

Rollins College

Rollins Scholarship Online

Communication

Honors in the Major Theses

Spring 2020

Framing U.S.-Venezuelan Relations Under Bush and Chávez: Origins of A Country In Crisis

Rashaunna Campbell
Rollins College

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarship.rollins.edu/honors-in-the-major-communication>



Part of the [Communication Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Campbell, Rashaunna, "Framing U.S.-Venezuelan Relations Under Bush and Chávez: Origins of A Country In Crisis" (2020). *Communication*. 1.

<https://scholarship.rollins.edu/honors-in-the-major-communication/1>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Honors in the Major Theses at Rollins Scholarship Online. It has been accepted for inclusion in Communication by an authorized administrator of Rollins Scholarship Online. For more information, please contact rwalton@rollins.edu.

FRAMING U.S.-VENEZUELAN RELATIONS UNDER BUSH AND CHÁVEZ:
ORIGINS OF A COUNTRY IN CRISIS

Rashaunna Campbell

A Senior Project Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of Requirements Of

The Honors Degree Program

April 2020

Faculty Sponsor: David Lynn Painter

Rollins College

Winter Park, Florida

Dedication

Thank you to my friends, family and professors who have helped and supported me through this process.

Table of Contents

<i>Dedication</i>	2
<i>Abstract</i>	4
<i>Introduction</i>	5
<i>Literature Review</i>	7
<i>Theoretical Framework</i>	15
<i>Research Questions</i>	18
<i>Method</i>	19
<i>Results</i>	22
<i>Discussion</i>	26
<i>References</i>	32
<i>Appendix</i>	38

Framing U.S.-Venezuelan Relations:

Origins of a Country in Crisis

Abstract

Venezuela has the largest proven oil reserves in the world and is the third largest source of U.S. petroleum, but today it is a country in crisis. Moreover, relations between the U.S. and Venezuela shifted dramatically under the Bush and Chávez administrations. This contentious relationship along with Venezuela's ongoing political, economic, and humanitarian crises have resulted in a repressive government, hyperinflation, starvation, mortality, and mass emigration from the country. Based on the theory that international news coverage is influenced by the experiences and attitudes of people from different nations and regions, this study compared domestic and Latin American news coverage of the U.S.-Venezuelan relationship between 2001 and 2008 to provide some context for this present situation. The results of this quantitative content analysis indicate that there were significant differences in U.S. and Latin American newspapers coverage. Specifically, U.S. coverage was more focused on Venezuela, Hugo Chávez, and oil, while the Latin American coverage was more balanced in its focus on both Bush and Chávez as well as regional leaders' meetings. Further, U.S. coverage used significantly more negative frames in its stories about Venezuela's domestic conditions and international relations than Latin American coverage did. Additionally, while U.S. news coverage portrayed Bush and Chávez more neutrally, it also characterized Chávez as an enemy of the U.S. more frequently than Latin American coverage. Overall, the implications of these results are important considerations when trying to understand the origins of the contentious U.S.-Venezuelan relationship as well as the ongoing political and economic crisis in Venezuela.

Framing U.S.-Venezuelan Relations:

Origins of a Country in Crisis

Once Latin America's wealthiest nation, Venezuela's ongoing political, economic, and humanitarian crises over the past decade have resulted in mass mortality and migration at rates unprecedented outside of war zones (Kurmanaev, 2019). Specifically, nearly a quarter of Venezuela's population is starving, infant mortality rates have risen 40%, inflation hovers around 10 million percent annually, and more than 10% of Venezuela's population has fled the country (Kurmanaev, 2019). Further worsening the situation, the Trump administration's sanctions intended to force Nicolas Maduro to cede power to Juan Guaido have crippled Venezuela's ability to sell oil or import food and medicine (Herrero & Krauss, 2019).

The roots of Venezuela's current collapse can be traced back to Hugo Chávez's election in 1999 and his subsequent 13-year regime. During that time, Chávez's anti-U.S., anti-capitalist, and populist rhetoric resonated with the country's poor who kept him in power (Sylvia & Danopoulos, 2003). As the third largest source of imported U.S. petroleum and strategically located at the convergence of the Caribbean Sea and the Atlantic Ocean, Venezuela and the U.S. had enjoyed an amicable relationship for decades (Lapper, 2006). However, Chávez's policies brought him into direct conflict with the U.S., and President George Bush. This breakdown in U.S.-Venezuelan relations was epitomized when Chávez called Bush "the devil" during his speech at the United Nations in 2006 (Lapper, 2006).

Generally, both the U.S. media and public pay little attention to international compared to domestic affairs (Hess, 1996). Further, research suggests that U.S. media coverage of international events is largely biased in western political and cultural terms, generally focusing on the ways in which foreign affairs may affect U.S. interests (Chang, Shoemaker, & Bredlinger,

1987). However, threats to U.S. economic and strategic interests as well as ongoing crises have resulted in comparatively greater domestic coverage of Venezuelan affairs, especially in the context of its relationship with the U.S. (Lapper, 2006).

While prior research has examined the U.S. elite media's coverage of the U.S.-Venezuelan relationship under Presidents Bush and Chávez (Bonomi & Pan, 2013), it is important to remember that this relationship is not unilateral. Moreover, media coverage in different countries may portray their relationships as well as each country's actions and leaders differently, largely dependent upon their cultural news values, perceived interests, and historical experiences (Hanusch, 2015). Given that the U.S. has historically imposed its will on Latin America, intervening to force regime change in at least a dozen countries in the 20th century alone, it seems reasonable to expect that the people in those countries may resent U.S. hegemony. However, no previous analyses of the U.S.-Venezuelan relationship that included coverage from either Venezuela or Latin America could be located in the literature. Thus, the purpose of this investigation is to analyze domestic and Latin American news coverage of the U.S.-Venezuelan relationship in its native American English and Spanish languages, respectively, between 2001 and 2008 to fill this gap in the research.

The goal of this research project is to better understand the origins of the contentious U.S.-Venezuelan relationship as well as the ongoing crisis in Venezuela. In order to conduct the analysis, I will first discuss the historical development of U.S.-Venezuelan relations and then elaborate on the news values and framing theoretical frameworks guiding the research. Next, I will pose my research questions and explain the quantitative content analysis methodology used to analyze the news coverage. Then, I will present the results of the statistical analyses and discuss the findings in terms of their theoretical and practical implications.

Literature Review

Historical Context

Historically, U.S. policies toward Latin American countries were designed to prevent European powers from establishing or expanding oppositional bases in the western hemisphere. Specifically, the 1823 Monroe Doctrine opposed European powers' territorial, economic, and military expansion in Latin America, but U.S. policy became more aggressive and interventionist as belief in manifest destiny spread later in the 19th century (Loveman, 2016). Further, the 1895 Olney Corollary to the Monroe Doctrine stated that, "the United States is practically sovereign on this continent and its fiat is law upon the subjects to which it confines its interposition" (Loveman, 2016, para 1). About ten years later, the Roosevelt Corollary asserted that the U.S. had the right to intervene in the Latin American conflicts and internal political affairs to protect its national and economic interests in the region (Loveman, 2016). Combined with Roosevelt's Big Stick policy, this corollary attempted to legitimize U.S. military intervention in multiple Caribbean, Central, and South American countries.

Although U.S. attention and resources were largely diverted toward Europe through World War II, the subsequent Cold War spurred the formation of the Organization of American States in 1948 to unite the western hemisphere against the spread of communism (Loveman, 2016). The Cuban revolution and Fidel Castro's ascension to power in Cuba in the late 1950s and early 1960s, however, disrupted U.S. hegemony throughout Latin America. The relations between Cuba and the U.S. began to derail after Castro had a meeting with Soviet Vice Premier Anastas Mikoyan to form an alliance (Cannon, 2013). Castro knew that opposing the U.S. would result in some negative consequences, so he sought the protection of the Soviet Union by striking

a deal in which the Soviet would buy Cuban sugar cane in exchange for Soviet oil to subvert U.S. power and domination over Cuba (Cannon, 2013).

