcare situation of Latinos was linked with “AIDS,” “low wage jobs” and the plight of the “undocumented Latino workers” in America.

There is overlap between these two communitarian frames and the presidential campaigns previously examined in this chapter. There are also some critical differences. Most of the overlap occurs in the core and peripheral concepts as well as the language in these frames and the core actors involved. Much of the distinction is also visible in the main narrative, which serves as a subtext for each frame as well as the power relations invoked. The following sections in this chapter will provide a description of the Latino-subgroup frames that emerged from the framing analysis in the current research.

**Latino-Subgroup Frames**

In addition to the communication content from the political and communitarian campaigns examined in the previous sections, the content analysis in this dissertation also included in-depth interviews with 21 members of three key Latino subgroups (Colombian, Cuban and Puerto Rican Americans) in the state of Florida. The transcript for each in-depth interview was treated as a communication text and was content analyzed using the same scheme that was used involved in the content analysis of campaign messages (see Appendix B). The in-depth interviews focused on various issues that this population has considered as important during previous elections. However, the central topic discussed during the interview was the issue of healthcare coverage in the
America. The Latino individuals participating in this study were from the south, central and northern regions of the state of Florida. There was an almost equal number of men and women, 11 and 10 respectively. And an effort was also made to interview Latinos from all three subgroups in the three regions of the state of Florida. Table 5-3 shows a break down of respondents by Latino subgroup, geographic location and gender.

Table 5-3. Demographics of Latino respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Colombian American</th>
<th>Cuban American</th>
<th>Puerto Rican American</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Florida</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Florida</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Florida</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Colombian American</th>
<th>Cuban American</th>
<th>Puerto Rican American</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Colombian-American Frames**

A content analysis of a total of seven in-depth interviews with Colombian Americans in the state of Florida classified these seven interviews into two frames surrounding the issue of healthcare coverage in America. The seven Colombian-American respondents in this analysis are representative of mixed demographic characteristics, which help to provide the content analysis with many different worldviews and rich experiences. Four of the Colombian-American respondents were male and three were female. They ranged in ages between 22 and 52 and they represented all three major regions in the state of Florida—North Central, Central, and South Florida. There were two college students, a lawyer, a publisher, a chemical engineer, a Spanish language translator and an accounting firm employee represented.
Respondents have lived in the state of Florida for different lengths of time. The time-frame for their residence in the state ranges from three to 30 years. Four respondents were citizens of the United States and three were legal residents. Also, five of the seven respondents were parents. One respondent was a single working mother of a young girl. Additionally, most Colombian-American respondents held moderate to liberal political views. Finally, when asked what the were the most important issues on their mind and for their community during the U.S. presidential election 2004 they said that homeland security, immigration, social security, foreign policy, the war in Iraq, the crisis in Colombia, the Cuban Embargo and the plight of Colombian exiles. However, when probed as to whether issue of healthcare coverage was an important issue on their mind during the presidential election in 2004, they all responded positively.

The frames are the *Struggling Latino* frame, and the *Universal Healthcare Hybrid* frame. As was the case with other frame sources in this dissertation, there was some overlap between these two frames. First, all seven respondents shared their distrust of the major corporate players behind the healthcare industry. All respondents referred to pharmaceutical companies as dishonest and corrupt and some went as far as targeting physicians specifically as part of the problem. A 52 year old chemical engineer from South Florida likened physicians in America to Colombian drug lords and referred to a physician as a “traficant of health” in reference to their high salaries and get-rich-quick attitudes. He declared that “un médico aquí casi, se vuelve un abusador traficante de la salud en vez de un médico. Incluso tratan de hacerse multi-millonarios en poco tiempo. Como se ven. Los médicos yo creo que abusan de ésto” [a physician here almost becomes a traficant of health instead of a physician. In fact, they try to become multi-
millionaires en a short time. You see them all the time. I think that physicians are abusive]. Most respondents also considered the healthcare system as broken and in need of reform. The issue of reform and what type of reform was necessary is where some of the major differences emerged among respondents. Some Colombian-American respondents called for a complete overhaul of the healthcare system in America to design a new “universal” healthcare system—a much more progressive view. Others felt that more moderate changes to the system such as cracking down on “frivolous lawsuits” and controlling abuse and reducing the price of medicine would suffice to ease the crisis. There were also some differences in the actors assigned to the good-guy and bad-guy lists. The following sections will describe each one of these Colombian-American referential frames regarding the issue of healthcare in America.

The first Colombian-American frame identified was the Struggling Latino frame. The master narrative in this frame typically describes a healthcare industry controlled by frivolous lawsuits and by a pharmaceutical industry that over-medicates Americans. The main theme is the out-of-control prices of prescription medicines. But the buck does not stop with the companies behind the healthcare crisis, as government is also blamed for the problem affecting Latinos and all Americans. While a distinction is made in the narrative in this frame between more vulnerable undocumented workers and more established Latino families, there is still a general consensus among respondents that the system is broken and it needs repair.

Some of the core concepts that are foundational in this Colombian-American frame are those of accountability, fairness, equality and humane treatment. The concept of accountability goes in either ideological direction. It often represents comments that are
commonplace for the right—frivolous lawsuits should be controlled. Accountability also is used to support leftist views that encourage more government involvement in regulating the industry or to hold the pharmaceutical industry accountable for advertising and over medicating Americans. These two views, while present in this frame held by Colombian Americans in this study is also representative of the two competing political parties during the election season—Democrats and Republicans.

Fairness was typically used to refer to providing fairer priced medications and insurance coverage. It also meant providing different cost schedules for people from different income brackets. Equality generally supported ideas about equal access to healthcare by both legal immigrants and undocumented workers. This particular view was prominent among most Colombian-American respondents in this dissertation, but there were some dissenters who held individuals also accountable for their and their family’s healthcare coverage. Finally, the concept of human treatment was directly linked to equal access as it referred exclusively to the particular needs of illegal aliens. Most participants identified in this frame felt that illegal aliens, as human beings, should at the very least receive some medical attention. The more progressive minded respondents argued for providing complete healthcare coverage for illegal aliens, who they argued are often the most vulnerable members of society. A 22 year old college student in North Florida described what she believed should be the healthcare platform for a presidential candidate who is truly concerned for the well being of Colombian Americans in general. Regarding the ideal platform she said, “I think that it would have to deal with, the low cost and something that has to do with whether you are a resident or an illegal alien or
something. Something that would address the issue of you can have healthcare even if
you don’t have papers, or if you’re not a citizen.”

The core actors in the *Struggling Latino* frame were mixed with some actors
playing a prominent role in accounts by all respondents and some other actors were
selected as prominent by just one or a few Colombian Americans. Common core actors
among all respondents categorized in this frame were presidential candidates George W.
Bush and John Kerry and their respective campaigns and running mates. The role each
one of these actors played was usually driven by the ideological views of the respondent.
Some respondents who held more cynical views about one or both candidates typically
viewed them as not doing enough to solve the healthcare issue or just “glossing over it.”
Respondents with a more positive outlook about the candidates usually described them as
being part of the solution and cited some of their ideas such as Kerry’s proposal of
controlled import of prescription medicine from Canada to the United States and Bush’s
proposals for Social Security and Medicare reform. A single father of three children in
Central Florida described his reaction to Kerry’s proposal regarding bringing in medicine
from Canada:

Me acuerdo que él estaba proponiendo una importación controlada de medicinas
que me parece una fórmula excelente porque hay muchos países que producen
medicinas. Obviamente, una de las buenas cosas que tienen estos países es que se
aseguran bien de que las medicinas estén dentro de los canones y de los parámetros
que deben tener. [I remember that he was proposing a controlled importation of
prescription medicines that seems to me as an excellent formula, because there are
many countries that make sure that their medicines meet certain standards and
guidelines.]

Another common actor in this frame consisted of the pharmaceutical companies.

Most of the respondents in this frame and all Colombian-American respondents that were
interviewed regarded the pharmaceutical companies as being at the heart of the problem
and described their behavior as robbing Americans by overmedicating, overcharging for medication and abusing the system by overcharging existing programs. This view was held by conservatives, moderates and progressives among Colombian-American respondents. Core actors, specific to certain respondents, include hospitals, which were described by one respondent as withholding healthcare and as part of the problem. Also, attorneys were described by a more conservative Colombian-American respondent as being out of control with frivolous lawsuits. This same respondent described the dynamic between attorneys and doctors in terms of “doctors being sued out of business.” Finally, undocumented workers were mentioned by some as playing a major role in the healthcare crisis in America. They were described as powerless members of society who pay taxes and yet never see where their taxes go and who contribute to the American economy, but are not treated fairly by the bosses, healthcare providers and government that denies them much needed coverage. A single father from Central Florida made a comment regarding the plight of undocumented workers:

Gente que paga impuestos entre comilla porque hay gente y hay patrones que aun uno tenga una identificación que no es la que debes, te descuentan los taxes y todo esos pero esos taxes se van a un limbo, se pierden y esa gente no tiene protección médica. [People who pay “taxes,” because there are people and bosses who even if you have some kind of identification, because it’s not the one you should have they take out taxes from your salary and all of that, but those taxes go no where, they get lost and those people have no medical protection.].

Peripheral actors included in this frame are employers who are typically described as part of the problem by most Colombian Americans interviewed. Their efforts to provide coverage to their employees are considered to be between minimal and non-existent. Foreign doctors also played a role in one interview where a Spanish language publisher from Central Florida suggested a healthcare system that would end the shortage of doctors that is making healthcare costs rise. He said that if asked by a presidential
candidate for a solution to the crisis he would suggest bringing doctors from Central and South America where they are driving taxis because there are so many doctors to America. These doctors could serve at community health clinics for some time. He further stated that, “un médico Colombiano, Peruano, Chileno o lo que fuera que le digan venga agárrese aquí, x cantidad por un tiempo con una cifra específica para unas clínicas donde se dediquen específicamente a atender a gente de esos limitados recursos y que fueran flotando” [a Colombian, Peruvian, Chilean or whatever he/she is that is asked to come to the U.S. and take x amount for some time with some specific numbers for some clinics where they are focused on individuals with limited resources and that they be rotated].

As was the master narrative in discerning between frames so were the power relations, explicit or implied, a critical factor that served to organize these frames. The particular power relations communicated in the Struggling Latino frame depicted government either in a partisan way or in a general sense that was negative or neutral. One single mother one from Central Florida, who was more open about her political views and partisanship, did not hesitate to express her views about how she believed the government to be part of the solution, but was also not doing much to resolve the healthcare crisis. This accounting employee was also very willing to place the blame on the Bush administration and described it as irresponsible and obstructionist. She believed that a Kerry administration would be more true to the role government should play as a reformer that looks out for individual Americans and not the big corporations. She explained that “Kerry lo que más me llamaba la atención es que se veía una persona muy humana. Me parece que Bush sólo se preocupa por él. En cambio Kerry se veía como
que se preocupaba por la gente” [Kerry what caught my attention most was that he looked like a very human person. I get the impression that Bush is only looking out for himself. However, Kerry seemed like he cared about people in general]. Other respondents held a similar view about the absence of government reforms and called for an interventionist government that would control the rising price of healthcare in America. Government in this frame is part of the solution, but is not doing much at the time.

As mentioned earlier, attorneys were pointed out as part of the problem and along with pharmaceutical companies were described as manipulating the American people and providers to rack up the price of healthcare coverage. In this frame attorneys and pharmaceutical companies are part of the problem and they cannot be trusted. Latinos in general were described by most respondents as powerless before the rising cost of medicine and coverage. However, some respondents also believed that through their vote Latinos could change the course of healthcare coverage in America and help fix the system. The picture was a grim one for undocumented Latinos who were constantly portrayed as completely powerless and also hopeless unless Latinos made their needs and views known through their vote. Some respondents believe that legal Latinos are in some ways responsible for looking out for less fortunate undocumented workers. The vote of legal Latinos is the only hope for these immigrants one respondent said.

Some of the key language used to describe these frames included terms such as “high cost,” “revise the system,” “families,” “much needed reform,” “new health insurance plans” and “government provided plans” was used to refer to the problems with the current system. The “great burden” of “undocumented workers” was also prominent
in the wording chose to frame this issue. These phrases along with terms such as “status,” “abuse,” “accountability,” “out of control,” “frivolous lawsuits,” “pushing products” and “business people in control” were also common among Colombian-American respondents.

The second Colombian-American frame identified after categorizing in-depth interview content was the *Universal Healthcare Hybrid* frame. The master narrative in this frame describes a broken healthcare system, which overlooks the needs of Latinos. It is critical of the increasing emphasis on the needs of the elderly only and encourages a broader definition of the healthcare crisis to include workers and helping small businesses provide coverage to their employees. Healthcare should be something to which everyone in America has access. It should be a guarantee, this frame suggests. The difficulty reaching coverage is shared by illegal aliens, legal immigrants and even working families according to respondents in this frame. At the heart of this narrative is the need for a humane approach to dealing with the healthcare crisis by a progressive government. Common among respondents whose comments were assigned to this frame is the idea a universal healthcare system available to all in America. However, there are again some more moderate views that feel comfortable with a system that provides different degrees of coverage to different members of society and that is linked with employment.

A young member of the Socialist Party who represents one of the more liberal voices among Colombian Americans objects to any kind of involvement by big business in reforming healthcare, who he considers as part of the problem. In his view, reforms in healthcare should be the result of a movement, not of government since he is suspicious even of the more progressive elements in government, but resulting from a movement
from among the people. He considers corporations too greedy to care about the “little people” and government too close to big business to be able or willing to do anything about it. “They’re trying to make you think that they can do these things,” the young college student said of presidential candidates promising to reform healthcare. He explained that for real reform to occur, a candidate has to work to “sell the issue,” something that neither candidate did to his satisfaction. Both the liberal and moderate voices in this frame agree is that all Americans should be covered. The call is for a universal healthcare system that would guarantee some degree of basic coverage to working families, the unemployed and even illegal aliens.

The core concepts central to this frame are fairness, humane treatment, equality and corruption. The concept of fairness was often used to refer to the need for fair drug costs and a fair system that would link employment with healthcare coverage, but that would account for those who are not employed though they are looking for a job. A female Spanish Language translator from Central Florida who is in her 40s said it was unfair to link healthcare to work, as it is for most middle class families and yet not provide enough employment opportunities. She explains that “para alcanzar un seguro médico, hay que tener un empleo….Pero si no hay empleos como van a tener los seguros?” [to reach healthcare insurance you need to have a job…But if there aren’t any jobs how will they have insurance?] and she recommends that in order to help those suffering without healthcare, a president needs to first “ayude más con la parte de los empleos.”[help more with finding jobs]. As with the previous frame discussed (Struggling Latino frame), humane treatment here is used to refer to the need shared by all human beings for some healthcare coverage. The idea is that human beings should be treated as such, regardless
of their “status” and therefore they should be guaranteed some kind of health coverage in America. Equal access to healthcare services was another common peripheral concept that alluded to the discrimination that both legal and illegal Latinos are often subjected to by physicians and healthcare facilities. Corruption was also a common concept typically used to refer to greedy corporations and the government officials that are associated with them. A male Colombian-American student from Orlando Florida explained that “a big reason people want to get into pharmaceuticals is because it makes money. Where’s that money coming from? The backs of poor people.” He also asserted that due to the exorbitant prices of healthcare, people are forced to choose between their health and debt. “You shouldn’t have to make that choice,” he said. “Especially if you’re paying taxes.”

The core actors that were characteristic of the Universal Healthcare Hybrid frame were very close or almost identical among these accounts. Government, big business and the pharmaceutical industry were common among these Colombian-American respondents. Physicians and hospitals also played a prominent role. Latinos in general also played a common role according to respondents’ comments. The reaction to the role government has played and can play in resolving this issue ranges from lukewarm among most respondents to dead cold for one particular respondent. The young Colombian-American student in the previous quote wrote off any effort by the government as simple manipulation and accused the current administration of being more concerned with spending American tax dollars on war than on healthcare. The more moderate views in this frame mentioned some proposals made by both presidential candidates, but considered as too little too late or as not broad enough and targeting only specific groups—the elderly. That same male engineer from South Florida claimed that the
proposed plans focused on aiding “la gente más o menos de edad, acerca del Medicare y fortaleció un poquito eso para ayudar a los ancianos y bajarle el costo de la medicina a los ancianos, pero en general no hubo una propuesta para la mayoría de la población en este país.” [the elderly, regarding Medicare and he strengthened that a bit to help senior citizens and reduce the price of drugs, but in a general sense there was no proposal for most of the population in this country.]

Core actors typically identified as health providers—pharmaceutical companies, physicians, hospitals and insurance companies—all fit the same category for respondents in this frame. They all were part of the problem. They were described as abusive and only concerned with becoming rich rather than helping. Physicians were singled out as a profession of the elite “the chosen.”

Hospitals and clinics were rebuked for turning away patients in need of care over and over again. In this frame these core actors are not viewed as partners along with government as was suggested by most Bush/Cheney campaign frames. A 22 year old male college student in Central Florida, who is a member of the Socialist Party described the healthcare system in the U.S. as controlled by greed and the principle of supply and demand, with medical schools producing few physicians, and therefore setting the system up to take advantage through steep prices for mediocre service. “You go to the ER, you gotta wait like eight hours to get attended….I shouldn’t have to wait in the hospital for like eight hours because there’s one damn doctor for the whole ER when there’s hundreds of people who could be qualified.” The same Spanish language translator from Central Florida placed blame on both the government and physicians, stating that “el gobierno tiene que controlar esos asuntos. Tienen que controlar los médicos.”[government has to
control those factors. They need to control physicians. Employers were viewed as generally helpful and part of the solution with the right industry reforms in place. Finally, Latinos were left out for the most part and in a few instances were described as playing a minimal role, perhaps representing the sense of powerlessness felt by these respondents before this daunting issue.

The power relations in this frame were very similar to the description of the core actors. Generally, government is viewed as overlooking the healthcare needs of Latinos and as not being very proactive to keep costs down. Therefore, government is not the protagonist in this frame. However, for at least one respondent government is playing an antagonistic and oppressive role as it keeps Latinos from much needed healthcare. Physicians and pharmaceutical companies oppress Latinos and exploit them to enrich themselves. Employers can potentially, given the right regulation, be part of the solution and empower Latinos by providing more healthcare coverage options. Currently, Latinos are viewed as powerless before the huge crisis. However, one dissenting voice sees hope for Latinos through empowerment vis a vis a movement to fight back against the system. The same Socialist Party member insists that by uniting with others that are dissatisfied with the current system, “you’ll be able to bring up the issue. And then they won’t be able to deny it. They won’t be able to hide behind the cameras and things like that. They will come to the forefront. They’ll have to address it.”

Some key language used to describe the problem includes “costly,” “alarming,” “unreachable coverage,” “indebted for life” and “911.” The solutions needed to end the crisis were referred to using words and catchphrases such as “medical security,” more
efficient,” “government control,” “control doctors,” “control hospitals,” “link jobs and healthcare,” “equal treatment for legals and illegals” and “universal healthcare.”

**Cuban-American Frames**

In addition to the previous Colombian-American frames regarding the healthcare issue in America, the content analysis in this dissertation yielded a distinct frame surrounding this same issue, which emerged from a series of in-depth interviews with seven Cuban Americans. The seven Cuban-American respondents in this analysis also represent mixed demographic profiles. This diversity helps to provide the content analysis with different viewpoints. Six of the seven Cuban-American respondents were male. Their ages ranged between 37 and 60+ and they represented North Central and South Florida. There were two sales account executives in the health insurance industry, a dentist, a university liberal arts professor, a food sales agent, a retiree and a handy man who did odd jobs.

Respondents have lived in the state of Florida for different lengths of time. The time-frame for their residence in the state ranges from three to 30 years. All respondents were citizens of the United States. Also, six of the seven respondents were parents. Additionally, most Cuban-American respondents held moderate to conservative political views. Finally, when asked what were the most important issues on their mind and for their community during the U.S. presidential election in 2004 they said U.S. policy toward Cuba, the economy, the war in Iraq, homeland security, Cuban-American preparedness for a post-Castro Cuba, tax policy, immigration, jobs and separation of church and state. However, as with Colombian Americans when probed as to whether the issue of healthcare coverage was an important issue on their mind during the presidential election in 2004, they all responded positively and had comments to offer.
One main frame was identified that best represented the views held by members of this subgroup. A content analysis of the transcripts of the depth interviews with Cuban-American respondents using framing theory identified a central frame reference for Cuban-American respondents—the *Enforcement vs. Reform* frame. Some common themes connected respondents’ views. Among common themes was the one that suggests that the for-profit actors involved in their accounts of the healthcare crisis in America are part of the problem. These agents are corrupt and making life more difficult for Latino patients. The one nemesis of every single Cuban-American respondent was the pharmaceutical manufacturing industry. All explanations typically offered by the industry were ignored and instead they were described as “ripping off” consumers. There was universal agreement about the need for government reform. However, the form of that reform varied among respondents in this Latino subgroup. Respondents were divided almost in half between those who believed that simple enforcement of current laws and standardized pricing of services would suffice to end the crisis and those who saw the need for an overhauling of the entire healthcare system as the only solution for the problem—hence, the frame’s label.

The master narrative in the *Enforcement vs. Reform* frame either called for government intervention and control of the industry or for government to step back and allow industry forces to moderate costs. These divergent views could be directly linked to the political ideology of the respondent. Conservative Cuban Americans believed that competition among pharmaceutical and health insurance companies would reduce the cost of health care in the long run and that government should simply focus on enforcing current laws and curbing corruption and abuse of the system. “It’s gotta be left in the
private sector because the private sector has to compete within itself to provide quality healthcare,” asserted a 37 year old male who is a health insurance professional from South Florida. He went on to explain that the role of the government should be “to get involved in what is being charged to the consumer and what is being charged to the health insurance companies. Is it ok for a hospital to charge 17 dollars for a Tylenol when they pay two cents for it?” More moderate and progressive respondents supported the idea of a more proactive government, increased policing of corporations and offering better opportunities in healthcare for all Americans. When asked how to convince many Americans struggling with no healthcare to vote for a particular candidate, one respondent’s advice was to “offer these people the world. Give people what they have coming to them.” The narrative in this frame also describes the healthcare system that is characterized by unfair costs, that is robbing consumers while government does nothing to help and where the rich are getting richer. Even the more conservative voices among these respondents complained about how Latino families struggle to gain access even as they “play by the rules,” pay their taxes, work and still can’t afford healthcare coverage. There is a call for fair pricing, more health education for Latinos and a crackdown on abuses of Medicaid and Medicare.

Core concepts included fairness, equality, humane treatment, corruption, freedom and responsibility. The concept of fairness again called for fair pricing of healthcare coverage and medicine. Equality in this frame referred to equal access to healthcare for all Americans, including Latino families and basic care for Latino illegal immigrants. The idea of providing healthcare to illegal immigrants was shared by three respondents from the pool of seven. Contrary to Colombian Americans, however, these Cuban-American
respondents had to be probed on the question of legal versus illegal Latinos before they would comment on the issue. They did not link the problem of access to healthcare in America to the plight of undocumented workers as did most Colombian-American respondents. Perhaps this is due to the different migration experiences both of these Latino subgroups have had in entering the United States, with Cuban Americans being supported by a much more favorable immigration policy than Colombian Americans. Freedom was central to the idea of being able to choose your own provider, your own physician. The idea of freedom in this frame also set boundaries between those respondents who wanted more aggressive intervention by government in resolving the healthcare issue and those who did not want Health Maintenance Organizations (HMOs) to have a legal mandate to dictate which physician they could or could not visit. A 38 year old male who works as a food sales agent in Gainesville Florida where he lives with his wife and two children commented, “the way I saw some healthcare plans coming about were that they were going to dictate to you what you were going to do. Instead of being able to dictate for yourself what you want to do. What you are willing to do.”

The concept of responsibility was common also among those who preferred that government serve a more law enforcement role. These respondents held the view that ultimately it was the responsibility of each Latino head of household to provide for his or her family. The responsibility of government was only to provide for those in society who “cannot” provide for themselves. These same Cuban-American respondents would also say that that the measures to care for the less privileged in society such as Medicaid and Medicare were already in place. These programs just needed to be supervised and administered better, they argued. “I think the money is there to do something about it. I
don’t think it’s a big issue,” was the opinion of a 50 year old male sales executive from Miami Florida. He said the government’s responsibility should be to make sure “things are done right so that we can use that extra money instead of making people rich, and giving it back to the people that need it.”

Corruption was a concept that referred to various ideas. It referred to the corruption in a healthcare system with outrageous costs. It also referred to the corruption in current entitlement programs by individuals who are abusing the government. This latter view was more common among conservative respondents. More moderate and progressive respondents used the concept of corruption to refer to the former view. The concept of humane treatment was also directly linked to equal access as it referred exclusively to the particular needs of illegal aliens. Interestingly, the two respondents who became the biggest proponents of providing illegal aliens with some degree of medical care—even just emergency care—are also the two with the higher levels of education. One is a university professor and the other a physician. It was this particular physician who also raised the issue of providing emergency room care to illegals and raising efforts to provide health education among minorities. “I think absolutely if it comes down to whether someone, whether they’re a legal immigrant or a non-legal immigrant, whatever, if they’re here, and they have a true medical emergency, they should be tended to,” the physician declared.

The core actors for the Enforcement vs. Reform frame were government, which all respondents unanimously agreed was not doing enough and some went as far as to suggest that it was not “touching” the issue as a conscious decision. Proposals by the two major presidential candidates were recognized by several respondents. But others were
not so impressed and lambasted the government for overlooking the “real needs” of the Latino community. Some respondents accused physicians and hospitals of being corrupt and robbing Americans, but interestingly enough two of the seven Cuban Americans interviewed were professionals in the healthcare insurance industry and placed most of the blame on pharmaceutical companies and physicians not the coverage providers. The other five Cuban-American respondents also blamed the pharmaceutical companies for the cost increases, but put part of the blame on hospitals and healthcare insurance providers and physicians. The high paying salaries of physicians were also blamed for the healthcare crisis in America as suggests this 46 year old handy man from North Central Florida. “Sin embargo un doctor gana 200 mil casi 500 mil al año…Y los servicios de hospitals son carísimos y los servicios de emergencia son carísimos,”[However, a doctor makes 200 thousand almost 500 thousand per year…And hospital services are very expensive and emergency services are very expensive]. Doctors were viewed as part of the solution by one respondent who said that doctors should be more involved in educating patients about health risks. Employers were seen as part of the solution as a provider of healthcare coverage rather than the government. Clearly, in this frame the antagonists were the pharmaceutical companies. The government was doing too little. However, the views about what needed to be done differed as suggested in the label given to this frame.

Who were the big losers according to this pool of Cuban-American respondents and this frame? The losers were the uninsured Latino workers, families, poor Latinos, legal and illegal immigrants who are being taken advantage of and/or neglected by the system. They are being abused by the industry and ignored by their government. The
uninsured are not getting the help they need from the government say the moderate voices among these respondents. Cuban Americans are not getting the quality and affordable healthcare options they deserve, say the more conservative private industry-supporting respondents. Legal immigrants are not getting the preventative care and education they need and illegal immigrants are being denied the humane emergency care they deserve utter the more progressive voices. A male dentist from South Florida in his early thirties recommended that a presidential candidate specifically offer this type of care to those in need, his potential message stating, “We’re going to provide you some kind of education. Community centers where you can come and we can educate you on different diseases and screen you and do prevention.” A health insurance sales associate from South Florida stated that candidates should be “trying to take care of those less fortunate individuals who cannot afford it.”

Peripheral actors in this frame include the Canadian government, which provided universal healthcare to its residents that includes basic emergency care to illegal aliens and much cheaper prescription costs for all Canadians. A female retiree from North Florida asked why this couldn’t be done in America, the richest country in the world. She said “Porque ahí tu tienes el Canadá que están a unas horas como el que dice y tiene un sistema de medicina que toda la clase media puede vivir. Yo conozco personas, la vecina mia del frente, recibe las medicinas del Canadá. Por qué no se puede?” [Because there you have Canada that is just a few hours you can say and they have a drug system that allows the middle class to exist. I know people, my neighbor from across the street, receives her drugs from Canada. Why can’t we?] The former U.S. President and First Lady Bill and Hillary Clinton were peripheral actors also. They were mentioned in
reference to their efforts to reform the healthcare system in the 1990s, but their failure to
do so was highlighted by a conservative health insurance sales associate in South Florida
who believes the government should have a hands-off policy in dealing with healthcare
reform. “The last thing in the world I want is for the government to get involved in our
healthcare because they can’t control anything they already have, if they get involved in
healthcare that’s just going to be another fiasco in itself,” this 37 year old father of two
from Miami said.

The power relations that characterize this frame depict government mostly as
passive and using a hands-off approach to dealing with the issue. For some respondents
this turns government and politicians into part of the problem—they are either ignoring
the healthcare coverage crisis, failing to pass legislation to control the industry or perhaps
even supporting the further enrichment of the industry pharmaceutical giants. For other
respondents this passive posture by the government represents a good thing because they
are allowing free enterprise to correct itself, or it can represent the government’s failure
to enforce the laws that are already on the books and that will reduce the number of
abuses by healthcare providers and fraud among patients. Therefore, in terms of power
relations the government is viewed as oppressing, ignoring or empowering Latinos
depending on which one of these Cuban-American respondents questioned. The
pharmaceutical companies are the one unequivocal oppressor in this frame and among
members of this subgroup who were interviewed. They benefit from the powerlessness of
Latinos. Furthermore, pharmaceutical companies cannot be trusted since they coordinate
efforts to abuse the poor. The dual power relation between the Latino community and
physicians, hospitals and healthcare insurance companies is evident in the fact that these
providers are viewed as both part of the problem and potentially part of the solution. They play both the role of antagonists by some accounts or potential protagonists given the right policies and set of circumstances.

A close look at some of the key terms used to describe the healthcare crisis illustrates the divergent views in this frame. Some respondents used catchphrases such as “high prices,” “doctors’ salaries,” ”spiral out of control,” “high costs” and “raping the consumers” to describe the crisis. Meanwhile, other respondents referred to too much government intervention as a “disaster” comparable to the universal healthcare system of Canada. They also used phrases such as “individual responsibility” and referred to the “Medicaid” and “Medicare” programs to offer their more conservative views about level of healthcare reform they felt was necessary. One respondent used figurative language in the form of metaphors such as prices of medicine costing “an eye from your face/un ojo de la cara” a very popular Latino metaphor to refer to a very costly item or service. He also described what he will have to do “eat salt/comer sal” when his wife retires and can no longer offer him the healthcare benefits she now gets from her job. The more progressive side of this frame—the reformers—use language such as “necessary basic care,” “humane,” “humanitarian” and “community health centers,” “government controls,” “universal,” “government intervention” and “working class” to make their case. Conservatives referred to “the blame game,” “Medicare,” “Medicaid” and “individual responsibility.”

Puerto Rican-American Frames

The seven Puerto Rican-American respondents in this analysis were also mixed in terms of their demographic profiles. Diversity among the respondents is very important because it helps to provide the content analysis with a variety of opinions and shared
experiences. Diversity among respondents also adds texture to this analysis as members of the Puerto Rican-American community talk about their lives as they deal with the issue of healthcare in America. Six of the seven Puerto Rican-American respondents were female. Their ages ranged between 19 and 53 and they represented North Central, Central and South Florida. Three of the respondents were college students. The professional careers of the remaining four respondents included a high school Spanish language teacher, a marketing executive, a dentist and a social worker.

The time-frame during which they had lived in the state of Florida ranged from five to 20 years. All respondents were citizens of the United States. Also, four of the seven respondents were parents. Additionally, most Puerto Rican-American respondents held moderate to liberal political views on economic issues. Finally, when asked what were the most important issues on their mind and for their community during the U.S. presidential election 2004 they said that general perceptions of Puerto Ricans as being lazy and uneducated, government intrusion in the personal decisions of women (i.e. plans to ban abortion), education, the war on terror, abortion and gay marriage (conservative views), the war in Iraq, healthcare, halting military exercises on the island of Viequez and social security. As with the other two subgroups, when asked if the issue of healthcare coverage was an important issue on their mind during the presidential election in 2004, they all responded positively and had many comments to offer.

From the analysis of the seven in-depth interviews with seven Puerto Rican Americans emerged two frames regarding the healthcare issue in the United States. The two frames were the Struggling Latino Worker frame and the Progressive Government frame. Some common themes linked respondents’ views forming these frames. A
common theme among respondents was the idea that government would have to be more progressive than it currently is and direct some support toward middle class working families. This theme was particularly important in the identification of the Progressive Government frame. Respondents felt that the current healthcare system and government safety net did very little for lower and middle class working families.

The idea that a reliance on employer-provided health benefits was not enough was a central theme in the Struggling Latino Worker frame. This view by respondents in this frame was in direct contradiction with one of the principle proposals by the Bush/Cheney Campaign to assist Americans with healthcare coverage. These particular Puerto Rican-American respondents had experienced firsthand how unhelpful employers usually were in providing affordable healthcare coverage. Common to both frames was the idea that pharmaceutical companies are corrupt and that they are ripping off American consumers with their high drug prices. There were some mixed views about the two major political parties with some respondents offering very candid candidate evaluation. More Puerto Rican-American respondents offered good comments about Kerry and his proposals to address the issue of healthcare coverage than they did about Bush. There were some calls for a universal healthcare system in America that guaranteed coverage for all Americans, but it was not a prominent feature of comments by Puerto Rican-American respondents. Instead, they emphasized a need for specific entitlement programs and specific healthcare treatment that would benefit specifically the Puerto Rican-American community, which was portrayed as a struggling middle class community made up of families with jobs but no healthcare. This last comment on the struggling Latino working community will serve
as a segway to a discussion of the first Puerto Rican-American subculture frame—the Struggling Latino Worker frame.

The master narrative in the Struggling Latino Worker frame describes the situation of the uninsured in the U.S. These are individuals who are not poor enough to receive Medicaid and as a result live with the worries of suffering an accident or sudden illness. The healthcare industry is described as out of control as in most other frames discussed so far. The high price and limited access to healthcare coverage is ruining lives and bankrupting families, this frame suggest. Those who do not have benefits through their jobs cannot afford their own. A female dentist age 53 with her own practice in North Florida shared the story of a young Latina she knew who found herself without benefits after loosing her job and being diagnosed with a brain tumor shortly thereafter.

“Comenzó con dolor de cabeza, se fue a Shands, le diagnosticaron un tumor y ahi mismo la tienen que bregar, todo eso, se han metido en una deuda sobre 100 mil dólares. Entonces ellos no tenían seguro médico,” [She started to feel headaches, she went to Shands, she was diagnosed with a tumor and they had to treat her right there on the spot, now their into a 100 thousand dollar debt. They have no health insurance,] the respondent explained.

Cynicism about both presidential candidates is very high in this frame. Neither Bush nor Kerry have a solution to the problem and just make proposals to win votes, but they are not truly concerned, said one respondent. Another young college student and Kerry supporter from Central Florida described the situation as Bush hiding the healthcare crisis while Kerry may provide a solution. “John Kerry is a little more open to finding some new ways to reach out to more people since about 40 million people don’t
have insurance in America right now,” she said. “I know that Bush has ties to the pharmaceutical companies and stuff and the insurance companies. So I felt that the Democratic candidate would do more for healthcare.” Government was generally described as being on the sidelines while pharmaceutical companies sell overpriced medications to patients and health insurance companies. Health insurance companies then turn around and overcharge high deductibles to patients. It is a system where everyone gets their buck except patients. The tone among Puerto Rican Americans who hold this view and were identified with this frame was one of intense desperation, because ultimately they bear the cost of an overpriced healthcare system. A 41 year old male full-time high school teacher and part-time satellite dish installer in South Florida described his frustration:

El gobierno va a tener que intervenir y regular ya ciertas tarifas y cosas porque un hospital esta cobrando demasiado por visitas médicas y estas compañías farmacéuticas están cobrando demasiado dinero por una prescripción….Es algo que esta, hay muchas personas que no tienen para pagar un seguro médico. Para mi familia nos salen 200 dólares quincenales de mi cheque. Eso es mucho dinero. [The government will have to intervene and regulate certain rates and things because a hospital is charging too much for medical visits and these pharmaceutical companies are charging too much money for a prescription drug….It’s something that is, there are many people who don’t have the money to pay for health insurance. For my family it comes out to 200 dollars bi-weekly out of my cheque. That’s a lot of money.]

The principal concepts underlying this frame included the core concepts of rights vs. privileges, fairness and honor/credibility. The concept of rights vs. privileges usually referred to the way that healthcare is treated in America as a privilege and not a right of all Americans and of all human beings. Latinos in America deserve access to a healthcare system that does not discriminate against them. The need for fair benefits that include basic coverage regardless of one’s employment status is the idea behind the concept of fairness in this frame. Fairness also includes healthcare and drug prices and costs that are
fair to Latinos from all income brackets. A 19 year old college student from Central Florida, who was so disillusioned with American politics that she didn’t vote, explained that Latinos who have just immigrated to the United States often live in fear due to their lack of health insurance.

They’re in desperation to get a job because they desperately don’t want to have to not have medical coverage, which having two kids, or having a new baby, or they just got married, and you know, it’s important to have, because once you’re to the doctor, once you’re to the emergency room, it ends up costing you almost four hundred dollars if you’re lucky.

The concept of honor and credibility was the driving force behind the constant criticism by respondents of politicians who make “promises that people want to hear” but who are not planning to deliver on their promises. Among respondents there was a widespread feeling of dissatisfaction with government and the minimal role it had played so far in alleviating their troubles. This dissatisfaction and distrust of government officials also became apparent in the role assigned to core actors in this frame as well as the power relations that were defined by respondents.

The core actors in this frame were the politicians and elected officials who were typically regarded by respondents as simply saying what people want to hear and as not offering any concrete solutions. Simply put, they were not believable parties in this matter. Some respondents saw a greater role for government in resolving the healthcare crisis in America and called for more involvement by elected officials. However, most elected officials were categorized as not doing much to help, and Bush appears to have carried most of the fault among Puerto Rican-American respondents. One very politically active female college student in her early 20s described Bush as pushing the healthcare issue “under the rug” and stated that Kerry wants to give better coverage. Kerry, she said, “pointed out all the people who don’t have healthcare…he did want to move towards
something where more people are covered and he did point out how other westernized countries have nationalized healthcare.”

Another set of core actors that played a critical role in this frame were healthcare providers. The healthcare industry as a whole was usually described as out of control and unaffordable. Hospitals were accused of charging “outrageous amounts” for their services and turning low income people away. Pharmaceutical companies were plain antagonists who were at the core of the problem and abused people with their high prices for drugs. Older people, Latino families and low and middle income Americans in general are the clear victims in this frame as in most others. Family heads cannot afford to provide healthcare to their families and it is eroding the core values of Latino families as the family head is unable to provide healthcare benefits for his/her family. One 19 year old female respondent from Orlando, Florida explained that “a woman that works two part-time jobs and supports a family of five, you know it’s really hard for her to get medical coverage for her entire family….I think that it should be lowered for people that have a family.” The elderly are powerless in their struggle to obtain assistance with their drugs. A 38 year old female marketing director in South Florida said “as far as healthcare, I feel sorry for older people, I feel sorry for us. What’s going to happen?”

The power relations in this frame are not very optimistic. Government is understood to be part of the problem as it oppresses low and middle income Latino families. Elected officials are more concerned with getting elected than with helping people. In fact, according to one respondent, government is simply benefiting from the additional tax revenue coming in from the higher priced drugs and healthcare services.
Additionally, it is empowering pharmaceutical and insurance companies while oppressing uninsured workers.

The language used in this frame highlighted the focus on Puerto Rican-American workers as they struggle to obtain healthcare coverage for their families or to maintain their families covered amidst the increasing cost of healthcare. When alluding to the difficult situation of Hispanics catchphrases and keywords such as “poverty line,” “expensive,” “outrageous” and references to Latinos who “risk losing property…due to a medical bill” were among those used by respondents. Other words and phrases used to describe the crisis include “out of control,” “abuse,” “desperation” and “outcasts.”

The second frame that emerged after coding and analyzing transcripts from interviews with Puerto Rican Americans is the Progressive Government frame. The master narrative in this frame consisted of calls for a leader with the convictions to enact healthcare reforms and provide programs that will alleviate the suffering of Latino families who struggle without healthcare. Calls are made by respondents for candidates to propose and implement specific services that are much needed in the Puerto Rican-American community and among Latinos in general. Some of the services mentioned include basic checkups for the uninsured, medication at an affordable price and special prices for diabetes medications. Others called for a loosening of Medicaid and Medicare guidelines. Respondents emphasized the need for government to create a family plan to reduce healthcare related costs and showing an appreciation for the important contributions Latinos make to American society rather than alienating them. The general idea in this frame is that everyone has healthcare needs and in America everyone should be offered the opportunity to be covered. A 20 year old male registered voter in North
Florida described her frustration and embarrassment due to the number of uninsured in America: “I think it’s horrible how we’re like one of the richest nations and yet so many people don’t have healthcare;”

The core concepts of fairness, equality, family health, prevention, human rights were central to this frame. Fairness was used, as in the previous frame, to refer to both the unfair practices by healthcare providers as well as to illustrate what respondents describe as fair coverage. The right of every human being to have some kind of healthcare coverage was the driving force behind the idea of equality in this frame. Both the poor and the middle classes should be covered in a system of equals that does not discriminate against the less fortunate. In this frame health was often linked to the notion that it was a family affair. Providing healthcare to one’s family was as important as providing meals and shelter. For family heads it was a very dehumanizing experience to not be able to provide this basic need. The concept of prevention was used by respondents who made their case for basic healthcare services for the uninsured to prevent illnesses from turning into chronic illness and preventing the spread of disease among poor Latinos. An argument was offered for the use of preventative medicine to reduce the cost of curative medicine. Finally, the core concept of human rights was pervasive in comments regarding the right of every Latino and American, rich or poor, to have access to “great healthcare.”

