SPEECH CHOICES IN MEXICO CITY 2012

By

Yazmin Morlet Corti

Submitted to

Central European University

Department of Political Science

In partial fulfillment for the degree of Masters of Arts in Political Science

Supervisor: Marina Popescu

Budapest, Hungary

(2013)

i

Abstract

What strategies do politicians apply when deciding on speeches they will deliver? Modern politics and political marketing consider that politicians exploit their personality traits in order to target the median voter. However, this is not always the case. In this study, through a qualitative content analysis of 50 speeches of a candidate from Partido de la Revolucion Institucional (PRI) in Mexico City I look at the three main strategies that candidates take into account: the party, their niche and personality. The study shows that politicians do not always take into account past results and demographics to design their campaigns. The results of the analysis demonstrate that, since politicians cannot cover every area, they must prioritize their time and resources and work with what they have available. In this case, given the circumstances, the candidate decided to prioritize on party issues and party identification in order to promote the party. In addition to all the considerations they must take into account, such as who they target, politicians need to be strategic about what they say to whom and where. The key implication of the study is that politicians have different ways of directing their messages and their audiences to fulfill political objectives and that there is no general standard of doing it. This analysis contributed to a field that has been underresearched, Mexico City voting behavior.

iv

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Marina Popescu for her constant support in all the levels of the development of this work. A student is nothing without a good advisor, one that listens, suggests, encourages and helps. Marina Popescu, thank you for your understanding, as well as your support in my academic life.

Bogdana Buzarnescu, the best (and wittiest) research assistant I have met so far.

My academic family in Mexico who encouraged me to go abroad: Carola Garcia, Leonardo Figueiras, Gerardo Dorantes, Patricia Martinez, Carlomagno Avila, Hector Quintanar, Fernando Elorriaga.

My entertaining family, The *Royal* Morlet Corti-*baums* in Mexico and Argentina (you are far, but not distant); Adriana, Rene, Abu and Alicia. A special thanks to my *sis* Adrianita who sent me the data from my back up hard drive.

For simply being you: *The Tripod* and *The Specks*.

The *Original Four* and *the Peoples*, it has been an honor: Bogdan, Iva, Mindaugas and Maryam Haq who took time from her busy schedule of saving people to help me edit this work.

The girls who added a bit of stability in all of the craziness, Lara R., Nena O.

My library companions, the *crazy S's* Katarina K., Silvia H.,

Betty F. for her methodological guidance

You have all managed to make this year unforgettable.

Finally, Council of Science and Technology in Mexico, as well as the Institute of Science and Technology of Mexico City.

> *We are nothing more than a colorful irregular composition of the people we meet and the experiences we endure.*
>
> William J. Preston, you live on.

v

Table of Contents

LIST OF TABLES

CEU eTD Collection

1. INTRODUCTION

Campaign strategists use voting behavior in order to estimate how constituents might vote in future elections. Political campaigns are both big events for politicians and campaign consultants and a significant topic of research in political communication and voting behavior. In political campaigning politicians make strategic choices to act one way or another in oder to gain an advantage in votes. These choices are constrained by the nature of the political competition from a party politics point of view and in relation to the known patterns of citizens' voting behavior, as well as by the position of the candidate in relation to the party and the electoral context. This thesis looks at how issue and personality based stances, party and candidate related appeals were used by one candidate in the Mexico City mayoral election campaign in 2012. Taking into account the contextual circumstances, the study tries to understand whether these appeals were specifically targeted in order to make the best use of an unfavorable situation and how this was related to the likelihood that party interests had to prevail.

Beatriz Paredes Rangel was candidate for *Partido de la Revolucion Institucional* (PRI) Mexico City Mayor in two high stakes elections, in 2006 and 2012, in both occasions she lost. The main assumption is that the candidate used three speech strategies in order to exploit her personality and her niche; and two regarding party identification (one is the issues and the second is the presidential candidate). The main hypothesis is that Paredes most likely emphasized in the content of her speeches on party issues. This hypothesis is based on Fenno's (1978) assumption that candidates in a party system focus more on party issues, because it is their base constituency and they must fulfill the base. Given the circumstances Paredes faced, it was difficult for her to appeal to the median voter in Mexico, because of the stance residents of Mexico City have towards PRI due to the 71 years PRI governed Mexico

1

and the sixty seven years PRI governed the city without elections. These expectations are based on the principle that a candidate who runs for a political party the first main audience they must target is their party members and sympathizers. In addition to the party members being the first targeted audience, there is also a question of context. As it will be explained in the first part of this project, Mexico City inhabitants actively reject *Partido de la Revolucion Institucional* (PRI).

The thesis does not aim to look at the effects of the speeches and it is designed to focus on speech choices made by the candidate in terms of content and to link content choices with location choices. In terms of content, the first focus is related to political issues, which are the policies a candidate advocates and promises to enact if elected to office, and the social cleavages the candidate and the party can mobilize. The second focus refers to the individual characteristics of the candidate and looks at the importance assigned to candidate's personality in order to promote, reinforce and possibly manufacture an image in the voter's mind (Bowen 1976; Campbell, 1983; Campbell, Gurin, & Miller, 1954; Downing, 1965; Gant & Davis, 1984).

In regard to the location of the speeches, it is expected that she indeed targeted the median voter in Mexico City. She also targeted the more educated and literate in Mexico City in order to appeal to her personal niche. A secondary hypothesis is that she went to districts where she did better in 2006. Lastly, in regard to the actual content, meaning what she said and the geographical location (electoral districts) of the speeches. The expectation is that she put her issues second, when it was appropriate given the circumstances. And the second hypothesis is that she emphasized on party issues and the PRI presidential candidate in districts where the party (without her) did well in 2006.

Why is Mexico City chosen for this research? Mexico City "the second-largest urban agglomeration in the Western Hemisphere, after Sao Paulo (Brazil), but before New York-

2

Newark (US)"[1] it is coincidently a newly democratized city, as of 1996 residents are able to freely elect their own government. In spite of the importance of the city, little studies have been conducted on the city in political terms. There are several studies done on the city and its politics, but these tend to be descriptive and less oriented to political science or political behavior. The importance of this study relies on the objective to understand voting behavior in the second largest agglomeration in the Western Hemisphere. Many studies have been conducted on Mexico as a whole country, but they focus little specifically on the city. Yet, another interesting phenomenon is that Mexico City is not a representative sample of the general or average Mexican population that also adds importance to this topic. Through a comparison between the national averages and the averages of citizens in Mexico City it is found that citizens of the capital are not different from a large part of the country[2]. Another reason for conducting this research my experience of the campaign as well as cultural competence, which means an understanding the context of Mexico City, Mexican politics and the specificities of the elections under study.

The content analysis will be limited to the 50 speeches that were made public to the media and that the candidate delivered during the legal period of the 2012 election campaign for the mayor of Mexico City, which means from 28 April 2012 through 27 June 2012. All of the statistical analysis in this research will be computed with "IBM *SPSS* Statistics"

---

[1] Mexico City 19.319 million habitants, Source: CIA Factbook. https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/mx.html. Consulted march 13,

[2] The averages of 2005 and 2012 of both the city and the national census show little compatibility between Mexico as a whole and Mexico City. For example, population density in the city is 5,921 habitants per square Km; the average density in Mexico is 57 habitants per square Km^2. Mexico City has the lowest illiterate population in the country. The locality with the highest years of education is Mexico City, with 10.5 years of education, well above the national average of 8.6 years of education. Finally, in economic terms, Mexico City has the highest Gross Domestic Product in the country (1,502,162,672 Mexican pesos 18% of the total GDF of Mexico) it is also the second place of the GDF per capita. These averages are highly significant considering population in the rest of the States in Mexico. This data points to the fact that Mexico City is not a reflection of National voting preferences; the population is not the average voters in Mexico. Understanding voting behavior in Mexico City would allow the comprehension of a different type of voter in Mexico, a voter that is not the average population. Source of information: INEGI, Instituto Nacional de Estadistica y Geografia , census averages 2005 and 2010 http://www.inegi.org.mx/est/contenidos/espanol/sistemas/perspectivas/perspectiva-df.pdf Consulted March 14, 1754 hours.

Despite the level of interest and importance of Mexico City elections it is necessary to note the limitations of this study. First there is a lack of data on Mexico City elections which makes it difficult to have reliable information to analyze. Moreover, the local electoral institute of elections of Mexico City although established in 1999 as a result of the 1996 political reform in Mexico City, it does not have all the data for most of the elections, since it was a new institutions that was not fully mastering of process of data collecting for elections until approximately 2003-2006. Therefore the most reliable election results that are available are after 2006.

Second, the content analysis has some limitations and, if it is not possible to perform inter-coder reliability checks since only one person coded the speeches. The limited time and resources to develop this research project did not allow many alternatives around the inter code reliability issue[3]. However, given the simplicity of the coding and its factual rather than interpretive nature, I believe that the analysis provides a good first analysis of an original body of text and it is related to the best possible electoral data available.

The novelty of this research largely mitigates in my view this limitations. The analysis contributes to a field that has been under researched. First, there have been few articles published on Mexico City elections since the city's democratization in 1996 although it represents a peculiar context within Mexico being dominated not by PRI but by *Partido de la Revolucion Democratica* (PRD). Second, this study complied and analyzed an original data set, the speeches pronounced by Beatriz Paredes that has not been accessible to researchers although the speeches were public; certain local media outlets had access to them during the campaign but, they were not published as raw speeches, but summarized and interpreted by journalists when covered in the press.

---

[3] An alternative solution to the inter-coder reliability is to use automated coding software such as Alceste. Alceste is a software that analyzes textual data and it is developed by the Image society, together with the French National Scientific Research Council (CNRS in French). This software was meant to be used for the qualitative analysis, but time limitations did not allow this. Although the software has been purchased and will be used after the submission of this thesis in order to check the results.