Pre-Chávez U.S.–Venezuelan Relationship

Although the indigenous peoples and then the Spanish conquerors knew Venezuela contained oil reserves for centuries, it was not until the early 1910s that the first significant oil wells were drilled (McBeth, 2002). Subsequently, Venezuelan dictator Juan Vicente Gomez granted U.S. oil companies concessions for exploration and drilling, and by 1940 Venezuela was the third largest producer of crude oil in the world (Brown, 1985). Not only did further exploration reveal that Venezuela held the largest oil reserves in the world, but also it quickly became Venezuela's primary source of revenue and made it the fourth largest supplier of foreign oil to the U.S. (Di John, 2009).

Due to Venezuela's generous oil policies with the United States, conflict between the two countries was minimal through the mid 1900s. As with most other Latin American countries, authoritarian governments and regimes that were aligned with U.S. Cold War policies and economically beneficial to U.S. corporations were supported by a variety of U.S. administrations (Derham, 2002). On January 23, 1958, however, a military coup ended Venezuela's right-wing military dictatorships and the government became more democratic, if no less corrupt (Derham, 2002). Since this transition did not significantly disrupt Venezuela's oil industry and contracts, its political and economic relationship with the U.S. remained relatively intact for the next two decades. This relationship was further strengthened after the Cuban revolution when Castro embraced the Soviet Union while Venezuela remained a U.S. ally (Trinkunas, 2005).

Fueled by rising oil prices in the 1970s, Venezuelan leaders spent heavily on "La Gran Venezuela," a plan to make Venezuela a developed nation in just a few years (Melcher, 1995).

These costly government projects, subsidies, and price controls combined with rampant corruption among Venezuela's governing class resulted in increased indebtedness that multiplied when oil prices dropped by 70% in the mid 1980s (Di John, 2009). Facing financial collapse and an 85% annual inflation rate in the late 1980s, newly-reelected President Carlos Andres Perez agreed to International Monetary Fund (IMF) loans and other austerity measures that were extremely unpopular, especially among Venezuela's poor population (Levine & Crisp, 1999).

Hugo Chávez's Rise to Power

Hugo Chávez was a career Army paratrooper commander who was dissatisfied with Venezuela's pro-U.S., kleptocratic government when he led a failed military coup attempt against president Carlos Andres Perez in 1992. Chávez was subsequently captured and appeared on television asking his co-conspirators to give up the fight "por ahora" or "for now" (Cannon, 2013). Although his coup attempt was unsuccessful, his television appearance endeared him to Venezuela's poor who viewed Chávez as their hero who was fighting government corruption and kleptocracy (Cannon, 2013). After serving two years in jail, President Rafael Caldera pardoned Chávez and his fellow officers once they were discharged from the military in 1994.

Four years later, Hugo Chávez launched an anti-corruption, anti-poverty campaign and won the 1998 election with 56% of the popular vote, largely due to his near-universal support from Venezuela's poor and oppressed (Cannon, 2013). Hours after being sworn in, Chávez began a campaign to rewrite the Venezuelan constitution that garnered overwhelming support in a public referendum. This new constitution changed the country's name to the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, re-structured the government with a weaker legislative and a stronger executive branch, and inaugurated a wide range of socio-economic changes in line with Bolivarianism, or what Chávez deemed, Socialism for the 21st Century (Manwaring, 2005).

Chavez based his Bolivarian Revolution “on the leftist and nationalist portrayals of Simón Bolívar as an anti-imperialist hero” (de la Torre, 2017, p. 1273). Simón Bolívar or “El Libertador,” led New Granada, which included all or portions of present-day Venezuela, Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru and Panama, in their fight for independence from Spain, which was won in 1821. Further, Bolivar served as president of Gran Columbia, the first union of independent nations in Latin America that included the New Granada territories from 1819 to 1830. Since that time, Bolivarianism has developed into a term that refers to anti-imperialism.

In 2000, Chávez was re-elected in a landslide, but two years later he lost the military’s support after proposing harsh retaliation measures against protestors who opposed his “Cubanization of Venezuela” (Chaplin, 2013). However, a 36-hour coup headed by Pedro Carmona, a prominent business leader who was declared interim president, ended after the public demanded Chávez’s return to power. During this time, Chávez accused the U.S. of backing the short-lived coup and plotting his assassination, claims which he reiterated frequently over the course of his presidency. Moreover, after Chávez was reinstated, workers at the Petróleos de Venezuela S.A. (PDVSA), the state-owned oil company, went on strike for two months to try and force Chávez out of office. However, Chávez used this strike as an opportunity to dismiss more than 18,000 employees, replacing workers and technocrats with loyal political supporters so that his government could regain control of the country’s oil industry and the world’s largest oil reserves (Johnson, 2018).

In 2003 Chávez launched the Bolivarian Missions, a wide range of social programs funded by oil revenues in an attempt to strengthen his public support. These government programs provided adult literacy, health care, housing and food services for low-income Venezuelans (Council on Foreign Relations, 2013). Such Bolivarian Missions restored

Venezuelans' confidence in Chávez, which was affirmed in his 2004 recall referendum victory. Further, after Chávez's allies won all 167 seats in Venezuela's National Assembly in 2005, he announced his plan to create a two-million-person civilian military to fight against foreign invasion while ending the 35-year military relationship between the United States and Venezuela (Martin, 2017).

Escalating Venezuela-U.S. Tensions

In 2006, Chávez offered low-income communities in the U.S. discounted prices on heating oil and called U.S. President George W. Bush the "devil" in his address to the UN General Assembly (Stout, 2006). In December 2006, Chávez was reelected with a 63% landslide victory and announced the creation of Venezuela's single political party, the United Socialist Party of Venezuela (PSUV) (Council on Foreign Relations, 2013). Now that Chávez and his Chavistas controlled all three branches of government, they nationalized the energy, agriculture, and banking industries, canceling broadcast licenses for private organizations critical of their government and creating state-owned media outlets to promote their cause (Corrales & Penfold-Becerra, 2011; Ellner, 2005; LeoGrande, 2007).

After repaying Venezuela's foreign debt ahead of schedule in 2007, Chávez severed ties with the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank, denouncing them as institutions dominated by U.S. imperialism (Kozloff, 2007). Alternately, Chávez tried to develop a Bank of the South funded largely by Venezuela's oil revenues that would provide loans to South American countries without the free market reforms required by the IMF or World Bank (Kozloff, 2007). Although leaders from Argentina, Brazil, Paraguay, Uruguay, Ecuador, and Bolivia signed an agreement pledging large deposits, the Bank of the South never became a viable institution or alternative to the IMF or the World Bank. This failure notwithstanding,

Chávez continued his attacks on what he deemed as imperialist U.S. policies, including the Iraq War, and cultivated relationships with U.S. enemies such as Cuba and Russia (Kozloff, 2007). Moreover, Chávez sought to build Venezuelan international influence through leadership in the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC), a failed attempt to gain a seat on the United Nations' Security Council, and deals providing cheap oil to Latin American and Caribbean countries (Kozloff, 2007).

In 2007, Venezuela held a referendum on the 69 amendments to the 1999 constitution because Chávez wanted to abolish presidential term limits, restrict or eliminate press freedoms, and detain disloyal citizens without habeas corpus during a state of emergency (Council on Foreign Relations, 2013). However, this referendum failed, marking the first time in nine years that Chávez lost an election and delaying his plans to transform Venezuela into a socialist state (Cabas-Mijares, 2016). By 2008, U.S – Venezuelan relations reach an all-time low after Chávez expelled the U.S Ambassador and recalled Venezuela's ambassador from Washington (Cabas-Mijares, 2016). At the same time, Human Rights Watch (2008) released a 230-page report on the Chávez regime's human rights record that found he had used the judiciary for his own financial and political gain while intimidating the media, labor unions, and the public into heed his orders.