The government and elected officials were also core actors in this frame. However, they played a more potentially proactive role, according to some respondents. Government was encouraged to develop family plans and to treat Latinos as an important part of the United States. A 19 year old college student from Orlando Florida put it this way:
Even though they’re addressing the Hispanic community, when they do so, it’s like they’re trying to bring someone that’s out, in. Instead of making them feel like part of the country, because you are still a resident of the United States. So instead of making them feel like you, Puerto Ricans, it should be more of a group thing, like us.

There was a clear call for government to help solve the problem. There were not any advocates for the government taking a passive role and allowing the healthcare providers to police themselves. Not one single respondent expressed the view that the industry would correct itself through competition among providers as some Cuban-American respondents did. Among Puerto Rican-American respondents what was clear was an emphatic call for government to get more involved and implement progressive policies to expand already existing programs such as Medicaid and Medicare and to create new guarantees for those that tend to fall through the cracks. A 45 year old social worker, mother of two described the need for more programs:

I know that with the Medicaid and Medicare people make above the poverty line, but they don’t have enough money to get good insurance or to buy to pay that extra money for an insurance plan for the family so they don’t qualify for Medicaid and Medicare, but they also don’t have the money for an insurance plan. Maybe we should reform Medicaid and Medicare a little more.

In this frame as in the previous, healthcare providers were clear obstacles for Latinos to getting fair healthcare coverage and only represented part of the problem. Latinos were depicted again by Puerto Rican Americans as powerless and being taken advantage of by the industry and government.

The power relations implied or made explicit in this frame by Puerto Rican-American respondents included the portrayal of government as part of the solution (maybe) and having the capacity to empower Latinos and all Americans. However, some felt that the right leadership was also necessary for government to play a progressive role in this issue. Some called for a change in leadership and said they were disappointed
when they realized they were not getting one after the election results. When asked about her participation in political activities, a 19 year old college student from Central Florida described her experience of attending a John Edwards rally. “One of my favorite quotes was hope is on the way. It was just so inspiring.” Another 20 year old college student explained her enthusiasm about the voting process. “I was really really excited because I really don’t like Bush so I was like finally maybe I can make a difference, and we’ll change things and there’ll be something new to look forward to, and it won’t be the same stuff.”

Puerto Rican-American respondents displayed a greater propensity to express their political views and partisan leaning than Cuban and Colombian Americans. They were also more willing to assign responsibility for the healthcare crisis in America. However, the progressive respondents identified with this particular frame seemed to express their feeling that a Kerry victory would have resulted in greater change in their healthcare realities than if Bush remained in the White House for another four years.

The pharmaceutical companies were described again as oppressing consumers and patients including families, the elderly and workers. Latinos and low and middle income Americans were described as in a powerless situation with no other hope than that their vote could somehow result in a change in the direction of the healthcare industry in America. A male 41 year old high school Spanish language teacher from Fort Lauderdale had this to say about the unfair way that prices have been doubling for some senior citizens “a ellos también se la doblaron eso es algo que esta verdaderamente fuera de control completamente y todo eso tiene que llegar a un punto en que tienen que regular todo eso. Las compañías de farmacia tienen un abuso terrible.” [their prices were also
doubled that is something that is truly totally out of control and it will all have to reach a point where it has to be regulated. Pharmaceutical companies are being terribly abusive.]

A 20 year old female college student attending a university in North Central Florida described her own personal plight of living without healthcare:

   Definitely affects my family. We’re poor. We don’t have any healthcare. I mean, no one in my family has healthcare. Definitely there’s some that have Medicare, I don’t know about Medicaid, but the rest that are young like me, 20, 30, 40, nah, no healthcare, nothing. And it affects us, you know? You could get into an accident anytime. You could…anything could happen.

   The language used in this frame pointed out key programs Puerto Rican Americans considered vital to provide more equitable healthcare options to all Americans. Phrases and key words such as “Medicare,” “Medicaid,” “guaranteed general exams” and “everyone deserves great healthcare” were typically used to signal a need for expansion of current healthcare entitlement programs in the United States. Broader calls for “universal healthcare,” “guaranteed emergency room services,” and “family healthcare plans” were also made by Puerto Rican-American respondents.
CHAPTER 6
DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, LIMITATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Discussion

Identifying Political, Communitarian and Latino-Subgroup Frames

Research questions one and two in this dissertation were concerned with identifying the major frames used in the public relations strategies by the political and the communitarian campaigns and by Colombian, Cuban, and Puerto Rican Americans, respectively.

- What were the major frames used by the political and communitarian campaigns to define the issue of healthcare coverage in their voter mobilization efforts targeting Florida Latinos during the 2004 presidential election?
- What were the major frames used by Latino subgroups to define the issue of healthcare coverage during the 2004 presidential elections?

As is visible from Table 6-1 the findings in this dissertation suggest that there were several different frames used to define the issue of healthcare coverage in America. Various frames were incorporated into the public relations strategies used by the campaigns to target Latinos in the state of Florida. Colombian, Cuban and Puerto Rican Americans also relied on their own unique frames of reference when defining and discussing the issue of healthcare coverage in America during the interviews.

There was some overlap among the major frames identified in this study. The overlap between frames was often due to similar language such as the catchphrases, code words or slogans used. Also, similarities in the selection of core actors and the way they were depicted as well as the power relations implied or explicit in the frame created
overlap between two or more frames at times. The *Failure and Struggle* frame from the Kerry/Edwards campaign is exemplary of an overlapping frame. The focus of this frame on the difficulties faced by Latino voters who struggle to obtain fair healthcare coverage make it a frame with themes, language, and power relations that are common to several frames by multiple sources in the current research.

This analysis also identified very distinct frames that. For example, frames that were aimed at highlighting the specific strengths or weaknesses between the two presidential candidates (Bush vs. Kerry) by pointing out their different policies on healthcare tended to show less overlap with other frames other than with those from the same campaign. The Bush/Cheney campaign’s *Bush Agenda for America* frame and the Kerry/Edwards campaign’s *Stronger America* frame are good examples of this. Some of the key distinctions between these two frames were evident in their different main narratives, the different roles they assigned to both major party candidates as antagonists and protagonists and the language used.

The extent to which the major frames identified in this dissertation tend to overlap with frames from other sources, is depicted by the “Yes” labels in Table 6-1. These labels indicate if a particular frame (i.e. *Failure and Struggle, Stronger America, and Healthcare Reform*) was used by one or more of the frames sources listed in the columns (i.e., Bush, Kerry, and Cuban and Puerto Rican Americans).

**Campaign and Latino-subgroup frames**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campaign Frames</th>
<th>Bush</th>
<th>Kerry</th>
<th>LULAC /SVREP</th>
<th>Colombian American</th>
<th>Cuban American</th>
<th>Puerto Rican American</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bush Agenda for America</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combative Frame: Bush Policy vs. Kerry Policy</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino American Dream</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stronger America</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comparing and Contrasting Political, Communitarian and Latino-Subgroup Frames

Research question three in this dissertation was primarily concerned with the diversity of the frames identified and described in the previous chapter.

- What were the differences and/or similarities between the political and communitarian campaign frames and those used by Latino subgroups?

Both the political and communitarian campaign frames as well as the Latino-subgroup frames ranged in terms of the core concepts that served as their foundation, the peripheral concepts that aligned them ideologically with diverse social groups and institutions and the actors or agents that were described as being part of the plot or as having a say in the way the healthcare issue in America was being played out.

Additionally, there were variations in the power relations that were implied or stated as well as the key words and catchphrases used and main narrative among most frames.

Tables 6-2 through 6-8 represent a series of matrices that provide an aid to better visualize the variation between the campaign and Latino-subgroup frames. The tables use the label “Yes” to indicate whether a frame component or a frame was used or shared by a frames source when addressing the issue of healthcare coverage in America. This mechanism was used to show differences between the frames sources in this dissertation pertaining to specific components of a frame according to Hertog and McLeod (2001).
**Master narrative**

The driving force in setting boundaries between frames in order to distinguish them from one another was usually the main narrative in the frame. A quick glance at Table 6-2 summarizes the narratives that were least and most shared between frames sources. The most common narratives were those that described the difficulties faced by Latinos who struggle with the issue of healthcare coverage in America and that describe the problems with the healthcare system. Among the least common frames were those, which were pertaining to specific reforms and which attacked a particular presidential candidate.

Table 6-2 Master narratives used in political and communitarian campaign and Latino-subgroup frames

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Master Narrative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Depicts a progressive government that will provide reform in healthcare to benefit all Americans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depicts an empathetic government that will provide reform in healthcare to benefit low and middle income families and Latinos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depicts a progressive government that supports disease prevention and health education programs in low income communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depicts an empathetic government that will lower prices of prescription medicine to aid the elderly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tells of Kerry’s insensitive and destructive voting patterns that hurt those already struggling in poverty and with no healthcare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plight of low/middle class Latinos struggling with no healthcare or poor access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tells a story of how Latinos are welcomed and made to feel at home in America, and given opportunity by U.S. government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6-2 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Master Narrative</th>
<th>Bush</th>
<th>Kerry</th>
<th>LULAC/SVREP</th>
<th>Colombian American</th>
<th>Cuban American</th>
<th>Puerto Rican American</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tells of the lack of humane treatment surrounding the healthcare system particularly for Latinos and the need for a progressive government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describes Bush’s tax cuts that will make healthcare affordable for all Americans</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Story of Bush’s broken promises to Latinos that has led to their poor healthcare situation and poverty level</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems with the Interim Payment System in Medicare that are hurting many senior citizens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Story of a healthcare system that is in desperate need of reform and is leading to diminished health and opportunities for Latinos</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depiction of an out-of-control healthcare industry where prices for insurance, medicine, and treatment are exorbitant and selfish providers are at fault</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depiction of an out-of-control healthcare industry where the best option for price control is competition in corporations and pharmaceutical industry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describes political candidates as unconcerned with the plight of Latinos and simply eager to win their votes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Power relations

The power relations implied and explicit also facilitated the process of sorting out between frames of reference used by Latino-subgroup members as well as between those between the diverse campaigns. Table 6-3 shows the degree of similarity and difference between sources of frames (i.e., Bush, Colombian-American, Cuban-American etc.) based on the power relations they relied on for their frames. One of the most common
power relations implied was that Pharmaceuticals oppress Latinos with all but the Bush campaign relying on this power relations to frame the issue of healthcare coverage. Among the least common power relations was the one that suggests that Government empowers small businesses and their employees, which was used by the Bush/Cheney campaign in their Bush Agenda for America frame.

Table 6-3 Power relations used political and communitarian campaign and Latino-subgroup frames

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Power Relations</th>
<th>Bush</th>
<th>Kerry</th>
<th>LULAC/SVREP</th>
<th>Colombian American</th>
<th>Cuban American</th>
<th>Puerto Rican American</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government oppresses Latinos</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government empowers Latinos</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government oppresses the People</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government can be trusted to care for its citizens</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government empowers small businesses and employees</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government empowers the People</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government is be out of touch and fails the people</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government protects drug and Insurance companies</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctors, hospitals and health Providers oppress Latinos</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some patients abuse the Healthcare system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmaceuticals oppress Latinos</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voters have power over the government</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latinos have power over their Destinies</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LULAC, SVREP, HCD empower Latinos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government as passive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Core concepts

The core concepts were perhaps the single most powerful component in setting the ideological tone for each frame. Table 6-4 summarizes the degree of overlap that exists between different frame sources pertaining to core concepts. Again some concepts were
unique to one or two frame sources alone, while others were shared by almost all of the campaigns and the Latino subgroups. Prominent among core concepts identified in this analysis were the concepts of equality and fairness. Less common concepts included rights and privileges.

Table 6-4 Core concepts used in political and communitarian campaign and Latino-subgroup frames

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Concepts</th>
<th>Bush</th>
<th>Kerry</th>
<th>LULAC/SVREP</th>
<th>Colombian American</th>
<th>Cuban American</th>
<th>Puerto Rican American</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corruption</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credibility</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greed</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honesty</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honor</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humane Treatment</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Rights</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationalism</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimism</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reform</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rights vs. Privileges</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Peripheral concepts

Although core concepts played a prominent role in this framing analysis, it was their function as peripheral concepts that proved most useful in differentiating between frames. At the peripheral level, it was much easier to connect core concepts with key
groups in society, different institutions as well as to diverse ideology. For example, the core concept of equality, which was used by every frames source in this study, appeared in the form of *Equal access to healthcare treatment* and *Equal treatment of documented and undocumented workers* can be linked to advocacy groups that support the idea of providing universal healthcare. The peripheral concept of *Equal access to healthcare treatment*, however, can also be linked to healthcare reform advocates who do not necessarily prescribe to pro-illegal immigrant legislation. Table 6-5 summarizes the key peripheral concepts identified in this analysis.

### Table 6-5 Peripheral concepts used in political and communitarian campaign and Latino-subgroup frames

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peripheral Concepts</th>
<th>Bush</th>
<th>Kerry</th>
<th>LULAC/ SVREP</th>
<th>Colombian American</th>
<th>Cuban American</th>
<th>Puerto Rican American</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equal access to healthcare treatment</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal treatment of documented and undocumented workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair treatment</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair prices of drugs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair access to healthcare for those employed and unemployed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide Families with support</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmaceuticals are greedy</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government is greedy</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporations are greedy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health insurance companies are greedy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitals are greedy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physicians are greedy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government should provide honest/honorable leadership</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humane treatment of poor Latinos</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humane treatment of all immigrants</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humane treatment of undocumented workers</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of all human beings to have basic healthcare coverage</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corruption of Medicaid and Medicare users</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peripheral Concepts</td>
<td>Bush</td>
<td>Kerry</td>
<td>LULAC/SVREP</td>
<td>Colombian American</td>
<td>Cuban American</td>
<td>Puerto Rican American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of every American to have reasonably priced healthcare</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government should provide leadership in solving the healthcare crisis</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Americans should be offered the opportunity to choose a healthcare plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government should sponsor disease prevention programs in the Latino community</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government is making progress in solving the healthcare crisis</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government is not making progress in solving the healthcare crisis</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A great deal of reform is necessary to fix the healthcare crisis</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal reform is required to solve the healthcare crisis</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcing existing laws will be all the reform needed to solve the healthcare crisis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government is responsible for making sure all Latinos have access to healthcare</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government and political candidates are not credible or honest</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing healthcare coverage to Latino families is an important value</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latinos deserve equal access to opportunity in America</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activism in politics leads to positive change</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frivolous lawsuits should be controlled</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmaceuticals should be held accountable for their advertisements and overmedicating Americans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Core actors

Core actors and the role (antagonist vs. protagonist and part of the problem vs. part of the solution) they played in the frames used by each source appear in Table 6-6. This was one of the components that showed the most overlap between frames and between frames sources. Among the most widely used core actors were Government as part of the problem, Pharmaceutical companies as part of the problem, and Latinos suffering under the current healthcare system. The least used core actors included Kerry is the problem/antagonist, which was only used by the Bush/Cheney campaign as is typical of any election. Physicians and businesses as victims and part of the solution were also among the core actors used the least.

Table 6-6 Core actors used in political and communitarian campaign and Latino-subgroup frames

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Actors</th>
<th>Bush</th>
<th>Kerry</th>
<th>LULAC/SVREP</th>
<th>Colombian American</th>
<th>Cuban American</th>
<th>Puerto Rican American</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government as part of the Problem</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government as part of the solution</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bush is the problem</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerry is the problem</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bush has a solution</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance companies as part of the problem</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerry has a solution</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physicians/Hospitals are part of the problem</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physicians/Hospitals are part of the solution</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physicians are victims</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private industry as part of the problem</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private industry as part of the solution</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior citizens as benefiting from healthcare reform</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior citizens as suffering under healthcare system</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small businesses as victims and part of the solution</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6-6 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Actors</th>
<th>Bush</th>
<th>Kerry</th>
<th>LULAC/SVREP</th>
<th>Colombian American</th>
<th>Cuban American</th>
<th>Puerto Rican American</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children as receiving benefits from the healthcare system</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Latinos as benefiting from healthcare reform</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latinos as suffering under healthcare system</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latinos as benefiting from healthcare reform</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LULAC/SVREP as part of solution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicare providers as suffering under healthcare system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employers as part of the problem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employers as part of the solution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorneys (frivolous lawsuits) as part of the problem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Peripheral actors

There were very few peripheral actors that emerged from the content analysis.

Table 6-7 summarizes these and shows how they were used by their corresponding frames source (political and communitarian campaigns and Latino subgroups).

Table 6-7 Peripheral actors used in political and communitarian campaign and Latino-subgroup frames

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peripheral Actors</th>
<th>Bush</th>
<th>Kerry</th>
<th>LULAC/SVREP</th>
<th>Colombian American</th>
<th>Cuban American</th>
<th>Puerto Rican American</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sons and daughters of elderly are benefited by healthcare reform</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign doctors as a possible solution for doctor shortage and reducing physician costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian government as having a fair healthcare system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill and Hillary Clinton as having attempted to reform the healthcare system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Strategic language

Another component that showed a mix of overlap and exclusivity between frames was the strategic language used. Catchphrases, keywords, code words, and other linguistic devices that were used to reinforce the main narrative, power relations or core actors in a frame are listed below in Table 6-8. This table shows the way certain sets of keywords and code words were more commonly used by specific frames sources. In fact, some language is exclusively used by specific frames sources.

Table 6-8 Strategic language used in political and communitarian campaigns and Latino-subgroup frames

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Language</th>
<th>Bush</th>
<th>Kerry</th>
<th>LULAC/SVREP</th>
<th>Colombian American</th>
<th>Cuban American</th>
<th>Puerto Rican American</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare centers</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor communities</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invest</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agenda for America</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare savings accounts</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association Health Plans</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable healthcare</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voted against</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrong priorities</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missed votes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frivolous lawsuits</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laci Peterson</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undocumented workers</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our country</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our president</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Business</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children born in the U.S.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pregnant women</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicare</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stability</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanding coverage</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing cost</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stronger America</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embracing diversity</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Heritage</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Language</td>
<td>Bush</td>
<td>Kerry</td>
<td>LULAC/SVREP</td>
<td>Colombian American</td>
<td>Cuban American</td>
<td>Puerto Rican American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep faith</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One America</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrong direction</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smears and lies</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compassionate conservatism</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fight</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited Options</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>His own interests</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halliburton</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alarming</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency situation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulnerable</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frail</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensive care beneficiaries</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home care providers</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universal healthcare coverage</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equitable</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor quality of care</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency room bias</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stereotyping</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inconsistent relationships with primary healthcare providers</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIDS</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low wage jobs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High costs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise the system</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much needed reform</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New health insurance plans</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government provided plans</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great burden</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abuse</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of control</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pushing products</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businesspeople in control</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unreachable coverage</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indebted for life</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>911</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical security</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More efficient</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government control of health care</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control doctors</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control hospitals</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link jobs and healthcare</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Language</td>
<td>Bush</td>
<td>Kerry</td>
<td>LULAC/ SVREP</td>
<td>Colombian American</td>
<td>Cuban American</td>
<td>Puerto Rican American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal treatment for legals and illegals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disaster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctors’ salaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An eye from your face/ Un ojo de la cara</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eat salt/Comer sal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necessary basic care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanitarian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government controls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government intervention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual responsibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Line</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expensive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outrageous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk losing property due to medical bill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desperation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcasts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guaranteed general exams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everyone deserves great healthcare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family healthcare plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmaceuticals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breadwinner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mobilizing Latino Communities: How Did the Campaigns Fare?**

How did the political and communitarian campaigns use the healthcare issue to mobilize Latino voters to register and vote in the 2004 presidential elections? Upon examination of the frames used by the political and communitarian campaigns observed in this dissertation, the conclusion is that results are mixed. To have a positive impact on mobilization among Latinos, the frames used would have had to meet several important criteria identified in the literature in political science, public relations and communications for development and nation/community building. First, the campaigns would need to meet the parameters identified by scholars in the field of political science...
as being conducive to increased civic participation among minority groups. They should also avoid the pitfalls that are often blamed for reduced participation among Latinos.

As outlined in the literature on Latino political behavior in chapter two of this dissertation, the pitfalls to be avoided by these campaigns are discrimination based on racial, ethnic or cultural differences, setting up language barriers and recognition of the Latino socio-economic reality in America—most Latinos live in poverty or just above poverty levels. These campaigns must recognize the Latino identity as a true cultural factor of this minority group. They also must acknowledge the dual reality that many Latinos live both here in America, where they have established their new home, as well as back in their nations of origin where they may still have close relatives or may still be personally or politically concerned with the state of affairs. A successful mobilizing campaign speaks to the cultural values of Latinos such as the principles of work, family, identity and justice.

All three campaigns incorporated frames that emphasized the important values with which Latinos identify. The values of work, providing for one’s family, freedom and opportunity were among several important core concepts that were incorporated by all three campaigns and were also reflected in the Latino-subgroup frames. The public relations frames usually fused these values with the depiction of the true difficulties that are faced by low and middle income Latino families in the United States. Some campaigns such as the Kerry/Edwards campaign and the LULAC/SVREP campaigns also incorporated the plight of undocumented workers. The word choice and catchphrases selected to accentuate the values and the dilemmas is also notable. Phrases such as
“healthcare coverage for all” and “humane treatment of undocumented workers” highlighted this point.

With all this in mind, it is one of the conclusions of this analysis that all three campaigns fared well in some way or another. All campaigns exhibited strengths and weaknesses as the frames they used were at times closer or more distant from the realities of the different Latino participants in the interviews. For example, the central idea of the Bush Agenda for America frame linking employers with healthcare was an idea that was very much in line with that of some Colombian Americans. Meanwhile, most Puerto Rican Americans saw employers as playing less of a role in resolving the issue than they did government reform. Similarly, ensuring that all children (including Latino children) had healthcare coverage in America was a central idea of the Kerry/Edwards campaign’s Stronger America frame and the LULAC/SVREP Latino Plight frame. The Bush/Cheney campaign communications examined did not have much to say about this topic, whereas the Kerry/Edwards campaign communications mentioned the problem and need to cover all children in America and specified that these children were the children of legal immigrants, according to this analysis.

Public relations campaign strategies that seek to mobilize Latinos to become more involved in the political process in America also need to be subjected to some guidelines that apply to the general population and have been identified as relevant for Latinos as well. Negative campaigning has been identified over and over again as a key factor that turns off voters from participation in election contests. These campaigns should avoid relying on highly cynical messages and endeavor to provide concrete answers to the critical issues impacting Latinos these days. Additionally, policy propositions by the
candidates should come across as genuine and sincere despite general cynicism about politics. Both the Kerry/Edwards campaigns and the Bush/Cheney campaigns left much to want in this area. They each included at least one frame that was identified in this analysis as partly having the strategic function of attacking the opposing campaign. Bush/Cheney campaign communications often meshed the important issue of healthcare in the United States with “Kerry’s wrong votes” or “Kerry’s liberal bias” or “Kerry’s absence in the Senate.” Similarly, Kerry/Edwards campaign communications included references to “Bush’s failed leadership” or “Bush’s ignoring Latino needs” along with his propositions for addressing the healthcare crisis in America. LULAC/SVREP frames, however, focused on pointing out the failings of the system and avoided partisan rhetoric in their communications with Latino communities. Their messages were much more educational for Latino audiences and provided an agenda of issues regarding healthcare coverage in America for activist groups to procure. It is the conclusion of this analysis on this particular quality of communications for mobilization that both the Bush/Cheney and the Kerry/Edwards campaigns might have been less effective in mobilizing Latino voters than the less partisan and less political LULAC/SVREP campaigns. The effectiveness of the Bush/Cheney and Kerry/Edwards political campaigns might have been limited by the electoral nature of their communications. While their communications, even the most negative ones, are typical of election contests and they might have worked to galvanize their base by highlighting their opponent’s misgivings, these same negative strategies might have had a tapering effect on Latino voters in general.

Latinos, similar to voters from other ethnic groups, are also interested in concrete, tangible, doable policy positions and like other voters in America they are tired of the
commonplace political rhetoric characteristic of election politics. There is a serious call for politicians to remember that Latinos have proven to be, for the most part, an elusive and highly pragmatic voting bloc with loyalty only sworn to their communities, families and issues that are important to them (Roberts, & Martinez, 2004). Recent election results showing support both for Democrats and Republicans in various contests are exemplary of this characteristic of Latino voters.

Public relations campaign strategies that seek to mobilize Latinos to participate fuller in elections also need to ensure that certain components are included in their messages. The field of communication for development has also set some guidelines, which if followed can increase the positive impact on cognitions, attitudes and behavior among key audiences of public relations strategies. These campaigns must seek to empower Latinos to change their situation. This focus on the locus on power in society as prescribed by framing mechanisms is consistent with the calls from Durham (2001) for increased efforts in framing studies to identify and describe the power relations implied or explicit in communication. According to the more postmodern view of framing (Gamson, & Modigliani, 1989; Durham, 2001; Maher, 2001), as well as the more traditional views in emic and etic research (Pike, 1954; Sigman, 1984), this should be the ultimate goal of research in communication studies—to identify the inequalities in the distribution of power in society and call attention to these in hopes of finding resolutions that will alleviate the hardships of those with least power in society. A focus on the larger questions will also address the call by Takeshita (1997) for focus on the politico-economic issues affecting society today—a focus on “real” problems in mass media research. This focus on the location of power as viewed by the participants could
represent a starting point for addressing the problems with healthcare coverage in America from the patient’s point of view.

While it is recognized in this analysis that these particular communications were not the sole mechanism used by political and communitarian campaigns involved in this effort to mobilize Latinos, as mentioned in chapter two, many of these campaigns also included community recruitment of volunteers, training, door-to-door registration and even provided transportation for some voters to their voting polls—it does not fail to see where these communications might have been effective in empowering Latinos and where they might have disempowered them.

Some of the communications analyzed in this dissertation incorporated very clear reminders to voters that they were able to help change their present healthcare situation by becoming involved. Other communications either lacked such empowering information for Latinos or they discouraged Latinos all together from changing their condition. This latter case was among the least cases, however. Perhaps the framing item where this became most clear is when looking at the power relations that were incorporated into the framing of the issue by each source (see Table 6-3).

Regarding the concept of development from the field of communication for development and nation building, the record of the campaigns is also mixed with most of them incorporating some of the newer development models referred to in chapter three (basic needs, women in development, liberation and critical models). All three campaigns incorporated themes, language and references to power relations that empowered Latinos as families, as individuals and as communities. Some specific campaigns such as the Bush/Cheney and the Kerry/Edwards campaigns included direct references to the needs
of pregnant women—this idea can be linked to the women in development model—and also spoke of the need for children to have healthcare coverage. Nevertheless, the modernity model reared its ugly head from time to time, especially in those particular frames that emphasized the relationship between economic development in the Latino community and healthcare coverage resulting from it. This was particularly the case of frames that had a strong pro-healthcare provider, pro-healthcare industry and pro-private industry slant to them. Perhaps the most proactive campaign when it comes to incorporating “postmodern” ideas of development into their healthcare agenda for Latinos in America is the LULAC/SVREP campaign. Their policy positions included some very proactive and patient centered initiatives, which were virtually ignored by the Bush/Cheney and Kerry/Edwards campaigns, mainly an increase in Latinos participating in research to help identify and deal with disease and healthcare crisis in their communities.

In summary, when one takes into account the fact that these campaigns relied on much more than just these mass media frames to mobilize the Latino community, and that they also relied on interpersonal systems to interact with, educate and provide instructions to potential voters, one must conclude that the overall capacity to mobilize Latinos could only have been enhanced by these public relations strategies. As indicated by Tables 6-2 through 6-7 and this analysis, there were many distinctions between these public relations frames and also some similarities. However, overall evaluation of how these campaigns fit within the parameters outlined in the literature on political participation among Latinos and the core concepts driving the field of communication for development indicate that their public relations strategies might have enhanced their
capacity to mobilize Latinos. This analysis shows the potential impact of these campaigns on mobilization of the Latino community. It also helps sort out those frames that can be most useful in mobilizing Latinos to vote using the issue of healthcare coverage in America from the ones that are bound to be least effective.

**Emic and Etic Analysis**

In addition to the results of the content analysis, a detail description of the findings of the in-depth interviews with Latino-subgroup members is offered here, which is guided by the concepts of emic and etic. This was the main goal of research question four:

- What level of cultural affinity (emic and etic differences) can be ascertained from the Latino-subgroup frames?

Each particular Latino subgroup examined in this dissertation appears to have a set of frames that they relied on to highlight important perspectives regarding the issue of healthcare coverage. These frames are considered to be emic frames, because although they are about the issue of healthcare in America, they differ from other frames in the meaning they convey, the worldviews they identify and ultimately the function they serve—to elicit certain specific knowledge, sentiment, reaction, call to action on a specific issue key to that group. Conversely, there are certain frames that were used by more than one Latino subgroup (even if they were labeled differently in this framing analysis) to organize their ideas surrounding the issue of healthcare coverage in America. One of these common or general (etic) frames was the *Latino Struggle* frame. This frame was used by Latino-subgroup members in order to describe the plight of Latinos as they struggle to obtain healthcare coverage. The *Latino Struggle* frame was also used to describe the serious problems with the healthcare industry in America. This view of
communication behavior as representing emic or etic qualities is consistent with the more traditional views regarding the emicity of human communication forwarded by Pike (1954) and Sigman (1984).

There were also a series of distinct (emic) and common (etic) characteristics of frames that emerged from this analysis of Latino-subgroup frames. There were characteristics of the Latino-subgroup frames that were similar among the three subgroups. Also, there were ways in which these Latino-subgroup frames differed from one another. The most prominent similarities and differences are summarized below:

**Similarities among Latino subgroups**

- Although very few Latino respondents mentioned the issue of healthcare coverage when asked about the foremost issue on their mind during the presidential election in 2004 or when asked about the foremost issue impacting their community, they all considered the healthcare coverage issue as a critical one once the issue was raised by the interviewer.

- Most respondents were not satisfied with the proposals made by the political candidates during the elections. Also, most of them did not remember the proposals the candidates made or held such strong partisan leanings that they avoided listening to the candidate for the opposite party all together.

- There is a common call for more government intervention in “controlling” prices and reducing costs among Latino respondents regardless of their subgroups. This call is also for a halt in abuses of the uninsured.

- Most Colombian and all Puerto Rican Americans focused on the abuses by the healthcare industry on consumers and patients, rather than on others sources of costs such as medical malpractice law suits.

- Pharmaceuticals are the biggest antagonists in the picture—their unfair price gauging is making healthcare costs less and less affordable. This was clearly the view of most respondents among all three subgroups.

- Generally speaking, most Latino-subgroup members agree that government is at best unresponsive to the needs of poor and middle income Latino families. At worse, they are in partnership with corporations to exploit the poor and benefit from the taxes earned from high cost of prescription drugs and from medical coverage sold at over inflated prices.
• For the most part respondents do not agree with the idea of leaving the solution for the healthcare crisis in the hands of employers and private industry alone.

• All Latino participants feel powerless before the increasing cost of healthcare in America and the increasing power of providers of healthcare services in the United States. Their hope is that elected officials will deal with the crisis. It does not matter whether it is the Democrats or the Republicans who improve things, but respondents hope for immediate help, they say.

**Differences among Latino subgroups**

• Colombian-American participants were the strongest proponents of extending human rights protections such as providing healthcare insurance to undocumented workers who are often reported to the authorities upon arriving at a hospital emergency room and denied services. This was a notable difference between members of this Latino subgroup and Cuban and Puerto Rican Americans.

• There is a dissenting voice among a minority of Cuban and Colombian Americans who suggest that the problem of healthcare should be left to private enterprise to resolve.

• A small group (only three out of 14 Cuban and Colombian Americans) of Latino-subgroup respondents mentioned the abuses in Medicaid and Medicare as well as medical malpractice lawsuits (tort reform) as part of the problem. They called for a crack down on abusive patients and attorneys as a way to reduce some of the costs that are inflating the price of healthcare coverage in America.

• A very small number of respondents accused physicians of representing an elite class of professionals who they consider as partly responsible for the increasing price of healthcare.

• While all Latino subgroups agree that there is a need for change there are divergent views among them as to the form and extent of reform, intervention or control. Colombian Americans present an almost united voice in advocating for a universal healthcare plan that will cover all (including undocumented workers) and that will control prices and increase accessibility. Puerto Rican Americans mostly call for expanding current programs and addressing the need for coverage by working families. Cuban Americans did not advocate for any specific reforms. Cuban Americans were divided among those who want general change (universal healthcare), those who simply want prices brought down and those who want enforcement of current laws and regulations without any further expansion or government involvement.

• One of the greater differences among Latino subgroups on the issue of healthcare as they framed the issue is how to pay for a broader healthcare program. Some are in favor of linking healthcare directly to jobs and that seems to be a popular view among Colombian-American respondents or perhaps this is the way they usually
talk about it. They also call for a system that provides basic benefits to undocumented workers. Most Cuban Americans see a blanket healthcare system as a last resort type of program. Puerto Rican Americans advocate for more government funding (including tax increases) of current programs such as Medicaid and Medicare and creating new programs for working families.

- Another difference is that some groups link the healthcare crisis issue to other groups. Colombian Americans would like to extend the healthcare benefits to cover illegal aliens. This emphasis on covering undocumented workers was much more visible in the interviews with Colombian Americans than with any other Latino subgroup. This is perhaps a direct reflection of their close proximity to the general experience of immigrants to this country. As indicated earlier in chapter two, Cuban and Puerto Rican Americans enjoy certain migratory privileges due to past and present U.S. foreign policy toward their nations.

In summary, while there were many differences in the way that Latino subgroups framed the issue of healthcare, as visible in Table 6-1, there is also some commonality in the factors that went into the design of these frames (component tables 6-2 to 6-8) as well as the major themes that emerged from these in-depth interviews. There were also many differences and similarities between the Latino-subgroup frames and those used by the political and communitarian campaigns. The following section will summarize the overall conclusions of this dissertation and offer some recommendations for future research. Also, limitations of this research and the implications for its application in public relations campaign for nation building will be discussed. Furthermore, the impact of the current research on theory development in mass communication and public relations will also able expounded.

**Final Conclusions**

This dissertation sought to identify, describe, and understand the different frames used by campaigns targeting Latino-subgroup members (Colombian, Cuban, and Puerto Rican Americans) and the referential frames used by Latino subgroups during the 2004 presidential election in the United States. The analysis in this dissertation highlights some
key findings. First, there were very important differences between the political and communitarian campaign frames regarding the issue of healthcare coverage in America that were used to mobilize Latinos to register and vote. One of the key differences is evident in the partisan quality of some frames. This characteristic of the frames used by the Bush/Cheney and Kerry/Edwards campaigns is common to most election campaign communication and was clearly incorporated into communications targeting Latinos in the state of Florida. This partisan quality of the communications emerged during the framing analysis and was incorporated into certain frames.

Another important difference in the campaign frames consists in the selection of certain key actors and their portrayal in the frame, as well as in terms of the narrative used to organize the information regarding healthcare in certain frames. An actor that was portrayed differently by both political campaigns in their framing of the issue was the pharmaceutical companies. The Bush/Cheney campaign described the drug companies as part of the solution. Meanwhile, the Kerry/Edwards campaign described them as part of the problem. Both the Kerry/Edwards and LULAC/SVREP campaigns focused heavily on describing the struggle of the Latino community in dealing with healthcare, while Bush offered a more optimistic view emphasizing the future impact of his policies toward healthcare. While there was a difference between these campaigns on this matter, this is not uncommon due to the incumbency status of the Bush/Cheney campaign.

There were also similarities between the campaign frames. The political campaigns showed a tendency to resort to key values and concepts that are central to both American cultures in general, as well as Latino culture specifically. In fact, the LULAC/SVREP campaigns also used concepts such as work, family, fairness, and equality to call for
increased funding of Latino-specific health research initiatives. The political candidates’ campaigns avoided the undocumented worker issue for the most part. Only LULAC/SVREP called for basic healthcare services for undocumented workers. Even the Kerry/Edwards campaign, when it called for coverage for “all children,” clarified that it was referring to the children of “legal immigrants.” There was also a great deal of overlap in terms of the core concepts and actors involved in the framing of the healthcare issue by both the political and communitarian campaigns targeting Latinos in the state of Florida.

In addition to the differences and similarities between the campaigns, there were also similar findings in the analysis involving the Latino-subgroup frames. Key differences involved the focus of a few Cuban Americans on more government enforcement of current laws as a way to control healthcare costs. Another difference was the way Colombian Americans stood out in their association of the issue of healthcare with undocumented workers, which was more noticeable than with any of the other two subgroups. Similarly, Puerto Rican Americans’ emphasis on expansion of entitlement programs such as Medicaid and Medicare was notable. Additionally, the view of some respondents working in the healthcare industry who felt that government managed universal healthcare would be a “disaster” and that the industry should be left to police itself was noted. The rationale was that competition would reign in prices, making reform unnecessary. Finally, another difference was the view of some conservative Colombian and Cuban Americans that ultimately it was the responsibility of individuals, and not of the government, to provide healthcare for their families.

The similarities among Latino-subgroup frames include the emphasis on drug price reductions across the board and the manner in which all Latino respondents regard
pharmaceutical companies as the antagonists that are driving the cost of healthcare out
the roof. Virtually every main narrative focused some attention on the difficulties faced
by low and middle-income Latinos in their efforts to acquire healthcare benefits. Latinos
were mostly described as powerless under the rising prices of healthcare, even by
conservatives. All Latino-subgroup frames included some type of role for government in
dealing with the healthcare crisis, even if the particular role assigned differed somewhat
from subgroup to subgroup and from frame to frame or based on political ideology.

As mentioned earlier, these findings represent interesting implications for the larger
question being addressed in this dissertation: how can public relations practitioners best
design frames that are representative of the view(s) of the particular publics involved?
The findings in this dissertation highlight the importance of public relations practitioners
not assuming that affinity exists between their campaign communications and the views
of the publics they are targeting. This should be especially the case when multicultural
communities or societies are involved. As this dissertation suggests, even when targeting
a specific minority group, such as Latinos, using a widely discussed issue of healthcare
coverage in America, there can still be a great deal of variation in the way the issue is
defined, understood, and discussed by members of a group. As is suggested in these
findings, there can also be variations in the solutions prescribed for the problem and the
moral judgments that are made in reference to the source and cause of the problem
(Entman, 1993).

Although no inferences are made in this dissertation about the actual impact these
campaigns had on the way Latinos in the state of Florida viewed the issue of healthcare—
whether there was any persuasion that took place—the results of this dissertation do
indicate that public relations practitioners need to exercise caution and avoid viewing minority groups as a monolith. While it may be true, as is the case of Latinos, that there can be cultural factors that keep an ethnic group together and that may even produce a minority-specific political movement or phenomenon (i.e. Black politics and Latino politics), one should also be mindful that nuances can exist within a minority group’s background, present situation, and future expectations that can impact their worldview and, more importantly in this case, their issue-specific view.

A linkage can be made in this discussion between key characteristics of frames and a subgroup’s past experience with immigration to the United States, as well as their history in this nation and their current social, economic, and ideological realities. The same may apply to other minority groups that are also growing in numbers as well as in diversity, but for various reasons may be labeled as a monolith (e.g. Asian Americans and Arab Americans). Perhaps the labels are emerging as a result of coalescing forces that are bringing specific groups together and forming new communities. Whatever the force, the public relations practitioner must be mindful of the differences that can exist within varying cultural groups.

This dissertation argues that a careful examination of subculture views, prior to implementing a public relations campaign, could result in clearer, more strategically designed and potentially effective messages that can be used in community development efforts targeting minorities. This dissertation also argues that framing analysis provides a much more intricate and comprehensive mechanism for professionals and scholars in the public relations field to examine messages, both before implementation—to measure levels of frame affinity—as well as in a post-implementation environment, to assess
campaign effectiveness. Public relations practitioners will find a powerful tool to assess public relations strategy/publics frames affinity in the analytical model presented in this dissertation. The heuristic value of this model lies in its accessibility as a pre-implementation model as well as during and post-implementation.

The literature in communication for development (Melkote, & Steeves, 2001) and the post-modern and reflexive perspectives in public relations (Holtshauzen, 2000; Holtzhausen, & Voto, 2002; Holström, 2003) suggest that a culturally sensitive and introspective approach to practicing public relations and developing a campaign will take into account the worldviews of the publics that are the target of these communication efforts. The findings of this dissertation also indicate that an understanding of these specific worldviews can often mean the difference between producing tailored messages that speak to distinct subgroup needs and the creation of less effective one-size-fits-all public relations tactics.

The analytical model proposed in this dissertation uses framing theory and the emic and etic concepts to provide practitioners with more access to public-specific information in order to tailor messages to those publics. While it is true that tailoring messages for Latino or other minority subgroups will present practitioners with a much greater challenge than approaching these subgroups as a monolith, it is also true that public segmentation is the future of public relations and other communication professions. This is being imposed on both the professional practice and on academic research in communication by the changing nature of the societies in which we live—we are becoming more culturally diverse. Segmentation is the future and those practitioners who are able to look at multicultural societies and communities with a special lens that allows
them to use a higher degree of precision when designing communications will be the winners. As minority groups continue to grow, as is the case of Latinos in America, they will provide greater opportunities for academic research and the marketing of new products and services. Those practitioners who possess the appropriate tools and knowledge to identify nuances between subgroups and to craft strategic messages to target these subgroups will be at an advantage over those who do not. Practitioners and researchers who have access to such poignant strategies will be more effective in their publicities, in establishing and maintaining relationships with key publics, and in growing the body of theoretical knowledge in the public relations field. Therefore, it is in practitioner’s best interest to become familiar with new ways to understand their publics and to create strategically-designed messages. This dissertation provides such a tool to assess differences among public specific frames of reference and also to measure the affinity of frames used in public relations strategies vis a vis these same public specific frames.