The objective is to understand the speech strategy choices Paredes made in the campaign and how it can be related to what we know about voting patterns in Mexico City in relation to her party as well as about her position within the party. There will be a general overview o the context of Mexico City, then an explanation of the party, of the candidate for Mayor and the candidate herself that are the focus of the thesis. Three main lines of inquiry are followed through the thesis, from the theory to the analysis of speech choices and their links to locations, which responds the question of the strategies used in the speeches. The first part of the analysis will focus on the location of the speeches separately. The second part is the content analysis, meaning specifically what was said. The third part of the analysis will look what was said where. Each section of the analysis will be divided into subcategories according to the theory. Each will approach the results in terms of the personality of the candidate, the candidate's niche in Mexico City, the party issues seen from two different aspects, firstly the presidential candidate mentions and references, and the second, party issues which are related to PRI's niche, party identification and party values.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORY

2.1. Literature Review

Past studies conducted on Mexico City do not necessarily address voting behavior in the city, most of the research conducted in Mexico is mainly descriptive and although there are quantitative and qualitative studies they focus mostly on Mexico as a whole country. The few studies found on Mexico City have concluded some generalities on voting behavior in the city. For instance, Chappell Lawson proved that Mexico City voters avoid PRI and "among the 40 percent of Mexico City residents who say that they would never vote for the PRI remain undecided about which opposition party they prefer"(1997:19). Meaning voters avoid PRI, but are open to other major parties, such as PAN or PRD. Jorge Dominguez and James McCann (1995), through two nationwide public opinion polls explored economic voting and cleavages in Mexico, through 1988 and 1991, but they did not explore the details of Mexico City. The first poll rant from 12 May through June 1988, with a total of 2,960 personal interviews. The second poll was conducted from 15 through 28 July 1991, with a total of 3,053 personal interviews. The quantitative data showed that there was an opposition towards PRI in Mexico City:

> […]*Attitudes toward the ruling party's future strongly shape voter choice. There was also stronger opposition in Mexico City. There was, however, a relatively weak connection between party choice and attitudes toward issues; general judgments about present and prospective economic performance were important in 1988 though they were not nearly as effective discriminators of voter choice as the question that connected the economy's future with the prospects that a party other than the PRI would gain power*[…](Dominguez, McCann, 1995 :47)

Joseph L. Klesner (2001) describes the initial phases of democratic Mexico, and with that the end of PRI's 71 year hegemonic regime in Mexico, during the year 2000, PAN won the federal elections, with a majority in the Senate, Diputados and the President of the

Republic, leaving PRI as the opposition, but, PRD gained strength in Mexico City. Researchers in Mexico, such as Jaqueline Peschard (1988) have conducted a descriptive study in which she reviews the Federal elections in Mexico City from 1964 and 1985. Leonardo Figueiras (2007) applied in 2006 a survey to 250 citizens of Mexico City in order to measure voting preferences. Figuerias also in 2012 published a book in which he describes the 2009 intermediate election in Mexico City, it is a descriptive historical study in which he focuses on the effects of electoral reform on the 2009 results in Mexico City. Alejandro Moreno (2008) has conducted several voting behavior studies in Mexico, were Moreno describes the average Mexican voter individually and as a member of a collective. The data analyzed is the 2000 campaign in Mexico and he concludes what variables influence Mexicans in their voter choice. Finally, Carola Garcia Calderon (2013) compiled a book in which the authors review the effects of media and political campaigns during 2012.

In regard to past research elaborated on the effects of political speech this was developed by Lazarsfeld's studies in 1964 of how voters make up their minds and the effects of political campaigning. Studies conducted by Benoit, Blayney & Pier (2000) as well as Hershey and Holian (2000) analyzed the election campaign speeches of state governors' races in regard to the abortion issue, in order to detect the presence of specific themes and rhetorical patterns. Most studies regarding political speech try to determine effect sizes of speeches in voting, but this is very difficult to prove because of the different variables that must be taken into consideration when analyzing effect sizes. The issue with qualitative analysis is the interpretation the coder may have on the messages. Because themes, and messages in the speeches shape the interpretation that voters give to the message. These themes will eventually shape the coding of the speeches. Political speech is a political message found inside the praxis of political communication. According to Omar Ochoa (2000) two of the

7

main features of a political discourse is the context and the degree of agreement or compromise between the receiver and the transmitter.

2.2. Theory

2.2.1. Candidate Personality

According to studies conducted by researchers in the end of the XX century[4], a candidate's personality is one that "involves systems of distinctive self regulatory mechanisms and structures for guiding cognitive, affective, and motivational processes toward achieving individual and collective goals" (Vitorio, Barbanelli, Zimbardo, 1999, p. 175).[5] A candidate's personality allows voters to create an image of them in their minds. Politicians, for the most part, prefer being perceived with positive traits that would benefit them in electoral processes. These traits are meant to bring politicians and constituents closer, in the sense that constituents would perceive politicians as one of their own. Personalities are associated with different actions and behaviors in politicians' public lives. Individuals tend to infer attributes of another person's personality from their actions and behavior (Fiske and Taylor 1991).[6] Due to the growing tendency of modern politics to make the private lives of politicians public, personality also entails what the public knows about the politician's life behind closed doors. Public perceptions of personal attributes of the party's candidates are considered by political scientists as one of the strategies used to appeal to the electorate. Although, personality is not the only factor that constituents take into consideration when they vote, "trait perceptions are (also) created and reinforced by issue ownership campaigning" (Hayes, 2005, p. 909).

---

[4] Bandura, (1997) Caprara (1996) Mischel & Shoda (1995).

[5] Vitorio, Gian, Barbaranelli Claudio, Zimbardo, Phillip. "Personality Profiles and Political Parties" Political Psychology, VOl 20. No. 1 Mar 1999. Pp 175-197... p. 175

[6] Cited in Hayes, Danny. "Candidate Qualities through a Partisan Lens: a Theory of Trait Ownership". American Journal of Political Science. Vol 49. No. 4. (Oct 2005), p.910

2.2.2. Niche

A candidate's personality can lead to them "owning" a niche, so to speak. This niche is a base, in which a group of constituents "follow" so to speak, a candidate. This niche shares two characteristics: the support and the approval of the political actor, inferred from a "quality" or a stance a politician may have on a topic. For instance, if a candidate is in favor of same sex marriage, it is very likely that the community that would benefit from this would be one of that candidate's niches. Some politicians take it upon themselves to "own" an issue as a personal stance on a topic or issue. This may attract or repulse certain niches or groups. Candidates tend to campaign on and talk frequently about the issues they "own" or have a relation to. Sometimes the issues are delimited by the political actor's experience; hence he has an association with a certain sector in the public. For instance, a politician who was the Minister of Education can easily possess the issue of educational reform. According to Hayes (2005), individuals tend to come to conclusions on politicians through issue information.

Rapoport, Metcalf, and Hartman (1989) concluded that voters frequently make inferences between candidate traits and issue information. Hayes explains that "both trait-to-issue inference and issue-to-trait inference occurred, but subjects were consistently more likely to infer candidate traits from issue information than the opposite" (Hayes, 2005, p. 910). The findings of Rapoport, Metcalf and Hartman (1989) suggest that candidates approach issues that may have an impact on the personal characteristics voters attribute to them (Hayes, 2005, p. 910).

2.2.3. Party Issues and Candidates

When simultaneous campaigns present themselves, meaning there are several elections for different levels of government, there is a dynamic in party systems in which candidates are constrained by their parties. Parties constrain candidates to do one thing over another, because of loyalty, ideology, or principle; as a result candidates that belong to the party have to

9

include themselves in the party dynamic. By including themselves in this dynamic they ensure (to a certain extent) support and resources from the party. But they also have an obligation to the party in exchange for the support they receive. In campaigns that are running in different geographical locations and different levels of government, the dynamic is usually very concentrated in getting the most out of the constituents in favor of the party. During simultaneous campaigns, it is possible for candidates from the same party for different posts to campaign in favor of each other.

2.2.4. Party Issues Only

Political parties have to focus and target their base as a first objective, meaning they have to persuade their own supporters. Candidates that belong to a party have to target this base as well. Fenno in this regard sustains that as a result of how parties mobilize their bases a "candidate's policy is not free from the position of the 'primary constituents'"(1978). Although parties and candidates are not limited in scope to their sympathizers or base, Moon (2004) considers that candidates are constrained in two ways. Firstly, by the position of their party activists; and secondly, by the position of the median voter in their constituency. Hayes (2005) theorizes that trait ownership connects personality with the strategic campaign behavior that prompts candidates to focus their actions and make decisions based on issues their own party mobilizes.[7]

Aldrich and McGinnis (1989) show that the party does in fact attract their candidates towards the positions of the party. A consequence of the parties "pulling" candidates is that these actors must decide between the votes of the median constituents and the human and financial resources a party can provide[8].

---

[7] Hayes tested this in a cross national study of 25 years in the US National Electoral Survey in regard to Democrats and Republicans. (2005, p. 920).
[8] Cited in Moon, Woojin "Party Activis, campaign Resources and Candidate Position Taking: Theory, Test and Applications" British Journal of Political Science. Vol 34, No. 4 (Oct. 2004) pp. 611-633 p. 615

3. CONTEXT OF MEXICO CITY ELECTIONS

With the end of the Mexican Revolution (1910) in 1928, the law of Municipal Autonomy was repealed, which was replaced by the Organic Law of Districts and Federal Territories and with that the figure of Jefe de Gobierno "Head of Department" or "City Mayor" was born. This City Mayor was in charge of the administration of Mexico City or Federal District, this mayor was also appointed by the President of the Republic. History shows that the hegemonic Party, Partido de la Revolucion Institutional (PRI) had control of Mexico City government, due to the fact that it controlled 71 years of Mexico's federal government. Therefore there were no free elections to choose the mayor or local government of Mexico City from 1928 through 1987.

The 1985 earthquake in Mexico City caused 68.000 constructions to crumble uncovered the corruption of the PRI in Mexico City. Irregular licenses were issued by the PRI administration without concerning the safety of the population. This concerned Mexico City residents; with the next presidential election in 1988 this would have repercussions. Franyuti Hernández considers a rise in political participation in the City as a result of the earthquake: "the population of the Federal District had always been alien and distant to the solutions to their eyes opened becoming a civil society spoke up to demand greater participation."(2008, p.242).

The city between 1987 and 1988, suffered gradual institutional reforms which lead to electoral transformations that allowed the residents of the city to choose their government. By 1987, there was a Reform in the Local Assembly of Mexico City, and this allowed citizens to choose their Assembly representatives and their municipal delegates. This gave strength to a new Party formed in 1988: *Partido de la Revolucion Democratica* (PRD), a left oriented Party. Mexico City is a centralized regime (Klesner, 2001). During 1994 the federal administration was worried about the stability of the PRI regime, and it was decided to further

reform elections in Mexico City. Thanks to the reforms in Mexico City the President was limited in his interference in the City. Flores (2001) sustains that decentralization of electoral institutions both locally and federally, hindered the automatic triumph of PRI in great part of Mexico and more so in Mexico City.

During 1988, with the allegations of fraud, Mexico City "Cuauhtemoc Cardenas[9] as the legitimate president elect, marched from Mexico City's Revolutionary Monument to National Square where Cardenas demanded respect for the popular vote, asked the president to uphold the law" (Jhabvala, 1988, p.1842). In spite of the turmoil, Salinas de Gortari (PRI), came into power shortly after. Eighteen years later, in 2006 during one of the most polarized presidential elections in Mexican history, Mexico City also suffered as a result of the election results. PRD once again claimed a fraud, this time, Andres Manuel Lopez Obrador[10]. "Lopez Obrador's protest campaign culminated on September 16 2006, when tens of thousands of his followers gathered in downtown Mexico City to acclaim him "legitimate president" of Mexico"[11], during this period, the acceptance rate of Obrador was 72%. As a result, Mexico City citizens tend to believe there is electoral "fraud" in federal levels and they actively participate in public manifestations showing these concerns. Residents believe the preferences they have at a local level are the reflection of Presidential elections, the problem is that Mexico City is not a representative sample of voting preferences in a national level.

3.1. Paredes Campaign

The 2006 campaign for Mayor that Paredes ran had several issues. For one, the budget for the campaign was very limited. Although the campaign was terrestrial, there was little chance to interact with voters other than the usual PRI sympathizers in the city. There was no

---

[9] 1988 presidential candidate, claimed fraud. Founder of *Partido de la Revolucion Democratica* (PRD).
[10] Presidential Candidate. PRD in 2006, and 2012.
[11] Chappell Lawson. "How Did We Get Here? Mexican Democracy after the 2006 Elections". PS: Political Science and Politics, Vol. 40, No. 1 (Jan., 2007), pp. 45-48 p. 47

use of social media, and the propaganda that was distributed was low quality and scarce and it was mostly billboards over the city. Public appearances were very limited in 2006.

The main similarity between the two campaigns (2006 and 2012) was the coalition with the Green Party. The coalitions between PRI and the Green Party were done at a local and federal level in 2006, and in 2012 this formula repeated on a local level in Mexico City, as well as a Federal level (meaning candidates for federal posts such as representatives, senators and president were in coalition for Mexico City). In comparison, the 2012 campaign which had a higher budget, in spite of the fact that it was also a terrestrial campaign, used some social media, such as SoundCloud, Facebook, Twitter, YouTube, in order to distribute Paredes' messages to the press. There was little active participation online, mainly because campaigns in Mexico City are not done online. TV and Radio advertising was implemented to get the message out. During the 2012 campaign, Paredes focused on the issues or problems in specific delegations, even though the issues sometimes involved Federal policy, which the Mayor of the City could not resolve without approval of the President or Congress. This, however, allowed her to mention Peña's program.

3.2. Paredes' Personality

This female politician has several traits which distinguish her from many politicians in her party. Firstly, she is a woman who has had power throughout her life. Secondly, she is related to the arts; she has written poetry, she sings in her free time, and she reads and recites famous Latin American authors, especially Mexican authors. She is a sociologist, with a degree from the biggest public university of the country.[12] In addition to these characteristics that "make up" her personality[13], she also emphasizes Mexican culture and traits.

---

[12] Universidad Nacional Autonoma de Mexico.
[13] What is known to voters, the image she portraits.

3.3. Paredes' Niche

The candidature of Paredes represented an opportunity for PRI to interact with many cleavages, because of her active participation in various issues throughout her political career. Paredes has been a politician for almost four decades; hence she has gathered experience in diverse areas of public administration. Party politics is not something that is distant to her, for instance in 2008 she became the President (head) of *Partido de la Revolucion Institucional* (PRI). As a Senator, she was involved in the educational reform. Education is a very comfortable position and cleavage in Mexico City because it is the city with the most access to high schools and colleges. This makes it a very profitable cleavage, considering the number of private colleges and public educational institutes in Mexico City.

Paredes started her career as a party activist for agriculture reform and social movements in her home state, Tlaxcala. Hence, one of the main cleavages she interacted with was agriculture. Although there is little agricultural activity in Mexico City, there are some areas of the city in which it is still practiced; namely Milpa Alta, Xochimilco, Cuajimalpa, Tlalpan. It is important to mention that rural voters in Mexico City are a small minority. In addition to her wide range in politics, Paredes has also a relation to foreign affairs: she has been ambassador of Mexico to Cuba, and as a Senator she was on the International Affairs Committee. She has traveled to several United Nations summits and has done research on topics such as tourism, health and women's rights. Hence, she is well-versed in international affairs.

Paredes' experience has allowed her to interact with several different cleavages throughout her career. As a result, she has built her own niche of followers or voters, which do not necessarily belong to the party, or agree with PRI for that matter.

3.4. Partido de la Revolucion Institutional

The vote for Partido Revolucionario Institutional (PRI) in Mexico City[14], has been declining since 1988. Both on a local level and a federal level, meaning residents of Mexico City have been voting for other parties (*Partido de la Revolucion Democratica*, PRD and *Partido Accion Nacional*, PAN) since 1988. This presents a problem for PRI. The hegemonic party that once ruled Mexico for 71 years cannot seem to attract voters in Mexico City.

Mexico concentrates all of its power in its capital city; all major institutions and the concentration of the 3 powers of the republic are in Mexico City. This leaves the capitol vulnerable to public manifestations and social movements. There has been a clash since 1988 regarding presidential elections in the City. Citizens constantly think of "frauds" on a Federal level, this is due to the skepticism regarding 71 years of a hegemonic party running all levels of government. Mexico City residents relate corruption to fraud. A Beltran, Castafios, Flores and Meyenberg (1996, p. 133) found in a poll applied in 1995 Mexico City that 88% of respondents claimed that corruption was wide-spread. [..] 53% agreed with the statement that 'it is so difficult to comply with laws and regulations that at times there is no other way but corruption'" (Morris, 1999, pp. 622-623). The negative connotation voters in Mexico City give to PRI relating the party to corruption is a valence issue which in definition "involves linking of the parties with some condition that is positively or negatively valued by the electorate" (Hotelling, 1929)

Given the context explained above, we know that one of the main determinants of voter choice in Mexico City is to oppose PRI. This is because of all the skepticism in the City about PRI being related to corruption since the 1980s. As several studies proved, citizens in the city avoid PRI. When it comes to the Green Party, which has been identified as a party

---

[14] *SIC* Mexico City is the popular term, it refers to the Federal District and the metropolitan area; although for the purposes of this study, the reference of Mexico City only includes the Federal District which is composed of the 16 delegations that make up the Federal District or *Distrito Federal*. Mexico City is currently organized as a municipality and a federal entity.

was formed with politicians who had close ties to PRI, it is also avoided by Mexico City voters. Hence, it is difficult for the PRI and Green Party coalition to design an effective campaign in Mexico City. Both in 2006 and 2012, the PRI-Green Party coalition had the same candidate for Mayor of Mexico City, Beatriz Paredes Rangel.

The 2012 and 2006 elections are an interesting phenomenon to observe. There are several substantial differences between the 2006 and 2012 campaigns run by a PRI-Green Party coalition, both at a local and a federal level. The results for 2006 and 2012 where compared in order to determine how different results may imply different strategies for both PRI and Paredes. The data set was constructed in a personalized manner with the results at a federal level at 2006 for president, senator and representative, on the one hand; and Beatriz Paredes' results in the elections for Mexico City Mayor of 2006 and 2012, on the other.

A data set was constructed in order to develop the analysis. The data was provided by the local Mexico City Electoral Institute[15] and the Mexico federal Electoral Institute[16]. The local results were taken from the 2006 and 2012 elections. As for the federal results used, the 2006 results were chosen because these have been subject to revision after the elections; the 2012 official results have not yet been completely scrutinized.

In order to construct the data set, firstly it was important to pair the speeches delivered by Beatriz Paredes Rangel with local electoral district and the federal electoral district. The information contextualized with the delegation, the address, and the date the speeches were pronounced. Secondly, the local results for mayor in 2006 and 2012 were added and the percentage of those results for the 2006 coalition between the Green Party and PRI were estimated in accordance to the total votes cast by Mexico City citizens. The same was done for the 2012 results, with the difference that the 2012 results did not merely include the PRI

---

[15] http://www.iedf.org.mx/index.php/elecciones/estadistica-y-estudios-electorales/180-estadisticas-de-resultados/proceso-electorales-2006 and http://www.iedf.org.mx/index.php/elecciones/estadistica-y-estudios-electorales/459-estadisticas-de-resultados/proceso-electoral-2012
[16] http://www.ife.org.mx/portal/site/ifev2/Menu_Principal/?vgnextoid=b14cf4851e2ee010VgnVCM1000002c010 00aRCRD

and Green Party coalition votes, but also the votes each party received individually. Finally, in order to be able to contrast the results between 2006 and 2012, the Federal results in Mexico City were added to the data base: 2006 results for president, senator, and representative in Mexico City.

After observing the results, it was found that the results of PRI in Mexico City in regard to the presidential candidate had a very low difference between the lowest and the highest percentage of the votes (3.18%). This means that there were few votes for that candidate in 2006. The same observation can be made in regard to the percentage of votes obtained for federal representative, where the range was 6.49%; this is also quite low (see appendix 2, p. 47). However, there is a big difference between the results in 2006 in regard to the PRI Senator candidate, which was 29.13%, which is a lot considering that candidates win with that percentage. This is a significant percentage in this context because the candidate in second place in the 2012 elections, Federico Döring (PAN), became Senator for Mexico City in 2006 elections having obtained 25.53% of the votes in 2006. Sebastian Lerdo de Tejada Covarrubias was the PRI-Green Party candidate during 2006 in Mexico City, and he lost. Subsequently, in 2012, Lerdo was appointed by President Enrique Peña as the Director of Health Insurance[17] in 2012. It is known that Lerdo de Tejada has leverage in PRI, and he had access to a lot of resources to run a campaign in 2006.

In order to determine how different Paredes' results were from 2012 to 2006 the means of the percentages between the coalition were computed and then the difference between the 2006 and 2012 votes for the coalition were estimated. The election results of Beatriz Paredes from 2012 to 2006 are significantly different, over 1.99% difference between 2012 and 2006 (see appendix 1, p. 46). In 2006, Paredes had better results personally, although the Party in general had lower votes in 2006 than in 2012. It is important to clarify

---

[17] ISSSTE. *Instituto de Seguridad y Servicios Sociales de los Trabajadores del Estado*

that in 2006, the PRI-Green Party coalition was on the same ballot box, meaning the voters could not divide the vote into Green or PRI. Hence there is no information available on the votes divided between the parties in the 2006 coalition. Since the federal electoral reform of 2009, voters can determine if they want to vote for the coalition as a whole, or one party out of the coalition.

The descriptives imply that there could be correlations between the results. Taking into consideration the negative perception of PRI and Green Party in Mexico City, I expect negative correlations between 2006 and 2012 towards PRI and Green Party. The main expectation consists of PRI and Green Party having overall better results in 2006 in the City elections than in 2012. Correlation was run between the means of the results of 2012 and 2006 for PRI, the Green Party and the Coalition as a whole. After running the model, a significant positive small correlation (0.317) can be seen between the 2006 mean and the percentage of votes for the Green Party and PRI during 2012 in the local Mexico City elections. There is also medium negative correlation (-0.319) between the average of the votes in 2012 for the Green Party and the mean of the percentage of votes in 2006 (see appendix 1, p.46)

In order to compare the difference between the means of the results for each district, a paired T-test was conducted. A T-test was chosen in order to determine if two sets of data are significantly different from each other. It was found that the mean of percentage of votes in 2006 when paired with the percentage of votes in 2012 of PRI-Green Party increases significantly at (18.65). Although, the results also show that there is a negative voting scheme in Mexico City towards PRI in the local results of 2012 in comparison to 2006.

3.4.1. PRI Issues

Historically the city used to be organized in cleavages, but it is safe to say that these cleavages are currently tangled. The unions based in Mexico City used to provide PRI with a

18

clear mass for electoral purposes, and although it still provides a main cleavage for PRI, it is slowly dying out. This is mainly because, as the city developed, unions lost some of their power in the City. On a national level, PRI has a niche in the agriculture sector and the unions that belong to public servants, such as the Metro, athletes in general (both retired and current).

In regard to ideology, PRI has always located itself as a moderate Party, in the center between the left and the right major parties in Mexico. This is a comfortable position when it comes to issues. Due to the fact that PRI did govern the country for 71 years, it can persuade certain sectors with the major public works they developed in those decades; the economic sector, for instance. During PRI's administration in the sixties up until the late seventies, there was the "Mexican Miracle" in which the country remained stable economically with low unemployment, high investment, developing industry, increasing exports and mainly "low inflation"[18].

3.4.2. Enrique Peña Nieto - Presidential Candidate

The 2012 campaign coincided in local and federal elections in Mexico City. This meant that voters had the opportunity to vote for President, Senator, Diputado (Representative), on a federal level; and locally they could cast their vote for Jefe de Gobierno (mayor of Mexico City), Delegado[19] (municipal delegate) and Local Assembly Representative. Therefore, 2012 was a high stakes election in Mexico City. In the beginning of the year 2012, Beatriz Paredes Rangel, was chosen by PRI to run for the mayorship or Jefatura de Gobierno of Mexico City. Moreover, although Enrique Peña Nieto (current president) won the 2012 elections, his victory was not due to the votes in Mexico City.

---

[18] According to the official numbers, which were controlled by PRI at the time.
[19] Delegacion is the term used to reference municipalities in Mexico City.

The preliminary results of the 2012[20] election in Mexico City reflect that Enrique Peña Nieto, the presidential candidate for PRI, and the Green Party obtained more votes than Beatriz Paredes Rangel. Paredes also obtained fewer votes than in 2006. How is it possible that Paredes obtained more votes in 2006, than in 2012? Paredes obtained fewer votes than Peña Nieto considering that, even though they were running for different posts, they were both from the same party. In addition to the rejection of PRI in the city, Peña could not penetrate the median voter due to several scandals[21]. Hence, one of the objectives of this research is to determine if Paredes mentioned Peña in her speeches. Despite the circumstances, Peña Nieto signed several compromises in the 2012 campaign in Mexico City regarding education, social security and a sports federal program. These issues were salient at the time for PRI, but at a local level median constituents paid little attention to them.

---

[20] According to the PREP data (preliminary, Federal Institute of Elections, 2012 data) Nieto (PRI) obtained 1,258,717 (38.46%) votes[20] and Beatriz Paredes Rangel obtained 771,821 (17.42%) votes[20], in 2006 when she ran for the first time she obtained 1,030,805 (21.59%) of the votes in Mexico City, and the presidential candidate for PRI at 2006, Madrazo obtained 413,644 votes (8.55%). Source, November 2012. 1425 hours. http://siceef.ife.org.mx/pef2012/SICEEF2012.html# the final computation approved by the Electoral Tribunal is from may 2013, and it establishes that Enrique Peña Nieto obtained 25.92% of the votes in Mexico City. May 30th 2013, 1753 hours.
[21] *Atenco*. *#yosoy132*, the death of his wife, and his relationship with *Televisa*.

4. RESEARCH DESIGN

This research will employ content analysis, because this particular research technique allows replicable and valid inferences to be made from data to their context. Qualitative content analysis will allow the research process to incorporate the context; something that political science often overlooks. Context in political discourse (speeches) is very important; a speech without context compromises the understanding of its meaning. Political discourse has the objective to influence, inform or entertain (Ochoa, 2000, p. 50) constituents, voters, tax payers, citizens, the international community or receivers of the message in general. The fact that speeches can affect influence does not necessarily entail direct influence on voters, hence that will not be measured. However, this study will consider that the speeches were meant to persuade constituents into voting for Paredes. Political speech "is the art of eloquence with the objective to persuade an audience […]. Thus, Plato defined political speech as a rhetorical skill, defined it as the art of "governing the minds of men" (Ochoa, p. 131).

The basic unit in this particular study is "text". Text refers to the speeches made by the candidate. These speeches were directed to voters in Mexico City. There is one notable feature, these speeches were not pre-written; the candidate spoke freely and her words were later transcribed with the original audio files. According to Richards (2005), the process of qualitative research when it comes to speeches is, firstly, to delimit the texts that will be analyzed. Secondly, it is necessary to map these speeches according where they were pronounced. Third, it is necessary to layer the speeches. The layering of speeches will determine the units inside the units of analysis; the layering could be by sentence, paragraph or the speech as a whole. Coding, the term for qualitative analysis, "refers to data reduction either by a system of symbols (as in the Morse code which reduces everything to dots and dashes) or by numbers (as in the coded boxes to tick on a questionnaire)" (Richards, 2005, p.

21

85). In the case of my research, it means transforming the speeches to numeric values, setting one frequency per sentence, and determining which of the categories that layer belongs to. This is a qualitative study because it involves interpretation of speeches. In addition to the interpretation, the cases (speeches) are described in terms of when they were pronounced, where (delegation, district) and who was the main audience. The data has been put in context and a codebook generated with all of the segregated data collected, and this newly generated data is the descriptive of the speeches. The analytical coding are the categories that will be created to interpret the data. An initial analysis of the patterns in the categories found in the speeches has also been done.

According to Saldaña (2009, p.223), the coding can be categorized by a descriptive code in which the primary topic is summarized. This descriptive code is usually achieved during the initial coding or the first impression of the texts. After the initial coding of the speeches common categories were found, which relate to speech strategies of Paredes during the 2012 campaign. Hence, the coding separates the three strategies used during the 2012 campaign by Beatriz Paredes Rangel. Therefore, the data has been grouped according to these categories (personality, party (presidential candidate) and party issues). The coding of the speeches contemplates both: a first cycle coding process and a second cycle coding process. Although the big three categories will not shift, some sub-categories may be dropped, or grouped. According to the theory and methodology of the context of the Green-PRI coalition in Mexico City, as well as Beatriz Paredes Rangel's political campaign, there are certain expectations in the speeches. Since the speeches are structured in a certain way, it was determined that the text in the speeches should be grouped by bigger categories, or "lumper", in order to present more meaningful data. In this analysis there are three categories (one for each strategy used in the speeches), and each category has one or two main themes. Out of the main themes there are sub-themes (specific policy orientations for instance).

22

The proposal for the actual coding is both provisional and hypothetical. After an initial observation of the speeches, I expect to find the following categories in the speeches as a result of a first cycle analysis. These categories are expected without reviewing all of the speeches previously. Therefore, it entails two things: one, that the expected coding is a hypothesis and, two, that the flexibility to add more to this "provisional" coding will allow precision on the content of the speeches. This is because, as already mentioned, categories may be added, dropped, grouped, or separated according to what is found in order to present more meaningful results. The unit of analysis will be by sentences, so that each sentence will be catalogued in one of the mentioned categories. It is important to mention that some categories may overlap, and it will be necessary to measure which of the overlapping categories is more present in the same sentence.

It is important to also mention that, initially, a validity test on the coding scheme and the process of coding the speeches was to be performed using Alceste, which would have provided an alternative solution to the inter-coder reliability. Unfortunately, it was not possible to acquire the software in time for this research. However, since the software has now been purchased, it will be used after the submission of this thesis in order to check the results.

After reviewing the methodological options, it was found that first cycle themed coding might be a good option because it could reflect the themes Paredes applied during the speeches. Theming data allows proceeding from general to specific questions. It gives a general theme and then, through the analysis of the text, specifies the categories of that definition (see appendix 2, p. 47).

Second cycle coding methods are used to analyze the data through first cycle methods. This is the part of the process where the data extracted from the first cycle analysis might be merged, edited and/or dropped in order to generate more significant data. The result of the

second cycle is usually a smaller and more selective list of broader categories, themes and/or concepts.

Taking into account the axial coding methodology, I will further specify "dimensions of a major category."(Saldaña, 2009, p. 185).

4.1.Paredes Personality and Niche

The categories are defined by the theory. Firstly, personality will consider all the questions that refer to the candidate's experience, issue ownership related to her past skills and her perspective on certain topics, especially references to what she represents as a politician and a Mexican. Hence, the main category of personality will have several subcategories. The first subcategory will be her "left" issues; referring to those policies that have created a niche for her. These are: education, agriculture, inequality, health, social welfare, labor and women's issues. These were labeled "left" issues because of several factors. In Mexico City there is a different conception of what are "leftist" policies or guidelines, so that voters label women's issues, welfare, health, agriculture, etc. as more left.

The next subcategory will aggregate her experience, relating to her past experience as a public administrator, such as in the commission for the annual budget or foreign affairs, the commission for international relations and the treasury.

The third subcategory is the Mexican culture subcategory or theme. This one is closely related to Paredes' nationalism and her emphasis on she also emphasizes Mexican culture and traits. She characterizes herself as being nationalistic; her signature in this regard is her *huipil*[22]. Voters, politicians, the media, and anyone who knows who she is, points her out because of this "dress". This is the makeup of her "personality".

Finally, the last theme is just the substance, meaning her "plan" or how she would apply her proposals in practice, in real life in Mexico City.

---

[22] Typical Mexican dress that women wear in a state called Guerrero.

4.2. Party Presidential Candidate

The party presidential category will enclose all mentions in Paredes' speeches regarding the presidential candidate for PRI in 2012, including all references to policies he would implement if he wins. Any mention of Enrique Peña Nieto and any invitation to vote for him because of the program or agenda he has for the country, makes it possible to find policies in her speeches that would reference a Federal level of government and not just Mexico City. Hence, the first anticipated subcategory of the party category is focused on the message to vote for Enrique Peña Nieto, the PRI presidential candidate. The main message was "vote for all the PRI Green Party candidates but especially for Enrique Peña for president".

The arguments to vote for Peña are, therefore, the second sub category. The main message here was that "he has a plan, he has governed a state and he's committed with several federal compromises for Mexico". This category aggregated the compromises of Peña in lowering federal taxes, investing in infrastructure that would guarantee water for Mexico City, the federal education reform that Peña would implement, as well as investment for sports programs, universal social security and social programs for the poor.

4.3. Party Issues

The Party issues would be divided into subcategories, starting with the critique towards the Mexico City PRD (*Partido de la Revolucion Democratica*) administration of the city. This subcategory would group mentions of poverty in the city, construction issues, lack of public services, corruption, and insecurity. The second subcategory of party issues includes PRI values and party identification, as well as PRI cleavages in Mexico City. It also includes what PRI implemented in the past when they were in power and the corporatist values that characterize PRI.

Another theme is the critique of the administrations (2000-2012) of *Partido Accion Nacional* (PAN) in regard to the economy. These are the economic issues that concern the middle class and business sector, containing a critique of the 12 years of PAN federal administration. The second line of economic issues is unemployment, directed to the youth and to the underprivileged in Mexico City. These last two are grouped as party issues because of the focus they have; they are both a critique of the ways other parties have handled certain economic issues, using party ideologies to influence voters in Mexico. Meaning that out of all the available parties, economy is a issue which is covered by media outlets and politicians have stances on it according to the parties, implying variance in party identification.

Green issues on both a local and federal level would be another subcategory inside the party category. These would be aggregated together because, regardless of the difference between local and federal green issues, PRI had an upstanding coalition with Green Party not just in Mexico as a whole but also in Mexico City.

The last subcategory in party issues is tourism; this one is separate because although there is not a clear PRI program for it, PRI did implement a lot of tourist programs in the 71 years they governed, and they capitalize on this as a party.

5. DATA DESCRIPTION AND ANALYSIS

5.1.Data of Qualitative Content Analysis

In order to determine which speeches were used for the analysis, certain criteria were considered. Firstly, the speeches had to be delivered during a specific election campaign, mainly the time of the 2012 PRI and Green Party campaign for Mayor of Mexico City. Hence the time frame selected is from April 28th 2012 through June 27th 2012. After filtering the speeches by date, they were also filtered by audience and distribution, since our interest lies in the speeches pronounced in public rallies and those distributed to mass media. After the delimitations specified, 50 speeches met with the criteria. The data was collected during the 2012 campaign. It is important to mention that after running initial analysis of the data of the speeches, variance of location was found. This means that there was variance not just in terms of where the speeches were delivered (see appendix 3, p. 49), but also the type of events they were delivered at.

The analysis is done through speeches because they represent one type of campaigning and they are not detached from each other. The campaign focused on face to face communication between the candidate and the potential voters. It was a means of more direct communication than advertisements or debates. Variation exists because publics change and, therefore, the way a candidate addresses its potential voters also changes. Politicians use discourse for different objectives; to explain themselves, describe themselves, shift blame, offer blame, present ideas, etc. An issue with political speeches, however, is that politicians cannot say everything they want because of time limits and dangers in misinterpretation. This requires some interpretation of what the politician was referring to and thus, contextualizing. To capture the different messages transmitted by the campaign (speeches), content analysis is the most appropriate methodology to perform this study.

5.2. Speeches Choices

5.2.1. Location of the Speeches

Given what was previously explained, I have several expectations when analyzing where and to whom Paredes spoke; that is, where she decided to tour or deliver a speech. During the 2012 campaign, several strategic choices were implemented, and these varied across the districts. The short time to do the campaign (60 days) and the immensity of Mexico City did not allow Paredes to cover every area. Hence, Paredes had to prioritize districts accordingly. I list several expectations in regard to how the campaign strategy was conducted. Initially the strategies were most likely designed in order to exploit her traits in the party, as well as her niche in districts where she would be better received, or where she had had higher voting patterns in 2006. Since Paredes was in opposition in Mexico City, the priority was her uphill battle against the main – and ruling party – in the city: PRD.

5.2.1.1. Personality

As it was mentioned, it is expected that Beatriz Paredes, in order to capitalize on her personality and distinguish herself from other candidates, decided to deliver speeches in the electoral districts in which she did better in terms of results in the 2006 elections. The analysis shows that out of the 50 speeches delivered and the 40 available districts Paredes attended to 19, meaning Paredes went to almost half of the districts. Twelve speeches (24%) were concentrated in the Delegation Cuauhtémoc. This was the highest frequency in one same delegation. Paredes went to most of the delegations at least once, although she did not campaign in Venustiano Carranza.

The second highest delegation where she delivered speeches was Miguel Hidalgo with ten appearances (20%). Alvaro Obregon, Azapotzalco, Milpa Alta, and Tlahuac she attended once, but she did do a full day tour in each of these delegations, which accounted for 2% of the total (see appendix 3, p. 49). In order to determine if Paredes assisted the districts where

she obtained the best results a correlation was run between the districts and the results of the elections in 2006. The expected results were that Paredes toured the districts where she did best in 2006. However, the results suggest otherwise. The results of the correlation suggest that there is a negative (-0.301) significant correlation [0.033][23]* between where she campaigned in 2012 and her results in 2006. Thus the initial hypothesis regarding her choice of districts according to past results is denied. The fact that Paredes did not choose the districts according to the results implies that she may have used another strategy when it came to selecting where she would make public appearances. These results also imply that Paredes was trying to target other voters, not necessarily the ones who voted for her in 2006.

Beatriz Paredes Rangel, who is currently the ambassador of Mexico to Brazil, has had a long career in Mexican politics. She started her political career at the age of 21 – as a local assembly representative for Tlaxcala, her home state – and has always been a member of PRI. she had several personal characteristics that make her stand out.

Paredes has an intellectual and artistic side, being known for her singing, writing poems and books which have been published. This characteristic could imply that she decided to go to districts with the most educated population because a more educated sector might be more likely to empathize with her. In order to determine if Paredes visited the most educated districts, the percentages of literacy and 18 year olds enrolled in college is taken into consideration for the analysis. The range of the literate population in the City varies between 46% and 84%. The mean of the literate population in Mexico City, is 69.32%[24]. The average of literacy rate where Paredes visited during the 2012 campaign is higher than the general average of Mexico City (73.14%)[25] which shows that the sector of the population was more literate than the average of Mexico City. In addition to the literacy rate, it is necessary to look at 18 years olds enrolled in college in Mexico City and the general average of 18 year olds

---

[23] 95% statistically significant (0.05 level) 2 tailed.
[24] Standard deviation of 6.97.
[25] Standard deviation of 6.14

enrolled in college is 14.26% in Mexico City   whereas the general mean of all the districts which Paredes went to is 18.22%. In order words, this data reflects that she did assist districts with a slightly higher education rate and literacy rate than the rest of the City. The demographic information of the electoral districts in Mexico City can be consulted (see appendix 4, p. 50).

In addition to the strategy involving the more educated in Mexico City, it is possible that Paredes also targeted the median voter, because assuming that a sector of the median vote is also indecisive then Paredes could target voters outside her niche and her party. The assumption of targeting the median voter would be reflected if she would have assisted electoral districts with the average income and the average population density.   The income index was cross-calculated with each district she attended during the 50 occasions Paredes delivered public addresses. After running frequency tables and income, it was found that 64% of where she delivered speeches was in middle to low income electoral districts which is the average in Mexico City[26],

In addition to the average income, it is useful to calculate the population density and the districts where the speeches were delivered. After running descriptives, it was found that 56% of the districts that Paredes visited were considered a medium high population density (which is the average in Mexico City)[27]. Both the income and the population density data results confirm that Paredes was also targeting the median voter in the City.

The last expectation regarding her choice of location in addition to her personality is the fact that Paredes has personality traits that are linked to the party identification in the city. One of her traits is that she is considered a "popular" figure. In a survey applied to Mexico City voters in January 2012, Paredes was the most known PRI Mexico City politician with

---

[26] 24% of the public addresses where in high income electoral districts and 8% where delivered in middle income electoral districts.
[27] 20% of the electoral districts she pronounced a speech in where low population density, 12% were in high and 12% were in medium low population density districts.

83%[28]. This figure would imply that Paredes would choose to make her speeches more public than private. The public events consisted of tours and popular events, these were open events and accessible to all audiences; they were also covered by the media outlets. The rest of the events, are considered private because people needed a invitation or a ticket to access them, These were events for the Institute of Elections in Mexico City, health events which were with doctors, professional associations such as lawyers, notaries, accountants and academics. Other private events include schools, women's brunches, social events, events with the financial and business sector in Mexico City, and finally events that the party organized for party members as well as the events with Enrique Peña Nieto, which were not accessible to the public without an entry card and valid accreditations. Most of the private events were Party centered.

In order to test the first hypothesis of this thesis it is necessary to run frequencies of the events paired with the speeches that were delivered. The results show that most of the events she attended, in comparison to the others in subcategories, were open rallies where she exploited her personal traits. The most frequent events were open to the public and tours through the neighborhoods (26%). The second most frequent events were social events (16%), meaning events with social causes (environment, security, poverty, employment, etc), implying that a great deal of her strategy was personality centered. Although considering the party centered events, if the events closed to the party would be grouped, it would be found that 19% of the events were actually for the PRI party members. The third most common type of event was the PRI cleavage related event (14%). The PRI cleavage events where those that were considered closed doors, and were accessed by people who had a relation to the cleavages PRI has in the city, meaning: some State workers, syndicates, unions and

professional associations such as accountants, lawyers and notaries.The results are shown below in Table 1.

Table 1. Distribution of speeches per type of event

Type of Event	Frequency	Percent
PUBLIC EVENTS		
Tours and popular events	13	26
PRIVATE EVENTS		
Institute of elections	5	10
Health	2	4
Professional associations	3	6
Schools	2	4
Women's brunches	2	4
Social Events	8	16
Financial/ Business sector	5	10
PARTY EVENTS		
EPN policies in Mexico City	2	4
PRI cleavages	7	14
Pact with opposition	1	2
Total	50	100

5.2.1.2. *Party*

Beatriz Paredes has been a member of PRI since 1975 and would, therefore, have obligations as a party member. Under this assumption, Paredes would also have to capitalize the party. The most logical way to capatilize on the party is through the base, and the base could be represented in the 2006 results Mexico City elections. In order to determine if her strategy was also linked with PRI as a whole in the City it is necessary to run correlations between the location of the speeches and the 2006 senator and representative results. After running the correlation, it was found that there was a statistically significant negative correlation between where she chose to deliver speeches and the results for both Representative and Senator PRI candidates for 2006. This implies that she did not entirely

decide the location based on these results. Meaning she did not prioritize those places where PRI did better in federal elections in Mexico City.

Table 2. Correlation results of speeches and 2006 Federal Congress Voting Results Mexico City

Independent Variable	Correlation
Senator PRI 2006 and Speeches	-.399 [.004**]
Representative PRI 2006 and Speeches	-.497 [.000**]
**Significance at 99.99%	

Another expectation in regard to the exploitation of the party is the critique of both local and federal governmental administration, both of which did not belong to PRI during the 2012 election. The federal government was run by *Partido Accion Nacional* (PAN) and the local by *Partido de la Revolucion Democratica* (PRD). One of the main critiques that both Mexico City and Federal government have endured during these years is unemployment. Hence, it would make sense for Paredes to select electoral districts where employment levels were low, in order to capitalize on PRI.

Looking to determine if the districts in which she delivered speeches had low employment levels, it is important to compare the aggregated data for the districts where Paredes campaigned, in contrast with all other districts. Data suggest that the average employment was 44.36% in the districts where Paredes attended, in comparison to the aggregated mean 41.47%, for the City so Paredes visited the more employed districts. The results are shown in Table 3.

Table 3. Descriptives of employed population Mexico City and Employed population of districts visited

Independent Variable	Range	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Employed in Districts visited	18	33	51	44.36	4.711
Employed Mexico City	18.00	33.00	51.00	41.4750	4.03184

5.2.1.3. Niche

Paredes is related to the "left wing"[29] faction of PRI which entails that she herself has a niche inside PRI. This niche is closely related to women's issues, labor issues, environmental issues, education, inequality as well as her close tie to nationalistic and indigenous values. These issues translate to her as a niche inside her own party. With regards to this issue, there a slight measurement problem because it is not possible to measure and locate geographically with accuracy her actual niche in the party, due to that fact that there is no clear demographic of where that niche is, so her niche would be found in the values and themes of the speeches.

5.3. Qualitative Content Analysis

The content analysis for Paredes' speeches is focused on frequency, or how many times one theme was mentioned. As it was stated previously, the layering of the speeches was conducted on sentences. Hence, each sentence in the 50 speeches was coded, in total there were 2,486 sentences. The length of each speech varied from 400 to 5,000 words per speech. The coding considered three general categories based on the type of strategy used and more detailed categories within each. These broader categories were: personality versus substance, presidential candidate, and exploiting party issues (for complete coding scheme see appendix 2, p. 47). After the speeches were coded and segregated it was important to group the results

---

[29] Main representatives of this faction was Luis Donaldo Colossio, ex presidential candidate murdered during the 1994 presidential race.

by subcategories strategies. The main expectation in the analysis is that, although all three main categories should be present, party identification/party related issues should be more frequent in comparison to the others.

5.3.1. Personality

Paredes has several aspects of her personality that were found the speeches. Her overall personality traits constituted as 28.56% of the total speeches. The most used subcategory of her personality was her "left" issues with 17.22% out of the total, the second most common was her experience *per se* with 8.49%. The two least common categories are Mexican Culture and Paredes plan to implement her proposals.

5.3.2. Niche

There is proof that socio-demographics may have an influence in voting, more so when it comes to recently democratized countries, or in this case, Mexico City. Hence, there lies the importance of considering socio-demographics when applying political campaign strategies in Mexico City. In order to determine socio-demographics in Mexico City, a database was constructed with information from the National Institute of Statistics and Geography of Mexico (INEGI[30]) for the socioeconomic indexes. The latest 2005 census were taken into account for the data regarding population density, population and gender. Finally, the IEDF results for political participation was also taken into account. The results (see appendix 4, p. 50) show a variance of socio-demographics in Mexico City. In spite of the variance, it was found that out of 40 districts, 18 have medium-high population density, which means there is a frequency in regard to density. Income also has a frequent value; out of 40 districts 19 have middle income and 14 have middle to low income. These results can influence the hypothesis in regard to the choices of appearances Paredes made.

---

[30] Instituto Nacional de Estadistica y Geografia

The candidate's niche is part of the general category of personality. Her left issues were adopted because they represent her line in the party, meaning her niche inside the party. Paredes' niche is intertwined with her areas of expertise or her past political positions and that builds up her personality in the speeches, hence it is found in the personality general category. The expectation is that she targeted her "niche" more which is labeled as "her left issues" than her personality as such, hence "her left issues" should prevail throughout the speeches. As it was previously mentioned, her "left" issues constituted 17.22% of the total, and it is the most common subcategory from personality.

5.3.3. Party (Presidential Candidate)

The second general category that is found in the qualitative content analysis is the instances she mentions of the parties' presidential candidate. These are found in two instances the federal policies that Peña would implement if he became president, such as lowering federal taxes, sports programs, education reform, and employment programs. These constitute as the third most common category out of the three, hence it is the least mentioned with only 15.12% out of the total speeches.

5.3.4. Party Issues

As mentioned, Paredes has been a member of PRI for over three decades, so that in addition to her intention of reaching the median voter in Mexico City, she also had to concentrate some attention and effort towards the Party. This means that she also had to speak to the members and sympathizers of PRI. Hence, I expect this major category to show up, and to be the most frequent in her speeches.

 The results of the content analysis reflect that Paredes did, in fact, focus on the Party issues (as the party) more than the other categories, so the expectation is met. Paredes opted for giving preference to party issues. The six party issues aggregated result is 56.31% of the total sentences in the 50 speeches. The second most frequent trait is her personality which

constituted 28.56% of the speeches, and the least common category was the party seen as the presidential candidate references, which constitutes 15.12% of the content. Table 4 (on p. 38) shows the results of the content analysis.

Although, it is interesting to note that though she did give priority to party issues in general, several observations are to be made on the other categories. For instance, in her personality issues, she focused more on the issues she has experience in, rather than her experience per se; she also had hardly mentioned how she would actually implement her program. The second most frequent theme found in the personality category was Mexican culture, with 8.49% out of the total analysis. This shows that she incorporated nationalistic values in her personality with topics she knew the most.

With regard to the party viewed from the presidential candidate's stand point, Paredes did little to directly ask for constituents to vote for Peña Nieto. Instead, she emphasized more so on Peña's plan for the country, using more rational arguments to campaign in favor of Peña.

The most predominant subcategory in party issues was the party values which are tied to party identification; that is what PRI stands for at the national level, local level, and the values that the party has supported since its creation in 1929. The second most common subcategory in party issues was a critique of the local PRD administration in Mexico City.

In terms of the economic subcategories, although these did not have large salience, out of the two possibilities (for the unemployed and for the middle class or rich in Mexico City) she opted for speaking more towards the privileged. In addition, the issues regarding the coalition with the Green Party, were the fourth most common in this category. And the least common subcategory that was discovered was tourism. Mainly because there is little current relation between tourism and PRI; the cleavages have been dying out throughout the years

37

and PRD has managed to attract the tourism cleavage, which makes it possible to pay little attention to it when running.

Table 4.Results of categories in content analysis of Beatriz Paredes speeches 2012. Mexico City

Themes in speeches	Frequency in speeches	Percentage in speeches
PERSONALITY	**710**	**28.56%**
Paredes "left" issues	428	17.22%
Experience	211	8.49%
Mexican Culture	65	2.61
Paredes plan	6	0.24%
PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE	376	15.12%
Vote for Enrique Peña	66	2.65%
Enrique Peña Plan	310	12.47%
PARTY ISSUES	**1400**	**56.31%**
Critique PRD	335	13.48%
PRI values (party id)	485	19.51%
Economic middle class/rich	196	7.88%
Economic for underpriviledged	47	1.89%
Green Issues	280	11.26%
Tourism	57	2.29%
PARTY (Presidential Candidate) and Party Issues	1776	71.43%
TOTAL	2486	100.00%

The two issues that concern PRI, could be aggregated into one. Paredes would do two things simultaneously. She would first reference a party issue and then link that to Enrique Peña Nieto. If the party issues were grouped (meaning the presidential candidate references and the party issues) would constitute 71.43% of the speeches. Hence, in both levels of the analysis, Paredes preferred to direct her message towards the party issues and the party, and as a result she would be speaking more to the party members, than to the median voter.

5.4. Content and Location of Speeches

5.4.1. Personality

This last part of the analysis links the choice of the location of the speeches (which was previously covered) with the characteristics of the speeches themselves. Meaning, it puts the speeches in context: what she said And where. The first hypothesis in regard to her personality, is that her issues were emphasized when something different than the party needed to be emphasized. Meaning she put her issues second, when it was appropriate given the circumstances. In order to test this, it is necessary to look at the results of the districts were Paredes did well in 2006. Firstly all of the subcategories of her personality were summed, and later a correlation test was preformed with Paredes's results of 2006. The results are not significant, and there is no correlation between were Paredes choose to emphasize on her traits and the districts where she did best in 2006.

A second hypothesis is that she was trying to target the median voter in the city through her personality traits expressed in the speeches. First, the subcategories of her personality were run in regard to the average population density and average wage (these two variables were made dichotomous 0 for non average, and 1 for average population); the average and non average locations were run in regard to the subcategories related to her "left" issues, past experience, Mexican culture and her plan were run. These show no correlation with average population density and average wage (see appendix 5, p. 51); hence there is no correlation between personality traits and the median voter in electoral districts.

There is an assumption that, due to Paredes' personal traits, the educated demographic would be easier for her to target. So in addition to the average population, correlation tests were run between her personality traits and the 18 year old population with education. Yet no significant positive or negative correlations were discovered (see appendix 5, p. 51). So Paredes did not necessarily target the most educated with her personal traits in speeches.

39

5.4.2. Party (Presidential Candidate)

In order to determine if she decided to approach the category of Enrique Peña Nieto in accordance with the results in the districts in 2006, it is necessary to compare the mentions of the presidential candidate category in the content analysis and the results of PRI for 2006 in Mexico City on the federal election regarding senator and representative as well as the totals for PRI and the aggregated percentage that PRI and the Green Party obtained in each district in 2006 on a local level. It is important to mention that the presidential candidate of 2006 is not emphasized in this analysis because the candidate, Roberto Madrazo, was a particular case, which makes it an outlier. More so because Madrazo was boycotted by his own party and party members in 2006, and did not reach the average of votes PRI obtains for president since 1994.

I expect that Paredes decided to approach the topic of Peña Nieto in the electoral districts where PRI did well in terms of votes for senator and representative (meaning federal results). This is expected because she would need to exclude the people who voted for her in 2006 and to actually give priority and make decisions for the party base. In order to test this assumption, a correlation was run between the results of 2006 and the results of the 2012 content analysis that pertain to mentions of Enrique Peña Nieto. The results show several things in this regard. Firstly, there is no correlation between the mentions of Peña Nieto and the 2006 results for Senator and Representative (see appendix 6, p. 52). There is also no significant correlation between the presidential plan, or federal policy issues that Peña could implement if he were to become president, and the results of 2006 for Senator and Representative (see appendix 6, p. 52). In order to determine if Paredes did make a strategic decision when mentioning Peña, the two subcategories of president mentions were aggregated, and the correlation tests were run again. It was found that indeed there is no correlation between the aggregated mentions of Peña and the results for Senator and

Representative (see appendix 6, p. 52). Since no meaningful data was found, the correlation test was run again. The results show that there is a significant correlation 0.004 [0.978**] (see appendix 6, p. 52) between the mentions of Enrique Peña Nieto in the 2012 elections, in the districts where Paredes campaigned and the results of PRI and Green Party in 2006. This implies that she may have decided to mention Peña on the basis of the federal votes, but on the local aggregated percentages per district she obtained in 2006.

5.4.3. Party Issues

According to the theory and the hypothesis, Paredes would have to also emphasize with party issues (just the party) in the locations where the party did well in order to capitalize on the niche of the party as a whole in 2006. Therefore, it was necessary to compare the frequency of use of the party category in the results of the content analysis and the results of PRI for 2006 in Mexico City on a federal level regarding senator and representative.

The results for party categories in the content analysis show some significant data. For instance, there is a medium correlation 0.406 [0.003**] between critiques towards the PRD (*Partido de la Revolucion Democratica*) government in Mexico City, and the 2006 results for PRI candidate for Senator in Mexico City (see appendix 6, p. 52). The other subcategories, such as party identification, economic issues for both middle class and the underprivileged, as well as green issues do not show significant correlations with the PRI 2006 results for Senator, Representative or the Paredes results of 2006 in Mexico City. It is important to mention that in this part of the analysis the subcategory for tourism was dropped since it had very little relation to the rest of the data set.

After adding all of the party issues into one general category and running the correlation tests, again, no significant correlations were found in relation to the PRI 2006 results in Mexico City for candidates for Senator, Representative or Paredes (see appendix 6,

p. 52). Consequently, the conclusion in terms of party issues is that Paredes did not decide to emphasize party issues as a whole in regard to the 2006 results for PRI in Mexico City.

6. RESULTS AND FURTHER DISCUSSION

The history of Mexico City has an impact on voting behavior, especially when this voting behavior concerns PRI. Despite Paredes' own traits, she lost by a large margin in the 2012 election. One possible reason for this is her relationship to PRI. Even though she tried to persuade the median voters in Mexico City, it was not possible because the rejection to PRI is too much to revert. It is of course not possible to attribute this election result to her election campaign or even less to the speeches studied in this thesis.

The design of Paredes' campaign was dependent on several variables; meaning that she used several strategies in order to determine where she would hold public appearances in order to target distinct publics.

Paredes could not cover every district, because of several reasons; the lack of time (60 days), the immensity of Mexico City, in addition to the valence issue of the rejection towards PRI in the city, and the lack of resources. Paredes had to make strategic decisions. These decisions had to be based on a logic. In order to summarize, Paredes made some strategic decisions that do follow the theory, although not all of her decisions followed this logic.

While the statistical analysis does reflect a particular pattern in the way Paredes played with voter behavior, one cannot disregard certain variables that would not necessarily be included in the analysis. It has been found that Paredes did not necessarily make public appearances or visit those places where she obtained the most votes in 2006. The fact that Paredes didn't choose the districts according to the past results implies that she may have used another strategy to choose where she would make public appearances. It can also mean that Paredes was trying to target other voters, not necessarily the ones who voted for her in 2006. Another possibility is that Paredes could have chosen particular districts because of venue availability, which would not be an indicator for political strategy or voting behavior.

43

To the best of her opportunities, she tried to target several audiences at a time: the median voter in terms of average income and average population density, the above average population in terms of education, the party base, and her niche.

Paredes tried to make most of her events open to the public in order to reach the median voter, but if the numbers are analyzed more closely she did emphasize on party members by doing closed events for party members. The open events were intended to reach the population above average in terms of education; however, she failed to capitalize on the unemployed in the city, and this would have been a natural niche to target because of the conditions created by the opposition parties. She chose to prioritize the population that has a higher socio-demographic in the city. These decisions originated from the fact that she may have assumed that her personal niche was with the more educated and the economically stable in Mexico City. Regardless of the fact that (due to her history) she does have close ties to the rural (agriculture) base, this base is very small in the city, and it is also very volatile. Paredes' base is hard to locate geographically, in terms of education, literacy and economic conditions. The main reason for that is that she has been involved in very different areas of government and public administration.

The content analysis showed, as expected, that she in fact would give priority to the party issues. This is in accordance to Hayes' theory that "strategic campaign behavior prompts candidates to focus their actions and words on issues their party owns" (Hayes, 2005, p. 920). Although she did speak about her issues, which are related to her base. Paredes related her party identification to her niche and tried to direct her message to three different targets: her niche, the party's base, and the median voter. She was in a position where she had to make do with what was available to her as a member of the opposition party in Mexico City in addition to the low acceptance PRI has in the City. She had to make strategic decisions with what she had to work with as a member of PRI.

This study has certain data limitation, such as the inter-coder reliability for the content analysis, as well as the lack of confirmed results for the 2012 federal election, these results should be confirmed in the following weeks by the electoral court in Mexico. The Alceste software will be used to check for the intercoder reliability issue in the qualitative analysis. Paredes strategies were party based just as it was expected. The results contest the general theory that politicians rely more on their personality traits to obtain votes. The candidate opted for the party in order to promote it (and herself) amongst the base. She made certain decisions that could be analyzed further.

In regard to the decision on where and what she decided to say what, there is no real strategic decision behind her choices. She did not choose to exploit her personality where she did best in 2006 for instance. She also did not try to exploit her own qualities in median voter districts. This means that the median voter, according to her strategy, is not her niche. She also did not exploit mentions of Peña and his qualities in districts where the party did best in 2006, rather than where she did best in 2006. This implies that Paredes might have concluded that the constituents she attracted in 2006 would vote for Peña in 2012 anyway. She also did not capitalize on party issues in locations where the party did well in 2006 in Mexico City. The findings suggest however that the question would be worth pursuing further by improving on the content analysis and using more sophisticated data analysis techniques. Although this paper does produce findings on Mexico City elections, it does touch upon questions of general relevance by looking at the strategic choices of one candidate in an attempt to make up for the limitations that come with being in opposition and in a context in which strong party identities matter a lot. The case of this candidate is nevertheless interesting from a larger political science perspective as it looks at the complex balance of choices the candidate made in order to remain a faithful party soldier and emphasize her personal features, both those relevant within the party and with the electorate at large.

APPENDIX 1

Paired Samples Correlations of Results 2006 and 2012 local Mexico City elections

Independent Variable	Mean of percentage of vote 2006 PRI and Green and Percentage of vote 2012 in Green PRI coalition	Mean of percentage of vote 2012 PRI and Green and Mean of percentage of vote 2006 PRI and Green for Paredes	Mean of percentage of vote 2012 Green and Mean of percentage of vote 2006 PRI and Green for Paredes
Correlation	.317	0.837	-0.391
Significance	.025	.000**	.005*

**Significant at 99.99%
*Significant at 95%

APPENDIX 2

Categories and Themes of Content Analysis.

CODEBOOK QUALITATIVE CONTENT ANALYSIS BEATRIZ PAREDES SPEECHES 2012.

1. Personality versus substance
   - Paredes "left" Issue ownership related to her past experience and her "skills" and her perspective (personality + issue). Issues such as:
     - Education
     - Unemployment and employment in Mexico City
     - Green issues (water, pollution, etc)
     - Agriculture issues (production, farmers)
     - Inequality
     - Security or insecurity.
     - Health
     - Social welfare
     - Labor
     - Women's issues
   - Mexican Culture, nationalistic values
   - Substance only, meaning the actual plan in the campaign proposal.
   - The candidates past experience (for instance, foreign affairs)
2. Presidential candidate.
   - "Vote for Enrique Peña Nieto"
   - Reference to federal policy that PRI presidential candidate could implement if he becomes president. The policy lines where:
     - Lowering federal taxes (for example eliminating/lowering the IETU tax).
     - Unemployment --- unemploy directed to the undepriveliged on a federal level.
     - Water
     - Federal education program.
     - Social security federal program
     - Poverty
     - Sports federal program --sports
3. Exploiting PRI Party issues
   - Party Issues
   - Party Cleavages (PRI) has in the city, for example some Syndicates and unions)
   - Party ID: PRI values, candidates.
   - "Centrist" policies –policies implemented in the past by PRI when it was in power.
   - Critique PRD

- Poverty in the city
- Constructions and homes
- Lack or inefficiency of services. (roads, streets, trash, etc).
- Critique towards current (PRD) local governments, corruption, lack of will, bad penal system, use of social welfare for electoral purposes.
- Security/ insecurity
- Economic issues
  - Economic for unemployed and the youth – Critique towards PAN (2000-2012) federal government at the time on economic issues.
  - Economic issues framed towards the middle class and the rich in Mexico (investment, financial sector, industry, businessmen)
- Green issues on a federal and local level, with the green party coalition
- Tourism

APPENDIX 3

Frequency of Beatriz Paredes's assistance to Delegacions and Districts during the 2012 campaign.

Delegation	Local electoral district	Times candidate assited to the district	Percentage of total assitance
Alvaro Obregon	18,25,20,21,25	1	2
Azcapotzalco	3,5	1	2
Benito Juarez	17	3	6
Coyoacan	27	6	12
Cuajimalpa	21	4	8
Cuahtemoc	10,13,14	12	24
Gustavo A Madero	1,2, 4, 6, 7,8	0	0
Iztacalco	15,16	3	6
Iztapalapa	19.22.23.24,26,28,29	4	8
Magdalena Contreras	33	0	0
Miguel Hidalgo	9,14	10	20
Milpa Alta	34	1	2
Tlahuac	34,35	1	2
Tlalpan	37,38,40	2	4
Venustiano Carranza	11,12	0	0
Xochimilco	36,39	2	4

APPENDIX 4

Summary of Demographics of Mexico City Local Electoral Districts

Local District	Pop. 2005	Percentage of Literate pop.	Percentage of 18 yearold with College education	Percentage of employed population	Population density	Income	Percentage of political participation 2006
1	220510	46	5	44	Medium high	Very low	60.37
2	208362	80	22	45	Medium high	Middle	68.24
3	229221	74	15	42	High	Middle	68.89
4	207511	68	10	39	High	Low middle	64.65
5	211787	71	15	41	Medium high	Low middle	68.2
6	185865	67	9	38	High	Low middle	65.18
7	197231	67	17	38	Medium high	Middle	67.68
8	216063	67	13	37	Medium high	Middle	68.53
9	211301	71	17	41	Medium high	Middle	66.99
10	211784	70	15	41	High	Middle	64.71
11	232669	72	14	41	High	Middle	65.17
12	230137	72	12	42	Medium high	Low middle	66.08
13	228684	77	16	48	Medium high	Middle	62.82
14	217126	78	29	50	Medium low	High	66.47
15	212434	72	12	42	High	Low middle	66.63
16	198887	71	15	42	High	Middle	68.43
17	242004	79	32	48	High	High	70.47
18	234705	67	8	40	High	Low middle	66.44
19	192528	63	7	38	Medium high	Low middle	62.33
20	228943	76	32	47	Medium high	High	70.37
21	246456	67	10	41	Low	Middle	65.81
22	223765	66	12	37	Medium high	Middle	68.5
23	196655	64	7	37	Medium high	Low middle	63.31
24	238310	62	14	37	Medium high	Middle	69.49
25	246612	70	16	43	Low	Middle	67.86
26	208048	63	3	38	Medium high	Low middle	58.19
27	189348	84	30	51	Medium high	High	71.24
28	238995	74	12	45	Medium high	Middle	68.08
29	236797	76	6	45	High	Low middle	62.33
30	218715	78	26	45	Medium high	High	73.3
31	232360	63	15	38	Medium high	Middle	68.81
32	238245	66	6	40	High	Low middle	63.42
33	222050	68	12	41	Low	Middle	69.38
34	192619	57	6	33	Low	Low middle	66.11
35	206944	68	8	40	Medium low	Low middle	65.29
36	183386	66	8	39	Low	Low middle	65.46
37	192667	78	14	48	Medium low	Middle	67.79
38	198922	67	24	40	Medium low	High	72.18
39	186401	65	15	39	Low	Middle	68.89
40	190192	63	13	38	Low	Middle	68.23

APPENDIX 5

Correlation between themes of speeches and average population[31]

Themes in speeches	Average population density	Average Wage	18 year olds with education
Personality overall- Paredes	-0.019 [0.895]	-0.026 [0.840]	-0.025 [0.862]
Her left issues	-.011 [0.941]	0.077 [0.593]	0.039 [0.786]
Her experience	0.053 [0.714]	-0.022 [0.880]	0.197 [0.170]
Mexican Culture	-0.167 [0.247]	-0.182 [0.206]	0.006 [0.966]
Paredes Plan	-0.218 [0.128]	-0.269 [0.059]	-0.109 [0.453]
Party - presidential candidate	-0.351[0.012]	0.185 [0.198]	-0.034 [0.816]
Vote for Presidential Candidate (EPN)	0.026 [0.859]	0.063 [0.880]	-0.024 [0.868]
Presidential plan (federal issues)	0.145 [0.313]	0.175 [0.225]	-0.028 [0.846]
Party - issues	0.106 [0.462]	0.114 [0.432]	-0.026 [0.858]
Critique towards PRD	0.219 [0.127]	-0.208 [0.147]	-0.183 [204]
Party ID	0.022 [0.878]	0.311 [0.028]*	0.176 [0.222]
EconomicA	-0.069 [0.634]	-0.011 [0.938]	-0.092 [0.526]
Economic B	0.104 [0.472]	0.016 [0.912]	-0.168 [0.244]
Green	-0.026 [.0856]	-0.071 [0.624]	-0.050 [0.731]
Paredes Results of 2006			-0.513 [0.000]**

---

[31] **significant at 99.99%, * significant at 95%
Personality overall includes all of the personality traits of the candidate, experience, her issues, Mexican culture and the substance of her plan for Mexico City. Her left issues includes her view or proposals on education, unemployment, green issues, agriculture, inequality, security, health, social welfare, labor and women's issues. Her experience concentrates her past practical experience in politics and foreign affairs. Mexican culture contains all the references to prehispanic Mexican culture, history and nationalistic values. Paredes plan is the actual way of implementing policies she proposes in Mexico City. Party presidential candidate is the aggregated party presidential category. Separately Vote for presidential candidate is the reference to vote for Peña. Whereas the presidential plan includes the federal issues, the mentions of federal policies the presidential candidate could implement on a national level if he wins, Issues such as lowering federal taxes, water, federal education program, social security, poverty, sports federal program. Party issues includes all of the party issues in total. Critique towards PRD is are the critiques of PRD's administration of Mexico City, such as lack of services, water, constructions, security, insecurity, corruption and use of social welfare programs for electoral purposes. Party ID are those party cleavages PRI has in the city, as well as PRI values, and policies PRI implemented in the past when it was in power. Economic A corresponds to economic an issue that concerns the middle and rich of Mexico City, meaning investment, the financial sector and the industry, it is mainly a critique towards the PAN administrations. Economic B is framed toward unemployment and the youth. Green are the green issues both on a local and federal level. Paredes results of 2006, are the results of the 2006 election where Paredes ran for the PRI Green Party coalition.

APPENDIX 6

Correlations between results of 2006 and themes in speeches[32]

Themes in speeches	PRI and Green Results for Senator in Mexico City 2006	PRI and Green Results for Represenative in Mexico City 2006	PRI and Green Results for Presidential 2006	PRI and Green (Paredes) results for 2006
Personality overall- Paredes	-0.097 [0.502]	0.152 [0.291]	0.123 [0.393]	0.191 [0.184]
Her left issues	-0.161 [0.265]	0.041 [0.776]	0.126 [0.385]	0.103 [0.476]
Her experience	0.001 [0.994]	0.218 [0.129]	0.318 [0.024]	0.207 [0.148]
Mexican Culture	-0.164 [0.256]	-0.003 [0.985]	0.101 [0.484]	0.071 [0.625]
Paredes Plan	0.231 [0.107]	0.110 [0.446]	0.065 [0.653]	0.179 [0.212]
Party - presidential candidate	0.102 [0.482]	-0.052 [0.719]	-0.015 [0.917]	0.004 [0.978]**
Vote for Presidential Candidate (EPN)	0.144 [0.318]	0.051 [0.723]	0.116 [0.421]	0.087 [0.547]
Presidential plan (federal issues)	0.065 [0.656]	0.142 [0.324]	-0.049 [0.733]	-0.021 [0.885]
Party - issues	0.095 [0.513]	0.260 [0.068]	0.0319 [0.024]	
Critique towards PRD	0.406 [0.003]**	0.142 [0.324]	0.131 [0.363]	
Party ID	-0.141 [0.330]	0.151 [0.295]	0.224 [0.118]	
Economic A	0.085 [0.555]	0.153 [0.295]	0.164 [0.255]	
Economic B	0.085 [0.557]	0.241 [0.091]	0.310 [0.029]	
Green	-0.011 [0.938]	0104 [0.474]	0.219 [0.127]	
Location of speeches			-0.497 [0.001]**	

---

[32] **significant at 99.99%, * significant at 95%

Personality overall includes all of the personality traits of the candidate, experience, her issues, Mexican culture and the substance of her plan for Mexico City. Her left issues includes her view or proposals on education, unemployment, green issues, agriculture, inequality, security, health, social welfare, labor and women's issues. Her experience concentrates her past practical experience in politics and foreign affairs. Mexican culture contains all the references to prehispanic Mexican culture, history and nationalistic values. Paredes plan is the actual way of implementing policies she proposes in Mexico City. Party presidential candidate is the aggregated party presidential category. Separately Vote for presidential candidate is the reference to vote for Peña. Whereas the presidential plan includes the federal issues, the mentions of federal policies the presidential candidate could implement on a national level if he wins, Issues such as lowering federal taxes, water, federal education program, social security, poverty, sports federal program. Party issues includes all of the party issues in total. Critique towards PRD is are the critiques of PRD's administration of Mexico City, such as lack of services, water, constructions, security, insecurity, corruption and use of social welfare programs for electoral purposes. Party ID are those party cleavages PRI has in the city, as well as PRI values, and policies PRI implemented in the past when it was in power. Economic A corresponds to economic an issue that concerns the middle and rich of Mexico City, meaning investment, the financial sector and the industry, it is mainly a critique towards the PAN administrations. Economic B is framed toward unemployment and the youth. Green are the green issues both on a local and federal level.. Location of speeches refers to the district the speeches were delivered.

LIST OF REFRENCES

Aldrich J., McGinnis M. 'A Model of Party Constraints on Optimal Candidate Positions', Mathematical and Computer Modelling. 1989. (12): 437-50;

Beltran, F Castafios, J I Flores, Y Meyenberg & B H del Pozo, "Los mexicanos de los noventa". 1996.

Benoit,W. L., Blaney, J. R., & Pier, P. M. 2000. "Acclaiming, attacking, and defending: A functional analysis of U.S. nominating convention keynote speeches". *Political Communication,* (17): 61–84;

Bowen, B., et al. 1976. *Voting behavior: The 1976 election*. Washington, DC: *American Political Science Association*;

Campbell, J. E. 1983. Candidate image evaluations: Influence and rationalization in presidential primaries. *American Politics Quarterly*, (11): 293–314;

Campbell, A., Gurin, D., & Miller, W. E. 1954. *The voter decides*. New York: Row, Peterson;

Dominguez, Jorge I. and McCann, James A. 1995 "Shaping Mexico's Electoral Arena: The Construction of Partisan Cleavages in the 1988 and 1991National Elections". *The American Political Science Review*. Vol. 1 (89): 34-48;

Downing, J. 1965. What is a brand image? *Advertising Quarterly, 1:* 13–19.

Fenno, Richard F. Fenno Jr. 1978. "Home Style: House Members in Their Districts". Harper Collins;

Figueiras, Tapia, Leonardo. 2004. "Comportamiento Politico y Electoral" Ariel: 282;

Figueiras, Tapia, Leonardo. 2012. "Un candidato inventado. Reforma, campaña y contra campaña, 2009". Comunicacion Y Politica: 322;

Fiske, Susan T., and Shelley E. Taylor. 1991. "Social Cognition", 2nd Edition. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Flores, Grajales, Priscilla de los Ángeles. 2001. Tesis Ciencia Política "Cultura Política Y Comportamiento Electoral En El D. F. 1991-2000". UAM- Iztapalapa.

Gant, M. M., & Davis, D. F. 1984. "Mental economy and voter rationality: The informed citizen problem in voting research". *Journal of Politics, 46:* 132–153.

Hayes, Danny. 2005. "Candidate Qualities through a Partisan Lens: a Theory of Trait Ownership". *American Journal of Political Science*. 49. (4): 908-923;

Hernández, Franyuti. 2008. *El Distrito Federal: historia y vicisitudes de una invención. 1824-1994, Ed.* Instituto de Investigaciones Dr. José María Luis Mora, : 242.

Hershey, M. R., & Holian, D. (2000). Constructing explanations for U.S. state governors' races: The abortion issue and the 1990 gubernatorial elections. *Political Communication,* 17: 239–262;

Hotelling, Harold. 1929. "Stability in Competition" *Economic Journal*, 39: 41-51;

Garcia, Calderón Carola. 2013 "República de Telenovela. Medios, Campañas y Elección 2012". Comunicación y Política.

Jhabvala, Firdaus. 1988 "Mexican Elections and Their Aftermath". *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 23, No. (36) : 1841-1842;

Klesner Joseph L. 2001 "The End of Mexico's One-Party Regime". *PS: Political Science and Politics*, Vol. 34 (1):107-11.

Lawson, Chappell. 1997. "The Elections of 1997*." Journal of Democracy*, 8 (4): 13-27;
Lawson, Chappell. 2007. "How Did We Get Here? Mexican Democracy after the 2006 Elections". *PS: Political Science and Politics*, Vol. 40 (1): 45-48;

Lee Kaid, Lynda. 2004. *Handbook of political communication research.* Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. Pp.561;

Moon, Woojin. 2004. "Party Activist, campaign Resources and Candidate Position Taking: Theory, Test and Applications" *British Journal of Political Science*. Vol 34 (4): 611-633;

Moreno, Alejandro. 2003. "El votante mexicano: Democracia, actitudes políticas y conducta electoral. Mexico DF". Fondo de Cultura Económica": 252;.

Morris**,** Stephen D. 1999. **"**Corruption and the Mexican Political System: Continuity and Change." *Third World Quarterly*, Vol. 20 (3) "The New Politics of Corruption": 623-643;
Ochoa, Omar. 2000. "Comunicación Política y Opinión Publica". Mc Graw-Hill: 203;

Peschard, Jacqueline. 1988. "Las elecciones en el DF entre 1964 y 1985. *Estudios Sociologicos*, 6 (15) UNAM.

Rapoport, Ronald B., Kelly L. Metcalf, and Jon A. Hartman. 1989. "Candidate Traits and Voter Inferences: An Experi-mental Study." *Journal of Politics* 51(4): 917-32.

Vitorio, G. Barbaranelli, C. Zimbardo, P. 1999. "Personality Profiles and Political Parties". *Political Psychology*. 20 (5): 175.

Web Sources

Mexico City 19.319 million habitants, Source: CIA Factbook. https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/mx.html. Consulted march 13, 1445 hours.

INEGI, Instituto Nacional de Estadistica y Geografia , census averages 2005 and 2010 http://www.inegi.org.mx/est/contenidos/espanol/sistemas/perspectivas/perspectiva-df.pdf Consulted March 14, 1754 hours.

Sources of electoral results, Mexico City local and federal. http://www.iedf.org.mx/index.php/elecciones/estadistica-y-estudios-electorales/180-estadisticas-de-resultados/proceso-electorales-2006 and http://www.iedf.org.mx/index.php/elecciones/estadistica-y-estudios-electorales/459-estadisticas-de-resultados/proceso-electoral-2012
[1]http://www.ife.org.mx/portal/site/ifev2/Menu_Principal/?vgnextoid=b14cf4851e2ee010Vgn VCM1000002c01000aRCRD Consulted through January 2013, through June 2013.

Poll, Consulta Mitofsky. Methodology, 300 random electoral sections, door to door survey. 14 to 15 of January 2012. . Source: http://lasillarota.com/images/stories/documentosadjuntos/2012/febrero/consulta.mx_web_images_eleccionesmexicopdf_201201_DF_TendenciasElectorales.pdf. Consulted may 26, 2013. 1756 hours.