Rhetorical Context

Once Hugo Chávez was elected president, the U.S.-Venezuelan relationship underwent radical changes. Deeply influenced by Fidel Castro as well as other anti-U.S. scholars and leaders, Chávez's bombastic, populist rhetoric leveraged the poor's resentments of Venezuela's political and economic elites to create a base of support for his policies (Sylvia & Danopoulos, 2003). Moreover, Chávez hosted *Aló Presidente*, a weekly radio and television show throughout his presidency, giving him an advantage over his political opponents. "His ubiquitous presence

on national broadcast media allowed him not only to connect emotionally with his followers but also to impose his narrative over the opinion of dissenting leaders who could not access mass media as easily” (Cabas-Mijares, 2016, p. 2). During his presidency, *Aló Presidente* provided Chávez with a direct, unfiltered channel to communicate with the Venezuelan people, but he did not spend all of his time in serious policy discussions. “In the show, the president sang, danced, told stories of his youth, explained his ideology, showcased factories and housing complexes ‘Made in Revolution,’ confronted his domestic and international political enemies, hired and fired members of his Cabinet and even (almost) declared war against a neighboring country” (Cabas-Mijares, 2016, p. 2).

Overall, research suggests that Chávez used the historical, socioeconomic, and religious rhetorical frames consistently on *Aló Presidente* to build and maintain support for his Bolivarian Revolution in Venezuela (Cabas-Mijares, 2016, p. 2). Chávez used the historical rhetorical frame on *Aló Presidente* to ground his Bolivarian revolution in Venezuelan history. Chávez frequently glorified historical political figures such as Cipriano Castro, a military strongman who seized the presidency in the violent *Revolución Liberal Restauradora* in 1899. Chávez expressed his deep admiration for Castro’s refusal to repay loans to imperialist Britain, Germany, and Italy as well as his defiance of their naval blockade. Although Chávez downplayed Castro’s violence, repression, and corruption, he openly admired Castro’s nationalism and pride. Further, he drew parallels between Castro’s *Revolución Liberal Restauradora* at the end of the 19th century and his own Bolivarian Revolution at the end of the 20th century (Cabas-Mijares, 2016).

Second, Chávez used the socioeconomic rhetorical frame to define the revolution as a populist or people’s movement that was “anti-neoliberal, anti-capitalist and, after 2005, overtly socialist” (Cabas-Mijares, 2016, p. 55). Third, Chávez used the religious rhetorical frame not

only through Biblical quotes and references, but also to infuse the Bolivarian Revolution with the Theology of Liberation, a Roman Catholic movement focused on socioeconomic and political inequality in developing countries (Cabas-Mijares, 2016, p. 71).

While Chávez used *Aló Presidente* to communicate with his constituents, George Bush largely relied on his cabinet members to address U.S.-Venezuelan relations and Hugo Chávez's controversial rhetoric. Although using proxies or intermediaries allowed Bush to distance himself from the conflict, his administration's rhetoric was no less confrontational and bombastic. For instance, after Chávez regained power following the 36-hour coup attempt in April 2002, he repeatedly accused the U.S. of planning and funding his overthrow. While denying that the Bush administration was supporting regime-change efforts in Venezuela, Condoleezza Rice, President Bush's national security advisor, stated that: "We do hope that Chávez recognizes that the whole world is watching and that he takes advantage of this opportunity to right his own ship, which has been moving, frankly, in the wrong direction for quite a long time" (Council on Foreign Relations, 2013).

Moreover, in 2006, Bush's Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld compared Chávez to Adolf Hitler and accused him of authoritarianism and supporting violent acts against U.S. allies. In general, Bush countered Chávez's anti-U.S. statements by declaring the U.S. supported the Venezuelan people in their quest for democracy and economic wellbeing in the face of Chávez's growing despotism, socialism, and corruption (Sullivan, 2009). While Chávez's rhetoric was framed to discredit Bush and his motives toward Venezuela and Latin America as untrustworthy, Bush seldom criticized Chávez directly, relying instead on members of his administration to discredit Chávez as a president.

Theoretical Framework

Framing

Framing is one of the most commonly used theoretical frameworks for analyzing the ways in which the news media organize their stories as well as the influence of news coverage on viewers' perceptions. In short, Tewksbury and Scheufele (2009) explain that framing refers to the ways in which journalists use central organizing ideas to define and give meaning to an issue. These frames define problems, diagnose causes, make moral judgements, and suggests remedies (Entman, 1993) that may influence readers' beliefs, attitudes and behaviors (Tewksbury & Scheufele 2009). As noted by Entman (1993; 2004), frames occur at four different levels, including the culture, influential elites, the communication texts, and in the minds of the receivers, which are all involved in creating collective meaning around an issue. Moreover, by specifying the causes, effects, solutions, and morality of particular issues, these frames may also shape collective responses to particular issues (de Vreese, 2005). Indeed, Goffman (1974), considered the father of framing, argued that frames provide a social framework and a mental schema that create a shared public interpretation of reality. These frames not only serve as the basis for collective understanding, but also for responses and solutions.

For example, Iyengar (1991) developed the episodic and thematic frame construct to differentiate between news stories focused on specific events or individuals and news stories focused on broader trends that provide contextual information about the specific event or individual in the story. This line of research suggests that viewers of episodic news stories tended to blame the individual for their plight, such as unemployment and poverty. Viewers of news stories using the thematic frame, however, were more likely to blame social structures or policies for specific individual's situations. Following this line of generic frame development, Semetko

and Valkenburg (2004) suggested five frames for analyzing news coverage: conflict, human interest, economic consequences, morality, and responsibility.

When focused specifically on new coverage of Hugo Chávez and Venezuela, Boykoff (2009) found that news outlets utilized different types of frames in their coverage, dependent on factors such as the publications' audiences, stature, and influence on public opinion. In particular, *The New York Times*, *The Wall Street Journal*, and *The Washington Post* adopted four dominant frames when covering Hugo Chávez and his Bolivarian revolution: the dictator frame, the Castro disciple frame, the declining economy frame, and the meddler-in-the-region frame (Boykoff, 2009). Alternately, Bonomi & Pan (2013) analyzed *The New York Times*, *Washington Post*, and *Christian Science Monitor*'s coverage of the U.S.- Venezuelan diplomatic relationship over the first 100-days of Chávez's first two terms. Specifically, these scholars analyzed the tones, issue, and source frames as well as the portrayals of Hugo Chávez used in 124 stories from these elite U.S. publications. Overall, Bonomi & Pan (2013) found that U.S. coverage of the U.S.-Venezuelan diplomatic relationship became more negative and focused on oil problems and Venezuelan property rights in Chávez's second term. While these framing analyses provide scholars with clear descriptions of the content as well as the potential influences such coverage may exert on the audience, it is also important to consider how these frames were selected and who decides what gets published.

Gatekeeping and News Values

Put simply: gatekeepers control which news stories get published. Or, as Shoemaker, Vos, and Reese (2009) explain, gatekeeping is the process of "selecting, writing, editing, positioning, scheduling, repeating and otherwise massaging information to become news" (p. 73). Moreover, gatekeeping "is one of the oldest social science theories adapted and developed

for the study of news and has been used by communication scholars continuously since the 1950's" (Shoemaker, Vos, & Reese, 2009, p. 73). However, gatekeeping is not simply one single act, it is actually a process through which information is translated into the news as determined by journalists, news values, publication policies, and algorithms (Shoemaker, Vos, & Reese, 2009).

To a certain extent, gatekeepers have a level of autonomy to determine which stories they deem relevant for society. For instance, scholars such as Harrison (2006) and Palmer (2000) explain that journalists' judgments about which stories are newsworthy or what stories they want to write are based on their news sense within the constraints of the organizations in which they work. Although some news values such as timeliness, conflict, consequence, novelty, prominence, and human interest are relatively universal, others may be more culturally-bound. Indeed, the organizations in which the journalists work are formed and function within a specific society with a particular set of cultural values, shared experiences, and communication norms.