This dissertation uses Latinos and the issue of healthcare coverage in America to illustrate the importance of using a culturally-sensitive approach to practicing public relations. It does this by pointing out that although the issue of healthcare coverage in America is an important issue to Colombian, Cuban, and Puerto Rican Americans alike, these individual Latino subgroups also have different ways of discussing the issue and can prescribe different solutions for this problem. This is a unique contribution that this dissertation makes to the field of public relations and to mass communications.

There are also implications for public relations teaching as well as academic and professional research in the field that emerge from this dissertation. The proposed model
can be used in classrooms to illustrate for students the challenges they can face as practitioners and researchers in the public relations field, especially given the growing multicultural character of global society. The current research provides an excellent example of how public segmentation can be necessary to improve campaign communication effectiveness. It illustrates that at times a one-size-fits-all approach might not be the best way to create effective communications. It also highlights how public diversity can impact campaign design and the budget necessary to target culturally diverse groups. Furthermore, this dissertation provides a clear example of the challenges public relations professionals will face in the future as they develop, implement, and assess campaigns.

There are implications for public relations that emerge from this dissertation that pertain to the various stages of the campaign development process. These can also be used in the classroom to illustrate for students the impact that culture has on communication and to familiarize students with different ways to address these challenges. The model proposed in the current research can be used in the formative research stage of a public relations campaign to assess referential frame preferences among diverse publics regarding key issues. These preferred frames can later be incorporated into campaign messages to increase communication effectiveness. This is perhaps the stage where the proposed model would make the greatest impact, and it has been argued in this dissertation that this is one of the areas where practitioners need the most help—making sure that their communications are relevant by incorporating public’s views, which is a post-modern ideology. This analytical model can also be used during the campaign implementation stage to ensure campaign message relevance as certain
frames may become obsolete and/or some new frames may emerge throughout the duration of a campaign. The proposed model can also be used as part of post-implementation evaluation efforts to assess changes in public opinion regarding a particular issue by measuring referential frames after the culmination of a campaign.

In addition to the impact this framework can have on the diverse stages of campaign development, it also has important implications for what is considered by many as the primary function of public relationships—establishing, building, maintaining, and managing mutually beneficial relationships between organizations and their key publics. The reflexive and postmodern character of the culture framing model proposed in this dissertation brings organizations a step closer to being able to experience more balanced and mutually beneficial (symmetrical) communication with their key publics. This model encourages organizations and public relations practitioners to increase their awareness of their public’s views regarding important issues that affect them both. Such an approach can be instrumental in moderating relations between organizations and activist groups that may have previously been difficult to manage. Increased awareness of the way an issue is framed by an opposition group will provide the practitioner with knowledge useful to prepare contingency plans and may serve as a pre-crisis management technique. It is an argument of this dissertation that having an awareness of how issues are framed is as important as knowing what the emerging and current hot issues are. This position emphasizes the importance of including the culture frames model within environmental scanning efforts as a preventative mechanism to avoid having to resort later on to much harder to manage and expensive crisis management techniques.
Theory development in public relations and mass communication in general also benefit from the model used in this dissertation as well its findings. Theory development is currently one of the greatest needs in the still fairly young field of public relations, and as Sallot et al. (2003) pointed out, there is still a great need for analytical models that focus on cultural and ethnic diversity in the field. This dissertation makes a contribution in this regard.

The culture frames model forwarded in this dissertation also helps focus more research in public relations on the tactics and strategies relied upon by practitioners and the quality (rather than quantity) of their communication content. This levels the plain with other areas that have received greater attention in recent years such as the role of practitioners, characteristics of organizational/public relationships, and professional development opportunities among practitioners. The current effort hopefully provides a catalyst that will result in a greater focus on the characteristics of content and on the importance of cultural awareness in future research.

This dissertation also makes very important contributions to the development of the framing paradigm both in public relations and in mass communication in general. As mentioned in the framing discussion in chapter three, the framing model has been previously explored by public relations scholars. One of these scholars is Hallahan (1999), who suggested using framing theory to identify different frames that publics use to communicate about key issues. He suggests that practitioners should identify the main frames used by key publics and incorporate those into public relations campaign strategies to increase communication effectiveness. This approach, Hallahan suggests, will also increase the opportunities for symmetrical communication between
organizations and the key publics they are targeting through their campaigns. This dissertation goes beyond Hallahan’s suggestions by not limiting practitioners to reliance on a priori determined frames to craft campaign messages and instead providing them with a mechanism to assess (identify, describe, and understand) the particular frames of reference of specific publics. Furthermore, unlike purely academic exercises that point out ideal practices and desirable results without indicating the process to achieve these, this dissertation provides public relations practitioners with a practical and timely model to assess public specific frames. It does this by offering a more systematic approach whereby practitioners can actually identify frames and measure frame affinity levels prior to implementing a campaign strategy. These ideas had not been explored in the framing literature emerging from the public relations field until this study. Finally, this dissertation also argues for the use of the culture frames model in the same way that focus groups are used prior to designing a campaign to assess message effectiveness. It is argued here that this analytical model provides a much more powerful interpretive mechanism to ascertain the meaning and functionality of communication content and publics views than simply relying on a traditional research method such as interviews or focus groups.

The broader field of mass communication also benefits from the culture frames model used and the findings of this dissertation. The current research demonstrates the power of the framing paradigm when it is utilized as an interpretive heuristic as suggested by different scholars (Scheufele, 2000; Durham, 2001; Gamson, 2001; Maher, 2001; Reese, 2001; D’Angelo, 2002). It shows how framing can be used in specialized communication fields such as public relations and advertising to aid practitioners and
researchers as they design and/or appraise communication content. It also demonstrates the way that framing theory can be used in conjunction with other perspectives to help facilitate the investigation of different communication phenomena. This dissertation has combined both framing theory with a cultural framework (emic/etic approach) to generate a culture frames model that is useful in assessing the preferred frames of Latino subgroups in the state of Florida regarding the issue of healthcare coverage in America. This complex analytical model was also used to ascertain the frames regarding this issue that were incorporated into public relations strategies that targeted the Latino community to encourage them to become more politically active.

This current research provides framing research with a new context to test this theory. The result has been a set of findings that confirm the power of this research paradigm to help understand the meaning of communication by individuals, groups and organizations. Additionally, this dissertation shows the way that framing can be used as an assessment tool to identify the general and specific meaning of communication messages. Finally, this study demonstrates the interdisciplinary character of the framing perspective as it is imported into a complex communication milieu in the current research that incorporates political, cultural, interpersonal, public relations, and mass communications components, which come together to create a challenging environment to test the framework.

The emic and etic approach was also introduced in this dissertation in an analytical form. This approach helps identify and sort frames based on varying degrees of meaning and functionality. This component of the model proposed in this dissertation is also a new development in the application of the framing paradigm in public relations and mass
communication. The emic and etic approach enhances the ability of practitioners to
distinguish between frames by focusing on both their meaning and functionality. There
are no previous studies that have combined the framing and emic/etic paradigms to study
communication targeting ethnic minorities or focusing on the issue of healthcare
coverage in America. In this and other ways this dissertation presents a unique study that
is the first of its type.

Limitations

Like all research, this dissertation is not without limitations. One of the limitations
of this research is evident in the small number of communications examined for each
campaign. For purposes of conducting the most rigorous possible research, a larger
sample of perhaps 100 communications per campaign would have been preferred. Also, a
larger size of communications from each campaign may have resulted in a larger pool of
healthcare-related communications to be content analyzed than the 60 communications
included in this analysis that had this issue as the main topic. It should be said, however,
that with the sample size of 125 communications and more than 60 healthcare-related
articles, a reasonable degree of saturation was achieved as the researcher would reach a
point where the communications from a particular campaign were continually falling
within a limited number of frames.

Another limitation of this research deals with the reliance on materials downloaded
from campaign Web sites. Although a great deal of the communications content analyzed
consisted of public communications that were aired either on television or radio or
published in periodicals, others were not and they were taken directly from the campaign
Web site. Additionally, Colombian, Cuban, and Puerto Rican Americans are among the
largest Latino subgroups in the state of Florida. However, a sample of respondents that is
more representative of the macro situation in the United States, would need to also include Mexican Americans. Mexican Americans represent two-thirds of the Latinos in the United States, and any study of Latinos at that level must include representatives from this ethnic subgroup. The gender dynamic in the sample of interview respondents is another potential limitation of this study. It is difficult to ascertain the impact that having only one Puerto Rican-American male and one Cuban-American female may have had on the frames identified for these particular subgroups. A more balanced gender distribution among Latino subgroups might have resulted in different frames for these subgroups. Furthermore, the use of telephone technology to conduct four of the 21 interviews might have also had an impact on the findings in this dissertation.

Finally, a limitation of this study is its timeframe. The political and communitarian campaign communications that were content analyzed were collected almost entirely before and during the 2004 U.S. presidential election. The in-depth interviews with Colombian, Cuban, and Puerto Rican Americans were conducted between five and six months later. One of the main assumptions made in this dissertation is that not much would have changed in the experiences of Americans regarding the issue of access to healthcare coverage between April of 2004 and April of 2005. No major legislation has been passed addressing the issue during the timeframe that the current research took place. Also, there has been no major dialogue by either of the two major parties that could have changed public perceptions about the issue since the November, 2004 election. While this is recognized as a potential limitation because of its possible implications for validity, it is not considered to be a critical factor.
Suggestions for Future Research

This dissertation offers insight into the key frames used by public relations strategies targeting Latinos in the key swing state of Florida during the 2004 U.S. presidential election. It also identifies the key referential frames used by Latino-subgroup members, specifically Colombian, Cuban, and Puerto Rican Americans. The differences and similarities between these frames were explored using both framing theory and an emic and etic cultural approach. The nature of this research was purely exploratory and sought to understand and describe the different frames involved in discussing the issue of healthcare in America. In addition to the identification and discussion about the key healthcare frames used, this dissertation also provides an argument regarding the implications of these findings for both research and practice in the public relations field. The implications for the field of mass communication in general are also examined. The potential impact of these findings on future public relations campaign strategies that seek to do nation/community building are also considered.

Based on these findings, future research could utilize the specific frames generated in this research, regarding the healthcare issue, in content analysis of public relations strategies in the future. Utilizing these key frames from political campaigns, communitarian campaigns and specific Latino-subgroup frames could propel this research beyond the realm of exploration and perhaps be used to develop hypotheses that can be tested in future studies. Also, future research can adopt a more deductive approach than the one utilized in this dissertation and import these frames into new cultural milieu such as other Latino subgroups or explore trends among African Americans, Asian Americans, and Arab Americans to see if these healthcare frames hold when tested using members of different minority groups as well as their ethnic-specific media.
Research that seeks to expand on the findings of the current dissertation may also use the proposed model to explore the framing of other important issues to Latinos in the United States such as employment, immigration, the economy, and education. Future research may also explore the impact of generational differences among Latinos on their framing decisions of important issues. The current research has included first and second-generation Latinos among the respondents. However, using a design that is more focused on generational gaps may prove to be a useful heuristic in understanding the role this phenomenon plays in developing frames preferences. In addition to diversity of topic and age among Latinos in future research, perhaps a greater focus on their “status” as legal or illegal aliens in the United States may provide further understanding of this topic.

Another way to use these findings in the future can consist of incorporating some of the key components of frames identified such as the power relations explicit or implied in each frame as well as the key language and catchphrases used, into more structured interviewing methods such as a public opinion polls. This would provide a quantitative mechanism to test these components and could result in generalizable data useful to public relations practitioners in their decision making. Future research may also explore the ideas of inter-media competition and information subsidies as they apply to the use of mass communication mechanisms and the framing of these mechanisms to improve the condition of minority communities in the United States and around the world.

This dissertation and these suggestions represent an ambitious agenda that can be pursued if practitioners wish to adopt a model with pragmatic and politico-economic implications. It is the researcher’s hope that the model proposed in this dissertation will be used to generate a consistent stream of research that will go beyond the superficial
analysis of communication content and that will attend to the greater social problems deeply affecting our lives and our communities. This dissertation represents a sincere effort to help move the field of public relations closer to that goal.
APPENDIX A
QUESTIONNAIRE GUIDES

Questionnaire Guide: English Version

Individual Hispanics/Latino Questionnaire Guide for Doctoral Dissertation
Revised 4/30/05

[Test recorder and tape (please state your name and occupation) then proceed.]
Thank you for participating in this study. During this interview you’ll have the
opportunity to share some of your experiences and opinions about the 2004 presidential
election and comment on the issues that were most important to you. You will also have
the opportunity to share the critical factors that influenced your decisions to participate or
not participate in the 2004 presidential election. I encourage you to be as candid as
possible about your feelings, reactions, views and opinions during this interview. There
are no wrong answers. The goal of this study is to understand the true and honest
experience and opinions of Hispanics/Latinos in the state of Florida about these issues.
I’d also like to remind you that only your experiences will be included in the report. Your
identity will remain confidential for purposes of this study. Do you have any questions
before we start? Ok, let’s start talking about your experience.

First, we’ll start with some basic screening questions to make sure you meet the criteria
set for this study.

Demographics and Ethnic Identifiers

Are you eligible to vote in the U.S.?

Are you registered to vote?

When did you register?

Why did you register to vote?

Why didn’t you register to vote?

Were you born in the U.S. or back in ________?

Are you an U.S. citizen?

Were you born a U.S. citizen or are you a naturalized citizen?
If you were born in the U.S., what is the last member of your family to be born back in his/her/their nation(s) of origin?

Do you identify yourself mostly as an American or as a Hispanic/Latino (subgroup Latino) or some combination of these? (Cultural heritage)

Do you identify with the ethnic identifier “Latino (a)” or “Hispanic”? Why?

What race do you consider yourself to be? White, Black, Mestizo, Mulato other?
What percentage of your identity would you assign as American and what percent would you say is Hispanic/Latino or some other ethnic origin?

What is the language you speak most at home?

What is the language you speak most with close relatives such as parents, spouse or children?

What is the language you speak most with friends?

What is the language you speak most at school or at work?

What city do you live in permanently?

Now, I’d like to hear about your previous involvement in political activities.

**Previous presidential election voting behavior**

How much attention would you say you pay to elections politics? [Probe in terms of hours/day and hours/week spent reading, watching listening to election news or discussion election politics with others]

How much attention would you say you pay to government activities in general? [Probe in terms of hours/day and hours/week] [Probe in terms of hours/day and hours/week spent reading, watching, listening to election news or discussion election politics with others]

Tell me about your general opinion about the importance of voting in presidential elections.

Have you ever voted in a presidential election in the U.S.?
   [If yes] Tell me about your most recent experience.
   [If no] Why not?

Did you vote in the recent presidential election of 2004?
   [If yes] Tell me about that experience.
Did you/do you ever vote back in your country of origin in a presidential election?
   [If yes] Tell me about your most recent experience.
   [If no] Why not?

What would you say is the value of voting in presidential elections among members of your family?

What would you say is the value of voting in presidential elections among members of your community?

Does your nation of origin allow you to have dual citizenship so that you can participate in U.S. politics?
   [If yes] How do you feel about that decision by the government of (nation)?
   [If no] Would you like to have that opportunity? Why? Why not?

Based on your experience, do you think political leaders are interested in the problems of particular concern to (Hispanics/Latinos) living in the state of Florida? Why?

Regardless of how you may have voted in the past, please tell me which of the two dominant parties (Democrat or Republican) do you think has more concern for Hispanics/Latinos in general or do you believe there is no difference at all? Why?

Now let’s talk about some other forms of participation in civic life.

Other forms of political behavior during 2004 presidential elections

Did you attend a public meeting or demonstration in your community during the 2004 U.S. presidential election?
   [If yes] Tell me about that experience.
   [If no] Why not?

Did you attend a political party, meeting, rally or function in your community during the 2004 U.S. presidential election?
   [If yes] Tell me about that experience.
   [If no] Why not?

Did you volunteer with an organization last year to promote voting in your community?
   [If yes] Tell me about that experience.
   [If no] Why not?

Did you volunteer with a presidential campaign during the election of 2004?
   [If yes] Tell me about that experience.
   [If no] Why not?
Did you make any financial contributions to a candidate or party during last year’s presidential election?

[If yes] Tell me about that experience.
[If no] Why not?

How large would you say your contribution was in relation to your household income? Would you say it was an insignificant, somewhat significant or very significant contribution?

Did you contact an elected official during last year’s election season?

[If yes] Tell me about that experience.
[If no] Why not?

Did you write a letter to the editor of your favorite print publication during last year’s election season?

[If yes] Tell me about that experience.
[If no] Why not?

Did you wear a campaign button, put a bumper sticker on your car or display a sign on your property during last year’s presidential election season?

[If yes] Tell me about that experience.
[If no] Why not?

**PR Campaign Message Exposure**

In what language are the news programs you consume the most?

What about TV?

What about radio?

What about print (newspapers and magazines) sources?

What about the online sources?

Any other format?

[If difference in language orientation of source probe for cause for difference in language orientation]

Now, let’s talk about the kinds of messages that you might have heard during the 2004 presidential elections. This is where you get to tell me if there were any particular messages that aimed to encourage you to vote that may have impacted you or that caught your attention last year.
Do you recollect any key messages that encouraged you to become more politically active by registering or by voting in last year’s presidential election?

What do you remember about those messages?

Who were the sponsors of those message(s)?

Information from the English/Spanish Media

Discussions about information in Print/TV/Radio/Internet/Interpersonal

Influence by Friends/Family/Co-worker/Volunteer

Information from Community/Florida Organization

What was your reaction to the message(s) that encouraged you to become more politically active?

What was your reaction to the message(s) that encouraged you to register and vote?

What do you think was the reaction of others in the Hispanic/Latino community to this call to become more politically active and register to vote?

Would you recommend to a friend or family member that they register to vote and become more politically active? (Interpersonal component)

[If yes] Why?
[If no] Why not?

Are you familiar with the registration and GOTV efforts targeting Hispanics/Latinos in the state of Florida coordinated by the South Western Voter Registration Education Program (SVREP)?

What can you tell me about these efforts?

Are you familiar with the registration and GOTV efforts targeting Hispanics/Latinos in the state of Florida coordinated by the League of United Latin American Citizens’ (LULAC)?

What can you tell me about these efforts?

Are you familiar with voter registration or GOTV efforts by any other community, government, religious or media organization that targeted Hispanics/Latinos in your community?

What can you tell me about these efforts?
Who do you think should be responsible for these voter registration and GOTV drives? (Political parties, political campaigns, corporations, churches, schools or other institutions)

Let’s discuss some of the issues that influenced your decisions about participating in the electoral process in 2004.

Important Issues

What were the most important issues on your mind during the 2004 presidential election? (Salience of issues) Why?

What are some of the most important issues or concerns affecting your community (Colombian, Cuban or Puerto Rican) today?

Please describe the impact or non-impact of the following issues on: you [pause], your family [pause], and your community? (individualistic/collectivistic)

You: Education, jobs, the economy, war in Iraq, terrorism, healthcare, immigration, tax cuts, others.

Your family: Education, jobs, the economy, war in Iraq, terrorism, healthcare, immigration, tax cuts, others.

Your community: Education, jobs, the economy, war in Iraq, terrorism, healthcare, immigration, tax cuts, others.

What were the issues you considered to be less important during the 2004 presidential elections? (Exclusion/inclusion framing) Why?

Now let’s discuss a specific issue: Healthcare.

As you may know there was a lot of discussion about the spiraling cost of healthcare in America as well as the issue of access to quality healthcare in the country during last year’s election season. This discussion was lead by the candidates, the media as well as community organizations.

Healthcare

[If responded yes to healthcare as an important issue read this question] You mentioned earlier that healthcare was an important issue to you during the 2004 presidential election. Could you please elaborate?

[If responded no to healthcare as an important issue read this question]
Was healthcare an important issue on your mind during the 2004 presidential election in the U.S.? Why, why not?

What do you remember about the way Bush addressed the healthcare issue?

What do you remember about the way Kerry addressed the healthcare issue?

Do you feel like they addressed the issue to your satisfaction? Why?

What do you remember about any other views on the issue of healthcare that were offered by organization in your community or by the media during the 2004 election?

Here is a hypothetical scenario. You have been asked by your presidential candidate of choice to construct a message about healthcare to target your ethnic subgroup (Colombian, Cuban, and Puerto Rican) and encourage them to register and vote. What would that message sound like?

How would you use the healthcare issue to encourage a friend or any other relative to register and vote in future presidential elections? What would you say?

How would you use the healthcare issue to encourage others in your community to register and vote if the presidential election were held today? What do you think the main message should be?

_A few more questions on demographics and we’re done._

What is your age?

What is your occupation?

What is your religious affiliation?

How long have you lived in your community?

How long have you lived in the state of Florida?

How long have your parents lived in the state of Florida?

We’re done. Thank you very much for your time!
Questionnaire Guide: Spanish Version

Individual Hispanics/Latino Questionnaire Guide for Doctoral Dissertation
Translated 4/15/05 Revised 5/14/05

[Test recorder and tape (por favor diga su nombre y ocupacion) then proceed.]

Gracias por participar en esta entrevista. Usted tendrá la oportunidad de compartir algunas de sus experiencias y opiniones acerca del voto Hispano/Latino durante las elecciones presidenciales del año 2004 al igual que comentar sobre los asuntos de importancia para usted. Usted también tendrá la oportunidad de compartir los factores críticos que impactaron su decisión acerca del partido que apoyaría durante las recientes elecciones presidenciales al igual que los temas que le motivaron a participar o a no participar en las elecciones. Quiero motivarte a que seas lo más sincero posible con relación a tus sentimientos, reacciones, puntos de vista y opiniones durante esta entrevista. No hay respuesta incorrecta en esta investigación. El propósito es comprender mejor la experiencia de Latinos que viven en el estado de Florida con relación al voto y como toman decisiones electorales. También me gustaría recordarte que tu identidad permanecerá confidencial para propósito de este estudio. Tiene alguna pregunta antes de que comencemos? Muy bien, concemos esta conversación.

Primero, comenzaremos con algunas preguntas básicas para asegurarnos de que usted pueda participar en este estudio.

Demographics and Ethnic Identifiers

Puede usted votar en los Estados Unidos?

Esta usted registrado para votar?

Cuando se registro?

Por qué se registro para votar?—asuntos o valores

Por qué no se ha registrado para votar?

Usted nació en los EU o en ________?

Es usted un ciudadano de los estados unidos?

Usted nació siendo ciudadano o hizo la ciudadanía una vez llego a los EU?

Si usted nació en los EU, cual es el último miembro de su familia que nació en ________?
Cual es la heredad cultural con la que se identifica usted? Usted se considera Americano, Latino (o de un subgrupo Latino) o alguna combinacion de estas?

Que percentage diria usted que es Estadounidense y que percentage diria usted que es Latino o Hispano?

Usted se identifica como “Latino” o “Hispano”? Porque?

Cual raza usted se considera? Blanco, Negro, Mestizo, Mulato u otra?

Cual es el idioma que usted mas habla en su hogar?

Cual es el idioma que usted mas habla con sus padres o parientes cercanos?

Cual es el idioma que usted mas habla con sus amigos?

Cual es el idioma que usted mas habla en la escuela o en el trabajo?

En que ciudad vive usted permanentemente?

Ahora, me gustaria que hablara sobre su participacion previa en actividades politicas.

**Elecciones presidenciales**

Cuanta atencion diria usted que le pone a la politica electoral? How much attention would you say you pay to politics in general and government? [Probe in terms of hours/day and hours/week spent reading, watching, listening to election news or discussion election politics with others]

Cuanta atencion diria usted que le pone a las actividades del gobierno? [Probe in terms of hours/day and hours/week spent reading, watching, listening to election news or discussion election politics with others]

Cual es su opinion general sobre la participacion en las elecciones presidenciales?

Alguna vez ha votado en elecciones presidenciales en los EU? [If yes] Hableme de su ultima experiencia. [If no] Porque no?

Voto usted en las elecciones presidenciales del 2004? [If yes] Hableme de esa ultima experiencia. [If no] Porque no?
A votado usted alguna vez en elecciones gubernamentales/presidenciales en (pais de origen)?

[[If yes] Hableme de su ultima experiencia.
[[If no] Porque no?

Cual diria usted que es el valor que su familia le da al voto en las elecciones generales?

Le permite su pais de nacimiento que usted tenga doble ciudadania para que pueda participar en la politica de los EU?

[[If yes] Que le parece esa decision por el gobierno de______________?
[[If no] Le gustaria tener ese derecho? Porque? Porque no?

Segun su experiencia, le parece que los lideres politicos en los EU estan interesados en los problemas que afectan a los Hispanos/Latinos) que viven en el estado de Florida? Porque?

No obstante a como usted haya votado en el pasado, por favor digame cual de los dos partidos principales (Democrata o Republicano) cree usted que se ocupa mas de las necesidades de los Hispanos/Latinos en general o cree usted que no hay diferencia? Porque?

Ahora hablemos de otras formas de participacion civica.

**Otras formas de comportamiento politico durante las elecciones presidenciales del 2004**

Asistio usted a alguna reunion o manifestacion publica en la comunidad donde usted vive durante las elecciones presidenciales del 2004?

[[If yes] Hableme de su experiencia.
[[If no] Porque no?

Asistio usted a alguna reunion, rally o alguna otra funcion por un partido politico en su comunidad durante las elecciones presidenciales del 2004?

[[If yes] Hableme de su experiencia.
[[If no] Porque no?

Sirvio usted como voluntario con alguna organizacion para promover el voto en su comunidad durante las elecciones del 2004?

[[If yes] Hableme de su experiencia.
[[If no] Porque no?

Sirvio usted como voluntario con alguna campana presidencial durante las elecciones del 2004?

[[If yes] Hableme de su experiencia.
[[If no] Porque no?
Hizo usted alguna contribución financiera a algún candidato o partido político durante las elecciones del 2004?
   [If yes] Hableme de su experiencia.
   [If no] Porque no?

Con relación a su ingreso familiar cuál es el tamaño de su contribución? Diría usted que fue una contribución grande, moderada o pequeña?

Se puso usted en contacto con algún político durante las elecciones del 2004?
   [If yes] Hableme de su experiencia.
   [If no] Porque no?

Escribió usted una carta al editor de su publicación (periódico o revista) favorita durante las elecciones del 2004?
   [If yes] Hableme de su experiencia.
   [If no] Porque no?

Se puso usted un botón de campaña, le puso un letrero a un carro o a su propiedad durante las elecciones del 2004?
   [If yes] Que representa para usted eso?
   [If no] Porque no?

**PR Campaign Message Exposure**

En qué idioma son los programas de noticias que usted más ve?

   En la TV?

   En la radio?

   En la prensa (periódico y revista)?

   En la red mundial/internet?

   [If difference in language orientation of media source] Ask: Porque la diferencia en el lenguaje del medio?

_Ahora hablemos de los anuncios que usted puede haber visto u oído durante las elecciones presidenciales del 2004. Ahora usted tendrá la oportunidad de decirme si hubo/hubieron algun(os) anuncio(s) acerca de la importancia de participar en las elecciones que le llamaron a la atención._

Recuerda usted algún mensaje que le motivaron a usted a que fuera más activo políticamente a través de la registración y el voto en las elecciones presidenciales del 2004?
Que recuerda usted acerca de esos mensajes?

Quién patrocinó el/los mensaje(s)?

- Los Medios Inglés/Español
- Prensa/TV/Radio/Internet/Interpersonal
- Amigos/Familia/Compañero de trabajo/Voluntario
- Organización en Comunidad/Florida/EU

¿Cuál fue su reacción cuando usted vio/oyó/leyó información que le aconsejaba a registrarse y a votar en las elecciones presidenciales del 2004?

¿Cuál cree usted que habrá sido la reacción de otros en la comunidad Hispánica/Latina al llamado que le invitaba a ser más activo políticamente en el proceso electoral, a registrarse para votar y a votar?

Le recomendaría usted a un amigo o familiar a que se registre para votar? (Interpersonal component)

- [If yes] Porque?
- [If no] Porque no?

¿Está usted familiarizado con el programa de registración para votar y esfuerzos para salir a votar del South Western Voter Registration Education Program (SVREP) que se enfocó en los Hispanos/Latinos en el estado de Florida? ¿Qué me puede decir usted sobre estos esfuerzos?

¿Está usted familiarizado con el programa de registración para votar y esfuerzos para salir a votar de League of United Latin American Citizens’ (LULAC) que se enfocó sobre los Hispanos/Latinos en el estado de Florida? ¿Qué me puede decir usted sobre estos esfuerzos?

¿Está usted familiarizado con el programa de registración para votar y esfuerzos para salir a votar auspiciados por cualquier otra organización en la comunidad, del gobierno, religioso a algún medio de comunicación que se enfocó sobre los Hispanos/Latinos en el estado de Florida? ¿Qué me puede decir usted sobre estos esfuerzos?

¿Quién cree usted que debe ser responsable por estos esfuerzos que pretenden registrar más Hispanos/Latinos para votar? (Political parties, campaigns, churches, schools or other social institutions)

Vamos a discutir algunos de los asuntos que influenciaron su decisión durante el proceso electoral en el 2004.
**Important Issues**

Cuales fueron los asuntos o preocupaciones mas importantes que estuvieron en su mente durante las elecciones presidenciales del 2004? (Salience of issues) Porque?

Cuales son algunos de los asuntos o preocupaciones mas importantes para su comunidad (subgroup) estos dias?

Por favor describe el impacto o la insignificancia de los siguientes asuntos sobre: Su vida personal [pausa] sobre su familia [pausa] y sobre su comunidad? (individualistic/collectivistic)

Su vida personal: Educacion, trabajos, la economia, la Guerra en Iraq, terrorismo, cuidado medico, inmigracion, impuestos, otros.

Cuales fueron los asuntos o preocupaciones menos importantes para usted durante las elecciones presidenciales del 2004?  (Exclusion/inclusion framing) Porque?

**Ahora discutamos un asunto en especifico: Cuidado Medico en los EU.**

**Cuidado Medico**

*[If responded yes to healthcare as an important issue read this question]*

Usted menciono mas temprano que el asunto del cuidado medico en los EU fue uno importante para usted durante las elecciones presidenciales del 2004. Por favor explique que usted quiere decir con eso.

*[If responded no to healthcare as an important issue read this question]*

Considero usted el asunto del cuidado medico en los EU como uno importante durante las elecciones presidenciales del 2004? Porque, Porque no?

Que recuerda usted sobre las propuestas que hizo Bush para resolver el asunto del cuidado medico en los EU?

Que recuerda usted sobre las propuestas que hizo Kerry para resolver el asunto del cuidado medico en los EU?

Se sintio usted satisfecho con las propuestas que hicieron los candidates?
Se sintió usted satisfecho con la forma en que hablaron los candidatos sobre el asunto del cuidado médico en los EU? Porque?

Recuerda usted alguna otra propuesta u opinión expresada por organizaciones en su comunidad o por los medios de comunicación durante las elecciones presidenciales del 2004? Por favor explique?

Ahora le presentare una situación hipotética. Supongamos que su candidato presidencial de preferencia le pidió que componga un mensaje sobre el asunto del cuidado médico en los EU para una campaña publicitaria dirigida a la comunidad (Colombiana, Cubana o Puerto Riquena). El propósito de esta campaña es el de motivar este grupo a registrarse para votar en las elecciones presidenciales. Cual sería el mensaje que usted recomendaría?

Como usaría usted el asunto del cuidado médico en los EU para animar un(a) amigo(a) o un miembro de su familia a registrarse para votar y a votar en futuras elecciones presidenciales en los EU. Que le diría usted?

Si las elecciones presidenciales fueran hoy, como usaría usted el asunto del cuidado médico para animar a otros en su comunidad a que se registren para votar y a que voten? Cual cree usted que debería ser el mensaje principal?

Ahora unas preguntitas sobre usted terminamos.

Cual es su edad?

A que se dedica usted?

Cual es su afiliación religiosa?

Cuanto hace que reside en su comunidad?

Cuanto hace que vive en el estado de Florida?

Cuanto hace que sus padres viven en el estado de Florida?

Hemos terminado. Muchas gracias por su tiempo!
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1. Item No#: __________  2. Date Coded: _______________

3. Coder: 1. Belio (   ) 2. Lindsey (   )

4. Source (Political/Communitarian Campaign or Latino Subgroup)
5. Language:  1. English  2. Spanish
   8. Other ________________

6. Type of Communication content analyzed:
   12. Other __________

7. Main issue focused on:  8. Other issues mentioned or linked
to main issue:
   1. Employment
   2. Economy
   3. Education
   4. Healthcare
   5. Immigration
   6. War in Iraq
   7. War on Terror
   8. Taxes
   1. Employment
   2. Economy
   3. Education
   4. Healthcare
   5. Immigration
   6. War in Iraq
   7. War on Terror
   8. Taxes
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. Social Security</td>
<td>10. Social Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Medicare</td>
<td>11. Medicare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Medicaid</td>
<td>12. Medicaid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Foreign Policy Cuba (gen.)</td>
<td>13. Foreign Policy Cuba (gen.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Foreign Policy Cuban Embargo</td>
<td>14. Foreign Policy Cuban Embargo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. CAFTA</td>
<td>15. CAFTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. NAFTA</td>
<td>16. NAFTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Trade with Latin America</td>
<td>17. Trade with Latin America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Foreign Policy Other</td>
<td>18. Foreign Policy Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Abortion</td>
<td>19. Abortion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Environmental</td>
<td>27. Environmental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Small business</td>
<td>29. Small business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Parental rights</td>
<td>30. Parental rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Prescription prices</td>
<td>31. Prescription prices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Senior citizens</td>
<td>32. Senior citizens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Other _______________</td>
<td>33. Other _______________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hertog & McLeod’s “Multiperspectival Framing Approach” (2001)**

9. Core concepts – see definition page.

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

10. Peripheral concepts – see definition page.
11. Core Actors – see definition page.

12. Peripheral Actors – see definition page.

13. Master Narrative – see definition page.
14. Power Relations – see definition page.

Entman’s (1993) Functions of Frames

16. Entman: Problem Definition:
17. Entman: What is causing the problem?

18. Entman: What are the moral judgments being made regarding the problem cause?

19. Entman: What remedies or solutions are offered?
9. **Core concepts** – Are abstract and general notions that are pervasive throughout a given culture and may include a wide array of phenomena. They can include myths, narratives and metaphors that resonate within a specific or several cultures.


   **Myth**: A popular belief or tradition that has grown up around something or someone; especially: one embodying the ideals and institutions of a society or segment of society

   Ex: Washington couldn’t tell a lie; the American myth of Individualism

   **Narrative**: An account of incidents or events that is told in a specific form.

   Ex: Movie John Q as tells the story of a man who can’t get healthcare coverage for his son and his battle against HMOs, Cuban Missile Crisis.

   **Metaphor**: A figure of speech in which a word or phrase literally denoting one kind of object or idea is used in place of another to suggest a likeness or analogy between them.

   Ex: Describing a political election as a horse race; “drowning in money”

10. **Peripheral concepts** – Are more concrete notions that can be linked to core concepts within a cultural milieu. They can be linked more specifically to distinct groups within a broader cultural context.

    Ex. Equal access to healthcare, Freedom of speech, Equal wages.

11. **Core Actors** – Individuals, organizations, groups or institutions that played an essential role in issue(s) development in the narrative (i.e. offering a solution to, source of, representing a majority or key position on an issue or being an embodiment of the issue; being directly or most impacted by the issue).

    Ex. Ryan White is an embodiment of the HIV issue; Hillary Clinton proposed a Universal Healthcare plan as a solution to healthcare crisis in America; Pharmaceutical corporations are considered source of rise in cost of healthcare coverage; Paul Wolfowitz is viewed by the left as being the designer of the Bush preemptive doctrine; middle-income level Latinos are being directly and most influenced by unfair tax policies.
12. **Peripheral Actors** – Individuals, organizations, groups or institutions that played a less central role in issue(s) development in the narrative (i.e. contributing to the issue, having a less influential opinion regarding the issue; being indirectly impacted or less impacted).

Ex. The role of nurses in the increasing cost of healthcare coverage in America; John McCain is not viewed as playing a major role in deciding to go to war with Iraq; Pro legalization groups hold a minority opinion on legalization of marijuana; Latino children are indirectly impacted by high taxation of their parents.

13. **Master Narrative** – Powerful organizing devices that organize a large amount of disparate ideas and information.

Ex. Elian Gonzalez debacle in South Florida; Terri Schiavo.

14. **Power Relations** – The different power actors and their relations with equals or less powerful individuals, organizations, groups and institutions. The impact these power relations have on the actors involved (as in hegemony, liberation theology, anarchy).

Ex. Government suppresses the people; government empowers the people; corporations are in charge; corporations cannot be trusted; President leads Congress and the nation; undocumented workers are oppressed by their employers; liberal judges are legislating from the bench.

15. **Key words, language, “code” words, modifiers, catch phrases** – Strategically chosen words, phrases, slogans, themes and sentence structures that are used to provide meaning or symbolic representation of a topic in a frame.

Ex. The use of terms such as baby, abortionist, pro abortion forces, unborn in the pro-life frame or the use of terms such as fetus, doctor, woman and freedom for the pro-choice frame. Also, the use of terms such as voluntary personal accounts for the Bush social security reform plan in the personal accounts frame.
Translation of Bush TV Ad “Nuestro País, Nuestro Presidente” (Our Country, Our President):

President Bush, On-Camera: I am George Bush and I approved this message.

Announcer: It doesn’t matter where we came from or why we came. On this land we find opportunity, a better education for our children, medical care that our families deserve. We live in a country that has opened its hearts, it has given us a real opportunity. The United States, our country. George W. Bush, our President.


*Translation by the Hispanic Voter Project at Johns Hopkins University*

Figure C-1. Bush/Cheney sample communication 1
Jueves, 05 de agosto de 2004

Bush-Cheney '04 anuncia nuevo comercial de televisión en español

ARLINGTON, VA - Bush-Cheney '04 anunció hoy el lanzamiento del más reciente comercial de televisión en español titulado "Nuestro País, Nuestro Presidente". El nuevo comercial enfatiza el hecho de que el Presidente George W. Bush entiende la lucha de los latinos por alcanzar el Sueño Americano. El comercial será transmitido a partir de hoy en mercados selectos en Arizona, Colorado, Florida, Nevada y Nuevo México. Además de dos comerciales de radio, "Nuestro País, Nuestro Presidente" es el quinto comercial de televisión en español lanzado por la campaña de reelección del Presidente.


Guión de "Nuestro País, Nuestro Presidente"

Presidente Bush:
Soy George W. Bush y aprobé este mensaje.

VO:
No importa de donde venimos, o porque vinimos... en esta tierra encontramos oportunidad... una mejor educación para nuestros hijos... el cuidado médico que nuestras familias merecen. Vivimos en un país que nos ha abierto su corazón y nos ha dado una verdadera oportunidad. Los Estados Unidos - nuestro país. George W. Bush - nuestro Presidente.

Gráfica:
Presidente Bush
Nos conocemos.

Figure C-2. Bush/Cheney sample communication 2
Martes, 28 de septiembre de 2004

Líderes empresariales hispanos de Nevada endosan al Presidente George W. Bush

Las Vegas, NV - Hoy, Brian Sandoval, Fiscal General de Nevada; Otto Merida, Director Ejecutivo y Co-fundador de la Cámara de Comercio Latina; y miembros de la Junta de Directores de dicha organización endosaron al Presidente George W. Bush para un segundo término. Al hacer el anuncio, los líderes empresariales hispanos hicieron hincapié en el histórico de logros del Presidente Bush con la comunidad hispana y en su agenda para el crecimiento económico.

"La agenda del Presidente Bush promueve una sociedad en donde todos, incluyendo los hispanos, pueden ser dueños de algo. Gracias a las políticas del Presidente, más hispanos, mujeres y otras minorías son dueños de una casa o de un negocio", dijo Merida. "Mientras que el Presidente Bush ha sido claro y consistente en promover el crecimiento económico, el Senador Kerry tiene un plan para más impuestos y más gastos del gobierno que van a perjudicar a las pequeñas empresas".

Los empresarios latinos se han beneficiado de los recortes de impuestos del Presidente y se espera que el número de latinos dueños de pequeños negocios sobrepase los 2 millones en 2004.

"Las políticas del Presidente están teniendo un impacto positivo en la comunidad hispana - más pequeñas empresas latinas, más hispanos dueños de su casa, mejor acceso al cuidado médico y mejores escuelas son ejemplos de cómo el Presidente ha ayudado a los latinos a tener éxito", dijo Sandoval. "En contraste, John Kerry ha dado por sentado el voto latino y tiene un pobre historial de atender las necesidades de los hispanos".

Los líderes empresariales hispanos que endosaron al Presidente son: Malena Burnett de Amigo Services Scribes, Carlos Collado de MGM Grand Hotel & Casino, Leticia Gardea de Wells Fargo Home Mortgage y Sylvia Vazquez de University Medical Center of Southern Nevada.

(El uso del nombre de organizaciones es por motivos de identificación solamente y no significan un endoso por parte de las organizaciones mencionadas.)
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Nuevo Anuncio de Radio de Kerry-Edwards
La Comunidad Hispana Rechaza Anuncios Negativos

Para Publicación Inmediata

Washington, DC - La campaña Kerry-Edwards lanzó un nuevo anuncio de radio hoy contrastando los ataques negativos de los Republicanos y la visión positiva para el futuro de John Kerry.

