

The Pennsylvania State University

The Graduate School

College of Communications

**THE EXPANDING CULT OF CANDIDATE PERSONALITY: AN
ETHNOGRAPHIC CONTENT ANALYSIS OF GENDER AND RACE IN
POLITICAL ADVERTISING OF MEXICO AND THE UNITED STATES**

A Dissertation in

Mass Communications

by

Nadia Ivette Martínez-Carrillo

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements
for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

May 2013

The dissertation of Nadia Ivette Martínez-Carrillo was reviewed and approved* by the following:

Colleen Connolly-Ahern
Associate Professor of Communications
Dissertation Adviser
Chair of Committee

Marie Hardin
Associate Dean for Graduate Studies

John S. Nichols
Professor Emeritus of Communications

Matthew Restall
Edwin Erle Sparks Professor of History

Amit Schejter
Associate Professor of Communications

*Signatures are on file in the Graduate School

Abstract

The 2006 Mexican presidential election and the 2008 U.S. presidential election are valuable opportunities for cross-cultural comparative research. Hillary Clinton and Barack Obama, a woman and an African American man, were two candidates in the United States. Patricia Mercado, a woman and strong defender of minorities' rights, was one of the candidates in Mexico. This dissertation used a comparative ethnographic analysis of these candidates' political advertisements to identify the framing devices that female and minority candidates utilized in their self-presentations to audiences. The findings show that candidates in both countries use similar frames and tend to emphasize personality traits over issues and policies.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables	vi
Acknowledgements.....	viii
Chapter I. Introduction.....	1
Why is Comparison Important?	1
Patricia Mercado Background.....	6
Hillary Clinton Background.....	8
Political Background of the 2006 Mexican Presidential Election	10
Political Background of the 2008 U.S. Presidential Election	17
Significance of the Study	20
Chapter II. Literature Review	22
Comparative Studies	22
Selection of the Theoretical Framework.....	24
Selection of Comparable Social Units	26
Country Selection.....	27
Legal Framework	27
The “Americanization of Political Advertising”	29
Framing and Political Advertising	33
Women in Society.....	36
Women in the 2008 U.S. Presidential Election.....	37
Representations of Women in the U.S. Media.....	38
News Coverage	39
Political Advertising	40
African Americans in the 2008 U.S. Presidential Election.....	40
Representations of African Americans in the U.S. Media.....	42
Representations of Indigenous Peoples in the Media	43
Representations of Native Americans in the U.S. Media	43
Women in Mexico During the Colonial Period	45
African Women.....	46
Indigenous Women	48
European Women.....	51
Women in Contemporary Mexico	54
Women in the 2006 Mexican Presidential Election.....	55
Representations of Women in the Mexican Media.....	56
African Mexicans in the 2006 Mexican Election	58
Representations of African Mexicans in the Mexican Media	60
Indigenous peoples in the 2006 Mexican Election	61
Representations of Indigenous Peoples in the Mexican Media	62
Research Questions.....	63
Chapter III. Methodology	65

Sample.....	66
Data Analysis	67
Chapter IV. Results	70
Protector.....	72
Good Family Person	73
People’s Candidate.....	79
Conciliator.....	84
Trustworthy Person.....	88
Enduring Strength	92
Toughness-Domestic Policy	93
Toughness-Foreign Policy	96
Consistent.....	103
Military Pride	105
Pointing Fingers	109
Know How	112
Knowledge/Experience	112
Business Approach.....	115
Reformer	117
New politics	118
Activist.....	120
Charisma	123
Popular	123
Authentic.....	125
Religious Person	127
Religion-Friendly	127
The “Americanization” of Political Advertising and the Cult to the Candidates Personality.....	129
Role of Women and Minorities.....	141
Chapter V. Discussion and Conclusions.....	147
Limitations and Future Research	155
References.....	158

List of Tables

Table 4.0 Frames and sub-frames.....	72
Table 4.1 Framing and reasoning devices for the “Good Family Person” sub-frame	73
Table 4.2 Framing and reasoning devices for the “People’s Candidate” sub-frame	80
Table 4.3 Framing and reasoning devices for the “Conciliator” sub-frame	85
Table 4.4 Framing and reasoning devices for the “Trustworthy Person” sub-frame	89
Table 4.5 Framing and reasoning devices for the “Toughness-Domestic Policy” sub-frame	94
Table 4.6 Framing and reasoning devices for the “Toughness-Foreign Policy” sub-frame	97
Table 4.7 Framing and reasoning devices for the “Consistent” sub-frame	103
Table 4.8 Framing and reasoning devices for the “Military Pride” sub-frame....	106
Table 4.9 Framing and reasoning devices for the “Pointing Fingers” sub- frame.....	109
Table 4.10 Framing and reasoning devices for the “Knowledge/Experience” sub-frame	113
Table 4.11 Framing and reasoning devices for the “Business Approach” sub-frame	116
Table 4.12 Framing and reasoning devices for the “New Politics” sub-frame....	118
Table 4.13 Framing and reasoning devices for the “Activist” sub-frame	121
Table 4.14 Framing and reasoning devices for the “Popular” sub-frame.....	124
Table 4.15 Framing and reasoning devices for the “Authentic” sub-frame.....	125
Table 4.16 Framing and reasoning devices for the “Religion-friendly” sub- frame.....	128

Table 4.17 Predominant frames used by women and minorities in their political
ads.....141

Acknowledgements

Many wonderful people guided, supported and inspired me during my doctoral years. I treasure everything I learned from them and will be forever grateful to them. First, I would like to thank my advisor, Dr. Colleen Connolly-Ahern. Her expertise, guidance, and never ending support and enthusiasm were invaluable in the completion of this study. I am also very grateful to my committee members, John Nichols, Matthew Restall, and Amit Schejter for their insightful comments and contributions to this research. I will always remember our meetings as the most intellectually challenging and enjoyable.

Also, my deepest thanks to John Nichols, Marie Hardin and Betsy Hall for all the encouragement and help I always received from them. I would also like to express my gratitude to the National Council of Science and Technology in Mexico (CONACYT) for the grant that allowed me to conduct my doctoral studies.

I am also grateful to my colleagues and friends for being a source of support and inspiration during this process. The space is limited and it will be unfair to name just a few of them, but they know who they are because they have become my Penn State family.

I would like to thank my parents, brothers, and my husband, Dan Tamul, for being my infinite source of strength, love, support and inspiration during my doctorate years. To Dan, he has unintentionally made it very difficult to thank him in the few lines I have available because of all his help in proofing the final draft of this study and for how much he has brought into my life. To my fortune, I will have the rest of my life to thank him. And to Nico, the sixth and most beautiful witness of my dissertation defense.

Chapter I

Introduction

Women and minorities are usually excluded from formal political structures and tend to be stereotyped and marginalized in the media. Their participation as candidates in presidential elections is also scarce. As a consequence, their opportunities of self-representation in the political arena limit the opportunities to research how they represent themselves as political candidates. Even though there is a significant body of research on political advertising of female candidates in the United States, research on this topic in other countries is rare (Kaid, 2004). Similarly, studies on political advertising of members of minorities are also infrequent.

The 2006 Mexican presidential election and the 2008 U.S. presidential election represent valuable opportunities for cross-cultural comparative research. Hillary Clinton and Barack Obama, a woman and an African American man, were two candidates in the United States. Patricia Mercado, a woman and strong defender of minorities' rights, was one of the candidates in Mexico. The objective of this dissertation was to apply a comparative framing analysis that identified and detailed the framing devices these candidates used to present themselves to the audience through their political advertising. Also, this study sought to understand how the role of women and minorities is constructed in the political advertising of both countries.

Why is comparison important?

Despite the differences between Patricia Mercado and Hillary Clinton's campaigns and the distinctive characteristics of their political and cultural contexts, research indicates that gender and race constructions play a key role in electoral processes. Mercado's nomination and her strong defense of indigenous peoples' rights and other underrepresented groups provide a significant opportunity to study constructions of gender and race in political advertising in Mexico. Coincidentally, the participation of Clinton and Obama in the Democratic presidential

nomination of the United States offers many angles of comparison and analysis. The objective of this dissertation then is to study the role of women and minorities in Mexican and the U.S. societies as constructed in the political advertising of these countries' respective 2006 and 2008 presidential campaigns.

The 2006 Mexican election and the 2008 U.S. election were selected for this dissertation for several reasons. First, these women represent significant opportunities to study key issues in the communication field. Female presidential candidates are scarce across the world and the study of political advertising and media coverage of female candidates is limited to their presence in electoral processes. According to "The World's Women 2010: Trends and Statistics" report by the United Nations (UN, 2010), only 7 of 150 elected state leaders across the world and 17% of the members of national parliaments are women. Although it is true that in the last few decades there have been more women running for public offices around the globe, women candidates for heads of state are still a rarity. For that reason, the rare participation of two women, Mercado and Clinton, in the presidential elections of their respective countries represents an equally rare opportunity to study the role of women in Mexico and the United States as expressed in political advertising during a relatively similar timeframe.

Second, the amount of scholarship on women candidates' political advertising outside a U.S. context is almost nonexistent (Kaid, 2004). Along with the relative global increase in the participation of women as political candidates in electoral processes, there has been a slight growth in scholarship investigating how they are represented in political advertising. However, this growth has been uneven across countries and the great majority of the extant research is concentrated on candidates from the United States. Few attempts have been made to study political advertising of female presidential candidates in countries other than the United States

(Kaid, 2004). This dissertation begins to fill this gap in the literature through the study of Mercado's political advertising during the 2006 presidential campaign in Mexico.

Third, in general, research on political advertising in Mexico is practically nonexistent (Lozano, 2006). The few extant studies about political advertising in Mexico also do not explore dimensions of gender, race, ethnicity or class (Lozano, 2006) and little research in the United States does either. However, extreme political and social inequalities have been constructed in society around these dimensions. Since political advertising has become one of the most important means of political communication in Mexico in the last two decades (Lozano, 2006) and is one of the most important means in the United States (Kaid, 2006), it is worthwhile to study depictions of otherwise underrepresented groups. According to Cohen (2002), mass media are the primary source of information regarding social problems. Depictions of underrepresented groups in political advertising are important because they may have an effect on the way these groups are perceived in society, in the self-perception of group members, and in society's decisions about policies that affect them (Connolly-Ahern & Castells i Talens, 2010).

Specifically, political advertising was not important for voters in Mexico until the late 1990s, mostly because of the way that the *Partido Revolucionario Institucional* (Institutional Revolutionary Party or PRI) governed the country for more than 70 years. During this time, the media functioned as a branch of the state, giving no space to opposition parties. Only PRI candidates were covered by the media and received favorable coverage (Lozano, 2006). The very few political ads of the opposition political parties that were approved and shown by the media only functioned as a "façade" to maintain the pretense that the media gave space to all of the political parties (Lozano, 2006). This could be one of the reasons why there is a lack of research in political advertising in Mexico. However, the passing of new legislation in the 1990s

guaranteed more balanced media coverage for all of the political parties and a more equal distribution of funds for their campaigns (Lozano, 2006). This created a more balanced environment where political advertising became one of the most important means of political communication in Mexico in the last two decades (Lozano, 2006). For this reason, this dissertation provides a benchmark for Mexican political advertising, since it is one of the first studies conducted on political advertising and within the supposedly more democratic environment.

This study also explored the roles women and minorities—other than the candidates—played in political advertising in Mexico and in the United States. This is significant since no scholarship on representations of women in political advertising could be identified in Mexico. In the same way, while there are some studies on the portrayal of African Americans in political advertising in the United States, no studies on Native Americans could be identified in that country. In the case of Mexico, a search of the literature uncovered no studies that dealt with any minorities whatsoever within the context of political advertising.

Finally, there is a lack of international comparative studies in the area of political advertising in Mexico (Lozano, 2006). This study addresses this hole in the literature and, hopefully, will lead to more cross-cultural studies on this topic in the way of follow-up investigations. In the same way, this dissertation contributes to the field by analyzing the seemingly natural social constructions of gender and race via political advertising in both Mexico and the United States (Hallin & Mancini, 2004).

The two elections analyzed in this dissertation provided an opportunity to study one type of message in particular: political advertising on broadcast television. This study used a comparative approach to analyze the construction of frames associated with women and

minorities in the political advertising of both presidential elections. This comparison contributes to our understanding of political communication by illuminating similarities and differences in how candidates negotiate and construct gender and race in their political messages.

The method employed here was a comparative content analysis of political advertising on broadcast television during the 2006 Mexican presidential election and that of the 2008 U.S. presidential election. The study consisted of two main comparisons: (1) Comparison of the role of women in the Mexican and the U.S. political advertising, and (2) Comparison of the role of minorities in the Mexican and the U.S. political advertising.

The first comparison examined the selection of frames associated with women and female candidates in the broadcast political advertising of both elections. According to Kaid and Johnston (2001), messages in political advertising are based on the fears, myths, concerns, and narratives that exist in culture and voters. However, candidates carefully select the frames that they use in these messages to push their political agenda. Altheide (1996) explained that frames “suggest a taken-for-granted perspective on how one might approach a problem” (p. 31). Accordingly, the analysis of the selection of frames associated with women and female candidates in political advertising contributes to the field of political communication and gender representation in the media by explaining how the role of women in society is constructed in political advertising.

The second comparison analyzed the selection of frames associated with minorities in the broadcast political advertising of both elections. This contributes to the field of political communication and gender and race representation in the media by explaining how the role of minorities in society was constructed in the political advertising examined here.

In summary, these comparisons identified the similarities and differences in the role of women and minorities within the Mexican and the U.S. society, as constructed in political advertising and defined by the forms of self-identification of each of these groups. This study also examined how society is encouraged to think of these groups and their role in the political process through the lens of political advertising.

Patricia Mercado Background

Before beginning her political career, Mercado was known as social activist. She received a Bachelor's degree in Economics in the *Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México* (National Autonomous University of Mexico or UNAM), where she founded the Autonomous Group of College Women. In 1981, she joined the *Partido Revolucionario de los Trabajadores* (Workers' Revolutionary Party or PRT) (NOTIMEX, 2006). She was also part several of non-governmental organizations such as *Mujeres Trabajadoras Unidas* (United Working Women) and *Mujeres en Acción Sindical* (Women in Syndicate Action). These organizations fought for the rights of working women that were affected by the earthquake of 1985 in Mexico City (P Mercado, 2006). Mercado was also part of the political party *Democracia Social* (Social Democracy) and *Mexico Posible* (Mexico Possible), parties that both fought for women's rights and gay rights. The group also combated discrimination more broadly. However, these political parties eventually dissolved, the *Mexico Posible* because it did not gain enough votes to be officially registered in the federal election of 2003 (P Mercado, 2006). Finally, she founded and was the first president of the *Partido Alternativa Socialdemócrata y Campesina* (PASC). She resigned from that position to participate in the 2006 presidential election as a candidate, officially beginning her political career (P Mercado, 2006). There is little information about Mercado's personal life. However, some journalists wrote in 2006 that Mercado was the mother of two children and was

married to Horacio Romo Vázquez, a former leader of the *Sindicato Mexicano de Electricistas* (Mexican Electricians' Union or SME) (Televisa, 2006).

From the beginning of her campaign, Mercado was thought to have little or no chance of winning the 2006 presidential election in Mexico (Saldierna, 2006). Mercado was running on the ticket of a newly created, underfunded party and her nomination was not supported by one of the factions of her party. According to polls Consulta Mitofsky (2006) conducted, only 3% of voters supported her. Mercado was positioned behind the candidates from the *Partido Acción Nacional* (PAN), *Partido de la Revolución Democrática* (PRD) and the *Partido Revolucionario Institucional* (PRI) political parties. In addition to trailing in polls, several news organizations also claimed she had no chance to win the race. Mexico's *La Jornada* wrote that she joined the race on the *Partido Alternativa Socialdemócrata y Campesina* (PASC) ticket “con la certeza de que no ganará los comicios de julio próximo [convinced that she will not win the ballot next July]” (Saldierna, 2006). The *San Francisco Chronicle* announced that “Mercado's chances of winning the top office Sunday are next to nada” (Campbell, 2006). *The Economist* (2006) declared that the most positive result that Mercado could get in the election was to “steal a few left-wing votes from Mr. López Obrador.”

Running on the ticket of a small party was not the only reason why Mercado was thought to have no chance of winning the election. Journalists like Saldierna (2006) expressed their belief that her political agenda would find little support among Mexican voters. Her agenda seemed to be pushing established social boundaries in the Mexican political and cultural context, specifically by openly discussing the country's painful realities of race, gender and class. To a degree, this was true as Mercado's political platform was based on the defense of human rights.

From the beginning of her campaign, Mercado established that the defense of underrepresented sectors of the population such as women, gays, and indigenous groups, would be a priority in her political agenda (P Mercado, 2006). Mercado proposed the creation of programs and policies that included but were not limited to: promoting gender equality, legalizing abortion and same-sex marriage, and stopping racism and discrimination. These were sensitive topics that tended to be ignored by the rest of the candidates who, unlike Mercado, had no clear positions on these issues.

Some journalists like Monica Campbell (2006) and Germán Dehesa (as cited in Campbell, 2006) praised Mercado's political agenda while at the same time admitting it was one of the main reasons why she would have no chance at winning the race. Mercado ended in fourth place in the election with 2.71% of the vote after candidates from PAN, PRD, and PRI (Instituto Federal Electoral [IFE], 2006).

Hillary Clinton Background

In contrast to Mercado, Clinton was not tied to a small, underfunded party. On January, 20, 2007, Clinton announced her intention to compete for the presidency in the 2008 U.S. presidential election and was considered to have a realistic chance of winning the Democratic Party nomination (Falk, 2010). Clinton was considered the front-runner for several months as illustrated by a November 2007 Gallup poll that found 48% of Democrats supported Clinton's candidacy. Obama was second with 21% (Carroll, 2007).

Although Clinton was popular in the polls, her case parallels Mercado's in that news media downplayed her as a potential frontrunner. For instance, news media seemed to be more focused on Obama than on Clinton. Falk (2010) noticed that in the month in which both candidates declared their intention to pursue the presidency, six of the top U.S. newspapers

published 59 articles with Obama's name in their headlines, and only 36 with Clinton's name placed similarly. Not only did news media give Obama more coverage, but what coverage Clinton did receive, according to the Center for Media and Public Affairs (CMPA, 2007), was more negative than that of the rest of the candidates. Also, in a study of advertising, web sites, and media coverage of women candidates, Bystrom (2010) found evidence of gender bias in the coverage of Clinton's campaign. Media coverage of Clinton was more focused on appearance, personality and campaign strategies than on issues. For example, in July 20, 2007, the *Washington Post* wrote an article about Clinton's cleavage stating, "Hillary Clinton's Tentative Dip Into New Neckline Territory" (Givhan, 2007). The *New York Times* ran an article on the "Clinton cackle" titled "Laughing Matters in Clinton Campaign" (Healy, 2007). Similar coverage was not given to Obama.

Race was also a key topic during the 2008 U.S. Democratic presidential nomination. The candidacies of Clinton—a woman—and Obama—an African American—were both considered groundbreaking in U.S. politics. This represented a dilemma for many Democratic voters, since they had to decide between helping to break gender or race barriers (MacManus, 2010). From May to December 2007, the number of news stories focused on gender in the election was about the same as the number of news stories focused on race (Duerst-Lathi, 2010) However, race became the dominant story by January 2008 (Duerst-Lathi, 2010), possibly as a result of one comment made by Clinton that was interpreted as her downplaying Dr. Martin Luther King's role in the Civil Rights Movement. On January 13, 2008, Clinton was quoted as having said, "Dr. King's dream began to be realized when President Johnson passed the Civil Rights Act" (Komblut & Bacon, 2008). She also said that "it took a president to get it done"(Komblut & Bacon, 2008) and added that Obama was "deliberately distorting this" (Komblut & Bacon,

2008). The next day, the *Washington Post* wrote “Clinton’s King comment ‘Ill advised,’ Obama Says” (Komblut & Bacon, 2008). This was—potentially—the beginning of the end of Clinton’s run for the Democratic ticket. Even though Clinton’s popularity in the polls slowly decreased during the campaign, she won 9 of the last 16 primaries and caucuses. However, she conceded the nomination to Obama on June 7, 2008 (Carroll & Dittmar, 2010).

Political Background of the 2006 Mexican Presidential Election

The 2006 presidential election in Mexico opens up as a significant opportunity for comparative research. In 2000, after 71 years of being ruled by a single-political party regime that strongly controlled news media and the electoral processes, Mexico had an electoral campaign where opposition presidential candidates finally received media coverage (Lozano, 2006). In the past, only candidates of the PRI (*Partido Revolucionario Institucional*), the ruling party, were covered by news media favorably. Before 2000, political advertising was not important for voters and the very few political ads of the opposition political parties that were shown in the media only functioned as a “façade” to maintain the pretense that the media gave space to all of the political parties (Lozano, 2006). However, this changed in the late 1990s, after the passing of new legislation that guaranteed more balanced media coverage for all of the political parties and a more equal distribution of funds for their campaigns (Lozano, 2006). In this new environment, political advertising suddenly became important. According to Lozano (2006), political parties assigned approximately 60% of their campaign budgets to televised ads after this recent legislation.

Before the period of interest examined in this study, Mexico’s political system was, as previously indicated, a process that resembled democracy only in name. It is debatable whether the political process is truly democratic at present, but between 1968 and 2008, Mexico’s

political system has undergone significant changes, moving it from what Ortiz-Ortega and Barquet (2010) call an authoritarian system to a democratic one. One key component of this transition was women's increased ability to participate in the public sphere. Women's participation in this transitory process is starting to be documented but there is a lack of scholarship about women's mobilizations and women's representation from 1968 to 2008 (Ortiz-Ortega & Barquet, 2010). The social sciences in Mexico still trivialize and marginalize these topics and gender blindness in research is still a normal procedure (Ortiz-Ortega & Barquet, 2010). What follows is a brief history of the changing role of women in Mexico's public sphere in order to contextualize Mercado's participation in the electoral process.

Within contemporary Mexican history, women have been active participants in democratic mobilizations. However, it was not until the 1970s that their involvement started to include a gender dimension thanks to feminism (Ortiz-Ortega & Barquet, 2010). By 1971, women started to meet in public to discuss gender issues such as sexuality, motherhood, abortion, and sexual division of labor. One of the feminist demands resulting from these discussions was the right of women to have control over their reproductive capacities as contraception was forbidden at that time in the country (Ortiz-Ortega & Barquet, 2010). Also, feminists argued that the prohibition of abortion implied legal control over women's reproductive capacities. The state did not legalize abortion, but did respond to this critique by amending the Constitution's article 4 in 1974 to promote gender equality. This reform was followed by the legalization of contraception and the promulgation of laws that gave women more access to the labor market and to land ownership (Ortiz-Ortega & Barquet, 2010).

Women started to fulfill roles different from the traditional domestic ones that they had been relegated to by society. Women joined the labor market in higher numbers and increased

their political participation. However, their access to the public arena remained conditioned, “they gained access only through others’ representations of their demands” (Ortiz-Ortega & Barquet, 2010, p. 115). In particular, there was no feminist presence in electoral politics. But thanks to the links between feminist groups and the left, feminist demands entered the electoral arena through left-wing parties (Ortiz-Ortega & Barquet, 2010).

Nevertheless, left-wing parties used feminist demands “to gain electoral presence among progressive sectors while excluding feminists from their political maneuvers” (Ortiz-Ortega & Barquet, 2010, p. 117). By 1982, the economic crisis in the country and the internal struggles in the left-wing parties practically erased gender issues from the national discourse (Ortiz-Ortega & Barquet, 2010). Even when the presence of left-wing parties in the Chamber of Deputies and the Senate increased by 1988, that did not mean that gender issues were more present in the political discourse. It was not until the late 1980s and the early 1990s that gender issues started to be discussed again, thanks to the United Nations promotion of women’s organizations (Ortiz-Ortega & Barquet, 2010).

Women’s rural and urban movements increased between the 1980s and the 1990s along with the creation of nongovernmental organizations (NGOs). Given the difficult economic situation of the country at that time, it is not surprising that the main claims of these women’s movements and NGOs were on the lack of state services such as housing, transportation and public health (Ortiz-Ortega & Barquet, 2010). Soon, women started to realize that the vote was not enough to gain equal political representation. Thus, NGOs included political activities and began to serve as “the platform of action for women whose voice had been denied in established political parties” (Ortiz-Ortega & Barquet, 2010, p. 121).

During this time period, the PRI hegemony had already begun to erode and opposition parties gained positions in the government at the state and federal levels. Some women's organizations also established formal associations with political parties. It was also during this period of time that Rosario Ibarra de Piedra emerged as the first female presidential candidate in contemporary Mexican history, running in both the 1982 and 1988 presidential elections (Ortiz-Ortega & Barquet, 2010). Ibarra ran on the ticket of the left-wing PRT, winning the 1.76% of votes in 1982 but only 0.39% of votes in 1988 (PT, 2012; Becerra-Acosta, 2012). Married, mother of 4 children, and homemaker, Ibarra became a political activist after the detention and disappearance of one of her sons at the hands of the state in 1975 (Cardoza, 2005; Becerra-Acosta, 2012). This happened during the period known as "The Dirty War" in which the state persecuted, detained, and disappeared leaders of oppositional movements (Franco, 2010; PT, 2012). Two years after, she founded the Committee for the Defense of those Imprisoned, Persecuted, Dissappeared, and Exiled for Political Reasons, also known as the *Comité Eureka!* (PT, 2012). In 1979, Ibarra also founded the *Frente Nacional Contra la Represión* (National Front Against Repression or FNCR), which was integrated by 54 human rights organizations (PT, 2012). She served as Federal Deputy from 1985 to 1988, during which time she promoted amnesty laws for those imprisoned and disappeared for political reasons (PT, 2012). Ibarra was a close collaborator and supporter of Andrés Manuel López Obrador in his campaign for the 2006 presidential elections (Acosta Riveros, 2011).

In 1993, electoral laws were reformed to promote female participation. By 1994, 14.1% of seats in the Chamber of Deputies and 12.5% of seats in the Senate were occupied by women (Ortiz-Ortega & Barquet, 2010). Also, there were two female presidential candidates in the elections of 1994: Marcela Lombardo and Cecilia Soto (Rodríguez, 2003).

Soto held a Bachelor's Degree in Physics from the UNAM and was co-founder of the *Frente Democrático Nacional* (National Democratic Front or FDN), a dissident section of the PRI that later became the PRD (CNN, 2012). She was also Deputy in the Congress of Sonora from 1988 to 1991 and Federal Deputy from 1991 to 1994. In 1994, she left the *Partido Auténtico de la Revolución Mexicana* (Authentic Party of Mexican Revolution or PARM) to run on the ticket of the PT in the presidential election of that year (CNN, 2012), where she won the official registration of her party with 2.75% of all votes (Becerra-Acosta, 2012). After the 2000 presidential election, she started to collaborate with the elected president Vicente Fox and the PAN. Soon, Fox named Soto the Ambassador of Mexico to Brazil and she occupied the position until 2006 (CNN, 2012). In the 2006 presidential election, she supported the candidacy of Felipe Calderón from the PAN (Yañez, 2012).

On the other hand, Marcela Lombardo was the daughter of Vicente Lombardo Toledano, who was the first leader of the *Confederación de Trabajadores de México* (Workers' Mexican Confederation or CTM) that was created in 1936 (De Buen, 2011). The CTM was the main labor union in the country (Muñoz Ríos, 2011). It was loyal to the government of president Lázaro Cárdenas first and then remained loyal to the PRI party (De Buen, 2011). After being expelled from the CTM, Vicente Lombardo founded the left-wing *Partido Popular Socialista* (Popular Socialist Party or PPS) (De Buen, 2011) and ran on the ticket of that party in the 1952 presidential election (Becerra-Acosta, 2012). Marcela Lombardo was Federal Deputy of the same party from 1976 to 1979 and then of the FDN from 1988 to 1991 (Becerra-Acosta, 2012). She also ran on the ticket of the PPS in the 1994 presidential election, winning about one-half of one percent of votes and losing the official registration of the party (Yañez, 2012).

After the 1994 election, it was not until 2006 that Mexico had another female presidential candidate. Although Mercado, a known leading feminist and activist, was not the first female presidential candidate in contemporary Mexico's history, she was the first one to participate in a more balanced electoral process that did not exclusively favor the PRI.

In the 2000 electoral pre-campaign, Mercado was the favorite to win the Social Democratic Party's (PSD) nomination. Despite her popularity in the polls and her impressive credentials, the PSD endorsed the nomination of its founder, Gilberto Rincón Gallardo (Rodríguez, 2003). In Mexico, each political party has the responsibility to nominate its own candidate through an internal election; the general public does not participate in this process. Six years later, the PSD changed its name to Social-Democratic and Rural Alternative Party (PASDC) and endorsed the nomination of Mercado as its presidential candidate for the 2006 elections (Rodríguez, 2003).

Three political parties and two coalitions were scheduled to participate in the 2006 presidential election. At the top of the polls were the Leftist PRD, *Partido del Trabajo* (PT), and the *Convergencia* (C) coalition named "Por el bien de todos," led by Andrés Manuel López Obrador, former head of the Federal District government; the Rightist PAN, led by Felipe Calderón, former Secretary of Energy; and the Rightist PRI and *Partido Verde Ecologista de México* (PVEM) coalition named "Alianza por México," led by Roberto Madrazo, former president of the PRI (IFE, 2006). The other two candidates—Mercado from the Leftist PASC and Roberto Campa from the Partido Nueva Alianza (PN)—were at the bottom of the polls, with 2% and 1% of the support respectively (IFE, 2006).

The previous presidential election of 2000 was characterized as a free and fair one. The victory of Vicente Fox, the PAN candidate, brought hope in a time when Mexico was still

recovering from the economic crisis of 1995 and the assassination of Luis Donaldo Colosio, the PRI candidate in the 1994 presidential election (Krauze, 2006). Indigenous peoples were also in the struggle to get their rights recognized by the Mexican state (Gutiérrez, 2003). In the report of its 2006 Mexico's presidential election observer mission, the United States-Mexico Chamber of Commerce (USMCOC, 2006) noted that the PRD believed that its platform was invincible; PAN had decided to keep the presidential office that it had just gained in 2000; and the PRI was desperate to get it back.

In the run up to the 2006 elections, the change from a single-party political system to a more segmented one began to reveal several shortfalls of the new political system. There was no agreement on how the state could build firm basis for democracy outside of the one party system. The three main political parties, the PAN, the PRD and the PRI, refused to establish any basic consensus on key issues since the end of PRI regime (Krauze, 2006). According to Krauze (2006), the political parties were focused on ideology and had little real parliamentary experience of the *de facto* dictatorship. They kept postponing an “urgently needed accord to ensure that no matter who becomes president, Mexico would be governable even when the president's party has a minority in Congress” (p. 57). Such accord was impossible as any agreement with another party was considered a betrayal. Meanwhile, the power of drug cartels and organized crime continued to grow and some experts believed that the hostile environment would erupt into violence (Krauze, 2006).

During this election period, Calderón, the PAN candidate, was labeled “inexperienced” and “soft.” He was associated with Fox's administration, which maintained economic stability and promoted relatively more freedom of expression to the country, but failed to fight crime and insecurity (Krauze, 2006). López was a former social activist who was regarded as having done a

commendable job during his tenure as the head of the Federal District of Mexico City. However, his tendency to use populist rhetoric, mass mobilization, and class polarization was not very well received by some (Krauze, 2006). Finally, Madrazo, the PRI candidate, was a former governor of the state of Tabasco and president of the PRI was associated to the authoritarian image of the PRI regime.

The elections took place on July 2, 2006. The IFE (2006) announced that Calderón had won the election with 35.98% of the vote and that López finished second with 35.31%. Mercado ended fourth with 2.71% of the vote, enough to obtain the registration of her political platform as an official political party. López appealed the results, declaring the election results fraudulent and led massive protests in the streets of Mexico City for some time afterward. However, Calderón's victory was ratified by the IFE (2006).