Instead of conceptualizing news values as criteria used to determine what kinds of information audiences want, Weaver, Beam, Brownlee, Voakes, and Wilhoit (2007) argue they are more a reflection of the organizational, sociological, and cultural norms as well as the economic factors within which the journalists operate. Similarly, in their analysis of the international media's coverage of the 2008 Obama campaign, Painter, et. al (2010) found that the media and cultural systems in different countries significantly influenced the tone and content of their news stories. Further, when analyzing the ways in which the U.S. media cover international events, research indicates it is largely incomplete, often inaccurate, and frequently biased (Hanusch, 2015; Herman, 1993; Hess, 1996). Considering that the cultural values and media systems are much different in Venezuela and Latin American countries, it seems logical to

expect their coverage to differ from that in the U.S. However, no prior research that analyzed Latin American coverage of the U.S.-Venezuelan relationship could be located in the literature.

Research Questions

Situated in this historical context and theoretical framework, this investigation posed three sets of research questions to analyze domestic and Latin American coverage of the U.S.-Venezuelan relationship between 2001 and 2008. The first set of research questions focused on the primary frames used in the coverage. Specifically, these primary frame questions asked:

RQ1: What person or country was the primary focus of domestic and Latin American coverage of the U.S.-Venezuelan relationship?

RQ2: How were episodic and thematic frames used in domestic and Latin American coverage of the U.S.-Venezuelan relationship?

RQ3: What was the tone of the U.S. and Latin American coverage of the U.S.-Venezuelan relationship?

The second set of research questions inquired about the secondary frames used in U.S. and Latin American coverage of the U.S.-Venezuelan relationship. In particular, they asked:

RQ4: How were issue frames used in U.S. and Latin American coverage of the U.S.-Venezuelan relationship?

RQ5: How were source frames used in U.S. and Latin American coverage of the U.S.-Venezuelan relationship?

RQ6: How were situational frames used in U.S. and Latin American coverage of the U.S.-Venezuelan relationship?

Finally, the third set of research questions asked how the presidents of the U.S. and Venezuela were portrayed in U.S. and Latin American coverage of the U.S.-Venezuelan relationship. Specifically, these presidential portrayal questions asked:

RQ7: How was President Bush portrayed in U.S. and Latin American coverage of the U.S.-Venezuelan relationship?

RQ8: How was President Chávez portrayed in U.S. and Latin American coverage of the U.S.-Venezuelan relationship?

Method

Sample

To answer the research questions about domestic and Latin American newspaper coverage of the U.S.-Venezuelan relationship under Presidents Bush and Chávez, a quantitative content analysis was conducted. To gather domestic newspaper coverage, Lexis-Nexis database Boolean searches for articles in *The New York Times* and *Washington Post* mentioning the U.S., Venezuela, George W. Bush, and Hugo Chávez between January 20, 2001 and January 20, 2008 were completed. *The New York Times* and *Washington Post* were purposefully selected to replicate prior research (Bonomi & Pan, 2013; Boykoff, 2009) and because these elite publications coverage of international news sets the agenda for many other domestic publications (Weaver, 2004). To gather Latin American newspaper coverage, NewsBank database Boolean searches for articles in Venezuela mentioning the U.S., Venezuela, George W. Bush, and Hugo Chávez between the 2001 and 2008 were completed. Since no Venezuelan newspaper articles before 2005 were indexed in any available databases and the individual newspaper websites were not searchable, it was decided to expand the search to include Latin American newspapers more broadly. Although the vast majority of the articles sampled between 2005 and 2008 were

published in Venezuela's *El Nacional*, the articles sampled between 2001 and 2004 originated in Argentina's *La Nacion* as well as Mexico's *Mural* and *El Norte* newspapers. Moreover, cross-tabulations with this study's coding categories as the dependent variables and the Latin American newspaper sources as the independent variables indicated there were no significant differences across categories, $p > .05$.

Data

Once all of the articles retrieved, they were individually reviewed to eliminate any duplicates or stories with only incidental mentions of the U.S.-Venezuelan relationship under Presidents Bush and Chávez. As shown in Table 1, there were 349 stories in the New York Times and the Washington Post that formed the population from which 10 stories from each year between 2001 and 2008 were randomly selected. Likewise, 249 stories from Latin American newspapers formed the population from which 10 stories from each year between 2001 and 2008 were randomly selected. Thus, the U.S. sample included 46% of all stories in the population while the Latin American sample included 75% of all the stories in the population, making the total sample 60% of the universe of stories.

Table 1: U.S. and Latin American Coverage and Sample

Year	U.S. Coverage	Latin American Coverage
2001	50	41
2002	51	38
2003	26	22
2004	31	20
2005	61	31
2006	59	35
2007	46	42
2008	25	20
<u>Total</u>	<u>349</u>	<u>249</u>
Sample	160	160
Percentage	46	75

Unit of Analysis

Each article was considered a single unit of analysis and was coded for primary and secondary frames as well as portrayals of Presidents Bush and Chávez.

Coding Categories

Specifically, the coders first determined the person or country that was the major focus of each article: Hugo Chávez, George W. Bush, Chávez and Bush equally, Venezuela, U.S., Venezuela/U.S. equally, coup leaders, multiple countries, or other. Second, each article was coded as using either an episodic or thematic frame based on Iyengar's (1991) explanation that "episodic framing depicts concrete events that illustrate issues, while thematic framing presents collective or general evidence" (p. 14). Thus, articles that focused on a discrete events were coded as episodic while those that provided context for an event were coded as thematic. Third, the coders determined the tone of each article as either positive, neutral, or negative. This determination was based the assumption that the article was factual, neutrally describing phenomena in frequently mixed positive and negative phrasing unless it was overwhelmingly either positive or negative in its descriptions of events, conditions, relations, leadership, and/or relations.

Next, the secondary frames in each article were coded using categories adapted from prior research (Bonomi & Pan, 2013; Boykoff, 2009). First, the coders determined which issue frames were the most prominent: economy, military, international relations, Venezuelan politics, oil, U.S.-Venezuelan differences, Chávez's statements, or other. Second, the most prominent source frame in each article was coded. When an article quoted more than one source, prominence was determined by source placement (lede priority), source mention counts, and source length counts. The source categories included: No quote in article; Venezuelan

government official; international leader; anti-Chávez Venezuelans; U.S. government official; journalist, academics/experts; Bush; or Chávez. Third, the most prominent situational frame in each article was coded: problematic conditions, neutral conditions, positive conditions, cause of problematic conditions, cause of positive conditions, endorsing remedy, neutral description of remedy, criticizing remedy, and conveying moral judgment.

Finally, the portrayals of Bush and Chávez were coded (Bonomi & Pan, 2013). First, coders determined the dominant portrayal of Bush and the categories included: absent/incidental mention only; negative judgment; positive judgment; U.S. president neutral judgment, or other. Then, Chávez's dominant portrayal was coded: absent/incidental mention only; U.S. enemy; dictator; leftist/socialist; Venezuelan President (neutral); corrupt, or populist.

Intercoder Reliability

Two trained and independent coders double-coded 20% of the total sample. Intercoder reliability was determined using Krippendorff's alpha and Cronbach's alpha. The reliabilities ranged from 0.83 to 1.0, with an average alpha score of .91, suggesting the results were reliable.

Results

The first set of research questions focused on the primary frames used in U.S. and Latin American coverage of the U.S.-Venezuelan relationship. Specifically, the first research question asked which person or country was the primary focus of the coverage between regions. To answer this question, I performed a cross-tabulation with the chi-square statistic and the results indicated the differences between domestic and Latin American coverage were significant, $X^2(7, N = 320) = 74.30, p < .01, V = .48$. As shown in Table 2, the U.S. coverage focused more on Chávez and Venezuela while the Latin American coverage focused more on the U.S./Venezuela equally as well as multiple countries other than the U.S. and Venezuela.

Table 2: Primary frames by region (in percentages)

	US	Latin America	Total	df	X ²	p	V
Chávez	47	17	32				
Bush	2	9	6				
U.S./Venezuela Equally	12	31	21				
Venezuela	24	7	16	7	74.30	.00	.48
U.S.	0	4	2				
Coup Leaders	4	11	7				
Multiple Countries	8	18	13				
Other	3	3	3				

The second research question inquired about the use of episodic and thematic frames in U.S. and Latin American coverage of the U.S.-Venezuelan relationship. The results of the cross-tabulation indicated that 54% of U.S. and 52% of Latin America coverage was thematically framed, so the differences between regions were not significant, $p > .05$.