El anuncio de radio "Respuesta" discute los anuncios de ataques políticos de la campaña de Bush que exageran, distorsionan, y lanzan acusaciones falsas que alteran la verdad y engañan a los votantes. John Kerry ampliará oportunidades educativas, proveerá asistencia médica económica y traerá un nuevo liderazgo para los Estados Unidos y la comunidad Hispánica.

"A diferencia de George Bush quien habló de ayudar a la comunidad hispana al principio de su término y falló repetidas veces, John Kerry luchará por los hispanos y todos los estadounidenses," dijo Fabiola Rodríguez-Ciampoli, Directora de Medios Hispanos para la campaña Kerry-Edwards, "John Kerry entiende y respeta la comunidad hispánica y lo va a demostrar con sus actos y no con frases vacías en Español."

"50-50 RESPUESTA"

MARI: ¡Ay... estoy furiosa Susana! Escuché otro anuncio de los republicanos y de Bush contra John Kerry y los demócratas.

SUSANA: ¡Sin vergüenza! ¡No entienden lo que son temas personales entre familia. Bush y los republicanos no quieren que salgamos a votar por eso hacen bromas para enojarnos. Son trucos sucios para espantarnos a que no votemos. Realmente no conocen a nuestra gente.

MARI: ¡Sí! Ellos hablan de valores familiares pero no valoran a nuestras familias porque no respetan nuestra cultura, religión y comunidad.

SUSANA: ¡Exacto! Bush y los republicanos atacan, distorsionan y mienten. Kerry y los demócratas dicen la verdad.

MARI: ... van a crear más empleos, mejorar nuestras escuelas... y reducir los costos médicos...

SUSANA: ... mientras ese Bush y los republicanos na’más ayudan a sus amigos en las compañías de seguros y farmacéuticos.

MARI: ¡Susana, tenemos que votar por John Kerry y los demócratas ahora!

Figure C-4. Kerry/Edwards sample communication 1
La Opinión, el Diario de Habla Hispana Más Grande de Estados Unidos, Endosa a John Kerry para Presidente

Para Publicación Inmediata

Washington, D.C. - La Opinión, el diario de habla hispana más grande de Estados Unidos, endosó hoy a John Kerry para presidente.

"Se hace necesario cambiar, y el Senador John Kerry puede guiar al país a salir del círculo de opciones limitadas donde lo ha puesto el Presidente George W. Bush," explicó el periódico.

El diario añadió que "John Kerry tiene la capacidad y el carácter para ser comandante en jefe y velar por la seguridad nacional ante las amenazas del terrorismo y las complicaciones creadas en la guerra de Irak. Un cambio de gobierno ayudará a dar vuelta la página y retomar relaciones importantes que pueden ayudar a estabilizar a la nación árabe. En lo interno, creemos que es posible proteger a la sociedad sin violar los derechos civiles y sin maltratar a los inmigrantes."

La Opinión fue establecido hace 77 años en Los Angeles, California y ha sido nombrado unos de los 100 mejores diarios de los Estados Unidos. Con 500,000 lectores diarios, y 1.2 millones de visitas diarias a su página de Internet (www.laopinion.com), es el segundo periódico más leído en Los Angeles, después de Los Angeles Times. El periódico ha sido honorado por su trabajo con diferentes premios de la Asociación Nacional de Periodistas Hispanos (NAHJ), la Asociación Inter-Americana de la Prensa (Inter-American Press Association), y la Sociedad de Diseño de Periódicos (Society for News Design).

El editorial completo de La Opinión está incluido a continuación.
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Translation of Kerry Campaign :30 Radio Ad “Noticiero”

MAN: In the four years since Bush promised to improve our country, one out of every three Latinos doesn’t have health insurance, almost half of our children don’t graduate from high school, and the Census reported that since we elected Bush, there are half a million more Hispanic children living in poverty. Does the President really know us?

WOMAN: He would if our community was made up of millionaires and companies like Halliburton. But George Bush has demonstrated that his values are based on his own interests, not in doing what’s best for our community.

MAN: As president, John Kerry will increase the minimum wage to $7 an hour, help one million students graduate in the next five years and wants all children to have access to health insurance. John Kerry is a man of honor and he delivers on his promises.

WOMAN: Like ours, these are John Kerry’s values. Vote for John Kerry for a better future.

JOHN KERRY: "I’m John Kerry, I’m running for president, and I approve this message."


Figure C-6. Kerry/Edwards sample communication 3
APPENDIX D
SAMPLE COMMUNITARIAN CAMPAIGN COMMUNICATIONS

HEALTH

According to 2002 Institute of Medicine report to Congress, access to quality health care is a problem for the vast majority of Latinos. Lack of insurance coverage, poor quality of...

Figure D-1. LULAC sample communication 1
care at public facilities, inconsistent relationships with primary health care providers, language barriers, and under-representation in national research programs threaten to harm the health and well being of a majority of Hispanics.

Latinos are less likely to have health insurance because their low wage jobs do not include health benefits. Latinos accounted for about 35 percent of the 44 million people without insurance. Although many Latinos live below the poverty line, they are not all entitled to Medicaid coverage because they are undocumented. Confusion regarding the 1996 immigration reform created problems for legal residents and their children, as well by making it unclear who was entitled to benefits. Even those Latinos, who are insured at the same levels as whites, are less likely to have a "consistent" relationship with their primary care providers, leading to poorer care. Latinos are also more likely to receive less desirable procedures, than non-Hispanic whites.

Latinos are at a greater risk to contract Hepatitis C, Diabetes 2, cervical, colorectal and lung cancer. Latinos represent 13.3 percent of the population, yet they account for 20 percent new HIV infections and 17 percent of deaths related to AIDS. The prevalence of AIDS in the Hispanic community is three times higher than among non-Hispanic whites. The impact on states bordering Mexico has been particularly strong.

According to the 2002 Survey of New Medicines in Development for Major Diseases Affecting Hispanic Americans, Mexican Americans are particularly at risk of experiencing strokes. Mexican Americans between the ages of 45 and 59 are three times more likely to have a stroke than non-Hispanic whites. Furthermore, the survey documented that Mexican Americans appear to have high levels of "bad" (LDL) cholesterol similar to those of non-Hispanic whites, higher levels of triglycerides, and lower levels of "good" (HDL) cholesterol factors that increase the likelihood for heart disease.

Figure D-1. Continued
Latinos are not sufficiently represented in clinical research trials, health care assessments, and have little access to telemedicine. Furthermore, there is an apparent lack of methodology for monitoring disease in the Hispanic community.

The Challenge

- How does the candidate propose to address disparities in accessing health care for Latinos?
- Does the candidate support universal health coverage? If not, how does the candidate plan to address the problem of low or inadequate health insurance coverage in the Latino community?
- What is the candidate’s course of action regarding HIV/AIDS education, prevention, and testing in the Hispanic community, particularly concerning at risk youth, women, and gay men?
- What is the candidate’s strategy to gain access to prescription drugs, vaccinations, and medicines for the treatment of chronic and life-threatening diseases prevalent in the Latino community?
- How does the candidate propose to bolster preventative measures in preempts illnesses associated with environmental causes?

Figure D-1. Continued
RESOLUTION 21: Health Care

WHEREAS THE LEAGUE OF UNITED LATIN AMERICAN CITIZENS (LULAC) supports the purpose of fostering and enlarging the opportunities for training, education, civil rights, job opportunities, housing, economic development, and welfare of all Hispanics in the United States; and,

WHEREAS, the new Medicare Interim Payment System for home health is having devastating effects on home care providers and patients alike, and;

WHEREAS, the Interim Payment System is reducing access to needed care, particularly for more intensive care need Medicare beneficiaries, and;

WHEREAS, the most frail and most vulnerable of Medicare beneficiaries are most at risk of being most negatively affected by the Interim Payment System, and;

WHEREAS, the Interim Payment System is creating inequities among states, for the most efficient home care agencies, for new providers, and for providers who have long participated in Medicare, and

WHEREAS, many Members of Congress, from both houses and both parties, are calling for solutions to these inherent problems, and;

WHEREAS, some Members of Congress have declared the current situation regarding the Interim Payment System as an emergency situation and acknowledged that mistakes have been made, and;

WHEREAS, some of America's most efficient and upstanding home care providers are on the brink of ceasing operations, and;

WHEREAS, the undersigned organizations represent individuals and agencies from throughout the nation that have identified the changing of the Interim Payment System as a top federal legislative priority this year.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the 1998 National Assembly convened in Dallas, Texas on the 4th day of July, 1998, urge Congress to repeal or make fundamental changes to restore fairness and equity to the new Interim Payment System for home health care within this legislative session.

Approved this 4th day of July, 1998.

Rick Dovalina
LULAC National President
RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, Latinos in the United States continue to suffer the effects of limited access to quality healthcare, and

WHEREAS, evidence of this is the alarming incidence of diseases among Latinos related to this disparity including diabetes, cancer, and HIV, and

WHEREAS, 150,000 Americans, including Latinos, die every year from medication errors and 1.3 billion people including Latinos are accidentally injured by medical therapy in the United States annually, and

WHEREAS, up to $75-billion in hospitalizations annually, including those of Latinos, are preventable because they result from the misuse of medicines, now

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the League of United Latin American Citizens, LULAC, the nation’s oldest and largest advocacy organization for Latinos, hereby supports Hispanic Community Development, HCD, a California-based Latino organization staging "Buena Salud", a National Latino Health and Technology Conference and Expo to be held in Los Angeles in 2002 to focus national attention on this Healthcare crisis affecting Latinos in the United States and to seek solutions through improvements in systems and technology, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, LULAC supports HCD’s call for public hearings to be held in advance of this Conference and Expo in select cities to receive public input and testimony on the serious effects of this discriminatory situation, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, LULAC supports HCD in the establishment of the National Latino Health Research Center at UCLA and either UTSA or UT Health Science Center in San Antonio, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, LULAC calls upon companies involved in delivering Healthcare to Latinos including pharmaceutical manufacturers and distributors, pharmacy retailers, hospitals, and other related business entities to dialogue with HCD and LULAC, to seek ways to improve their systems and procedures, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, LULAC calls upon the same companies to actively support, assist in funding, and participate in campaigns with HCD to educate Latinos of these Healthcare concerns.

Approved this 8th day of December, 2001.

Rick Dovalina
LULAC National President
3 Simple Steps to Get A Medicare-Approved Drug Discount Card

Different people have different drug needs and prefer to get their medicines in different ways. To compare cards and decide which Medicare-approved drug discount card is best for you, contact Medicare for help – either by calling 1-800-MEDICARE (1-800-633-4227), visiting www.medicare.gov or contacting your local State Health Insurance Assistance Program (SHIP). If you visit www.medicare.gov, you can use our Price Compare tool to help choose your card or you can download our Guide to Choosing a Medicare-Approved Drug Discount Card for more information. You can always talk to a live person at 1-800-MEDICARE to get the facts you need. To better serve you when you contact us, have the following information ready:

1. Your ZIP code,
2. Your medicines and doses (you can find this information on your pill bottles), and
3. Your total monthly income (if you are interested in the additional financial help available for people with Medicare who have lower incomes).

To help narrow your discount card choices, you can also tell us your preferred pharmacy, whether you are interested in low-cost or no-cost cards, and the names of any specific cards you want more information about.

If you call 1-800-MEDICARE, we will send you a personalized brochure that allows you to look at discount cards based on your drug needs and your preferences about how to get your medicines. You can use this personalized information to:

- Look at the prices being offered for all of your drugs,
- Look at the annual enrollment fee charged by card sponsors that provide the best prices on your drugs, and
- Look at the pharmacies that accept the discount card to make sure your preferred pharmacy is included.

We will also send you a simple enrollment form and tell you how to contact the card sponsors directly for additional information or to enroll.

Requests for information about the Medicare-approved drug discount cards are at an all-time high. We have increased the number of customer service representatives from 1,200 to 3,000 at the Medicare call centers to make sure we can respond to every one of your calls. We are taking other steps to help reduce your call time and to use our medicare.gov website more easily. The best days to call are Thursday, Friday, Saturday and Sunday.

Addressing Hispanic Disparities Among Latinos

By Mary Ann Gomez

The U.S. Hispanic population is now 42.6 million, which is larger than the total population of Canada (31.9 million) and more than twice that of Australia (19.5 million). Hispanics are faced with many challenges to access care and prescription drugs. One of the largest barriers is lack of health insurance. Findings in a study conducted March 2004, Survey Brief by the Pew Hispanic Center and The Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation found that more than 50% Hispanics in the U.S. do not have health insurance. There are those who assume that Hispanics are uninsured because they are not employed which is incorrect. Two-thirds of Hispanics who report being uninsured are employed (63%). Many Hispanics are employed by small businesses or are self-employed and do not have access to affordable health insurance. Twenty percent are homemakers or stay-at-home parents, 12% are currently unemployed, 3% are retired and 3% are students.

In the National Survey of Latinos in 2002 study by the same co-authors found that although many Hispanics do not have health insurance, they also experience other challenges such as delaying seeking care because of costs or getting needed health care services. They also reported having problems communicating with health care providers due to language barriers or getting care due to their race and ethnic background. Hispanics also have less access to medications. In a recent study conducted in February 2004, Genes, Culture, and Medicines: Bridging Gaps in Treatment for Hispanic Americans by the National Alliance for Hispanic Health and the National Pharmaceutical Council in February 2004, the findings revealed significant disparities in access, quantity and quality of pharmaceutical care. If they do have access, they are less likely to get newer state-of-the-art medications. There are also differences in how medicines are metabolized which may be due to variations in genes regulating drug metabolism, environmental factors, or their interaction. The study also found that language barriers and differences in cultural values can have an impact on the quality of care delivered and can negatively influence medication compliance, self-management of chronic diseases, and overall health outcomes for many Hispanic patients.

All the studies make several similar recommendations but the 2002 National Survey of Latinos argues for a more dynamic approach in regard to Hispanics because this is a population undergoing constant change due to the processes of assimilation and immigration taking place side by side in communities. Recommendations include:

- Meet quality standards of cultural proficiency and communication
- Improve access to pharmaceutical therapies
- Treat coexisting conditions

For more information on PHRMA contact Mary Ann Gomez, maryann@gomezcommunications.com.
Interview with: 52 year old Colombian-American male who is a chemical engineer and lives in South Florida.

B = Interviewer

A= Respondent

Date Conducted: 5/12/05  8:01 a.m.

Gracias por participar en esta entrevista. Usted tendra la oportunidad de compartir algunas de sus experiencias y opiniones acerca del voto Hispano/Latino durante las elecciones presidenciales del ano 2004 al igual que comentar sobre los asuntos de importancia para usted. Usted tambien tendra la oportunidad de compartir los factores criticos que impactaron su decision acerca de el partido que apoyaria durante las recientes elecciones presidenciales al igual que los temas que le motivaron a participar o a no participar en las elecciones. Quiero motivarte a que seas lo mas sincero possible con relacion a sus sentimientos, reacciones, puntos de vista y opiniones durante esta entrevista. No hay respuesta incorrecta en esta investigacion. El proposito es comprender mejor la experiencia de Latinos que viven en el estado de Florida con relacion al voto y como toman decisiones electorales. Tambien me gustaria recordarle que su identidad permanecera confidencial para proposito de este estudio. Tiene alguna pregunta antes de que comencemos? Muy bien, concemos esta conversacion.

Primero, comenzaremos con algunas preguntas basicas para asegurarnos de que usted pueda participar en este estudio.

**Demographics and Ethnic Identifiers**

B: Puede usted votar en los Estados Unidos?

A: No.

B: Esta usted registrado para votar?

A: No.
B: Usted nació en los EU o en Colombia?

A: Nací en Bogotá Colombia.

B: Es usted un ciudadano de los estados unidos?

A: No.

B: ¿Cuál es la heredad cultural con la que se identifica usted? Usted se considera Americano, Latino (o de un subgrupo Latino) o alguna combinación de estas?

A: Hispano.

B: ¿Cuál raza usted se considera? Blanco, Negro, Mestizo, Mulato u otra?

A: Blanco.

B: ¿Cuál es el idioma que usted más habla en su hogar?

A: Espanol.

B: ¿Cuál es el idioma que usted más habla con sus padres o parientes cercanos?

A: Espanol.

B: ¿Cuál es el idioma que usted más habla con sus amigos?

A: Espanol.

B: ¿Cuál es el idioma que usted más habla en la escuela o en el trabajo?

A: Ingles.

B: En qué ciudad vive usted permanentemente?

A: Henry County, Clewiston, Florida, 33440.

B: Ahora, me gustaría que hablara sobre su participación previa en actividades políticas.

**Elecciones presidenciales**

B: Cuánta atención diría usted que le pone a la política electoral? How much attention would you say you pay to politics in general and government? [Probe in terms of hours/day and hours/week spent reading, watching, listening to election news or discussion election politics with others]
A: Basicamente en esa epoca estoy muy atento a la situacion politica. Unas tres horas al dia.

B: Cuanta atencion diria usted que le pone a las actividades del gobierno? [Probe in terms of hours/day and hours/week spent reading, watching, listening to election news or discussion election politics with others]

A: Como una hora al dia leyendo el periodico y viendo la television.

B: Cual es su opinion general sobre la participacion en las elecciones presidenciales?

A: Yo creo que el Latino ya esta muy presente en las cuestiones de politica del pais porque definitivamente nosotros tenemos una gran influencia en el desarollo del pais y debemos tener mucha participacion en ellos.

B: Cual diria usted que es el valor que su familia le da al voto en las elecciones generales?

A: Bueno las personas que conozco le dan un valor muy bajo a las elecciones y mas los que son Latinos. Son gente que viven agenos a la politica de este pais. Estan participando en la vida de este pais, pero es muy pobre la participacion que estamos teniendo.

B: Segun su experiencia, le parece que los lideres politicos en los EU estan interesados en los problemas que afectan a los Hispanos/Latinos) que viven en el estado de Florida? Porque?

A: Pues realmente muy poco, solamente ellos hacen alguna manifestacion cuando estan en las elecciones porque saben que los Latinos tienen un poder de decision. Pero basicamente no hay una Buena accion de los politicos hacia los Latinos.

B: Diria usted que ellos se preocupan solo por el voto de los Latinos?

A: Yo diria que si que esa es la tendencia de ellos.

B: Se refiere a todos los politicos en general o solo a los de la Florida?

A: A todos en general. Ya hay mucha participacion porque de hecho nosotros somos una poblacion bastante grande. En la Florida hay una cantidad de personajes.

B: No obstante a como usted haya votado en el pasado, por favor digame cual de los dos partidos principales (Democrata o Republicano) cree usted que se ocupa mas de las necesidades de los Hispanos/Latinos en general o cree usted que no hay diferencia? Porque?
A: Yo creo que el partido democrata es mucho más sensible para, tiene más abierto las puertas para acoger las necesidades de los Latinos. Es un partido más general. El partido conservador trata de mantener un poco alejada las cosas foráneas y se ocupa mucho de proteger mucho la identidad del Americano. El partido democrata es mucho más abierto, un partido que da más participación a todos los Latinos y a todos los extranjeros.

B: Recuerda usted alguna instancia en el pasado reciente en el que usted haya visto una diferencia entre esos dos partidos?

A: De hecho ahora de la época de Clinton a la época de Bush se ha visto una Xenophobia hacia los extranjeros. Parece que los republicanos tienen una política en contra de la gente extranjeras.

**PR Campaign Message Exposure**

B: En que lenguaje son los programas de noticias que usted más ve?

A: Bueno yo uso los dos para ver los temas del país.

B: En la TV?

A: Ingles

B: En la radio?

A: No escucho mucho radio, pero escucho las emisoras de mi país por el internet.

B: En la prensa (periodico y revista)?

A: Yo leo la prensa de este condado y la noticia nacional y esta en inglés.

B: En la red mundial/internet?

A: También veo CNN en la red.

B: Algun otro formato?

*If difference in language orientation of media source* Ask: Porque la diferencia en el lenguaje del medio?

Ahora hablemos de los anuncios que usted puede haber visto o oído durante las elecciones presidenciales del 2004. Ahora usted tendrá la oportunidad de decirme si hubo/hubieron algún(os) anuncio(s) acerca de la importancia de participar en las elecciones que le llamaron a la atención.
B: Recuerda usted algun mensaje que le motivaron a usted a que fuera mas activo politicamente atravez de la registracion y el voto en las elecciones presidenciales del 2004?

A: Bueno asi en particular asi especial no, no me acuerdo.

B: Que recuerda usted acerca de esos mensajes?

B: Cual fue su reaccion cuando usted vio/oyo/leyo informacion le aconsejahaba a registrarse y a votar en las elecciones presidenciales del 2004?

A: Yo realmente hubiera querido participar en las elecciones. Y vi tambien que el mismo voto Hispano esta muy dividido tambien.

B: En que sentido?

A: Hay una division grande entre los Latinos. Que igual a los Latinos estan divididos en su concepcion politica. Hay mucha diversidad de opinion. Y nosotros conformamos muchos paises.

B: Le recomendaria usted a un amigo o familiar a que se registre para votar?

(Interpersonal component)

A: Obviamente que si claro y lo he hecho. Porque hay una necesidad de que le voto Hispano este suamando cada vez mas. La poblacion Latina esta creciendo y diferente y las decisiones que se estan tomando aqui en el pais. Mientras mas votantes podamos tener la situacion nos va a favorecer mucho mas.

B: Esta usted familiarizado con el programa de registracion para votar y esfuerzos para salir a votar del South Western Voter Registration Education Program (SVREP) que se enfoco en los Hispanos/Latinos en el estado de Florida? Que me puede decir usted sobre estos esfuerzos?

A: Si. Pero no recuerdo exactamente lo que hicieron. Solo recuerdo que tenian esa campana para los Hispanos.

B:Esta usted familiarizado con el programa de registracion para votar y esfuerzos para salir a votar de League of United Latin American Citizens’ (LULAC) que se enfoco sobre los Hispanos/Latinos en el estado de Florida? Que me puede decir usted sobre estos esfuerzos?

A: No recuerdo esta organizacion.

B: Esta usted familiarizado con el programa de registracion para votar y esfuerzos para salir a votar auspiciados por cualquier otra organizacion en la comunidad, del gobierno,
religioso a algún medio de comunicación que se enfoco sobre los Hispanos/Latinos en el estado de Florida? Que me puede decir usted sobre estos esfuerzos?

A: Si un grupo de Colombianos llamado CASA aquí en la Florida me llamo para motivarme a registrarme a votar.

B: Quien cree usted que debe ser responsable por estos esfuerzos que tartan de registrar mas Hispanos/Latinos para votar? (Political parties, campaigns, churches, schools or other social institutions)

A: Yo creo que basicamente los partidos politicos y las organizaciones Latino Americanas. No creo mucho que las iglesias se deben envolver en eso aunque si lo hicieron.

B: Porque no?

A: Esto hace mucho dano y tiene mucha influencia hasta el punto de haber afectado los resultados las ultimas elecciones. Yo vi como la iglesia le cambio la mente a mucha gente. Yo estoy en una area rural. Donde hay gente de mucha pobreza. Y gente de un nivel cultural muy pobre entonces vi como les fueron trabajando una campana contra un candidate, por estar disque promoviendo el matrimonio de homosexuales y por estar a favor del aborto cuando en realidad eso no era cierto. Se hizo una campana contra de la religion catolica que es la religion mas comun en el pueblo Latino. Y vi como hizo efecto esa campana.

B: Osea usted noto que funciono?

A: Parece que funciono. Definativamente funciono.

B: Entonces a usted le parece que la iglesia debe permanecer fuera de esos esfuerzos.

A: Obviamente si.

B: Y que sip or ejemplo es una campana por parte de un ministro o pastor de una iglesia que no es partidaria y simplemente le dice a sus miembros "vayan y registrense a votar y voten su conciencia."

A: El problema es que deben recomendarle el voto pero no influir en la decision del pueblo.

B: Que tal los negocios? Deben ser parte de estos esfuerzos?

A: Claro deben motivar a que los trabajadores voten, pero tampoco deben influir demasiado, deben dejar que voten no deben coaccionar a ninguna persona a que voe de alguna manera.
B: Entonces usted cree que cualquier tipo de organización que se envuelva debe ser neutral, con la excepción de los partidos claro?

A: Obviamente.

Vamos a discutir algunos de los asuntos que influenciaron su decisión durante el proceso electoral en el 2004.

**Important Issues**

B: Cuáles fueron los asuntos o preocupaciones más importantes que estuvieron en su mente durante las elecciones presidenciales del 2004? (Salience of issues) Porque?

A: Mis preocupaciones personales?

B: Sí. Cuáles fueron los asuntos más contundentes en su mente durante las elecciones presidenciales?

A: Me habría gustado que se planteara el asunto de la intervención de este país en la política extranjera. Yo estoy absolutamente en desacuerdo con lo que se hizo en Iraq. Me parece que fue un error tremendo y un antecedente para este país. Éste es un mal presidente y está tomando acciones belic peace en contra de otros países.

B: Entonces la guerra contra Iraq o específicamente la política extranjera?

A: La guerra contra Iraq básicamente.

B: Que otro tema estuvo en su mente entre los principales el año pasado durante las elecciones?

A: Bueno también, la situación económica de este país. Que después del cambio de gobierno a cambiado tremendamente. El señor Clinton tenía una economía bastante fuerte y sólida y ahora las cosas han cambiado fundamentalmente. Inclusive el peso de la moneda Americana con respecto a otras monedas está muy pobre. La situación del país, es diferente la situación económica, comparado con la de hace seis o cinco años.

B: Cuáles son algunos de los asuntos o preocupaciones más importantes para su comunidad (Colombiana) estos días?

A: Bueno la comunidad Colombiana se ha ido desplazando hacia este país en busca de encontrar una situación porque no está pendiente a la guerra interna que nos ha sacado del país a muchas personas. La gente está muy preocupada por el arreglo de la situación de ese país. Esa guerra está alimentada básicamente por tres aspectos – el narcotráfico donde este país juega un papel muy importante porque en este país es que esta alimentando el narcotráfico, porque hay un alto consumo de la droga. Pero sin embargo la prohibición la mantiene en un alto precio. En Colombia se produce mucha droga y eso
nos ha producido un sin numero de problemas. El negocio sucio que hay detrás de la droga el cual nos ha causado problemas tremendous e internacionales.

B: Como esta afectado el Colombiano que esta viviendo en los EU?

A: No. A nosotros nos toco desplazarnos a vivir a otro país, porque alla es muy inseguro vivir ahora. Alla hay unos bandos criminales que son los panamilitares y los guerilleros. Los negocios principales de esos grupos criminales son el de la produccion de la droga. Y basicamente aqui no se hace nada por detener el consume y Colombia esta llevando la consecuencia de esta situacion.

B: Hay algun otro asunto que usted cree sea importante para la comunidad colombiana?

A: Si claro. La situacion politica y la situacion economica de este pais. Es una situacion bastante delicada, todo realmente originado por la guerra que, la economia se ha ido abajo tremendamente y no hay una esperanza de poder resurgir de esa crisis en que estamos. Hay problemas de desempleo no hay oportunidades de desarrollo en la parte rural. Hay muchas, muchas cosas.

B: Por favor describe el impacto o la insignificancia de los siguientes asuntos sobre: Su vida personal [pausa] sobre su familia [pausa] y sobre su comunidad?

A: Educacion.

Definitivamente es un tema muy importante, aunque de pronto a mi no me toca porque mis hijos ya estan educados, pero si veo que es uno de los factores importantsimos en este pais. Aquí hay una tendencia entre la juventud a estar muy pasiva, en muchos aspectos en la educacion no estan, la juventud que esta desarrollando ahorita y que va a ser el futuro de este pais, estan en una situacion muy critica sin educacion.

A: Empleos.

En el curso de estos ultimos anos el desempleo ha aumentado en el pais. Hay esos factores que que han contribuido como los actos terrorisas, pero se hubiera podido manejar de otra manera a como se ha hecho. Eso a generado un desempleo tremendo.

B: La economia.

A:

B: La Guerra en Iraq.

A:

B: Terrorismo.
A: El terrorismo es otro tema que es bastante delicado. El terrorismo se hace, es una de las cosas tremendas que tiene este país ahora. Pero si el país supiera manejar su política internacional, yo creo que podría disminuir la incidencia de terrorismo aquí en este país. Lo que pasa es que se esta haciendo equivocadamente.

B: Bueno realmente si este país debía estar más atento a atender sus cuestiones internas y no estar interviniendo tanto en las tomas de decisiones de otros países. Es lo que yo pienso que mas que todo es de tipo económico con el tema del petróleo. Y me parece que no esta bien. Eso se ha ganado el odio de muchas personas del mundo a este país. Eso no es bueno eso genera terrorismo tambien. Ese es terrorismo cuando los países se ven amenazados por un gigante que le esta invadiendo. Se hacen muchas cosas para combatirlo como en Iraq y se le llama terrorismo.

B: El cuidado medico.


B: Cuales son las condiciones que a usted le gustaría ver?

A: Bueno que las personas puedan tener acceso a un servicio de salud mucho más eficaz y mucho más económico del que se tiene ahora. Es muy costoso para tener un seguro de salud. Demasiado costoso.

B: Inmigracion.

A: Es otro problema gravisimo tambien. Es evidente que cada vez que se este aumentando la cantidad de gente aquí tambien se van aumentar la cantidad de problemas. Ese es una cosa cierta, pero, básicamente el que esta viniendo aquí es para trabajar, para salir adelante para aportar con sus actividades con su trabajo, apoyar para el desarrollo de este país. Este país debe tener una buena política hacia aceptar mas al imigrante; hacerlo sentir mas en su casa, mas propio de aquí a donde a emigrado y facilitar las condiciones para que se establezca y se acomode aquí en este país. Es básicamente este es un país muy grande. Aquí hay mucha. Hay una perspective muy equivocada.

B: Que me dice de los impuestos.

A: La clase menos favorecida economicamente, es la que está pagando altos impuestos. La clase alta esta pagando muy poquitos impuestos. Cuando se hacen liberaciones de impuestos los que se favorecen son los leones capitales, gente que tiene acciones en la bolsa, gente que tiene grande. Pero la gente común tiene una carga de impuestos bastante alta.
B: Cúales fueron los asuntos o preocupaciones menos importantes para usted durante las elecciones presidenciales del 2004? (Exclusion/inclusion framing) Porque?

A: Bueno se debatió mucho sobre la seguridad y la guerra y creo que no se debió debatir así. Se debió hablar del poderio que tiene este país frente al tercer mundo, básicamente es los que se habla. Se debe cambiar este perspectiva. Los EU debe darse a conocer por el aporte por la ayuda que le presta al mundo, no por como le está quitando al mundo su riqueza. Deben de cambiar un poco la concepción sobre eso – de ser poderoso sobre las armas sino por otro tipo de acción que tenga.

Ahora discutamos un asunto en específico: Cuidado Medico en los EU.

Durante las elecciones presidenciales del año pasado se habló mucho sobre la forma en que el costo del cuidado medico en los EU está subiendo sin control y sobre la importancia de tener acceso a buen cuidado medico. Este tema fue discutido por los candidatos presidenciales, los medios de comunicación al igual que organizaciones en las comunidades.

Cuidado Medico

B: Usted mencionó más temprano que el asunto del cuidado medico en los EU fue uno importante para usted durante las elecciones presidenciales del 2004. Por favor explique que usted quiere decir con eso.

B: Que recuerda usted sobre las propuestas que hizo Bush para resolver el asunto del cuidado medico en los EU?

A: Bueno, Bush tuvo unas propuestas para la gente mas o menos de edad, acerca del Medicare y fortaleció un poquito eso para ayudar a los ancianos y bajarle el costo de la medicina a los ancianos, pero en general no hubo una propuesta para la mayoría de la población en este país. No, aunque se hablo del social security, ya que hay una crisis tremenda en el social security, pero asi de cosas que aporten a la comunidad Latina, muy pocas cosas sobre la salud.

B: Que recuerda usted sobre las propuestas que hizo Kerry para resolver el asunto del cuidado medico en los EU?

A: Kerry también esta haciendo un emphasis en la, en el mejorar los sistemas de salud y ver un nivel de mayor participación en incorporar toda la gente que esta pues fuera de algun plan de salud. El estaba haciendo un plan para que la cobertura del sistema de salud fuera más amplio porque ahora en este país hay una gran cantidad de gente que no tiene acceso al sistema de salud. Creo que se debe tener un sistema como en otro países. Es una cosa más regulada la forma que se vincula un trabajador en una empresa, de tal manera que puedan estar amparado por un sistema de salud.
B: Se sintió usted satisfecho con las propuestas que hicieron los candidatos?

A: Si las propuestas no estaban mal, pero realmente los resultados es lo que no se ve en acción. Debe haber una forma para que todas las personas que estan habitando este país tengan un sistema de seguridad social y seguridad de salud.

B: Ahora le presentare una situación hipotética. Supongamos que su candidato presidencial de preferencia le pidio que componga un mensaje sobre el asunto del cuidado medico en los EU para una campana publicitaria dirigida a la comunidad (Colombiana, Cubana o Puerto Riquena). El proposito de esta campana es el de motivar este grupo a registrarse para votar en las elecciones presidenciales. Cual seria el mensaje que usted recomendaría?

A: Que debe haber una forma para que todas las personas que estan habitando este país tengan un sistema de seguridad social y seguridad de salud.

B: Osea usted le recomendaría al candidato que le ofreciera seguro medico a todo el mundo.

A: Si claro, obviamente.

B: Entonces, una de las preguntas que van a surgir es como se va a pagar por ese seguro medico, como le recomendaría al candidato que hablara sobre eso?

A: Bueno las empresas donde estan vinculadas laboralmente un trabajador pueden aportar parte de, pues una persona obviamente, un trabajador debe hacerlo, pero veo que no hay ese sistema aqui establecido para que cuando una persona se vincula laboralmente o de alguna manera a una institucion o alguna entidad nunca se le facilita tener acceso. Tiene que ser uno por su propia cuenta, entonces un seguro personal es muy costoso y cuesta mucho. Tambien deben vigilar de cerca el sistema de algunos medicos que es costocisimo. El mecanismo aqui es muy poco controlado. Un medico aqui casi, se vuelve un abusador traficante de la salud en vez de un medico. Incluso tratan de hacerse multi-millonarios en poco tiempo. Como se ven. Los medicos yo creo que abusan de esto.

B: Como usaria usted el asunto del cuidado medico en los EU para animar un(a) amigo(a) o un miembro de su familia a registrarse para votar y a votar en futures elecciones presidenciales en los EU. Que le diria usted?

A: Bueno si un candidato tiene un buen plan yo creo que tendría un echo tremendo en la comunidad porque eso es una de las grandes necesidades que tiene esta sociedad de estar amparados por un sistema de salud bien bueno y bien accessible y yo creo que ese es una buena bandera politica para que un candidate pueda tener una buena influencia en sus votos, aceptacion entre la poblacion votante. Si es un plan de salud que convenza a la gente de que si va tener asi le cueste un poquito pero que sea sienta que si tiene ese sistema de seguridad.
Ahora unas preguntitas sobre usted terminamos.

B: Cual es su edad?
A: 52 anos

B: A que se dedica usted?
A: Ingeniero quimico

B: Cual es su afiliacion religiosa?
A: No tengo. Cristiano.

B: Cuanto hace que reside en su comunidad?
A: 2 anos.

B: Cuanto hace que vive en el estado de Florida?
A: 8 anos.

B: Hemos terminado. Muchas gracias por su tiempo!
Colombian-American Interview 2

Interview with: Colombian-American male in his 40s who is a publisher and single father of two living in Central Florida.

B = Interviewer

F= Respondent

Date Conducted: 5/25/05  10:33 p.m.

Gracias por participar en esta entrevista. Usted tendra la oportunidad de compartir algunas de sus experiencias y opiniones acerca del voto Hispano/Latino durante las elecciones presidenciales del ano 2004 al igual que comentar sobre los asuntos de importancia para usted. Usted tambien tendra la oportunidad de compartir los factores criticos que impactaron su decision acerca de el partido que apoyaria durante las recientes elecciones presidenciales al igual que los temas que le motivaron a participar o a no participar en las elecciones. Quiero motivarte a que seas lo mas sincero possible con relacion a sus sentimientos, reacciones, puntos de vista y opiniones durante esta entrevista. No hay respuesta incorrecta en esta investigacion. El proposito es comprender mejor la experiencia de Latinos que viven en el estado de Florida con relacion al voto y como toman decisions electorales. Tambien me gustaria recordarle que su identidad permanecera confidencial para proposito de este estudio. Tiene alguna pregunta antes de que comencemos? Muy bien, concemos esta conversacion.

Primero, comenzaremos con algunas preguntas basicas para asegurarnos de que usted pueda participar en este estudio.

Demographics and Ethnic Identifiers

B: Usted nacio en los EU o en Colombia?

F: Naci en Cali Colombia.

B: Es usted un ciudadano de los estados unidos?

F: No.

B: Cual es la heredad cultural con la que se identifica usted? Usted se considera Americano, Latino (o de un subgroup Latino) o alguna combinacion de estas?

F: Hispano.

B: Usted se identifica como “Latino” o “Hispano”? Porque?
F: Con el termino Hispano. Entiendo que el termino Hispano es mas amplio. Muchas veces se asocial Latino America con Latino, aunque hay un poco de confusion con relacion a las raices Latina. Encambio Hispano se refiere a lo que son los Hispanos parlantes por ejemplo Espana que apesar de que esta en Europa esta incluido en lo que se conoce como Hispano parlantes. Es un termino mas aplio, no? De hecho pues aqui en los EU se ve mucho la convergencia de una cantidad de culturas y especificamente creo que lo que nos une a nosotros, como Hispanos en primera instancia es el idioma no? Y de ahí en adelante hay una cantidad de coincidencias y a la vez de divergencias y de pequenas diferencias entre una cultura y otra.

B: Cual raza usted se considera? Blanco, Negro, Mestizo, Mulato u otra?

F: Pues yo pienso que Mesitzo, De hecho el color de mi piel esta ahí en el centro y me siento igual que todos los demas. Para mi no es una parte trascendente. No me preocupa, nunca me ha preocupado mucho mi color de mi piel. Pero si me preguntas simplemente es obvio.

B: Cual es el idioma que usted mas habla en su hogar?

F: El Espanol. Hablo con mi hija en Espanol y afortunadamente mi hija tiene seis anos y habla muy bien el Espanol porque cuando estamos en la casa siempre hablamos Espanol. Ya cuando se enfrenta al mundo en la escuela pues que ya hable el ingles. Es vital para nosotros que se hable en espanol en nuestras casas para que nuestros hijos no pierdan, sobre todo los que han nacido aqui en los EU, como el caso de mi hija, no pierdan ese valioso tesoro que es la herencia que tenemos nosotros que es el idioma espanol.

B: Cual es el idioma que usted mas habla con sus padres o parientes cercanos?

F: El espanol definitivamente.

B: Cual es el idioma que usted mas habla con sus amigos?

F: El espanol.

B: Cual es el idioma que usted mas habla en la escuela o en el trabajo?

F: En mi trabajo tambien el espanol porque yo tengo un periodico Hispano y entonces tipicamente mis companeros y yo estamos siempre hablando en espanol porque es lo que tenemos que, es nuestro producto final. Nuestro periodico sale en espanol. Por esa razon siempre nosotros hablamos en espanol.

B: En que ciudad vive usted permanentemente?

F: En Ocala, Florida.

B: Ahora, me gustaria que hablara sobre su participacion previa en actividades politicas.
Eelecciones Presidenciales

B: Cuanta atencion diria usted que le pone a la politica electoral? How much attention would you say you pay to politics in general and government? [Probe in terms of hours/day and hours/week spent reading, watching, listening to election news or discussion election politics with others]

F: Yo hora por dia, en terminus del porcentaje o de horas que yo invierto, para estar al tanto de los temas politicos yo diria que un 30 porciento. Para mi es vital es imporantisimo. Yo creo que mas me atreveria decir que casi que un 35 o 40 por ciento es vital la parte politica. Pienso que lo que nosotros tenemos como Hispanos basicamente es una limitante en el ambiente politico, porque ya somos la minoria mas grande de los EU. Tenemos un poecentaje grande en cuanto a poder adquisitivo, pero todavia no tenemos una representacion, que realmente nos vale en cuanto a la toma de decisiones de este pais. Seguimos siendo relegados a un Segundo plano en cuanto a la toma de decisiones de este pais. De hecho solamente tenemos dos senadores Hispanos en los ultimos 28 anos. Solamente dos senadores un democrata y un republicano. Entonces eso es preocupante Entonces yo creo que nosotros como medio de comunicacion, tenemos el gran reto, la gran obligacion, de promover la gente que tiene la oportunidad y la capacidad que probablemente no la tienen todos, pero esa gran masa que tiene esa probabilidad de hacer uso de ese derecho, de alguna manera se debe exigir una representacion real, en cuanto a la toma de decisiones en este pais. Siempre le he dado importancia al tema.

B: Cuanta atencion diria usted que le pone a las actividades del gobierno? [Probe in terms of hours/day and hours/week spent reading, watching, listening to election news or discussion election politics with others]

F: Como te digo para mi es vital la parte politica por mi profession como periodista y publicador de un periodico. Y por el concepto que te acabo de hablar tan claro que para nosotros como Hispano, como unica posibilidad de que relamemos una verdadera presencia y una verdadera importancia en la toma de decisiones es el aspecto politico. Si te pones a ver en cuanto a musicos, cantantes tenemos gente que esta destacadas. Tenemos politicos digamos, hay muy pocos politicos pero en el cine en el teatro en la industria en la NASA, tenemos un cantidad de personajes Hispanos ocupando posiciones privilegiadas en una cantidad de posiciones independientes. Pero realmente los que toman las decisiones en este pais, la gente que toma las decisiones en este pais, no tienen la verdadera representacion porcentual que deberiamos de tener los Hispanos. Por esa razon seguimos practicamente relegados a un segundo plano en cuanto a la toma de decisiones. Yo diria que hasta un 35 por ciento le dedico a las noticias de politica.