Political Background of the 2008 U.S. Presidential Election

The 2008 presidential election in the United States was also a significant opportunity for comparative research. Televised political advertising had been an essential tool for U.S. campaigns since the 1950s and had become the most used and expensive instrument of political communication between candidates and voters (Kaid, 2006). According to Kaid (2006), candidates and affiliated groups spent \$600 million on television advertising alone in the 2004 presidential election.

Widespread dissatisfaction with how Bush, a proxy for the Republican Party, had handled key foreign policy decisions stemming from the 9/11 attacks was a major factor in the 2008 elections. Even though the event had occurred several years prior to the 2008 elections, Al Qaeda and Osama Bin Laden threatened the U.S. government and demanded a change in U.S. foreign policy with respect to the Middle East (Matsaganis & Payne, 2005, p. 387). In the 2004

presidential election, terrorism dominated much of the political discourse and the war against Iraq continued (Matsaganis & Payne, 2005, p. 387). Shortly before the election, Osama bin Laden released a video tape threatening the United States. Some experts believed that this may have helped George W. Bush to defeat Senator John Kerry in the election, since the war against terrorism was a central part of Bush's political agenda (Nye, 2008). By 2005, Bush's popularity in the polls declined. His campaign against terrorism was labeled as unsuccessful by news media and the assessment seemed to stick (Matsaganis & Payne, 2005).

Toward the end of his presidency, Bush's past decisions regarding the Middle East were more widely criticized than previously (Moldovan, 2009). According to Moldovan (2009), "the chances of the Republicans to win again were undeniably slim, so it soon became evident that whoever candidate managed to secure the Democratic nomination had the greatest odds to be elected president in November 2008" (Moldovan, 2009, p. 42). Both Obama and Clinton then, were entering a presidential campaign in which either candidate would likely defeat any Republican challenger due to the widespread perception that the previous president had bungled issues related to national security and foreign policy.

After Bush's 2004 reelection campaign defeated Kerry, Clinton emerged in the polls as the top contender for the Democratic nomination for the 2008 election (Carroll & Dittmar, 2010, p. 50). However, she did not express any interest in running for the presidency until three years later. In January 2007, Clinton announced her candidacy for the Democratic Party's presidential nomination. According to the Center for American Women and Politics (CAWP, 2008), before Clinton, there were at least 11 women running for the presidency of the United States between 1872 and 2004. The 2008 election was different as Clinton was the "first serious female contender for the U.S. presidency" (Carroll & Dittmar, 2010, p. 50).

The race for the Democratic presidential nomination was defined as historic for other reasons as well (Butler, 2009). In February 2007, Obama announced that he was running for the presidency as well (Feeley, 2008). Obama was not only the first African American nominee of a major party, but also one of the youngest candidates ever (Nye, 2008). Obama and Clinton, “the first woman and the first African-American with a legitimate chance of winning” (Butler, 2009, p. 338) became “symbols of two historic freedom struggles” (Feeley, 2009, p.7), the African American freedom struggle and the womens’ freedom struggle (Feeley, 2009).

The 2008 presidential elections in the U.S. consisted of eight candidates, Barack Obama, Hillary Clinton, John Edwards, Bill Richardson, Joe Biden, and Chris Dodd (Political Communication Lab of Stanford University, 2008) and two of those eight candidates represented major advancements for groups previously unrepresented in presidential elections. For several months, Clinton, former New York Senator and first lady of the United States, was the front-runner to win the Democratic Party’s nomination (Butler, 2009). However, two other candidates also “stood out from the pack” (Butler, 2009, p. 337): Edwards, former vice-presidential nominee (Butler, 2009) and Obama, former Illinois Senator (Moldovan, 2009) and civil rights attorney (Smith & King, 2009). Edwards was not able to compete after Iowa (Butler, 2009), his fundraising campaign only raised \$58 million, less than half of the amount that Clinton and Obama each raised (Butler, 2009). This left Obama as Clinton’s primary competition for the Democratic ticket.

Many experts believed that Iraq or national security would be the main issues in the 2008 election campaign. However, the 2008 U.S. presidential race took place amid the worst economic crisis in the country since the start of the Great Depression in 1929. This development

meant it was the candidates' ability to manage the financial crisis or, at least, their ability to argue that each could manage the crisis, was a central issue in the election (Nye, 2008).

In addition to the looming financial crisis, voters in the Democratic Party were divided between Clinton and Obama because of what each represented as "the first woman and the first African-American with a legitimate chance of winning" (Butler, 2009, p. 338). For Democratic Party voters, the meaning assigned to their candidacies "created passionate supporters who identified viscerally with their candidate" (Butler, 2009, p. 338). The division amongst Democratic voters was actually more demographic than ideological (Butler, 2009). Where Clinton's strongest supporters were amongst the working class, women, Hispanics, and older voters. As a candidate, Obama appealed to African Americans, younger voters, white collar workers, and highly educated voters (Butler, 2009). Support for Obama and Clinton was also of relatively equal size but their respective portions of voters changed to favor Obama after the primary victory in Iowa and after former president Bill Clinton made some comments that were considered offensive (Butler, 2009). Clinton officially announced the suspension of her campaign in June 2008 and supported the nomination of Obama (Carroll & Dittmar, 2010).

Significance of the study

This dissertation is significant because it contributes to the scholarship of political communication by analyzing the selection of frames in political advertising and how these frames reflect and construct cultural and political values in society associated with race and gender. This study also provides insight about patterns of discrimination and/or empowerment of women and minorities in political advertising. Second, this study contributes to the field by offering insight about how women and minorities could be perceived by society through political advertising. Furthermore, as political advertising can serve as a construction of minorities for

non-minorities, it may also serve as a social construction for minorities themselves. Therefore, it is important to know precisely how political advertising could serve as a source of self-perceptions for minorities. Such perceptions may relate to self-concepts or to how society views minorities.

Third, this dissertation provides an analysis of how presidential candidates include women and minorities in their political agendas and how they use these representations to push their political agendas. It also contributes by analyzing similar and different patterns of selection of frames associated with women and minorities in Mexico and the United States. Consequently, the study contributes to expand the scholarship on international political communication.

Chapter II: Literature Review

Comparative Studies

Social science research stipulates that socially constructed realities do not exist independently of one another and that these constructions must be compared in order to derive meaning from them (Oyen, 1990). Many researchers have acknowledged the need to conduct comparative studies that address the complexities of a globalized world (Hallin & Mancini, 2004). This global context “is encouraging many communication researchers to address the transnational dimensions of cultural institutions, products, audiences and policies” (Livingstone, 2003). These scholars have encouraged the creation of more studies that go beyond the limitations of studying one country.

Although intra-national comparisons result in valid data, cross-cultural or cross-national studies have definite benefits. Researchers recognize that cross-national comparative studies are a different type of research because they “represent a new or a different set of theoretical, methodological and epistemological challenges” (Oyen, 1990, p. 4), many certainly highlight and praise their benefits. Edelstein (cited in Livingstone, 2003, p. 478) defines comparative research of media systems as “a study that compares two or more nations with respect to some common activity.” According to Livingstone (2003), comparisons are helpful for:

Improving understanding of one’s own country; improving understanding of other countries; testing a theory across diverse settings; examining transnational processes across different contexts; examining the local reception of imported cultural forms; building abstract universally applicable theory; challenging claims to universality; evaluating scope and value of certain phenomena; identifying marginalized cultural forms; improving international understanding; and learning from the policy initiatives of others. (p. 479)

Hallin and Mancini (2004, p. 2) explain that, well applied, comparative research plays two main purposes in the social sciences: “concept formation and clarification” and “causal inference.”

For this study in particular, comparative analysis is also useful as Hallin and Mancini (2004) argue that comparative research is useful in the deconstruction of ethnocentrism and to understand the limitations of concepts that are assumed to be “natural” in our own culture (Hallin & Mancini, 2004, p. 2). In short, comparative research brings to our attention issues that otherwise would remain imperceptible because of our familiarity with them (Hallin & Mancini, 2004). Comparative studies also help “translating a concept from one cultural context into another cultural context, without distorting the content and the meaning of the concept” (Oyen, 1990, p. 196).

Hallin and Mancini (2004) state that this kind of research develops our sensitivity to similarity and difference. It is by the identification of similarities and differences that a comparison’s goals are achieved (Livingstone, 2003). Livingstone (2003) suggests balancing similarities and differences when making comparisons. Looking for differences may lead researchers to “exacerbate national stereotypes, overstating internal homogeneity while underplaying heterogeneity, ambiguity and borderline phenomena” (Livingstone, 2003, p. 479). In other words, it is best to derive additional meaning in a comparative analysis via a search for both similarity and difference.

Hallin and Mancini (2004) explain that the interest in developing comparative studies is very recent. Although Chan et al. (2001) identify that some authors were acutely aware of the importance of this field in the 1950s, Hallin and Mancini (2004) and Chang et al (2001) note that strong efforts to conduct this kind of research and to develop new approaches did not start until the 1970s. Before that period, “social problems were understood as specific in time and space”

(Scheuch, 1990, p. 19). However, during World War II, social science researchers directed their efforts to explaining the maintenance of regimes in places such as Germany and Japan in addition to examining the influence of these regimes on other societies (Scheuch, 1990). In this sense, the comparison of the Mexican and the U.S. media systems made in this dissertation will contribute to develop this relative young area of research.

Comparative studies have been conducted in a context of controversy over the new world information order and researchers have recognized the importance of addressing these concerns (Chang et al. 2001). Accordingly, this dissertation addresses these concerns and contributes to fill the research gap between Mexico and the United States. In addition, the growing importance of political advertising in Mexico demands empirically-based theory that could address the specific characteristics of that country; the body of research on Mexican political advertising would also benefit from cross-national studies that can relate domestic events to international or global phenomena.

This study is comprised of a comparative study of broadcast political advertising of presidential elections in two countries. This comparison allowed for an examination of “natural” constructions and concepts within each context. The study follows Livingstone’s (2003) advice in balancing similarities and differences and it also highlighted issues about representations of gender and race in political advertising that otherwise would remain imperceptible in the study of one single country (Hallin & Mancini, 2004, p. 2).

Selection of the Theoretical Framework

Chang et al. (2001, p. 429) identify important methodological problems present in many comparative studies and offer useful suggestions to minimize them. Some of the problems that commonly plague comparative analyses include the absence of a theoretical framework, clear

goals, and a detailed justification for the study (Chang et al., 2001). Hallin and Mancini (2004) point out a general lack of empirically supported theory in comparative research. In their study of 151 cross-national studies published in six major communication journals between 1970 and 1990, Chang et al. (2001) found that 64.9% of these studies were atheoretical. As a consequence, most of these studies showed problems in their design, reliability and validity.

Chang et al. (2001) emphasize that comparative studies should be linked to a theory or framework. They insist in “the importance of a clear link between theory and methodology in mass communication research” (Chang et al. 2001, p. 421). Even though data seem to be “directly comparable, cultural divergence must of necessity reappear at the point of interpretation and theory” (Livingstone, 2003, p. 489). For this reason, interpretation should be conducted “within a systematic theoretical framework” (Livingstone, 2003, p. 489). This need was also identified by Teune in the past (1990). The lack of a theoretical perspective, results in studies that fail to “effectively address the structural factors that might have affected the interpretation of findings” (Chang et al. 2001, p. 422). Thus, studies end up describing what is happening instead of explaining “how and why” (Chang et al., 2001, p. 422). According to Chang et al. (2001, p. 422), studies with a comparative design linked to a theory often “generate more fruitful results and penetrating insights than a single nation study.”

Consequently, it is important to clearly identify a theoretical framework that could explain “why” a phenomenon occurs in both countries. The lack of a theoretical framework could lead researchers to only describe the phenomenon without understanding the contextual dynamics that cause it in the first place (Chang et al., p. 422). In order to address these theoretical concerns, this study will use framing theory to guide the comparison of broadcast

political advertising of the 2006 Mexican presidential election and the 2008 U.S. presidential election.

Selection of comparable social units

According to Chang et al. (2001), the definition of comparable social units is also essential in comparative studies. Social units should be selected in concordance with the selected theoretical framework and should be comparable in terms of addressing characteristics of the context that may have an impact on the observations (Chang et al., 2001). In terms of variables, they:

Can be held constant by selecting units or subunits from the same categories to reduce variance of the characteristics defining the class itself (e.g. national vs. local newspapers). (Chang et al. 2001, p. 429)

It is essential to determine if one social unit is comparable to the other and if the variables can also be compared in both contexts (Chang et al., 2001). Accordingly, the selected social units for this dissertation are the selection of frames associated with women and minorities in political advertising during each one of the presidential campaigns.

In the same way, Chang et al. (2001, p. 425) emphasize the importance of selecting equivalent units of observation and that the sample is representative of the population at large (Chang et al., 2001). Concepts are also an important part of the study, they vary from context to context and it is important to establish “different indicators to measure the same concept across countries” (Chang et al., 2001, p. 426). Accordingly, the unit of observation selected in this dissertation is broadcast political advertising. Women and minorities are political actors in both countries and the political advertising analyzed in this study was created for presidential campaigns at a national level.

Broadcast political advertising is an essential tool of political communication in both countries and accounts for the largest expenditure in political campaigns (Lozano, 2006; Kaid, 2006). Broadcast advertisements also reflect the frames selected by candidates to represent women and minorities in their messages to voters.

Country Selection

According to Livingstone (2003), the country selection is closely related to the research question. A study using a nation as the context of study should look for countries that allow it to capture the diversity along the variable that is being analyzed. In this way, generalizations about that variable can be made (Livingstone, 2003). The rich differences among the social, political, and cultural context of the United States and Mexico seem able to capture the diversity along the selection of frames associated with women and minorities in political advertising.

Chang et al. (2001) also suggest that in the analysis of specific dimensions, such as the political one, the data of each country should include media from “the opposite end of the spectrum” (Chang et al. 2001, p. 430). In order to address these concerns, this dissertation analyzed political advertising from all of the presidential candidates in both elections.

Legal Framework

It is also important to note that political advertising operates within the legal and regulatory structure of a country. This legal environment can shape the messages provided by political advertising. For this reason, it is relevant to this dissertation to analyze the differences and similarities between legal regulations that affect political advertising in Mexico and the United States.

Mexico. For many years, TV stations in Mexico used news programs to cover the activities of the reigning PRI party, seldom giving coverage to other political parties. Political

ads were broadcast for no other reason than to provide a democratic façade to elections and they were not important for voters (Aceves, 2000). However, after years of social and political struggle, oppositional political parties started to have more access to media and political advertising.

By 2006, The Federal Code of Electoral Institutions and Procedures (COFIPE) already regulated electoral advertising in television. According to this code:

Each political party has 15 free minutes per month to promote its candidates and programs. Also, during presidential campaigns, TV stations must provide a total of 200 free hours for all the parties ... In addition, during electoral campaigns, the Federal Electoral Institute buys 400 twenty-second spots per month and distributes 30% of them evenly among the political parties and 70% proportionately to each party. (Lozano, 2006, p. 262)

Also, political parties can use their own funds to buy time, with authorization of the Federal Electoral Institute (Lozano, 2006). Before the 2006 election, most parties used 60% of their campaign budget on television ads (Lozano, 2006). The COFIPE (2008, p. 42) also stipulates that no individual or institution different from political parties can buy political advertising in radio or television that is directed to influence electoral preferences in voters.

In terms of regulation of content, the COFIPE (2008, p. 34) establishes that political advertising should not use “any expression that denigrates institutions and parties or that defames people.” In any case, political ads should follow what is stipulated in *The Political Constitution of the United Mexican States (IIJ-UNAM, 2012)*, article 6th, first paragraph that reads:

The expression of ideas will not be subject to any judicial or administrative inquisition, except in the case that it attacks morality, the rights of a third person, provokes a crime, or perturbs the public order.

In addition, political parties also are forbidden from using “religious symbols, expressions, allusions or arguments of religious character” (COFIPE, 2008, p.34) in their political ads.

The United States. Political advertising operates in the United States mainly under three areas of law: the U.S. Constitution, the Federal Communications Commission (FCC), and the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act of 2002 (BCRA) (Kaid, 2006). The First Amendment to the U.S Constitution stipulates that:

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances. (NARA, 2012)

The Constitutional protection of Free Speech is strongly defended by the courts. For that reason, regulations on political advertising are very rare (Kaid, 2006). According to Kaid (2006, p. 39) “any regulation of the content or format or distribution of a political message in any form or any medium is almost unthinkable.”

The FCC requires that all commercial television stations give all candidates reasonable access to air-time or the opportunity to buy reasonable air-time (Kaid, 2006). In the case of candidates buying air-time, stations are required to give “equal time” to all candidates and to sell this time at “the lowest unit charge” (Kaid, 2006, p.39).

Finally, the BCRA forbids “corporations and labor unions, as well as independent, tax-exempt, nonprofit organizations, from sponsoring or indirectly financing communications related to a federal candidate within 60 days of a federal general election” (Kaid, 2006, p. 40). The BCRA also stipulates that political ads have to be endorsed by the sponsoring candidate and that the candidate has to provide a personal identification in them.

The “Americanization” of Political Advertising

Despite the legal and cultural differences among countries, some scholars have argued that political advertising in other countries keeps a certain degree of similarity to U.S. political

advertising. According to these researchers, political advertising in other countries has been “Americanized” because of the propagation of U.S. strategies of political marketing across the world (Aceves, 2009).

The origins of political marketing in the United States have been traced back to the 1952 presidential campaign of Dwight Eisenhower (Aceves, 2009) and since then, U.S. political advertising can be said to have moved through three stages of development (Mareek, 1997). The period from 1952 to 1960 was characterized by the intensive use of spots in radio and television and the employment of short and direct messages. From 1960 to 1976, the use of the radio spot was perfected. During the third stage, in the 1980s, television became the most important medium of political advertising and represented most of the budget of political campaigns. Also, it was during this period that negative political advertising increased (Aceves, 2009).

It was during the second stage of the development of political marketing in the United States that political marketing, as it was known in the United States, appeared in Latin America. Mainly through the hiring of foreign consultants and mass media experts for the political campaigns as well as local publicists (Aceves, 2009). For example, Venezuelan political parties hired the American political consultants Joe Napolitan and David Garth for their campaigns, as well as The Gallup Organization (Aceves, 2009).

Several important strategies were then identified as having moved from U.S. campaigns to other nations. The emphasis of the candidate over the party (also called “personalization”), the use of political spots (specially television spots), polls, image consultants, publicists and negative political advertising, were identified as elements of U.S. political marketing that were used more frequently in the electoral campaigns of many countries across the world (Aceves, 2009). According to Aceves (2009), Mexico, Venezuela, Chile, Argentina, Brazil, Spain, the United

Kingdom and Russia were some of the nations that embraced the U.S. political marketing model. Zovatto (2007) also identified elements of the U.S. political marketing model in campaigns of Costa Rica, Nicaragua and Peru. In the specific case of Mexico, it was not until the 1990s that political marketing started to be a relevant element in the electoral processes. This may be due to the lack of a serious need for political advertising as the PRI enjoyed a *de facto* monopoly of both political power and broadcasting. After the electoral reforms of 1993 brought more balance in the space assigned to political parties in the media, the 1994 presidential election was the first one where the use of political advertising started to be of significance (Aceves, 2009).

The 2006 Mexican presidential elections featured many of the elements of the U.S. political marketing style. This is not surprising since some of the companies and the consultants that candidates hired for their campaigns were strongly connected to the world of U.S. political marketing. Thus, it can be argued that the political advertising of the 2006 presidential campaigns in Mexico was an example of “Americanization.”

To start, Calderón, the candidate of the PAN, hired Dick Morris to manage his media strategy. Dick Morris had been advisor of Bill Clinton in his two presidential campaigns and had collaborated in the presidential campaign of Vicente Fox in 2000, where Fox was elected president of Mexico (Sánchez Murillo & Aceves, 2008). Calderón’s television spots were filmed under the supervision of the company Ogilvy and Mather Mexico, a branch of the international advertising firm with the same name that is based in New York (Sánchez Murillo & Aceves, 2008). So, the presence of U.S. political marketing elements in Calderón’s campaign is not rare.

Madrazo’s (The PRI candidate) also featured political marketing elements Madrazo’s campaign was managed by Carlos Alazraki (Sánchez Murillo & Aceves, 2008), president of the Mexican publicity agency *Alazraki y Asociados* (Alazraki and Associates). Alazraki started his

career in the United States working for film and advertising companies. Before working with Madrazo, Alazraki had worked with Hal Greenfader, Publicis Romero, and JVM (Zapiáin, 2010). Also of note, Madrazo's campaign made extensive use of negative political advertising (Sánchez Murillo & Aceves, 2008).

Calderón and Madrazo were the candidates with the highest spending on television and radio spots so it is no surprise that their political advertising dominated the radio and television space during the campaigns (Sánchez Murillo & Aceves, 2008). Calderón spent approximately 617 million pesos (about 45.96 million dollars), and Madrazo around 452 million (about 33.67 million dollars). On the other hand, López, the candidate of the PRD, spent an estimated 290 million pesos (about 21.6 million dollars) and Mercado had the lowest spending of these four candidates with around 52 million pesos (about 3.87 million dollars) (Sánchez Murillo & Aceves, 2008).

López's media campaign was managed by the publicist Tere Struck, the owner of the publicity agency *Tere Struck y Asociados* (Tere Struck & Associates) (Sánchez Murillo & Aceves, 2008). Information regarding Struck is scarce as she did not like interviews and did not like to attend public events. That said, Lopez's campaign still featured some elements of the U.S. political marketing style. For example, there was an extensive use of television political spots and it was known that Struck used to design her campaigns based in public opinion surveys (Grajeda, 2005),

Finally, there is little information about the creators of the campaigns of Mercado and Campa. The few academic articles on the 2006 presidential campaigns, such as the ones written by Aceves (2009) and Sánchez Murillo and Aceves (2008), have only brief mentions of these two candidates. They were more focused on the PAN, PRI, and PRD, the three main parties.

However, there are reports that Mercado's political advertising was designed by the company *Imaginería* (Zárraga, 2006), a Mexican publicity agency (Imaginería, 2009).

It is important to note that although it is common to say that politics around the world have been "Americanized," mostly because of the use of U.S. political marketing tools in the electoral processes of many countries, the limits of the "Americanization" concept are subject of an ongoing debate among political communication scholars (Aceves, 2009). This dissertation acknowledges this debate. Most scholars use the term "Americanization" to refer only to the increasing adoption, adaptation and importance of the elements of U.S. political marketing in the electoral processes of many countries (Radunski 1996; Berlín Villafañá 2006; Zovatto, 2007). But some researchers are concerned that the term "Americanization" can be interpreted as a "modernization process." In other words, that it can be understood as "the assimilation and reproduction of the characteristics of the American political system" (Aceves, 2009, p. 38).

Framing and Political Advertising

According to Entman (1993, p. 52), framing consists of selecting "some aspects of a perceived reality making them more salient in a communicating text, in such a way as to promote a particular problem definition, causal interpretation, moral evaluation and/or treatment recommendation for the item described." Frames provide us with "interpretive packages" that guide our understanding of a social phenomenon (Reese, 2010, p.19). Within this understanding, frames can and do impact public opinion.

In political communication, politicians, journalists, and others compete to frame issues and policies. In this way, frames are "the imprint of power" (Entman, 1993, p. 55). They reflect the values of the actors that dominate the political discourse without explicitly stating these values (Entman, 1993). In other words, they "suggest a taken-for-granted perspective on how one

might approach a problem” (Altheide, 1996, p. 31). In this way, frames naturalize the social constructedness of issues and problems.

Framing is a central part of political advertising. The controlled nature of political advertising, allows candidates to carefully select the frames they use in their messages to voters (Entman, 1993). Frames “define problems,” “diagnose causes,” “make moral judgments,” and “suggest remedies” according to their political agenda (Entman, 1993, p. 52). This is significant because frames selectively highlight some issues and actors in a situation while omitting others, which gives salience to selected elements of a phenomenon and might lead to different perceptions and attitudes in the public (Entman, 1993).

Frames are also deeply rooted in culture (Reese, 2001, p.11). According to Van Gorp (2007), frames exist in culture; they have always been present in different times and contexts in society. Consequently, it is important to distinguish between text and frame. The frames selected in a text are related to certain cultural phenomena by the audiences because of the audiences’ familiarity with these frames (Van Gorp, 2007). Frames are seen as “normal,” “unnoticed” and “implicit” (Van Gorp, 2007, p. 63). Thus, frames are “invitations” and “incentives” to understand texts in a specific way, even when the effects of these frames might depend on the receiver’s individual values, beliefs and circumstances (Van Gorp, 2007, p. 63). Frames are not intrinsic or attached to the text. Rather, audiences “read” the frames based on a perceived shared meaning with the text. Different audiences might perceive different frames in the same text.

Framing in political advertising reflects the values of political elites (Connolly-Ahern & Castells i Talens, 2010). According to Connolly-Ahern and Castells i Talens (2010), to the extent that the frames selected by candidates in political advertising are similar, they provide us with “a generalized picture of the values of political elites” (p. 316); to the extent these frames are

different, they reveal “partisan fissures within the political system” (p. 316). The frames these political elites select in their political advertising compete with other available frames in the broad political discourse in society.

In political advertising, frames exist “within the writer, within the text, and within the receiver” (Parmelee, Perkins, & Sayre, 2006, p. 185). In other words, understandings of frames—and by extension, issues—are not universal. One understanding can exist in candidates, another can be expressed in political advertising, and another noticed by audiences. Each actor plays a role in the negotiation of meaning (Parmelee, Perkins, & Sayre, 2006).

In news discourse, there are four structures in which frames are usually constructed (Pan & Kosicki, 1993): syntactical, which involves “the arrangement of sentences and words”; script, which consists of how the story is told to the audiences and how it answers the “who, what, where, when, and how” of the issue covered in the text; thematic, in which the thematic structure for the story is provided through a hierarchical organization of themes and subthemes; and rhetorical, which employs some tools identified by Gamson and Modigliani (1989) such as: “metaphors, exemplars, catchphrases, depictions, and visual images” (Pan & Kosicki, 1993, p. 59-62).

In sum, frames are “organizing principles that are socially shared and persistent over time, that work symbolically to meaningfully structure the social world” (Reese, 2001, p.11). Political advertising is a form of reality for voters and framing is an important element in its process (Kaid & Johnston, 2001). The way in which political advertising presents reality influences how audiences interpret and evaluate issues and events (Kaid, 2006).

Accordingly, the study of frames associated with women and minorities is important because the depictions of certain groups in political advertising may influence the way these

groups are perceived by the public, the public's beliefs and attitudes toward policies that affect these groups, and also the groups' self-perception (Connolly-Ahern & Castells i Talens, 2010).

Women in Society

Social constructions influence the way in which female candidates are perceived in society. In modern societies, according to Yuval-Davis (1997, p. 2), the “common sense understanding of western social and political order” has been based on classical theories of “the social contract.” These theories have divided the civil society into the public and the private realms, where only the public realm is given political relevance. Under this view, women and family have been associated with the private domain and excluded from the public arena (Yuval-Davis, 1997).

This division of the private and the public domains is not real (Yuval-Davis, 1997). However, it has had deep effects in the perception of women within their national cultures. Yuval-Davis (1997) explains that,

As nationalism and nations have usually been discussed as a part of the public political sphere, the exclusion of women from that arena has affected their exclusion from that discourse as well. (p.2)

In this way, women have always been present in the production and reproduction of the national arena and have always been active participants and contributors to the national projects (Sinha, 2006; Yuval-Davis, 1997; Gutiérrez, 1995). However, their unnatural exclusion from the political sphere, where the hegemonic political discourse in general is carried out, has portrayed them as “outsiders.” This certainly affects society's perceptions of women active in the political sphere, such as female presidential candidates.

This hegemonic discourse has had the power to establish cultural and legal regulations to individuals based in their sexual/biological difference, associations that are imagined and that are

not reflecting reality as many authors argue (Yuval-Davis, 1997; Socolow, 2000). Under these normative standards:

The position of men and women in any society is a social construct, not a natural state. Each society and every social group has a culture that defines the roles and rules of masculinity and femininity; by conforming to these definitions an individual becomes a 'legitimate' man or woman. (Socolow, 2000, p. 1)

The position and roles of women in society have been determined mostly by gender but also by a combination of other factors such as "race, class, demography, life course, spatial variations, local economy, norm and reality, and change over time" (Socolow, 2000, p.1). Within these factors, race alone is by itself a very complex factor (Socolow, 2000).

Accordingly, the experiences of women in both countries and the two female candidates during each of the presidential elections likely differ from society's expectations. In order to understand the differences between women's experiences and society's expectations, a historical analysis of the real and the expected experiences of women in both countries is provided below.

Women in the 2008 U.S. Presidential Election

In the United States, women worked within party organizations to get their right to vote recognized (Burrell, 2010). Some years before the passage of the 19th Amendment, the political parties created their own women's organizations to integrate women (and their votes) into their political projects (Burrell, 2010).

This effort led to greater representation of women within political parties. In the years after the passage of the 19th Amendment, approximately 15% of the delegates to the parties' national conventions were women. However, by the late 1960s, women were still not promoted as candidates for public offices. The rare cases in which they were promoted by their parties were cases where the party's chances to win were minimal (Burrell, 2010).

More pressure on political parties to increase women's representation came during the second women's rights movement, when women created partisan political organizations (Burrell, 2010). Women's long and difficult struggle for representation slowly came to fruition. In 1968, 13% of the total number of delegates in the Democratic Party were women, and 17% of the total number of delegates in the Republican Party were women. By 1972, the numbers increased to 40% and 30% respectively (Burrell, 2010).

The struggle for representation continued throughout the following decades. By 2008, women constituted 50% of the Democratic delegates and 32% of the Republican delegates (Burrell, 2010). The 2008 election was especially significant as the presence of Hillary Clinton as the front-runner represented the possibility to crack the "ultimate political glass ceiling" (Burrell, 2010, p. 216). This struggle for the representation of women in the United States coincided with another important struggle—the participation of Barack Obama in the race for the Democratic nomination—and was not realized. For many, Obama's candidacy represented a step in the right direction for race equality and likely overshadowed gender equity.

Representations of Women in the U.S. Media

There are a fair amount of studies examining representations of women in political advertising. However, studies that simultaneously include gender and race in their analysis are less common. The literature reviewed reflects an unfair and unbalanced portrait of women in the media, especially in the cases of Native American and African American women. The findings are worrisome since early studies in the United States showed that news media may reinforce social patterns of discrimination against women. According to Tuchman (1978), women are symbolically annihilated through their omission, trivialization or condemnation in the media.

News Coverage

According to Meyers (2004), few studies have examined representations of female presidential candidates in the news. Specifically, studies on media coverage of female candidates show a persistent gender bias since the time when women started to participate as political candidates in the 19th century. One of the recurring findings in these studies is that women candidates tended to receive less media coverage than male candidates (Falk, 2010). At the very least, this means that women candidates receive less exposure to the public than their male counterparts, putting them at a distinct disadvantage.

Also, Falk (2010) identified some common negative portrayals of women within the political arena. First, women candidates tend to be portrayed as new and “unnatural” to the so called “public sphere.” Accordingly, female candidates are usually discussed in terms of being the first women to accomplish professional goals in that arena (Falk, 2010).

In addition, women candidates tend to be discussed in terms of their family links and physical appearance more frequently than men candidates (Falk, 2010). Their experience, toughness, and competency are also called into question more often (Carroll & Dittmar, 2010; Falk, 2010). When women are assertive in their roles as politicians and candidates, they are often portrayed as “aggressive” (Carroll & Dittmar, 2010; Falk, 2010) whereas their counterparts receive no such criticism for assertiveness.