Table 3: Tone of coverage by region (in percentages)

	U.S.	Latin America	Total	df	X ²	p	V
Positive	4	12	8				
Neutral	27	32	30	2	10.03	.02	.18
Negative	69	56	62				

The third and final primary frame research question asked about the tone of the U.S. and Latin American coverage of the U.S.-Venezuelan relationship. The results of the cross-tabulation indicated that the differences were significant, $X^2(2, N = 320) = 10.03$, $p < .05$, $V = .18$. As Table 3 shows, most of the coverage from both regions was negative, but U.S. coverage was more negative while Latin American coverage was more positive and neutral.

The next set of research questions inquired about the use of secondary frames in U.S. and Latin American coverage of the U.S.-Venezuelan relationship. Specifically, the fourth research question asked how issue frames were used in the coverage. The results of the cross-tabulation indicated that the differences in main issues were significant, $X^2(7, N = 320) = 38.57$, $p < .01$, $V = .35$. In particular, Table 4 shows that Venezuelan politics and oil were more frequently the

most prominent issues in the U.S. coverage while international relations, the economy, and U.S.-Venezuelan differences were more frequently prominent issues in Latin American coverage.

Table 4: Issue frames by region (in percentages)

	US	Latin America	Total	df	X ²	p	V
Economy	7	16	12				
Military	2	0	1				
International Relations	26	34	30				
Venezuelan Politics	31	12	21	7	38.57	.00	.35
Oil	11	4	7				
US-Venezuelan Differences	10	23	17				
Chávez's Statements	4	2	3				
Other	9	9	9				

The fifth research question asked about the use of source frames in U.S. and Latin American coverage. The results of the cross-tabulation indicated that the differences in source frames between regions were significant, $X^2(8, N = 320) = 83.43, p < .01, V = .51$. As shown in Table 5, Chávez was the most prominent source quoted in the U.S. coverage while no source was most frequent in Latin American coverage.

Table 5: Source frames by region (in percentages)

	U.S.	Latin America	Total	df	X ²	p	V
No Quote	5	39	22				
Venezuelan Government	12	5	8				
International Leaders	8	16	12				
Anti-Chávez Venezuelans	11	1	6	8	83.43	.00	.51
U.S. Government	11	15	13				
Journalists	1	2	2				
Academics/Experts	10	2	6				
Bush	5	1	3				
Chávez	37	19	28				

The sixth research question asked about the use of issue frames in U.S. and Latin American coverage of the U.S.-Venezuelan relationship. The results of the cross-tabulation indicated that the differences between regions were significant, $X^2(7, N = 320) = 35.65, p < .01,$

$V = .33$. As shown in Table 6, U.S. coverage used the problematic conditions frame and Latin American coverage described conditions neutrally most frequently.

Table 6: Situational frames by region (in percentages)

	U.S.	Latin America	Total	df	X ²	p	V
Problematic Conditions	43	16	30				
Positive Conditions	2	4	3				
Cause of Negative Conditions	12	17	15				
Endorsing Remedy	1	1	1	7	35.65	.00	.33
Moral Judgment	3	3	3				
Cause of Positive Conditions	4	2	3				
Describing Conditions Neutrally	26	51	39				
Describing Remedy	8	6	7				

The final set of research questions inquired about the portrayals of Presidents Bush and Chávez in domestic and Latin American coverage of the U.S.-Venezuelan relationship. Specifically, the seventh research question asked about portrayals of President Bush. The results of the cross-tabulation indicated the differences in Bush's portrayals between regions was significant, $X^2(4, N = 320) = 71.16, p < .01, V = .47$. As shown in Table 7, U.S. coverage most frequently portrayed Bush neutrally as the U.S. president while the Latin American coverage most frequently only mentioned Bush incidentally or not at all.

Table 7: Dominant Bush portrayals by region (in percentages)

	U.S.	Latin America	Total	df	X ²	p	V
Absent/Incidental	34	60	47				
Negative Judgment	6	5	6	4	71.16	.00	.33
Positive Judgment	0	14	7				
President (Neutral)	60	19	39				
Other	0	2	1				

Similarly, the eighth research question asked about the portrayals of Chávez, and the results of the cross-tabulation indicated the differences between regions was significant, $X^2(6, N = 320) = 80.63, p < .01, V = .50$. Specifically, as shown in Table 8, the U.S. coverage most

frequently portrayed Chávez as a U.S. enemy while the Latin American coverage most frequently only incidentally mentioned Chávez or not at all.

Table 8: Dominant Chávez portrayals by region (in percentages)

	U.S.	Latin America	Total	df	X ²	p	V
U.S. Enemy	40	28	34	6	80.63	.00	.50
Dictator	6	8	7				
Leftist/Socialist	7	3	5				
President (neutral)	29	17	23				
Corrupt	5	6	6				
Populist	13	2	7				
Absent/Incidental	0	36	18				

Discussion

This investigation analyzed the tone, framing, and portrayals of Presidents Bush and Chávez in U. S. and Latin American coverage of the U.S.-Venezuelan relationship between 2000 and 2008. A total of 320 newspaper articles, 160 from each region, were included in the analysis. The results indicated that there were significant differences in the coverage. Specifically, in terms of primary frames, the U.S. coverage was most focused on Hugo Chávez while the Latin American coverage was more balanced in its focus on both the U.S. and Venezuela equally as well as other countries and their leaders. Further, while the tone of the majority of the coverage from both regions was negative, Latin American coverage was more neutral and positive than U.S. coverage.

Next, when analyzing the secondary frames, the findings indicated that Venezuelan politics was the most frequently used issue frame in the U.S. coverage while international relations was the most frequently used in the Latin American coverage. Additionally, when analyzing the source frames, Hugo Chávez was the most frequently and prominently quoted source in the U.S. coverage but nearly 40% of the Latin American coverage did not include any quotes at all. Lastly, when analyzing the use of situational frames in the coverage, the U.S.

coverage used the problematic conditions frame most frequently while the Latin American coverage used the neutral description of conditions frame most frequently.

Finally, the analysis of the portrayals of the U.S. and Venezuelan presidents yielded some interesting results. First, the U.S. news coverage portrayed Bush neutrally in the majority of its coverage while the Latin American coverage most frequently failed to mention Bush at all. However, the Latin American coverage also portrayed Bush more positively than the U.S. coverage. Similarly, Hugo Chávez was not mentioned in more than one-third of the Latin American coverage while the U.S. coverage most frequently portrayed Chávez as an enemy of the United States. Interestingly, the U.S. coverage also portrayed Chávez more neutrally than did Latin American coverage.

Theoretical Implications

Overall, the differences in tone, framing, and presidential portrayals in domestic and Latin American coverage of the U.S.-Venezuelan relationship are indicative of the ways in which cultural norms, media systems, and historical experiences may influence the news values in different regions of the world. First, as Table 2 illustrates, Chávez captured the main focus of nearly half of the U.S. coverage, indicating how conflict and novelty may be the highest news values in contemporary U.S. society. Indeed, Chávez was very nearly a media darling in his outrageous denunciations of President Bush that kept the U.S. media's attention riveted on him.

Chávez was not only a master at capturing U.S. headlines, but also, he was the most prominent source quoted in the U.S. coverage. It appears that Chávez knew how to use both harsh language and dramatic gestures in his speeches as well as his regular appearances on *Aló Presidente* to make his quotes irresistible to U.S. media. For instance, while addressing the U.N. in 2006, Chávez said: "The devil came here yesterday, and it smells of sulfur still today, this

table that I am now standing in front of" (Brubaker & Lynch, 2006). Then, Chávez made the sign of the cross, folded his hands into prayer position, glanced upwards, and continued: "Yesterday, ladies and gentlemen, from this rostrum, the President of the United States, the gentleman to whom I refer as the devil, came here, talking as if he owned the world. I think we could call a psychiatrist to analyze yesterday's statement made by the president of the United States" (Brubaker & Lynch, 2006). Although U.S. spokespeople characterized Chávez's speech as outrageous and cartoonish, it was received with thunderous applause at the U.N. General Assembly as well as international acclaim. It must be remembered that President Bush was very unpopular at this time after invading Iraq three years due to Saddam Hussein's supposed stockpile of weapons of mass destruction.