B: Cual es su opinion general sobre la participacion en las elecciones presidenciaes?
F: Bueno pienso que por estas mismas razones que te acabo de decir y por un compromiso en cierta forma que es de todo medio de comunicación, bueno un gran porcentaje, se ha hecho una buena labor y se está tratando de concientizar a la gente de la importancia de votar especialmente los Hispánicos. Si vieras las estadísticas de las últimas elecciones, te vas a dar cuenta de que hubo un incremento serio y fue producto de una campaña pues creo que, muy activa y donde participaron medios de comunicación. Inclusive gobiernos. Específicamente un gobierno que había permanecido indiferente a las elecciones como es el gobierno de Puerto Rico en estas últimas elecciones comenzó a promover la participación urgente aquí en los EU, obviamente, pues de todos los Puerto Riquenos en la participación de las elecciones. Ese es un simple ejemplo de lo que ya todos los demás gobiernos, México, Centro América, Latino América que han empezado a enfatizar la importancia de los inmigrantes que representan un grupo super importante dentro de los ingresos de los países Latino Americanos como en México y Centro América. Hoy en día los gobiernos están conscientes de que los inmigrantes a los EU significan un porcentaje bastante valioso para la economía de todos los países. Por esa razón ellos están viendo que tienen que trabajar por y para esta gente que está aquí en este país enviando recursos que son valiosos para el desarrollo de estos países.

B: Que me dirías del valor que representa el voto en las elecciones presidenciales como individuo en los EU. Tu hablaste de lo que representa para los Latinos como grupo, pero que tal el individuo?

F: Bueno, yo creo que como consecuencia lógica e inmediata. Como te decía si yo como individuo no me concientizo de cómo me afecta el que las personas voten o no voten pues definitivamente pues creo que tengo un criterio muy limitado y de repente hace falta que todos nos concientizemos de eso. Hay gente que sigue pensando todavía que las elecciones no nos afectan, que eso no es problema de ellos alla de los políticos. Pero indiscutiblemente de eso todos somos tocados de manera claramente directa por esas decisiones. Es lo que estamos viendo ahora con toda la problemática que se desarrolló después del 911 – Las políticas que siguen implementándose, a los inmigrantes que no tienen estatus y también a los que no tienen estatus. Entonces indiscutiblemente de ese principio básico es importante que cada individuo se concientice de que como individuo sí es tocado por las decisiones que se toman en cualquier país y que sí no se participa en un proceso de elecciones, pues básicamente se está renunciando a ese derecho de pelear por sus propios intereses. Se están decidiendo cosas tan claras como el manejo de los impuestos, como el seguro social o sea, indiscutiblemente ese es nuestro más grande reto. Ojalá que todos nos concientizemos que cualquier proceso electoral nos va a afectar directamente como individuos.

B: Según su experiencia, le parece que los líderes políticos en los EU están interesados en los problemas que afectan a los Hispanos/Latinos) que viven en el estado de Florida? Porque?

F: Pues mira yo miro con gran satisfacción que esa clase política que venía flotando, diría yo, flotando en una inercia que aparentemente pareciera no terminar, ha llegado el momento que esta tocando el fondo y que realmente se han disparado las alarmas y
sencillamente saben que para poder ganarse el voto, específicamente que creo que es el tema de tu entrevista, realmente tienen que usarse cosas concretas y asuntos que estan afectando la comunidad Hispana realmente. Porque si no, definitivamente están resagados y no van a tener gran respaldo de la gente. Ahora lo mas importante de todo es que las elecciones, como te has dado cuenta en los últimos anos, específicamente aquí en los EU, se han decidido por una cantidad minima de votos. Lo que significa que el voto Hispano es radicalmente y claramente el voto que esta definiendo las elecciones en este país. Obviamente, es decir, ningún politico que tenga una mediana claridad mental puede esconder hoy en día, la importancia del voto Hispano. Los Hispanos en estos momentos somos concientes de esa capacidad de negociación, para usar un termino entre comillas, que tenemos. O sea tenemos que vender caro nuestro voto. O sea el voto nuestro vale. Entonces si yo voy a votar por alguien debo tener la certeza de que ese alguien va a hacer algo por mi, como individuo y obviamente como comunidad.

B: Te parece entonces que el interes de los politicos de atender a las necesidades de la comunidad Hispana entonces es genuino, o es totalmente debido al voto Latino?

F: Yo diria que, a ver, no se puede generalizar. Hay politicos de pronto tienen un interes genuino yo han mostrado atravez de su traeectoria. Pero para serte honesto, hablando de una forma general, yo pienso que hablando de una forma general, eso es lo que realmente ha hecho que el politico se empiece a preocupar por la problematica Hispana.

B: Cual de los dos partidos principales (Democrata o Republicano) cree usted que se ocupa mas de las necesidades de los Hispanos/Latinos en general o cree usted que no hay differencia? Porque?

F: No yo pienso que si hay una diferencia marcada atravez de la historia y ha sido corroborada en los ultimos tiempos. Sit u te pones a analizar la mayoria de los proyectos que hoy en dia estan rodando los pasillos del senado. Y las mismas directrices que estan guiando esta Casa Blanca. En America se puede hacer eso a diferencia de nuestros paises. El presidente Bush, practicamente puede hacer una recomendacion en uno u otro sentido en relacion a cualquier proyecto abierta y plenamente. Entonces, indiscutiblemente se ha visto que el mayor, digamos el grueso paquete de los lejisladores republicanos siempre se han caracterizados por tomar medidas mas radicales y muchas veces en contra de los intereses de los Hispanos. El real ID es una muestra y yo pienso que esa situacion va a hacer que en las proximas elecciones en los EU toman una ruta completamente diferente con relacion al voto Hispano, porque una cantidad importante de Hispanos seguian pensando, y se dejaron convencer de pronto de algunas ideas especificas en que se iva a recibir un apoyo del presidente Bush y del partido republicano y al muy poco tiempo de las elecciones ya se han visto posiciones fatales hacia la comunidad Hispana. El caso tipico Real ID, el caso tipico licencia de conducir, el caso tipico de una cantidad de medidas que se estan tomando en este momento y que se estan gestando en este preciso momento y que van en contradia radical, el caso tipico del gobernador, nuestro amigo el actor. Ha sido un desastre total. Yo pienso que dificilmente los Hispanos, después de lo que ha ocurrido en esa area especifica y en nuestro pais en general, van a volver a
cometer el mismo error de dar su voto tan fácilmente por un partido que tipicamente va en contra de los intereses de los Hispanos.

*Ahora hablemos de otras formas de participacion cívica.*

**Otras formas de comportamiento político durante las elecciones presidenciales del 2004**

B: Asistio usted a alguna reunión o manifestación pública en la comunidad donde usted vive durante las elecciones presidenciales del 2004?

*If yes* Hableme de su experiencia.

*If no* Porque no?

F: Yo asistí a algunas manifestaciones específicas, pero asistí como observador en ambos lados. La posición de mi periódico ahora mismo es una donde trato de mantener un balance. Yo trato de que el periódico mantenga la reputación de un medio de comunicación perfectamente neutral, aunque en este país es muy difícil ser neutral como medio de comunicación. Casi todos los medios de comunicación en este país están ubicados en una u otra línea, bueno y en otros países. Pero yo he pretendido que el periódico mío se mantenga en esa línea. Por eso eso talvez asistí simplemente como observador y no tome ninguna posición específica aquí, por lo menos abiertamente.

B: Sirvio usted como voluntario con alguna organización para promover el voto en su comunidad durante las elecciones del 2004?

*If yes* Hableme de su experiencia.

*If no* Porque no?

F: Bueno promovi el voto de una manera frontal, pero independientemente de ninuno de los dos partidos políticos atraves de la tribuna del periódico, através de la tribuna del periódico, através de las reuniones a las cuales fui, através de la organización Hispana donde yo participo.

B: La campana que generaste fue general o enfocando a la comunidad Hispana?

F: No. Enfocando específicamente a la comunidad Hispana.

B: Cual fue la reaccion que tuviste?

F: Pues mira fue buena, tuvimos muchas llamadas, tuvimos muchas respuestas. Hay mucha gente conciente. Bueno yo pensamos que, bueno yo pensaba que tuviera la claridad con ese tema. Pero se encuentra uno con que hay mas gente de la que uno cree que tiene realmente criterio bueno y por lo menos creamos una gran expectativa y una gran inquietud entre mucha gente y eso lo pudimos ver a través de las llamadas y a través de los emails que nos llegaron. Tipicamente nosotros presentábamos las dos caras. Eso nosotros lo veíamos en las portadas y todo inclusive a nivel local – el Sheriff del partido x y el Sheriff del partido y. Teníamos un espacio para cada uno de ellos y con los
candidatos presidenciales. Hablamos de sus campanas de sus posiciones. Siempre la hemos mantenido en esa línea – presentar las dos caras pero sobre todo hacer énfasis en la importancia del voto Hispano.

**PR Campaign Message Exposure**

B: En qué lenguaje son los programas de noticias que usted más ve?

F: En español.

B: En la TV?

F: Español.

B: En la radio?

F: Español.

B: En la prensa (periodico y revista)?

F: No. La prensa si supieras que 50/50

B: En la red mundial/internet?

F: También diría que un 40/60. 60 en español y 40 en inglés.

B: Algun otro formato?

F: No.

*If difference in language orientation of media source* Ask: Porque la diferencia en el lenguaje del medio?

Ahora hablemos de los anuncios que usted puede haber visto u oído durante las elecciones presidenciales del 2004. Ahora usted tendrá la oportunidad de decirme si hubo/hubieron algun(os) anuncio(s) acerca de la importancia de participar en las elecciones que le llamaron a la atención.

B: Recuerda usted algún mensaje que le motivaron a usted a que fuera más activo políticamente a través de la registración y el voto en las elecciones presidenciales del 2004?

F: En la televisión indiscutiblemente en la televisión Hispana vi varios mensajes en ese sentido. Sobre todo sabes que? Me llamo mucho la atención que las grandes cadenas de televisión como Univision, Telemundo empezaron a desarrollar a través de programas noticiosos y a través de programas de opinión, y entrevistas, empezaron a entrevistar
gente que te daban opinion y empezaron a tratar de ilustrar a la gente sobre la importancia del voto. Sinceramente me llamo mucho la atencion y creo no equivocarme en el sentido de que es una gran parte de esta union que hubo entre medios de comunicacion Hispanos atravez de todos los EU en cuanto a la promocion de la importancia del voto Hispano. Yo creo que hoy en dia yo creo que algo sirvio y ahí estan las estadisticas. Yo creo que eso es un motivador adicional para que en las proximas elecciones, los medios de comunicacion empiezen a tomar una participacion mas active. Y no solamente los medios de comunicacion si no la organizacion Hispana. Todos los lideres Hispanos, pues lideres religiosos por que no, ya que todos modos toman un partido en uno u otro sentido y creo que ellos, los lideres Hispanos especificamente en los EU, tienen mucho que ver en los resultados de las elecciones ahi, la problematica del aborto, y las celulas madres y todo lo demas.

B: Entonces tu crees que la responsabilidad de motivar y fomentar la participacion de los Latinos por medio del voto es responsabilidad de todos?

F: Definitivamente, los medios de comunicacion como tal tienen una responsabilidad extra, por ser eso como medio de comunicacion. Pero indiscutiblemente las organizaciones Hispanas, los lideres religiosos absolutamente todos tenemos que concientizarnos de que tenemos un compromiso y una responsabilidad.

B: Algunas personas que yo he entrevistado han tenido una posicion muy apasionada de que la iglesia no debe estar envuelta en estos esfuerzos de motivar a los Hispanos a votar. Asi que es interesante que tu mencionaste al igual que otros que yo he entrevistado, que los lideres religiosos deben motivar a sus feligreces a participar en la votacion presidencial en los EU. Mucha de la gente que he entrevistado me ha dicho que las iglesias tuvieron un impacto muy grande en influenciar al voto Latino. Que tu dices de eso?

F: No, definitivamente, fue un hecho eso fue algo radical. Y yo creo que desde ese puto de vista, si me parecio que hubo un poquito de presion mal sana en algun momento dado pero si se enfoca como dicen algunas de las personas en algun sentido de la palabra, que los lideres religiosos motiven a su gente a votar, a participar en un proceso democratico, a venderle la idea a la gente de la importancia de la democracia como tal. Avezes cuando se habla del voto se olvida el concepto basico del voto. El voto es la democracia. La democracia en si es lo que se debe fomentar para motivar al votante y la iglesia muchas veces, y por eso te digo quizas eso fue lo que ayudo a Bush mucho en muchos estados que es que son estados que tipicamente son conservadores. Entonces, era casi que una orden, no se puede votar por nadie que este al favor del aborto especificamente. No se puede tocar ese punto y hablan de ese candidato como si fuera el demonio. Entonces, casi tiene una obligacion cristiana o realmente de cualquier iglesia para no mencionar especificamente ningun tipo de religion pero casi que era una obligacion como miembros de una organizacion religiosa de votar en contra de quien estuviese a favor del aborto. Y vendian la idea de ese personaje como el mismisimo demonio que ha bajado a la tierra. Eso influyo muchisimo a muchos votantes y los lideres religiosos quieralo o no los lideres religiosos siempre han tenido en un sentido u otro mucha influencia. Una
influencia inegable y bastante decisiva, especialmente cuando se tocan temas tan radicales como ese. Como que el aborto era, por ejemplo, era casi como un mandamiento. Yo creo que lo que yo pude recojer y leer el tema era tan radical como eso. O sea si tu votes por alguien que este a favor del aborto te vas a condenar en el infierno. Así es.

B: Esta usted familiarizado con el programa de registracion para votar y esfuerzos para salir a votar del South Western Voter Registration Education Program (SVREP) que se enfoco en los Hispanos/Latinos en el estado de Florida? Que me puede decir usted sobre estos esfuerzos?

F: Decirte que estoy bien familiarizado con ella no. Quizas la vi pero familiarizado no.

B: Esta usted familiarizado con el programa de registracion para votar y esfuerzos para salir a votar de League of United Latin American Citizens’ (LULAC) que se enfoco sobre los Hispanos/Latinos en el estado de Florida? Que me puede decir usted sobre estos esfuerzos?

F: LULAC si.

B: Conoces los esfuerzos que hicieron ellos en la Florida?

F: si, si, si, claro.

B: Que me puedes decir de esos esfuerzos?

F: No solo en la Florida, pero básicamente esa es una de las organizaciones, de hecho yo participo en una organizacion Hispana, que mas miembros tiene.

B: Esta usted familiarizado con el programa de registracion para votar y esfuerzos para salir a votar auspiciados por cualquier otra organizacion en la comunidad, del gobierno, religioso a algun medio de comunicacion que se enfoco sobre los Hispanos/Latinos en el estado de Florida? Que me puede decir usted sobre estos esfuerzos?

F: No realmente no.

Vamos a discutir algunos de los asuntos que influenciaron su decision durante el proceso electoral en el 2004.

**Important Issues**

B: Cuales fueron los asuntos o preocupaciones mas importantes que estuvieron en su mente durante las elecciones presidenciales del 2004? (Salience of issues) Porque?

F: Mi preocupacion grande es, que a la vez que nosotros no participemos efectivamente en unas elecciones no podremos tener una verdadera representacion y nunca vamos a participar en las decisiones que se toman en este pais. El tema economico, la seguridad
fue uno de los temas. La seguridad interna y la participacion en la guerra no sea creo que compromete mucho los intereses de los EU. Desgraciadamente hoy los EU se estan vendiendo como el nino que muy poco quieren.

B: Hubo algun otro tipo de tema que influenciara tu opinion el ano pasado durante las elecciones?

F: Bueno la economia, la seguridad y la guerra. La situacion de los indocumentados tambien es una de las preocupaciones mas grandes para mi. La comunidad Hispana debe reclamar que vamos a votar por un presidente y esperamos el compromiso serio de que haga algo por eso. Esa quizas es la preocupacion mas importante para mi como Hispano.

B: Como Colombiano, cual dirias tu que son los asuntos mas importante para la comunidad Colombiana dentro de los EU?

F: Para la comunidad Colombiana dentro de los EU, a ver yo pienso que el estatus para la gente que no lo tiene y para el resto de Colombianos que de una manera u otra tienen la suerte de ya formar parte de un sistema, como se dice de EU fundamentalmente, impulsar el comercio y las exportaciones de nuestro pais, que tenemos una gran cantidad de riquezas y que yo creo que podemos hacer mucho mas por nuestros paises para fomentar la economia de nuestro pais. Hay paises que han sido mas agresivos y han tenido resultados muy buenos como el caso mismo de Centro America. Ellos se han lanzado a atacar el mercado Americano que obviamente es uno de los mercados mas grandes del mundo y creo que Colombia en esta area esta revolucionando, pero pensamos que los Colombianos de este pais tenemos el compromiso de luchar por el bien estar de nuestro pueblo.

B: Por favor describe el impacto o la insignificancia de los siguientes asuntos sobre: Su vida personal [pausa] sobre su familia [pausa] y sobre su comunidad? (individualistic/collectivistic)

B: Educacion.

F: La educacion es quizas la unica herramienta para tu poder tener una participacion en todos los aspectos economico, administrativo, politico por ejemplo. Si tu no tienes una buena educacion y no puedes formar parte de un aparato reproductivo, formar parte de aparato politico te vas a ver relegado a una persona que de repente es un numero mas en una estadistica y de repente no vas a tener ninguna opcion de progresar.

B: Empleos.

F:

B: La economia.
F: la economía mira que precisamente esta define el estatus en cuanto a calidad y al nivel de vida de la gente no. Pero precisamente la economía es la que puede permitir a la gente aspirar a una mejor educación desgraciadamente es así. Aquí la educación en los primeros niveles es completamente gratuita pero cuando ya tu aspiras a otro rol comienza a ser costosa entonces yo creo que. Sabes que en la Universidad de la Florida hay más de 4 mil hispanos. Eso es un síntoma de hay personas que han llegado aquí a asumir un rol netamente productivo. Tal vez porque no tenían un nivel educativo o quizás porque el nivel educativo que traían de su país no era suficiente. Pero ese sacrificio está comenzando a dar frutos y toda la gente sabe que lo primero que tiene que hacer es darle la oportunidad a sus hijos a ir a la Universidad para que puedan tener un futuro mejor. Y a la vez ese es el futuro económico de nuestra comunidad.

B: Tu estas vinculando aquí la economía con la educación.

F: Sinceramente si, yo pienso que mientras que la gente no tenga digamos el recurso para enviar a sus hijos a estudiar a otro nivel, es muy difícil porque cada vez inclusive hay personas que no tienen la opción de por ejemplo ir a la Universidad y ahora se están poniendo mas barreras porque sus padres no tenían estatus. Hoy en día es cada vez mas difícil. Hoy en día se le ponen mas trabas a los estudiantes que no tienen estatus para ir a las universidades. Y no es por capacidades porque muchas veces nuestros estudiantes hispanos, tipicamente son los que mas se destacan. Muchas veces son destacados entre el grueso grupo en los niveles primarios. Sin embargo, hay un nivel de tensión en las Universidades preocupante para nosotros los hispanos.

B: El cuidado medico.

F: Bueno es inegable que los hispanos siempre hemos estado, los que tenemos la oportunidad de trabajar en una compañía y tenemos estatus, entre comillas, estamos cubiertos, pero esa personas que están trabajando sin estatus, la situación de ellos es precaria y a raíz de toma de decisiones que estamos hablando de los republicanos donde a cualquier persona tenía derecho a una atención médica por el hecho de ser una persona, hoy en día, este concepto, lo están revalidando ciertos personajes a nivel de los personajes que toman decisiones y hoy en día practicamente ya da miedo ir a un hospital porque hay gente que prefiera casi que morirse en la calle que ir a un hospital porque si te atienden y todo eso pero ahí mismo te están deportando. Esa es una situación gravísima que tenemos que entrar a denunciar y que hay que hacer algo rápido en torno a esa situación porque todo eran conscientes de ese gran porcentaje de personas que no tienen una atención médica. Gente que paga impuestos entre comillas porque hay gente y hay patrones que aun un tenga una identificación que no es la que debes, te descuentan los taxes y todo esos pero esos taxes se van a un limbo, se pierden y esa gente no tiene protección médica. Y para acabar de complicar el panorama de los hispanos a nivel de atención médica en Colombia estamos viendo ya las últimas decisiones que se están tomando en algunos estados donde no se le da atención médica a los que no tengan estatus que eso me parece que eso va contra los principios básicos de la constitución de este país que ha vendido al mundo de ser el mas justo y el mas democrático del mundo.
Ahora discutamos un asunto en específico: Cuidado Medico en los EU.

Durante las elecciones presidenciales del año pasado se hablo mucho sobre la forma en que el costo del cuidado medico en los EU esta subiendo sin control y sobre la importancia de tener acceso a buen cuidado medico. Este tema fue discutido por los candidates presidenciales, los medios de comunicacion al igual que organizaciones en las comunidades.

**Cuidado Medico**

B: Considero usted el asunto del cuidado medico en los EU como uno importante durante las elecciones presidenciales del 2004? Porque, Porque no?

F: Sí. Porque la parte de salud es una carga grandisima para la mayoria de familias, especificamente para los Hispanos de una forma u otra nos vemos relegados a otro tipo de cosa. Ahora, el seguro social esta en tal condicion que Bush esta desesperadamente tratando de buscar opciones que todo se va ya es algo que no se visualizaba en este pais. Porque precisamente a raiz que todo esta toda esta cantidad que se esta gastando en la guerra en la intervencion tan giganteza que se hace en armas. Tu sabes que la industria de armas en este pais mueve mucho dinero. Si no hay guerra, no se vende y esta industria se acaba, entonces que pasa todo este dinero que se ha gastado aqui esta haciendo que los fondos que debia tener este gran pais para cubrir las necesidades de salud de este pueblo en este momento estan amenazados. Ya sabemos que a un corto plazo se van a quedar sin fondo la proteccion social y la gente va estar basicamente en crisis y la atencion de la salud, bueno yo te digo sinceramente en esa parte obviamente tengo muchas diferencias con Cuba y por su politica y eso pero yo te digo sinceramente que a mi me parece inconcebible que los costos medicos sean tan altos en este pais. Los costos medicos son exageradamente altos. Sera que faltan medicos? Habiendo tantos medicos en Sudamerica y en todas partes que estan practicamente sin empleo yo pienso que el gobierno Americano no van a permitir que, un medico en este pais es un personaje que puede tener un nivel adquisitivo giganteza por lo menos a cierto nivel de cirujia porque porque los costos de este pais sinceramente me parecen desproporcionados pienso que debe haber una revision de este sistema de salud de este pais.

B: Que recuerda usted sobre las propuestas que hizo Bush para resolver el asunto del cuidado medico en los EU?

F: Bueno el estaba proponiendo basicamente, hasta donde yo recuerdo el objetivo central de el, uno de los temas es la cuestion social. La parte social. En cuanto a la medicina el estaba proponiendo tratar de subsidiar las medicinas para la gente de la tercera edad y que se yo. Pero tambien sinceramente toda esa plataforma que se estaba planteando, yo oia que cojia por el lado de los fondos y no habia fondos. Todo eso se le cayo porque de donde va a sacar esos fondos para lo que estaba proponiendo para la salud. El estaba hablando de una cosita que a mi me parece importante de los famosos seguros que le cobran a los medicos que eso tambien a mi me parece una exageracion. Yo tengo un amigo medico y el me comentaba y el me decia que eso hace que encarezca y
precisamente eso es que digo que deben revizar el sistema de la salud de este país. Porque ellos tienen que pagar unos seguros gigantezcos. Eso fue lo que yo vi que el propuso. Hay gente que demanda por demandar y eso el lo propuso y lo ha cumplido. La legislacion hizo unos recortes.

B: Que recuerda usted sobre las propuestas que hizo Kerry para resolver el asunto del cuidado medico en los EU?

F: Me acuerdo que el estaba proponiendo una importacion controlada de medicinas que me parece una formula excelente porque hay muchos países que producen medicinas. Obviamente una de las buenas cosas que tienen estos países es que se aseguran bien de que las medicinas estén dentro de los canones y de los parametros que deben tener. Obviamente que el estaba apoyando y el controlar esto seguros tan astronomicos para los medico. En eso creo que convergian los dos. Pero a mi me llamo mucho la atencion la cuestion de las medicinas que proponia Kerry. El decia que tenia que controlarse la importacion de las medicinas. Eso es algo muy importante. Las medicinas en este país son carisimas.

B: Se sintio usted satisfecho con las propuestas que hicieron los candidatos?

F: No. Como te digo yo pienso que para mejorar el sistema de salud en este país hay que hacer unas reformas muy grandes porque yo por lo menos si tuviera que tomar decisiones comenzaria por incrementar el numero de medicos. Utilizando medicos que por ejemplo son, igual o mas capacitados que los mismos medicos americanos para que de esa manera se pueda tener una medicina mas asequible a la gente. En estos momentos hay una cantidad muy alta de medicos y los estan controlando para que los costos sean altisimos. Tu sabes que si hay una oferta de servicios o de medicina, eso va a hacer que los precios de la medicina y los servicios bajen, pero en este momento al contrario en vez de abrir puertas se han cerrado muchas puertas para los medicos de otros países que pudieran estar aqui en este país. Eso pienso yo que ellos tocaron tangencialmente el tema de las salud. A mi me parece que las medicinas, por ejemplo, que ellos tocaron, y esto, pues no soluciona el problema de salud de este país. Ademas, tampoco se le esta dando, pues yo retomo un poquito la experiencia de los países subdesarrollados en ese respecto. Que es lo que hace basicamente que a la medida que haya suficiente medicos, como te digo hoy en dia hay tanta oferta de medico en los países nuestros que ya los medicos estan manejando taxi porque ya no tienen nada que hacer.

B: Ahora le presentare una situacion hypotetica. Supongamos que su candidato presidencial de preferencia le pidio que componga un mensaje sobre el asunto del cuidado medico en los EU para una campana publicitaria dirigida a la comunidad (Colombiana, Cubana o Puerto Riquena). El proposito de esta campana es el de motivar este grupo a registrarse para votar en las elecciones presidenciales. Cual seria el mensaje que usted recomendaria?

F: Bueno yo diria que pues no solamente los Colombianos yo diria que los Hispanos tambien que va a trabajar seriamente en bajar los costos de medicinas, permitiendo
alguna importación real confiable y controlada y sobre todo como te digo bajar los costos de los seguros medicos. Ese es un punto clave yo pienso que la medida y hacer planes, no? Sobre todo desarrollar unos planes de seguros familiar que sean realmente asequible a las personas de ingresos medianos. Inclusive las personas de ingresos super limitados no. Desarrollar un verdadero y serio estudio de seguros medicos y cobertura general para familia y para grupo de familia, tanto grupo de trabajadores como grupo de familias no? En la medida que se hagan ese tipo, porque el seguro de familia en este momento es costoso, pero yo he escuchado y leído un poquito de lo que puede ser un grupo, un seguro de grupos familiares donde por ejemplo ponerle algo algo, interviene un grupo grande de familias eso hace que el costo de ese seguro medico sea mas bajo. Pero ofrecer algo solido en el respecto dar cifras, dar numeros y empezar hablando un poco de esto. Yo creo que cualquier planteamiento para mi no solamente en los aspectos medicos en cualquier tipo de problematica que un candidato quiera abordar, debe empezar por hablar de cifras. Por hablar de las cifras que hay realmente, hablar de una estrategia como la que yo te planteo por ejemplo atacar el tema de las medicinas. Atacar el tema de los seguros familiares, y los seguros,

B: O sea planes concretos.

F: Concretos y hablar de cifras. Decirle, por ejemplo, como seria interesante decirle a la gente “mire usted para una cantidad de 200 dolares o 150 dolares al mes puede cubrir la salud de toda su familia. Por decirte algo, no? En un plazo de X cantidad de anos y “eso lo vamos a lograr gradualmente” Alguna cosa asi no? Decir vamos a tener unos fondos de alguna parte que vayan enfocados a poder garantizar que esto se va a cumplir en determinado tiempo. Yo permitiria la participacion, si es el caso y si fuera necesario de medicos de otros paises que pudieran venire a hacer esa labor. Yo te aseguro que un medico Colombiano, Peruano, Chileno o lo que fuera que le digan venga agarrese aqui, x cantidad por un tiempo con una cifra especifica para unas clinicas donde se dediquen especificamente a atender a gente de esos limitados recursos y que fueran flotando. Podrian garantizar dar un buen seguro medico a unos costos realmente bajos. Creear una clinica piloto cuando llega uno a Ocala donde se traigan medicos de Peru, de Chile, de Ecuador de no se que. Que ellos de todos modos le pagan en dolares y se van a sentir remunerables. Que tienen capacidad porque hay medicos nuestros que son excellentes eso esta bien interesado a venir y hacer un trabajo de seis meses u ocho meses y que fueran rotando de alguna manera, no se eso es una idea simplemente, y esa institucion medica podria ofrecer servicios medicos de calidad a muy buenos precios y para competir habria que establecer tambien unos parametras para definir quienes tienen acceso al ese tipo de servicio y quienes no. Los taxes definen quien es quien en este pais.

B: Como usaria usted el asunto del cuidado medico en los EU para animar un(a) amigo(a) o un miembro de su familia a registrarse para votar y a votar en futures elecciones presidenciales en los EU. Que le diria usted?

F: Pues mira, primero tendría que comentarte algo. Dificilmente creo que yo con un solo tema podría motivar un votante. Para motivar un votante habria que hablar del paquete grande. Pero entiendo que ahora en la entrevista estas tratando a un tema especifico pero
te debo aclarar. Pienso que para motivar un votante se necesita un paquete. Un paquete
completo que cobra el mayor porcentaje de la expectativa del votante. Pero si quiero hacer
emphasis en la salud como parte de ese paquete que te acabo de mencionar, pues
entonces sí lo haría básicamente diciéndole que puede tener un seguro médico a un precio
razonable que garantice la seguridad de la salud de su familia y que pueda tener
medicinas de buena calidad y a buen precio.

*Ahora unas preguntitas sobre usted terminamos.*

B: Cual es su edad?

F: 30-38 años.

B: A que se dedica usted?

F: En este momento me dedico al periodismo.

B: Cual es su afiliacion religiosa?

F: Bueno mi afiliacion como tal, yo nací en la religión Católica, pero hoy en día mi
posición es un poco más amplia. No soy un Católico radical.

B: Cuanto hace que reside en su comunidad?

F: 3 años y ocho meses

B: Cuanto hace que vive en el estado de Florida?

F: Ese mismo tiempo.

B: Cuanto hace que sus padres viven en el estado de Florida?

F: Mi familia no vive aquí.

B: Hemos terminado. Muchas gracias por su tiempo!
Cuban-American Interview 1

Interview with: Cuban retiree in her 60s who lives alone in North Florida in a retirement community.

B = Interviewer
A = Respondent

Date Conducted: 4/27/05  11:30 a.m.

Gracias por participar en esta entrevista. Usted tendra la oportunidad de compartir algunas de sus experiencias y opiniones acerca del voto Hispano/Latino durante las elecciones presidenciales del ano 2004 al igual que comentar sobre los asuntos de importancia para usted. Usted tambien tendra la oportunidad de compartir los factores criticos que impactaron su decision acerca de el partido que apoyaria durante las recientes elecciones presidenciales al igual que los temas que le motivaron a participar o a no participar en las elecciones. Quiero motivarte a que seas lo mas sincero possible con relacion a sus sentimientos, reacciones, puntos de vista y opiniones durante esta entrevista. No hay respuesta incorrecta en esta investigacion. El proposito es comprender mejor la experiencia de Latinos que viven en el estado de Florida con relacion al voto y como toman decisions electorales. Tambien me gustaria recordarle que su identidad permanecera confidencial para proposito de este estudio. Tiene alguna pregunta antes de que comencemos? Muy bien, concemos esta conversacion.

Primero, comenzaremos con algunas preguntas basicas para asegurarnos de que usted pueda participar en este estudio.

Demographics and Ethnic Identifiers

B: Puede usted votar en los Estados Unidos?
A: Si

B: Esta usted registrado para votar?
A: Si

B: Cuando se registro?
A: Hace muchos anos. Llevo como 25 anos que me registre.

B: Porque se registro para votar? – asuntos o valores
A: Me motivo que teniamos las amistades que se estaban postulando para supervisor de la escuela. Entonces me registre para darle mi voto.
B: Usted nacio en los EU o en Cuba?
A: En Cuba.

B: Es usted un ciudadano de los estados unidos?
A: Si.

B: Cual es la heredad cultural con la que se identifica usted? Usted se considera Americano, Latino (o de un subgrupo Latino) o alguna combinacion de estas?
A: Cubana Americana

B: Que percentage diria usted que es Estadounidense y que percentaje diria usted que es Latino o Hispano?
A:

B: Usted se identifica como “Latino” o “Hispano”? Porque?
A: Latina.
B: Porque?
A: Porque soy de Latinoamerica.

B: Cual raza usted se considera? Blanco, Negro, Mestizo, Mulato u otra?
A: blanca.

B: Cual es el idioma que usted mas habla en su hogar?
A: Espanol.

B: Cual es el idioma que usted mas habla con sus padres o parientes cercanos?
A: Espanol.

B: Cual es el idioma que usted mas habla con sus amigos?
A: Espanol.

B: Cual es el idioma que usted mas habla en la escuela o en el trabajo?
A: Ingles.
B: En qué ciudad vive usted permanentemente?

A: Gainesville, Florida por los últimos seis meses. El año pasado me acababa de mudar aquí y por eso no pude votar.

B: Ahora, me gustaría que hablara sobre su participación previa en actividades políticas.

**Elecciones presidenciales**

B: Cuánta atención diría usted que le pone a la política en general? How much attention would you say you pay to politics in general and government? *[Probe in terms of hours/day and hours/week spent reading, watching, listening to election news or discussion election politics with others]*

A: 100%. Si estamos en término de política yo estoy atenta todos los días.

B: Cuánta atención diría usted que le pone a las actividades del gobierno? *[Probe in terms of hours/day and hours/week spent reading, watching, listening to election news or discussion election politics with others]*

A: Como un 50%.

B: ¿Cuál es su opinión sobre la participación en elecciones generales?

A: Las elecciones es una cosa muy importante porque ese el gobierno que nosotros vamos a estar viviendo en el. Usted como ciudadano debe tener su voto debe dar su opinión. No que mire lo del gobierno y este al tanto y participe donde más le guste.

B: Usted cree que es importante darle su voto?

A: Claro que sí. Eso es el derecho de cada ciudadano de los estados unidos. Votar por el presidente que uno quiere; si es presidente, si es gobernador.

B: Alguna vez ha votado en elecciones presidenciales en los EU?

A: Sí.

B: Voto usted en las elecciones presidenciales del 2004?

A: No.

B: Porque no?

A: Porque me acaba de mudar.
B: Hableme de su ultima experiencia.

A. Bueno yo fui partidaria de Bush. Ahí corri un poquito con las elecciones porque me gustaban sus ideas me gustaba su manera de ser.

B: Que le gustaba?

A: Su libertad de hablar. La forma en que hablaba. Y la herencia de la familia que se conoce – una familia conocida. Yo la conocía mayor que la del otro candidate.

B: A votado usted alguna vez en elecciones gubernamentales/presidenciales en (país de origen)?

[[If yes] Hableme de su ultima experiencia.

[[If no] Porque no?

A: No. Yo sali de Cuba muy ninita.

B: Cual diría usted que es el valor que su familia le da al voto en las elecciones generales?

A: Igual que yo. La misma forma que yo. Mi familia es la que me ha ensenado que el voto es muy importante para comunicar tu opinion sobre el presidente que vamos a tener nosotros en el país en que vivimos.

B: A que familia usted se refiere?

A: Bueno me refiero a mi papa vivio conmigo un tiempo aquí. Tambien yo me case joven y mi esposo siempre estuvo, la primera vez que yo vote fue con mi esposo y el fue que me indico como era y ahí fue como yo aprendí a ver como era la politica.

B: Segun su experiencia, le parece que los lideres politicos en los EU estan interesados en los problemas que afectan a los Hispanos/Latinos) que viven en el estado de Florida? Porque?

A: Hay algunos que si. Otros todavia no.

B: Deme un poquito de detalle.

A: Bueno, hay alguno que se interesan especialmente por los Hispanos, es la raza mia. Como el gobernador es un gobernador de la Florida que siempre esta atento de lo que puede pasar, de lo que esta pasando, de las oportunidades que se le pueden brindar a los Hispanos. Esas cosas. Otros no estan atento de eso. Otros estan pendiente a otras cosas. No estan pendiente a los Hispanos.

B: No obstante a como usted haya votado en el pasado, por favor digame cual de los dos partidos principales (Democrata o Republicano) cree usted que se ocupa mas de las
necesidades de los Hispanos/Latinos en general o cree usted que no hay diferencia? Porque?

A: Yo creo que no hay diferencia. Eso de los gobernadores, los senadores, las camaras de representates; no creo que ni el Republicano ni el Democrata, diciendo que es democrrata o republicano se distingue para los Hispanos.

B: Usted esta de acuerdo si digo que lo que usted dice es que lo que hace que un partido este pendiente al latino es el lider?

A: Es el lider. Estoy de acuerdo con eso.

Ahora hablemos de otras formas de participacion civic.

Otras formas de comportamiento politico durante las elecciones presidenciales del 2004

B: Asistio usted a alguna reunion o manifestacion publica en la comunidad donde usted vive durante las elecciones presidenciales del 2004?
   [If yes] Hableme de su experiencia.
   [If no] Porque no?

A: No.

B: Asistio usted a alguna reunion, rally o alguna otra funcion por un partido politico en su comunidad durante las elecciones presidenciales del 2004?

A: No.

G: Hay alguna razon porque?

A: Estaba en el proceso de mudarme para Gainesville.

B: Sirvio usted como voluntario con alguna organizacion para promover el voto en su comunidad durante las elecciones del 2004?

A: No.

B: Sirvio usted como voluntario con alguna campana presidencial durante las elecciones del 2004?

A: No.

B: Hizo usted alguna contribucion financiera a algun candidate o partido politico durante las elecciones del 2004?
A: No.

B: Se puso usted en contacto con algún político durante las elecciones del 2004?
A: No.

B: Escribió usted una carta al editor de su publicación (periodico o revista) favorita durante las elecciones del 2004?
A: No.

B: Se puso usted un botón de campaña, le puso un letrero a un carro o a su propiedad durante las elecciones del 2004?
A: Sí.

B: ¿Qué representa para usted eso?
A: No nada yo participe queriendo que saliera el presidente, Bush. Y entonces me encontre un botón en una tienda y me lo puse.

B: Y para usted qué representa eso?
A: Bueno, llamar indirectamente a las demás personas que yo estoy de acuerdo con ese presidente.

**PR Campaign Message Exposure**

B: En qué lenguaje son los programas de noticias que usted más ve?
A: En Español.

B: En la TV?
A: Español.

B: En la radio?
A: No aquí porque a mí me gusta el Español y no hay emisora Hispánica aquí en Gainsville.

B: En la prensa (periodico y revista)?
A: No lo hice.

B: En la red mundial/internet?
A: No usa la computadora.

B: Algun otro formato?

A: No.

B: Entonces usted depende primordialmente de la televisión para sus noticias?

A: Exactamente.

[If difference in language orientation of media source] Ask: Porque la diferencia en el lenguaje del medio?

Ahora hablemos de los anuncios que usted puede haber visto u oído durante las elecciones presidenciales del 2004. Ahora usted tendrá la oportunidad de decirme si hubo/hubieron algun(os) anuncio(s) acerca de la importancia de participar en las elecciones que le llamaron a la atención.

B: Recuerda usted algun mensaje que le motivaron a usted a que fuera mas activo políticamente através de la registracion y el voto en las elecciones presidenciales del 2004?

A: Me gusta el votar porque yo me siento con derecho de hacerlo. Eso es para mi also como un deber, como ciudadana que soy. Yo me siento como que es como si yo votando estoy eligiendo algo que yo quiero.

B: Hubo algun mensaje que le recordara eso?

A: Bueno no. En la television vi al padre de Bush y como es su familia y eso me ayudo a elegir mucho.

B: Cual cree usted que habra sido la reaccion de otros en la comunidad Hispana/Latina al llamado que le invitaba a ser mas activos politicamente en el proceso electoral, a registrarse para votar y a votar?

A: Bueno eso es una cosa elastica porque eso depende de la condicion educative que tiene la persona de acuerdo. Figese que puede ver dos personas, estan viendo el anuncio y ponerle atencion y decir “contra, tengo que salir a votar” o “que, yo no voy a votar!,” o lo ignora. Y eso yo considero que eso va en la educacion de la persona para tomar esa decision. Muchas veces usted se encuentra una persona y le dice “viste el anuncio?” y te dice “yo no.” Otra persona te dice “vi el anuncio y creo que esta bien.” Tambien en Miami por ejemplo es una ciudad muy Hispana, de muchos politicos Hispanos que estan impulsando aquello. Por ejemplo, no los homes pero en el lugar de los veteranos ellos estan comiendo la gente y llega el que se esta postulando y dicen “caramba voy a votar
B: Le recomendaría usted a un amigo o familiar a que se registre para votar? (Interpersonal component)

A: Definitivamente. Ese el derecho que todo ciudadano debe tener.