No research on news coverage of African American women candidates was identified in a review of the literature. However, Collins (1991) argues that the portrayals of African American women are mostly negative and are still linked to the image of the enslaved African woman in the sense that racial oppression is usually present. Accordingly, African American women are usually portrayed as foreign and in position of economic, sexual, or social

subordination in images of “stereotypical mammies, matriarchs, welfare recipients, and hot mammas” (Collins, 1991, p. 69). Often, African American women are also presented as Jezebels, sexually promiscuous as well as overachieving (Meyers, 2004).

Political Advertising

Studies examining political advertising of female presidential candidates have found that female candidates tend to reaffirm their capacity of managing stereotypically “masculine” issues such as national security than “feminine” ones such as gender equality or welfare (Kaid, 2006). In the same way, women candidates try to emphasize “hard issues while trying to portray a softer image” congruent with social norms (Kaid, L.L., 2004, p.178). Bystrom and Kaid (2002) also found that women candidates usually speak more often in their ads, dress more formally, and smile more frequently than male candidates. Also, women have shown an increase in the use of negative ads and tend to use more testimonials, special effects and technological distortions than men (Kaid, L.L., 2004).

Despite the increasing amount of scholarship on political advertising of women candidates, the role of Native American and African American women has not been addressed in these studies.

Portrayals of African American men in the media also tend to be negative. An analysis of the societal and political implications of the participation of Barack Obama as presidential candidate and of the media representations of African American men that he faced is provided to understand the context of the election.

African Americans in the 2008 U.S. Presidential Election

The participation of Barack Obama as presidential candidate in the 2008 election had important social and political implications. The 1964 Civil Rights Act moved the United States

to a racially inclusive direction but did not end racial inequalities and tensions in the U.S. society (Smith & King, 2009). Smith and King (2009) identify three eras of “rival racial institutional orders” (p. 28) in the United States history: the slavery era, the Jim Crow era, and the race-conscious controversies era.

According to Smith and King (2009), racial institutional orders are composed by “durable alliances of political actors, activist groups, and government institutions united by their agreement on the central racial issue of their time, which their conflicts help to define” (p. 28). In each one of these three eras, there has been one order focused on maintaining the privileges of the White population and a rival order that has been focused on ending these privileges (Smith & King, 2009).

During the slavery era, from 1789 to 1865, the main issue was to keep or to end slavery. From the 1890s to 1954, during the Jim Crow era, the issue was to keep or to end segregation. The race-conscious controversies era, from the 1970s to the present day, debates between color-blind or race conscious policies (Smith & King, 2009).

The advocates of color blind policies believe that the central goal of the civil rights movement was “that persons would be judged not by the color of their skin but by the content of their character” (Smith & King, 2009, p. 28). On the other hand, the advocates of race conscious policies believe that the goal of the civil rights movement “was to reduce deeply entrenched, unjust, material racial inequalities” (Smith & King, 2009, p. 28). For color-blind proponents, race conscious policies do not accomplish the objective of the civil rights movement and promotes racial divisions. For race conscious advocates, color-blind policies maintain White privilege (Smith & King, 2009).

The fact that Barack Obama, who self-identified as a Black man, announced that he was running for the presidency raised concern among color-blind advocates that, as a president, “he would champion racial preferences” (Smith & King, 2009, p. 30). However, supporters of race conscious policies were willing to believe that, as a civil rights lawyer and a Black man, Obama would be on their side given the dramatic racial inequalities still present in the United States (Smith & King, 2009, p. 30).

Representations of African Americans in the U.S. Media

Scholarship on representations of African Americans in political advertising in the United States is in infancy. However, studies examining advertising more broadly show that they are usually negatively portrayed, marginalized, trivialized, objectified, and ignored (Bristor, Lee & Hunt, 1995). Often, African Americans tend to be portrayed in a position of economic or social subordination to Whites. Usually they are represented as foreign to the U.S. soil, as minor characters, workers, or within a poverty environment (Bristor, Lee & Hunt, 1995).

Also, African Americans are not associated with family environments; they are usually portrayed as overly sexual or as possessing genetically endowed physical skills (Bristor, Lee & Hunt, 1995). Light-skinned African Americans are usually more present in advertisements than dark-skinned African Americans (Bristor, Lee & Hunt, 1995).

In news media, African Americans are more likely to be associated to violent crime than Whites; and more likely to be shown as criminals, violent, dangerous or threatening (Oliver, 2003). Danger and violence have also been associated to indigenous peoples in the media. This is relevant given the political context that surrounded the 2006 presidential election in Mexico. An explanation of this political context is provided.

Representations of Indigenous Peoples in the Media

According to Gutiérrez (2003), indigenous peoples started to be at the center of the national debate in Mexico in the second half of the 1990s. In the 2006 presidential election, Mercado was very explicit in stating that one of her causes was to defend indigenous rights. The inclusion of indigenous peoples in the political discourse in Mexico opens up a good opportunity to compare how indigenous peoples are represented in the political advertising of both countries. Accordingly, representations of Native Americans in the U.S. media are then analyzed.

For centuries Indigenous populations have been misrepresented and excluded from spaces of self-representation in the public arena (Rodríguez, 2001). Moreover, there is evidence that stereotypical representations of indigenous peoples in the media contribute to their symbolic annihilation (Merskin, 2011). Misrepresentations of indigenous cultures have been present since the Europeans arrived to North America. Indigenous peoples were presented as “inferior” and “uncivilized” (Merskin, 2011). The Romantic ideas of indigenous peoples provided by Alexander von Humboldt in the early 19th century still influence current representations in news and entertainment media. Indigenous peoples were presented as strongly linked to their land but not to their archeological works (Connolly-Ahern & Castells i Talens, 2010). They were seen as children of nature (Merskin, 2011) or as part of a “pure” state of nature (Weston, 2005). These representations contributed to dispossess indigenous populations from their history. Archeological works were attributed to a departed culture with no links to the contemporary descendants of that culture (Connolly-Ahern & Castells i Talens, 2010).

Representations of Native Americans in the U.S. Media

Native Americans were described as exotic and ancient, presented in a dichotomized way as “noble savages” or as “evil savages” but uncivilized and inferior to colonizers in either case

(Judd & Copley, 1971). The “evil savage” or “bad Indian” was described as pagan, lecherous, brutal, cruel, indolent and treacherous. However, the image of the “noble savage” or “good Indian” took force after Native Americans stopped being a military threat. The “good Indian” was described as an object of pity, poor, unemployed, and drunk (Weston, 2005). The “good Indian” also had a strong connection with nature and embraced the White culture (Weston, 2005).

Historically, Native Americans were presented as a homogenous group, diverging from the White ideal, or as immoral (Berkhofer (1979). According to Merskin (2011, p. 334), to reduce indigenous populations to these stereotypes helped justify genocide as an adequate answer to the “Indian problem.”

Modern representations of Native Americans still use these stereotypes. In film, they are presented as one homogeneous group of “Indians,” existing only in historical contexts and in conflict with Whites (Merskin, 2011). Mostly, film portrays Native Americans as plains warriors who lack humor, intelligence, and English-speaking skills (Merskin, 2011). The rare cases in which Native Americans are represented in the present time, their lives are being presented as reservation lives, even when only one-third of Native Americans today live on reservations (Merskin, 2011). Characteristics of the reservation life in the media include: “poverty, suicide, family violence, school failure, infant mortality, and alcohol-related illness” (Merskin, 2011, p. 334).

In the news, Weston (2005) identifies two recurrent problems in the coverage of Native Americans. The first is that there is typically a lack of context in which to place contemporary Native Americans. The second is that contemporary news media replicate stereotypes that have

been present since colonial times. Native Americans are presented as out of place in the present and described as childlike, exotic, and primitive (Weston, 2005).

Studies of the representation of Native American women in media are even less common than those of Native Americans more generally. Some studies looking at portrayals in film find evidence that women are dichotomized in unreal and dehumanizing representations of “princesses” and “squaws” (Bird, 1999). These two myths are deeply embedded in the U.S. nationalistic discourse. The princess, usually sexualized and exoticized, does not represent a threat for the European colonizer. She is seen as the “good Indian”, “willing to sacrifice her happiness, cultural identity, and even her life for the good of a new nation” (Bird, 1999, p. 72). The squaw, usually faceless and more common in media more broadly, is seen as unimportant, sexually available, and immoral (Bird, 1999).

Women in Mexico During the Colonial Period

In the case of Mexico, Gutiérrez (2003) argues that a structure of social tensions around gender, race, ethnicity and class has been present in Mexican society since colonial times. It is then important to understand how those tensions developed since they may have influenced the construction of taken for granted ideas about race and gender that are still present in the modern Mexican society. Specifically, those constructions may still be present in the political advertising of interest to this study.

The conquest brought more complexity to an already complex prehispanic society. A socio-racial hierarchical distinction was created between Indigenous Americans, African and European cultural groups in the early years of the conquest. The development of the colonial society added more socio-racial categories to this caste system, in which European groups were always at the top of the structure (Socolow, 2000). The system classified women and men as

criollo, mestizo, mulatto, among other categories. Each category was expected to play specific roles and follow determined norms established for them (Socolow, 2000).

Women's experiences were often far from normative standards of behavior. However, these standards played an important role in shaping women's lives by providing them "with both different opportunities and limitations" (Socolow, 2000, p. 2). As Socolow (2000, p. 3) explains: "all people live in their culture and usually act in accord with the prevailing values of their time." Nevertheless, they also participate as active creators of their own histories (Schroeder, 1997).

African Women

Approximately 1.4 million women were kidnapped and brought from Africa to Spanish America as slaves since the conquest (Socolow, 2000). These women were completely deprived of their freedom, separated from their families and customs and forced to embrace Spanish culture and religion. They were given the lowest rank in the Spanish society.

The Catholic Church did not approve the enslavement of indigenous peoples but did approve and even justify enslavement for Black peoples (Lewis, 2003). Catholic religion viewed Blackness as a "divine" punishment for the sins committed (Lewis, 2003, p. 29). In this sense, Blackness in African women and men was a visible sign that they were "guilty" and that slavery was a justified penance for them.

Black men and women were often punished; they were seen as bellicose and in need to be "domesticated" (Lewis, 2003, p. 70). However, slaveholders expected a benefit from this assumed bellicosity and they used to send their female slaves to exercise their control over indigenous peoples (Lewis, 2003, p. 70).

The caste system considered Black and mulatto slave females inferior to and different from both Spaniards and indigenous peoples (Lewis, 2003). The law did not offer any protection

to Black women that were slaves. They were viewed as merchandise, even as a status symbol. They were legally a property that could be sold, bought and rented out by their “owners” (Socolow, 2000, p. 133). Very often, these women were subjected to sexual and physical exploitation (including torture and death in some cases) by their White masters (Socolow, 2003).

In the rare cases in which Black slave women denounced these abuses in ecclesiastical or legal courts, the law usually favored the slaveholders (Socolow, 2000). Sexual abuses to Black women were not punished because Spanish society considered them “not sexually virtuous.” According to Spanish moral standards, Black women had no “honor” to protect and they were seen as sexually available for their White masters (Socolow, 2000, p. 134). Consequently, the living conditions and the freedom of slave women were mostly in the hands of their owners (Socolow, 2000).

The establishment of sexual relationships with their male masters sometimes caused them to be mistreated by their female masters; but in other cases, they received better treatment and even freedom and economic benefits. Rare were the cases in which these unions ended in marriage. Spanish law and religion did not approve interracial unions and legal recognition of paternity in those cases was also very uncommon (Socolow, 2000).

Slave women were also assigned with the hardest physical tasks. In the cities, they were assigned to domestic labor or rented out as day laborers by themselves or by their owners (Socolow, 2000). In rural settings, they were usually assigned to field labor (Socolow, 2000). Prostitution of slave women was not allowed by law, but some of them practiced it. Either by own decision or forced by their masters. The income that these women received from these activities sometimes was enough to buy their freedom (Socolow, 2000). However, in most of the

cases, that did not improve their living conditions or change the activities they performed (Socolow, 2000).

Spanish families assigned their female slaves to chaperone young women in order to protect the Spanish women's chastity. The honor of Spanish families was closely linked to the chastity of their female members. Honor played a significant role in the definition of the social and economic positions of members of the elite (Twinam, 1998). Since honor in elite families was associated to the sexual behavior of the females in that family, a family could lose its honor if the fact that one of its female members had lost her virginity before her wedding day became public knowledge (Twinam, 1998, p. 81). Thus, slave women were usually assigned with the task of chaperoning the young female members of elite families (Socolow, 2000). They functioned as guardians of these females' "honor" and by extension as indirect guardians of the social and economic position of the family.

In sum, Black and mulatto women slaves were:

The most disadvantaged of all women. Deprived of their freedom and lacking effective protection from abuse, they were used in a wide variety of difficult physical tasks, ranging from planting and cutting cane, to working as laundresses. Viewed by European society as lacking in honor, they were often the victim of the unwanted sexual advances of their masters or other men. (Socolow, 2000, p. 145)

Indigenous Women

Colonial society was based in the assumption that indigenous peoples were subordinated to Spaniards in every area of society, even in sexual interactions (Carrasco, 1997). However, some elite indigenous women were in a higher social rank than Spaniards due to their wealth, which made them attractive bride candidates (Wood. & Haskett, 1997). Many indigenous-Spanish marriages were established under this schema, although the opportunities to marry well were not the same for non-elite indigenous women (Wood & Haskett, 1997).

Indigenous women rarely had formal authority in any context but many of them retained their wealth or even increased it after the conquest (Schroeder, 1997). They had very important roles in “marketing, food preparation, and domestic service” (Wood and Haskett, 1997, p. 324). They also owned property and had a key-role in small-scale production of products and trade (Wood & Haskett, 1997).

Indigenous women’s experiences differed according to urban or rural locations. Urban environments represented more opportunities for less elite indigenous women since they had closer contact with Spaniards (Wood & Haskett, 1997). Also, the elite indigenous women that married powerful Spaniards occupied a place at the top of the colonial social structure (Wood and Haskett, 1997).

For indigenous women in rural places, the conquest came to aggravate gender inequalities in a society where males enjoyed more power than females in politics, family structure, and property management (Espejo-Ponce Hunt and Restall, 1997). However, they were also provided with new opportunities to improve their position in society, which they often used in very creative ways (Espejo-Ponce Hunt and Restall, 1997).

Maya women activities, before and after the conquest, mostly consisted of household management, agriculture, raising children and the production of cotton cloth (Espejo-Ponce Hunt and Restall, 1997). Their roles mostly determined women’s different position in society.

Noble Maya women were not able to establish marriage alliances with conquerors and first settlers of Yucatan that would have granted them the entrance to the exclusive group at the top of the Spanish power structure. By the time that Spaniards consolidated their dominance over the Maya region, most of the members of the Spanish elite were already married to Spanish women or indigenous women from central Mexico and their descendents usually married other

elite members (Espejo-Ponce Hunt & Restall, 1997). However, some wealthy Maya women established marriage alliances with impoverished Spanish men at the beginning of the 17th century (Espejo-Ponce Hunt and Restall, 1997).

These alliances were beneficial for both sides, Spanish men gained economic power and Maya women and their families were integrated into the structure of power of the Spanish society (Espejo-Ponce Hunt and Restall, 1997). By 1650, the number of Spanish women in the region increased and marriage alliances between Maya women and Spanish men became more uncommon. Maya nobility wealth decreased and Spanish men had the opportunity to forge alliances with wealthy Spanish women (Espejo-Ponce Hunt and Restall, 1997). The presence of noble Maya women in the Spanish society diminished, they usually stayed in the *cahob* and their functions in the Spanish society were usually defined by their marriage with “Hispanicized individuals” or by their commercial activities (Espejo-Ponce Hunt & Restall, 1997, p. 240).

In the case of lower caste Maya women, they were brought to the cities as temporary servants or long-term servants. The status of these women increased over time by their own financial management or by the generosity of the Spaniards to whom they worked (Espejo-Ponce Hunt & Restall, 1997). Spanish and Maya women did not have legal powers by law, but there was certain flexibility in practice that allowed them to manage their property (Espejo-Ponce Hunt & Restall, 1997).

Non-elite Maya women living near Spanish cities usually performed traditional activities and were more isolated from the Spanish society. However, some of these women came in contact with Spanish or Hispanicized men through commercial interactions. Some of these interactions resulted in “irregular alliances” that hardly ever ended in marriage but that gave

these women and their descendents certain economic and social benefits (Espejo-Ponce Hunt & Restall, 1997, p. 241).

For the non-elite Maya women living in rural places, their roles in politics and society did not suffer major changes. Women's participation in society continued to be active but defined by their gender. The Maya society had patriarchal characteristics but the roles played by women were not considered inferior than the roles played by men (Espejo-Ponce Hunt & Restall, 1997).

In sum, even when society limited Maya women access to certain roles and positions in society, it also opened opportunities for them. Maya women played a key role as cultural guardians and discovered many creative ways to improve their status in society and to challenge their assigned roles. Maya women are shown "not as victims but rather as survivors" (Espejo-Ponce Hunt and Restall, 1997, p. 252).

Nevertheless, the access of indigenous women to formal structures of power was strongly limited.

European Women

Very few Spanish women arrived in the first years of the Spanish conquest. Women were not considered essential for military expeditions and most of the conquerors left their wives and/or female family members in Spain. In the later years of the Spanish conquest, the Spanish crown and the Catholic Church established policies that rewarded those Spanish men who brought their Spanish wives to America (Socolow, 2000).

The crown and the church believed that the arrival of Spanish women to America would bring stability, civilization and the spread of Spanish culture and population into the region (Socolow, 2000). Thus, Spanish women in the early years of the conquest were seen as having a key role in the biological and cultural reproduction of Spain in America. They were also assigned

the role of “civilizers” and guardians of culture and morality (Socolow, 2000, p. 53). The arrival of Spanish women was thought to stop “the immoral behavior of the conquerors” (Socolow, 2000, p. 53).

Class was an important factor in determining moral standards for Spanish women (Socolow, 2000). In terms of sexuality, elite women had a role in maintaining their “honor,” which was equated to “virginity” or “purity” until marriage (Twinam, 1998, p. 81). The loss of their honor and negatively affected the social, political and economic position of the entire family (Twinam, 1998). Mostly because of the role these women played in the establishment of beneficial marriage alliances within their own socioracial group (Socolow, 2000).

For this reason, marriage by love was very rare and young elite women moved in a very limited social circle. They were usually isolated and strongly supervised and controlled by their families (Socolow, 2000). This helped to protect their “honor,” and limited their romantic opportunities (Socolow, 2000). After marriage, elite women were assigned to take care of their husbands, children wealth, and household (Socolow, 2000)

On the other hand, honor for men involved economic power and how this power gave these men control over “the labors, sexual services, and property of inferiors” (Stern 1995, p. 14).

Sexuality was less controlled in non-elite Spanish women, who were ranked lower in the honor system. Infidelity was acceptable in men but not acceptable in both elite and non-elite women. In those cases, men “had the right to kill” their wives (Socolow, 2000, p. 66).

By law, Spanish men had legal control over their wives, daughters, and family property. Although their daughters could take legal control over themselves at the age of twenty-five (Lewis, 1998), many women married before their twenties (Socolow, 2000). However, this did

not stop women from playing an active role in the decisions and initiatives concerning their families' wealth. Women could also exercise authority in the temporary absence or the death of male figures (Socolow, 2000).

Some of these women, usually unmarried or widowed, did manage their property and participated in the economy by investing, or renting properties and/or slaves (Socolow, 2000). They managed to do this without being present in the public space, since women's enclosure was essential for maintaining their good reputation (Socolow, 2000). Usually, elite women used male relatives and surrogates as an extension of their personas in the public space (Socolow, 2000). On the other hand, non-elite Spanish women were usually in more economic need. These women tried to stay at home according to social standards. But some of them established family workshops, or worked in the husband's business (Socolow, 2000). Occasionally, women even ran the family business in the absence of their husbands (Socolow, 2000).

Elite Spanish women were the most privileged in terms of living conditions and physical work and informal power. They were at the top of the caste system and were considered key players in the maintenance of the economic, social and racial hierarchy that shaped the patriarchal structure of this system. Even when they had no access to formal structures of power, there were many "institutional and cultural loopholes" of negotiation that women used for challenging this structure (Stern, 1995, p. 16).

As an example, their role as charity givers and educators of their children and servants placed them as cultural keepers and promoters of Spanish values and religion. But it also created networks and opened spaces that helped them to contest these values (Stern, 1995). Some of these spaces of contestation can be seen in the influence women had over decisions related to the

well-being of people serving them and over decisions made by their political and economically powerful husbands and male friends and relatives (Socolow, 2000).

Women in Contemporary Mexico

The enlightenment did not bring major changes to the roles played by women in Mexican society and the few changes which were made typically only favored elite women. Even though there were important improvements such as more education for women and the space for women rebelling against abuse, the socio-racial divisions established by the colonial society still defined women's roles (Socolow, 2000). Despite women's active involvement in the independence movement; the social, political and economic changes that resulted from it did not improve their circumstances (Socolow, 2000).

The economic development of the country and other social factors led women to start questioning their colonial legacy more strongly by the end of the 19th century (Socolow, 2000). Stern (1995) attributes this phenomenon to the liberal anticlerical politics that were generated in that time and that resulted in important improvements in terms of family law and the creation of mixed-sex public schools. The improvements were very limited but opened some spaces for women in the public arena. However, it was until the revolution that traditional gender dynamics started to be transformed (Stern, 1995).

Women's active participation and the question of socioracial and power structures during the revolution opened a limited political discussion over women's roles in society. Traditional ideas on divorce, suffrage, and sexual double standard started to be challenged (Stern, 1995), not without a strong opposition from the Catholic Church (Rodríguez, 2003). After the revolution was institutionalized, the government started to be more cautious about establishing a clear position about gender. However, there was a significant social transformation in that area:

The assault on landed wealth and the church, the insistence on the relevance of an integrated education for girls, and the discourse of social equality unsettled conventional articulations of gender culture, political culture, and traditionalist morality in the country side. (Stern, 1995, p. 328)

The idea of modernization that was embraced after the revolution promoted industrialization and moved many people from rural to urban centers (Stern, 1995). This increased the diversity of labor market for women expanding it to urban centers and undermined patriarchal structures of power in rural settlements (Stern, 1995). However, the initiative of modernization established by the state provoked a defense of “*lo mexicano*” (“*the Mexican*”) which associated machismo as an essential part of the national culture (Stern, 1995, p. 329). In contrast, between the 1970s and 1980s, the Mexican cultural and political discourse started to integrate again a discussion about gender equality (Stern, 1995).

Even when the revolution was “a patriarchal event” in the sense that it had the objective of ending with the oppression of who were considered subordinated men; it also opened spaces and opportunities for women: “The social conventions of gender that had once organized patriarchal power and that had structured a terrain of gender struggle gave way to social conventions of gender.” (Stern, 1995, p. 340)

Women in the 2006 Mexican Presidential Election

Women’s movements and gender discourse are now part of the political and social environment in Mexico while traditional norms and definitions of women’s roles have been extremely weakened. There is now a “cultural argument about mutuality among equals or near-equals, an argument about equity of right and duty among partner-companions in a world where male and female spheres and roles might overlap considerably” (Stern, 1995, p. 340). As shown earlier, Mexican women had made significant inroads in obtaining more power in the public

sphere through participation and control over their bodies. This advancement was not reflected universally with Mexican women having come “considerably further in the informal than in the formal sphere of politics” (Rodríguez, 2003, p. 87). Despite their active role in shaping the social and political life in Mexico, women have had their access denied to formal structures of power—this certainly resonates with the struggle for representation fought by American women. Representation then is one reason why Mercado’s campaign was significant for Mexican women in a similar way that Clinton’s campaign was for American women in the United States.

Over the last several decades, women have gained some formal power in the federal government. In 1952, there were no women in the Mexican senate and the chamber of deputies was made up of 161 men and only one woman. By 2006, there were 22 women in the senate out of 128 seats, an improvement over their complete absence several decades prior (Rodríguez, 2003). The chamber of deputies showed a similar growth in the number of seats given to women over the same time period (80 seats of 500) but did not reach parity (Rodríguez, 2003). In 2010, there were 19 people in the executive cabinet and only three of them were women (INEGI, 2010). Even though women have made great strides in closing the gap, the gender gap in Mexico’s formal power structure is still worrisome.

Representations of Women in the Mexican Media

Scholarship on representations of women in the Mexican and Latin American media is almost nonexistent. Only one recent study examining portrayals of women in political advertising in Latin America was identified.. Connolly-Ahern and Castells i Talens (2010) found that indigenous women in Guatemala were represented as “voiceless, without profound propositions, and with limited participation.” (Connolly-Ahern &Castells i Talens, 2010, p. 329). Outside of a political context, portrayals of women are not much more hopeful.

In Mexico, Hinds and Tatum (1984) identified three dominant categories of representation for women in comic books: ideal fiancée-spouse, mistress sex-object and witch. These categories are dichotomized in “good” and “bad” women. The ideal fiancée-spouse is the only “good” woman model and it is associated with motherhood, submissiveness, sexual repression, servitude and passiveness. The “good” women are also described as “long suffering females dependent upon males for their self-esteem” and are confined to the private sphere (Hinds & Tatum, 1984, p. 146). The mistress sex-object and the witch are presented as the “bad women.” They are associated with sexual assertiveness, mystery, seduction, power, and passive self-objectification. The “bad” women often suffer in the stories and even die violently because of their actions (Hinds & Tatum, 1984).

These problematic portrayals are also not merely limited to comics and the political sphere. Vega (2009) conducted a content analysis of television programming of the 5 top-rated channels in Mexico. The analysis included film, telenovelas (soup operas), news broadcasts, series, advertising and cartoons. The findings showed that women are mostly trivialized, objectified, valued by their appearance and being subject of violence. Women were also portrayed in such a way as to encourage simplistic judgments of their value and could be classified into two categories, “good” and “bad.” Whereas in reality the role of any single individual is far more complex, across these various forms of media, women’s worth was boiled down into these two broad camps. Arguably some people could be judged as “good” or “bad” but few people could be accurately assessed under this dichotomous rubric. Physical, emotional and sexual violence against women is also portrayed as an accepted and justified behavior (Vega, 200, p. 60).

The portrayals of women of African origin and indigenous women were not considered in the Mexican studies. The only exception was identified in the study conducted by Vega (2009), in which it is mentioned that indigenous women are discriminated against in telenovelas, but no more details were given.

These media representations seem to resemble two of the central metaphors developed in the foundational myths of the modern Mexican nation: the Malintzin and the Virgin (Taylor, 2006). According to Natividad Gutiérrez (as cited in Taylor, 2006), history textbooks in Mexican primary schools described the Malintzin as the indigenous mother of the imagined Mexican nation. This was an effort directed by the state in order to construct an idea of a homogeneous mestizo nation through the myth of common descent. The Malintzin, represented as the mistress of Hernan Cortes, is usually described in the nationalistic discourse as “the flawed mother, the impure, the traitor, the opportunist,” with an inferior place within the patriarchy and used for political alliances and sexual exploits (Messinger, 2005, p. 16).

The other important mythical mother figure is the Virgin of Guadalupe, who is presented as in an “alter-ego relationship” with the Malintzin (Taylor, 827). The Virgin of Guadalupe is associated with “motherhood, family values and the beliefs of the Catholic Church” (Brown, 1997, p.86). She is a solitary, “all-suffering, noble, selfless, and dedicated to her children”, the Mexicans (Brown, 1997, p.86). Judging from the extant literature on portrayals of women in Mexico, this national foundational myth is still present in current political rhetoric (Taylor, 2006).

African Mexicans in the 2006 Mexican Presidential Election

The presence of Africans and peoples of African origin in the chronicles of Spanish colonizers and colonial officials is marginal, especially in the early period of the colony

(Vazquez, 2010). Descriptions of their daily lives in colonial Mexico are rarely detailed. However, some references from Bernal Diaz del Castillo and other colonizers give some insight of the important roles played by Africans and peoples of African origin in the maintenance of colonial institutions as explorers, military assistants, and laborers (Vasquez, 2010). Some of these colonial chronicles show religious associations and the military as places where Africans and peoples of African origin could have the opportunity to receive economic benefits and social privileges in exchange for their services (Vasquez, 2010).

In the contemporary Mexico, African Mexican peoples' participation in the construction of Mexican history and culture has been obscured by nationalist historians, who privileged the foundational myth that Mexico is a mestizo nation (Vasquez, 2010). That is, a nation of people of mixed descent.

According to Vaughn (2005), even though most African Mexicans cannot trace their origins, they identify themselves as Black and this identity is meaningful in their daily lives. Their historical experience and interactions with other groups are the roots of their sense of Blackness (Vaughn, 2005). African Mexicans do not accept the assumption that Mexico is a mestizo nation. The discourse has denigrated Blackness by implying that Blackness does not exist in the country and also has influenced the way they perceived themselves and how society sees them (Vaughn, 2005).

This rejection of the mestizo nation assumption is beginning to gain note among scholars but only recently has research begun to explore how the rejection of this assumption is affecting public discourse. According to Vaughn (2005), this has resulted in a greater self-awareness within the Black community and the African diaspora. African Mexicans' celebrations have started to embrace Blackness, for example, the Mata Clara Carnival has changed its name to the

Festival de la Negritud (Blackness Festival) and the Costa Chica Encuentros de Pueblos Negros (Costa Chica Encounters of Black Towns) was recently created. Both have incorporated “African-based (drum) music, dance, and even costume into the festivities” (Vaughn, 2005, p. 56). African Mexican groups such as México Negro (Black Mexico), now interact with groups of peoples of African origin from other countries.

Representations of African Mexicans in the Mexican Media

Studies on representations of African Mexicans in Mexico are scarce. The marginal accounts of peoples of African origin in the colonial period are mostly negative (Vazquez, 2010). In 1692, Carlos Siguenza y Góngora wrote about his concerns over the number of peoples of African origin in Mexico and the agency they had. His accounts ridiculed and stereotyped peoples of African origin and indigenous peoples (Vazquez, 2010). However, there were clear differentiations between peoples of African origin and indigenous groups. Peoples of African origin were given the lowest rank in society. According to Lewis (2003, p. 23): “while Indians were given a sociopolitical designation, African peoples were labeled with a color term, *negro* [black].”

Official Spanish documents from the colonial period tended to downplay and overlook African religious traditions. They also tend to associated African peoples and peoples of African origin with backwardness and notions of paganism (Vazquez, 2010)

More recently, Vaughn (2005) explains that, outside of Afro-Mexican communities, Blackness is mostly understood as only existing outside of Mexican borders. One of the reasons is that the nationalistic discourse in Mexico is strongly based on the assumption that Mexico is “a *mestizo* nation, a nation that is racial mixture of Indians and Spaniards” (Vaughn, 2005, p. 54). This nationalistic discourse was promoted by the Mexican government. The creation of this

founding myth had the objective to unify a diverse nation through an imagined idea of homogeneity (Taylor, 2009).

Indigenous Peoples in the 2006 Mexican Election

Indigenous peoples have also struggled to get social recognition in Mexican society. In January 1994, the EZLN (Ejército Zapatista de Liberación Nacional) declared war on the Mexican state (Gutiérrez, 2003). International and domestic pressure forced the government to call a ceasefire after 12 days of combat. From their side, the Zapatistas committed to continue their fight with the Mexican government solely within the political sphere (van der Haar, 2004).

After the ceasefire, indigenous peoples were suddenly at the center of the national debate and their experiences of poverty, exploitation, marginalization and discrimination were more visible than ever (Gutiérrez, 2003). The EZLN pushed for a legal reform that could strengthen indigenous rights and also implemented the “autonomy in practice;” which was not legally recognized by the state (van de Haar, 2004, p. 99).

The EZLN, became a symbol for the fight for indigenous rights and autonomy for many indigenous groups in Mexico (van de Haar, 2004). After the uprising, negotiations to create greater indigenous rights between the Mexican government and the EZLN were long and difficult. These negotiations eventually ended with the government and the EZLN signing the San Andrés Accords in 1996 (van de Haar, 2004). The agreement was historically and politically significant because it was the first such document signed concerning indigenous rights for more than 500 years. Despite being ratified by the government, they were not respected by the government (Gutiérrez, 2003).

The legal reform passed in April 2001, was supposedly the result of the translation of these agreements to the legal plane. However, the government used the reform to deceive the

indigenous peoples and the EZLN. The government passed a limited law that was described by the EZLN (2005) as “a law that does not work”.

In August 2005, the EZLN, consisting of 300 indigenous men and women, along with members of 51 other indigenous organizations in the country gathered to plan a campaign alternative to the presidential campaigns (Hernández Castillo, 2006). In November 2005, months before the presidential elections, the EZLN (2005) announced the creation of the *Otra Campaña* (The Other Campaign). The objective of the Other Campaign was to constitute a diverse front to design an alternative national agenda during the 2006 electoral process (Hernández Castillo, 2006). During this campaign the EZLN traveled around the country and met with other groups and organizations.

Representations of Indigenous Peoples in the Mexican Media

Contemporary studies of media representations of indigenous peoples in Mexico, and in Latin America in general, are rare. Even though indigenous activists have expressed their concerns about stereotypical representations of their cultures in the media (i.e. *Apocalypso*), scholars have given little attention to the topic (Connolly-Ahern-Castells i Talens, 2010).

Some indigenous groups have found a space for self-representation on the radio. In Guatemala, Maya peoples created the Guatemala Radio Project, a network of unlicensed radio stations that live under the constant threat of being closed by the government (Alia, 2009). The Internet has also become a space for self-representation. Some indigenous groups use it as a way to promote their causes (Alia, 2009).

More recently, Connolly-Ahern and Castells i Talens (2010) studied the representation of indigenous peoples in political advertising in Guatemala. The findings show that indigenous peoples are portrayed as playing a passive and ornamental role in the political discourse, in

which they are: “crowd members, candidate contacts, and victims” (Connolly-Ahern & Castells i Talens, 2010, p. 328). They are also infantilized, silenced and represented as outsiders.

Research Questions

According to the literature reviewed in this dissertation, framing theory suggests that frames are deeply embedded in culture and are constructed through rhetorical structures that present the audiences with devices to understand the world. Also, the literature reviewed suggests that the frames associated with women and minorities may affect how they are perceived in society and on their own self-perceptions. This latter point, that frames have perceptual effects, is, without a doubt, worth investigating. However, because of the largely non-existent literature on frames used within a political context in Mexico, this study will necessarily focus on identifying and describing the frames used in Mexican and U.S. political advertising.

In order to address this area of research and to place it under an international comparative approach, this study proposes the following question:

RQ1: How are the candidates framed in political advertisements in Mexico and the United States?

As women and minorities have historically experienced discrimination at the hands of powerful majorities, it is of interest to examine how such groups are framed within political advertising. A political advertisement might not only frame its sponsor in a particular way but also other candidates and outside groups or individuals. Therefore, the second research question asks:

RQ2: Are there differences between the U.S. and Mexico in the way women and minorities in political advertisements are framed?

In addition to comparing and contrasting frames between countries, significant differences might also arise when comparing how minority candidates are framed compared to non-minority candidates. Therefore, the following research questions expand on RQ2:

RQ2a: What are the frames associated with female and minority candidates and to what extent are these frames similar or different to the rest of the candidates?

RQ2b: What are the frames associated with women and minorities other than the candidates in the ads?

Comparative studies on the representations of women and minorities in political advertising are scarce. No comparative studies between Mexico and the United States on this topic could be identified. Specifically, no studies on representations in political advertising could be identified in Mexico. For this reason, this study proposes the following research questions to explore the creation of frames associated to these social groups in political advertising from a comparative approach:

RQ3: What are the roles of women and minorities as constructed in the political broadcast advertising of Mexico and the United States and to what extent are they different or similar?

Chapter III

Methodology

An ethnographic content analysis (ECA) was used to study the research questions proposed for this dissertation. ECA is a qualitative textual analysis based in the constant comparison of the texts and focused on identifying frames (Altheide, 1996). ECA suggests that “an ethnographic perspective can help delineate patterns of human action when document analysis is conceptualized as fieldwork” (Altheide, 1996, p. 14).

The aim of ECA is to be “systematic but not rigid” (Altheide, p. 16). According to Altheide (1996, p. 16), “the data collection, reflection, and protocol refinement is more significant for a study.” In the ECA process, *apriori* themes can direct the study at the beginning but the method is designed to foster a “constant discovery and constant comparison of relevant situations, settings, styles, images, meanings, and nuances” (Altheide, 1996, p. 16). This typically means that researchers employing ECA may start from extant theory in devising their codebook or, in the case of this study, frames. From there, researchers can modify the *apriori* frames.

Due to the lack of relevant literature on this subject, there were no *apriori* themes relevant for this study. Therefore, the primary objective of this method was to implement an open coded analysis of frames in the political advertising of both the U.S. and Mexico. One of the reasons for conducting the study in this way was to identify as many themes and frames as possible in the ads without limiting the analysis to a predetermined set of hypothesized frames. Even though the analysis of the frames was openly coded, the study was focused on four main topics around which candidates constructed frames in their ads. These four issues were candidates, women, minorities, and issues. Accordingly, the study was focused on understanding

how candidates portrayed themselves, women, minorities, and political issues. There could be additional frames in the political advertisements that serve to help audiences interpret other topics outside of the areas of interest for this study, but those avenues were not explored.

Sample

The U.S. sample consisted of copies of broadcast political advertising from candidates of the 2008 presidential primary campaign. The ads represented the whole political spectrum and included the following candidates: Joe Biden, Hillary Clinton, Chris Dodd, John Edwards, Rudolph Giuliani, Michael Huckabee, John McCain, Barack Obama, Mitt Romney, and Fred Thompson. The ads were collected online from the Political Communication Lab (2008) at Stanford University. The U.S. portion of the sample consisted of 336 political advertisements.

The Mexican sample consisted of broadcast political advertising from the candidates in the 2006 presidential campaign. It is also important to mention that the investigator was fluent in both English and Spanish so no translation was necessary. All translations of Spanish-language advertising are the work of the author. The ads represented the whole political spectrum and included the following candidates: Patricia Mercado, Felipe Calderón, Andrés Manuel López Obrador, Roberto Campa and Roberto Madrazo. The Mexican political ads were not available from a single source and were collected in stages. First, the investigator requested the political advertisements through the Federal Electoral Institute of Mexico's (IFE) website. The ads should have been available through this avenue as stipulated in the Mexican Freedom of Information Act (IFE-INFOMEX, 2010). The IFE, however denied the request for the advertisements, citing that the material was not available for the period of this study. The ads then were collected from the website You Tube (2012) by using the name of the candidates in the search, with a combination of the words: "PRD," "PRI," "PAN," "2006," "Nueva Alianza," "comercial,"

“presidencial,” and “elección.” The first five words are the abbreviations or names of the different parties and the year of the election and the other words are the Spanish words for ad, presidential, and election. The Mexican portion of the sample then consisted of the 94 ads available on YouTube. Dimitrova and Bujega (2007) have identified the unreliable subsequent retrieval of online resources and the need to extend their half-life. For that reason, the material analyzed in this dissertation that was preserved by downloading the videos from the Internet and storing them in a digital archive.

Data Analysis

This study used the constant comparative method proposed by Glaser and Strauss (1967) to analyze the data in this study. Glaser and Strauss (1967) suggest combining coding with analysis. This entails analyzing the findings of the study as coding is taking place. This is also an iterative process which means that the political advertisements were coded multiple times, adding greater depth and complexity to the descriptions of frames with subsequent codings.

The analysis itself is based heavily on the work of Pan and Kosicki (1993) and Gamson and Modigliani (1989). During this process, the investigator identified frames and described both how those frames encouraged particular interpretations of material covered in the political ad in addition to how the frame itself was expressed or cued. Therefore, it was important to identify not only the “effect” or the interpretive element of each frame, but also the framing devices, or, in short, how each frame is cued in the ad. Of particular importance in identifying the framing devices were the actors in the ad, arrangement of sentences and words, “how” the story is told, and issues covered in the ad. In addition to these more manifest or explicit framing devices, the investigator also examined literary framing devices such as metaphors, exemplars, catchphrases, depictions, and visual images.

In all, 430 ads were analyzed. The initial phase consisted in viewing all of the ads twice. During this phase, the investigator examined how the candidates portrayed themselves, women, minorities, and issues paying particular attention to the use of metaphors, comparisons, visuals, and sounds. This allowed the investigator to identify several potential frames in which she could start coding the data. In this phase, the investigator identified some potential coding categories for the other phases of this study.

The second phase of the study used Van Gorp's (2010) suggestion of using a frame matrix to help organize framing devices into frame packages. This frame matrix consists of a series of rows and columns, with columns representing source text, framing devices, and reasoning devices and rows then consisting of complete frame packages.

The focus of this part of the study was to extract the framing and reasoning devices from the text in the ads. According to Van Gorp (2010), this is an inductive process in which the attention is on the framing and reasoning devices and not so much on identifying frames. When the analysis is complete, this strategy allows the researcher to identify frames that were not as visible at the beginning of the analysis.

The third phase of this study consisted of organizing the frame packages into frames. According to Van Gorp (2010), this portion of the study consists of classifying the framing and reasoning devices around "axes of meaning," each of which, when complete, will be a separate frame.. So, this part of the study was focused on grouping the framing and reasoning devices that describe or define problems, causes, moral judgments, and suggested remedies in a similar way (Entman, 1993). According to Van Gorp (2010), the final step is to assign each axes of meaning a name or a label to that can give a clear idea of the meaning each contains.

Similar to the coding of the texts, this is an iterative process. Initially, 30 frames were identified but were subsequently refined into six frames and 15 subframes. In order to address issues of validity, I shared the frames and sub-frames that I identified with a U.S. cultural informant and verified that the informant agreed with my results.

During the process frames which applied to each of the candidates and the issues they discussed in the Mexican and U.S. ads were noted in order to answer RQ1. Then, a comparison was made between the frames associated with female and minority candidates and how they were different or similar to the rest of the candidates in both countries in order to answer the questions RQ2 and RQ2a. After that, frames associated with women and minorities—other than the candidates in the ads—were examined in order to answer question RQ2b. Finally, an analysis was conducted to determine how these frames explain the role of women and minorities in both countries in order to answer question RQ3.

Chapter IV

Results

This study consisted of an analysis of 430 political broadcast advertisements. The first part of the analysis focused on how the candidates described themselves and political issues to the audience (RQ1) and how they described female and minority candidates in contrast to the rest of the candidates (RQ2 and RQ2a). Candidates' advertisements were characterized by six different frames (RQ1): "Protector," "Enduring strength," "Know how," "Reformer," "Reachable," and "Religious." These frames contained a total of 15 different sub-frames. For a complete list of frames and sub-frames see Table 4.0.

This chapter provides a description of each frame identified in the analysis. An explanation of the sub-frames of each parent frame then follows. The main characteristics of the frame are described and followed by illustrative examples and a more detailed description of the reasoning devices used in the ads, specifying the ones associated with female and minority candidates (RQ2 and RQ2a).

Before starting with the description of the frames, it is important to note that one of the main findings of this study was that the ads were overwhelmingly focused on the candidates' personality rather than on the issues and policies that candidates proposed. This does not mean that discussion of issues was totally absent from the ads. It means that in the cases in which issues were discussed in the ads, they were discussed in a way that allowed the personal characteristics of the candidates to be emphasized. For example, in several Clinton's ads that discussed the Iraq war it was explained that the reason why Clinton wanted to end the war was to "bring our sons and daughters home from Iraq" (Clinton, 2008-7). There was no explanation provided about the broader political, economic or social implications of ending the war and/or

why ending the war was the best decision for the country. This implies that ending the war was a result of Clinton's personal concern about reuniting families and not a result of the analysis of other political, social or economic factors in the country.

Accordingly, complex issues in both countries were oversimplified and presented as able to be fixed by one person. This oversimplification of issues encourages audiences to think that a problem in the country can be solved by the candidate that possesses the appropriate personal characteristic or characteristics. Thus, the countries' complex democratic processes and other factors that influence the issues discussed are ignored. Candidates are presented as able to deal with these issues and to solve them mostly with the power of their personalities. This may encourage audiences to generate practically unachievable expectations about the candidates. This cult of the candidates' personality will be further discussed after the description of all of the frames and reasoning devices associated with the candidates. Since many of the issues in the ads are discussed within a frame package directed to present a candidate and not the issue per se, issues are discussed in this section within the frames that are used to portray the candidates. For example, the topic of immigration was presented mainly as a problem for the United States in the ads. However, in the ads it was discussed in a way that helped to emphasize the toughness of the candidates. In other words, immigration was discussed as a problem and the solution presented for that problem was that the candidates' toughness to deal with the immigration issue (*Toughness-foreign policy* frame). For that reason, immigration is discussed under the *Toughness-foreign policy* frame. The same happened with most of the issues discussed in the ads.

Table 4.0
Frames and Sub-frames

Protector	Enduring strength	Know how	Reformer	Charisma	Religious
Good family person	Consistent	Knowledge/ Experience	New politics	Popular	Religion-friendly
Trustworthy	Military pride	Business approach	Activist	Authentic	
People's candidate	Toughness-domestic policy				
Conciliator	Toughness-foreign policy				
	Pointing fingers				

Protector

The *Protector* frame presents candidates as being on the side of citizens. Candidates are presented in a paternalistic light and shown as protectors, defenders, unifiers, and caretakers of the people and the families of their country. Within this frame, the candidate interacts with citizens who are usually portrayed as victimized, needing to be protected, defended, cared about, and brought together. Candidates are described as good-hearted leaders that people can trust to protect and to defend them, their interests, and their families. This implies that candidates care about the well-being of their constituents and identify with them. It also implies that as presidents candidates will make decisions that will protect people's interests. This frame was extensively used by most of the candidates. The four sub-frames that belong to this frame are: *Good family person, Trustworthy, People's candidate, and Conciliator.*

Good Family Person. This sub-frame encourages viewers to see the candidates as members of happy and loving families that embrace strong, universal values. The framing devices here dwell on the idea that the candidates were raised in healthy environments that made them good and loving people. Candidates are presented as caring about their families and it is argued that, by extension, they will care about others’ families as presidents. It is implied that as presidents, candidates will be driven by the same values that they were raised with when making important decisions and that they will promote these values in the country (see Table 4.1).

Table 4.1
Framing and Reasoning Devices for the “Good Family Person” Sub-frame

Source text	Framing devices	Reasoning devices
Clinton’s words: “my mom taught me to stand up for myself...” “...I am proud to live by those values, but what I am most proud of is: knowing who I passed them on to.” Image of Clinton looking at her daughter smiling. (Clinton, 2007-1)	Family is the source of the candidate’s values.	The candidate has strong family values. She is driven by them and promotes them.
Calderón words: “I want to be president because I have a family too...” “...well paid jobs and security for our sons.” Image of Calderón talking to the camera in the park. Children playing around him. (Calderón, 2006-2)	Other people’s children are as important for Calderón as his own children.	The candidate wants to improve the conditions of the country for his family and other families in the country.
Obama talking about his grandparents: “they didn’t have money, but they gave me love, a thirst for education and the belief that we are part of something larger than ourselves.” (Obama, 2008-3)	Family as the source of love and family values. Love, values and education are more important than money.	The candidate was raised in a family where love, values and education was more important than money.

Within this sub-frame, one of the framing devices used presented the candidates as close to their families and as embracing and promoting the values that they learned from them. For

example, a Clinton's (2007-4) ad said, "Hillary's mom lives with her." The reasoning here is that Clinton is a good daughter because she is close to her mother and takes care of her. This implies that Clinton is a good person and that she cares about her family. In one of Romney's ads, different images of home videos showed Romney and his wife, Anne Romney, in happy family moments with their children and grandchildren. Anne Romney's voice can be heard in the ad saying that "Mitt says his greater success is being able to say 'I have been a good father and good husband'" (Romney, 2007-5). Again, the audience is encouraged to think that the candidate is a good person because he is a good father and a husband that loves his family.

The idea that candidates love their families and care about them is tied to the idea that, as presidents, they will care for the well being of the families of their countries as a parent would. Calderón's ad is one example of that (Calderón, 2006-2). He said, "I want to be president because I have a family too..." In this case, the reasoning proposed is that Calderón wants to be a president because in that way he can improve the lives of families in the country, his family included. Furthermore, because he has a family, Calderón would be a good president. This reasoning is also proposed by the framing devices used in an Obama's ad in which his sister, Maya Soetoro-Ng, said "Obama wants to make sure that everybody has the opportunities that his daughters have" (Obama, 2008-6). Thus, it is emphasized that candidates seek the presidency as a way to improve the lives of other families and not as a way to benefit only their families or themselves.

Some of the reasons that candidates give for some policies are also presented in the interest of protecting families. For instance, Clinton wanted to "bring our sons and daughters home from Iraq" by ending the war (Clinton, 2008-7). The reasoning provided by this framing device is that what motivates Clinton to end the war is that she cares about families and wants to

reunite the women and men that are fighting in Iraq with their families. Family then is presented as the priority and there is no mention of how ending the war can be related with other broader political, economic or social issues or interests. Thus, candidates' important political decisions are presented as moved by their interest in protecting families and not by any political or economic interest.

Also, another framing device used by the candidates is to describe family as the place where the values of any person are formed. Huckabee (2007-8) illustrates this in one of his ads. He said, "Family is where people learn, where the basic rules of life are." The reasoning given by this ad is that all good values in life come from family. Viewers are discouraged from thinking that good values can be developed outside of the family environment in other social environments such as the school, work, military, government, or higher education, just to name a few. Under this view, knowing the values that the candidates and their families embrace seems to be important since they indicate what values will drive the candidates' acts and decisions as future heads of the country.

The candidates' family values are also presented as similar to the values of the audience. This framing device encourages audiences to perceive the candidates as more socially and politically proximate to themselves. In Clinton's (2007-9) ad, she mentioned that "as I travel around I see so many families that share the same values I was brought up with." The logic provided in this ad is that Clinton's family values are similar to the values of the families she was in contact with in her campaign around the country. Accordingly, it is implied that readers should think that Clinton identifies with them because she was raised with the same family values that the readers were raised with too.

Many of the values mentioned by the candidates are universal values that most people can agree with, such as love, empathy and generosity. For instance, Clinton's mother described her daughter by saying that "she never was envious of anybody," "she was helpful," and that "she has empathy for other's peoples unfortunate circumstances" (Clinton, 2007-10). The framing device used in this ad is to associate Clinton with universal values that most people can agree with. Therefore, it is implied that viewers should think of Clinton as a good person, with values that they can agree with, that she will embrace the same universal values as a president, and that those values will beneficially inform her decisions as president.

Obama also emphasized some similarities between his family and families from Puerto Rico in his ad (Obama, 2008-11),"Born on an island, his family didn't have much, but Barack Obama understands the worries of parents on our island. That explains why the Obama plan is the best plan for Puerto Rico." The ad provides readers with framing devices that present Puerto Rico as a poor island and Obama as coming from a poor island too, and from a poor family. Thus, it is implied that Obama understands poor parents and that this personal characteristic helped him to develop a plan that will help these parents.

Framing devices also tie important moments in the candidates' family lives with the audiences' geographical space. Audiences are encouraged to think that the candidates' families were influenced by the values of the communities where these audiences live and that for that reason their values are similar. Clinton used this association in different ads. In one of them (Clinton, 2008-12) directed to voters in Arkansas, she stated, "Over 30 years ago I came to Arkansas, Bill and I married and I became Chelsea's mom here too." In another ad, targeting Pennsylvanian voters, old pictures of Clinton's family and a lace mill are shown while she said, "Scranton, where my father was raised and my grandfather worked in a lace mill" (Clinton,

2008-13). In a third ad, intended for voters in Illinois, Clinton declared that she came from Park Ridge, Illinois; where her father served in the navy and her mother was a teacher. She stated that “I carry with me not just their dreams but the dreams of people like them all across our country” (Clinton, 2008-14). The reasoning given in all these three examples is that Clinton spent important moments of her family life in the places to where these ads were directed too. So, it is implied that she understands local families and that she will help them to accomplish their dreams when she is a president.

Candidates also use endorsements from family members as a strategy in political ads. The reasoning device provided in these ads is that candidates are good people because their families admire them and love them. As this frame also typically contains references to candidate’s values, family members tacitly verify the values of the candidates. That they are participating in the ads also implies that they have good family relationships. In an Edwards’ ad (Edwards, 2007-15), his wife, Elizabeth Edwards, endorsed him by saying that Edwards is “the most optimistic person that I have ever met, but at the same time, he has an unbelievable toughness, particularly about other people, and that is his ability to fight for them.” In another ad, McCain’s mother praised her son’s integrity and declared “I almost feel sorry for his opponents” (McCain, 2007-16), simultaneously lauding her son’s values and denying this sub-frame to his contenders. In other words, it is implied that other candidates do not have the same values that her son has, which presents other candidates as not fitting the *Good family person* sub-frame as McCain does.

Obama also uses family endorsements. In one of his ads his sister Maya Soetoro-Ng expressed that “people recognize themselves in Barack and they feel understood by him. In part it is because he listens so well” (Obama, 2008-6). In this way, family members confirm the values of the candidates and it is implied that they have good relationships with them. Also, in

the specific case of the Obama's ad, there is a reference to social distance that implies that Obama is "close" to people.

Portraying candidates as protectors of children is one more framing device used within this understanding of the candidates. Candidates establish that some of the objectives of their policies are to protect children and their future. Thus, audiences are encouraged to think of candidates as people that do parental acts of good. In many of her ads, Clinton emphasized her work defending children's rights. *The Hartford Courant* is quoted in one of her ads saying that Clinton had "a particular interest in children" (Clinton, 2008-17). In many of Clinton's ads she also appeared hugging, kissing or talking to babies and children. In the same way, Calderón stated that "we will make Mexico the best place for our children, with security and good paying jobs" (Calderón, 2006-18). Obama claimed that he wanted to improve education because "we should give every child the same chances that I had" (Obama, 2007-19). Campa affirmed that "only with education, our kids will reach their dreams" (Campa, 2006-20). Madrazo promised to renovate schools and equip them with technology because "it is the least that our children deserve" (Madrazo, 2006-21). Dodd said that "I want my campaign to be about all of our children and the kind of world we'll give them" (Dodd, 2007-22). Mercado spoke about protecting children from children traffickers (Mercado, 2006-23). In all of these examples, the candidates present themselves as good people that care about children. Candidates talk about the children's well-being as the target of their policies, which discourages audiences to tie candidates' policies to broader political, economic and social issues.

In summary, the *Good Family Person* sub-frame is used by most of the candidates. Clinton and Obama used this sub-frame extensively. Within this sub-frame, Clinton and Obama used a range of very similar framing devices. However, Mercado only used the framing device

that presented her as protector of children. Mercado did not use this sub-frame as much as Clinton and Obama and she did not position herself in a family environment. She did not mention or presented her family in her ads and she did not talk about her family values. She only discussed her interest to protect children.

People's Candidate. This sub-frame encourages audiences to think that candidates have a genuine, intrinsic interest in helping and serving the people of their countries. This sub-frame is different from the Good family person frame in that it is not family-oriented. Candidates are portrayed as protecting citizens from powerful individuals and institutions that only look for improving their political and economic power at the expense of citizens' well-being. This sub-frame emphasizes that candidates are on the people's side—as opposed to the side of corporations or other interests—and that candidates are motivated to help, protect and defend their constituents from institutions, politicians and political systems that could harm citizens' interests. The candidates' interest in protecting people's well-being is described as not new in the candidates' lives. It is a vocation and it is not motivated by political vote mongering or economic personal gain. Thus, candidates are portrayed as unselfish and devoted to people, which implies that, as presidents, their administration will serve citizens' interests first and foremost (see Table 4.2).

Table 4.2
Framing and Reasoning Devices for the “People’s Candidate” Sub- frame

Source text	Framing devices	Reasoning devices
“Hillary Clinton has spent her life standing up for people others don't see.” (Clinton, 2007-25)	Clinton interest in defending people is not new. She cares about people whose problems are not usually present in the public discourse.	The candidate defends the interests of the less privileged and underrepresented people in society.
“Loves, defends and protects people. López Obrador: brave honesty.” (López, 2006-27)	López cares about people and protects them.	The candidate cares about people. He works for them.
Words of Professor Laurence Tribe of Harvard University Law school: “It was absolutely inspiring to see someone as brilliant as Barack Obama, as successful. Someone who could have ridden this ticket on Wall Street, take all of the talent and all of the learning and decided to devote it to the community and to making people's lives better.” (Obama, 200-29)	People are more important than money.	The candidate has a genuine motivation to help people. He does it for the people and not for any personal benefit or material reward.

Generally, audiences are encouraged to think of candidates as their rescuers within this sub-frame. Candidates are usually portrayed as the saviors of people that are victimized by other politicians, political parties, governments, privileged groups, or corporations. Clinton, Mercado and Obama made extensive use of this sub-frame. For example, Obama (2008-30) stated, “I first came to Chicago because I saw people being laid off from steel plants that were closing and no one was fighting for them.” In other words, Obama was motivated in his political career to come to Chicago because of the needs of a community. He also implies here that other politicians or

existing interests were not willing to engage in similar behavior, as no one else would fight for the people laid off.

Clinton also used this sub-frame when she said: “It’s time that the American worker had a partner in the White House ...the wealthy and the well connected have had a president” (Clinton, 2008-31). In this case, Clinton also uses a framing device that positions her in the side of people and opposed to the side of wealthy institutions and individuals that have been benefited in the past administration. Then, the reasoning given is that she will give preference to the interests of her constituents over the interests of the privileged organizations and individuals in society.

Edwards also portrayed himself in the same way when he declared “I spent my life fighting for middle class families hurt by powerful interests. Big corporations control Washington” (Edwards, 2008-32). Similar to Obama, Clinton and Edwards allege that they are politicians that work for the middle class—a common substitute for “the people”—and that past presidential administrations and politicians more generally do not.

In another version of this sub-frame, candidates not only protect people from unscrupulous politicians and political interest groups, the candidates are also portrayed as generous providers. Candidates use framing devices that portray themselves as supplying unprivileged sectors of society with policies, tax cuts, and even money. The reason given for providing people with these benefits is that the candidates care about them. López (2006-36) exemplifies this when he promised in an ad, “Free school supplies and textbooks to all elementary school and high school students” while a song is played in the background with the lyrics, “Loves, defends and protects people; López Obrador: brave honesty” (López, 2006-36). In this way, the reasoning provided is that is López, because he loves people is driven to protect them. Giving school supplies to students is only one such way he acts on this desire. There are

other ads from López promising food pensions for older people, lower prices of electricity, and money to people with income lower than 9000 pesos or less—about \$900 US dollars. Again, the reasoning provided is that he will do that because he “loves” people. This also implies that he—and not the government—is able to give these free articles to people because he loves people and not all of the candidates do. So, policies are portrayed as the result of a candidate’s personal characteristics within this frame more than as the result of a planned and detailed analysis of the political, economic, and social issues of the country. Viewers are also discouraged to think that the free supply of these articles to voters will bring the candidate a political gain.

The interest of candidates in protecting people was disassociated from any individual political or economic benefit candidates could reap as a result of enacting such policies. In this way, viewers are encouraged to think that candidates are on their constituents’ side because they truly care about people and not because they are a way to reach their political, economic, or individual goals. Clinton (2008-40) stated

You helped to remind everyone that politics isn't a game. This campaign is about people, about making a difference in your lives. It is time we have a president who stands up for all you.

In the same way, one of Obama’s ad said that “Obama urges Wall Street to protect the middle class” and that “Barack Obama is not politics as usual” (Obama, 2007-41). Mercado (2006-24) also stated that she wanted to “make public policies based on people’s needs,” and Madrazo (2006-28) explained that “this is what this election is about; it is about your happiness and your future.” The implication of these candidates’ statements is that their motivation to help and protect people does not stem from a search for individual political power or benefits but to a genuine interest on helping their constituencies.

Clinton specifically emphasized that her interest in helping people came from a genuine and unselfish motivation to help others. She stated that her life is driven by this interest because she wanted “to give others the same opportunities and blessings that I took for granted, that is what wakes me up in the morning” (Clinton, 2008-42). Thus, audiences are encouraged to think of Clinton as an unselfish person that is aware of her privileged position in society and that wants for other people what she wants for herself. In another ad where Governor Ted Strickland of Ohio praises Clinton, he stated, “She is a person who has devoted her life to caring about other people making sure that America works for everyone” (Clinton, 2008-43). Accordingly, Clinton is depicted as someone who has the motivation to help people as the goal of her life. This implies that her motivation is not new; it did not come along with the start of her presidential campaign just to gain votes. It is genuine and has been there all of her life.

A different version of this frame presents a less victimized portrayal of people. Within this version, candidates are not protectors or savers but rather peers of voters. The candidates are at the side of their constituents fighting for their interests. Whereas in the ads previously described, citizens are assumed to lack agency, within these ads, people are portrayed as having the power to improve their own future with assistance from the candidate. In one ad, Mercado (2006-44) stated:

For the respect to your rights, so no one can make you feel that they are a government’s gift, you have a choice different from the past and better than the present. The alternative is in your vote.

In this way, Mercado placed herself on people’s side, but also recognized and encouraged the power that people have to change their government and their circumstances. Then, Mercado is not presented as a magnanimous provider to people because of her love for them, but as someone that will fight for people’s rights because she thinks that it is fair.

Obama (2007-45) also uses this frame when he said, “It's with your power, with your voice, that we are going to be able to make a difference,” then he adds:

One voice can change a room and if it can change a room, it can change a city, and if it can change a city, it can change a state, and if can change a state it can change a nation and if can change a nation, it can change a world, let's go and change the world! (Obama, 2007-45)

In this way, voters are portrayed as fighting side by side with candidates, as having power to control what happens around them.

In summary, this sub-frame was extensively used by Clinton, Mercado and Obama. Within this sub-frame, Obama and Clinton use very similar framing devices. Both of them use devices that victimized people and present them as protectors of people with the genuine motivation of helping people. However, Mercado and Obama also employ framing devices that present people as more empowered and less victimized.

Conciliator. This sub-frame encourages people to think of candidates as people that can bring unity to the country. Candidates are portrayed as good negotiators that are able to reach agreements between people of different and opposite ideologies. Candidates also appeal to people's love for their country and present such as the common unifier for a very diverse country. Audiences are encouraged to think that no matter how different they feel from other people that live in the country, they always have their love for their country in common and the fact that they are all human beings. Viewers then are encouraged to think that candidates know how to find a common ground from which they can motivate people to work together to find solutions for the country (see Table 4.3).

Table 4.3
Framing and Reasoning Devices for the “Conciliator” Sub- frame

Source text	Framing devices	Reasoning devices
Two famous soccer players endorse Calderón: “Together we will go ahead ...” “...For a strong and united Mexico.” Image of boys playing soccer. (Calderón, 2006-46)	Country represented as a team. Calderón is associated with union.	The candidate represents the union of the country.
Obama’s words: “What if there was hope instead of fear, unity instead of division, what if there was one president that believes that we are one nation.” “There is no liberal America and conservative America, there is a United States of America.” “We are one people, all of us pledging allegiance to the stars, all of us defending the United States of America.” (Obama, 2007-47)	Obama is associated with union and hope. Nation as the common goal and unifying factor.	The candidate believes that despite the differences, people are united through their love and commitment to their country.
Mercado’s words: “A new commitment to start finishing with inequality and building together a world with future for everybody, with jobs, without corruption, without <i>machismos</i> , without exclusions” (Mercado, 2006-48)	Union will end with the country’s problems.	The candidate believes that problems in the country can be solved if people are united.

Within this sub-frame, the negotiation skills of the candidates are emphasized. In the case of Obama, one of his ads shows Republican Senator Kirk Dillard and former Democrat Senator Larry Walsh endorsing Obama. They stated that as a senator, Obama was “successful in a bipartisan way.” They added that “Republican legislators respected Senator Obama” and “he has negotiation skills and an ability to understand both sides which served the country very well”

(Obama, 2007-51). Consequently, audiences are encouraged to think that Obama is respected in both political parties because he is emphatic and a good negotiator who has the well-being of the country as his main goal. McCain (2008-52) also declared that in his administration he “will take the best ideas from both parties.” This implies that the candidate is able to integrate ideas from the opposite party and encourages people to think of him as an inclusive politician.

This sub-frame also portrays candidates as different from the people that they claim are to blame of provoking division in their nations. The frame is reaffirmed when advertisements deny the conciliator frame to other candidates. As example, one of Obama’s ads affirmed that “as a president, he’ll do what the others cannot, unite a divided nation” (Obama, 2008-53). In this case, Obama is shown as having the skills to unite the country but also as different from those who cannot do it. In another ad (Obama, 200-54), Senator Claire McCaskill stated, “Nothing ever gets done, the division, the politics, we can’t go on like this.” She then emphasized how Obama was different, she said, “I have watched Barack Obama bring Republicans and Democrats together” (Obama, 2008-54). This is a good example of how the ads presented an issue (political polarization in this case), and then they pointed out to a personal characteristic of the candidate (moderator skills) as the solution to that issue. Obama then is presented as someone capable of finding common ground and to reach agreements in a polarized political environment. He is also portrayed as the only person having the skills to unite the country. Unifying the country is portrayed as an action that one person with the right skills would be able to do alone no matter what other factors are also influencing the issue.

Madrazo differentiated himself from another two opposing political parties, which are represented in the ad with the images of two boxing gloves. Madrazo (2006-55) stated that “both of them divide Mexico.” The reasoning given in this statement is that the opposing parties have

no political will and that, even for the well-being of the country, they are unable to find a common ground where they could reach political agreements, softening the polarization of their constituencies.

Mercado also presented herself as different from other parties' candidates, presenting those candidates as people that are unable to agree or to find common ground. She argued in one ad (2006-57) that in a previous political debate the only ideas they agreed with were her ideas. In this way, audiences are encouraged to think that Mercado is able to reach the gap between political ideologies.

Candidates also compare themselves with people that can represent union or conciliation to the political culture of the country. An Obama ad demonstrated this by showing Caroline Kennedy stating that "once we had a president who made people hopeful about America and brought us together to do great things, today Barack Obama gives us that same change" (Obama, 2008-58). Images of John F. Kennedy are shown in the ad. The ad implies that Obama is making people feel hopeful and united in the same way that Kennedy did and that for that reason he alone will bring the same union and hope to the country.

Candidates also portray themselves as believing that people are more similar than different and that for that reason they will treat people equally and that will help to end with divisions. Since similarities are portrayed as a cause of union and differences as a cause of division, viewers are encouraged to think that candidates are more inclusive than exclusive because they are focused on similarities. For instance, Obama (2007-59) said

In this holiday season we are reminded that things that unite us as a people are more powerful and enduring than anything that sets us apart ... we all have a stake in each other in something larger than ourselves.

In the same way, Maya Angelou appears in one spot and she said about Clinton, “she dares to say human beings are more alike than we are unlike” (Clinton, 2008-60). The word “dares” in this ad also implies that Clinton’s perception that people are more similar than different might not be held by others. In this way, Obama and Clinton emphasized that they are focused on finding similarities that will help them to end with divisions.

In summary, the *Conciliator* sub-frame is used by Clinton, Mercado, and Obama. Within this sub-frame, Clinton, Mercado, and Obama use very similar framing devices. Both of them portray people as more similar than different and also represent themselves as able to reach the gap between political ideologies. Although in some cases Clinton and Obama use framing devices that are vague to specify if their ability to reach union among people is related to political differences or to another kind of social division. One slight difference between the framing devices used by Clinton and Obama and those used by Mercado is that Mercado does not use framing devices that portray people in her country as more similar than different.

Trustworthy Person. This sub-frame encourages the audience to believe that they can trust candidates because candidates are honest, that they always will tell them the truth, and will continue to do so when they are president. Candidates also portray themselves as ethical, incorruptible, and as corruption fighters by emphasizing how they have fought corruption during their lifetime. Candidates also disassociate themselves from corrupt institutions and individuals and associate themselves with honest ones. It is implied that viewers should think that the candidates are truthful and that they will not lie to them in order to win their votes. It implies too that candidates have a strong code of ethics and they will not be influenced by specific interest groups (see Table 4.4).

Table 4.4
Framing and Reasoning Devices for the “Trustworthy Person” Sub-frame

Source text	Framing devices	Reasoning devices
Calderón words: “My hands are clean.” (Calderón, 2006-61)	Metaphor: reference to being free of wrongdoing.	The candidate is honest, he is not corrupt.
Obama’s words: “we can't just tell people what they want to hear, we need to tell them what they need to hear, we need to tell them the truth.” (Obama, 2007-63)	Truth first than popularity.	The candidate is honest. He will tell the truth even if that affects his political support.
“Fighting corruption in both parties.” (Thompson, 2007-65)	Fred Thompson as different from the corrupt politicians of both political parties.	The candidate is not corrupt.

Within this sub-frame, candidates present themselves as people that have fought corruption during their lives. One of McCain’s ads (2007-67) explains how he helped uncover obscure dealings between the company Boeing and the Department of Defense. The ad said, “Everyone looked the other way, everyone except one man ...” McCain is then presented as a corruption fighter, the ad explains that thanks to him the country had “... corruption exposed, billions saved, wrongdoers jailed” (McCain, 2007-67). In this case, McCain is depicting himself as an honest person that denounced and fought corruption. It is implied that he alone was able to uncover an important act of corruption in the government. Accordingly, it is implied that he will be honest as a president and that he will not tolerate cases of corruption and malfeasance during his administration. It is implied that he also can be trusted to pursue corruption in powerful institutions such as the Department of Defense.

Obama also uses this frame, on ad affirmed “when he passed Illinois most sweeping ethics reform in a generation, it wasn't to win favors from political insiders” (Obama, 2007-68).

In this case, Obama is presented as someone who promotes ethics even when this could have affected him politically. So, Obama does what is right because he is honest and not because of any political benefit he can get from it.

Thompson also is presented as someone who fights corruption. In one of his ads a woman explained her experience after exposing a governor involved in corruption. She said, “When I spoke up, I was threatened and fired ... I turned to Fred Thompson” (Thompson, 2007-69). She said that with Thompson’s help “the governor went to prison and I got my life back” (Thompson, 2007-69). Then Thompson is also presented as an honest person that will not allow dishonesty in his government.

In the same way, Calderón (2006-70) emphasized his commitment with transparency:

I am the only candidate that has declared his personal assets and annual income and I renounced to the bank secrecy. I have nothing to hide, I have never given a contract to any family relative and I never will. I am the father of three children and I can look them straight in the eye like I can do with you because my hands are clean, my heart is at peace, and my conscience calm.

Then, Calderón places himself as someone honest and transparent that can be trusted to not use his position of power as president to get unlawful economic benefits.

Candidates also differentiate themselves from corrupt individuals or institutions. By doing this, they reinforce the *Trustworthy Person* sub-frame by presenting themselves as different from corrupt people and organizations. For example, Madrazo’s ad asked “What is the similarity between López and Calderón?” (Madrazo, 2006-55). He answered, “Everything: both of them lie, both of them have very dirty hands” (Madrazo, 2006-55). The idea behind this example is that Madrazo is honest and not corrupt like López and Calderón.

Mercado also includes this frame. She said in one ad, “We are all not the same. You, for example, are not corrupt and neither am I. You, for example, have not received a suitcase full of

money and neither have I. You, for example, do not enjoy impunity to harm others without being punished and neither do I” (Mercado 2006-23). In this ad, Mercado identified with the audience by saying that they have in common that they are not corrupt and that they are different from corrupt politicians. López also differentiated himself from corrupt politicians by affirming that he is not going to allow other politicians to “keep stealing the money of the budget that is the people’s money” (López, 2006-71). Edwards did something similar when he declared that he will “confront people who exploit their power for personal advantages” (Edwards, 2007-72). In the same way, Obama disassociates himself from politicians that are not truthful. He criticized other politicians’ strategies as short term solutions that are directed to fool the voters. He said, “Let’s find some short term quick fix that we can say we did something even though we are not really doing anything” (Obama, 2008-73).

Candidates also associate themselves with people and institutions that have an honorable reputation in the country. Joe Wilson and Valerie Palmer-Wilson endorsed Clinton and said “We challenged the Bush administration when they wouldn’t tell the truth about weapons of mass destruction and they tried to destroy us for speaking out” (Clinton, 2008-74). The endorsement of two people that claimed to have defended the truth at the cost of their lives encourages viewers to think they would not endorse someone that is not truthful. Accordingly, the fact that they are endorsing Clinton promotes the idea that Clinton is an honest person.

Calderón also used celebrity endorsements to instill this frame. In his ad, several different soap opera actors and actresses such as Laura Zapata, Sherlyn González, Erick del Castillo, and Gerardo Quiroz, spoke about the need to have an honest president and about how Calderón fits that need. Each one of these actors and actresses said different words of the following sentence: “Open your eyes and heart to see and feel that Mexico needs a president that is honest, prepared,

that speaks with the truth” (Calderón, 2006-75). In this case the popularity of the celebrities is used to verify the frame.

A different version of this sub-frame attributes honesty to a specific gender. This is the case of Mercado. She asked people to trust her because her word is a woman’s word. She said, “Believe me, trust me. Woman’s word” (Mercado, 2006-76). This encourages people to think that the word of a woman is more trustworthy than the word of a man.

Another version of the *Trustworthy* sub-frame is used by Clinton. One of her ads explains that she helped a father to find medical help for his son. The man describes Clinton as the one who saved his son’s life. She said, “I trusted this woman to save my son's life, and she did” (Clinton, 2007-77). In this case, audiences are encouraged to think that Clinton is trustworthy because people trust her with the lives of their children and she did not let them down.

In summary, the *Trustworthy Person* sub-frame is extensively used by the candidates. Clinton, Mercado, and Obama constantly use it in their ads too. Within this sub-frame, Clinton, Mercado, and Obama use different framing devices. Clinton tends to build her credibility by using endorsements from politicians and public personalities. Obama uses endorsements too but he also uses framing devices that Mercado use. Both of them present themselves as fighting corruption and as different from untruthful institutions and politicians. However, Mercado uses a framing device that presents honesty as a virtue of her specific gender.

Enduring Strength

This frame portrays candidates as forceful in their words and actions. Candidates are shown as strong, resistant, disciplined, supportive of the use of force and able to make tough decisions. This frame groups the sub-frames that talk about the strength of the candidates in their attitudes and convictions. In this way, it is implied that as presidents candidates will be strong

enough to lead the country through difficult times and will be able to make difficult decisions.

The five sub-frames grouped under this theme are: *Toughness-Domestic Policy*, *Toughness-Foreign Policy*, *Consistent*, *Military Pride*, and *Pointing Fingers*.

Toughness-Domestic Policy. The candidates are portrayed as able to manage the presidency in difficult times with a strong hand. They are also defined as people with character that fight for their convictions. Audiences are encouraged to think that candidates are strong leaders for the country. This implies that they can face any challenge as presidents, will defend their beliefs, and take strong measures to get things done in the country (see table 4.5).

\

Table 4.5

Framing and Reasoning Devices for the “Toughness-Domestic Policy” Sub-frame

Source text	Framing devices	Reasoning devices
<p>“A nation at war, troubles at home, America at crossroads, demands a leader with a steady hand who will weather the storms, solve our problems, rebuild our middle class and renew our greatness.” Images of foreclosure signs, the national debt amount, graffiti that reads: “Katrina was here.” Image of Clinton. (Clinton, 2007-78)</p>	<p>America at crisis. Image of Clinton appearing when the words “steady hand” are said. Clinton as strong.</p>	<p>The candidate has the strength to lead America out of the bad times.</p>
<p>Edwards’ words: “When I am president, I am going to say to members of Congress and members of my administration, including my cabinet: I am glad that you have health care coverage and that your family has health care coverage, but if you don’t pass universal health care by July 2009 in 6 months, I am going to use my power as president to take your health care away from you.” (Edwards, 2007-79)</p>	<p>Edwards as taking strong measures.</p>	<p>The candidate is tough. He will take strong measures to get things done.</p>
<p>Madrazo’s words: “Keep laughing, your time is up. I warn you: during the first week of my government I am going start the transformation of the attorney general office, with fairer laws and punishments that are going to keep you awake at night. With me, this is over.” Image of criminals laughing at the police. One of them pee his pants after Madrazo talks. (Madrazo, 2006-81)</p>	<p>Madrazo as tough against criminals.</p>	<p>The candidate will use strong measures against criminality.</p>

Within this sub-frame, candidates portray themselves as strong defenders of their convictions. Specifically, in one of McCain’s ads, he explained, “I didn’t go to Washington to win the miss congeniality award, I went to Washington to serve my country” (McCain, 2007-83).

This encourages viewers to think that McCain is strong and will make decisions for the well being of the country even when those decisions are not popular or can affect his political support.

Also, candidates use difficult passages of their lives that illustrate how strong they are. In the case of Edwards, he talks about how he and his wife, Elizabeth Edwards, reacted after she was diagnosed with cancer. Edwards said, “Elizabeth and I decided in the quiet of a hospital room, after 12 hours of tests and after getting very bad news, what we were going to spend our lives doing” (Edward,2007-84). He explains that they decided “to go out and fight for what it is we believe in” (Edwards, 2007-84). Thus, it is implied that the candidate and his wife are strong and courageous and that they do not give up even in extreme situations.

Candidates also emphasize their strength in handling difficult situations as presidents. Clinton’s (Clinton, 2008-85) ad stated that “Harry Truman said it best: if you can't stand the heat, get out of the kitchen.” After this, the same ad poses a question to listeners: “Who do you think has what it takes?” (Clinton, 2008-85) This is then followed by an image of Clinton. Viewers are provided with the reasoning that she can handle stressful and critical situations. Another ad points out that the *Hartford Courant* has endorsed Clinton and that “she has endured nearly two decades of strict scrutiny ...she survives and thrives” (Clinton, 2008-17). Then, audiences are encouraged to believe that Clinton is a resilient person that can endure rough situations successfully as a president.

Madrazo also described himself as a strong person. He explained that “the challenges reinforced my character, the determination is the force that impulse me and I apply that in every aspect of my life (Madrazo, 2006-86). Certainly, Madrazo presents himself as strong and able to endure difficult moments in his life. Then, it is implied that he will also stand firm in difficult situations as a president. Mercado also warns her opponents about her strength: “to all my

adversaries, I warn you: do not make a mistake, I am a Mexican woman, you are not going to defeat me” (Mercado, 2006-76). In this example, Mercado attributes her strength to her identity and gender. The reasoning given is that Mexican women are strong and undefeatable and since Mercado is a Mexican woman, she can endure any situation.

In summary, the *Toughness-Domestic Policy* sub-frame is used by several candidates with varying framing devices. Clinton uses endorsements to present herself as a strong person while Mercado presents her strength as a characteristic of her gender and national identity. In contrast, Obama did not emphasize his strength or his toughness in his ads.

Toughness-Foreign Policy. This sub-frame differs from the *Toughness-Domestic Policy* one in that it applies to international issues. In this sub-frame, candidates are portrayed as able to manage international issues with a strong hand and that foreign policy is an issue that needs such toughness. They are also defined as people with character that will defend the country by taking strong positions and measures to manage international problems. Under this sub-frame, the country is portrayed as victimized by foreign threats. It is important to note that the way the candidates present themselves in this frame is related to the way they present certain issues. Then, the way candidates depict these issues is also analyzed within the confines of this frame. The reason for this is that these issues involve representations of minorities, which is significant to this dissertation. Consequently, this frame is analyzed even when it was not used by Clinton, Mercado or Obama (see table 4.6).

Table 4.6

Framing and Reasoning Devices for the “Toughness-Foreign Policy” Sub-frame

Source text	Framing devices	Reasoning devices
Thompson’s words: “Americans know we have an illegal immigration problem” “giving up by granting amnesty is not the answer.” “It’s unfair to those who have played by the rules and ignores the rule of law, it’s also a matter of national security.” (Thompson, 2007-87)	Undocumented immigration is seeing as a problem by all Americans. Amnesty is equated to give up. Immigration tied to national security. Immigrants threaten the country. Thompson as strong against immigrants.	The candidate will not back up in his fight against undocumented immigration. Undocumented immigrants are dangerous and laws should be reinforced no matter what.
Giuliani’s words: “Iranian mobs took American hostages and they held the American hostages for 144 days, and they released the American hostages in one hour, and that should tell us a lot about these Islamic terrorists that we are facing.” “The one hour in which they released them was the one hour in which Ronald Reagan was taken the oath of office as president of the United States.” “The best way you deal with dictators, the best way you deal with tyrants and terrorism is standing up to them, you don’t back down.” (Giuliani, 2007-88)	Islam associated with terrorism. Ronald Reagan as a tough leader that terrorists fear. No context (no mention of the Iranian revolution, CIA intervention, etc.). Giuliani as tough, as taking Reagan as example.	The United States is threatened by terrorists and the candidate will take hard measures against them. Strong fight against terrorism regardless of the specific characteristics of the case or the consequences.
Huckabee’s words: “it ought to be at least as difficult to get across an international border to as it is to get on an airplane in our own hometown.” “Mike Huckabee will fight to secure our borders.” “No to amnesty and no to sanctuary cities.” “Build a border fence, secure the border and do it now.” (Huckabee, 2007-90)	Crossing an international border illegally is safe, easy, and comfortable. Border is not secure, it is dangerous.	The candidate will use strong measures against undocumented immigrants. The border is dangerous and porous and undocumented immigrants cross it effortlessly. The solutions to undocumented immigration is to build a fence and secure the border

Within this sub-frame, candidates are shown to be “tough” with foreign policy and actors and that this toughness is a well-reasoned response to these issues because they are typically shown to endanger the country and its population. Usually, the domestic country or population is victimized while the foreign country or population is vilified. In this sense, international issues are presented as dangerous, imminent, and present every moment, so tough measures seem desirable. As McCain described, “We live in a dangerous world and these are dangerous times” (McCain, 2008, 203); and Giuliani stated, “Leaders assassinated, democracy attacked, Osama Bin Laden still making threats...” He added, “In a world where the next crisis is a month away, America needs a leader who is ready.”

Specifically, one of the issues in which candidates used this sub-frame is undocumented immigration. Undocumented immigration was usually tied to the U.S.-Mexican border in the ads. Romney made this connection in one of his ads by mentioning the words “illegal immigration” while the image of a wired fence appears in the screen with the words “2,000 miles of US-Mexico border” (Romney, 2007-91). Therefore, undocumented immigration is presented first as a problem and then as only related to the U.S. Mexico border.

One of the candidates equates the experience of crossing the international border with the experience of boarding an airplane in the United States. He affirmed, “It ought to be at least as difficult to get across an international border to as it is to get on an airplane in our own hometown” (Huckabee, 2007-90). This encourages viewers to think that crossing the border is easy for anyone, even criminals. Under this view, the border is currently unsecure, dangerous. The implication of this is that something urgent and drastic has to be done to secure the border and protect citizens. In this way, undocumented immigration is tied with national security as Thompsons affirmed, “It is unfair to those who have played by the rules and ignores the rule of

law. It is also a matter of national security.” (Thompson, 2007-87). This implies that tough measures such as the militarization of the border, building a fence, and state police participation in immigration law enforcement are desirable solutions. Accordingly, candidates embrace and promote these solutions. For example, Giuliani proposes in his ads to “close the borders now,” “protect our borders,” “build the fence,” “train the border patrol,” “border monitoring,” “have a tamper-proof ID card” (Giuliani, 2007-92).

Candidates also described undocumented immigrants as illegal immigrants. Giuliani makes a distinction between immigrants and undocumented immigrants when he said “immigrants yes, illegals no” (Giuliani, 2007-92). This encourages audiences to believe that documented immigrants are a different and superior category of people than undocumented immigrants and in consequence do not deserve similar treatment because of their classification as people that broke the law. Also, the use of the word “illegal” labels undocumented immigrants as criminals. This encourages audiences to think about them as people that deserve to be punished. In this way, regardless of their circumstances, they are already judged and sentenced. Just as Giuliani mentioned in one of his ads, “Entering the United States illegally is illegal!” (Giuliani, 2007-92). Accordingly, under these framing devices, tough measures and positions against undocumented immigrants appear to be “fair.” Such as the ones proposed by Thompson: “against amnesty and benefits for illegals” (Thompson, 2008-93).

Under this sub-frame, undocumented immigrants are also presented as a cultural threat. Audiences are encouraged to think that tough measures are necessary to protect American culture. For instance, one of the tough strategies that Romney claims to have used to fight against undocumented immigration is that he “fought for English in the classroom” (Romney, 2007-91). This implies that English was not the language in the U.S. classrooms anymore and that other

languages are threatening the existence of the English language in the U.S. classrooms.

Furthermore, it promotes the assumption that by promoting English in the classrooms, Hispanic culture's or other cultures' influence on the U.S. will be mitigated.

Additionally, even in the case that undocumented immigrants become citizens, they are required to renounce to their culture and to embrace what is to be "American." For example, Giuliani stipulated "then if you become a citizen you have to be able to read English, write English, speak English and understand American citizenship" (Giuliani, 2007-94). This implies two things. First, that if a person cannot understand English that they will not understand what it means to be an American citizen. This is accomplished by proximally linking English with American citizenship in the same sentence. The meaning would be significantly different had Giuliani stated that citizenship will be granted to immigrants if they understand what it means to be a citizen *in addition to* speaking English. Second, this implies that undocumented immigrants are not willing to learn English and to embrace "American culture." This claim also does not take into consideration that there are several U.S. territories, such as Puerto Rico, where citizens primarily do not speak English. The logical extension of this thinking is that Puerto Ricans may not, then, deserve their U.S. citizenship.

The *Toughness-Foreign Policy* sub-frame was also present in ads that discussed terrorism. Under this frame, the tough measures that the candidates proposed responded to an immediate danger represented by war and terrorism in their ads. Usually terrorism is associated with Islam in the ads, "that should tell us a lot about these Islamic terrorists that we are facing" (Giuliani, 2007-88), and in some cases to people wearing turbans and veils. The religious preference of the people wearing turbans and veils is usually not identifiable. There are no geographical markers or any kind of self-identification used in the ads. As an illustration, in one

of his ads, Giuliani (2008-95) said, “An enemy without borders, hate without boundaries, people perverted, a religion betrayed, a nuclear power in chaos, madmen ...” These words are accompanied by an Arabic song in the background and the images of women wearing veils protesting, people with turbans burning a flag, a person with a turban speaking to a crowd, images of war, and the image of the president of Iran while the word “madmen” is mentioned by the narrator. There is a lack of context and reference for the images of angry people and war, which encourages audiences to think that the world, or at least the portions of the world associated with this imagery, likely Arabic or Islamic states, are chaotic, dangerous and full of leaders bent on destruction. It also encourages viewers to think that people with turbans and veils are dangerous enemies full of hate as the audio mentions.

Complex international issues and conflicts are also simplified by the candidates under this frame and the “toughness” of the candidate is typically shown to be an effective solution. Giuliani gives no context for the conflict where American hostages were held in Iran in the 1970s. He said

Iranian mobs took American hostages and they held the American hostages for 144 days, and they released the American hostages in one hour, and that should tell us a lot about these Islamic terrorists that we are facing. (Giuliani, 2007-88)

According to Giuliani, the reason why the hostages were released was that Ronald Reagan took power an hour before they were released, implying that hostages were released because Reagan took a harder stand than the previous administration. However, there is no mention of the context surrounding these events. The only reason given by Giuliani for terrorists acts is that terrorists “try to take away from us our freedom” (Giuliani, 2007-88) and that the United States should not back down to “Islamic terrorists.” Thus, audiences are not provided

with enough information about the complexity of the conflict and are left with the association of Islam, terrorism and danger.

Romney said Jihadism is a threat for the United States and that “their goal is to unite the world under a single jihadist caliphate, to do that, they must collapse freedom-loving nations, like us” (Romney, 2007-96). The oversimplification of complex international issues and their presentation as “us” against “them,” implies that audiences should think that there are simple solutions for these issues. Also, these types of descriptions and the use of vague and abstract concepts such as “freedom” do not provide audiences with information about the underlying causes, consequences and implications of the issues discussed. One simple solution to these simplified problems is to use military force as a fix to Islamic fundamentalism. Romney’s solution is to strengthen the military, increasing it “by at least a 100,000” (Romney, 2007-96). This idea is also shared by Thompson, who also said “You can trust me to protect your security against the Islamic raiders,” creating the impression that Islamic terrorists are on the doorstep of many homes already, ready to pillage (Thompson, 2008-93).

Presenting the world as a very chaotic, incomprehensible and dangerous place implies that strong measures have to be taken to protect the country. Accordingly, candidates present themselves as strong protectors of the country and promoters of tough measures. For example, Giuliani presents himself as never backing down to tyrants and terrorism, “The best way you deal with dictators, the best way you deal with tyrants and terrorism is standing up to them, you don't back down” (Giuliani, 2007-88).

In summary, the *Toughness-Foreign Policy* sub-frame is not used by Clinton, Mercado, or Obama and was not used in the Mexican ads. However, it uses framing devices that associates Islam with terrorism and undocumented immigrants with danger and cultural threat. This may

influence the way that minorities such as Muslims and undocumented immigrants are perceived in the United States.

Consistent. Candidates in this sub-frame are portrayed as internally consistent. Their acts are consistent with their beliefs and their beliefs will not change regardless of particular circumstances. Candidates portray any change on their beliefs or agreement with other political ideologies as a betrayal of their convictions. Any change, regardless if this change comes from a newfound sympathy, knowledge, or circumstances. This encourages audiences to believe that as presidents the candidates will more or less remain unchanged during their tenure in the White House and that this unchanging nature is a boon to a president (see Table 4.7).

Table 4.7
Framing and Reasoning Devices for the “Consistent” Sub-frame

Source text	Framing devices	Reasoning devices
Different common people endorsing McCain: “a clear record of conservatism.” “A genuine conservative.” (McCain, 2008-98)	People identify McCain as conservative.	The candidate is consistent with what people define as conservative beliefs.
Chuck Norris endorses Huckabee: “Mike is a principled authentic conservative.” (Huckabee, 2007-99)	Celebrity endorsement. Huckabee as a consistent conservative.	A celebrity defines the candidate as having strong conservative principles.
About Romney: “In the most liberal state of the country, one Republican stood up and cut spending instead of raising taxes.” “He enforced immigration laws.” “Stood up for traditional marriage and the sanctity of human life.” “Conservative principles.” “Strong military.” “Strong economy.” “Strong families.” (Romney, 2007-100)	Conservative values as Republican values. Conservative values defined as: cut government spending, no raising taxes, strong immigration laws, no gay marriage, pro-life position, and strong military. Romney as consistent with what he defines as conservative values.	The candidate has strong beliefs that he defines as conservative and is consistent with them.

Within this sub-frame, candidates also draw upon the *Consistent* sub-frame by accusing other candidates of being inconsistent in action or belief, denying them this frame. To illustrate, Romney accused McCain of agreeing with Clinton's ideas. In the ad, Romney asked, "Don't we need a leader who agrees with conservatives?" (Romney, 2008-101). Thus, audiences are encouraged to think that Romney is consistent because he agrees with conservatives, not liberals. Furthermore, Romney is not like McCain. Viewers are encouraged to think that McCain is betraying his conservative beliefs by agreeing with someone that is considered liberal. In short, when conservatives agree with those who hold alternative or opposing ideologies, conservatives are being inconsistent, regardless of whether or not the agreement is in discord with conservative ideology.

Even though one candidate might use this framework to alter perceptions of rivals, this does not prevent those rivals from doing the same. For example, McCain also drew on this frame when he alleged that Romney is not a conservative because Romney criticized Ronald Reagan in the past (McCain, 2008-102). In this case, Ronald Reagan is associated with conservative beliefs and Romney as attacking Reagan. This implies that Romney is not as conservative because McCain alleges he is "against" a person that is almost universally considered conservative.

Thompson also presents an ad where he shows a visual of Romney stating, "I believe that abortion should be safe and legal in this country" (Thompson, 2007-103). Then, Thompson's ad shows Huckabee stating that he would raise taxes. Thompson differentiates himself from them by stating, "We will win next November by sticking to our conservative principles." (Thompson, 200-103). Overall, conservative candidates that were not internally consistent by favoring practices such as abortion and raising taxes are denied the *Consistent* frame.

In summary, the *Consistent* sub-frame is not used by Clinton, Mercado, or Obama. The frame was also only used in U.S. ads. However, it was consider important to analyze in order to compare how different or similar are the frames used by candidates other than Clinton, Mercado and Obama.

Military Pride. In this sub-frame, candidates are either represented as military heroes or as proud of their military. The military is presented as a formative institution and the military background of the candidates or their links to the military are emphasized and glorified. The participation of the candidates in the military is portrayed as the source of their personal growth. In this way, it is implied that audiences should think that participation in the military makes people better and that candidates are better people because they were in the military or because they support the military. This sub-frame was not used by Clinton, Mercado or Obama. However, it was included in the analysis because it involves representations of minorities, specifically Hispanics, which are relevant for this dissertation (see table 4.8).

Table 4.8
Framing and Reasoning Devices for the “Military Pride” Sub-frame

Source text	Framing devices	Reasoning devices
About John McCain: “The naval academy at Annapolis compels traditions.” “Veneration of courage.” “An honor code.” “Fidelity to principles.” “Americans who sacrifice greatly for our country.” “Who prove worthy of our country's trust.” “He grew to understand the honor of serving a cause greater than his self-interests.” Images of the naval academy, of McCain in the academy, of U.S. ships and planes, and war.	Military as a life-changing institution that makes people better, McCain as someone that grew to be a better person thanks to the military.	The military makes people better. The candidate became a person that cares others and not just about himself in the military.
About John McCain: “Time for a real hero.” “John McCain, the American president that America has been waiting for.” Image of a younger McCain in pain, wounded and giving his rank and his official number.	McCain as a war hero.	The candidate endured physical and emotional pain while he fought as a soldier for his country in the war. He is a war hero.

Within this sub-frame, candidates with a military background are presented as heroes. Their families’ military background is also emphasized. For example, in one of John McCain’s ads, it is explained that he is “the son and grandson of Admirals” (McCain, 2008-104). The candidates are not shown during the moments in the war where they could have harmed others. They are shown in the moments that they were victimized, wounded, or in pain and their suffering is emphasized. To demonstrate, in many of the McCain ads he is shown in a bed, in pain, wounded and answering questions. In one of his ads, it is emphasized that McCain “sacrificed for his country” (McCain, 2007-105).

Thus, according to this sub-frame, war is a situation where soldiers are passive actors. They are never shown actively attacking; they are usually defending themselves and being victimized. To illustrate, there are many images of McCain wounded (McCain, 2007-105,107; McCain, 2008, 108,110), but there is no mention of him hitting or wounding anyone. This does two things for the reader: First, it downplays the fact that our candidate “heroes” actively or passively assisted in killing, maiming, or hurting enemy combatants. This effectively sanitizes the frame. Second, it removes the larger political, economic, and social contexts for wars in the first place and leaves fate as the reason why they were sent to war. They were there because it was their destiny, “the calamity of fate delivered him (McCain) to North Vietnam” (McCain, 2008-111). No country, government, institution, or individual is mentioned as responsible for sending “hero” soldiers to war.

War and the military are also presented as an antecedent to personal growth. People become better citizens—and in the case of our candidates, better politicians—after war or at least after having served in the military. One of McCain’s ads illustrates this point. The narrator of the ad states, “It was an understanding of honor that changed his life forever” (McCain, 2008-111). War and the military also seem to give minorities a social recognition that otherwise is usually denied to them. For example, John McCain speaks about Hispanics in the military in one of his ads:

“When you go to Iraq or Afghanistan today, you’re going to see a whole lot of people who are of Hispanic background. You’re even going to meet some of the few thousand that are still green card holders who are not even citizens of this country, who love this country so much that they’re willing to risk their lives in its service in order to accelerate their path to citizenship and enjoy the bountiful, blessed nation. So let’s, from time to time, remember that these are God’s children. They must come into the country legally,

but they have enriched our culture and our nation as every generation of immigrants before them.” (McCain, 2008-112)

In this case, it is accepted that Hispanics are of a lower social class than other groups because McCain has to remind the audience that White Americans are not the only group to be included in the category of God’s children, Hispanics fit in there as well. In a sense, he positions Hispanics as equal to other groups and implies that members of the audience may not believe that they are actually not equal. However, the reason that leads McCain to “elevate” Hispanics position in society is the fact that they joined the military. Thus, they are socially “more accepted” or “better people” because of their participation in the military. This begs the question: Would they be part of God’s children if they had not served? That is left up to individual interpretation.

Nevertheless, this is far from being even a half-recognition. Hispanics are still reprimanded for being a “disobedient” minority, because after all they “... must come into the country legally” (McCain, 2008-112). This also applies an inaccurate generalization that Hispanics are new immigrants or undocumented immigrants. Consequently, Hispanics are otherized and placed as foreigners, ignoring that the Hispanic presence in the region dates back to the 18th century at least (Hernández, 1994). It also ignores other groups of Hispanics such as Puerto Ricans and Hispanics whose ancestors had not entered the U.S. but had rather become U.S. residents when borders shifted. Overall, this sub-frame was not used by Clinton, Mercado or Obama and was only used by U.S. candidates. However its portrayal of Hispanics makes it relevant to this dissertation. The way that Hispanics are stereotyped and otherized may influence the way this group is perceived by audiences and viewers’ attitudes toward policies that affect Hispanics.

Pointing Fingers. This sub-frame presents candidates as the safest choice for the voters by pointing out the flaws with other candidates or their policies. Through these more “negative” ads, candidates take an offensive position and present opposite candidates as out of control or as dangerous for the country. Opposite candidates are also portrayed as having caused or as capable of bringing economic, political or social chaos (see Table 4.9).

Table 4.9
Framing and Reasoning Devices for the “Pointing Fingers” Sub-frame

Source text	Framing devices	Reasoning devices
Calderón’s ad: “if López Obrador wins, the national debt will increase, there will be devaluation and crisis. Who can save Mexico?” Image of López with a peasant hat. (Calderón, 2006-113)	López as bringing economic crisis to the country. Mexico in danger.	López will be dangerous for the country’s economy as a president.
Madrazo’s ad: “In the DF [Federal District], the PRD did not govern well. It couldn’t do anything against criminality, for public transportation, against corruption.” “The PRD should not govern the nation.” Image of an armed criminal, a crowded subway car, a prison guard being bribed. (Madrazo, 2006-114)	PRD as allowing criminality and corruption.	The PRD allows criminals and corrupt people to operate.
López’ words: “Salinas created the worst crisis in history, the crisis ended up in the FOBAPROA fraud in 1999 that was approved by the PAN and the PRI with Calderón.” “More than 628 thousand houses were in foreclosure, there were more than 1 million jobs lost and we have a debt of 120 thousand million dollars.” “The PAN and the PRI harmed you, dirty hands, a job for his brother in law.” (López, 2006-115)	The PRI, PAN and Calderón linked to Salinas. Also, as fraudulent and affecting the lives of Mexicans.	The PRI, PAN and Calderón are fraudulent and dangerous for the economy and well-being of Mexican families,

Within this sub-frame, candidates associate opposing candidates with historical or current issues and individuals that have generated social, economic or political unrest and fear in the country. Audiences are encouraged to think that opposing candidates can cause a critical or dangerous situation in the country that can put audience members' family, money, or lives at risk. Accordingly, López (2006-115) associated the PRI, the PAN, and Calderón with Carlos Salinas, a former president that had been accused of causing the worst economic crisis in Mexican history. So, audiences are encouraged to think that the PRI and the PAN's candidates can create a similar situation. Thus, the PRD candidate is seen as a "safer" option.

Madrazo also does something similar, he said that Calderón and López "... represent governments that couldn't do anything against insecurity, violence, or unemployment" (Madrazo, 2006-55). These words are accompanied by the images of an armed criminal inside of a bus, a criminal holding the neck of other man and pointing his gun to him, and an image of unemployed people in Mexico's city downtown. In this way, Madrazo associated his competition with images of crime and fear, implying that other candidates will allow or cause these types situations continue or increase. Madrazo, then, is presented as a "safer" option. Calderón also presents himself as a "safer" option. He criticized López's economic policy by saying that it is similar to the one proposed by former president Carlos Salinas, which has been pointed out as the one that led to the worst crisis in Mexico's history (Calderón, 2006-116). Images in this ad show the word "crisis" in the screen destroying a map of Mexico.

Candidates also portray other candidates as out of control. Calderón (2006-117) showed short videos of a heated López insulting an implied crowd of unidentified people by calling them hypocrites, parasites, puppets, dummies, and saying they belong in "history's dumpster!" –this last one implies that the target of the insult should be erased from history. Then, the narrator

asked, “Do you want this for Mexico?” The ad ended with another image of López yelling “shut up, *chachalaca!*” (Calderón, 2006-117). The word *chachalaca* is used as an insult to mean noisy bird. The images of an angry López and the absence of context that could provide the audience with information about the causes and the target of his anger, encourages viewers to think that he is out of control and that he does not respect citizens or his peers. This implies that as a president he will not have a cool head to deal with difficult situations in the country and that he can make visceral decisions.

Many of these ads (e.g. Calderón, 2006- 113, 117-121) use the image of López with a peasant hat while the word danger (*peligro*) is “stamped” in red letters in his face. The peasant hat links López with poor and rural settings of Mexico, where many poor people and indigenous peoples live. Since the candidate identifies himself as a defender of the poor people, this portrayal of López resembles the concepts of *indio permitido* (*sanctioned Indian*) and “the other” Indian, formulated by Hale (2004) in his studies on indigenous peoples. The concept refers to the limits that society imposes to indigenous peoples in political participation and in their fight for their rights. Thus:

The sanctioned Indian manages to negotiate his or her modernity, proposes instead or protesting, uses the dominant language, and acts with authenticity. In contrast, “the other” Indian is rebellious, revengeful, and conflictive. In postwar Guatemala, the sanctioned Indian receives rewards whereas “the other” is relegated to poverty and social exclusion. (Connolly-Ahern & Castells i Talens, 2010, p. 318)

Accordingly, López is presented as “the other” Indian, as a danger for the maintenance of the current social system. As one of Calderón’s ads said, “López Obrador: un peligro para México (López Obrador: A danger to Mexico)”.(Calderón, 2006-118).

Candidates also present their opposition as able to damage the well-being of the audience. The framing devices used by one of Calderón’s ad state that “with López Obrador, we all lose” (,

2006-122). The opposing candidate then is presented as likely creating job and home loss. Another of Calderón's ads goes on to say "López Obrador says that he will fill out our pockets, but he is going to accrue so much in debt that the prices are going to increase and increase, we will lose our jobs, the house, the little we have ... we will even lose our pants" (Calderón, 2006-123).

Overall, this sub-frame was not used by Clinton, Mercado or Obama and was only used by Mexican candidates. However, it is considered important for the analysis since it includes portrayals of candidates that matched the concept of the *sanctioned Indian*. A concept related to the participation of indigenous peoples in the political arena.

Know how

This frame presents candidates as possessing the experience and the knowledge to govern the country. The ability of the candidates to solve problems is emphasized as well as their experience and accomplishments in the private or the public sector. It is implied that as presidents, candidates will be able to know how to handle the country and to use their experience and knowledge to provide solutions and for the country's problems. This frame includes the following sub-frames: *Knowledge/Experience* and *Business approach*.

Knowledge/Experience. This sub-frame emphasizes the knowledge and the experience that the candidates possess to manage the country. Experience is not limited only to that gained in the political realm as this frame also stresses their time spent working in the public sector and/or other professional accomplishments. Typical framing devices candidates use include the endorsement of prominent publications, politicians, and public figures and their praise of a candidate's accomplishments, experience and knowledge (see Table 4.10).

Table 4.10
Framing and Reasoning Devices for the “Knowledge/Experience” Sub-frame

Source text	Framing devices	Reasoning devices
“The New York Times has made its choice, Hillary Clinton for president.” “We are hugely impressed by the depth of her knowledge, by the force of her intellect and by the breath of her experience.” (Clinton, 2008-124)	Newspaper endorsement. A prominent newspaper praises Clinton’s knowledge and experience.	The candidate has the experience and the knowledge to manage the country.
“Joe Biden has dealt with the world's most dangerous problems, from nuclear weapons in the former soviet union to genocide in the Balkans and Darfur.” “Over 30 years as a head of the foreign relations committee.” (Biden, 200-126)	Biden has experience in managing critical international issues.	The candidate has experience in foreign policy managing extreme conflicts,
Madrazo’s ad: “Vote for the well-being of your family, vote for experience.” (Madrazo, 2006-55)	Madrazo is associated with experience and the well-being of Mexican families.	The candidate has the experience to manage the country to make it better for Mexican families.

Within this sub-frame, the word experience is commonly associated with the candidates in their ads. As framing devices for this frame, Madrazo showed in his ad some people in a *cantina* (a Mexican bar) explaining that they are going to vote for Madrazo because “they (The PRI party) have experience and know how to govern” (Madrazo, 2006-127). In this case, Madrazo associated himself with the 70 year period of time when the PRI party had governed the country before the 2000 elections. Thus, the reasoning device used is that Madrazo will draw from the political experience that the PRI party has accumulated during those years, tap into that extant pool of accumulated knowledge, and govern more effectively as a result.

Another framing device found within this frame is stressing a candidate's individual experience. Clinton used this framing device—the constant emphasis of her experience—by frequently repeating the specific number of years she had worked in politics. Some examples include when she said, “I have 35 years experience making change” (Clinton, 2007-128) or when a narrator stated, “Every stage of her life has prepared her for the presidency” (Clinton, 2007-129). Her experience and knowledge is also emphasized in her ads by several prominent publications, politicians and public figures. Some of them are: *The New York Times*, *The Hartford Courant*, *The De Moines Register*, Philadelphia Mayor Michael Nutter, General Wesley Clark (retired), General Merrik A. McPeak, Maya Angelou, and North Carolina Governor Mike Easley, among others (Clinton, 2008-17, 60, 124, 130-134). The reasoning proposed by these framing devices is that Clinton's knowledge and experience to manage the country is exceptional because it is praised by many prominent publications and personalities. In other words, she is not only experienced, but other politicians and actors in prominent positions of power have noted her ability to draw upon that experience effectively.

Clinton also emphasized her experience in “meeting with leaders around the world as a first lady” (Clinton, 2007-129). Accordingly, Clinton is presented as an “insider,” as someone that already knows how the presidency works, “someone who already knows the world's leaders, knows the military, someone tested and ready to lead in the dangerous world” (Clinton, 2008-135). She can—so to speak—“walk the walk.”

By drawing on this experience, candidates also emphasize that they know how to put together the best policies—another common framing device. Clinton claimed to have “the only health care plan that covers *every* American and the *only* economic plan that freezes foreclosures” (Clinton, 2008-136). Some candidates also imply that their knowledge could have

helped to prevent some difficult times in the country, as was the case when Clinton claimed that “she called for action on the housing prices about a year ago” (Clinton, 2008-137). In an Obama’s ad, a young man stated:

I worked to Delfa for 13 years, I was making good money. Then NAFTA came along, they started moving our work to Mexico first and China. We lost over 2,700 jobs and I lost my job because of it. Obama was against NAFTA. (Obama, 2008-138)

Taken together, these framing devices imply that because candidates are experienced, they possess knowledge about big issues like the economy and are able to recognize when something is wrong and then prevent undesirable situations.

Also, candidates emphasize their accomplishments. López affirmed that during the time he was its governor, the Federal District was “first place in foreign investment, first place in public construction, created 800,000 jobs, first place in private investment ...” (Obrador, 2006-139). This encourages audiences to believe that he had a successful experience governing the Federal District, that his knowledge in governing the Federal District is transferable to the presidency, and therefore he knows how to rule the country too. Dodd also uses this framing device and by claiming that “I have helped to end wars in Central America and bring peace to Northern Ireland” (Dodd, 2007-140). The reasoning suggested by this framing device is that he has experience managing foreign relations in his previous roles as a politician and that he will know how to handle foreign relations as a president.

Overall, this sub-frame was used extensively by Clinton, but it was also used by Obama. Both of them used the endorsements of politicians, personalities, and citizens. In contrast, Mercado did not use this frame.

Business Approach. This sub-frame associates candidates with the private sector. The private sector is assumed and portrayed as naturally more efficient than the public sector and its

promotion as the solution for the problems of the country. Candidates with experience in the private sector are portrayed as more able to manage the problems of the country than candidates with experience in the public sector (see Table 4.11).

Table 4.11
Framing and Reasoning Devices for the “Business Approach” Sub- frame

Source text	Framing devices	Reasoning devices
Romney’s words: “America's challenges are simply too big for Washington politicians.” “I spent my life tackling big problems.” (Romney, 2007-141)	Romney as experienced in handling big problems. Washington politicians as not able to handle problems. Romney is better than them.	The candidate has a long experience managing difficult situations. He will manage problems better than Washington politicians.
About Romney: “Best businessman in North America.” “Created and revolutionized American businesses.” “Turnaround the most Democratic state.” “Turnaround major companies.” (Romney, 2007-142)	Romney as a successful businessman. Able to manage challenging politics and companies efficiently.	The candidate is successful and knows how to manage institutions in the public and the private sector.
“Strongly promoting investment.” (Calderón, 2006-143)	Supporting businesses is a way to improve the economy.	The candidate will improve the economy by supporting businesses.

Within this sub-frame, candidates portray themselves as successful in the private sector and sometimes even as superstars, e.g. as a “business legend” (Romney, 2007-144). They also present themselves as better prepared than other candidates thanks to their business background or vision, for example, Romney said, “I think I am probably the only guy in the stage that has spent most of his career in the business world; I understand how the economy works” (Romney, 2007-145). In this sense, Romney is positioning himself as better prepared than the other candidates because he knows how the economy works in practice and not in theory. He claims

that “he knows how the economy works because he has worked in the private sector for more than 25 years” and that “I spent my life in the real economy” (Romney, 2008-146). This experience also helps him answer basic questions about issues such as the national budget by drawing on prior private sector experience: “In business you only spend what you have” (Romney, 2007-147). Although not always the case, at times these claims also preclude other candidates from using the same frame, as was the case when Romney differentiated himself from other candidates as being the only one with serious private sector experience.

Candidates also associated the private sector with the creation of jobs and modernization. So audiences are encouraged to think that candidates are promoting the economic growth and the modernization of the country by supporting businesses, as was the case in several Calderón ads. For example, he claimed, “Tourism will be my priority, to generate jobs in the coasts, in the woods, in all of those magical places of Mexico” (Calderón, 2006-148), “micro-loans for your business,” “reducing taxes for workers and business” (Calderón, 2006-148). This sub-frame was not used by Clinton, Mercado or Obama. However, it was included in the analysis in order to provide a comparison to the frames that were used by Clinton, Mercado and Obama.

Reformer

This frame presents candidates as representing a new form of making politics. They are presented as a change to the present political system and the status quo in general. Candidates are presented as challenging social, political or economic structures by promoting new dynamics. It is implied that as presidents they will change dynamics in the status quo and will bring change, new ideas and different ways to manage politics. The two sub-frames that belong to this frame are *New Politics* and *Activist*.

New Politics. This sub-frame presents candidates as embracing a new kind of politics. Old politics are described as focused on gaining political power and negative attacks while lacking follow through on campaign promises and new ideas. The candidates portray themselves as looking for new directions and new ideas, and focused on solving problems (see Table 4.12).

Table 4.12
Framing and Reasoning Devices for the “New Politics” Sub-frame

Source text	Framing devices	Reasoning devices
Obama’s words: “The same old Washington textbooks campaigns just won't do.” (Obama, 2007-149)	Obama as a change from old political strategies.	The candidate represents a new way to address politics.
Calderón words: “All my life I have dreamed with a different and better Mexico.” (Calderón, 2006-61)	Calderón as wanting change.	The candidate will bring change for the country and will make it better.
“Hillary Clinton: a new beginning.” (Clinton, 2007-78)	Clinton as a break from the past. Representing a new start.	The candidate represents change for the country. She is different from past administrations.

Within this sub-frame, candidates emphasize that their main goal is to solve problems and to do the right thing, not to gain political power. This differs from the *People’s Candidate* sub-frame in that the interest of making changes is because the candidates are forward thinking and different from backward thinking ones. Obama for example, talks about ending “the politics that value score and points over making progress” (Obama, 2008-151). Clinton also distances herself from the fight for political power by saying, “In Washington they talked about who's up and who's down ... we talk about what's right and what's wrong” (Clinton, 2008-152).

Candidates also label political attacks as a strategy of old politics and associate opposite candidates with that strategy. For example, Obama says about Clinton, “There is a reason why

people are rejecting Hillary Clinton's attacks, because the same old Washington politics won't lower the price of gas or help our struggling economy" (Obama, 2008-153). This encourages viewers to think of Clinton as representing "old politics." It implies that she is a person that is not working on finding solutions for the problems of the country and that is instead wasting time and resources in attacking other candidates. In another ad, Obama asks "What is Hillary Clinton's answer?" and then answers, "The same old politics" (Obama, 2008-154).

Some candidates, mostly from new and small parties present themselves as a change to politics and distanced themselves from big parties by associating them with "old politics" and the past. For example, Patricia Mercado stated, "Nothing will change if we keep doing nothing or voting for the same parties" (Mercado, 2006-155). She also explains that "We have made our culture, our music, our food. If you realize, the things that we have done well are mostly things in which politicians have had little involvement" (Mercado, 2006-48). In one of his ads, Roberto Campa asks the audience to "... not look to the past" (Campa, 2006-156). Mercado (2006-23) also portrays opposing candidates as being part of the same old political, authoritarian and sexist culture. She said, "We have again a messiah, a *caudillo*, a savior ..." and, "the name has little importance, they are different labels for the same authoritarian culture, and forgive me for saying it: *machista*. It is always the same" (Mercado, 2006-23). With each of these examples, the candidates use the framing device of setting themselves apart from the "old regimes" to imply that they will invigorate the political system.

Candidates then, present themselves as agents of change, as bringing a "new kind of politics" (Obama, 2008-157). One of the examples is Barack Obama as he constantly associates himself with change in his ads, e.g. "You know, hope and change haven't just been campaign slogans for me, they have been the causes of my life" (Obama, 2007-158), "He'll bring about the

change we need” (Obama, 2008-160). Other candidates also use this strategy: “We will be the new in the 2006” (Mercado, 2006-23), “We need new energy, we need new ideas and we need new leaders” (Romney, 2008-161), “... a new beginning” (Clinton, 2007-162).

Candidates also present themselves as looking for new ideas and directions. Some examples are Clinton and Romney. Clinton (Clinton, 2007-163) presented herself as interested in developing new sources of energy and Romney (Romney, 200-150, 164) presented himself as favoring innovation and research.

This sub-frame was used by Clinton, Mercado and Obama and they used similar framing devices. They portrayed themselves as different from “old politics.”

Activist. This sub-frame presents the candidates as aware of the social and economic inequalities in their countries and the problems that derive from them. The candidates present themselves as promoting awareness of such problems and as fighters against inequalities. Audiences are encouraged to think that as presidents, the candidates will take strong stands against these inequalities and will fight for social change (see Table 4.13).

Table 4.13
Framing and Reasoning Devices for the “Activist” Sub-frame

Source text	Framing devices	Reasoning devices
Mercado’s words: “10 million of indigenous peoples live every day exclusion and racism. Things are very bad for to them.” (Mercado, 2006-48)	Mercado is aware of the racism in the country.	The candidate recognizes that there is a problem of racism and discrimination in the country.
Mercado’s words: “Every 8 hours a Mexican woman is killed in her home, yes, in her home. Things are not even very bad for them anymore.” (Mercado, 2006-48)	Mercado is aware of the problem of violence against women in the country.	The candidate recognizes that there is a problem of violence against women in the country.
Patricia Mercado’s words: “Our causes: gender equality, opportunities for the youth, the rights of sexual, religious, and ethnic minorities, respect for the environment, protection of our children, participation of civil society, combating social inequality and poverty” (Mercado, 2006-76)	The candidate as fighter for social change.	The candidate will fight for social change

Within this sub-frame, candidates explain social and economic inequalities and relate them to other problems in the country. For example, in one of her ads, Mercado (2006-48) explained:

But there is something that we have not been able to solve, something that has led you to leave your land and your people. It is an inheritance that governments more to the right or more to the left, governments of chili, candy, or lard could not or did not want to mess with. That something is the enormous inequality that exists between us ... inequality in the access to health care and education, inequality in the access to new technologies and loans, inequality in the access to power and decision-making, inequality between women and men, inequality for gay people, inequality for indigenous people. Inequality generates three problems for us: it stops development and economic growth with jobs, propitiates

the corruption of the whole social body and particularly of power and generates a fertile environment for crime, delinquency and insecurity.

Mercado (2006-48) then portrays herself as aware of the inequality problems of the country and as someone that wants to bring awareness about them. Mercado also ties inequality to other problems in the country. Audiences then are encouraged to think that she is well informed and that knows the complexity of the problems that the country faces.

Mercado also encourages the active participation of the audience in the political life of their country when she said, “They made us think that there was no reason to dream, to fight, to grow, to complain. They made us think that there was no reason to participate, to give our opinion, to chose, to vote. That is over” (Mercado, 2006-165). In this way, audiences are encouraged to think of Mercado as an activist, as someone that fights for change and not only encourages people to actively participate in the political process but that also have citizens think of themselves as having agency. Both the candidate and citizens are shown to embrace the defense of human rights.

Obama also declares himself a civil rights activist in many of his ads. He never mentions discrimination explicitly except in one of his ads, where it is implied that he was a victim of discrimination himself. Congressman Raúl Grijalva stated in Spanish that “We know what it is to be used as a scapegoat because of our origin and last name, and nobody understands this better than Barack Obama ... [He] has become a leader of immigration reform” (Obama, 2008-166). The ad is directed to Spanish speakers since the language used is Spanish. Thus, in this case, audiences are encouraged to think that Obama is himself a victim of discrimination and that he is aware of the discrimination against Spanish speakers and empathic to them. Audiences are also encouraged to think that he is an activist that fights for the immigration reform and that he will fight for it as a president. However, the message associates the Spanish language with

immigration, which also implies the generalization that Spanish speakers are foreigners, immigrants or undocumented immigrants. This ignores again the diverse composition of the Spanish speaking population in the United States.

The language chosen by Mercado is also reflective of her interest in fighting inequality, specifically in terms of gender inequality. Mercado does not use masculine nouns to describe a group that is integrated by females and males. For example, other candidates use the term *mexicanos*, which is a masculine noun, when they refer to the Mexican women and men of the country. However, Mercado uses the feminine and the masculine nouns: “*mexicanas y mexicanos*” (Mercado, 2006-48).

This sub-frame was not used by Clinton. It was used by Mercado and Obama and they used similar framing devices, they presented themselves as fighting against inequality. However, Mercado explicitly detailed her positions and the causes she defended while Obama maintained a vague position.

Charisma

This frame presents candidates as “real,” as people that are liked and followed by audiences. Candidates are shown as natural, charming and able to attract and captivate other people. It is implied that as presidents, the candidates will not change who they are and will be followed and liked by the people in their respective countries. The sub-frames that belong to this frame are *Popular* and *Authentic*.

Popular. This sub-frame presents the candidates as magnetic leaders that people like and follow. They are presented as attracting crowds of followers and as successful in the polls. This encourages audiences to think that candidates have high possibilities to win the election since many people like them and will possibly vote for them (see Table 4.14).

Table 4.14
Framing and Reasoning Devices for the “Popular” Sub-frame

Source text	Framing devices	Reasoning devices
“17 million Americans have voted for Hillary Clinton.” “More than for any primary candidate in history.” (Clinton, 200-167)	Clinton has the support of many Americans.	The candidate is popular. She has millions of voters and has big chances to win the nomination.
Images of crowds of people gathered in the streets. Obama in front of big crowds, people cheering at him and trying to shake his hand. Obama leading a big crowd in the street. (Obama, 2007-29, 41, 45, 47, 51, 53, 58, 68, 149, 158, 168-177)	Obama attracts people. Many people like him and follow him.	The candidate is popular. Crowds of people follow him so he has big chances to win the nomination
López’s ad: “Successful campaign closings in all of the country.” “Smile, we won already.” Images of big crowds of people cheering at Obrador. Obrador dancing with an old lady in the middle of a big crowd. (Obrador, 2006-37, 178, 181, 182)	López Obrador attracts people. Many people like him and follow him. He is close to people.	The candidate is popular. He attracts big crowds and is close to them, so he has big chances of winning the election.
Calderón words: “Vamos juntos, hasta la victoria!” Image of Calderón speaking in a stadium crowded with people cheering at him. (Calderón, 2006-113, 183-185)	The candidate attracts people, many people like him.	The candidate is popular, many people like him so he has big chances to win the election.

Within this sub-frame, candidates portray themselves as speaking to large crowds who cheer and clap at seeing and hearing their candidate. They also present themselves as winning in the polls. For example, Edwards’s ad said “the only Democrat that beats all the Republicans in the recent CNN poll? John Edwards is the only one” (Edwards, 2008-186). This implies that the candidate attracts people and can win the general election. Calderón (2006-184) also uses this strategy when an ad claimed “Many recent polls declared Felipe Calderón as a winner.” These

words are accompanied by images of newspapers and the image of Calderón in front of a large crowd of supporters.

This sub-frame was used by Clinton and Obama and they used different framing devices. Clinton used framing devices to portray herself as popular in the polls and Obama used framing devices to portray himself as leading crowds and followed by big crowds. Mercado did not use this frame.

Authentic. This sub-frame presents the candidates as human beings and imperfect people. They portray themselves as naturally spontaneous, relaxed and/or informal. In this frame, the candidates do not “pose.” This encourages audiences to think of candidates as down to the earth and to believe that what candidates show is their true personality and that “what you see is what you get.” It is important to note that this frame was mostly used by Obama (see Table 4.15).

Table 4.15
Framing and Reasoning Devices for the “Authentic” Sub-frame

Source text	Framing devices	Reasoning devices
Obama’s words: “I am not a perfect man, and I won’t be a perfect president, but I can promise you this: I will always tell you where I stand and what I think.” (Obama, 2008-151)	Obama as an imperfect human being.	The candidate is able to show himself as not perfect. So, he is a transparent and genuine person.
Obama’s words: “I went to Detroit to insist that we have to increase fuel efficiency standards.” “Now, I have to admit, the room got kind of quiet.” People laughing. (Obama, 2007-63)	Obama telling a joke.	The candidate shows his sense of humor.

One of the strategies used in this sub-frame is to allow other individuals who are close to the candidate and know her well to tell the candidate's story. This "sneak peak," so to speak, into the candidate's life implies that this is an authentic, "true" view of the candidate and that they therefore have nothing to hide. For example, many ads of Obama (Obama, 2007-29, 47, 51, 169, 170) use a documentary format for telling his life story. In addition to the framing device mentioned above (having others tell the story), the formal features of documentary films—i.e. the nonfiction nature of this format—encourages audiences to think of the candidate as real and genuine. The people that are interviewed for these ads talk about how Obama was when they had close contact with him. They do not seem to be in a studio and they do not say explicitly that Obama can be a good president. They talked about how he was before he "made it" and their experiences with him. There are pictures of a younger Obama working in poor neighborhoods of Chicago, images of an article from *The New York Times* talking about Obama being the first Black President of the Harvard Law Review. These ads encourage people to think that Obama is letting other people tell his story and that he is "real."

Other strategies used are showing Obama in informal attire, with no tie and sleeves rolled up while he talks to people in the street (Obama, 2007-33, 54, 63, 171, 172, 187-191). This encourages people to think that he is relaxed, "natural," and relatable.

The use of jokes is also another strategy, humor is almost absent from other ads employing different frames. In an ad employing this framing device, Obama is shown talking in front of a small group of people. His joke targeted the car industry and made the point that the car industry did not agree with increasing fuel efficiency standards. The ad showed people laughing at his joke, encouraging audiences to think that he showed sense of humor and spontaneity when he said, "I went to Detroit to insist that we have to increase fuel efficiency

standards ... Now, I have to admit, the room got kind of quiet.” (Obama, 2007-63). This shows that he is human, not perfect, and unassuming.

This sub-frame is also not limited to Obama, although he seems to have made the most use of it (Clinton and Mercado did not use it). McCain also employs similar framing devices. He is shown telling a joke in one of the debates, targeting the Woodstock festival. He said that he was sure that the festival was “a cultural and pharmaceutical event” (McCain, 2007-107). Aside from the reference to the use of drugs in the festival, the joke made the point that Clinton’s proposition to use one million dollars to create a museum for the Woodstock festival was not as important as other issues in the country. The ad showed Rudolph Giuliani and other people laughing at McCain’s joke, encouraging audiences to think that he showed sense of humor and that other candidates appreciated this as well. Huckabee, Dodd, and Rudolph also each used an ad with humor. However, the ads were more elaborate and planned, which made them look less spontaneous. For example, in one of the ads, Huckabee (2007-99) had a “Chuck Norris approved” ad, where Chuck Norris appeared seated next to him. Dodd (2007-192) says in another ad that he is the only candidate with white hair because white hair comes from hard work. In the meantime the camera makes a close up to a white rabbit that is in front of him.

Religious Person

This frame presents candidates as directly or indirectly associated with religion. This frame only has one sub-frame called: *Religion-friendly*.

Religion-Friendly. There are two versions of this sub-frame. In the first one, candidates present themselves as people of faith or associated to religious organizations without specifying their religious preferences. This encourages audiences to think that candidates are people of faith or close to people of faith, likely making them more likable to certain parts of the

population for whom religion is important. The second frame presents candidates as people that identify themselves with one specific faith. This encourages people to think that candidates are driven by religious values and make candidates more likable to certain parts of the population for whom that specific religion is important (see Table 4.16).

Table 4.16
Framing and Reasoning Devices for the “Religion-friendly” Sub-frame

Source text	Framing devices	Reasoning devices
Thompson words: “Our rights come from God and not from government.” (Thompson, 2007-87)	The candidate believes in God. Religion rules society over the state.	The candidate is religious and puts religion first.
Huckabees words: “What really matters is the celebration of the birth of Christ and being with your family and your friends.” (Huckabee, 2007, 193)	Context: Christmas ad. Religion first.	The candidate is Christian.
About Obama: “As an organizer with Christian churches.” (Obama, 2008-30)	Obama associates himself with Christianity.	The candidate has good relationships with Christian organizations.
About Clinton: “She is a person of deep faith.” (Clinton, 2008-43)	Clinton as religious.	The candidate is a religious person.

Within this sub-frame, the association of candidates with religion, their religion or religious values are discussed. For some of them, religious values are described as the values that lead their political positions and decisions. For example, Huckabee (2007-194) declared that “faith doesn't influence me, it really defines me.” He described himself as a “Christian leader” (Huckabee, 2007-194) and established that these religious values influenced his position on abortion when he said, “I believe that life begins at conception” (Huckabee, 2007-194). In this

way, audiences are encouraged to think of Huckabee as a Christian person that follows his religion when taking political stands. This sub-frame was not present in the Mexican ads.

In summary, only Clinton and Obama used this sub-frame. They used similar framing devices, presenting themselves as linked to religion but without specifying their religious preferences. Mercado did not use this sub-frame.

The “Americanization” of political advertising and the cult to the candidates’ personality

After analyzing the frames associated with each of the candidates and the issues discussed in the Mexican and U.S. ads, it is important to emphasize that one of the main findings was that the cult to the candidates’ personality was extensively present in the ads of both countries. The cult to the candidates’ personality includes the emphasis of the candidate over the party (also called “personalization”), which is identified as one of the elements of U.S. political marketing (Aceves, 2009). Its extensive use in the Mexican ads reinforces the idea that political advertising in Mexico has been “Americanized” to a certain degree, as scholars as Aceves (2009) have argued.

The use of U.S. elements of political marketing in the Mexican political advertising of the 2006 presidential election is not surprising. Some of the media campaigns, or at least the ones with the biggest budgets and media resonance, were created by consultants and companies that built their experience and knowledge in the world of U.S. political marketing. (Aceves, 2009; Sánchez Murillo & Aceves, 2008).

This cult of the candidates’ personalities also has important implications since candidates were identified as the only ones that can individually solve all the problems facing the country thanks to specific personal characteristics they claim to possess. For example, according to some ads, poverty will end in Mexico with the election of a caring candidate (López, 2006-27) and

bipartisan laws will be passed in the United States by the mere election of a candidate that understands both parties (Obama, 2007-51). However, the political systems of both countries are structured in a way where no one individual's decisions can make such a substantial difference due to checks and balances. What is more, in a globalized world, solutions to some of these issues may depend, to a certain degree, on decisions made by other countries' governments as well as on other multiple factors.

So, marketing candidates by creating the impression that many—if not all—of the nation's important issues can be fixed by a single individual's personality or values may create unrealistic expectations for citizens. Furthermore, complex issues are simplified in a way that they can be perceived as able to be solved by one person, the all mighty candidate.

In response to RQ1 and RQ2, an analysis of the frames associated with female and minority candidates and how they are different or similar to the frames associated with the rest of the candidates (RQ1 and RQ2), will be provided below. In the same way, I will analyze the extent to which the frames associated with female and minority candidates are different or similar in Mexican and U.S. political advertising (RQ2a).

Clinton, Mercado and Obama tended to use the *Protector* frame. This was one of the similarities between these candidates. They presented themselves in a paternalistic light, caring about families, protecting citizens from corporate greed and corruption, and unifying people in the country. Within the *Protector* frame, the three candidates tended to associate themselves with the following sub-frames: *Good family person*, *People's candidate*, *Conciliator*, and *Trustworthy* (see Table 4.17). This means that the three candidates portrayed themselves as family oriented, honest, ethical, peacemakers, and caring about people.

The existent gender and race stereotypes can explain why male and minority candidates use the *Protector* frame. First, women candidates tend to be seen as more caring, honest, understanding and tend to be more associated with family, which can be an advantage politically speaking (Carlin & Winfrey, 2009). So, their use of the frame *Protector* helps them to emphasize those characteristics. Specifically in the case of Clinton, she needed to portray a “softer” image since her strategies to appear powerful and strong brought negative results for her campaign (Carlin & Winfrey, 2009). According to Carlin and Winfrey (2009), Clinton was seen as “the woman who simply wouldn’t go away,” a perception Clinton struggled to correct (Carlin & Winfrey, 2009, p. 331).

Even when Mercado use the same sub-frames used by Clinton, there were some significant differences. Mercado used the *Good Family Person* sub-frame but she avoided to position herself in a family environment. According to Carlin and Winfrey (2009), the association of women candidates with family environments can also have negative effects. Their ability to perform a leadership role in the so called public arena can be questioned if women are associated with family, motherhood or emotional matters. Moreover, the image of the “super mom,” that is the woman that works and has children, is usually seen as unattainable and more for women who make public their mother responsibilities. Women are seen as not capable of combining a professional career with motherhood (Carlin & Winfrey, 2009). Actually, Mercado was praised for being discrete about her family life and for keeping it separated from her professional career (Sevilla, 2006). Considering this, Mercado’s strategy seems appropriate. Besides, she did not need to “soften” her image in the way that Clinton needed it.

As for Obama, the use of the *Protector* frame shows him as different from the negative stereotypes that portray African Americans as not associated with family environments, and as violent, dangerous or threatening (Bristor, Lee & Hunt, 1995; Oliver, 2003).

In contrast, the use of the sub-frames of the *Protector* frame was not consistent among the rest of the candidates. Calderón, Madrazo and McCain were the only candidates that used all of the sub-frames that were used by the female and minority candidates. Edwards used all of them except for the *Conciliator* sub-frame. Obrador used the *People's candidate* and the *Trustworthy* sub-frames. Dodd, Huckabee, Romney and Campa only used the *Good family person* sub-frame, Biden and Thompson only used the *Trustworthy* sub-frame, and Giuliani did not use the *Protector* frame at all.

It is possible that the use of sub-frames by candidates that are not women or minorities is determined by factors that are not as related to their gender and/or race as they are in the case of female and minority candidates. Female and minority candidates' political advertising seem to be directed to respond to the gender and race stereotypes existent in society in addition to other factors or circumstances surrounding their campaigns. In contrast, the political advertising of the rest of the candidates seems to respond directly to factors or circumstances surrounding their campaigns. In other words, White and mestizo males need to show to the audience that they will be good presidents; while female and minority candidates need to show that they will be good presidents and, in addition, that they do not fit any gender or race stereotype.

The *Enduring Strength* frame was only used by Clinton and Mercado but not by Obama. Both female politicians presented themselves as having the strength to manage the presidency in difficult times. This reaffirms the results of previous research that showed evidence that female candidates tend to emphasize their capacity of managing difficult situations as a strategy to avoid

a possible gender bias in the audience (Kaid, 2006). This is done specifically as a way to avoid the “pet” stereotype, which is the perception that women are weak or not able to handle difficult situations (Carlin & Winfrey, 2009). However, Clinton and Mercado tended not to use the *Consistent, Military Pride, Toughness-Foreign Policy and Pointing Fingers* sub-frames (see Table 4.17), which means that the emphasis in their strength was not focused on not agreeing with other political ideologies, presenting themselves as military heroes, or taking strong measures on international issues.

This is not surprising, this kind of portrayal of women candidates can be seen as “too tough” or “too masculine” and can evoke what these authors called “the iron maiden” image (Carlin and Winfrey, 2009, p. 328). This image does not represent a political advantage for women because “women who exhibit too many masculine traits are often ridiculed and lose trust because they are going against type or play into male political stereotypes that voters are rejecting” (Carlin & Winfrey, 2009, p. 328).

In the case of Clinton, she was already seen as “too aggressive.” So, the use of the *Consistent, Military Pride* and *Toughness-Foreign Policy* sub-frames would not have been a good idea and did not seem to be part of her strategy. The media started to point to the desperate attempts of her campaign for “humanizing” her image (Carlin & Winfrey, 2009). At some point in her campaign, Clinton mixed the mother and the commander in chief images together, perhaps trying to show a balance between “masculine” and “feminine” traits. The result was not favorable; the ads showed children sleeping in their rooms while the voiceover asked who the audience wanted to answer the phone in the White House at 3 a.m. Then, Clinton was shown answering the phone in her office (Carlin & Winfrey, 2009). Even when the ad was meant to highlight Clinton’s experience and her motherly concern for children’s well-being, the reaction it

got from the audience was mostly one of fear (Carlin & Winfrey, 2009). This is just one example of the challenges that gender stereotypes represent for women candidates.

Mercado, on the other hand, was not seen as too aggressive or threatening (Sevilla, 2006) and made use of the *Toughness-Domestic Policy* sub-frame. She portrayed herself as strong, but not “too strong,” as the *Consistent*, *Military Pride*, *Toughness-Foreign Policy* and *Pointing Fingers* sub-frames may have done. Besides, the use of the *Military Pride* sub-frame would have been odd in a country where having a military background is not an important political advantage for a presidential candidate.

Obama did not use the *Enduring Strength* frame at all. Given that in news media, African Americans are more likely to be associated with criminality, violence and danger (Oliver, 2003). It is possible that Obama avoided emphasizing a tough and forceful image in his ads that could have reminded the audience of stereotypes that associate African Americans with violent and intimidating behavior.

There is a certain pattern in the use of the *Enduring Strength* frame among White and mestizo male candidates. All of the candidates that tended to use the *Consistent*, the *Military Pride* and the *Toughness-Foreign Policy* sub-frames were U.S. candidates from the Republican Party. In the case of the *Military Pride* sub-frame, it is not unexpected or surprising result of the political agenda that the Republican Party has for managing international conflicts and immigration.

The *Pointing Fingers* sub-frame tended to be used only by Mexican candidates. It is important to say that some of the reasoning devices for this sub-frame contain a racist rationale. However, as it has been addressed in the literature review, one of the foundational myths of the Mexican nation is that Mexico is a one-race nation, a mestizo nation. Since there is a widespread

belief that there is only one-race in Mexico and there is little awareness of the racial and ethnic diversity in the country, racism is not an issue in the mainstream political discourse. Thus, racist remarks in the Mexican media are not usually subject of controversy. In contrast, race is often a topic of discussion in U.S. political discourse. That can explain why none of the U.S. candidates associated themselves to the *Pointing Fingers* sub-frame. The *Know How* frame was predominantly used by Clinton and Obama, they made use of the *Knowledge/Experience* sub-frame to present themselves as having the knowledge and the experience to manage the country. In the case of Clinton, her competence was rarely questioned (Carlin & Winfrey, 2009). However, the use of the Knowledge/Experience sub-frame could have responded to the sexist comments that she was object of. According to Carlin and Winfrey (2009, p. 339):

Her competence could not overcome a considerable amount of personal and political baggage. Unfortunately, because she is “intimidating” to some and she chose a masculine leadership style to prove she could be commander-in-chief, she was seen as fair game for sexist attacks.

Chris Matthews for example, stated during the campaign that Clinton’s successful political career was the result of her husband’s known affair (Carlin & Winfrey, 2009).

In the case of Obama, he was subject of Clinton’s attacks about his lack of experience. So, the use of the Knowledge/Experience sub-frame could have in part responded to this (Carlin & Winfrey, 2009)

Neither Clinton nor Obama used the *Business Approach* sub-frame that would have associated them with the private sector. The *Business Approach* frame would have been difficult to use by Clinton and Obama since they presented themselves on the side of people and not on the side of corporations. Mercado did not use the Know How frame at all. Some of the Mexican ads that emphasized the experience of the candidates associated the candidates with the

experience that their parties had in the political arena. However, Mercado's party was newly created and it could have been difficult to use the same framing device in her case.

It is interesting that only two White and mestizo male candidates, Dodd and López respectively, used the *Knowledge/Experience* sub-frame. Possibly because the knowledge and the experience of White and mestizo male candidates is a given and does not need to be established. However, more research should be done in order to find evidence that supports this theory.

As for the *Business Approach* sub-frame, only Romney and Calderón associated themselves with it. Romney, on the one side, had a strong business background and in the case of Calderón, the PAN party is associated with the business elite in Mexico (Flores Olea, 2010).

Clinton, Mercado and Obama used the *Reformer* frame. They presented themselves as interested in changing old political dynamics to solve the problems in the country. In this sense, the *New Politics* sub-frame fitted these three candidates perfectly. Many voters in Mexico and the United States wanted a change in politics. It is possible that the female candidates represented a change. Since their presence as presidential candidates is still rare, they could have been seen as something new and different (Carlin & Winfrey, 2009). Also, breaking the gender barrier could have been part of this perceived change. In the case of Obama, an African American presidential candidate was also very rare in the U.S. political scene. So, he could have represented something new too, as well as the possibility to break the race barrier. However, more research should be done in order to find evidence that supports this theory.

Only Mercado and Obama used the *Activist* sub-frame that showed them as fighting against inequalities in their countries (see Table 4.17). The only sub-frame used by Mercado and

not used by Clinton was actually the *Activist*, where Mercado specifically portrays herself as aware of the social inequalities of her country and as an active fighter against them.

The *New Politics* sub-frame was also used by Campa, Romney and Calderón. However, they used it differently than female and minority candidates. They portrayed themselves as something innovative in politics, but it is possible that they did not represent the kind of social change that female and minority candidates represented. In the case of Campa, he was running on the ticket of a party of new creation and the reasoning devices of his ads were oriented to show that he was the “newest” option. In the case of Romney, he presented himself as someone that would bring new solutions to the country issues, and in the case of Calderón, he portrayed himself as someone that would improve Mexico.

The *Charisma* frame was used by Obama more extensively than by Clinton. He showed himself as liked by people and as “real.” Clinton only portrayed herself as liked by people and Mercado did not use this frame at all. This frame may have been difficult to use by Mercado since her party was a newly created one. From the rest of the candidates, only López, Calderón and Edwards used the *Charisma* frame.

The *Religious Person* frame was only used by Clinton and Obama. They portrayed themselves as associated with religion. In both cases, the use of this sub-frame could have been directed to religious voters. But specifically in the case of Obama, the use of this frame could have been useful to respond to the circulating rumors that Obama was a Muslim (PBS, 2008).

This frame was not used by Mercado. The *Religion-Friendly* sub-frame, it would not have matched her strong position on favor of a secular state. Actually, Mercado’s position contrasted with the *Religion-friendly* sub-frame. Mercado stated, “Through our history, we have done some good things. We have for example a secular state, in which nobody can be imposed,

at least legally, with a way of thinking, a way of doing, a way of loving...” (Mercado, 2006-48). In this way, Mercado praised the establishment of a secular state as one of the good things that have been done in the history of Mexico. This presented Mercado as someone that strongly believes in the separation of Church and state and encourages people to think that she will not make any political decision based on religious values. Besides, the use of religious symbols and associations in political advertising are forbidden by the Mexican state. It is not rare then that none of the other Mexican candidates made use of the *Religion-friendly* sub-frame. As for the United States, only Huckabee and Thompson associated themselves with it.

Overall, female and minority candidates tended to associate themselves with the following sub-frames: *Good Family Person*, *Trustworthy*, *People’s Candidate*, *Conciliator*, *Popular*, *Knowledge/Experience*, and *New Politics* (see Table 4.17). It is important to say that female and minority candidates use many similar frames. This similarity is not shared with the rest of the candidates. About half of the White and mestizo candidates use the *Good Family Person*, the *People’s Candidate* and the *Trustworthy* sub-frames, but besides that, the use of the sub-frames is quite diverse.

It is possible that the similarity in the use of frames among female and minority candidates comes from the need to respond to specific gender and race stereotypes that already exist in society, in addition to the happenings surrounding the campaigns. In contrast, the use of sub-frames by the rest of the candidates can show a wider disparity because they do not need to respond to gender and race stereotypes attached to them. However, more research should be done in order to find evidence that could support or reject this theory.

It is also important to note that Clinton and Obama only differ in three of the sub-frames (see Table 4.17). Contrary to Clinton, Obama uses the *Authentic* and the *Activist* sub-frames and

he does not use the *Toughness-domestic policy* sub-frame. More specifically, Obama portrays himself as informal and spontaneous. Also, Obama portrays himself as aware of the discrimination to the Spanish speaking population and as a leader of the immigration reform. Clinton mentions at some point that she is against the “anti-Hispanic demagogy” (Clinton, 2008-19) that politicians use, but she does not develop the topic further.

Mercado uses many of the sub-frames also used by Clinton (see Table 4.17). The sub-frames used by Clinton but not used by Mercado are: *Knowledge/Experience*, *Popular*, and *Religion-friendly*. Again, the *Knowledge/Experience* frame and the *Popular* frame could have been difficult to use by Mercado, since her political party was a small party of new creation.

Nevertheless, there are some interesting portrayals of Clinton in the ads of some opposite candidates that are outside of the 16 sub-frames previously discussed. The first one portrayed her as superficial. In the ad, McCain criticized Clinton’s proposition of using one million dollars to open a Woodstock museum. The ad showed images of the Woodstock festival, specifically the image of a woman dancing in circles on the stage. Then, McCain said that he was sure that it was a “cultural and pharmaceutical event” but that he was not in the festival because he was “tied up” (McCain, 2007-107). The ad then showed an image of a younger McCain lying in a bed recovering from the wounds he got in the Vietnam War. The comparison between the images of a woman dancing in a music festival and the images of a McCain recovering from war wounds encourages audiences to believe that Clinton proposition was superficial. In another ad, McCain compares Clinton’s proposition with other propositions and constructions such as a bridge to nowhere. He calls the other propositions outrageous while he describes Clinton’s one as predictable. This implies that Clinton is expected to make superficial decisions.

Another portrayal of Clinton encourages audiences to believe that she had no experience because "she has never run anything, and the idea that she can warm up to be president as an internship doesn't make any sense." (Romney, 200-195). In this way, Clinton's experience, including her service as a New York Senator, is dismissed and Clinton is presented as "new" to the political arena.

In the same way, Hillary Clinton is often called by her first name instead of by her full name of by Senator Hillary Clinton. This is usually different for the male candidates, who are generally called by their full name or addressed by official titles. For example, Dodd did this when he said: "I don't know why you bring that up. Bill Richardson, Hillary, Joe Biden and I, we are all about the same age. I don't think the white hair is an issue" (Dodd, 2007-140).

There were no portrayals of Mercado out of the 16 sub-frames previously discussed. Consequently, there is no way to compare these portrayals. However, in summary, Mercado and Clinton have the similarity of using all of the frames grouped in the *Protector* frame. Also emphasizing their toughness in domestic policy (*Enduring Strength* frame), and presenting themselves as a change from old politics (*Reformer* frame).

There are no candidates in Mexico that identify themselves as members of any minority. For that reason, there is no way to compare the similarity and difference of the frames used by Obama in his ads. However, he used all of the sub-frames that Clinton also used, only adding the *Authentic* and the *Activist* sub-frames and avoiding the *Toughness-domestic policy* one. He also used most of the sub-frames used by Mercado, only avoiding the *Toughness-domestic policy* one and adding the *Knowledge/Experience*, *Popular*, *Authentic* and the *Religion-friendly* sub-frames (see Table 4.17).

Table 4.17
Predominant Sub-frames Used by Women and Minorities in their Political Ads

Frames	Hillary Clinton	Patricia Mercado	Barack Obama
Good Family Person	X	X	X
Trustworthy	X	X	X
People's Candidate	X	X	X
Conciliator	X	X	X
Consistent			
Military Pride			
Toughness-Domestic Policy	X	X	
Toughness-Foreign Policy			
Knowledge/Experience	X		X
Business Approach			
New Politics	X	X	X
Activist		X	X
Popular	X		X
Authentic			X
Religion-friendly	X		X

Role of Women and Minorities

After analyzing the frames associated with female and minority candidates. The investigator analyzed the frames associated with women and minorities other than the candidates in the ads in order to answer the question RQ2b. Also, to address question RQ3, the roles of women and minorities were analyzed as constructed in the political broadcast advertising of Mexico and the United States is and to what extent they are different or similar.

The role of women as constructed in the Mexican political advertising is tied to family and children. Women's interests are related to family and home and stereotypically "feminine roles." The principal motivation of women pursuing a career outside of their homes is to take care of their children and professional goals are not shown as important. The unequal participation of men in the family and in the care of their children is normalized in the same way that the unequal participation of women in the so called "public arena" is also normalized. In this sense, Mercado presents herself as a different role model, far from stereotypes and fighting against gender inequality.

In the case of Mexico, women are usually portrayed in stereotypically "feminine roles" and portrayed inside of their homes. For example, one of Madrazo's (2006-196) ads, showed the image of men engineers supervising the construction of a building with Madrazo. Then, an image of Madrazo talking to some women sewing clothes is shown. Many of Madrazo's ads showed images of mothers with their children and women talking about how worried they were about their sons and daughters. However, images of fathers with their children or worried about them are absent.

Calderón also used images of mothers with their children. Some of his ads use the images of boys playing soccer outside, playing with airplanes and playing to be firefighters while girls are shown dressed as princesses in pink, dancing and playing with a tea set inside of their home (Calderón, 2006-18). Calderón also showed fathers coming back home from work. In this case, women and girls are presented as doing stereotypically "feminine tasks." They are presented as responsible of children and tied to their family and their houses. This is made even clearer when in one ad Calderón said "I know that your worry as a working mom is your children, for that reason you will have day cares centers close to you" (Calderón, 2006-197). Day care, in all of

Calderón's ads that was mentioned, was only offered to working mothers, not to working fathers. Accordingly, women are presented as the ones responsible of taking care of their children. The same idea was also present in another ad where Calderón (2006-198) said "working woman: I am going to extend the daily school schedule until 5 in the afternoon. We will have children better taken care of and better Mexicans."

In this way, the idea is that only mothers are responsible of taking care of their children. Contrary to this, fathers are not portrayed as responsible for their children. Another of Calderón ads stated that "for working moms: flexible schedules and the national system of day care centers" (Calderón, 2006-148). He also said "I am talking to you: woman who heads a family. I know that you need to take care of your children, for that reason, you will have flexible work schedules" (Calderón, 2006-199).

In the U.S. ads, women tended to be less portrayed in "feminine roles." Also, images of fathers and mothers with their children are shown in many of the ads. However, there is an interesting ad from Romney in which his wife, Anne Romney, endorsed him by saying:

Mitt says his greater success is been able to say I have been a good father and a good husband ... I have been home with those 5 boys and it was rough ... He called home and reminded me that what I was doing was much more important that what he was doing ... Mitt says that there is no work more important than what was goes on within the four walls of and American home. (Romney, 2007-5)

In this way, Anne Romney endorsed her husband by using her husband's own words ("Mitt says"). So, Romney is a good father and a good husband because he says that family is important even though he does not, according to his wife, serve as the primary caretaker of his children. She also has to be reminded by him that her work is important. In this way, Mitt Romney's opinion is given privilege over Anne Romney's opinion.

Thus, the role of women as constructed in the U.S. political advertising is different from the Mexican political advertising but also has some similarities (RQ3). Women and men are more equally represented except for a few exceptions and Clinton presents herself also far from stereotypes. However, there are still some few stereotypical portrayals of her done by other candidates.

The role of minorities as constructed in Mexican political advertising is practically inexistent (RQ3), only indigenous peoples are mentioned on two occasions and they were portrayed as victimized. The role of minorities as constructed in the U.S. political advertising is inexistent for Native Americans too (RQ3). The only two minorities that exist in political advertising are Hispanics and Muslims and their role is to be foreigners, and even dangerous and threatening in some cases. There are few references to Hispanics and Muslims that portray them in a more humanized way.

There is no mention or portrayal of minorities in the Mexican ads with the exception of two ads. In one ad Mercado (2006-48) mentioned that "10 million indigenous people live each day under exclusion and racism " and in another ad she criticized the existent "inequality for indigenous people" (Mercado, 2006-48). Thus, the only two times that indigenous peoples were mentioned, they were presented as victimized, with no mention of the indigenous peoples' long and active struggle for their rights and without any space given to their voices.

In the U.S. ads there is no mention or portrayal of Native Americans at all. So, there is no point of comparison with the U.S. ads (RQ2). The only two minority groups portrayed in the U.S. ads are Hispanics and Muslims. In the case of Hispanics, White male candidates usually portray them as foreigners. The diverse composition of this group is usually simplified by using the broad term Hispanics to refer only to immigrants and undocumented immigrants. Also,

Hispanics are the only minority group tied to immigration and undocumented immigration in the ads. They are generally presented as problematic, since undocumented immigration is usually presented as a dangerous problem. Also, the Hispanic culture and the Spanish language are portrayed as threatening to American culture. Hispanics can only be recognized through military service, and even then, they will still not have a full recognition. Thus, Hispanics tend to be constructed in the ads as a “disobedient” minority, reaching to the point of portraying them as dangerous invaders not able or unwilling to embrace American culture.

Clinton and Obama had few ads portraying Hispanics. In these few ads, a different portrayal of Hispanics is used. For example, some ads show Hispanic families in their houses talking to the candidates. Also, in one of Obama’s ads it is explained that Hispanics are victims of discrimination. However, Hispanics were still presented as foreigners.

In the case of Muslims, Islam was usually associated with terrorism, violence, war, and danger in the White male candidates’ advertising. The words “Islamic” and “terrorist” usually went together in the ads.

It is also important to mention than men wearing turbans, women wearing veils and the Arabic language were also associated with terrorism and danger. For example, one of Biden’s ads proposed to keep "nuclear weapons out of the hands of terrorists" (Biden, 2008-200), while the ad showed images of two men with tunics and turbans carrying a missile launcher. In the same way, McCain warns that America is at risk while images of people with turbans and weapons were shown on the screen (McCain, 2007-106). Another McCain ad criticized Mitt Romney by saying that "Mitt Romney says ‘the next president doesn't need foreign policy experience’" (McCain, 2008-201). At the same time, the ad showed images of bombs exploding,

audio of someone speaking Arabic, wounded people, cars on fire, and people with turbans and guns.

Clinton and Obama did not use these framing devices, except for one ad of Obama in which he mentioned that America is held hostage of foreign oil while an image of a person with a turban is shown in the screen (Obama, 2008-2012).

Chapter V

Discussion and Conclusions

This dissertation provides an understanding of how the role of female and minority candidates is constructed in political advertising of Mexico and in the United States. In so doing, it also shows the way in which audiences are encouraged or discouraged to think about women and minorities in both countries and how these constructions are similar or different. One of the main findings of this study is emphasis on the candidates' personalities in contrast to messages about issues and policies.

First, it is important to note that the cult to the candidates' personality was extensively present in the ads. This has important implications since candidates were identified as the only ones that individually can solve all of the problems of the country. However, the political systems of both of these countries are not structured in a way that only one person can solve all of the issues in the country. There are several branches of government that are involved in these decisions. So, assigning candidates with the responsibility of fixing all of the relevant issues in the country is not viable and may create unrealistic expectations in the audience that are impossible to meet by the candidates.

It is also relevant to highlight that several elements of U.S. political marketing were extensively used in Mexican political advertising. This reinforces the idea that political advertising in Mexico has been "Americanized" to a certain degree.

There was certain similarity in the use of frames among female and minority candidates. It is possible that this similarity comes from the common need of these candidates to respond to specific gender and race stereotypes that already exist in society, in addition to the happenings surrounding their campaigns. In contrast, the use of sub-frames by the rest of the candidates is

not as similar, perhaps because White and mestizo male candidates do not need to respond to gender and race stereotypes attached to them. In other words, it seems that White and mestizo candidates can be presented as gender-free or race-free, while female and minority candidates cannot detach from their gender and race, or better said, from the stereotypes associated with their gender and race. However, more research should be done in order to find evidence that could support or reject this theory.

Also, it is important to notice Clinton and Obama created political ads that were mostly gender and race-free in the sense that they did not directly address issues of gender and race in the discourse of their political ads. However, their use of the sub-frames seems to respond to gender and race stereotypes. This reinforces the idea that there is a level of denial that sexism and racism are a problem in society (Carlin & Winfrey, 2009) and that female and minority candidates could be limited by society to a political discourse that does not challenge the status quo. This is the case even when these female and minority candidates come from a very privileged background, as it is the case of Clinton, Mercado, and Obama. Also, more research should be done in order to find evidence that could support or reject this theory.

In the same way, it is important to mention the *Pointing fingers* frame used by Calderón in which he associated López with the concept of the *sanctioned Indian* (Hale, 2004). López did not present himself explicitly as a defender of indigenous peoples, but he presented himself as a defender of people in poverty in the country. This association implies that there are not only limits for the political participation of indigenous peoples in Mexico, but that there are also limits for the political participation of people in situation of poverty.

Another finding is the few and stereotypical representations of minorities in the political ads of both countries. In the case of Mexico, there was only a brief mention in two of Mercado's

ads about the inequality that affects indigenous peoples in Mexico (Mercado, 2006-48, 76). In these two brief references, indigenous peoples were presented as victims of discrimination. Connolly-Ahern & Castells i Talens (2010) found evidence of similar portrayals of indigenous peoples in Guatemala's political advertising, where indigenous peoples were also presented as passive and victims. Accordingly, indigenous peoples in the political advertising of Mexico had no role in the political discourse. This is despite the indigenous peoples' long and active fight to get their rights recognized. For example, some indigenous peoples launched the "Otra Campaña" (The Other Campaign) movement at a national level just some months before the electoral process of 2006 (Hernández Castillo, 2006). However, this was not addressed in the political projects of most of the candidates.

In the U. S. ads, Native Americans were not even mentioned. The issues specifically related to this group were totally absent from the ads. Thus, Native Americans were not considered part of the national discourse.

The exclusion of indigenous peoples from the public arena and their stereotypical portrayals in the media is not new and has been associated with their symbolic annihilation (Merskin, 2011; Rodríguez, 2001). In this case, the absence and stereotyping of indigenous peoples in political advertising reinforces their symbolic annihilation by discouraging audiences from thinking that they are active and relevant in the political discourse.

For African Americans, the frames used by Obama to present himself represent a change from the negative and stereotypical portrayals of African Americans in the media. The *Family Person*, *Trustworthy*, *People's candidate* and *Conciliator* frames used by Obama contrast with stereotypical representations of African Americans as not family oriented and violent (Bristor, Lee & Hunt, 1995; Oliver, 2003). In fact, Obama is presented as close to his family, caring about

people and families, avoiding frames that portray him as though and looking for ways to unite and generate agreements between people. Moreover, the *People's candidates* frame positioned him as a protector of people and consequently as someone with the power to help people.

This represents a very different portrayal from the stereotypical association of African Americans to positions of economic and social subordination (Bristor, Lee & Hunt, 1995). Obama then is presented as someone privileged that will use that privilege to protect people's interests. Also, the *Popular* and *Authentic* frames he used, challenged stereotypical representations of African Americans as marginalized and ignored (Bristor, Lee & Hunt, 1995). Obama is presented as someone liked by people, popular, and in the center of the attention as the protagonist. Someone that can be genuine and informal but that is always in a position of power.

Thus, the frames used by Obama challenged the negative and stereotypical portrayals of African Americans existent in the media. However, aside from Obama, there were no other representations of African Americans in the ads. Also, none of the candidates, Obama included, explicitly mentioned African Americans as part of their political discourse (Smith & King, 2009). Even though Obama used the Activist frame by identifying himself as a civil rights activist, he made no reference to the dramatic racial inequalities still present in the United States. In this sense, his position over racial inequalities was vague enough to encourage both, defenders of race conscious policies and color-blind advocates, to think that Obama would be on their side.

Consequently, the U.S. ads were "race-free" in the sense that there were no explicit references to race or promises of policies that targeted racial inequality. In this sense, they fit better with the ideas of color-blind proponents.

The Mexican ads were also "race free," there was no mention of racial minorities in the country. In the specific case of African Mexicans, their absence in the ads matches the broad

nationalistic discourse in Mexico, which assumes that Mexico is a mestizo nation where African Mexicans have no space to exist (Vaughn, 2005). African Mexicans are not even victimized as indigenous peoples; they simply do not exist in the nation according to the political ads.

The only two minorities, not racial, that were explicitly mentioned in the U.S. ads were Muslims and Hispanics. Both of these groups were stereotyped and presented in a negative way. Muslims and Hispanics were portrayed as foreigners and as not part of the American culture. The religion of Islam was associated with terrorism and danger, and it was portrayed as threatening for the country. As for Hispanics, they were shown as a cultural threat. They were presented mainly as immigrants and undocumented immigrants coming from the U.S.-Mexican border. Hispanics were also presented as dangerous invaders. Thus, the diversity of the Hispanic population was not recognized and they were seen as not part of the American culture. Even more, they were shown as unable or unwilling to embrace American culture and English language. In the specific case where Hispanics received social recognition, it was just because of their participation in the military. Even then, they were still presented as foreigners, inferior and in need to be reprimanded by “American” society. Hispanics then, were shown as a “disobedient minority” that needs to be punished and educated.

A similar representation of a “disobedient” minority in Mexico was the allusion to the *sanctioned Indian* previously mentioned. Also, terrorism and immigration were not topics present in the Mexican ads. The only topic related to immigration/migration was the migration of people from Mexico to the United States. Usually the candidates presented the U.S. Mexican border as dangerous for Mexican migrants and addressed the need to protect the rights and the well-being of Mexicans that cross it. They also presented the need to create more jobs in Mexico, so Mexicans do not have to take the risks associated with migrating to the United States.

Clinton and Obama presented a different portrayal of Hispanics in only few of their ads and did not mention the Islam religion or Muslims in their ads. In the case of Hispanics, they were presented as people and even victimized. They were not shown as invaders but they were still presented as foreigners.

In sum, Mercado, Clinton and Obama were some of the candidates that presented portrayals of minorities and those portrayals were usually less negative than the ones presented by other candidates. In the case of Mexico, Mercado was the only one that addressed minorities in her ads.

In the case of women, Clinton and Mercado used many similar frames and sub-frames in their ads. However, they had important differences in the use of framing devices. For instance, when using the *Good family person* sub-frame, Clinton made use of framing devices that associated her with her family and the values of her family. She also associated herself with other families and portrayed herself as caring about the families in the country. In the case of Mercado, she did not associate herself with her family, with the values of her family, or other families, she only used framing devices that portrayed her as caring for children.

This strategy of Mercado had some differences with the frames that her opposing male candidates used to present women in their ads. With the exception of Mercado, candidates in Mexico tended to portray women in a family environment and/or as only caring about their families and children. This resembles the findings of previous studies that found that women that were described as “good” in the Mexican media were confined to the private sphere (Hinds & Tatum, 1984). It also matches the association of women with the values represented by the mythical mother figure of the Virgin of Guadalupe that is present in Mexico’s national foundational myth (Brown, 1997). Accordingly, “good” women in these political ads were also

associated with motherhood and family values and described as selfless and dedicated to their children (Brown, 1997). Considering this, the national foundational myth was still present in the ads (Taylor, 2006).

Women were also described as the only ones responsible of taking care of their children. Men were not portrayed as caring for their children or as having them being the source of their worry and motivation. Men were usually presented as workers, peasants, professionals, athletes, students, husbands and fathers (although as fathers, they tend to be presented only as providers). Accordingly, the role of men in Mexico as constructed in political ads did present a more complex picture of the participation of men in Mexican society. In contrast, the participation of women in Mexican society was reduced to the figures of mother and wife. It is also important to notice that no space was given in the ads to women members of ethnic or racial minorities.

Women's personal and professional ambitions and goals were never mentioned. For working mothers, their motivations and worries were only related to their families and children. Thus, the role of women in Mexican political advertising was constructed in a way that opens little space for representations that show women in roles different from mothers and wives. Mercado was the only woman that was presented differently in the Mexican ads. Even though she portrayed herself as a protector of children, she did not associate herself with her family or other families. Her family was never mentioned in her ads and she presented herself as motivated by reasons different from their family and children, such as the fight against inequality. Also, her role as a presidential candidate was per se a very different role from the roles of mother and wife in which other women were presented in the ads.

In the U.S. ads, women roles in society were not as defined by gender as they were in the Mexican ads. Women were presented as mothers, soldiers, waiters, doctors, nurses, daughters,

politicians and government officers, among other roles. Some of these women were shown endorsing the candidates. Thus, the role of women in the U.S. ads was constructed in a manner that it presented a more complex picture of the participation of women in the U.S. society than the one presented in the Mexican ads. However, it is important to notice that this was different for women of color. Maya Angelou, Maya Soetoro-Ng and Michelle Obama are the few women of color that were presented as endorsing candidates. Maya Angelou endorsed Clinton while Maya Soetoro-Ng and Michelle Obama endorsed Obama. No other candidates were endorsed by women of color.

Mercado and Clinton used very similar frames in their ads, although Mercado did not use the *Knowledge/Experience*, the *Popular* and the *Religion-friendly* sub-frames. The first two were possibly difficult to use for her since several candidates used framing devices that associate themselves with the political experience that their party had. In the case of Mercado, her political party was a small one of new creation. This also could have made it difficult for her to use framing devices that associated her with large crowds or with successful results in the polls. As for the *Religion-friendly* sub-frame, it would have not matched Mercado's strong position that favors a secular state. Besides, the law in Mexico forbids parties and candidates from associating themselves with any religion (COFIPE, 2008). So it is very unlikely to find this frame in any Mexican ad. Actually that frame was only present in U.S. ads.

There were also some representations in both the U.S. and the Mexican ads that reinforced stereotypical conceptions of women. McCain's presented Clinton as superficial by describing her plan to fund a Woodstock museum as shallow and her position on that as predictable. In the same way, Romney presented Clinton as new to the political sphere and dismissed her experience in this area by saying that Clinton had never run anything in her life

and that she wanted to use the presidency as an internship. Clinton was also denied the formality that was given to male candidates. She was called by her first name in many of the ads, while male candidates were called by their full names or by their official positions. As for other women in the ads, it is also important to notice an ad from Romney where his wife, Anne Romney, endorses him. She endorses him not by using her own words and thoughts but by quoting Mitt Romney's words and thoughts about himself, encouraging the audience to think that Anne Romney's opinion is not important and what is important is what Romney thinks about himself.

In summary, the role of women as constructed in political ads presents a plain and unequal image of the participation of women in Mexican society. Women's experiences and interests are reduced to the family environment in which women are portrayed as having most of the weight in the responsibility of its well being. In the same way, the experiences and interests of women members of minorities are excluded from the image. In the case of the United States, the role of women as constructed in political ads presents a more complex picture of the participation of women in society. However, there are still subtle stereotyped portrayals of women and there is little inclusion of the experiences and interests of women members of minorities. This is important since the representation, exclusion or little inclusion of women and minorities may influence how these groups are perceived by the public, the public's beliefs and attitudes toward policies that affect them, and also the groups' self-perception (Connolly-Ahern & Castells i Talens, 2010).

Limitations and Future Research

The findings of this study should be taken within the specific moment in history in which the elections took place. Some specific issues surrounding the elections may have had an effect

in the frames that candidates used to portray themselves. Further research should be done in order to understand how different issues and circumstances, such as war, peace, economic crisis, or economic growth affect the frames that candidates select to present themselves. Also, further research can be done in order to understand how frames change with time and which ones prevail and which ones fade.

Another limitation of this study is that it cannot establish if audiences accepted the frames identified. Further research can be done to determine frames for women and minorities other than the candidates in political advertising. Another topic of future research is if the frames discussed in this dissertation have an effect in audiences' perceptions of candidates and in the perception of women and minorities. Also, further research can be done in order to establish how the frames identified in this study affect viewers' perceptions of policies directed toward women and minorities and also on how these frames affect women and minorities' self-perception.

Also, the frames used by Obama could not be compared cross-culturally since there were no representations of African Mexicans in the Mexican ads. In the same way, cross-cultural comparisons of representations of Muslims and Hispanics were not possible since there were no representations of Muslims in the Mexican ads and Hispanics are not considered a minority in the. Cross-cultural comparisons of portrayals of indigenous peoples were not doable since there were few references to indigenous peoples in the Mexican ads and not a single one in the U.S. ads.

This study cannot determine either the way in which candidates intended to portray themselves in their messages. Consequently, it cannot determine if the frames identified in this dissertation are similar or different to the how they wanted to present themselves to the audiences. Research that compares intended portrayals of the candidates with the frames

identified in this study is technically doable. However, the availability of the data needed for such a study will depend of the willingness of the candidates to disclose their campaigns' strategies.

REFERENCES

- Aceves, F. (2009). Elecciones, medios y publicidad política en América Latina: Los claroscuros de su regulación. *Comunicación y Sociedad*, 37(11/36).
- Aceves, F. (2000). La investigación académica sobre el papel de los medios de comunicación en los procesos electorales de México. *Comunicación y Sociedad*, 37(11/36).
- Acosta Riveros, F. (2011, March 23). Rosario Ibarra, promotora de la unidad. *La Jornada Jalisco*. Retrieved from <http://archivo.lajornadajalisco.com.mx/2011/03/23/index.php?section=politica&article=004a1pol>
- Alia, V. (2009). Outlaws and citizens: indigenous people and the 'New Media Nation'. *International Journal of Media & Cultural Politics*, 5(1/2).
- Altheide, D. L. (1996). *Qualitative media analysis* (Vol. 38). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Becerra-Acosta, J. P. (2012, January 26). Las mujeres que no llegaron. *Milenio Semanal*. Retrieved from <http://www.msemanal.com/node/5329>
- Berkhofer, R. (1979). *The White man's Indian: Images of the American Indian, from Columbus to the present*. New York: Vintage.
- Berlín Villafana, I. (2006), México: Campañas electorales americanizadas. *Chasqui*, 96: 46–51.
- Bernard, H. R. & Ryan, G. W. (2010). *Analyzing qualitative data: Systematic approaches*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Bird, S. (1999), Gendered construction of the American Indian in popular media. *Journal of Communication*, 49: 61–83.
- Bristor, J. M., Lee, R.G. & Hunt M. R. (1995), Race and ideology: African American images in television advertising. *Journal of Public Policy and Marketing*, 14(1): 48–59.
- Brown, J. (1980). *Ethnicity and the American short story*. New York: Garland.
- Burrell, K. (2010). Political parties and women's organizations: Bringing women into the electoral arena. In S. J. Carroll & R. L. Fox (Eds.). *Gender and elections: Shaping the future of American politics* (pp. 210-238). NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Butler, R. (2009). Momentum in the 2008 presidential contests. *Polity*, 41(3): 331-344.
- Bystrom, (2010). Advertising, web sites and media coverage: Gender and communication along the campaign trail. In S. J. Carroll & R. L. Fox (Eds.). *Gender and elections: Shaping the future of American politics* (pp. 239-262). NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Bystrom, D. G. & Kaid, L. L. (2002). Are women candidates transforming campaign communication? A comparison of advertising videostyles in the 1990. In C. S. Rosenthal (Ed.). *Women transforming Congress* (pp. 146-169). Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

- Campbell, M. (2006, June 29). The Mexican woman running for president: Mercado emphasizes issues the major candidates avoid. *San Francisco Chronicle*. Retrieved from <http://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/560/01/>
- Cardoza, M. (2005, May 2). Rosario Ibarra de Piedra: Paradigma materno ante la ignominia. *La Jornada*. Retrieved http://www.jornada.unam.mx/2005/05/02/informacion/81_rosario.htm
- Carlin, D. B. & Winfrey, K. L. (2009). Have you come a long way, baby? Hillary Clinton, Sarah Palin, and sexism in 2008 campaign coverage. *Communication Studies*, 60(4): 326–343.
- Carroll, J. (2007, November 16). Clinton sustains huge lead in democratic nomination race. *Gallup*. Retrieved from <http://www.gallup.com/poll/102799/clinton-sustains-huge-lead-democratic-nomination-race.aspx>
- Carroll, S. J. & Dittmar, K. (2010). The 2008 candidacies of Hillary Clinton and Sarah Palin: Cracking the highest, hardest glass ceiling. In S. J. Carroll & R. L. Fox (Eds.). *Gender and elections: Shaping the future of American politics* (pp. 44-77). NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Chan, T., Berg, P.P., Fung, A. Y., Kedl, K. D., Luther, C. A. & Szuba, J. (2001). Comparing nations in mass communication research, 1970-97: A critical assessment of how we know what we know. *International Communication Gazette*, 63(5): 415-434.
- Chan, C., & Hitchon, J. C. B. (2004). When does gender count? Further insights into gender schematic processing for female candidates' political advertisements. *Sex Roles*, 51(3/4):197-208.
- Carrasco, P. (1997). Indian-Spanish marriages in the first century of the colony. In S. Schroeder, S. Wood & R. Haskett (Eds.). *Indian Women of Early Mexico*. (pp. 87-104). Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.
- CAWP (2008). Women presidential and vice presidential candidates. *Center for American Women and Politics*. Retrieved from http://www.cawp.rutgers.edu/fast_facts/levels_of_office/documents/prescand.pdf
- CNN (2012, February 6). Las mujeres que han intentado gobernar México. *CNN*. Retrieved from <http://mexico.cnn.com/nacional/2012/02/06/cecilia-soto-la-candidata-que-dio-vida-al-pt>
- COFIPE (2008). Código Federal de Instituciones y Procedimientos Electorales. *Instituto Federal Electoral*. Retrieved from <http://www.eleccionesenmexico.org.mx/pdf/REG2.pdf>
- Cohen, S. (2002) *Folk Devils and moral panics: The creation of the mods and rockers*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Collins, P. H. (2000). *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment*. New York: Routledge.
- Connolly-Ahern, C., & Castells i Talens, A. (2010). The role of indigenous peoples in Guatemalan political advertisements: An ethnographic content analysis. *Communication, Culture and Critique*, 3(3): 310-333.
- Consulta Mitofsky (2006, July 20). General format. Retrieved from http://www.ife.org.mx/documentos/proceso_2005-2006/encuestas_2006/EncSalida_ConteoRap/encuestas_entregadas/CONSULTAMITOFSKY-ES.pdf

- De Albuquerque, A. (2008). On Models and Margins: Comparative Media Models Viewed from a Brazilian Perspective. Unpublished manuscript presented at the seminar "Comparing media systems beyond the Western World" San Diego, September 2008.
- de Buen, N. (2011, July 10). Las elecciones y el sindicalismo. *La Jornada*. Retrieved from <http://www.jornada.unam.mx/2011/07/10/politica/021a1pol>
- Dimitrova, D. & Bugeja, M. (2007), The half-life of internet references cited in communication journals. *New Media & Society*, 9(5): 811–826.
- Duerst-Lahti, C. (2010). Presidential elections: Gendered space and the case of 2008. In S. J. Carroll & R. L. Fox (Eds.). *Gender and elections: Shaping the future of American politics* (pp. 13-43). NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Entman, R. M. (1993), Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. *Journal of Communication*, 43: 51–58.
- Espejo-Ponce Hunt M., & Restall, M. (1997). Work, marriage and status: Maya women of colonial Yucatan. In S. S. Schroeder, S. Wood & R. Haskett (Eds.). *Indian Women of Early Mexico* (pp. 231-254). Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.
- EZLN (2005, June). Sexta Declaración de la Selva Lacandona. *Ejército Zapatista de Liberación Nacional*. Retrieved from <http://enlacezapatista.ezln.org.mx/sdsl-es/>
- Falk, E. (2010). *Women for president*. Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Feeley, D. (2008). The Obama-Clinton Contest: Liberation Movements in Conflict?. *Against The Current*, 23(1): 7-9.
- Fiske, J. (1986). Television and popular culture: Reflections on British and Australian critical practice. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, 3:200-216.
- Flores Olea, V. (2010, September 13). El PAN contra los centenarios. *La Jornada*. Retrieved from <http://www.jornada.unam..mx/2010/09/13/opinion/023a2pol>
- Franco, I. (2010, August 19). 10 mexicanos que cuestionaron al gobierno. *CNN México*. Retrieved from <http://mexico.cnn.com/bicentenario/2010/08/19/rosario-ibarra-de-piedra>
- Gallagher, M. (2001). Feminist media perspectives. In A. Valdivia (Ed.), *Companion to media studies*. (pp.19-39). Oxford, England: Blackwell.
- Gamson, W. A. & Modigliani, A. Media discourse and public opinion on nuclear power: A constructionist approach. *American Journal of Sociology*, 95(1): 1-37.
- Galtun, E. (1990). Theory formation in social research. In E. Oyen (Ed.) *Comparative methodology: Theory and practice in international social research* (pp.96-112). Newbury Park, CA: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Givhan, R. (2007, July 20). Hillary Clinton's tentative dip into neckline territory. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007/07/19/AR2007071902668.html>

- Glaser, B. G. & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Chicago: Aldine.
- Grajeda, E. (2005, March 28). La mujer detrás del “no al desafuero”. *El Universal*. Retrieved from http://www2.eluniversal.com.mx/pls/impreso/noticia.html?id_nota=274
- Gutiérrez Chong, N. (1995). Miscegenation as nation-building: Indian and immigrant women in Mexico. In N. Yuval-Davis & Stasiulis, D. (Eds.) *Unsettling settler societies: Articulations of gender, race, ethnicity and class* (pp. 161-188). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Gutiérrez Chong, N. (2003). La autonomía y la resolución de conflictos étnicos. Una perspectiva de los Acuerdos de San Andrés Larráinzar, *Nueva Antropología*, 63(19): 11–39.
- Hale, C. (2004, October). *El protagonismo indígena, las políticas estatales y el nuevo racismo en la época del ‘indio permitido’*. Paper presented at the conference “Construyendo la paz: Guatemala desde un enfoque comparado”. The United Nations Verification Mission in Guatemala (MINUGUA).
- Hallin, D., & Mancini, P. (2004). *Comparing Media Systems*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Healy, P. (2007, September 28). Laughing matters. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com/2007/09/28/us/politics/28web-healy.html>
- Hernández Castillo, R. A. (2006). The indigenous movement in Mexico: Between electoral politics and local resistance. *Latin American Perspectives*, 33(2): 115-131.
- Hinds, H. E. & Tatum, C. (1984). Images of women in Mexican comic books. *Journal of Popular Culture*, 18(1): 146-163.
- IFE (2006, May 11). Encuestas y resultados electorales. *Instituto Federal Electoral*. Retrieved from http://www.ife.org.mx/documentos/proceso_2005-2006/cuadernos/inicio.html
- IFE-INFOMEX (2010). INFOMEX. *Instituto Federal Electoral*. Retrieved from <https://ciudadania.ife.org.mx/infomex/ActionInitSAILoginINFOMEX.do>
- IJ-UNAM (2012, Feb 9). Constitución Política de los Estados Unidos Mexicanos. *Instituto de Investigaciones Jurídicas de la Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México*. Retrieved from <http://info4.juridicas.unam.mx/ijure/fed/9/7.htm?s=>
- Imaginería (2009). *Imaginería Casa de Publicidad*. Retrieved from <http://www.youtube.com/user/ImagineriaPublicidad>
- INEGI (2010). *Instituto Nacional de Estadística y Geografía*. Retrieved from <http://www.inegi.org.mx/Sistemas/temasV2/Default.aspx?s=est&c=21702>
- Judd, B., & Copley, S. (1971). *Meanings of history*. New York: American Heritage Publishing.
- Kaid, L. L. & Holtz-Bacha, C. (2006). Television advertising and democratic systems around the world. In L. L. Kaid & C. Holtz-Bacha (Eds.). *Handbook of political advertising* (pp. 445-457). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

- Kaid, L. L. (2006). Political advertising in the United States. In L. L. Kaid & C. Holtz-Bacha (Eds.). *Handbook of political advertising* (pp. 37-61). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Kaid, L. L. (2004). Political advertising. In L. L. Kaid (Ed.). *Handbook of political communication research* (pp. 155-202). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Kaid, L. L. (2001). *Videostyle in presidential campaigns*. Westport, CT: Praeger/Greenwood.
- Kaid, L.L. & Davidson, D. K. (1986) Elements of videostyle: A preliminary examination of candidate presentation through televised advertising. In L.L. Kaid & D. Nimo & K.R. Sanders (Eds.), *New perspectives on political advertising*. (pp.184-209). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Kaid, L.L. & Johnston A. (2001). *Videostyle in presidential campaigns: Style and content of televised political advertising*. Westport, CT: Praeger/Greenwood.
- Kohn, M. L. (1989). Introduction. In M. L. Kohn (Ed.) *Cross-national research in sociology*. Newbury Park, CA: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Komblut, A. E. & Bacon, P. (2008, January 14). Clinton's King comment 'ill-advised,' Obama says. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2008/01/13/AR2008011303624.html>
- Krauze, E. (2006). Furthering democracy in Mexico. *Foreign Affairs*, 85(1): 54-65.
- Lewis, L. A. (2003). *Hall of mirrors*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Livingstone, S. (2003). On the challenges of cross-national comparative media research. *European Journal of Communication*, 18(4):477-500.
- Lozano, J. C. (2006). Political advertising in Mexico. In L. L. Kaid & C. Holtz-Bacha (Eds.). *Handbook of political advertising* (pp. 259-268). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Maarek, P. J. (1997). *Vote, marketing político y comunicación. Claves para una buena información política*. España: Paidós Comunicación.
- MacManus, S. A. (2010). Voter participation and turnout: Female star power attracts men voters. In S. J. Carroll & R. L. Fox (Eds.). *Gender and elections: Shaping the future of American politics* (pp. 78-116). NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Masmoudi, M. (1979). The new world information order. *Journal of Communication*, 29(2):172-179.
- Matsaganis, M.D. & Payne, J.G. (2008). Agenda setting in a culture of fear. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 49(3): 379-392.
- Merskin, D. (2010). The S-word: Discourse, stereotypes, and the American Indian woman. *Howard Journal of Communications*, 21(4): 345-366.
- Messinger S. (2005). "Mother" Malinche and allegories of gender, ethnicity and national identity in Mexico. In R. Romero & A.N. Harris (Eds.). *Feminism, nation and myth*. Houston, TX: Arte Público Press.

- Meyers, M. (2004). African American women and violence: Gender, race, and class in the news. *Critical Studies in Media Communication*, 21(2): 95-118.
- Moldovan, R. (2009). A tale of two clintons: Media bias in the coverage of Hillary Clinton's 2008 presidential campaign. *Studia Universitatis Babeş-Bolyai. Studia Europaea*, 54(2): 41-59.
- Morgan, M., & Shanahan, J. (2010). The state of cultivation. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 54(2): 337-355.
- NARA (2012). Bill of Rights. *The U.S. National Archives and Records Administration*. Retrieved from http://www.archives.gov/exhibits/charters/bill_of_rights_transcript.html
- NOTIMEX (2006, January 18). Semblanza de la candidata a la presidencia del partido Alternativa Socialdemócrata y Campesina: Dora Patricia Mercado Castro. *La Crónica de Hoy*. Retrieved from http://www.cronica.com.mx/nota.php?id_notas=221567
- Nye, J. S. (2008). America's crisis election. *The Korea Times*. Retrieved October 13, 2008 from http://belfercenter.ksg.harvard.edu/publication/18588/americas_crisis_election.html?breadcrumb
- Oliver, M. (2003). African American men as “criminal and dangerous”: Implications of media portrayals of crime on the “criminalization” of African American men. *Journal of African American Studies*, 7: 3–18.
- Opler, M. E. (1945). Themes as dynamic forces in culture. *American Journal of Sociology*, 51: 198-206.
- Ortiz-Ortega, A. & Barquet, M. (2010). Gendering transition to democracy in Mexico. *Latin American Research Review*, 45(4): 108-137.
- Oyen, E. (1990). The imperfection of comparisons. In E. Oyen (Ed.) *Comparative methodology: Theory and practice in international social research* (pp.1-18). Newbury Park, CA: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- P Mercado. (2006, January 19). Un compromiso histórico con la libertad para conseguir la justicia [La sociedad mexicana cambió y no podemos permitir que el acceso a los recursos económicos, tecnológicos, sociales y culturales, esté condicionado por nuestro origen, raza, preferencia sexual o manera de pensar.]. Retrieved from <http://patriciamercado.wordpress.com/>
- Pan, Z. & Kosicki, G. M. (1993). Framing analysis: An approach to news discourse. *Political Communication*, 10(1): 55-75.
- Parmelee, J., Perkins, S., & Sayre, J. (2006, June). “What about people our age?” *Using framing theory to uncover how political ads alienate college students*. Paper presented to the International Communication Association. Dresden, Germany.
- PBS (2008, January 4). Anatomy of a smear. Sorting fact from fiction in the 2008 election campaign. *Public Broadcasting Service*. Retrieved from <http://www.pbs.org/now/shows/401/political-smears.html>
- Przeworski, A., & Teune, H. (1970). *The logic of comparative social inquiry*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- PT (2012). Rosario Ibarra de Piedra-semblanza. *Grupo parlamentario Partido del Trabajo*. Retrieved from <http://www.ptsenadores.org.mx/index.php/rosario-ibarra-de-piedra/>

- Radunski, P. (1999). Management de la comunicación política. En Thesing, J. y Priess, F. (Eds.). *Globalización y democracia en América Latina* (pp. 217-248). Argentina: CIEDLA/KAS.
- Reese, S. D. (2010). Finding frames in a web of culture: The case of the war on terror. In P. D'Angelo & J. A. Kuypers (Eds.). *Doing news framing analysis: Empirical and theoretical perspectives* (pp. 17-42). NY: Routledge.
- Rodríguez, V. E. (2003). *Women in contemporary Mexican politics*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Saldierna, G. (2006). Patricia Mercado. *La Jornada*. Retrieved from <http://www.jornada.unam.mx/elecciones2006/?candidato=mercado>
- Sánchez Murillo, L. F. & Aceves, F. (2008). Campañas políticas y configuración del voto electoral en 2006. Encuestas electorales y publicidad política. *Revista Mexicana de Ciencias Políticas y Sociales*, 202: 93-116.
- Scheuch, E. K. (1990). The development of comparative research: Towards causal explanations. In E. Oyen (Ed.) *Comparative methodology: Theory and practice in international social research* (pp.19-37). Newbury Park, CA: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Schroeder, S. (1997). Introduction. In S. Schroeder, S. Wood & R. Haskett (Eds.). *Indian women of early Mexico*. (pp. 3-24). Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Sevilla, C. (2006, April 13). Patricia Mercado... y sin embargo se mueve. *La Jornada de Oriente*. Retrieved from <http://www.lajornadadeoriente.com.mx/2006/04/13/puebla/c1coc-13.php>
- Sinha, M. (2006). *Gender and nation*. Washington, DC, American Historical Association.
- Smith, R. M. & King, D. S. (2009). Barack Obama and the future of American Racial Politics. *Du Bois Review: Social Science Research on Race*, 6(1):25-35.
- Socolow, S. M. (2000). *The women of colonial Latin America*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Stern, S. J. (1995). *The secret history of gender*. Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press.
- Taylor, A. (2006). Malinche and matriarchal utopia: Gendered visions of indigeneity in Mexico. *Signs*, 31(3): 815-840.
- Televisa. (2006). Dora Patricia Mercado Castro. *Noticieros Televisa*. Retrieved from <http://www.esmas.com/dialogospormexico/PrecandidatosyPropuestas/485868.html>
- Teune, H. (1990). Comparing countries: Lesson learned. In E. Oyen (Ed.) *Comparative methodology: Theory and practice in international social research* (pp. 38-62). Newbury Park, CA: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- The Economist (2006, May 11). *The Economist*. Retrieved from <http://www.economist.com/node/6919431>
- The Political Communication Lab (2008). Department of Communication at Stanford University. Retrieved from <http://pcl.stanford.edu/campaigns/2008/primary/>

- Twinam, A. (1998). The negotiation of honor. In L. L. Johnson & A. S. Lipsett-Rivera (Eds.). *The faces of honor: sex, shame and violence in colonial Latin America* (pp. 68-102). Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press.
- Tuchman, G. (1978). *Making news*. New York, NY: The Free Press.
- UN (2010). The world's women 2010: Trends and statistics. *United Nations*. Retrieved from http://unstats.un.org/unsd/demographic/products/Worldswomen/WW_full%20report_color.pdf
- USMCOC (2006, July 3). 2006 Mexico's presidential election observer mission. *United States-Mexico Chamber of Commerce*. Retrieved from <http://www.usmcoc.org/pdf/ReportPresidentialElection.pdf>
- van der Haar, G. (2004). The zapatista uprising and the struggle for indigenous autonomy. *European Review of Latin American and Caribbean*, 76: 99-108.
- Van Gorp, B. (2010). Strategies to take subjectivity out of framing analysis. In P. D'Angelo & J. A. Kuypers (Eds.). *Doing news framing analysis: Empirical and theoretical perspectives* (pp. 84-109). NY: Routledge.
- Vaughn, B. (2010). The African diaspora through ojos mexicanos: Blackness and mexicanidad in southern Mexico: *The Review of Black Political Economy*, 33(1): 49-57.
- Vasquez, I. A. (2010). The long durée of Africans in Mexico: The historiography of racialization, acculturation, and Afro-Mexican subjectivity. *The Journal of African American History*, 95(2): 183-201.
- Vega, A. (2010). La responsabilidad de la televisión mexicana en la erradicación de la violencia de género contra las mujeres y las niñas. *Comunicación y Sociedad*, 13: 43-68.
- Weston, M. (2005). Attitudes and mindsets hinder journalists in their coverage. *Nieman Reports*, 59(3): 23-24.
- Wood, S., & Haskett, R. (1997). Concluding remarks. In S. Schroeder, S. Wood & R. Haskett (Eds.). *Indian women of early Mexico*. (pp. 313-330). Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Yañez, S. (2012, March 5). Ellas, las mujeres candidatas a la Presidencia. *El Universal*. Retrieved from <http://yopolitico.redpolitica.mx/notas/?p=1228>
- You Tube (2012). You Tube LLC. Retrieved from <http://www.youtube.com/>
- Yuval-Davis, N. (1997). *Gender and nation*. Thousand Oaks, CA, SAGE Publications.
- Zapiáin, M. (2010, January 21). Crean alianza Emyco y Alazraki. *Milenio*. Retrieved from <http://leon.milenio.com/cdb/doc/noticias2011/656481a84786e736e71b1fbe23d23d05>
- Zárraga, P. (2006, May 14). Adelantan que el IFE citará a los dirigentes de Alternativa. *El Universal*. Retrieved from <http://www.eluniversal.com.mx/nacion/138343.html>
- Zovatto, D. (2007). América Latina después del "rally" electoral 2005-2006: Algunas tendencias y datos sobresalientes. *Nueva Sociedad*, 207: 23-33.

VITA: Nadia Ivette Martínez-Carrillo

Education

Ph. D., Mass Communications, The Pennsylvania State University, 2013

M. A., Master in Marketing and International Business, Universidad de las Américas-Puebla, Mexico, 2002

B.A. Business Administration, Universidad de las Américas-Puebla, Mexico, 1999

Conference Presentations

Connolly-Ahern, C. & Martínez-Carrillo, N. I. (2009, August). Changing Gears: A Comparison of Coverage of Hillary Clinton and Cristina Fernandez Kirchner's Presidential Bids. Presented at the 92nd annual meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication in Boston, MA.

Connolly-Ahern, C., Schejter, A., Obar, J. & Martínez-Carrillo, N. I. (2009, September). A Slice of the Pie: Examining the State of the Low Power FM Radio Service in 2009. Presented at the 37th Research Conference on Communication, Information and Internet Policy in Arlington, VA.

Martínez-Carrillo, N. I. (2011, February). The Gaze of a Woman: Media and Gender in Mexico. Presented at the Women Studies Graduate Organization Conference, Inviting Intersection: Interdisciplinary Dialogues of Feminism and Feminism Concerns in State College, PA.

Tewksbury, D., Tamul, D. & Martínez-Carrillo, N.I. (2012, May). Our Unmanned Heroes: Techno-Centric Agency and the Discourse of Unmanned Drone Attacks. Presented at the 2012 Union for Democratic Communications Conference in Tallahassee, FL.

Employment

2010-2012, Instructor, The Pennsylvania State University

2008-2010, Research Assistant, The Pennsylvania State University

1/2008-6/2008, Aid Coordinator, Municipal System for Integral Family Development (DIF), Xalapa, Mexico

6/2002-12/2007, Head of the Research Management Department, Universidad de las Américas-Puebla, Mexico

6/2002-12/2007, Instructor, Universidad de las Américas-Puebla, Mexico

8/2001-6/2002, Academic Coordinator, Universidad de las Américas-Puebla, Mexico