The most frequent primary frame in Latin American coverage, on the other hand, was focused on the U.S. and Venezuela equally. Moreover, the Latin American coverage was more balanced in tone than the U.S. coverage, although the majority of stories from both regions were negative. These findings regarding the tone of the coverage are reinforced when considering that U.S. coverage most frequently situationally framed the U.S.-Venezuelan relationship as well as Venezuelan socio-political conditions as problematic while the Latin American coverage most frequently described them neutrally. Further, 39% of the Latin American coverage did not include any source quotes while only 5% of U.S. coverage did not include a quote. These findings support prior research findings suggesting that people are less willing to be quoted in the media from developing countries, which are also generally less critical and more balanced in their coverage of international affairs than U.S. coverage (Painter et al., 2010).

The portrayals of Presidents Bush and Chávez also indicate the coverage is aligned the news values of these countries. Specifically, the U.S. coverage portrayed Bush neutrally as the

U.S. president in 60% of the articles, while Bush was absent/incidental 60% of Latin American articles. Similarly, Chávez is portrayed as a U.S. enemy in 40% of U.S. coverage, while he was absent or only incidentally mentioned in 36% of the Latin American. This result supports prior research indicating U.S. news values were biased in favor of U.S. government policy, which form a basis for news that is deemed acceptable by society (Herman, 1993). Additionally, these findings are not surprising because of the media culture in Latin America and how it influences what the media can and cannot publish. In particular, the Latin American press sampled in this analysis do not enjoy the same freedoms and protections as U.S. media. For this reason, Latin America media may not criticize Chávez for fear of retribution while it is normal for U.S. media to portray and label powerful leaders negatively, especially when their pronouncements are novel or unusual in wording or tone and/or put them in direct conflict with the U.S.

Practical Implications

The tone, framing, and presidential portrayals in media coverage of the U.S.-Venezuelan relationship also provide some practical implications in terms of their potential influence on readers' attitudes and government policies that persist today. For instance, 56% of Americans believe Venezuela's domestic issues are important to the national and economic security of the United States (Ipsos, 2019). This belief is reflected in the U.S. media's use of Venezuelan politics as its most frequent and prominent issue frame as well as its focus on Chávez as a U.S. enemy in its coverage of the U.S.-Venezuelan relationship. Further, many U.S. citizens cite Venezuela as the reason why they have a negative view of socialism, which could also be due to the negative political framing of the U.S. coverage (Pew, 2019). Likewise, Venezuelans' as well as most of the rest of Latin Americans' attitudes toward the U.S. reached their lowest point on record during the Bush administration (Pew, 2008).

In addition to their potential influence on public opinion, these findings also highlight issues with U.S. media's news values that favor coverage of conflict and novelty in ways that fuel populist movements. In particular, Chávez's rise to power was fueled by his nativist, populist rhetoric as well as his ability to monopolize U.S. press coverage of the U.S.-Venezuelan relationship. In many ways, Chávez was a model for other, more recent politicians, who have used his rhetorical tactics in similar ways. For instance, Chávez's name calling, a traditional propaganda technique, was illustrated in his labels for George W. Bush: Mr. Danger, drunkard, and devil, which were a way for him to create a narrative of Bush being morally corrupt. Likewise, President Trump has used this same tactic as a way to discredit his political rivals and foreign leaders. For example, he effectively labeled Hillary Clinton as Crooked Hillary, Ted Cruz as Lyin' Ted, Marco Rubio as Little Marco, Jeb Bush as Low-energy Jeb, and Kim Jong-un as Rocketman. This propaganda tactic has been very effective for both Chávez and Trump, which when combined with their populist, nativist rhetorical appeals, have allowed them to dominate the media. Moreover, these simple, fear-based appeals characterize themselves as patriotic, or morally good, and their domestic or internal opponents as corrupt enemies, or morally bad.

Limitations

While the findings in this project indicated there were significant differences in U.S. and Latin American coverage of the U.S.-Venezuelan relationship, several limitations must be noted. First, after an exhaustive search that included the Latin American and Caribbean collection at the University of Florida, no database that indexed Venezuelan newspaper stories prior to 2005 could be located. Initially, this study was designed to compare U.S. and Venezuelan newspaper coverage, but when this issue became insurmountable, the search was expanded to include

newspapers from Argentina and Mexico. These two countries were selected because their newspapers were the only Spanish-language, locally-produced, and mass distributed publications in the database. Additionally, the results of cross-tabulations across categories by countries indicated there were no significant differences in the tone, framing, and presidential portrayals in the news coverage from these countries. Thus, this inclusion of other Latin American newspaper stories was deemed appropriate and may actually allow for more broad interpretations of the results and their implications.

The crisis in Venezuela continues to escalate as the government continues to use tactics of fear among the public to maintain their power within the country. With this came a lack of resources for the population and made living in Venezuela impossible, resulting in, starvation, mortality, and mass emigration from the country. The U.S. in the beginning of the Venezuela crisis denounced their support for Maduro and have acknowledged Juan Guaidó as acting president of Venezuela. But this did nothing for the governance within Venezuela because the armed forces remained loyal to president Maduro, which keeps him in power to this day. The U.S.– Venezuelan contentious relationship led the U.S. administration to bring criminal drug charges against the Venezuelan government which has brought the U.S.– Venezuela relations to a new low since the beginning of their relational downfall during the presidencies of Bush and Chávez. The analysis of press coverage of the Bush and Chávez provides a clearer understanding of how the current state of Venezuela has only been exacerbated by the tumultuous relations of the two countries in the past and has become an unfortunate origin story of the plight of current day Venezuela and its ongoing political and economic crisis.

References

- Bonomi, V., & Pan, P. L. (2013). Framing of the US-Venezuela diplomatic relationship in major US newspapers. *Journal of International Communication*, 19(2), 235-251.
- Boykoff, J. (2009). Devil or Democrat? Hugo Chávez and the US Prestige Press. *New Political Science*, 31(1), 3-26.
- Brown, J. C. (1985). Why foreign oil companies shifted their production from Mexico to Venezuela during the 1920s. *The American Historical Review*, 90(2), 362-385.
- Brubaker, B. & Lynch, C. (2006, September 20). At U.N., Chávez calls Bush ‘the devil.’”
Retrieved from
<https://www.washingtonpost.com/archive/business/technology/2006/09/20/at-un-chavez-calls-bush-the-devil/652f4e62-cf95-44c8-948d-388bb6704147/>
- Cabas-Mijares, A.A. (2016). Conceptualizing the Bolivarian revolution: A critical discourse analysis of Chávez’s rhetorical framing in *Aló Presidente* (Unpublished master’s thesis). Ohio University, Athens, Ohio.
- Cannon, B. (2013). *Hugo Chávez and the Bolivarian revolution*. Manchester University Press.
Retrieved from
<https://www.manchesterhive.com/view/9781847792761/9781847792761.xml>
- Chang, T. K., Shoemaker, P. J., & Brendlinger, N. (1987). Determinants of international news coverage in the US media. *Communication Research*, 14(4), 396-414.
- Chaplin, A. (2013). *Chávez’s legacy: the transformation from democracy to a mafia state*. University Press of America.
- Corrales, J., & Penfold-Becerra, M. (2011). *Dragon in the tropics: Hugo Chávez and the political economy of revolution in Venezuela*. Brookings Institution Press.