B: Esta usted familiarizado con el programa de registracion para votar y esfuerzos para salir a votar del South Western Voter Registration Education Program (SVREP) que se enfoco en los Hispanos/Latinos en el estado de Florida? Que me puede decir usted sobre estos esfuerzos?

A: No.

B: Esta usted familiarizado con el programa de registracion para votar y esfuerzos para salir a votar de League of United Latin American Citizens’ (LULAC) que se enfoco sobre los Hispanos/Latinos en el estado de Florida? Que me puede decir usted sobre estos esfuerzos?

A: No.

B: Esta usted familiarizado con el programa de registracion para votar y esfuerzos para salir a votar auspiciados por cualquier otra organizacion en la comunidad, del gobierno, religioso a algun medio de comunicacion que se enfoco sobre los Hispanos/Latinos en el estado de Florida? Que me puede decir usted sobre estos esfuerzos?

A: No.

B: Quien cree usted que debe ser responsible por estos esfuerzos que tartan de registrar mas Hispanos/Latinos para votar? (Political parties, campaigns, churches, schools or other social institutions)

A: Los politicos yo creo que deben ser los responsables de llevar esa campana. Porque son como la madre y el padre y los hijos. Quien lleva la casa? La mama y el papa, los hijos, depended de eso. Nosotros dependemos de los politicos. Dependemos del presidente, muchas, no dependemos no quiero decir depender, sino disfrutar lo que nos da. Vamos a decir major asi. Ok nosotros las mayoria no tenemos que depender. Ellos dependen de nosotros indirectamente en mayoria, pero ellos nos tienen que facilitar a nosotros, para nosotros ser la mayoria, porque de otra manera no podemos ser mayoria, si no trabajamos en comun. Y yo creo que los politicos son los culpables de que. Porque yo he visto en Miami principalmente que lo he visto, y bueno yo cuando vivia en Union City tambien cuando yo era joven, yo he visto que los politicos van a la casa, recojen a la persona la llevan a votar. Eso lo unico que lo hace es el politico que esta interesado por el voto. Asi que los politicos igual que hacen eso hacen otras cosas para ayudar a los hispanos.
B: Y si hubieran otras organizaciones en la comunidad que estuvieran dispuestas a proveer ese tipo de servicio, usted estaría de acuerdo con el?

A: Definitivamente eso es bueno porque eso está ayudando a la persona a ilustrarse a aprender lo que es el voto, a aprender lo que es el gobierno.

B: Y qué le parece si las escuelas ofrecen ese tipo de servicio?

A: No. No creo.

B: Porque?

A: Las escuelas, vamos a decir los grammar school no, tan muy chiquito los muchachos para eso. Eso no. Ya si me habla del college, o de highschool, ya la cosa cambia ya va hacienda una parte, pero un grammar school no.

B: Qué le parece las iglesias?

A: Tampoco.

B: Porque no?

A: Las iglesias es una parte un centro muy especial de Dios, y Dios no tiene partido.

B: Y si por ejemplo fuera un esfuerzo que no es partidario, que el dice “Sal y vota,” “vota por quien tu quieras.”

A: Bueno eso fuera una cosa diferente, pero así todo no está muy apropiado.

B: Ok.

A: Porque el voto es cosa política y la política no se debe mezclar nunca con la religion.

Vamos a discutir algunos de los asuntos que influenciaron su decisión durante el proceso electoral en el 2004.

**Important Issues**

B: Cuáles fueron los asuntos o preocupaciones más importantes que estuvieron en su mente durante las elecciones presidenciales del 2004? (Salience of issues) Porque?

A: La economía. Bueno yo creo que el que tiene da. Porque el que no tiene no da. Y Bush viene de una familia muy rica y creo que es un presidente que da.

B: Hubo algún otro asunto en su mente?
A: No en realidad, no, no pense en otra cosa.

B: Cuales son algunos de los asuntos o preocupaciones mas importantes para su comunidad (subgroup) estos dias?

A: La verdad que yo como Cubana te voy a decir que el gobierno de Fidel es uno de los problemas mas importantes que hay. Y te puedo decir que llevo muchos anos aqui, no vivi bajo el gobierno de Fidel pero se que yo no estoy de acuerdo con el gobierno de Fidel, no porque sea el gobierno de Fidel sino porque es un lugar comunista y yo no soy comunista. Yo soy anti-comunista. Y el es un gobierno comunista.

B: Y para los Cubanos que viven aqui en los EU, por ejemplo en Miami, usted vio algun asunto que afectaba a la comunidad?

A: Yo creo que no. Yo creo que el gobierno le esta dando muy buenas oportunidades a los Cubanos. Es el unico pais que tiene el pie mojao o pie seco, que llega el Cubano y se puede quedar. Asi que eso es una super ventaja que le gobierno le esta dando a los Cubanos y yo como Cubana lo reconozco.

B: Por favor describe el impacto o la insignificancia de los siguientes asuntos sobre: Su vida personal [pausa] sobre su familia [pausa] y sobre su comunidad? (individualistic/collectivistic)

B: Educacion.

A: La educacion no es una educacion muy Buena.

B: Empleos.

A: Este pais es un pais de imigrantes y el que no trabaja es porque no quiere

B: La economia.

A: Es que yo no puedo hablar nada de eso porque yo he vivido en este pais tantos anos y lo de trabajo, economia escuela, yo he visto que el que de verdad quiere se puede salir adelante.

B: La Guerra en Iraq.

A: Ya eso es otro punto, pero si estoy de acuerdo con ella. Eso es una cosa mas seria. Eso es un problema mas de pensararlo el presdiente. Hay la duda de que se equivoco, porque se decia que habia armas atomicas alli, etc., etc., pero no las encontraron pero nosotros tenemos una frase “cuando el burro se cae a palo se levanta.” Asi que ya el esta metido en esa Guerra y ya tiene que terminar como es. Porque no puede salir andando y dejar todo tirao. Eso es lo que entiendo yo. Porque yo no concibo que comience una Guerra y porque no encontro lo iva entonces dejo a todo el mundo ahí empapao ahí to mundo. Hay
muchos muertos, y lamentamos mucho los muertos y lamentamos mucho todo, pero no se puede hacer nada.

B: Terrorismo.

A: Bueno el terrorismo yo creo que el presidente que tenemos ha sobrellevado bastante la cuestión del terrorismo. Yo creo que si el dicen muchas personas que el ha sido de mano dura y yo creo que si el no hubiese sido así. Se dice que lo aeropuertos no estan tan seguros, pero dicen en las noticias que algunas personas que han querido pasar no han podido pasar.

B: El cuidado medico.

A: Ahi el cuidado medico es lo que esta malo. Realmente el pobre no se puede atender como es debido. Apesar, estoy hablando en termino general, porque en Miami, cambia la situation. En Miami hay ciertas clinicas que te dan servicio con el Medicare y hasta te dan la medicinas y todo. Pero a la vez que tu sales del centro de Miami, ya la medicina esta muy cara y el ciudadano medio esta muy dificil comprarla. Eso es lo que yo creo que debe tener un poquito mas de arreglo.

B: Inmigracion.

A: Hay dos puntos de vista. Si tu miras el primer punto de vista, la immigracion como son seres humanos que vienen aqui a los EU, el globo de oro como le llaman, a hacer su vida y a desembolserse como un ciudadano normal, que imigren todos los que quieran. Pero si tu lo estas viendo como la economia del pais. Y la estas viendo como que esto cada dia es mas personas y mas extranas, y mas cosas ya ahi deberian tener mucho mas cuidado las personas que emigran a los EU. Entre esos emigrantes que estan entrando en general no estoy hablando de ninguna nacionalidad estan entrando terroristas. Personas que no tienen valores de ninguna clase que lo que hace es perjudicar al pais.

B: Impuestos.

A: Bueno eso depende de donde viene el corte de impuesto si viene de una cosa o viene de la otra ahi yo no estoy muy familiarizada con eso.

B: Cuales fueron los asuntos o preocupaciones menos importantes para usted durante las elecciones?

A: La verdad es que no me acuerdo y como estabai medio de la mudada, buscando casa ven pa aqui y ven pa aca. La verdad que no me.
Ahora discutamos un asunto en específico: Cuidado Medico en los EU.

Durante las elecciones presidenciales del año pasado se hablo mucho sobre la forma en que el costo del cuidado medico en los EU esta subiendo sin control y sobre la importancia de tener acceso a buen cuidado medico. Este tema fue discutido por los candidatos presidenciales, los medios de comunicación al igual que organizaciones en las comunidades.

Cuidado Medico

B: Usted menciono mas temprano que el asunto del cuidado medico en los EU fue uno importante para usted durante las elecciones presidenciales del 2004. Hay algo mas que quiera comentar?

A: No. No.

B: Que recuerda usted sobre las propuestas que hizo Bush para resolver el asunto del cuidado medico en los EU?

A: Si, yo recuerdo que el dijo que iva al Medicare le iva a dara un por ciento de, le voy a poner el caso, porque mayor le pongo el caso. El a las personas que tienen Medicare y que ganan cierta cantidad de dinero le da tal cantidad, tiene derecho con una tageta de que tienes que mandar informacion etc., etc., Te da una tageta y con esa tageta tu vas a la farmacia y te hacen un descuento en la medicina que tu compres. Eso lo cumplio, y eso fue una de las cosas que yo le puse atencion porque yo soy retirada y todo eso me afecta y particularmente, hablando de la medicina ahora ese ss un tema que muy pocos politicos hablan. Hablan asi superficial pero ya despues como que se olvidan. Ese es uno de los temas interesantes que el gobierno, la camara de representantes que todos los politicos en terminus generales deben de tocar. La medicina esta aqui en un estado inflado. Ha llegado un momento en que el pobre, tiene que morir porque no puede comprar la medicina, aunque el pobre pobre tiene Medicaid no estoy hablando de la clase media qu ena ma que tiene Medicare. Y yo creo, yo, me parece que al paso que vamos la medicina va a ser legalizada. O sea va a ver un control sobre la medicina sobre el gobierno. Las farmacias y las companias de medicamentos estan englobadas. Cuando digo englobadas lo que digo es que el precio esta super.

B: A que usted cree que se debe eso?

A: A que el gobierno no le ha puesto la mano a eso.

B: Entonces usted estaria de acuerdo con que el gobierno se involucre en eso?

A: Yo creo que si porque estan habiendo. Ya no es una ganancia, ya es una explotacion. Y eso no es una ganancia eso es una explotacion lo que esta haciendo con la medicina. Porque ahí tu tienes el Canada que estan a unas horas como el que dice y tiene un sistema de medicina que toda la medica clase puede vivir. Yo conozco personas, la
vecina mía del frente, recibe las medicinas del Canadá, porque no se puede. Ese es un tema que la verdad que, yo no sé que pasa con eso. Ahí está pasando algo que el gobierno no está haciendo lo que tiene que hacer o no se entiende bien ahí este problema pero si se que esta. Lo que es la medicina y el hospital, porque también lo que ha pasado es que muchísimas personas tenían seguro, digo tenían porque ya los seguros no quieren asegurar para las personas que no tienen una entrada que son retirados que son viejos. Entonces, que pasaba que la gente abusaba de eso. Y todavía mandan unos billetes que el Medicare tiene que estar pendiente de la gente, y tó esa cosa y diciéndole “por favor, no dé su número para que compren medicina cualquier información y han cogido personas hacienda negocio con el Medicare. Y ese si es un punto muy malo.

B: ¿Qué recuerda usted sobre las propuestas que hizo Kerry para resolver el asunto del cuidado médico en los EU?

A: No recuerdo.

B: ¿Se sintió usted satisfecho con las propuestas que hicieron los candidatos?

A: En realidad las propuestas se olvidan y lo que hace falta son los hechos. Y al hecho es que yo estoy pendiente.

B: ¿Si las propuestas que hicieron los candidatos el año pasado, si Bush hiciera lo que él propuso, estaría usted satisfecho?

A: Bueno claro, por lo menos en la medicina.

B: Y en el cuidado médico?

A: Cuando digo la medicina me refiero al cuidado médico en términos generales.

B: Recuerda usted alguna otra propuesta u opinión expresada por organizaciones en su comunidad o por los medios de comunicación durante las elecciones presidenciales del 2004? Por favor explíquela.

A: No.

B: Ahora le presentare una situación hipotética. Supongamos que su candidato presidencial de preferencia le pidió que compusiera un mensaje sobre el asunto del cuidado médico en los EU para una campaña publicitaria dirigida a la comunidad (Colombiana, Cubana o Puerto Riquena). El propósito de esta campaña es el de motivar a esta comunidad a registrarse para votar y a votar en las elecciones presidenciales. ¿Cuál sería el mensaje que usted recomendaría?

A: Primero que nada déjame decirte que eso está bien difícil porque yo no creo que en las condiciones en que está el cuidado médico y la medicina, etc, aíga moral para decirle al
Latino ni al Americano hagan esto porque yo le voy a dar esto, porque se han dicho muchas cosas de la medicina y de los hospitals y de todas las cosas esa y no han cumplido. Así que yo creo que eso no pudiera yo nunca hacer un reporte diciendo hagan esto.

B: Como usaria usted el asunto del cuidado medico en los EU para animar un(a) amigo(a) o un miembro de su familia a registrarse para votar y a votar en futures elecciones presidenciales en los EU. Que le diria usted?

A: Bueno, yo te voy a decir una cosa, entre lo malo, malo hay algo bastante que hay que reconocerlo – Que nosotros tenemos Medicare y Medicaid para aquellos que lo necesiten y eso cubre todo, todo de un hospital. Y entonces tu siendo un ciudadano con un voto, tienes derecho eso. Pero tu siendo una persona ignorada en este pais no tienes derecho a nada.

B: Si las elecciones presidenciales fueran hoy, como usaria usted este asunto para animar a otros en su comunidad a que se registren para votar y a que voten? Cual cree usted que deberia ser el mensaje principal?

A: Ahora unas preguntitas sobre usted terminamos.

B: Cual es su edad?

A: 60+

B: A que se dedica usted?

A: Retirada.

B: Cual es su afiliacion religiosa?

A: Catolica

B: Cuanto hace que reside en su comunidad?

A: 6 meses

B: Cuanto hace que vive en el estado de Florida?

A: Mas de 25 anos.

B: Cuanto hace que sus padres viven en el estado de Florida?

A: Murieron

B: Hemos terminado. Muchas gracias por su tiempo!
Cuban-American Interview 2

Interview with: 37 year old Cuban-American male who is a health insurance sales associate in Miami Florida. He is also a married father of two

B = Interviewer

D = Respondent

Date Conducted: 4/18/05 11:12 a.m.

[Test recorder and tape (please state your name and occupation) then proceed.]
Thank you for participating in this study. During this interview you’ll have the opportunity to share some of your experiences and opinions about the 2004 presidential election and comment on the issues that were most important to you. You will also have the opportunity to share the critical factors that influenced your decisions to participate or not participate in the 2004 presidential election. I encourage you to be as candid as possible about your feelings, reactions, views and opinions during this interview. There are no wrong answers. The goal of this study is to understand the true and honest experience and opinions of Hispanics/Latinos in the state of Florida about these issues. I’d also like to remind you that only your experiences will be included in the report. Your identity will remain confidential for purposes of this study. Do you have any questions before we start? Ok, let’s start talking about your experience.

First, we’ll start with some basic screening questions to make sure you meet the criteria set for this study.

B: Are you eligible to vote in the U.S.?
D: Yes.

B: Are you registered to vote?
D: Yes.

B: When did you register to vote?
D: 1986.

B: 1986, for the…
D: High school, I was in high school, I was a senior in high school.

B: Oh, ok. Why did you register?
D: At that point, realistically because they mentioned it, and that they mentioned that its’ your right as you get older, I mean at that time I didn’t really see any benefit in doing it cause I was young and immature, but I’m actually glad that I did, you know, take that step.

B: Why are you glad?

D: To get involved in the voting process and voice my opinion, and uh you know, on what I feel is the right thing for me and my family I guess.

B: Were you born in the U.S., or back in Cuba?

D: I was born in New Jersey.

B: In New Jersey.

D: Yeah.

B: So you’re a U.S. citizen.

D: Correct.

B: Uh, what, what is the last member of your family to be born back in Cuba?

D: Um, my mother and father were both born in Cuba.

B: What is your cultural heritage? Do you consider yourself mostly as an American or as a Cuban American or Cuban or something, some combination—

D: I would say Cuban American, I would say fifty fifty, you know I’m proud of my heritage, but I’m also proud to be an American. So I would say you know, don’t forget my past definitely, but also remember that we are in the United States and continue forward with that.

B: You answered my next question which was what percentage, fifty fifty… Do you identify yourself with the ethnic identifier Latino or Hispanic?

D: I would say more of a Hispanic, when I write you know and ask questions on different things, I would say I’m more of a Hispanic or Hispanic-American.

B: Is there a reason why you prefer Hispanic over Latino?

D: I think more because Latino is not really used here… I think Latino my understanding, you know just from news and everything, there’s more of a Mexican, you know, type heritage from California, I’ve always heard the term
Latino, and here in South Florida, we’ve always heard Hispanic, so we don’t really use the word Latino here much. It’s not a common word to use.

B: What race to you consider yourself to be? White, black, mestizo, mulatto, or other?

D: I would say a White Hispanic-American, I mean, if there’s such a thing.

B: What is the primary language you speak at home?

D: English.

B: What is the primary language you speak with close relatives, such as your parents, spouse, or children?

D: Parents and grandparents, Spanish, and my kids, a mixture of the two.

B: How about your wife?

D: English.

B: English? That’s good that you’re getting your kids—

D: Yeah, definitely, and they take Spanish at school.

B: What is the primary language you speak with friends?

D: English.

B: What is the primary language you speak at school or at work?

D: At work I would say it’s fifty fifty, because being in the South Florida marketplace, I mean I would say if you don’t speak Spanish, especially in sales, the way I’m in, you’re cutting yourself probably more than fifty percent of the business marketplace is Spanish speaking here in Miami, which is where I basically do most of my business. So I’d say fifty fifty, easily.

B: What city do you live in?

D: I live in Miami.

B: Now I’d like to hear about your previous involvement in political activities. How much attention would you say you pay to politics in general?

D: At election time, I pay fairly close attention to find out what platform the individual has, and uh even though at the time most of them are lying anyway,
you know, but it’s uh, you know just to see what their opinion is and how they’re going to maybe vote on issues, and how I feel about those issues. Somebody who feels as close as I do about the different issues.

B: Now, if you were to put it in terms of hours per week, how many hours on average would you say?

D: Not even an hour.

B: Not even an hour.

D: No. Maybe during election time, yes. Now I constantly read, you know and go on the internet, I don’t even read the paper much anymore because of the internet because you can go on MSN and CNN and all the different websites and get the information from there, but during uh political campaigns I definitely make it a point to hear what each individual’s opinion or what they’re leaning towards is.

B: So in terms of hours per week during an election season, about how many hours would you say?

D: You know I probably watch the news every day for about an hour or so, and I would say at least half of that is usually geared towards the political what’s going and you know I’ll watch the O’Reilly factor different things and you know I’ll watch him because he’s way to the right and then I’ll watch you know Hannity and Combes because he’s got a mix of the two in there even though it’s geared to the right, but it’s at least you’ve got a little bit of the other side.

B: How much attention would you say you pay to government activities in general? Not just electoral politics.

D: I mean as far as what how the government runs our country? I watch the news every day. To see what’s going on.

B: Ok. So when you say you watch about an hour of news a day and about half of that is politics then that implies both electoral and ???

D: And normal. Day to day.

B: Tell me your general opinion about voting and presidential elections in the U.S.

D: Uh I used to, well I don’t know if it matters but I used to be a Republican. I changed; I’m an Independent now, because before being a Cuban-born, they always lean far to the right, not necessarily far to the right is the way I feel, so I became an Independent which the only bad thing is I don’t get to vote in the primaries, but I do vote in the election, and it’s sad to say though, and I do go do it because it’s my right and I need to do it, but it’s sometimes sad because what I
want doesn’t happen anyway, so it almost seems like your, your vote doesn’t count, but it does though, because you need to go and you know, ant that’s our, our right in this country to do that.

B: When you say it’s your right, what exactly do you mean?

D: As far as, if you are a citizen, I don’t know if it’s you have to be naturalized or whatever but as long as you have the right to own and maintain a voter’s registration card I think you should go and vote regardless if it’s for what everybody thinks or not but you should go and do that because it’s your right in this country to do that and you should.

B: What kinds of personal convictions motivate you to vote in a presidential election?

D: Um you know the opinion of the candidate, which how do they lean, you know, I like Republican certain things but I don’t their uh you know their censorship that’s been going on lately, and I don’t know if it means anything, but Howard Stern, I’m a fan of Howard Stern. My opinion is if you don’t like Howard, turn off the radio, and I mean, if your kids—my kids should not listen to Howard Stern cause they’re little kids, but in this country, we live in a free country, you should be able to have that medium if you want to. You know, the government shouldn’t tell you everything that you can say and you can do because that’s wrong, that’s censorship. I mean that’s ce—We can censor our kids because I have little kids, but I shouldn’t be censored. This is the United States of America, it’s a free country.

B: So it’s your convictions in reference to the impact that not participating could have—

D: Exactly.

B: On your personal life?

D: I mean, you can very easily have an opinion on something, but if you don’t vote then your opinion means nothing because your by your vote is voicing your opinion because you’re basically backing a candidate who has similar interests or opinions that you do.

B: So you feel that vote sort of provides you with a mechanism to do something—

D: To an extent—I mean, a very little extent but it’s the only one I have so, I need to do it.

B: The next question was have you ever voted in presidential elections—
D: Yes, I make a point to do that.

B: Tell me about the last time you voted.

D: I voted in the uh Bush uh—

B: Kerry?

D: Yeah, election…

B: Tell me about that experience.

D: You know I uh remember they had all this pre-voting beforehand because of all the problems they had here in South Florida, I actually went and tried to do that a couple of times and it was hours and hours and hours of people, but then I actually went and voted on voting day and I waited twenty minutes to vote, so I mean it was simple, I went in and now we have electronic voting and I, you know I did that and I was in and out of there, like I said in twenty minutes at the most. And it was very simple.

B: In addition to the procedural steps involved in voting before you actually went and physically voted, tell me about your—

D: State of mind, thought process? My opinion was and it’s a personal—

B: You don’t have to tell me who you voted for—

D: Well part of my thinking is who I voted for because I personally wanted Bush out but then again in my opinion who would replace him I mean as a lesser of the two evils in my opinion. I don’t like him. But I like the other person less. And I ended up having to vote for the lesser of the two evils, which is a sad thing to say, you know I wish Bill Clinton would run again for office because I was young and coming but everything was going great in this country I mean things were going forward, the economy was doing good, everybody was doing great. Look where we are now. Into a big war, into a lot of different things that—we were lied to, you know we were lied to in the country, people lied to us.

B: So you were coming into the election, it sounds like, with a sense of—

D: I wanted change—Oh yeah, definitely I wanted change, but was that change the right change? I personally thought no. You know, so I needed to stick with the bad you know for four more years, because I didn’t know if the other was going to be worse. You know, I didn’t know enough then, you know I just, now you hear the Democrats coming up in the next election, you know they’re going to shoot themselves in the foot and we haven’t even started yet. Come up with a
strong candidate, you know? And they will win the election because I think this country wants a change.

B: Why do you say they’re going to shoot themselves—

D: Because they’re already talking about having Hilary Clinton run, which I don’t have a problem with, but this country unfortunately is not ready for a woman Vice-President, whatever the case is, and that that right there means automatic loss I mean, automatic. And you know that’s come on guys, Bob Graham, I thought Bob Graham would have made a good President cause he’s more towards the middle, he’s not ultra left and he’s not you know to the side, but he’s more in the middle and he weighs things for what they are and but you know we don’t have a candidate like that.

B: Interesting.

D: And it’s funny cause this conversation here in South Florida he had to be very careful here who you have it with because a lot of the Cubans are staunch Republicans, I mean and they are, my father used to be a staunch Republican, he’s an Independent now, you know because he’s tired of the lies and of even this thing with the Social Security, putting the Social Security money in the stock market, that’s destined to fail. There’s no guarantee, and we know that already. It’s ten thousand—ten thousand fifty five right now and it’s already fifty points down, and it’s going down more and more and more… very scary.

B: What would you say is the value of voting in presidential elections in your family?

D: Um my mother, well my mother doesn’t vote, because my mother actually came in 1959 and she never became a citizen, she’s actually going through that process right now as we speak and I mean she’s already been here so long and she’s been employed that it’s a simple process, but my father votes on every election, and my wife votes in every election, and we definitely like to go and voice our opinion you know by the ballot because that’s how you voice your opinion in this country.

B: Based on your experience, do you think political leaders are interested in the problems of particularly concerning to Hispanics living in the state of Florida?

D: In South Florida, yes, because to get the vote, they have to gear their views towards you know the Hispanic Latino community, if they don’t they’re not going to get voted in South Florida. I mean, if you’re Joe from Gainesville, Joe Smith and you’re American and you have no idea what goes on in the Hispanic community, you’re not going to get one vote in this town.

B: So would would it be fair to say that what you mean is that they’re interested because of the vote?
D: Uh, to an extent, I mean I would think also as a Cuban American, I would want to do things you know to uh help my culture because you know I’m a third gener—second generation American now because my parents were born in Cuba but they became Americans, and you know eventually my kids, as the generations go on they’re going to know less and less about Cuba and where we came from, and uh I think it’s important that we continue, you know and that the people we vote into office have that in mind also. Well, we are the banana boat republic, so here they do do things differently than they do things everywhere else. Yeah, I mean, and I’ve noticed that. When you leave South Florida, things are different. Completely.

B: But you like it.

D: And I understand, you know, I would like to go away one day and move to a different area, but you know I don’t have a problem with South Florida, I think it’s nice, and I have more of a problem that it’s a metropolis, that it’s growing, that it’s too big, the traffic and everything like that, but this is where I live and this is where my family is so, you know until something like that changes, this is where I am.

B: Regardless of how you may have voted in the past, please tell me which of the two dominant parties, Democrat and Republican, do you think has more concern for Hispanics, in general or is there no difference?

D: Uh, you know it’s funny because in the election, they all come down here when they want the Hispanic vote, but then again you never hear anything else as far as the Hispanics are concerned unless you have a good lobby. And Hispanics usually have had a good lobby. And they have a lot of wealthy people who do a lot of business, I mean our governor’s ex-partner was a Cuban American. Armando Codina. So you know those are big connections, you’re connected to the governor of Florida who’s the brother of the the leader of our country. You know there’s a lo—I think the Cubans do have a lot talk and say in what goes on in politics I don’t know if I answered your question

B: Sounds like you, you basically… you’re not making a distinction between Democrats and Republicans.

D: No, you know, I don’t think either one, you know I don’t—as long as they understand the plight of the Cuban American, I don’t really think either one leans more towards helping the Hispanics than the other, as I can see.

B: Ok. Now let’s talk about some other forms of participation in civic life. Did you attend a public meeting or demonstration in your community during the 2004 U.S. Presidential elections?

D: No.
B: Why not?
D: Um, time, and I didn’t think that by me standing out there in the heat would really make a difference.
B: Did you attend a political party meeting, rally, or function in your community during the elections?
D: No.
B: Same reason?
D: Yeah, not really, you know neither here nor there.
B: You are an independent?
D: Yeah.
B: Did you volunteer with an organization your community that tried to get people registered to vote?
D: No.
B: The same reasons.
D: Yeah, not, really not interested.
B: Did you volunteer with a presidential campaign?
D: I’ve never volunteered in a presidential, but I do have a friend who’s a commissioner for the city of Coral Gables, and I helped him with his election like two years ago.
B: Oh ok.
D: And that was more you know for help for him…
B: Did you make any financial contributions to a candidate or party during the 2004 U.S. presidential elections?
D: No.
B: Did you contact any elected officials during the election of 2004?
D: No.
B: Did you write a letter to an editor in your favorite publication?

D: No.

B: Did you wear a campaign button, put a sticker on your car or display a sign on your property?

D: No.

B: Any reason why?

D: Um, you know it’s my view, I didn’t necessarily want everyone to know what my view was, unless you ask.

B: Now let’s talk about the kinds of messages you might have heard during the 2004 presidential elections. This is where you get to tell me if there were any particular messages that were trying to get people out to vote or to register to vote… were there any that caught your attention last year? But first let’s talk about the way you consume your news. In what language are the news programs you consume the most?

D: English. They talk too fast in Spanish… And I have to translate everything, I mean, I speak fluent Spanish, but I hav—I’m still at a point in my life where I have to translate a lot of stuff and in Spanish by the time I’ve translated a sentence, they’ve said twenty more so, I get nothing out of it.

B: And, does that apply to TV?

D: Yes. Definitely.

B: What about radio?

D: English.

B: Print?

D: English.

B: And, online?

D: English.

B: Ok. What were the key messages that encourage—if any, that encouraged you to become more politically active by registering to vote, which since you registered to vote years ago, but by voting in the 2004 presidential election?
D: I not I don’t quite underst—

B: Were there any key, any messages in the media that you heard on TV, radio, online…..

D: No, not any specific message. Like I said I like to hear different points of view, different platforms, definitely the debates mean absolutely nothing. I mean, I, I consider the debates to be a joke because nothing of what they say ever gets accomplished anyway. And it’s—they’re saying that to sway people, but you know I don’t find that you know what, what tells you what their platform is is what they’ve done in the past and what you think they’re going to do in the future, not what they’re saying at the moment. So I mean through time, there’s not one specific statement that anybody made or any view I mean I like to gather my information and try to make my decision. I actually didn’t know who I was going to vote for this year until I stood in front of the election and uh cause I like to do things under pressure like that, cause I did not want to vote for George Bush. I did not want to do it. But I just, had no reason to vote for the other candidate. I just, couldn’t do it

B: So you’re one of those undecideds.

D: Yeah…I—I—I’m still not happy with my vote. And I don’t pay attention to polls. A poll means absolutely nothing. And I—you can ask whoever you want when you poll somebody and they they always give always give out these polls at the last minute anyway because if you leaning to one side what they do is they tell you that the other guy’s won by so much to try and get the other guys not to vote. So, you know don’t, don’t do a poll. You know? Do the poll afterwards, then the poll is who voted for who, that’s what your poll is. A poll means zero. So I think the polls are a gimmick. I really do. It’s uh, you know and I these are things you learn later on. As you go through time and you watch and you see what goes on.

B: So do you remember any messages that tried to encourage you to vote? Any messages by media or community organizations that said you know it’s elections, you’re Cuban American, you’re Latino, you’re Hispanic, can you think about—

D: No I mean I’m going to vote, I will always vote. And I need to voice my opinion through that vote, but there’s nothing specific that anybody said or did to do you know to sway me—

B: Is there anything that any organization put out such as a message to encourage you to vote, that stands out, even if it wasn’t a factor that influenced you just that stands out

D: I mean the only thing I did see was a lot of signs around town I don’t know if that answers your question but there was definitely signs on everybody’s corner, on the houses, all over the place you know
D: Exactly, yeah. And stickers on the cars, and stuff like that which I’ve never put on my car but uh… you see—I saw a lot of that.

B: What do you think was the reaction of others in the Hispanic community to this call to become more politically active and get out and vote this past year?

D: We got phone calls, we got phone calls at my house from different sites, I guess different political organizations making sure that we were registered voters and to go out and do it but nothing really…

B: Do you think this may have had an impact on you?

D: It’s funny though because when these the politicians have need to be voted in all the sudden they do get to people in low income communities and get all these people to vote for their side regardless of what their opinion is and it’s because those you know extra couple thousand votes might sway the election one way or the other. But when they finish getting their vote, they don’t care about those people again. I mean they’re there for one reason to for their, for their cause. And once their cause is accomplished they’re out and done and they’ll never see them again. George Bush will never, never go to, go to Little Havana again. What for? He already got what he wanted out of there.

B: Would you recommend to a friend or family member to register to vote?

D: Yes.

B: Why would you do that?

D: Because it’s your right in this country and that is your way of voicing your opinion. I mean we can sit down and talk about our opinions but if you don’t go vote, your opinion really means nothing.

B: Are you familiar with the South Western Voter Registration Education Program?

D: No.

B: Are you familiar with their efforts to get people registered to vote—Hispanics registered and out to vote in the state of Florida?

D: Never even heard of it.

B: Ok. Are you familiar with, LULAC, the League of United Latin American Citizens’ and their efforts to get Floridians—Latinos—
D: No.

B: Are you familiar with voter registration or get out the vote efforts by any other community, religious—

D: Well you usually hear about those at election time you know that’s usually when they do that big push

B: Are there any that stick out in your mind?

D: Well you usually hear about the church groups you know the conservatives trying to get their people to go out into the community and speak to people. But uh, they’ll go in, like I said, to the lower income neighborhoods to get them to vote, regardless.

B: How bout, uh, media, any media that stands out—

D: You see some commercials sometimes, you know that say, go out and vote, or contact some dot com so you can go ahead and register to vote—things like that.

B: Who do you think should be responsible for these voter registration drives? Political parties, campaigns, churches—

D: It’s got to be a neutral party. It’s got to be uh… you know, somebody who wants people to vote regardless of what their uh you know their opinion is, they’re either right or left, it’s gotta—which is very hard to do but it’s gotta be neutral, it’s gotta present what the platform is on the left, present what the platform is on the right, and let the individual make their decision you know based on what their opinion is, not somebody else’s opinion. Cause a lot of these drives do get you to vote, you know they get you to register on the platform they want you to register on, let’s be realistic. It’s for a cause, they want their person voted in. Complete personal interest.

B: Now let’s discuss some of the issues that influenced your decisions about participating in the electoral process in 2004. What are some of the most important issues or concerns affecting your community, Cuban Americans, today? Issues uh that would have some kind of political—

D: Well you know one of the things was a lot of things was a lot of people are upset about the law that Bush came up with of not allowing people to go to Cuba every three years. Personally, in my opinion, I don’t have a problem with the law. I mean it’s tough my father has eleven kids, only three of them are here, the rest of them are in Cuba, but these people going to Cuba every week you know every other week, taking money, taking food over there, they’re not making it better, they’re just making it worse you know. If something doesn’t work for forty or fifty years, it’s time to fix it. You know that’s definitely my opinion, and this is a
second generation American or whatever the case is, but you know if you haven’t gotten them out by sanctions or whatever in forty years, it hasn’t worked, try something else. You can’t stick by the same thing forever, it just doesn’t work. Either close the borders completely, or open them up completely you can’t be halfway in between because stuff trickles in it just makes—it just continues on the same path that it’s always been on. A lot of older Cubans disagree with me, but I was born and raised and educated in this country. I didn’t go through what my parents went through. You know coming to this country as orphans you know their parents live in Cuba.

B: Can you identify any other issues that are of concern to your community?

D: You know it’s funny because the Cuban Americans that have come to this country have been very self-sufficient, so you know a lot of the Cuban Americans that have come here, people will sometimes say that the Cubans made Miami. And made it what it is, granted, it’s the porthole to Latin America. You have a lot of other Latinos and Hispanics here, but the Cuban Americans have been pretty self-sufficient, other than the individuals who are now coming who require some sort of aid from the government or whatever, I think the Cubans have pretty much taken control of their own plight.

B: So then you would say that the immigration issue or the travel restrictions would be the main issue.

D: Probably.

B: In the larger scheme, the embargo—

D: That’s what you hear now, right, I know you’re maybe talking about maybe South Florida as the Latin community in South Florida, but the Latin community in South Florida is very self-sufficient, it’s not like a lot of the other Latinos or other countries that have come in that have not—the Cubans are maybe it’s a selfish opinion, but my father’s worked here every day of his life since he got here, the day he got off the airplane, and he’s never received a penny from anybody, or any government agency or help from anybody and he doesn’t understand doing that for others which is his opinion, but everything he has it’s because he’s hammered nails for, his whole life.

B: What were the most important issues on your mind during the 2004 presidential election?

D: The economy, was number one for me realistically, was the economy going down and down and down and also the war. The war that we’re in, you know I would have thought that by being in this war, gas would have—would have helped gas and oil prices, it’s just gone up even more, it’s doubled since we went over there, and then also you’re getting involved in religious wars which they were around
before we were here and they’re going to be around when we’re gone. It’s not going to change.

B: Could you elaborate a little bit more on the economy, as an issue important to you?

D: The economy is just the dollar, compared to the Euro is dead, you want to go to Europe—a European comes over here they get, what do they get? Like a dollar fifty for every dollar or something like that. Things like that, the economy needs to pick up. You try to follow things you try to look at the indicators everything indicates that we’re doing good, you hear Greenspan say that the economy is growing, but then again, the stock market today, last week exactly, for who? I guess the rich, I would assume the billionaires because they play with that stuff but it’s not growing for us. You know, I’m in a sales position. Sales has been sales were bad for a while, they’ve been good now again I guess it depends how it affects me and my family is which is mostly for most people.

B: What is the impact of these important issues on you, your family and your community? I’m going to enumerate a series of issues and just give me your opinion of the impact you believe they have on you, your family and your community. Education.

D: Education is very important. If you’re not educated, you’re going to be on the lower—you’re never going to be able to get a high paying job, you know you just need the piece of paper, you need to be educated in this country. You know of course there are situations where people have made it without that, but it while you’re young and while my kids live at home, and their responsibility is school. Get it done! You’ve got the rest of your life, and as my parents did tell me, it does not get any easier as you get older, and it’s true.

B: Jobs. As an issue on your mind, what kind of impact has it had on you, your family and your community. How important is it in presidential elections.

D: Employment is very important because that’s how we live and how we survive. I do think work is overrated. But it is what it is. The presidential elections, they talk about jobs and creating more jobs but the president himself cannot, you know, he himself is not going to necessarily make more jobs or not, they’re shipping the jobs out of the country anyway now.

B: Economy you mentioned already, war in Iraq, tell me a little bit more about the war in Iraq and how it affects you, your family—

D: Afghanistan I didn’t necessarily have a problem with I mean that was a lot easier to explain. I do have a problem with going into Iraq, we know why they went in but there was no WMDs or whatever they call them, and you know, we lied and Bush basically came out and said he was lied to. He was given false information.
But can you make that kind of a decision and invade a country on incorrect data? Cause that’s what they did. How can you do that? If I were to do something, just myself as the father of two children on incorrect data, I would end up in jail if I do something like that, or dead. Why was our country allowed to go invade—we’re actually hated now by the Muslim world. And if they hated us before they hate us ten thousand times more.

B: Terrorism. What impact does this have on you, your family, and your community?

D: Before 9-11 I never thought of terrorism, that happened in the Dakotas or wherever it was with the terrorist, but that was an American, he blew up the federal building, or whatever yeah. Terrorism is a scary thought, but we’ve always had open borders to the whole entire world so it’s not very easy to control that.

B: So you feel that this is something beyond control.

D: Oh definitely.

B: Does it weigh in in your decision making process when you go in the ballot box?

D: Not really, I think, Kerry had his opinion on it and Bush had his, but I think Kerry was close enough to Bush, let’s control terrorism and lets do everything we can to stop it from happening, I think they both said the same thing when it comes to that.

B: How about healthcare?

D: Healthcare is interesting. The last thing in the world I want is for the government to get involved in our healthcare because they can’t control anything they already have, if they get involved in healthcare that’s just going to be another fiasco in itself. But look, it’s hard to say. Clinton’s wife wanted to do something with healthcare, she wasn’t able to do it. Bush has said he wants to do stuff in healthcare, he hasn’t been able to do it. I mean I don’t think they--none of them can really change the way it’s going anyway.

B: But is this an issues that has an impact on you, your family—

D: No. The healthcare and the way the government—oh yeah, definitely, in my livelihood. Because I’m in the healthcare community. And my wife is also. So definitely, but I don’t think either candidate has enough of an opinion to say he’s better at this or he’s better at that. It’s not really, they say they’re going to provide healthcare for the needy and they’re going to provide this for everybody, but they never do.

B: How about immigration?
D: That’s a tough one to say as an individual whose parents did come from another country, I do think that they do need to tighten down the borders a little bit but that’s hypocritical of me to say because my parents are born in Cuba and came to this country so it’s like, who should you let in, who should you not let in. Very tough decision. But they do have to control things.

B: How about tax cuts?

D: It’s BS. I mean, Bush talks about tax cuts, I don’t even qualify for that thing, that four hundred dollar, tax cuts—it’s a crock. I’m being as candid as I want… it’s BS if I’ve ever heard it.

B: What were the issues you considered to be less important when you made the decision in 2004?

D: Could you give me some examples?

B: Tax cuts?

D: Well, they talked about it, but it didn’t really mean much, I mean I think education is a huge issue, I know you asked me to talk about the less important ones I mean, they were talking taxes was huge, but come on!

B: Social security…

D: Social security reform, I mean things like that, they’re going to do what they want anyway.

B: Gay marriage, abortion…

D: You know, gay marriage, we live in a country if you want to get married to another man or another woman, that’s your problem, as long as you’re not bothering anybody and you’re not forcing your opinion on other, do as you need to do. I mean, once you get involved in the decisions of individuals, then you’re getting too far to the right. Then you’re telling people what to do. And people are going to do it anyway. I mean let’s say you make abortion illegal in this country, people are going to do it anyway. They’re just going to go to a corner, in a place that’s not certified by the federal government or whatever, people re going to end up getting hurt or damaged by that. And that’s why we live in a free country.

B: Now an issue that was discussed heavily during the debates during the entire election season was the issues of healthcare, how healthcare is spiraling out of control. Was healthcare an important issue on your mind during the 2004 presidential elections?
D: It was, but I don’t think either candidate was going to change anything regardless of what he or she said. Because we already have examples of the Democrats trying to do something that didn’t work we’ve got examples of the Republicans saying they’re going to do something and they don’t anyway. So I mean…

B: So even if you didn’t think anything was going to get accomplished by the candidates, why was it an issue in your mind?

D: Because I’m involved in healthcare and I do see exactly what’s going and I do ask people their opinions a lot on what can change healthcare and not one person can actually tell me. Because everybody blames it on everybody else, the hospitals blame it on the insurance company, the insurance company blames it on the doctors in the hospitals it’s, it’s a blame game. The problem is it’s pharmaceuticals. Then if you watch the news and I try to watch the news every day, every single commercial that you see on the news is a drug. It’s a drug and it’s a drug, and it’s a drug. NBC nightly news or CBS or ABC, I’ve actually flipped the channels to see what commercial, because they all usually go to commercial about the same time, and it’s all—every single thing is a pharmaceutical ad. It’s an ad and it’s an ad and it’s an ad.

B: And you associate ad presence on TV with a sense of responsibility for the healthcare issue? You see a relationship there?

D: A little bit, yeah, definitely, no doubt.

B: What do you remember about the way Bush addressed the healthcare issue during the campaign?

D: I don’t really remember much truthfully. I know—same thing Kerry said, “I need to fix healthcare, I need to provide healthcare for the needy.” The same exact things that everybody says, and unfortunately, I don’t believe either one of them.

B: So would it be fair to say that you basically summarized the Bush and Kerry comments about healthcare as plain politician rhetoric?

D: Exactly.

B: So this question is answered…do you feel like they addressed the issue…

D: No.

B: What do you remember about the positions on the issue of healthcare offered by organization in your community or by the media during the 2004 election other than the candidates? What do you remember about the positions that they stated?
D: You would see some commercials. Maybe the hospitals saying to vote for this—we endorse this politician, and then maybe a doctors’ group, we endorse this politician. So they do have their way of getting to the public on who they feel would be the better candidate for their cause.

B: Do you remember what some of those endorsements were based on? What kind of points of view were argued, the logic?

D: No, I honestly don’t.

B: Ok. Here’s a hypothetical scenario. You have been asked by your presidential candidate of choice to construct a message for a campaign. This campaign is geared to getting people registered to vote and those who are registered to vote, getting them out to vote on election day. You’ve been asked by your candidate of preference to draft a message using healthcare as the theme to target Cuban Americans. What would that message sound like?

D: Doesn’t matter what party it is, just a party?

B: Right, right.

D: The message would be, this candidate has your best interests in providing you, your community, and you family with affordable quality health insurance, affordable being at a reasonable cost, and you know saying something like that because realistically in this country if it hurts you wallet, that’s what usually gets people’s ears. The whole healthcare situation right now is just the rate increases are going up twenty, thirty percent a year, and what I do is small businesses, these companies just cannot absorb thirty percent increases a year, they can’t raise the prices on their products that they sell to the community, thirty, forty percent, they just can’t do that.

B: It’s interesting. So it would sound something like—

D: Quality, affordable healthcare for you and your community, and trying to take care of those less fortunate individuals who cannot afford it. Who cannot afford the insurance, but you need to pay though, you can’t just sit at home when you’re a healthy person and you can get a job. What happens with healthcare a lot of times if you’re an hourly waged employee they can’t afford it, because the employer usually pays a portion of the cost to make it affordable for those individuals because they are working. I do have a problem with a person who sits at home and can work and can find a job getting free heathcare but if you’re a working individual there should be a way of giving that person some kind of coverage. I mean, you’re a working productive citizen.

B: How would you use the healthcare issue to encourage a friend or any other relative to register and vote in future presidential elections on a one on one basis?
D: Same thing. If I thought candidate A didn’t care and was going to allow health insurance to continue to spiral out of control and not give good quality, I would say don’t vote for him. If the other individual did—if I did feel like that individual was going to help the situation, I would sway them to vote that way or try to anyway. Now what I always tell them it’s just my opinion.

B: How would you use the healthcare issue to encourage others in the Latino community to register and vote if the presidential elections were held today? What do you think the message should be?

D: The message would be the exact same thing. I mean, my message would be the same thing to the wealthy as it would be to the hourly waged employee. Quality healthcare at an affordable cost. And you know reasonable coverage. Allow the individual if they do end up in the emergency room that it’s not going to cause them to lose their house or their car or something. That there is coverage when they need it. It would be the same message across the board, I don’t think I would discriminate against the rich or the poor.

B: See just to give you an idea of why this methodology is used in research, in-depth interview, I asked you three questions. One dealt with larger scale community, one dealt with a more interpersonal level and the way that you would frame the issue of healthcare, and it’s really interesting, and I expect to see some differences in the way that you framed, but you framed healthcare as something that should be purchased.

D: Right.

B: And that’s really interesting because I expect to see some differences, and that has been some of the characteristic differences in the way that you framed, but you framed healthcare as something that should be purchased.

D: Well, I can explain to you why I did that—

B: You don’t have to do that, I just want to give you an idea of why this kind of research is valuable, because it taps into those things.

D: Well in Canada they have quote free healthcare, but if you need an operation you’re not going to get one for a year or two unless you have cash in your pocket so what good does it do? I actually, my brother’s wife is Canadian, and her family is from Canada, and I see them you know once or twice a year, and that free quote unquote healthcare system is a disaster. It’s a disaster.

B: Exactly. And yet you have people that hold that view and you think that the solution to the healthcare issue, is government subsidized healthcare. That’s really interesting that in three different scenarios, in every single one—
D: It’s gotta be left in the private sector because the private sector has to compete within itself to provide quality healthcare because if I’m a health insurance company and my company has the same price as three others but my company provides bad service and bad network and bad everything, people are going to purchase the other things, so I do think it should be something that an individual does pay for, but the problem is of course the cost and affordability.

B: What would you say are the steps that whoever decides to fix the healthcare issue, which is cost, it’s not quality, it’s cost and affordability because we have a growing middle class that can’t afford, forget about the poor, it’s the middle class that can’t cover their families now. What would you say the steps that need to be taken are?

D: The steps that need to be taken are—the government needs to get involved in what is being charged to the consumer and what is being charged to the health insurance companies. Is it ok for a hospital to charge 17 dollars for a Tylenol when they pay two cents for it? I mean, do they need to do that because that’s what it costs them to run the facility, or are they doing that for pure profit? I understand companies are to be profitable, I mean I understand that and that’s the way we live, for profitability but how much profit is good also, I mean because when you provide a service that nobody else does, you can basically charge whatever you want for that service. But within that range, what is usual and customary? What is customary? What should be charged for that and I think the government does need to get involved to an extent and I understand if pharmaceutical companies have to charge a lot of money because they have the whole process for the medication and everything but then again look what happens too, sometimes they take medication off the market too soon—I think it’s sitting down and figuring out what does it cost to do—somebody has appendicitis. What does it cost to have that appendix removed? Let’s see what it costs to everybody. Put in a profit margin for everybody, but if it’s a thousand dollar procedure, let’s not charge six thousand dollars for it. I mean it definitely comes down to there being a cost chart or something telling you exactly what everything should cost and then within the range of what you pay for.

B: Like what they do with cars.

D: Exactly. You know exactly what you’re paying for. Exactly. It’s a fee schedule. That gives you exactly what it costs them to do it, what it costs them in materials, and then let’s put in a profit margin within there, but the way it’s set up right now they don’t have to do that. The pharmaceutical companies everything there is geared to whoever buys their stock. Their stock holders, make billions and billions and billions of dollars but let’s rape the consumer at the same time, because that’s what they do.
B: What’s ironic is that most of these larger pharmaceutical companies are U.S. companies and yet we in the U.S. pay the highest price.

D: The highest price, and they sell it Canada cheaper. I mean I’m in businesses every day. People tell me every day that they get their medication from Canada, every day, and I’m like more power to you, if you’re saving money, you do what you need to do, as long as it’s an approved medication and you know what you’re getting, good for you. Now if you don’t know what you’re getting, that’s your problem.

B: Now, these are some basic demographics, you can refuse to answer if you choose. But these are sort of to provide a picture without using your name or the name of your employer, provide a picture with some basic demographics of who the different respondents were in this study. Your age?

D: Thirty seven.

B: Income range, can be as wide as you can.

D: Between 80 and 150 thousand.

B: Ok. What is your occupation.

D: I’m an account executive sales rep.

B: Your religious affiliation?

D: I’m Catholic. Not necessarily practicing, I disagree with a lot of what Catholicism does and says. I have a problem with a priest telling me how to treat my wife and my children when is he neither married nor is he a parent. So it’s very hard. I don’t think there’s anything wrong with a priest being with a loved one, man or woman, because that’s their choice, I just don’t think a lot of the things in Catholicism, I don’t think they’re natural, and I think we’re realizing that now as time goes on how unnatural a lot of it is. Because we’re mammals, we’re humans. I don’t care what you say. You’re human. You have needs too. Nobody’s going to change you. ............
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Interview with: 39 year old Puerto Rican-American female who is a health insurance company Marketing Director in Miami Florida. She is also a single mother of a 5 year old girl.
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[Test recorder and tape (please state your name and occupation) then proceed.]

Thank you for participating in this study. During this interview you’ll have the opportunity to share some of your experiences and opinions about the 2004 presidential election and comment on the issues that were most important to you. You will also have the opportunity to share the critical factors that influenced your decisions to participate or not participate in the 2004 presidential election. I encourage you to be as candid as possible about your feelings, reactions, views and opinions during this interview. There are no wrong answers. The goal of this study is to understand the true and honest experience and opinions of Hispanics/Latinos in the state of Florida about these issues. I’d also like to remind you that only your experiences will be included in the report. Your identity will remain confidential for purposes of this study. Do you have any questions before we start? Ok, let’s start talking about your experience.

First, we’ll start with some basic screening questions to make sure you meet the criteria set for this study.

B: Are you eligible to vote in the U.S.?
A: Yes.

B: Are you registered to vote?
A: Yes.

B: When did you register?
A: I would say, I was, as far back as I was legal to vote, so I would say when I was 18.

B: So that was probably back when you were in New York?
A: No, I was here in Florida. In fact, when I was 18, it was that summer that I moved over here, so I would say when I was 19.
B: Why did you register to vote?

A: I don’t know I just felt that it was important, that it was my duty as a citizen of the United States to give my opinion, to give my input with regards to voting.

B: Were you born in the U.S. or back in Puerto Rico?

A: No, I was born in the U.S.

B: Yeah that’s right, so you’re a U.S. citizen. What is the last member of your family to be born back in Puerto Rico? Who is the closest member to you.

A: The closest member to me would be my mother.

B: How about your father?

A: My dad also.

B: What is your cultural heritage? Do you identify yourself mostly as an American or as a Puerto Rican?

A: Puerto Rican.

B: Do you identify yourself as a combination of these two, American and Puerto Rican?

A: No, I don’t bring out that American stuff, when people tell me, what’s your race, I say Puerto Rican. I say I’m here and I say Puerto Rican.

B: I’m going to ask this following question for a formality, but I think I know what your answer’s going to be. What percentage of your identity would you assign as American and what percent would you say is Hispanic or Latino?

A: I would say, I use American as my foundation, I never really bring that up because it’s not an issue for me. I see that that’s an issue for people that never had that. You understand what I’m saying? When you don’t have it, you have to say, oh I’m an American. But for me I was born in America and I know I’m an American so I’m secure of that so, I would say 80 percent of the time I’d say I’m Puerto Rican. And then from there a conversation will extend or you know because it’s usually just strangers or people you meet on the street they say what are you? So I’ll never come out and say I’m an American. They obviously want to know what my ethnic background is. They don’t want to know that I’m an American

B: Do you identify with the ethnic identifier Latina or Hispanic?
A: Hispanic.

B: Why?

A: You know, this is my opinion, but you know when you say Latina, it’s kind of stereotyping, even though Hispanic is that too, but it’s like for me it’s more conservative just saying that you’re Latin. You never say Latina. You say Latin, or Hispanic. Latina is more like slang, from the street and I don’t ever like coming across like that. So I just say Latin. Or if that comes up I very rarely use the term Latin. I’ll say Hispanic.

B: So you feel that Hispanic carries a more professional connotation?

A: Correct, correct.

B: What race do you consider yourself? White, black, mestiza, or mulatta? Mestiza would be more Spanish—

A: When I’m given that choice, I always put white.

B: White? Ok.

A: Because that’s what I understand. You know what I’m saying?

B: What is the language you speak most at home?

A: Spanish.

B: What is the primary language you speak most with close relatives such as parents, spouse or children?

A: Mix. Spanish, English, depending where the conversation is going.

B: Which one would you say you speak the most?

A: I would say that I speak to older people in Spanish, and like my siblings, and my generation in English, you know we’ll throw in a Spanish word here and there.

B: What is the primary language you speak with friends?

A: English.

B: What is the language you speak most at school or at work?

A: It’s mixed. I would say fifty percent Spanish, fifty percent English, because I deal with clients, dealing in Miami, Florida, you actually have clients that don’t speak
a word of English. You know? Or only know the basics of English. So in order to get your point across you need to speak to them in Spanish.

B: What city do you live in?

A: Miami.

B: Now, I’d like to hear about your previous involvement in political activities. This is just general questions. How much attention would you say you pay to politics in general?

A: Ten percent, fifteen percent.

B: Of your time? On a weekly basis?

A: On a weekly basis, yeah.

B: What kinds of issues—

A: Oh, you know, I don’t like stop to hear about social security and stuff like that because the way I see it it’s beyond our control. You can say and do whatever you want but unless you’re there making a difference, your opinion is not going to change what’s going to happen. When something serious is going on, when there’s a news release or something, I make it my business to know because I wanna know.

B: When you say that if you’re not there to make a difference, what to you mean?

A: Uh I’m not the type of person I’m going to go rally with somebody about social security. I listen enough so that I’m educated and I know what’s going on, but as far as sitting there in front of the TV and looking at Bush channel after channel after channel. I just want to know.

B: So you feel that it’s ultimately in the hands of the government officials that make the decisions—

A: Yeah, and you know what, even I was very disappointed when I voted, cause I didn’t vote for Bush and I don’t believe that that was fair. He didn’t win. In my eyes. He shouldn’t have. So that just kind of discouraged me. It doesn’t matter. It’s a wasted trip for me. It’s a wasted night that I took, I stood on line for 45 minutes…

B: To vote?

A: To vote and um it didn’t matter, because it’s not really what we want, you know? I’ve seen other things after that… I saw the movie that that gentleman did, and everything he said makes sense, and you don’t know what side to look at.
B: You’re talking about Michael Moore?

A: Yeah, yeah.

B: Now you say that’s not really what we want. What we are you referring to?

A: I’m talking about we. I know a lot of Latin people, Hispanic people, they voted for Kerry, not so much because Kerry was better than Bush, but it was different. You know? So it’s not a matter of Kerry being better than Bush, but you want something different. So anything is better than what you currently have. And when you know so many people voting for Kerry, Kerry, Kerry, and all the sudden Bush wins like I told you, I don’t follow politics too much, but I follow it enough to know what states belong to Kerry, and to see Bush win those states is bullshit.

B: What were those particular states?

A: Ohio. Ohio surprised the hell out of me, and I know because I went to Ohio in August and I have friends that live there, and everybody was voting for him. So it was like a sure thing. So when I saw that on TV, I said you know what? There’s something beyond our control that’s going on here. It’s just—

B: Well you know that Ohio played the role in 2004 that Florida played in 2000?

A: Right.

B: It was that fair-weather state that just turned the election around.

A: Yeah. But seeing Michael Moore’s movie and seeing how much involvement Bush’s family and friends and colleagues has in politics, makes you believe that they made him win. Not that he won. Bush has power behind everything, so why make an election? Call it Cuba. You know?

B: How much attention would you say you pay to government activities, and more to the legislative process?

A: I really don’t. Unless it’s something that hits me personally, or hits home, then I’ll look into it and, but I really don’t. I don’t participate. I’m not really a political person. Simply because there’s not a right answer. You know what I mean? When you start thinking about it, it’s scaring. So it’s like that, I just don’t deal with it.

B: Tell me about your general opinion about voting in presidential elections in the United States. You sort of hinted at it somewhat. If you had to give me a broad general idea of how you feel about the process. You gave me some specific examples for example that you feel like you wasted your time in line at the polls,
but not limiting your explanation to this particular election, thinking about elections in the U.S. in general, what’s your view?

A: I think that too much money is spent on the stuff that goes on before the election. I think if you just go out and make it simple and you touch people and you touch people’s hearts. Don’t go to a university where ten thousand police officers are protecting that candidate and people can’t get to him. If you want people to know you and like you, you have to keep in touch with them, and that means physically. You have to be open, of course there’s danger involved there, what I’m saying is you can’t put someone in a university and say there’s only a hundred tickets. You know what I mean? And I don’t think that these candidates should go out the summer of the presidential election, they should do this way in advance. If they want it that badly. That’s the way that I would do it. If I knew that in the next four years I wanted to be a candidate, I’ll start working today. And make it seen today. Not spend millions of dollars. You know I’ve never thought about that, now you’re making me think about that, the amount of money that’s spent on that and knowing everything else that’s going on in the world, just make it simple. Half of these things don’t get used anyway, the dinners the food that goes on and the parties, you know just make it simple, go out and visit people, see what their needs are, see what’s really important, and be yourself. Don’t give an answer that you want everybody to hear. An if you’re elected that’s fine and if you’re not, then you move on.

B: Do you feel that despite that view which many people share, elections have become ?????

A: Right, a popularity contest, entertainment.

B: Do you think that it’s still worth participating in voting?

A: Oh, I won’t stop voting because if something happens that I don’t agree on, I will always think in the back of my mind, maybe I could have made a difference.

B: I believe that you have sort of a cynical take on what I’m about to say, and I have the same take, because there’s always power ????? But it seems like in 2000 what happened in Florida, that Bush won Florida by 597 votes would sort of support what you just said, that sometimes we don’t want to take a chance and run the risk that maybe your vote would have made a difference.

A: Right. That one vote. I mean if that one little vote could have made a difference. So I won’t stop, but I have the right, I was born and raised in New York and I didn’t know so much about communism and that part of history, they don’t teach you, they don’t go that far. And coming here, I have taken for granted what so many people are fighting to have, and that’s just the freedom to speak and to eat what you want and go where you want, and drive where you want and live what you want. You know? And
coming here has opened my eyes to that and I won’t take that for granted. Maybe if I was in New York, I’d take a different attitude. But I’ve lived it now, so I know.

B: Tell me about the most recent elections. Tell me about your voting experiences. You mentioned that you had to stand somewhere?

A: Yeah, I had to go to a school that was near—it was in my district next to my home, there was a line outside, like a 45 minute wait. And no, it was a very relaxed evening, no tension or anything it’s just you go in there with hopes that you’re going to make a difference, even though you’re that one person and like I told you, the people that were talking and you overhear conversations, everyone was voting for Kerry. Nobody was voting for Bush.

B: I’m sure that encouraged you some.

A: Yeah, I’m like yeah, that’s where I want to go, even though there’s a large population in Miami that vote Republican. But my take on this is they don’t know why they’re voting Republican. The only reason why they’re voting Republican is because Castro said he was a Democrat. So they don’t trust Democrats, but they don’t know what the hell they’re voting for. They’re not the rich. They’re not the better kind, they’re not better than the middle class. They are Democrats. They should be voting for their type of person. But because they were fooled and they lost their country, and because somebody said the word Democrat, they don’t vote Democrat. It’s not so much that they’re Republicans and that’s what they believe, they don’t know what the hell they’re talking about. They just vote for that because Castro said he was Democrat. That’s all.

B: You mentioned that you were a little disappointed with the outcome. My question was about your most recent experience with the electoral process. Would you like to add something to that?

A: What do you mean in terms of what?

B: Your last experience voting—

A: It wasn’t bad, it wasn’t bad at all, it went pretty smooth, you know except for the waiting, it’s the presidential campaign, everybody wants to vote.

B: It sounds like your visit to the poll was not just out of a sense of duty. It sounds like you were a little bit interested in the process—

A: Yeah, I was, and that happened within the last week. Like in the last week you don’t know which way you’re going to go it’s like I don’t know if I’m going to vote for this person, I’m not going to vote for that person, I wasn’t going to vote for Kerry—

B: So were you one of those undecideds?
A: I was undecided, I’m going to tell you why, because when I saw Kerry earlier in that month, I saw his wife and I was not going to vote for him simply because of his wife.

B: Why?

A: Because she did a couple of things that I didn’t agree on first of all, I understand that she would have been the first lady, but there’s a place for her. And it looked like she was going to be the woman behind the man. And I didn’t like who I saw. Cause that’s what happened in Bill and Hilary’s case. She really supported him. I said if this guy’s gotta listen to his wife, she’s brutal. And I’m sure that Hilary was as brutal as she is but she came across as being professional. And this woman did not come across as being professional. I said I don’t know if I want her running my country. You know? But then I thought about all the other things and how, I want to say I’m unhappy. I’m not happy, I’m not unhappy, I just as far as the war is concerned, I want it to be over. So I said you know what, just for a change if you don’t like what’s going on, you have to take action.

B: So what was it specifically that made you turn around and vote for Kerry?

A: At the end it was the war.

B: His position on the war?

A: His position on the war.

B: Did the debates have any impact? Did you watch any of the debates?

A: I watched two of them.

B: Did that help in any way?

A: No, because he seemed weak to me, he didn’t seem like a strong person. But believe it or not that’s why I voted for him. Because he seemed more humble. And I want a person that’s like me, that thinks like me to run the country, not someone that’s over me and thinking, you know what I mean? I mean for me, the majority in the United States is middle class, and that’s what I am. So I want someone thinking in my terms, how to improve my life and those that have less than me, not those that have more than me.

B: Do you feel that that’s the case with Bush?

A: Yeah, oh yeah. And I’m not a political person, but that’s what I see, you know? You need money to make money. And that’s not the way it should be. You need to help those that don’t have money.
B: What would you say is the value of voting in presidential elections among members of your family?

A: Zero. Zero, I think I’m the only person that voted in my whole family—and I would say my immediate family unit, like my mother and my father, my brothers and my sister, I’m not talking about aunts and uncles, I know that they don’t vote and they live in New York, but it’s just not the way we were raised. We were raised to eat and work and put money away and be happy with what you have.

B: So where do you get this sense of duty?

A: Miami.

B: But you registered to vote before—

A: I registered to vote before Miami because when you become a young adult and you have all these responsibilities you turn 18 and you have all this permission to do all this stuff and I just wanted to stick my head into everything—I wanted to be involved.

B: But then your convictions then came when you moved to Miami. What was it about Miami?

A: Right, when I saw that somebody people—you know you complain because you had a rough day at work and here somebody came in a tire, and they’re just happy with what they have and I’m complaining because I broke a nail or I have a headache or something and this person is just happy cause they can eat what they want when they want.

B: Some of these questions don’t apply to you because you’re Puerto Rican, so I’m trying to skip those…So based on your experience, do you think political leaders are interested in the problems of particular concern to Hispanics living in the state of Florida?

A: No, I think that they’ll do what appeals to the majority to get that vote.

B: So you think it’s all about the vote.

A: That’s it. Power, it’s all about power.

B: Can you make any distinction between Democrats and Republicans?

A: I don’t—up until recently they have something now called Independent, but Democrat, Republican, or whatever, and I put Independent because I’ll go with what makes me feel comfortable, the way my life is. If I believe in what somebody says and you don’t ever believe—you’re not ever behind that person
100%, but there’s ??? that has to stick out that you believe in that makes you say ok I’m going to vote for ??? And so that ??? doesn’t make me either party. It’s whoever is going to do right by me for my future and for my daughter’s future. And that’s what happened with Kerry and Bush. It wasn’t a matter of being Republican or Democrat, it was a matter of what I believe in, where I think there should be improvements, and who’s going to make that change. And that’s why at the very last moment, I changed my mind.

B: Regardless of how you may have voted in the past, please tell me which of the two dominant parties Democrat or Republican do you think has more concern for Hispanics Latinos in general or is there any difference?

A: I think that right now I don’t think there’s any difference. Years ago I would say like the Clinton election and maybe before that, Democrats were concerned with Hispanic Latin community. But again this is where I tell you it’s where the vote is at, where the majority is going. If they need to get the Black Haitans in Miami, then that’s who they’ll go after, that’s who they’ll cater to. If they need to go to the Cuban Hispanics in Miami then that’s who they’ll cater to, and so on and so forth.

B: What do you believe has been a factor that has produced that change in the Democratic Party that you mentioned?

A: Greed and power. And the Democrat Party is always being looked at as the weak party not as the stronger party because they ??? and help the needy and the sick if you will. And that’s why. It’s power. It’s all about power.

B: Now let’s talk about some other forms of participation in civic life. Did you attend a public meeting or demonstration in your community during the 2004 U.S. presidential election?

A: No.

B: Why not?

A: Because it’s just not, you know—first of all I didn’t know who to vote for when that was going on, and to me it’s all entertainment. The parties and stuff, it’s all entertainment, it’s a matter of wasting money. You can watch it on TV whatever they have to say.

B: Did you attend a political party, meeting.. I guess the answer to that is no.

A: No.
B: Did you volunteer with an organization in the community during the election of 2004? Not necessarily a political organization, any organization that was perhaps trying to get people to register to vote…

A: No.

B: Why not?

A: Because I don’t think that that’s something. The general statement politics is like religion and usually when you do something like that you have to give an opinion, you have to explain to someone why it’s important to vote. You have to give them your views, you have to sell them on that and then you have to set examples with yourself. So I don’t want to go out and tell anybody look you need to vote or whatever, why, are you happy the way you’re living, do you want to then you have to ask them to choose. I think that’s not something you should impose your opinion on anybody. It has to come from within. Helping is one thing, but and the commercials that say vote and stuff, but when you’re going out in the public and you have people that are that really don’t know, and they’ll go to you for guidance and ??? giving them the wrong answer. It’s just not my business.

B: Did you volunteer with a presidential campaign?

A: No.

B: Did you make any financial contributions to a candidate or party…

A: No.

B: Did you contact an elected official during the 2004 election…

A: No.

B: Did you write a letter to an editor of a publication…

A: No.

B: Did you wear a campaign button, put a sticker on your car or display a sign on your property--

A: No.

B: Why not?

A: Because that’s personal for me, there’s some wacky people out there that are really political. I don’t want anybody…
B: Safety?

A: Yeah, for safety reasons number one, and number two I don’t think anybody deserves it. Nobody deserves for me to advertise.

B: You didn’t feel strongly enough about either candidate…

A: About either candidate, yeah.

B: Have you ever used a poster, or a sticker or a button or anything?

A: No.

B: No? Never have? Now, let’s talk about the kinds of messages that you might have heard during the 2004 presidential elections. This is where you get to tell me if there were any particular messages that caught your attention last year. Now my area of research is public relations. So this pertains more to a message, the communication aspect of the election season. Now this research that I’m doing is focusing on the registration drives that took place in the state of Florida trying to get more Latinos registered to vote. So these questions are going to be pertaining to those things. But these are very general questions. In what language are the news programs you consume the most?

A: English.

B: What about TV?

A: English.

B: Radio?

A: Depends, depends the mood I’m in. Spanish is a little more nerve-racking.

B: It’s almost like the Spanish news on television.

A: Yeah, it’s a little more nerve-racking, they have a way of being more dramatic. Latin and Hispanic channels are more dramatic than English.

B: I had an interesting conversation with about the different coverage that Latin stations have given the war in Iraq than the American mainstream coverage, and I was explaining to her how graphic the coverage of the war in Iraq is on Spanish television as opposed to English television.

A: It’s too loud it’s too crazy.

B: So on a good day you’ll do Spanish.
A: Right.

B: What about print newspapers and magazines?

A: English.

B: And online sources?

A: English.

B: Why do you give yourself that option with radio as opposed to the other media?

A: What do you mean?

B: The only one you mentioned you had the option of going English or Spanish was radio. Why was that?

A: Because just magazines and stuff like that, it appeals to me in English better.

B: So it’s preference.

A: It’s preference. And again, Hispanic people, they’re too dramatic, even magazines, it just—you know women look a lot more sluttier in the Spanish magazines. You know the makeup, they overdo it too much, they want too much attention. Do you know what I mean? They want to outdo America, or outdo the English, you know? You’ll even see a concert in Spanish and in English and you’ll see they’ll wear these goofy outfits thinking that they’re going to be better than an English show and it’s not, they’re just being too dramatic.

B: So you don’t appreciate that.

A: No.

B: What do you remember about the key messages if any that encouraged you to become more politically active by registering and voting in 2004? Do you remember any particular message, by a campaign or by a political organization or by a group that perhaps motivated you… You mentioned one already. The Michael Moore—

A: Yeah but I watched that after. I did it on purpose. I had it and I watched it after.

B: Interesting. Because you didn’t want it to influence—

A: I didn’t want that to interfere with my decision.

B: How did you feel afterwards when you watched the movie?
A: I would say ?? my choice. I didn’t know which way it was going to go. I heard people talking I didn’t know which way it was going to go but I didn’t want it to interfere. Because that’s one man’s opinion.

B: Did you—were there any mainstream messages during the elections before the elections that influenced you? So was there any particular message—there were many campaigns out there, politicians were telling you to go out and vote, many organizations, and grassroots organizations—

A: No, I, it’s my duty, there’s one time that I voted ?? in a presidential…

B: But was there any message that motivated you, that you felt made an impact?

A: No, I just wanted things to be different.

B: Ok, so the media had nothing to do with it.

A: Uh huh

B: Ok. But did you hear any messages at all?

A: Yeah, you know wherever you go, a month before, a week before, you have to vote, you have to vote, but I already knew in my mind I was going to vote, I just didn’t know for who.

B: Who were some of the sponsors of those messages? Do you remember—

A: No, you just see commercials, you see the commercial something about, the commercial I can tell you off the top of my head about Bush not going to war, and they’ll say Kerry did. But that didn’t influence me, it was just there on the TV, you’re walking by and you see it, it’s not like I’m going to vote for him, cause I still wasn’t convinced.

B: Ok. That was a Kerry campaign ad…

A: Correct.

B: Do you see anything that was not necessarily partisan, obviously partisan such as a campaign ad, a Democrat ad or a Bush ad or a Republican ad, something put out by an organization, any organization, just to help encourage—

A: No, I can’t, I can’t tell you that. There was so much, I can’t think off the top of my head. Like I said, it doesn’t really catch my attention.

B: Ok, but you were exposed to something.
A: Yeah, yeah. All over the corners, in every corner here.

B: So my next question was what was your reaction to the messages that encouraged you to become more politically active, to register to vote, or to vote, and your answer is that it didn’t have an impact.

A: I knew what I wanted to do. I just didn’t know who I was going to vote for.

B: Ok. None of those had—you didn’t really have a reaction to—

A: No.

B: It was everywhere, it was on billboards.

A: Right. It was like when you’re driving, I was just like, you know what, when the time comes I’ll make that decision. I’m not going ot pay attention to anybody else.

B: If there were a message or a campaign or a PSA, if it were to make an impact, if it were to motivate you or not motivate you or turn you off, what would that message have to include to sort of catch your attention? From a marketing point of view.

A: I’ll tell you the thing that caught my attention was Bush, what I didn’t like about him and I think this was part of the reason I didn’t vote for him, is like on abortion how he was going to ???? I’m not for abortion, I would never use that as a remedy or birth control. But things happen, and it’s ultimately a child in a person’s body, but it’s also that person’s body and you’re not thinking about the long-term commitment, and the life that that child is going to lead. If somebody is telling you I can’t do it, I’m not going to do it, look what’s out there already. You don’t want to bring somebody in a fucked up world and not take care of them. So if you have a 19-year-old, poor, telling you I don’t want this kid, you can’t make her have it. Because you know what? We’re going to end up paying for him anyway. Or he’s going to be a criminal, or he’s going to be in a foster home, or so that’s not his decision to make. Whereas you’ll see how opposite my opinion is with same sex marriage. That’s not really none of our business. And if there are churches and organizations that are accepting it, why should we—that’s not—nobody to judge. You know the Bible says whatever, but how many other laws and things have been changed no matter what the Bible says. Don’t give me that shit, you know the Bible says it has to be a man and a woman. That’s none of your business. You know. Look, there was somebody in office that was gay. Did anybody prosecute him? No. So don’t tell me that somebody can—who’s to say that two people of the same sex can love each other? It’s not for me, but if that’s their world, then make it easier by going along with it, not against it. I’m not saying that everything that’s—it’s not right—drugs is not right, you shouldn’t
go along with that, but two people that love each other and want to go on with their life, let them go.

B: So you’re trying to tell me that one thing that would motivate you or message that would motivate you to get involved is a message that ?????? intrusive personal—

A: Intrusive, right, don’t tell me what to do in my life. Don’t tell my friends what to do with their life. You know, work with the taxes, work on crime, work on the laws, work with the social security, work with the budget, stop the war, stop killing people, but don’t tell me how to live.

B: So messages that would highlight potential intrusive—

A: Control, right. Correct. Control, or the Howard Stern stuff with cursing and stuff. How many people on the radio do you hear say ass or whatever. They’re just bothering him cause he’s a little bit more out there than anybody else, and he’s on for four straight hours. But that’s freedom of speech. And you may not like it, but I may like it, and if you don’t want to hear it then don’t turn on the station. So things that have to do with the way I control my life, I don’t appreciate. That doesn’t mean that I agree with same sex marriage, I don’t agree with abortion, but that’s not my choice. That may not be right for me, but it could be ok for you and you may be in a bad situation where you may need that abortion or you may have a brother sister uncle cousin friend that is gay and they’re very happy together, so that’s their business.

B: What do you think was the reaction of other Hispanics to this call to become more politically active?

A: In Miami, they don’t know what the hell they want. They listen to their kids, or the old people just think that Castro was a Democrat, don’t vote for it, they’re just like totally—what they don’t understand, is that the reason why they have freedom of speech is because they’re here. So they shouldn’t try to impose. Especially here in Miami. They try to force you to be a Republican and they don’t understand that that’s the reason they are here—because they were not happy doing something that somebody else wanted so you know what? Excuse me, shut the fuck up. Take your opportunity to vote and keep your opinion to yourself. They don’t know what they want. I would say the majority. The older people, the generation that follows that, my generation, a lot of them are influenced by their parents because of what happened in Cuba. New York is a melting pot. I can only differentiate between the two states because that’s where I’ve lived. So everybody has an opinion and but it’s not because they were impacted by a past like the Cuban Americans. But I would say that the majority of them don’t know, they just know what happened in Cuba.

B: So you’re trying to say that those Latinos where were not politically active perhaps heard a call to become more politically active this election season.
A: It’s like my mom, she’s just lazy. They’re just lazy, they don’t want to fill out the forms, they don’t want do anything, they don’t want to stand in line you know there’s somebody that can come to your house, or you can bring a form, or a proxy form, it’s just out of laziness.

B: So some people won’t be politically active because they’re lazy and—

A: Or old, they’ll say you know what it doesn’t count, I’m already old already, what the hell am I doing, what am I voting for, it’s not my world, it’s your world—

B: And you think that here in South Florida, some people become politically active because of what others tell them.

A: Right, it’s not so much—I have a lot of friends, I deal with a lot of refugees. I do my nails, I do my hair, when I do my nails, it’s all Cubans, refugee Cubans. The whole place. I’m going to write a book on them, and each chapter’s going to be on their name, cause they have stories on how they escaped. And to come here and say I’m going to vote for Bush, they don’t know what they’re doing. Do you understand? They don’t know. When I talk to them I say, I’m not political, so I can’t really go out there and preach to them, but I know enough for me to satisfy why I voted for who I voted for. They don’t know. They’re just saying Bush, Bush, Bush, Bush. And I say, do you know why you’re voting for him? Oh because, the other guy wants this, or because of Clinton or whatever, you know Bush is putting a stop on the people that come in here. Because of Clinton you got your ass in here. You know? Those are things they don’t know, and again, I’m not too political. But little things like that I know. So they’re just following a generation. I don’t want to say that about all of them cause I see a lot of younger Cubans very politically involved, but I would say there’s a big majority of them, and I was once married to a Cuban, so I know it’s a way of life. ???: is being Cuban, depending on what happened in their life, or American. For me Puerto Rican is just a way of life, it’s like being Jewish. I’ll never say I’m American first. I’ll say I’m Puerto Rican. It’s the food I eat, it’s the way I dress, it’s what I believe in, it’s the way I speak, it’s whatever, it’s a way of life.

B: Would you recommend for a friend or family member to register to vote?

A: Absolutely.

B: Why?

A: Because, it’s an opportunity that you have. Whether, again I wouldn’t impose my opinion on that person and say oh it’s not going to make a difference. I wouldn’t destroy that for somebody. That’s the way I feel. That there’s a bigger power behind that. Whoever they want to be president is president. Whoever can buy whoever can pay the most, is the one that’s the president. But you don’t
discourage—I would never discourage my daughter. You know, I have a four-year-old and I want her to be heard and her to know that we have that opportunity, because again, maybe I wouldn’t have thought this way if I continued to live in New York, but coming here and knowing that what I have is so valuable, I would never take that away from anybody. So if I had that right, I would encourage that.

B: Are you familiar with the South Western Voter Registration Education Program?
A: No.

B: Are you familiar with the League of United Latin American Citizens’?
A: No.

B: Are you familiar with voter reg—ok, the reason why I asked you about South Western Voter Registration Education Program and LULAC was because these are two organizations that have very big operations here before the elections. They were trying to get more Latinos to register to vote, and then they also have what is known as get out the vote efforts, and these drives where they call people and tell them don’t forget—
A: I got phone calls like that, I just would hang up on them.

B: Ok. Well these two organizations have two very large programs. And my area of research in public relations and mass communications is development communication projects. Projects such as that one that try to take a community and improve some kind of and that includes political activism as well. So, are you familiar with any other organizations, registration, or get out the vote efforts that might have been led by community organization or government or religious organization or even a media organization that targeted Latinos in your community?
A: The only thing that I remember, when you would turn on the TV, was MTV. They were really big on voting, everything was get out to vote, make your vote count, that’s what I remember—

B: Do you remember anything targeting Hispanics?
A: Depending on who the entertainer was. You know if they would put Jennifer Lopez—yeah, she would tell Hispanic people, get out and vote, it’s your duty, as a citizen, if it was somebody else, they would target their kind of people.

B: How about the Spanish media? Did you see anything in Spanish media?
A: No, I don’t even watch Spanish media?

B: Radio?
A: Yeah, but you know what, when they start talking about politics, Latin people are very radical, that’s the word I was looking for, not dramatic, radical. And I don’t like that. I don’t appreciate that. So I just stay away from that.

B: Who do you think should be responsible for these voter registration drives? Political parties, campaigns, churches, schools other social institutions, or you’re not sure.

A: I’m not sure. I think that everybody that you mentioned should be involved to some extent. The candidates, of course they want the vote, they should be involved and do their research. Should the coerce people? No. Should they do their research and make transportation and other tools available to people like my mother to get that vote, yeah. But coercion, no.

B: Let’s discuss some of the issues that influenced your decisions about participating in the electoral season in 2004. What are some of the most important issues or concerns affecting your community, the Latino community, or more specifically, the Puerto Rican community in Miami?

A: We don’t really count in Miami. The people that count are the Cubans. I’m a minority. In New York, I’m a majority. In here, I’m a minority, so I don’t really count. There’s not enough of me to make a difference.

B: So would you say that that’s one of the most important issues affecting your community?

A: No, because I’m American. And even if I wasn’t born here as a Puerto Rican, I would be an American, so that’s wouldn’t be an issue and you always take for granted—like I said in the beginning—what you have. And I don’t think that--I think that whoever is here is not worried about what the Cuban Americans are worried about because they’ve had it.

B: As a Puerto Rican, can you identify any issues or concerns that are affecting that community, and I know that as you mentioned, the immigration issue is not an issue, Puerto Ricans can travel back and forth from the island as they wish, but are there any issues that you can identify as you know this is something that politicians should pay attention to?

A: Well the only issue with Puerto Ricans is the issue—to me there’s not a major issue—you get up, you eat, you sleep, you take a shower, you take care of your family—is laziness. You either see good, hard-working Puerto Ricans that speak good Spanish and make it their point to come across as intelligent American Puerto Ricans, and you have the lazy ones that live off of government help, don’t speak good Spanish, don’t speak good English, and come across as being idiots, and everybody says that. So that’s not an issue, they have an opportunity that a
lot of people in this state wish they had. So they just need to get it together. There’s not really an issue going on with the Puerto Rican community and I think that there is ???? and I’m not a part of that because I don’t get involved in stuff like that but pull together to get an answer, to get a result.

B: What were the most important issues on your mind during the 2004 presidential election?

A: The, abortion. Everything that would intrude, like you said, in my personal life. Anything that would intrude that would try to make me do something that was against my will. That had nothing to do with politics. Social security is one thing. It’s the government’s money, and whatever, and laws and stuff like that. But when it comes to the abortion, and the same sex marriage, it’s nobody’s business. And if you want church—again like I said, if you have churches and associations, and you know the archdiocese blessing it in one state, why not the other, because you don’t like it? And freedom of speech. What they’re doing now with the radio, and fining people, or taking people off the air because they don’t like what they say. I mean don’t listen. ????

B: If I asked you to prioritize your ???? from one to three or what were the top issues on your mind during the election?

A: The top issues would be the freedom to speak, because even though we say we can speak, we can’t speak, the second would be abortion, and the third one would be same sex marriages.

B: It sounds like on all of these, you’ve stood more with the Democrats than the Republicans.