- Council on Foreign Relations. (2013). Venezuela's Chávez era. Retrieved from <https://www.cfr.org/timeline/venezuelas-chavez-era>
- de la Torre, C. (2017) Hugo Chávez and the diffusion of Bolivarianism, *Democratization*, 24(7), 1271-1288. doi: 10.1080/13510347.2017.1307825
- De Vreese, C. H. (2005). News framing: Theory and typology. *Information Design Journal & Document Design*, 13(1), 51-62.
- Derham, M. (2002). Undemocratic democracy: Venezuela and the distorting of history. *Bulletin of Latin American Research*, 21(2), 270-289.
- Di John, J. (2009). *Windfall or curse? Oil and industrialization in Venezuela, 1920 to the present*. The Pennsylvania University Press.
- Ellner, S. (2005). Revolutionary and non-revolutionary paths of radical populism: Directions of the Chavista movement in Venezuela. *Science & Society*, 69(2), 160-190.
- Entman, R. M. (1993). Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. *Journal of Communication*, 43(4), 51-58.
- Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame analysis: An essay on the organization of experience*. Harvard University Press.
- Hanusch, F. (2015). Cultural forces in journalism. *Journalism Studies*, 16(2), 191-206.
- Harrison, J. (2006). *News*. London: Routledge.
- Herman, E. S. (1993). The media's role in US foreign policy. *Journal of International Affairs*, 23-45.
- Herrero, A.V., & Krauss, C. (2019, January 29). Opposition leader, and oil, become focus of Venezuelan-U.S. struggle. Retrieved from:

<https://www.nytimes.com/2019/01/29/world/americas/venezuela-juan-guaido-oil-assets.html>

Hess, S. (1996). *International news and foreign correspondents* (Vol. 5). Brookings Institution Press.

Human Rights Watch. (2008, September 18). A decade under Chávez: Political intolerance and lost opportunities for advancing human rights in Venezuela. Retrieved from <https://www.hrw.org/report/2008/09/18/decade-under-chávez/political-intolerance-and-lost-opportunities-advancing-human>

Ipsos. (2019, January 25). Sentiments on Venezuela crisis. Retrieved from https://www.ipsos.com/sites/default/files/ct/news/documents/2019-01/venezuela_012519.pdf

Iyengar, S. (1991). *Is anyone responsible? How television frames political issues*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Johnson, K. (2018, July 16). How Venezuela struck it poor. Retrieved from <https://foreignpolicy.com/2018/07/16/how-venezuela-struck-it-poor-oil-energy-chávez/>

Kozloff, N. (2007). *Hugo Chávez: Oil, politics, and the challenge to the US*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Kurmanaev, A. (2019, May 17). Venezuela's collapse is the worst outside of war in decades, economists say. Retrieved from:

<https://www.nytimes.com/2019/05/17/world/americas/venezuela-economy.html>

Lapper, R. (2006). *Living with Hugo: US policy toward Hugo Chávez's Venezuela* (No. 20). Council on Foreign Relations Press.

- LeoGrande, W. M. (2007). A poverty of imagination: George W. Bush's policy in Latin America. *Journal of Latin American Studies*, 39(2), 355-385.
- Levine, D. H., & Crisp, B. F. (1999). Venezuela: The character, crisis, and possible future of democracy. *World Affairs*, 161(3), 123-165.
- Loveman, B. (2016). US Foreign Policy toward Latin America in the 19th Century. Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Latin American History. Retrieved from <https://oxfordre.com/latinamericanhistory/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780199366439.001.0001/acrefore-9780199366439-e-41>
- Manwaring, M. G. (2005). Venezuela's Hugo Chávez, Bolivarian socialism, and asymmetric warfare. Strategic Studies Institute, US Army War College.
- Martin, H. (2017). Coup-proofing and beyond: The regime-survival strategies of Hugo Chávez. *Latin American Policy*, 8(2), 249-262.
- McBeth, B. S. (2002). Juan Vicente Gómez and the oil companies in Venezuela, 1908-1935 (Vol. 43). Cambridge University Press.
- McCombs, M. E. (2004). *Setting the agenda: The mass media and public opinion*. Blackwell.
- Melcher, D. (1995). The industrialization of Venezuela. *Economy*, 10, 57-89.
- Painter, D.L., Al Nashmi, E., Stromback, J., Fernandes, J., Xiang, Zheng, & Kim, J.Y. (2010). International coverage of the U.S. presidential campaign: Obamamania around the world. In J.A. Hendricks, & L. L. Kaid (Eds.), *Techno-Politics and Presidential Campaigning: New Technologies, New Voices, New Voters*. London: Routledge.
- Palmer, J. (2000). *Spinning into control: News values and source strategies*. London: Leicester University Press. pp.103 □ 22.

- Pew Research Center. (2008, December 18). Global public opinion in the Bush years (2001-2008). Retrieved from <https://www.pewresearch.org/global/2008/12/18/global-public-opinion-in-the-bush-years-2001-2008/>
- Pew Research Center. (2019, October 7). In their own words: Behind Americans' views of 'Socialism' and 'Capitalism.' Retrieved from <https://www.people-press.org/2019/10/07/in-their-own-words-behind-americans-views-of-socialism-and-capitalism/#socialisms-critics-say-it-weakens-work-ethic-some-point-to-venezuela>
- Semetko, H. A., & Valkenburg, P. M. (2000). Framing European politics: A content analysis of press and television news. *Journal of Communication*, 50(2), 93–109.
- Shoemaker, J. P., Vos, P. T., & Reese, D. S. (2009). Journalist as Gatekeepers. *The Handbook of Journalism Studies*. pp. 73– 87
- Stout, D. (2006, September 20). Chávez Calls Bush 'the Devil' in U.N. Speech. Retrieved from <https://www.nytimes.com/2006/09/20/world/americas/20cnd-chavez.html>
- Sullivan, P. M. (2009). Venezuela: Political Conditions and U.S. Policy. Congressional Research Service. Retrieved from <https://fas.org/sgp/crs/row/RL32488.pdf>
- Sylvia, R., & Danopoulos, C. (2003). The Chávez phenomenon: Political change in Venezuela. *Third World Quarterly*, 24(1), 63-76.
- Tewksbury, D., & Scheufele, D. A. (2009). News framing theory and research. In *Media effects* (pp. 33-49). Routledge.
- Trinkunas, H. A. (2005). Defining Venezuela's "Bolivarian Revolution". *Military Review*, 85(4), 39.

Weaver, D.H., Beam, R.A., Brownlee, B.J., Voakes, P.S., & Wilhoit, G.C. (2009). *The American journalist in the 21st century : U.S. news people at the dawn of a new millennium*. Routledge, 2009.

Appendix A:
Bush vs Chávez Codebook

Q1 Enter coder initials

- RC (1)
- DP (2)
- Other (3) _____

Q2 What is the date of the article?

Q3 What year is the article?

- 2001 (3)
- 2002 (4)
- 2003 (5)
- 2004 (6)
- 2005 (7)
- 2006 (8)
- 2007 (9)
- 2008 (10)

Q4 During what period was the article written

- Pre-Coup (before 4/11/2002) (1)
- Coup (4/9-4/13/2002) (2)
- Post-coup (4/13/2002 +) (3)

Q5 Enter the article headline:

Q6 What is the source of this article?

- WaPo (1)
- NYT (2)
- La Nación (Buenos Aires, Argentina) (3)
- El Nacional (Caracas, Venezuela) (4)
- El Pais (5)
- Portafolio (Bogota, Colombia) (6)
- El Mercurio (Santiago, Chile) (7)
- El Comercio (Lima, Peru) (8)
- Mural (Guadalajara, Jalisco, Mexico) (9)
- El Norte (Monterrey, Nuevo León, Mexico) (10)
- Reforma (Ciudad de México, Distrito Federal, Mexico) (11)
- Other, please enter (12) _____

Q7 Does the article have a byline for a news agency such as:

- No byline for news agency or news wire; only author and newspaper byline provided (1)
- Associated Press (AP) (2)
- United Press International (UPI) (3)
- Agence France Presse (AFP) (4)
- Reuters (5)
- Other: enter name (6) _____

Q8 Who/what is the major focus of this article?

- Hugo Chávez (1)
- George W. Bush (2)
- Chávez and Bush equally (3)
- Venezuela (4)
- U.S. (5)
- Venezuela and U.S. equally (6)
- President Carmona/Coup leaders (9)
- Multi-country leaders' meeting (8)
- Other: enter (7) _____

Q9 What topics were mentioned in this article? Check all that apply.