A: Absolutely, absolutely, they want their money, keep your money and buy your homes and your real estate. Leave the poor people to do what they can with their lives. You know what I mean? For them it’s an easy answer. They may ban abortion, but they can pay somebody three thousand dollars to give their daughter an abortion in their house. The middle class person can’t do that.

B: What is the impact these important following issues on you, your family ???? I’m going to give you some other issues that you didn’t mention, and I want you to tell me if these had an impact on you, your family, or your community. Education. Does it have an impact on you, your family or your community?

A: On me right now because I’m raising my daughter, so yeah, education, I haven’t thought about it in the broad scheme of things, but yeah, it does concern me.

B: What do you mean because you’re raising your daughter? About the public school system?

A: Public school system versus private school system.
B: Price, or quality?

A: Well, both before I put my daughter in school school, I went to at least ten schools and I wasn’t satisfied with the level of the teachers, the caring, it’s like I felt like staying home. In both, public school and private school.

B: So you ????

A: Yeah, very much so.

B: What about jobs? How does that have an impact on you, you family, and your community?

A: Everything. Jobs has an impact on everything—you start cutting jobs, you start getting people who start getting desperate, there’s more crime, I have a ??? of friends and my friends’ family, and you know unemployment, employment, that’s a big issue. I’ve been very blessed. I’m in a position where at one point or another, what I’ve learned, I can take with me and use it in another industry, but some people don’t have that. So that’s very important.

B: How bout the economy in general. As an issue?

A: Yeah, that’s an issue. That’s a huge issue. These are things that I don’t give much thought to, but they make you think. I just think that regardless of what everybody’s saying with the homes and the mortgages or whatever, I don’t see too many people doing well. Like I said, it’s the people that have money that are making money. That’s not the way it’s supposed to be.

B: How about the war in Iraq?

A: I’m very bothered about that. Because when it was crucial, nobody died, and now that it’s supposed to be a peaceful time and time to get a city in order, people are dying for no reason. And I think of my child and how I would feel if I had to send him over there, and they’re dying for other people’s opinions and causes, then send your own kids out there. Send your kid out there, you go out there, you put a helmet on your head and wear a gun. And see what happens. Don’t send my kid out there.

B: So I’m sure you love that scene in the Moore video where he follows the senator around—

A: Oh, yeah, yeah, I do. Send your kid out there, don’t send mine. You know?

B: How about terrorism? Is that an issue?
A: Yeah, when I think about it. And the reason why I compare it, I’m not saying it’s as scary as death but death is an issue that I don’t like to discuss. I don’t even go to people’s funerals. Cause there’s such a sense of insecurity when I leave a funeral, that it just sticks to me for days. And I don’t like to think about it. Because I don’t wanna leave my house, I don’t want to leave my daughter at school. I just, live day by day…

B: So sort of, the whole terrorist issue…

A: I don’t like it. I feel unsafe. I feel that it doesn’t matter what they’re going with security an the lighters and whatever, we’re not safe. If somebody wants to kill us and somebody wants to blow us up, they’re going to do it. I don’t care what money they’re spending on what devices, and how many people they’re hiring, they can’t pay anybody off and that amount is bigger than what we’re paying them—for security.

B: How about healthcare?

A: Oh you mentioned a sore subject because I sell health insure.

B: I know.

A: I just think that something’s gotta give. Either the healthcare industry has got to go back to selling original plans, original major medical plans, which is going to totally whack everybody out, because that means more out of pocket… or … I don’t know. I don’t see this system going as—what do they have—socialism, like in Canada. That’s never going to happen here. Cause they gotta make money. Everything’s about money over here. But as far as healthcare, I feel sorry for older people, I feel sorry for us. What’s going to happen.

B: Immigration? Does it affect you, your family, or your community?

A: It doesn’t affect me but and I don’t really think about it, but when you put yourself in somebody else’s shoes where they want to live a better life, and they can live a better life here. They can make more money, and they can, you know, why not? So long as they do everything that’s correct, why not? That’s how come America’s America and so powerful. Because ??? like that. So why give these people such a hard time? Just let them come over, if they’re having a problem, they’re having a problem, and let them come over. It’s when you push people like that away that you see a lot more crime. And a lot more hunger and starvation. And things that are just not human.

B: What about tax cuts?

A: I don’t know, I don’t really care, those are things beyond my control.
B: That’s on that list…

A: Yeah. It doesn’t really matter, I have to pay them. I have to pay taxes when I buy something, that’s it. Is my word going to make a difference? No, because has to do with money, and someone would probably kill me from the White House if I tried to make a big stink about it anyway.

B: So what would you say were the issues you considered to be less important in 2004 during presidential elections?

A: The taxes, the social security, anything that I cannot control. Anything that was not of immediate control to me. I didn’t care, because it wasn’t going to make a difference anyway. Like you say it was the things that were of a personal nature to me. Do I agree with the things that caught my eye? No, but I have friends and family whose lives were touched by those issues. By the speaking, by the same sex marriage, by the abortion ???

B: So let me make sure that I’m following you. It sounds like you’re dividing issues on two different—

A: Yeah, personal, and just out of my reach.

B: Out of your reach. But also, it sounds like you’re also labeling these two categories—

A: Can and can’t dos.

B: Exactly, issues that my vote will matter for, and issues that regardless of who gets elected—

A: Exactly, it doesn’t matter. It’s what they believe in. They’re going to do whatever they wanna do whenever they wanna do it. And you know what? They can make a thousand promises but when they sit behind the chair, they’re going to do what they want.

B: And that’s very interesting because that’s a very critical approach to politics. We’re going to talk about a very specific issue, this is the issue that I’m focusing on specifically in my dissertation, it’s healthcare ???? My first question was, “Is healthcare an important issue?” and you said “It is.” So I’m going to follow that up with this question: You mentioned earlier that healthcare was issue important to you in the 2004 elections. I’m going to ask you to please elaborate? Why was it an important issue to you?

A: Because the person I was voting for, and I don’t remember what he was going to do but I remember everybody, but I just don’t remember. Because I just don’t care to remember. Kerry was going to do something with healthcare and it was
going to definitely affect my job, but what he said is what I value more than my position. I said I’m in a position that has given me the ability to take my skills elsewhere. It’s not right or wrong to sell healthcare, but I see the way the premiums are going. And I know some people can afford it and some people can’t. But that’s what I do for a living, that’s what I chose. And health insurance is like automobile insurance. You really can’t go home without it—you can’t leave home without it. Because you can have a good ?? and lose your property and everything you worked for as a result of a medical bill. But what was the question?

B: So it sounds like if you’re given a choice between voting for someone who’s going to help you keep this particular job and I’m understanding you very well when you say that you’re learning a set a skills here that you can transfer to another industry other than the healthcare industry, communication and marketing and sales and stuff. So if you were given a choice you would vote for the candidate that would perhaps threaten your job security here in this particular industry, for the greater good. Is that fair to say?

A: Yeah. Cause I can always find another, the way I see it I’m very competent and I can always get another position, but to have my life affected, my personal, the way I feel is that this is my career, and I wanna say it’s a job, it’s what I do, a career, but within my career I have met people--I’ve been blessed--in other industries that I know I can take elsewhere. So yeah, my job would be threatened but I would still continue doing what I do.

B: And then it would be worth it if the outcome helps other people.

A: Absolutely. I’m like the underdog. I’m like the underdog approach cause that’s where I came from. Statistically, I should have been pregnant at 19 and maybe on welfare with three kids at my age or whatever, and I made it. So everybody that can’t, I fight for them. So I’m kind of like Robin Hood.

B: What do you remember about the way Bush addressed the healthcare issue during the campaign?

A: He was an idiot. But so was Kerry. They were like two little kids, they didn’t know what they were saying. They were following whoever wrote their speech for them. They didn’t speak with conviction.

B: Do you remember any specifics?

A: They didn’t speak with conviction. I’m really into that. When you believe in something, because that’s the way I am, so I follow what I live. And if you speak with conviction, then it’s coming from the heart. If you’re just talking words, then it’s coming from a piece of paper. So no one really believed or not believed
what they spoke about. They just went for the majority vote. What they thought was the majority vote in their party.

B: So that sort of answered my next question, which was, do you feel like they addressed the issue?

A: For their party.

B: Ok, but in general, for you, did they address the healthcare issue—

A: No, they didn’t really address—well Kerry did say—I don’t remember because I didn’t really care, I don’t remember what he said about healthcare, but everybody said if you vote for him you’re going to screw up your job, you’re going to fuck up your job. And I said, you know what? That’s ok. I can deal with that instead of a man telling me what to do with my body like I’m in Germany or whatever…

B: So with you and even with the healthcare it was more of a lesser of the two evils. I’d rather have someone mess with my job than with my personal body.

A: Exactly.

B: Ok. What do you remember about the positions on the issue of healthcare offered by any other organization in your community or the media during the 2004 election? Do you remember anyone talking about healthcare?

A: I just, I remember maybe something on the TV that said something about medicines or whatever, and then they’re like, well if you vote for Kerry you’re going to lose this, by the time you’re age 72 or whatever, you’re not going to have that. But again, it doesn’t matter to me. I didn’t care.

B: Here is a hypothetical scenario. You have been asked by your presidential candidate to construct a message about healthcare to target your Puerto Rican Americans and motivate them to register and vote. So let’s say for example you’re a ?? and Kerry has asked you as a communication marketing person to draft a message, a basic message, a slogan or a couple of sentences that will be used in efforts to motivate Puerto Rican constituents in Miami to get out and vote. What would that message sound like?

A: My message would have to be in Spanish. With a little bit of slang in there to get the ???

B: You can say it if you want—

A: I don’t know, I can’t think of—it’s something that I would have to think about. It would have to be something very deceiving. Making them believe that they didn’t have to spend a lot of time. The whole thing with voting and going to vote
and getting somebody to vote, is making them believe that the actual process is not as hard as they think it is.

B: But if you were using the issue of healthcare, and how it affects them, how would you use healthcare to persuade. Either it’s important to you, or it’s not important to you, or it has this impact, or decisions are being made... anything like that.

A: I don’t know. It’s not something that I can tell you—I would really have to think about it if I were going to go that far to do something to bring people in, it would have to be very slick and smooth.

B: How would you use the healthcare issue to encourage a friend or a relative to register and vote in future presidential elections? What would you say, if you were using that particular issue? As you would, for example, you talked about abortion, you would say, you know what, you need to go and vote, because if this guy wins, he’s going to tell you what to do with your body. If you were doing the same thing but the issue is healthcare, how would you use it?

A: I couldn’t. Because it doesn’t make a difference to me, and I can’t speak with conviction. I would just be saying it to say it. If it was something I believed in, I can get you to vote.

B: So conviction is very important to you.

A: Yeah, it’s gotta come from within. It’s not a big deal. I love my job, and it pays the bills. But it’s not a big deal. Whereas, if it’s set in stone that you’re going to be controlled to live a certain way, that to me is huge.

B: Just a few demographic questions and we’re done. And your age, you’re 26. You can refuse to answer any of these question... Your income range.

A: I’m 39, 100+

B: 100+, your occupation.

A: Salesperson.

B: Salesperson. Your religious affiliation?

A: Catholic.
Puerto Rican-American Interview 2

Interview with: 19 year old Puerto Rican-American female who is a single college student in Central Florida. She lives with her parents and has been in a military family all her life.

B = Interviewer

A = Respondent

Date Conducted: 5/02/05  4:45 p.m.

[Test recorder and tape (please state your name and occupation) then proceed.]

Thank you for participating in this study. During this interview you’ll have the opportunity to share some of your experiences and opinions about the 2004 presidential election and comment on the issues that were most important to you. You will also have the opportunity to share the critical factors that influenced your decisions to participate or not participate in the 2004 presidential election. I encourage you to be as candid as possible about your feelings, reactions, views and opinions during this interview. There are no wrong answers. The goal of this study is to understand the true and honest experience and opinions of Hispanics/Latinos in the state of Florida about these issues. I’d also like to remind you that only your experiences will be included in the report. Your identity will remain confidential for purposes of this study. Do you have any questions before we start? Ok, let’s start talking about your experience.

First, we’ll start with some basic screening questions to make sure you meet the criteria set for this study.

B: Are you eligible to vote in the U.S.?

A: Yes.

B: Are you registered to vote?

A: Yes.

B: When did you register?

A: Last year.

B: Why did you register to vote?

A: Because they stopped me on campus and they wouldn’t let me go to class.

B: Until you registered?
A: Pretty much.

B: Ok, so was that an aggressive recruitment kind of effort?
A: Right.

B: How did you feel after that? About voting? Did you feel violated?
A: No. I felt neutral.

B: Did you feel empowered?
A: No.

B: You felt like you did what you had to do to get to class.
A: Exactly.

B: How do you feel about it after the elections now?
A: Same, neutral.

B: Were you born in the U.S. or back in Puerto Rico?
A: I was born in the United States.

B: Where?
A: Minor, North Dakota

B: Minor, North Dakota, ok. So you’re a U.S. citizen.
A: Um hmm.

B: What is the last member of your family to be born back in Puerto Rico?
A: Both parents, my mother and my father.

B: Do you identify yourself mostly as an American or as a Hispanic Latina or some kind of combination of these or as a Puerto Rican American?
A: That’s a good question… as a Hispanic.

B: More so than as a Puerto Rican American?
A: Yep. More so, because I was raised in Panama. So I consider myself just Hispanic.

B: Do you identify with the ethnic identifier “Latinoa” or “Hispanic?”

A: Hispanic

B: Why?

A: I don’t know. Because Latin is more of being born there, being of the Latin community. Hispanic is like a Hispanic American because I was born here. Because like it or not, I have I have a lot of American culture too so…

B: What race do you consider yourself to be? White, Black, Mestizo, Mulato other? Mestizo is a mix of Spanish blood with Indian, native Indian from the Carribean islands in Latin America. And mulato is a mixture of Spanish with the Africans that were brought in from Africa.

A: Mestizo.

B: Ok, so you identify more with the Spanish blood and the Indian blood.

A: My grandmother’s Indian.

B: Your grandmother’s Indian? Where from?

A: Well, you know how they say that the Puerto Ricans are Taino Indians. My grandmother looks very Indian.

B: What percentage of your identity would you assign as American and what percent would you say is Hispanic/Latino?

A: I would say about twenty percent is American, eighty percent Hispanic.

B: What is the language you speak most at home?

A: Spanish.

B: What is the language you speak most with close relatives such as parents, spouse or children?

A: Spanish.

B: What is the language you speak most with friends?

A: Spanish.
B: What is the language you speak most at school or at work?
A: English.
B: What city do you live in permanently?
A: Oviedo, Florida.

B: Now, I’d like to hear about your previous involvement in political activities. How much attention would you say you pay to elections politics? This can include the time that you spend reading election related news, or watching or listening to election news, or even discussing election politics with others. Think of it in terms of hours per day or minutes per day.
A: That’s during election time?
B: During election time.
A: I would say, I mean it was surrounding everyone the last week or so, I’d say every day I turned on the news probably about an hour, two hours a day.
B: How much attention would you say you pay to government activities in general? So this is government news in non election season.
A: About two hours a week.
B: Tell me about your general opinion about the importance of voting in presidential elections.
A: To me honestly I don’t feel it’s very important. For the simple fact that I think the government runs it the way they want to. I don’t think that one person will make a difference.
B: And when you say one person, do you mean…
A: One vote.
B: So you don’t think it’s very important.
A: Nope.
B: Have you ever voted in a presidential election in the U.S.?
A: No.
B: Why not?
A: I didn’t vote because in a sense I wanted Kerry because I would agree more with the Democratic points of view but since the damage was already done, I wanted to see it carried out by Bush. To see how it would go because I don’t think that stopping what he’s doing in Iraq and changing the plan completely, I don’t think that would go out to well. So I wasn’t against anyone, but I wasn’t for anyone, so I figured whichever way it turns out, that’s the way it’s going to have to turn out.

B: Ok, so you were in favor of the Democratic candidate, but you knew the most reliable option at the time was the Republican incumbent, so you figured you’d just…

A: Right, just let it run it’s course.

B: Did you ever vote back in Puerto Rico—have you ever lived in Puerto Rico?

A: No.

B: What would you say is the value of voting in presidential elections among members of your family? Your father, your mother, your sister…

A: My mother actually, is the only one that has ever voted. And my sister, she can vote, but she wasn’t able to vote this year. She turned 18 the week after the presidential elections, so she couldn’t vote, and my dad has never voted. And I guess I kind of took after my dad.

B: Now, your dad is a military guy. Does that have anything to do with his decision not to vote?

A: No, I think the same way that he thinks, which is things will happen the way they’re meant to happen… whether I vote or not, it could get twisted, votes could get robbed, so either way, with or without our votes, history will take its course.

B: What would you say is the value of voting in presidential elections among members of your community, that being the Puerto Rican-American community?

A: Actually, I can’t think of one that did vote. All the Puerto Ricans that I know surrounding my family every day, surround me every day, I wouldn’t say too many voted. At least not this year, and this was the year that everyone was kind of pushing toward it, so this was the year that I realized.

B: What do you mean when you say pushing toward it?

A: You know, the artists, the singers, everyone was pushing vote or die this year and that hasn’t happened before. It was like the importance of this one was more than usual. More people than in the recent years voted this time because of all the media attention and all that kind of thing.
B: Does your nation of origin allow you to have dual citizenship so that you can participate in U.S. politics?

B: Based on your experience, do you think political leaders are interested in the problems of particular concern to Hispanics living in the state of Florida?

A: I know the one that I remember was Jeb Bush I think, who actually made an effort to speak Spanish when he reached out to… was that him? I think they’ve verbally addressed it. I haven’t seen any changes, I guess, specific changes but honestly I don’t know what they’re doing for Hispanics that do need the help and the assistance they’re talking about.

B: So you equate the effort of a candidate to speak Spanish with concern for the Latino population?

A: It shows an effort because while he was talking about the Hispanic community, he did make an effort to reach out to the ones that didn’t know how to speak English. I thought that that was admirable whether he did do anything or not.

B: Ok, so would it be fair to summarize your statement as you’ve noticed that some politicians will make the effort to address non-English speaking Hispanics, but you’re not sure that they implement any policy that makes a difference.

A: Exactly.

B: Ok, so then, you don’t really know if political leaders are interested in the problems of particular concern—

A: Right, I’m not too sure.

B: Ok.

A: Especially with this election, they have other things that they’re kind of focused on right now, and I don’t think that that would, and should be the main focuses right now. I think that there are other things that they have to prioritize before that so I don’t blame them. Or think that they’re lacking in one—you know, you can’t pay attention to everything all at once, so.

B: Regardless of how you may have voted in the past, and you just said you hadn’t voted, please tell me which of the two dominant parties, Democrat or Republican, do you think has more concern for Hispanics in general?

A: I think the Democrats.

B: Why?
A: Because they are more towards helping the people that don’t have enough, you know… that aren’t economically stable and things like that. And for many of the immigrants, they aren’t on the top of the list as far as economically goes, so I think that the Democrats more relate and try to reach out to the Hispanic community.

B: Can you recall any intendances where Democrats have actually reached out, or any initiative, or any issues that you—

A: Honestly I can’t remember any.

B: All right, but in general you equate the Democrat with being more sensitive to the Hispanic needs. Now let’s talk about some other forms of participation other than voting. Did you attend a public meeting or demonstration in your community during the 2004 U.S. presidential election?

A: No.

B: Why not?

A: I wasn’t aware of any.

B: Did you attend a political party, meeting, rally or function in your community during the 2004 U.S. presidential election?

A: No.

B: Why not?

A: Wasn’t made aware of any.

B: Did you volunteer with an organization last year to promote voting in your community?

A: No.

B: Why not?

A: Because I didn’t vote. I didn’t want to be a hypocrite and tell people to do something I wasn’t doing.

B: Did you volunteer with a presidential campaign during the election of 2004?

A: No.
B: Did you make any financial contributions to a candidate or party during last year’s presidential election?

A: No. To a cause? Yes. To a candidate? No.

B: Was it a political cause?

A: It was helping out with Iraq and now with the tsunami and that kind of thing.

B: Not as a political contribution.

A: No.

B: Ok. Did you contact an elected official during last year’s election season?

A: No.

B: Did you write a letter to the editor of your favorite print publication during last year’s election season?

A: No.

B: Did you wear a campaign button, put a bumper sticker on your car or display a sign on your property during last year’s presidential election season?

A: No.

B: Why not?

A: I just don’t like displaying anything on my car personally because there are people out there who do have prejudices and I wouldn’t want someone ignorant that didn’t respect others’ points of view to ruin my car or anything like that based on something like that.

B: So it’s a personal security, personal safety kind of decision?

A: Yeah, I’m just not the type to put anything on my car that’s an indicator of what I represent. You know, what I feel about certain issues. The only thing I have on my car is my UCF sticker.

B: In what language are the news programs you consume the most?

A: English

B: What about TV?
A: English

B: What about radio?

A: English

B: What about print (newspapers and magazines) sources?

A: English

B: What about the online sources?

A: English

B: Any other format?

A: No.

B: Now, let’s talk about the kinds of messages that you might have heard during the 2004 presidential elections. This is where you get to tell me if there were any particular messages that aimed to encourage you to vote that may have impacted you or that caught your attention last year. Do you recollect any key messages that encouraged you to become more politically active by registering or by voting in last year’s presidential election?

A: Not any that actually hit home.

B: Do you remember any that were specifically targeting you as a Latina?

A: Not as a Latina, but as a teenager, which was the Vote or Die campaign, it was all over MTV, the news, all the media, the singers, the actresses. None personally that targeted Hispanics.

B: What do you remember about those messages?

A: They just stressed the importance of voting and you know that one vote can make a difference and things like that.

B: How about in addition to media messages, was there any effort on the part of friends, family, coworkers, maybe a community organization that tried to motivate you to vote?

A: No. I guess I share the same points of view as my family, they’re pretty much neutral on everything also, and my friends, they really don’t—I don’t remember anyone actually speaking about it, so.
B: Would you recommend to a friend or family member that they register to vote and become more politically active?

A: I think that if they have strong political views and if they feel that it’s important, I wouldn’t discourage anyone from voting. I think it’s just a personal choice. I wouldn’t discourage or encourage anyone to do it. Just do whatever they feel.

B: Are you familiar with the registration and get out the vote efforts targeting Hispanics in the state of Florida coordinated by the South Western Voter Registration Education Program?

A: No.

B: Never heard of it? SVREP? How about the same efforts, but coordinated this time by the League of United Latin American Citizens’, LULAC?

A: I did hear about them. I did hear about them on campus. Pretty much everything that I heard about voting and registration and all that it was through the university.

B: Through the university? Ok. And you recognize the name LULAC?

A: Yes.

B: Did you –can you tell me anything about their efforts? Just the name.

A: Just the name, I remember.

B: Are you familiar with voter registration or get out the vote efforts by any other community, government, religious or media organization?

A: No.

B: Who do you think should be responsible for these voter registration and get out the vote drives?

A: I think it should be the political parties, because they’re the ones that are most interested in it, they’re the ones spending the most money on it, so it should matter to them more than to anyone else.

B: How about the government in general?

A: How about them?

B: Do you think they should—
A: They should. Because everything depends on it. And it should be more important to them than to the average Joe, who doesn’t really see a difference from day to day or from year to year.

B: How about corporations?

A: Corporations… the corporations that take part in donating money and charity and things like that—

B: Any corporation, like CVS for example. Do you think they should in some way encourage their publics to register to vote?

A: No.

B: Even if it’s a neutral kind of endeavor?

A: Well, I don’t think so. I think the media is enough, you know getting to everyone from university, if that’s not enough to encourage people to vote, why would you, you know pursue that while they’re working.

B: So you do approve of the media getting involved in campaigns?

A: Yeah.

B: Like the MTV… for example, Univision also has a campaign, and you’d approve of that?

A: I do approve of that. People can choose to actually watch it, you can choose to change the channel, but when you are at work, and someone’s telling you to do so, you can’t leave and—

B: What if it’s a customer though?

A: What if it is a customer?

B: Well you can leave if you’re a customer.

A: Yeah, but not if you’re an employee. See what I’m saying. If you’re talking about a corporation, that would be the head people telling the lower people to get involved, and I think it should be a choice. I don’t think it should affect your personal life or your work life. And the university, it shouldn’t affect you going to school either, but they’re not doing so in classrooms, they’re doing so outside, where you do have the choice to walk away, you have the choice to stay.

B: How about churches?

A: No.
B: Why not?

A: I don’t think that church should in any way be involved with the government. I think because, it’s very biased. Just like religion has their own biases within themselves, I don’t think that they should mix it with the government. I think that your religion and government should be separate. I think that your views have something to do with it, like the conservative people might have very strong church values, but I don’t think that they should mesh. I don’t think that one thing has to do with the other. I don’t.

B: Even if it’s a neutral kind of push to a pastor or a priest telling his church to go out there and register to vote and voice your opinion regardless of what party you favor, just it’s your duty, it’s your civic engagement.

A: No.

B: You still disapprove of that?

A: I still disapprove.

B: How about schools? High schools, colleges, universities…

A: I do agree with the high schools and the colleges because if provides a way for people to express themselves, and it does serve as a way to get involved in your community which is always a good thing. But as long as they keep it neutral, and as long as they keep it not away from your education but so it doesn’t interfere, and so that they don’t have a biased opinion. So that if you’re sitting here worshipping one person, if the teacher’s very very Republican and she teaches her class in a Republican manner, that’s going to affect the students, so I think that should be done outside of class.

B: What were the most important issues on your mind during the 2004 presidential election?

A: The war.

B: Why?

A: Because, it’s more of a security factor. I mean, they’re getting their foot in something really big over there. It’s bigger than—you’re dealing with the people’s lifestyle, with their way of living, with their way of life, with their culture, and they’re very strong minded people, and you don’t know what they’re capable of. So, it’s more of a security issue. And I know that they stressed healthcare a lot last year. You know first things first. You gotta make sure that your country’s safe.
B: Are there any other issues that were up there with Iraq? As you considered which party to support?

A: I would say that that was the main issue. The main issue and both parties, they were head to head. I didn’t really favor either one of them because again ???.

B: What are some of the most important issues or concerns affecting your community, the Puerto Rican community?

A: I would say healthcare is a big issue. I know a lot of people that are in between jobs, or they don’t have very high-paying jobs and the reason that they really need one is for healthcare for their families…medical coverage, and all sorts of things like that. Coverage for the eyes, the mouth…the kids… I don’t know about welfare, I haven’t met too many people that are on that so I would say that of what I’ve seen, healthcare has been the biggest issue with the people that I know.

B: So you say healthcare and the war again?

A: And the war.

B: Now when you say the war, are you really talking about security—the top issue on your mind is security and you would have voted for Bush likely because you want him to keep the country secure? Or is it the war because you’re against the war and you would have voted against Kerry because you reject Bush because he started the war…or…

A: If I would have voted, I would have honestly voted for Kerry. That would have been my vote, even though I would have wanted to see the things carried out, I am anti-the war. But the damage is done, so I don’t think that it’s safe to pull out the people that are there.

B: What do you mean when you say the damage is done?

A: The damage is done, we’ve already stuck our foot in the door. We already have our troops over there, we’re already trying to rebuild their government, or whatever it is that they’re trying to do over there. They already started it, so you can’t just pull out of there and tell people that you’re going to help them or whatever it is that you’re trying to do, you can’t stop midway. Because it could go both ways. It could be a good thing, it could be a bad thing, but I think that it’s leaning more towards the bad thing. They’re going to have a chance to get back on their feet and resent what Bush did which was interfere with their daily lives, and it’s not any good.
B: Ok. Please describe the impact or non-impact of the following issues on you, your family, and your community? Education.

A: That was a big issue. Education is a big big deal because the more that schools get crowded, the less they get paid attention to. There is a need for an expansion of schools, more attention, more extracurricular activities to keep kids from running around doing things they shouldn’t be doing. So I think that it’s a big big deal because there’s a lot of problems with the school system, in particular the kindergarten through the twelfth grade, not so much the university, that I see, but in particular high school and middle school and elementary.

B: Employment.

A: Big issue. Big issue. Because of all the cutbacks that were made…when was it, like four years ago? Like in this election, ever since Bush started running it, there have been a lot of cutbacks. From what I hear. It hasn’t affected anyone in my family, and it hasn’t affected anyone that I know, but from the news, I know that it has affected a lot of people.

B: The economy.

A: Ooh.. that’s a big big issue. A big issue. Bush, he made the economy go down right?

B: Well, some people say he has. Some people say he’s kept it from going into depression.

A: In comparison to the Clinton years…

B: Well, it’s a different economy.

A: That’s true. I’ve seen more people disagreeing with the economy now than I have. I don’t know if it’s my family, but even outside of my family I didn’t hear many complaints with Clinton as much as I do now with Bush. Even people my age are talking about it, which they weren’t talking about it with Bush.

B: What kind of complaints are you hearing? The economy in general, are they talking about jobs, I mean—

A: Jobs, I mean, I’ve seen a lot of news articles where people are losing jobs, the economy is going down, whether it’s affected me? It hasn’t.

B: Well, gas prices are—

A: Gas prices, but you know what? I think that was out of Bush’s control, the gas price, because everything is going to go up eventually. And people talk about, I
remember when Cokes were twenty five cents and now they’re up to a dollar twenty five. That’s the way it goes, and people don’t understand it. It’s a limited resource, and—

B: Coca Cola’s limited? Coca Cola’s a limited resource?

A: Gasoline.

B: What about, you talked about the war in Iraq, you sort of mentioned terrorism. Do you have anything…. Ok, well terrorism.

A: Let’s talk about terrorism.

B: Is it a factor that has an impact on you, your family, or your community?

A: I personally, it hasn’t been. I know that some of my Hispanic friends have felt a little bit biased towards because they do look somewhat like the Middle Eastern community. So I know that they sometimes felt a little more… how do you say… like the felt like they were being watched more at airports. But I guess so did everyone else. But you know that darker people tended to be targeted, not targeted, but watched more closely. So it did affect some of the people that I know, but as far as there’s terrorism every day coming from within this country. One of them, you know, like September 11th, it was just something that happened. But I don’t think that it affected incredibly anyone that I know.

B Healthcare. You mentioned healthcare, so we’ll skip that. Immigration.

A: Immigration hasn’t had any impact on my family because we’re Puerto Rican.

B: Taxes. Tax cuts.

A: I haven’t seen much of that one either. Actually, I don’t if this counts, but my dad usually gets cranky around tax time, around April, but this year in particular he was really bad. Because I don’t know if they took more from him or what, but I guess it has affected my dad. And my mother. But me and my sister who have part time jobs, we don’t really see too much… me? No. My family? Yes.

B: What were the issues you considered less important during the 2004 presidential elections last year? That you heard people talk about or the media or the candidates and you said just that’s not an issue as far as I’m concerned.

A: Um, I would say. They mentioned social security, it is important because the elderly population is growing, the biggest group out of the entire United States. So I can’t say that it wasn’t important even though I’m a teenager. To me it wasn’t but I know that it will be and I know it’s important to most people. It’s
just that they stressed the war so much, that’s the biggest chunk of the election that I do remember. That, and healthcare, and social security.

B: Ok. You might not remember because it wasn’t important.

A: Exactly. I really don’t remember anything other that what you mentioned. Those were the highlights of the total election. Over it all it was the war. And Iraq.

B: Now let’s discuss—

A: You know what? I’ll go back on that… welfare. Welfare wasn’t stressed too much. It wasn’t stressed too much in the last election. Not that I remember. And I remember that before that election, it was stressed more, since they didn’t have more things to concentrate on. Welfare was one of them.

B: Would that have been an issue or not an issue for you?

A: No, it wouldn’t have been an issue for me.

B: Now let’s discuss a specific issue: Healthcare. As you may know there was a lot of discussion about the spiraling cost of healthcare in America as well as the issue of access to quality healthcare in the country during last year’s election season. This discussion was lead by the candidates, the media as well as community organizations. You mentioned earlier that healthcare was an important issue to you during the 2004 presidential election. Could you please elaborate?

A: It wasn’t an important issue to me per say, to the people around me it did affect, because I’m under tricare health insurance, which is my dad’s, he’s worked for twenty five years, so we covered, I’m covered until I’m twenty one. But I have seen, you know my parents’ friends who have actually moved from Puerto Rico, or moved from a different state, they’re in desperation to get a job because they desperately don’t want to have to not have medical coverage, which having two kids, or having a new baby, or they just got married, and you know, it’s important to have, because once you’re to the doctor, once you’re to the emergency room, it ends up costing you almost four hundred dollars if you’re lucky. And that’s only a one night stay, so I know that it’s very important to I’m going to say most, not all, but most of my parents’ friends and close friends of the family.

B: What do you remember about the way Bush addressed the healthcare issue last year? If anything.

A: If he promised anything, I don’t remember what it was.

B: What do you remember about the way Kerry addressed the healthcare issue?
A: I know that both of them were more or less talking about getting more healthcare, getting easier access. You know making—sugarcoating all of it. But I don’t remember what way of getting there they were both proposing.

B: So the specific—

A: The specific proposals I do not remember.

B: What do you remember about any other views on the issue of healthcare that were offered by organization in your community or by the media during the 2004 election?

A: No. Absolutely none.

B: Ok. Here is a hypothetical scenario. You have been asked by your presidential candidate of choice, I believe you stated so far that it was Kerry. You’ve been asked by Kerry to construct a message about healthcare to target your ethnic subgroup, Puerto Rican American, and encourage them to register and vote. Ok? So it’s a publicity campaign targeting Latinos, Puerto Ricans specifically, with the healthcare issue as the main theme. What would that message sound like? What kind of advice would you give Kerry? Kerry, these are the elements you have to definitely include in your message… um… Senator Kerry, if you want to reach my Puerto Rican community, this is what you have to tell them about healthcare. About healthcare, and about your position on healthcare, and about the issue in order to get them motivated to register to vote and hopefully vote for you.

A: Healthcare is tied to…

B: Healthcare coverage, quality of the healthcare, if people have coverage or not, the cost, cost of medicine, pharmaceuticals, everything, the whole entire healthcare issue. What do you think the Puerto Rican community wants to hear, what do you think will get them energized? If they hear something about healthcare from a candidate. For example I just asked you what the proposals of Bush and Kerry were, and you couldn’t remember anything, so I doubt that anything really excited you last year. So what do you think would have gotten you excited about a candidate. And got you motivated and say you know what, I’m going to go vote for this guy because this guy’s going to make a difference. Because everyone agrees that we have a healthcare problem in America, the proposals for the solution vary from one political party to the next.

A: I have to tie it in with jobs right? Because you can only get healthcare through…

B: It’s up to you how you—because some people are talking about universal healthcare, free for every American, some people are talking about government subsidized healthcare, I mean, whatever you think would be the best thing for your community. There’s no limit here. The candidate for the presidency is
relying on your expertise, in terms of knowledge of the Puerto Rican-American community and their needs…

A: All right. I think there’s lots of ways to do this one. Because I know that personally, the people that live across the street are Hispanic American, they have three boys, and there’re two parents, and they have never had medical coverage, car insurance, nothing. Since I’ve known them, which has been about eight years, and one of the main reasons is because of the cost. Because a woman that works two part time jobs and supports a family of five, you know it’s really hard for her to get medical coverage for her entire family, so I would—

B: So what do you think that family wants to hear from the President?

A: ???? would probably be the cost of it. That helps. The only way to do it is to lower the cost, but everything has it’s… how do you say it, when something happens, it looks, is it a repercussion? Right? Everything has it’s repercussions, so if you take away from one side of the government, you’re going to have to put it in to somewhere else.

B: But don’t worry about managing the budget. Just say Mr. Kerry, Senator Kerry, you need to talk about this.

A: Then the first thing would be the cost, because that’s what worries most—

B: What about the cost?

A: It has to—I think that it should be lowered for people that have a family. Like a family healthcare plan. Also in order to get people more interested in healthcare, you have to get them more interested in jobs that have those benefits. And that have better benefits. The way to do that is to stress the importance of having a Latin American in—participating in some sort of a job that contributes to the government. Or even if it doesn’t, whether it’s being bilingual, or just putting an effort towards—it has to do with that. I would either go the cost way, or the job way, or both.

B: So let me see if I can come up with a fair summary. Senator Kerry, if you wish to reach the Puerto Rican-American community, and energize them so that they will register to vote and be excited about your candidacy, then you need to address one very important issue, and that’s healthcare. And what I suggest that you tell my community regarding healthcare is that you’re going to, your presidency, or your administration will provide every American with affordable healthcare coverage. Is that correct?

A: Um hmm. And also, even though they’re addressing the Hispanic community, when they do so, it’s like they’re trying to bring someone that’s out, in. Instead of making them feel like a part of the country, because you are still a resident of the
United States. So instead of making them feel like you, Puerto Ricans, it should more of a group thing, like us.

B: Use we as language rather than you.

A: Exactly. Instead of why don’t you come join us. You know? Like, you should make them feel like they’re just as important as the other ethnic groups.

B: And so, you need to talk to Puerto Rican Americans inclusively, as one of them, about affordable healthcare, being fair when it comes to families, understanding that they have more costs, and that it has to be affordable to families, and do something about making more jobs available that provide healthcare.

A: Exactly, that provide healthcare or that even have a need for specifically bilingual people. The more diverse that you have at your job, the better, and it’s not just Spanish and English, but if you’re targeting the Hispanic community, then you should stress their importance also, and their contribution to society.

B: So offer this community a program that will specifically target the, and you’re talking about creating some kind of industry, employment, provide employment opportunities that would be especially curtailed to the Latino community because of their ethnic diversity?

A: No. Not create an industry specifically for them, but here’s the deal. If you want people to contribute to you, you have to feel that you’re contributing to them. You have to feel like you’re giving something, but you’re also receiving something. And if they feel like an outcast, if they feel like you’re really not doing anything for them, they’re just doing you a favor, then they’re not going to want to do it. It has to be mutual. You have to look like you really care. Not that you care about the cause itself, that you care about whoever it is that you’re targeting.

B: How can Kerry do that?

A: By not using the word you or ostracizing the community in specific. But making you feel like you’re a part of them like you want them to succeed, not hat you’re doing it for a cause.

B: So you’re talking about. You talked about jobs. Let me see—I got it wrong the first time, let me see if I get it right this time. Were you talking about for example identifying an issue where a lot of Latinos work and perhaps they’re not getting health insurance, and tell them that these jobs will now include healthcare.

A: Exactly. I don’t think that we should ??? I don’t think that Kerry should specifically say hey, I’m going to make jobs where bilinguals are needed because they are needed everywhere. It’s just that their importance isn’t stressed. And if the people don’t feel—if they feel important only around election time, when you
know that their votes count, or if they feel actually needed for economic purposes, then I’m sure that they would vote, but if you only reach out to them once every four years, they’re going to be like yep, we knew this was coming, you know? You should stick to that program all the time, not just around election time and I think that that’s what’s the problem. Different people have stopped, or they don’t agree with the elections because they’ve seen a lot of talk and they haven’t seen a lot of action. And they always think well, what’s new? What’s going to make this different? The only way to do it is to prove it.

B: How would you use the healthcare issue to encourage a friend or any other relative to register and vote in future presidential elections? What would you say?

A: Do they have healthcare?

B: Maybe they do, maybe they don’t.

A: Well if they don’t, then the obvious route would be hey you need healthcare, because if you crack your head open on the sidewalk, you don’t wanna pay that bill…

B: What does that have to do with voting?

A: What do you mean what does that have to do with voting, if they’re promising a better healthcare system, then that will affect you in the future. As far as people that do have healthcare, and they’re perfectly happy and comfortable, I don’t think that that would really be an issue to them as far as voting is concerned.

B: How would you use the healthcare issue to encourage others in your community to register and vote if the presidential election were held today?

A: Same thing. If you don’t have healthcare, then ?? and if you do, then that’s not an issue for you.

B: So if you had a candidate with a viable platform or proposal for some kind of healthcare, you would feel comfortable encouraging someone to vote for that person?

A: Yes.

B: What is your age?

A: 19.

B: When do you turn 20?

A: June, 10th.
B: What is your occupation?
A: Pharmacy technician.
B: What is your religious affiliation?
A: Catholic.
B: How long have you lived in your community?
A: Eight years.
B: How long have you lived in the state of Florida?
A: Eight years.
B: How long have your parents lived in the state of Florida?
A: Eight years.
B: Where did you guys move to Florida from?
A: Panama
B: How long were you in Panama?
A: Four years.
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La entrevista solo tomará de una hora a una hora y media. Usted tiene el derecho de retirarse de la entrevista en cualquier momento sin ningún tipo de consecuencia. El cuestionario para esta entrevista consistirá de preguntas generales acerca de su participación política, orientación étnica y racial y otros temas básicos. Su participación en esta investigación será totalmente voluntaria. No hay riego alguno para usted relacionado con su participación en la entrevista. No habrá compensación si usted decide participar. Tampoco beneficios directos para usted si decide participar en este estudio. Su identificación permanecerá confidencial de la manera permitida por la ley durante la investigación. Su respuestas a las preguntas durante la entrevista no serán vinculadas a su nombre. Esta entrevista será grabada usando cassette audio y luego transcrita.

Si tiene alguna pregunta relacionada con esta investigación por favor no tarde en ponerse en contacto con la directora de mi comité la Dra. Marilyn Roberts a la dirección de email: mroberts@jou.ufl.edu o puede llamarla al teléfono 352-273-1090. Para preguntas acerca de sus derechos como participante en una investigación, puede ponerse en contacto con: UFRB Office, Box 112250, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL 32611-2250; ph 392-0433.

¡Gracias!

Yo he leído el proceso descrito arriba y estoy de acuerdo, voluntariamente, en participar en esta investigación. También he recibido una copia de este documento.

Participante: _______________________________ Fecha: ________________

Investigador Principal: ____________________________ Fecha: ________________
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