- Economy (1)
- Military (2)
- Positive international trade (3)
- Neutral international trade (23)
- Negative international trade (4)
- Positive international relations (5)
- Neutral international relations (24)
- Negative international relations (6)

- Unrest in Venezuela (25)
- Calls for Chávez resignation (26)
- Civil rights/freedom/media (7)
- Violence in Venezuela (8)
- Coup - short-lived government and attempt to eliminate Chávez (9)
- Oil prices (10)
- Oil problems (11)
- Constitutional reform (12)
- Corruption (13)
- Bilateral difference with U.S. (14)
- Chávez's controversial statement(s) (15)
- Chávez's first day in office (16)
- Caribbean issues (17)
- Property rights in Venezuela (18)
- Venezuela's neighbours (19)
- Paramilitary organisations (20)

Venezuela's allies (21)

Other: enter (22) _____

Q10 What was the most prominent/dominant topic in this report?

- Economy (1)
- Military (2)
- Positive international trade (3)
- Neutral international trade (23)
- Negative international trade (4)
- Positive international relations (5)
- Neutral international relations (24)
- Negative international relations (6)
- Unrest in Venezuela (25)
- Calls for Chávez resignation (26)
- Civil rights/freedom/media (7)
- Violence in Venezuela (8)
- Coup - short-lived government and attempt to eliminate Chávez (9)
- Oil prices (10)
- Oil problems (11)
- Constitutional reform (12)
- Corruption (13)
- Bilateral difference with U.S. (14)

- Chávez's controversial statement(s) (15)
- Chávez's first day in office (16)
- Caribbean issues (17)
- Property rights in Venezuela (18)
- Venezuela's neighbours (19)
- Paramilitary organisations (20)
- Venezuela's allies (21)
- Other: enter (22) _____

Q11 Dominant tone of article

- Positive tone (1)
- Negative tone (2)
- Neutral tone (3)

Q12 Sources attributed/quoted

- No quotes in article (1)
- Bush (14)
- Chávez (15)
- Venezuelan Government officials (2)
- Pro-Chávez supporters/government officials/family members (4)
- International opinion leaders/other country's leaders (5)

- Anti-Chávez leaders (7)
- Anti-Chávez followers (16)
- Independent Venezuelan leaders (8)
- U.S. government officials (9)
- Media workers/journalists (10)
- Venezuelan govt. institutions (11)
- U.S. govt. institutions (12)
- Other: enter (13) _____

Q13 What was the most prominent/dominant source quoted?

- No quotes in article (1)
- Bush (14)
- Chávez (15)
- Venezuelan Government officials (2)
- Pro-Chávez supporters/government officials/family members (4)
- International opinion leaders/other country's leaders (5)
- Anti-Chávez leaders (6)
- Anti-Chávez followers (7)
- Independent Venezuelan leaders (8)
- U.S. government officials (9)

- Media workers/journalists (10)
- Venezuelan govt. institutions (11)
- U.S. govt. institutions (12)
- Other: enter (13) _____

Q14 Which of the following frames are used in this article?

- Episodic: focuses on an individual or a single event; highlights how to fix the person experiencing a problem, while a thematic frame highlights how to fix the conditions that led to the problem. An episodic frame would more likely approach the audience as consumers (“news you can use”) in contrast to thematic frames, which approach the audience as citizens. Finally, the solution to problems within an episodic frame is better information, in contrast to a thematic frame, which asks for better policies. (1)
 - Episodic (2)
 - Thematic (3)
 - Other: enter (4) _____
-

Q15 What frames are used in this article?

- Defining problematic effects/conditions (1)
- Defining positive effects/conditions (2)
- Identifying cause/agent of negative conditions (3)
- Identifying cause/agent of positive conditions (8)
- Describing effects/conditions neutrally (9)
- Endorsing remedy (4)
- Describing remedy (neutral description) (7)
- Conveying moral judgment (5)
- Other: enter (6) _____

Q16 What was the dominant frame in this article? (headline/lede)

- Defining problematic effects/conditions (1)
- Defining positive effects/conditions (2)
- Identifying cause/agent of negative conditions (3)
- Identifying cause/agent of positive conditions (7)
- Describing effects/conditions (neutral description) (8)
- Endorsing remedy (4)
- Describing remedy (neutral description) (9)
- Conveying moral judgment (5)

Other: enter (6) _____

Q17 If the article uses the defining problematic effects/conditions frame, which of the following are the focus of the problem?

- This article does NOT use the defining problematic effects/conditions frame (1)
- Positive economic conditions: trade, oil, etc. (2)
- Neutral economic conditions; trade, oil, etc. (12)
- Negative economic conditions: trade, oil, etc. (3)
- Positive political conditions: freedom/lack of tyranny (5)
- Neutral political conditions; descriptions without judgment (13)
- Negative political conditions: lack of freedom/tyranny (4)
- Regional disputes: FARC/Colombia; insurgencies (6)
- Positive international relations: meetings/agreements/outside intervention/influence/disruption (7)
- Neutral international relations: neutral or mixed descriptions of meetings/agreements (15)
- Negative international relations: outside intervention/influence/disruption (8)
- Positive coup reports: hope for Chávez replacement from US/Western perspective (9)
- Neutral coup reports: neutral or balanced positive and negative descriptions of coup government/actions/leaders (14)

Negative coup reports: rallying support for Chávez (10)

Other: enter (11) _____

Q18 If the article uses the defining problematic effects/conditions frame, which of the following was the dominant problem focus?

- This article does NOT use the defining problematic effects/conditions frame (1)
- Positive economic conditions: trade, oil, etc. (2)
- Neutral economic conditions; trade, oil, etc. (12)
- Negative economic conditions: trade, oil, etc. (3)
- Positive political conditions: freedom/lack of tyranny (5)
- Neutral political conditions; descriptions without judgment (13)
- Negative political conditions: lack of freedom/tyranny (4)
- Regional disputes: FARC/Colombia; insurgencies (6)
- Positive international relations: meetings/agreements/outside intervention/influence/disruption (7)
- Neutral international relations: neutral or mixed descriptions of meetings/agreements (15)
- Negative international relations: outside intervention/influence/disruption (8)
- Positive coup reports: hope for Chávez replacement from US/Western perspective (9)
- Neutral coup reports: neutral or balanced positive and negative descriptions of coup government/actions/leaders (14)
- Negative coup reports: rallying support for Chávez (10)
- Other: enter (11) _____

Q19 Portrayals of Bush: choose all that apply

- Bush not mentioned in article (1)
- Bush mention incidental to article (minor mention/no substantive portrayal) (2)
- Fighter for democracy: Freedom Fighter (3)
- International meddler (4)
- Incompetent/not smart (5)
- Negative moral judgment: evil/devil (6)
- Positive moral judgment: "right" (7)
- President/neutral (8)
- Other: enter (9) _____

Q20 Portrayals of Bush: choose dominant portrayal

- Bush not mentioned in article (1)
- Bush mention incidental to article (minor mention/no substantive portrayal) (2)
- Fighter for democracy: Freedom Fighter (3)
- International meddler (negative) (4)
- International partner (positive) (10)
- Incompetent/not smart (5)
- Negative moral judgment: evil/devil (6)
- Positive moral judgment: "right" (7)

President/neutral (8)

Other: enter (9) _____

Q21 Portrayals of Hugo Chávez: choose all that apply

Chávez not mentioned in article (12)

Chávez mention incidental to article (minor mention/no substantive portrayal)
(11)

Military man (1)

Socialist (2)

Democrat (3)

Dictator (4)

Corrupt (5)

President/neutral (6)

Populist (7)

US Enemy (8)

Leftist (9)

Other: enter (10) _____

Q22 Portrayals of Hugo Chávez: choose dominant portrayal

- Chávez not mentioned in article (11)
- Chávez mention incidental to article (minor mention/no substantive portrayal) (12)
- Military man (1)
- Socialist (2)
- Democrat (3)
- Dictator (4)
- Corrupt (5)
- President/neutral (6)
- Populist (7)
- US Enemy (8)
- Leftist (9)
- Other: enter (10) _____

Q23 If there is any content in this article that needs to be included in the analysis, but is not captured in the questions above, please note it here:
