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ABSTRACT

Social science scholars agree that Cuban Americans in Miami-Dade, Florida are politically incorporated because they have achieved electoral and economic success (Warren, 1997). This community is considered a "Model Minority," one that other minorities that are striving for political and economic success should emulate. However, studies indicate that internal divisions may cause disagreements and conflict rather than political incorporation for community. The purpose of this study is to provide an account of the internal politics of the Cuban American community in south Florida and explain the divergent policy objectives of certain individuals and organizations regarding language policy.

Browning, Marshall, and Tabb measure political incorporation as a function of the relative number of elected officials from the Cuban American community, civic organizational involvement in the political process, and whether they took part in a coalition. While these factors are significant in determining a group's level of political incorporation, we demonstrate that political consciousness and mobilization must occur on two fronts. Support for individual candidates and consciousness and mobilization around particular issues are conditions that must be satisfied. We also demonstrated that symbolic reassurance was a major factor in shaping the political behavior of Cuban
Americans. By providing symbolic reassurance to the Cuban American masses, Cuban American elites were able to gain tangible benefits without losing support within the community. While the electoral strategies of Cuban American elites were not compromised by the tactics of non-mobilization that were employed regarding language policy, we can conclude that Cuban Americans, as a community, were not politically incorporated into the political system in Miami-Dade. There was no significant political mobilization around the issue of language policy in the 1980s; political mobilization did not occur because political consciousness had not been developed in regard to this issue and because community leaders provided symbolic reassurance to the Cuban American masses. I examine divisions based on race, gender, age, exile status, partisanship, and socio-economic status using a multi-method approach of focus groups, a mass survey and face-to-face interviews. This study makes a valuable contribution to the fields of Latino and racial politics.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

In this study we attempt to evaluate the Cuban American community in Miami-Dade County, Florida, and its diversity. We will specifically examine language policy and its political impact on them.\(^1\) This examination is couched in a larger discussion regarding political power, political empowerment, and political incorporation. Some social science scholars have posited that the rapid social, economic and political ascendance of Cuban Americans in south Florida is a direct result of the “Cuban Political Model” and that this strategy is one that other minority groups in the United States should adopt (Moreno 1997). This is a proposition worthy of investigation; it raises many questions: What is the “Cuban Political Model”? How is success defined by this strategy? How do we define political power and political incorporation? Can other minority groups adopt this strategy? Should they?

The Cuban Model

In “The Cuban Model: Political Empowerment in Miami,” Moreno (1997) claims that the “Cuban model” for political empowerment does not fit the pattern

---

\(^1\) Hero (1998) states that, “Counties are powerful governmental entities and the direct implementers of state social services, including voting materials and bilingual education” (127).
followed by other minority groups” (Moreno 1997, 209). According to Moreno, this is explained by the fact that Cubans have not suffered the same type of historical discrimination and oppression as other minority groups in the United States because Cubans entered the country voluntarily. Moreno (1997) further argues that many Cubans were assisted by the U.S. government during their resettlement, and were able to overcome the stigma of discrimination through the use of their talents and ambition. Moreover, the concentrated settlement pattern of Cubans to the Miami-Dade area facilitated the development of the Cuban enclave and eventually led to institutional completeness (Pérez 1992, 90-91). These aspects of Cuban immigration and settlement provided the foundation for the development of political empowerment.

Moreno’s (1997) definition of the Cuban pattern of political empowerment is characterized by five factors: ethnic mobilization behind individual candidates during elections, a conservative ideological consistency, incorporation into the Republican Party, the development and maintenance of civic and community-minded organizations such as the Cuban American National Foundation (CANF), and the powerful influence of Hispanic-owned radio and television stations. Moreno (1997) states that it is through

---

2 Cuban Americans living in exile would not agree that they left Cuba voluntarily.

3 This is not a unique claim. Many other groups, such as the Irish, Italians, and Poles, would they too were able to pull themselves up politically, socially, and economically.

4 In this study, we discuss a particular segment of the Hispanic population: Cubans and Cuban Americans, who make up 62% of Miami’s Hispanic population.

5 Although for many Latinos in the U.S. the term Latino has become the preferred term when making references to Spanish-speakers from the Americas, in Miami the term is rarely encountered and is infrequently used by Cubans for self-identification purposes. Therefore, the terms Hispanic or Latino, which are more common in local usage are used (Warren, 1997). At times, the terms Hispanic and Latino
these venues that Cuban Americans translated their numbers and their economic strength into political power in the first generation after arriving in the United States and that the Cuban model offers a competing model for minority group empowerment.

Political Incorporation

While Moreno’s (1997) study is key in that it points to the relative success of Cuban Americans in Miami-Dade in the electoral arena, there are a few assumptions that need to be addressed. First, Moreno (1997) inherently argues that political empowerment via electoral success is an end. This is problematic because electoral victory does not necessarily translate into any type of substantive power regarding political outcomes. Browning, Marshall, and Tabb (1997) posit that electoral success is not an end in and of itself, but a means to a larger end: effectively representing one’s groups in policy-making. Browning, Marshall, and Tabb (1997) define political incorporation as “the extent to which group interests are effectively represented in a coalition in policy making,” which is measured by “the extent to which it is represented in a coalition that dominates city policy making” (9).

Another dilemma in Moreno’s (1997) theory is that he defines any gain as a gain for the entire ethnic group. Browning, Marshall, and Tabb (1997) point out that gains for some individual group members do not necessarily contribute to the advancement of all group members – there is no monolithic whole. Reed (1999) bolsters this argument are used interchangeably throughout this essay. However, Hispanic is the term usually associated with the U.S. Census.
in his study of the post-segregation era in the U.S. Reed (1999) clarifies his argument by pointing out that it is possible for individuals to reap the political, economic and social benefits without social and economic uplift being extended to other group members. According to Browning, Marshall, and Tabb's (1997) theory of political incorporation, we must ask whether electoral success translates into group benefits, as well as whether group cohesion exists.

Third, the Cuban model assumes that a cohesive and undivided Cuban American community exists — Moreno (1997) lends his attention to middle class Cubans and the fact that they have been able to enter a favorable opportunity structure (McAdam 1982), but he never goes beyond this categorization. Clearly, there are Cubans of all races, religions, socio-economic classes, coming from different parts of Cuba and at different points in time, and this diversity may have political consequences. Thus these areas of diversity need to be examined to provide a more comprehensive analysis of the politics of Cuban Miami.

Therefore Browning, Marshall, and Tabb's (1997) theory of political incorporation illuminates a few weaknesses in Moreno's (1997) theory and allows us to ask many of the questions that have been left unanswered by previous works. There are several critiques of Browning, Marshall, and Tabb's (1997) theory that we will need to address, and improvements and extensions of this theory of political incorporation will have to be made as we investigate the Cuban American community in Miami-Dade and its diversity in the context of language policy and its impact on the level of political
incorporation achieved by the community. Before delving into these theoretical issues it is necessary to discuss the contributions this study will provide

The Plan of the Dissertation

This dissertation examines the Cuban American community in Miami-Dade with respect to language policies and theories of political incorporation. We examine various measures of diversity within the Cuban and Cuban American communities such as racial identity, gender, age, exile status, political ideology, partisanship, political knowledge, and political participation. We examine English Only policies relative to these issues to demonstrate their general significance and, thus, to provide a comprehensive discussion of political incorporation. The chapters proceed as follows.

Chapter 2 provides a historical overview of the various waves of Cuban immigration to Miami-Dade County. It also gives a current profile of Miami-Dade’s population, comparing the relative positions of Anglos, Blacks, and Hispanics in the areas of education, income, and business ownership. Theoretical concepts are then introduced along with a discussion of expected findings.

Chapter 3 provides a historical account of the development of language policy in Miami-Dade County, Florida as well as in California. This analysis will enable us to talk more broadly about the Latino experience regarding language policy in addition to discussing the unique nature of the language issue in Miami-Dade County. We will define the major players in Miami-Dade’s language debate and describe their political behavior regarding the issue. This will lead us into a more in-depth discussion of Browning, Marshall, and Tabb’s (1997) theory of political incorporation. In Chapter 4
we will define the concepts of the theory and operationalize those concepts. We will also define the dependent and independent variables and hypotheses of the study. This chapter will conclude with a delineation of the expectations the research has for the ensuing analyses.

In Chapter 5 we will examine the social context of language policy. We will ask: are there disconnects within the Cuban American community? If so, what are they and how do they affect the politics of the community? What is the impact of discrimination in the areas of education, income distribution, and language policy for the Cuban American community? How has language policy affected the social status of Cuban Americans in Miami-Dade?

This discussion is extended in Chapter 6 where we will address the political context and consequences of language policy. In this chapter we will study the key players within the Cuban American community and their respective reactions to language policy. Specifically, we will examine the role of civic groups, political and business leaders, and the grassroots components of the community in defining the political context and consequences of English Only policies.

In Chapter 7 we will define the symbolic importance of language policy. Here we will utilize Edelman’s (1964) symbolic politics theory to assess the effect of this policy on the political process and on the political incorporation of Cuban Americans in Miami-Dade County, thereby bridging the gap between Browning, Marshall, and Tabb’s (1997) theory of political incorporation and this case.
Finally, we will provide a summary of the findings and provide a discussion of the implications thereof in Chapter 8. This will be followed by a conversation about the contributions of this study to the field of political science. In particular, we will address the contributions to the subfields of political behavior, public opinion, and minority politics. In this chapter we will also discuss the possibility of future research regarding this population, location, issue area, as well as theoretical concerns.

Contributions

The greatest benefit of this study lies in what it can reveal to us concerning the nature of political incorporation and public policy. Assessing the connection between the tools and nature of political power in Miami-Dade will yield not only a better understanding of the concepts of political power and incorporation but better questions for implementation in future large scale studies such as the National Latino Political Survey (NLPS). Thus, this analysis can demonstrate a need for more large-scale, quantitative research. This line of research informs current knowledge in the discipline in several ways. For example, this research helps us to more fully understand differences within the Cuban American community.

As a discipline we have not acknowledged the diversity that exists within this subset of the Hispanic population. The focus of previous research has primarily served to reinforce the image of a cohesive, Republican voting bloc without taking note of within-group cleavages. Thus, the idea of the “Model Minority” has been essentialized and the community has been represented as a single, cohesive entity rather than an internally diverse population. We will get a better sense of the diversity within the
Cuban-Miami community. All of this suggests that there is much to be learned about the language issue in the Latino community.

This project stresses the importance of having an accurate, systematic study of the Cuban American community. While some scholars have attempted to provide this type of analysis, there has not been a study that employs the method of discussion groups. The Latino community, generally speaking, does not welcome non-Latino individuals who question their political behavior via telephone interviewing (Marin and Marin 1991). The focus or small group discussion setting, as well as using a moderator from the local area, may allow for improved results. Finally, this project can expand the way we, as social scientists, think about and study Latino politics, ideology, and public opinion. It will expand research in Latino politics by focusing exclusively on only one subgroup and the intra-group differences that exist, further examining theories of group cohesiveness and incorporation.

Using the conceptualizations of Browning, Marshall and Tabb's theory of political incorporation, we develop a theory of political incorporation where some members of the group have their interests reflected in policy and others do not. We will examine internal community divisions based on race, gender, age, immigration, partisanship, and socio-economic status using a multi-method approach of focus groups, a mass survey and face-to-face interviews. Focus groups will provide qualitative descriptions of the Cuban American community. The mass survey will provide more representative and generalizable data regarding the Cuban community, whereas the face-to-face interviews will allow for a more concentrated analysis of community leaders and
their policy objectives. We find that this community is not a monolith, but has intragroup divisions that need further exploration. This study should make a valuable contribution to the fields of Latino and racial politics.
CHAPTER 2

COMMUNITY FORMATION

One of the major critiques of Browning, Marshall, and Tabb’s pluralist theory of political incorporation is outlined by Hero (1992). In his book, Latinos and the U.S. Political System: Two-Tiered Pluralism, Hero (1992) argues that the pluralist model does not integrate the importance of history into the theoretical framework. Hero (1992) goes on to state that groups are seen as essentially similar and that prejudice and discrimination are not insurmountable. To address these critiques and therefore improve upon Browning, Marshall, and Tabb’s theory, this chapter is dedicated to providing a historical context from which to begin our analyses.

Further, Hero’s (1992) argument that Latinos have a unique place in the political system will also be adopted. Traditional political incorporation literature such as Erie’s (1988) study on the Irish and McAdam’s (1982) study on the political process in the African American community simply cannot be applied to the Cuban American community in Miami-Dade because the respective socio- and geo-political histories of each group is divergent. Even within the context of Latino immigration and settlement, the Cuban American story is unique. This chapter will reveal the distinctiveness of this
ethnic group, its inimitable history of immigration and U.S. settlement, and how these characteristics have shaped the formation of the Cuban enclave in Miami-Dade.

**Batista and Friends**

Since the early 1960s, the Cuban population in the United States has grown to become the second largest foreign-born minority in the country and the third largest Hispanic group.¹ Moreover, approximately half of this population is concentrated in the Miami Metropolitan Area (Portes and Mozo 1988). However, it is the experience a group has upon entering the U.S. that sets the tone for its rates of assimilation, acceptance by “mainstream” society, and economic and political success; in essence it creates a starting point from which to build a solid foundation. Each ethnic and racial group starts from a different point, some being more privileged – perhaps because they are able to enter an established, thriving ethnic community or perhaps because they are able to circumvent some of the immigration and settlement difficulties because of their political, economic, or social status - while others are much more disadvantaged, thereby framing the context for each group’s collective future.

In order to accurately assess changes of group cohesion over time, it is necessary to first analyze the history of “la lucha.”² During the 1940s and 1950s Cuba was a hot vacation spot for many of America’s elites, as well as the rich and famous. There were a

---

¹ According to the U.S. Census, Mexicans comprise the largest foreign-born ethnic group in the United States. Mexicans and Mexican Americans are the largest group of Hispanics in the U.S., followed by Puerto Ricans (U.S. citizens by birth – no naturalization needed), and then Cubans and Cuban Americans. The number of Cubans living in the U.S. today amounts to 10% of Cuba’s population.

² The struggle.
plethora of casinos and shows for tourists to enjoy. However, the façade of bright lights and showgirls did not expand far beyond the urban centers such as Havana and the beaches. Cuba's society was racially and ideologically divided (Helg 1995). Cubans of African descent, Afro-Cubans, and mulattoes had been kept out of elite social and political circles through various kinds of discrimination since the country gained its independence in the early 1900s – and probably long before.

These racial and ideological divisions were exacerbated by regional schisms between the urbanites and the provincials. At the far east end of the island, in Oriente, sugar plantations were the main source of employment – many of which were owned by citizens of the United States. Through the combination of Cuban and American elites in business ventures together (casinos and sugar) and the history of U.S. involvement in Cuban governmental affairs through the Platt Amendment, Cuban and U.S. elites had built a network of political and economic connections. Further, the Cuban government had a reputation among its citizens for being corrupt. Eventually this led to a series of strikes among sugar cane workers, which began in Santiago de Cuba in 1955. This was the beginning of a downward spiral for government-labor relations (Martinez Triary 1996). The time was ripe for revolution.

---

3 In 1901, after three years of U.S. occupation of Cuba, Congress passed the Platt Amendment which stated in Article III: The Government of Cuba consents that the United States may exercise the right to intervene for the preservation of Cuban independence, the maintenance of a government adequate for the protection of life, property, and individual liberty, and for discharging the obligations with respect to Cuba imposed by the Treaty of Paris on the United States, now to be assumed and undertaken by the Government of Cuba. In order to end the occupation of Cuba, the Cuban government had to insert the Platt Amendment into its constitution.
Castro’s Revolution

In the early 1950s Fulgencio Batista, a very powerful military officer with previous political and governmental experience, staged a military coup in Cuba, overthrowing President Carlos Prio and becoming Dictator of Cuba. Some thought that Batista had abandoned the Cuban constitution by allowing only staged elections in which victory would be guaranteed. Throughout the 1950s, Fidel Castro claimed that Batista’s regime was corrupt and that Cuba’s government was systematically discriminating against poor, female, and black citizens of Cuba and favoring U.S. business and political interests. Thus Castro made it clear that he felt that Batista catered far too much to the U.S. government, thereby allowing the U.S. to influence policy on the island. To change these and various other problems that Castro felt existed, he led a revolutionary movement to overthrow the government, which he successfully did in 1959.

Among Castro’s supporters were those who were marginalized by Batista’s government: Afro-Cubans and mulattoes, women, and the rural poor. Castro’s descent from the Sierra Maestra became the quintessential guerilla story of the 1950s, 60s, and 70s in Latin America, Asia, and Africa. Clearly Batista resisted Castro’s movement and civil war ensued. Batista was not alone in his fight against Castro. U.S. business interests were at stake and Cuban elites were threatened by the revolutionary activity, therefore they supported the old guard as long as possible before fleeing the island.

---

4 The movement was called the 26th of July Revolutionary Movement.
Shortly after his successful coup, Castro began to nationalize property and institute socialist policies that would attempt to redistribute wealth in Cuba.

The Beginning of an Exodus: The First Waves

There have been five basic waves of immigration from Cuba to Miami-Dade since 1959; many of them financed by Cubans already residing in the United States. The first wave was initiated in January of 1959 and ended in October of 1962. This first large wave was the result of Fidel Castro’s revolutionary take-over of Cuba and therefore included ousted Cuban President Fulgencio Batista and his followers (known as Batistianos), landowners, industrialists, managers, and professionals totaling approximately 215,000 exiles that entered Miami (Didion 1987). This group of exiles can be described as anti-Castro, but not necessarily strong ideological anti-Communists. They were white, economic and political elites who were well-educated and had connections already established in the United States via the business and tourism arenas. Many of the exiles of this wave traveled first to European and Latin American destinations before arriving in Miami by airplane. Despite their wealth, they had to leave many of their family members, friends, and possessions behind, on la isla. They did not intend to make a permanent home in United States, but believed that the revolutionary government would be toppled and that they would soon return to Cuba (de los Angeles Torres, 1988).
After the failure of the Bay of Pigs Invasion in 1961, hopes of bringing Castro and his government down began to fade. However, during the same year the United States brought more than 15,000 Cuban children to this country through the State Department-sponsored “Operación Pedro Pan” in which the Catholic Church and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce in Havana convinced Cuban parents that if they did not send their children to the U.S., the revolutionary government would send them to the Soviet Union (de los Angeles Torres 1988; 1999). The plan was that once in the United States, children could then legally claim their parents. These two events, the Bay of Pigs invasion and Operation Peter Pan, led to the second major wave of immigration. This wave was actually permitted by President Fidel Castro from November 1962 to November 1965 and included 74,000 Cuban exiles and 5,000 relatives of Cubans already living in the United States. In a sense it was in Castro’s best interest to allow

---

6 In January 1961, Kennedy, in one of the final acts of his administration, broke diplomatic ties with Cuba. An invasion of Cuba had been planned by the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency since May 1960. On April 15, 1961, three U.S.-made airplanes piloted by Cubans exiles bombed Cuban air bases. Two days later the Cubans trained by the United States and using U.S. equipment landed at several sites. The principal landing took place at the Bay of Pigs on the south-central coast of Cuba. The invasion force was unequal to the strength of Castro's troops, and by April 19 its last stronghold had been captured, along with more than 1,100 men. In the aftermath of the invasion, critics charged the CIA with supplying faulty information to President Kennedy and also noted that, in spite of Kennedy's orders, supporters of Batista were included in the invasion force, whereas members of the noncommunist People's Revolutionary Movement, considered the most capable anti-Castro group, were excluded. The captured members of the invasion force were imprisoned. From May 1961 the Kennedy administration unofficially backed attempts to ransom the prisoners, but the efforts failed to raise the $28,000,000 needed for heavy-construction equipment demanded by Castro as reparations. Castro finally agreed to release the prisoners in exchange for $53,000,000 worth of food and medicine. Between December 1962 and July 1965 the survivors were returned to the United States. Some critics thought that the United States had not been aggressive enough in its support of the Bay of Pigs invasion and had left an impression of irresolution. The incident was crucial to the development of the Cuban missile crisis of October 1962. For more information on this topic see Bay of Pigs Declassified by Peter Kornbluh (1998).

7 Operation Peter Pan

8 The Soviet Union became an ally to Castro’s Cuba in its early years until the end of the Cold War Era.
counterrevolutionaries to leave the country. President Castro needed for several things to occur in order for his revolution to make a relatively smooth transition: 1) to be seen as a legitimate government by the international community and, 2) be seen as a legitimate leader by Cubans on the island—thus mass support was necessary. It would have been much more difficult for Castro to gain this much needed support with a large number of citizens that publicly disagreed with the revolutionary changes he proposed. In fact Castro had been fighting against counterrevolutionaries in Cuba from 1959 through 1965, the year that the Cuban government defeated the internal anti-Castro movement.

Given that this second wave, like its predecessor, included a considerable amount of white, upper-middle class, well-educated, landowners, it is fair to say that they opposed Castro's plans for Cuba for several important reasons. One of the most common was that many were landowning businesspeople that would undoubtedly have money and property seized and redistributed to other citizens or nationalized. In essence, this agreement to exit was mutual in that the exiles wanted to leave Castro's Cuba and Castro wanted the enemies of the revolution to depart.

The next wave was the result of a series of agreements between the United States and Cuban governments, which were prompted by Castro's response to internal pressure for emigration. In the fall of 1965, the Cuban government opened a port and allowed persons from the United States to go to Cuba to pick up relatives who wanted to leave

---

9 Not all Cubans left Cuba because they were disaffected with the revolution, but it was a deciding factor for the initial waves of immigrants in the early to mid 1960s.
the country. According to Pérez (1992), some 5,000 Cubans left from the port of Camarioca before the U.S. and Cuba halted the boatlift and agreed to an orderly airlift that launched twice daily airlifts from Varadero Beach to Miami from December 1965 until April 1973; the airlifts were known as “freedom flights” (Pérez 1992). In all, the third wave was comprised of approximately 340,000 refugees, primarily relatives of U.S residents. Moreover, this wave included Cubans who entered the United States under the Cuban Refugee Act of 2 November 1966 (Jasso and Rosenzweig 1990).¹⁰ Undeniably, the entry and settlement of these Cuban exiles into North America’s society was greatly facilitated by the United States government (de los Angeles Torres 1988).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Immigration</th>
<th>Number of Cubans</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Immigrated from 1960 to 1990 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Born in the U.S.</td>
<td>285,244</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987-1990</td>
<td>33,837</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985-1986</td>
<td>16,963</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982-1984</td>
<td>23,163</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980-1981</td>
<td>125,313</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975-1979</td>
<td>33,256</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-1974</td>
<td>109,731</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965-1969</td>
<td>173,287</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>25.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960-1964</td>
<td>174,275</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950-1959</td>
<td>50,956</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before 1950</td>
<td>16,406</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,042,433</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 2.1: Number of Cubans in the United States by Year of Immigration, 1990

¹⁰ Between 1966 and mid-1988, 483,028 refugees were admitted to the United States via the Cuban Refugee Act of 1966 (Jasso and Rosenzweig 1990).
The subsequent wave began with Castro's unilateral decision to terminate the airlifts that had been agreed upon with the U.S. government in May of 1973. The fourth wave was small in comparison to those that preceded it, with only three thousand Cubans immigrating over the course of seven years. This period of relatively low migration from Cuba lasted through May of 1980, and its close was facilitated by the build-up of internal pressure on Castro for unrestricted emigration. The result was the creation of a fifth wave of immigration to Miami from the port of Mariel, Cuba (see Table 2.1).

The "Recent" Arrivals

Finally, during the fifth major wave of immigration, which lasted only four months, from May to September of 1980, over 125,000 Cubans arrived in Miami (Pérez 1986). In response to the internal pressure for unrestricted emigration that had built up during the previous wave of immigration, Castro decided to allow the departure of the thousands of Cubans who were crowded into the Peruvian embassy in Cuba demanding to leave the country (Croucher 1997). The refugees were named for the city they left behind in Cuba, Mariel. On April 21, 1980, the first Mariel refugees (Marielitos) arrived in Miami. However Castro also unloaded about 26,000 "undesirables" in this wave, which included criminals and homosexuals (Croucher 1997). Fidel Castro made this clear when he stated: "Those that are leaving from Mariel are the scum of the country - antisocials, homosexuals, drug addicts, and gamblers, who are welcome to leave Cuba if any country will have them" (Fidel Castro, May Day Celebration Speech, 1980). These views were reinforced by the major media outlets that printed stories and editorials that
portrayed the Marielitos in a negative light, such as *The Miami Herald* (Portes and Stepick 1993). Thus, this wave of immigrants has been set apart from the Miami Cuban community that had already been established in the area since the late 1950s. They were portrayed as poor, uneducated, unskilled, deviant, and black (see Table 2.2). In sum Moreno (1996) states, "Mariel destroyed the image of Cubans in the United States and, in passing, destroyed the image of Miami itself" (155).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Immigration</th>
<th>Race (s)</th>
<th>Other Race(s)</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1987-1990</td>
<td>84.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>33,838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985-1986</td>
<td>85.8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>16,963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982-1984</td>
<td>76.8</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>23,163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980-1981</td>
<td>77.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>125,313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975-1979</td>
<td>74.8</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>33,256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-1974</td>
<td>84.1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>109,731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965-1969</td>
<td>82.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>173,288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960-1964</td>
<td>90.7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>174,275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>83.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>515,552</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 2.2: Cubans in the United States, by Race, and by Year of Immigration, 1990

*Given these data, there were 28,000 Black Cubans immigrated to the U.S. in 1980-81.*
There is some evidence that older cohorts of Cuban exiles in the United States were ashamed of the newcomers and distanced themselves from the images they seemed to invoke. Many wanted to avoid “contamination” -- no one wanted to be associated with Castro’s undesirables. Despite evidence to the contrary, Cuban Americans living in the United States thought of the Marielitos as racially different (see Table 2.2). Portes and Stepick (1993) quote one Cuban American official: “... the Marielitos are mostly Black and mulattos of color that I never saw or believed existed in Cuba. They don’t have social networks; they roam the streets desperate to return to Cuba...” (21). By May of 1980, 57,000 Marielitos were camped under the bleachers at the Orange Bowl, in makeshift tent cities in the Orange Bowl parking area and on the public land under I-95. This was the most visible and most frequently traveled part of the downtown area (Croucher 1997), therefore all passers-by could witness the disgrace and humiliation that Castro sent to the United States – particularly the exiles.

Settlement and Beyond: Miami-Dade at a Glance

There are Hispanics from various countries of origin residing in Miami-Dade County (see Table 2.3). While these numbers and percentages have changed over time, Cuban Americans have been and continue to be the largest group of Hispanics in Miami-

---

11 This pattern is very similar to those exercised by other ethnic and racial groups when one particular segment of its community is being attacked or portrayed in a negative light. For example, many Italian Americans attempted to distance themselves from images of the Mafia during its heyday. In addition, many African Americans attempted to distance themselves from images of narcotics and violence in the early years of the “War on Drugs.” In some sense this is logical behavior because our society tends to group people with like characteristics such as race or ethnicity regardless of the accuracy of the information they receive. In turn entire groups begin to acquire labels and stereotypes that are attributable to a very small proportion of the community.
Dade. These current statistics should provide you with a somewhat improved picture of Miami-Dade and its residents. These population shifts have caused a major cultural transition to occur in Miami-Dade County. Given the current composition of Miami-Dade’s population, it is no surprise that Spanish is a part of the daily routine. However it is heard much more often outside the private homes of citizens when compared to other U.S. cities with significant Latino populations such as Los Angeles and New York (Castro 1992).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total population</th>
<th>2,253,362</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Hispanic population</td>
<td>1,291,737</td>
<td>57.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican</td>
<td>38,095</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rican</td>
<td>80,327</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuban</td>
<td>650,601</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Hispanic*</td>
<td>522,712</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Anglo population</td>
<td>465,722</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Black population</td>
<td>495,853</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2000 U.S. Census Report

Table 2.3: Race and Ethnicity Demographics for Miami-Dade County

Since 1970 the county’s population has grown by 883,861 residents. The size and composition of Miami-Dade’s population has been fluctuating since the late 1950s. For example there has been a significant decrease in the numbers of Anglos since the mid-1900s, a moderate growth in the number of Blacks, and a marked increase in the

* This group encompasses, in order from the largest to the smallest: Nicaraguans, Puerto Ricans, Colombians, Dominicans, Mexicans, Hondurans, Peruvians, and Guatemalan. For more information see Moreno (1996).
number of Hispanics. From Miami-Dade's current population of over 2.2 million, 2000 U.S. Census figures show that Whites comprise about 70% and Blacks comprise only 20%. The Metropolitan Miami Area includes more than 1.2 million Hispanics, mostly Cuban Americans, who comprise approximately 57% of Miami-Dade's population (http://quickfacts.census.gov).  

An aspect of Cuban American politics in Miami-Dade that adds to its complexity is that throughout all five immigration waves from the island, Cubans hoped to return to Cuba at the end of Castro's reign. Hence, various scholars and Anglos living in Miami-Dade thought that the Cubans would not attempt to firmly establish themselves (Crawford 1992a; Portes and Stepick 1993). As can be seen in Table 2.4 these ideas changed over time and Cubans have been increasingly characterized as a highly politicized ethnic group (de los Angeles Torres 1988).  

Further, Spanish is spoken in the corporate and political spheres in Miami and this is a unique factor of that community. Thus businesses that cater to Hispanics, such as restaurants with Latin American cuisine, clothing stores, grocery stores, music stores and stores with a variety of musical instruments, Spanish-language media outlets, and businesses engaging in trade with Latin American countries, have opened and thrived in this tri-ethnic environment.

---

12 These percentages add to only 90%, the remaining 10% is divided into extremely small numbers of Asians, Native Americans, and those who chose bi- or multi-racial categories.

13 The statistics provided by the Census are divided into separate racial and ethnic categorizations. Approximately 73% of Hispanics claim a white racial identity while approximately 13% claim a black racial identity. For more information see http://www.floridacensus.com/census/tables/fl_tab_4_PDF.
Table 2.4: Plans & Perceptions of Cuban Refugees During Their First Six Months in U.S

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1973 (N=590)</th>
<th>1976 (N=427)</th>
<th>1978 (N=413)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Plans to resettle in the U.S. permanently?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>53.7%</td>
<td>88.5%</td>
<td>95.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doesn’t Know</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Would return to Cuba if Castro government fell?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>60.6%</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td>51.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doesn’t Know</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Plans to become U.S. citizen?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>77.2%</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doesn’t Know</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Is there discrimination against Cubans in the U.S.?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>69.1%</td>
<td>69.8%</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doesn’t Know</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Are Anglo/Cuban relations close or distant?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close</td>
<td>69.4%</td>
<td>63.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distant</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doesn’t Know</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI. How do Anglos see themselves in relation to Cubans?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inferior</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal</td>
<td>56.4%</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>43.4%</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


14 *Anglo* is the term used most often in the Cuban and larger Latino community to describe Caucasians.
According to the Greater Miami Chamber of Commerce, Miami-Dade is the gateway for Latin American and Caribbean imports and exports. In 2000, exports and imports through U.S. Customs' Miami District exceeded $51.9 billion. Specifically, computers, office machine and computer parts, and telecommunication equipment and components comprise Miami-Dade top export cargos. The leading import commodities into South Florida included computer parts, aircraft and apparel. Latin American and Caribbean goods imported into the U.S. through Florida accounted for more than 50 percent of all U.S. imports from that region. In particular, Costa Rica, Brazil and the Dominican Republic were South Florida's top import partners in 1999; $6.5 billion combined.

**Economic Developments: Business Ownership**

The relationship between Miami-Dade and Latin America is also affected by the domestic business environment, particularly who owns domestic capital. Thus it is important to profile minority owned businesses in Miami-Dade. A historical context is provided by Portes and Stepick (1993) who report a statement about the economic situation of Miami in the 1960s made by Monsignor Bryan D. Walsh, a longtime civic leader in the area:

Two things happened in the next years that caused all money for development of tourism in South Florida to dry up. One, Disney World started operating . . . nobody would drive further south [than Orlando]. The second factor was the jet plane. It became just as cheap to fly to Jamaica or Puerto Rico . . . Had it not been for Cubans, Miami would have been a dead duck. We had an economic depression in 1959; 1960 was a total disaster . . . The Cubans moved into the vacuum; the place was full of empty stores (144).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry Division</th>
<th>Black-Owned</th>
<th>Hispanic-Owned</th>
<th>Women-Owned</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural service, Forestry, Fishing and Mining</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>1,398</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>2,148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>12,882</td>
<td>1,167</td>
<td>14,919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financing, Insurance And Real Estate</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>8,255</td>
<td>5,333</td>
<td>14,097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>2,404</td>
<td>981</td>
<td>3,565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Trade</td>
<td>1,798</td>
<td>11,487</td>
<td>4,827</td>
<td>18,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>8,194</td>
<td>48,122</td>
<td>32,099</td>
<td>88,415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation, Communications, and Utilities</td>
<td>1,611</td>
<td>11,062</td>
<td>2,531</td>
<td>15,204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale Trade</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>7,279</td>
<td>1,885</td>
<td>9,318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industries not Classified</td>
<td>3,248</td>
<td>17,783</td>
<td>7,022</td>
<td>28,053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Minority Businesses</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,918</strong></td>
<td><strong>120,605</strong></td>
<td><strong>56,234</strong></td>
<td><strong>193,831</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Total County Business</td>
<td>(7%)</td>
<td>(51%)</td>
<td>(24%)</td>
<td>(81%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Economic Census (1990-1997)

Table 2.5: Number of Miami-Dade County Minority Owned Businesses, 1990-1997

However, many scholars dismiss the fact that the Black civil rights movement was just gaining momentum in South Florida and many African Americans resented the governmental subsidies that were given to Cuban exiles to start businesses in the area regardless of the dire economic situation at the time. In turn, the cultural transition that occurred in Miami-Dade since the 1950s also affected and continues to affect its population in the areas of business ownership, income distribution and educational attainment.

* There was a total of 238,602 business in Miami-Dade County in 1997. Non-minorities owned 44,771 or 19% of the total businesses in Miami-Dade County.
According to a report by the Miami-Dade County Planning Department and the Beacon Council (2001), there are seven times as many Hispanic owned businesses as Black owned businesses and two times as many Hispanic owned businesses when compared to female owned businesses in the county. As can be seen in Table 2.5, the disparity is even more pronounced when we examine business ownership by industry division.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Immigration</th>
<th>Poverty Status</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Above Poverty Line</td>
<td>Below Poverty Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987-1990</td>
<td>61.3</td>
<td>38.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985-1986</td>
<td>79.4</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982-1984</td>
<td>83.9</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980-1981</td>
<td>72.1</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975-1979</td>
<td>71.3</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-1974</td>
<td>87.7</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965-1969</td>
<td>88.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960-1964</td>
<td>91.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>83.5</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 2.6: Cubans in the United States, by Poverty Status, and Year of Immigration, 1990

Accompanying this overall pattern of inter-group competition for the top spot in the economic hierarchy is a pattern of differential poverty within the Cuban American community as well. In Table 2.6 it is demonstrated that as the Cuban American
population in Miami grew in absolute and relative terms, there was increased economic stratification. In other words, despite the relatively high numbers of Hispanic-owned businesses shown in the table above, the percentage of Cuban Americans living below the poverty line increased over time and reached its highest level in 1990. This stratification may have a corollary in occupational diversity.\textsuperscript{15} Table 2.7 shows that blue-collar employment such as skilled and unskilled labor among Cubans rose in conjunction with population growth across gender categorizations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Immigration</th>
<th>Managerial, Professional</th>
<th>Technical, Support</th>
<th>Administrative Services</th>
<th>Precision Production, Craft, Repair</th>
<th>Operators, Fabricators, Laborers</th>
<th>Farming, Forestry, Fisheries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MEN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982-1990</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980-1981</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965-1979</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960-1964</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOMEN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982-1990</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980-1981</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965-1979</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960-1964</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 2.7: Cubans in U.S. by Occupational Attainment, Year of Immigration, Sex, 1990

\textsuperscript{15} Please note that the U.S. Economic Census data is from 1990-1997 while the poverty data in Table 2.6 ends at 1990. Poverty data for Miami-Dade County, by race and ethnicity, does not exist. The 1990 is the most recent available data.
Political Developments

One of the many political consequences of Cuban immigration in Miami-Dade has been the structural adjustments made by the county’s government over time. In 1956, state voters amended the State of Florida’s Constitution to allow for a Home Rule Charter under which Dade County was granted the power to create commission districts, pass ordinances, create penalties, and levy and collect taxes to support a centralized metropolitan form of government. Thus the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) may create municipalities, special taxing districts and other boards or authorities as needed. The Charter includes a Citizens’ Bill of Rights with provisions for: convenient access, truth in government, access to public records, the right to be heard, the right to timely notices, right to public hearing, no unreasonable postponements, prompt notice of actions and reasons, financial disclosure by candidates and other public officials, and a Commission on Ethics and the Public Trust (http://www.co.miami-dade.fl.us/info/about/government.htm).

Therefore, since its formation in 1957 Dade County has had a two-tier system of government, which was intended to reform government and avoid potential problems, such as inefficiency and corruption, before Cuban immigration – not as a consequence. Under this system, Miami-Dade is comprised of a large unincorporated area and 30 incorporated areas or municipalities. Each municipality has its own government (Mayor,

---

16 On November 13, 1997 voters changed the name of the county from Dade to Miami-Dade to acknowledge the international name recognition of Miami.

17 The Home Rule Charter for Miami-Dade County was adopted by referendum on May 21, 1957.
City Commissioner/Council, etc.) and provides city services such as police and zoning protection. The total population of the 30 municipalities is approximately 933,700. With a population of more than one million, Miami-Dade’s unincorporated area, if declared a city, would form the largest in Florida and one of the largest in the nation.

In terms of the county’s organizational structure, an Executive Mayor and the Miami-Dade Board of County Commissioners govern. Miami-Dade County is divided into 13 districts. In the past, commissioners were elected via at-large elections. However, it is now the case that one County Commissioner is elected from each district and serves a four-year term. Voters from the district in which the commission candidate lives choose commissioners in non-partisan elections. Once inaugurated, the Executive Mayor chooses a Chairperson to serve as leader of the BCC. Further, the Executive Mayor also recommends a County Manager who is then approved or rejected by the Board of County Commissioners. The county’s organizational structure can be seen in Figure 2.1.

A political consequence of Cuban immigration in Miami-Dade is the changing balance of the political environment. After their arrival, Cubans penetrated Miami by integrating themselves into the corporate sector, joining exclusive clubs and participating in the electoral process. Cuban Miamians were able to permeate important Anglo institutions such as the Non-Group, Greater Miami Chamber of Commerce, and the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees (AFSCME) (Grenier and Stepick 1992); approximately 26 percent of the Dade County union membership is
Cuban American (Grenier 1992). Cuban Miamians have also developed many organizations and institutions including the Spanish-American League Against Discrimination (SALAD), Cuban-American National Foundation (CANF), and the Latin Builders Association, and many radio stations like WQBA--La Cubanisma have been established and maintained over time (Portes and Stepick 1993). While some of the organizations have emerged out of a desire to counter a common enemy, Fidel Castro, others have been established to deal with domestic issues such as economic development.

Figure 2.1: Miami-Dade County Government

---

18 This is a much higher level of union membership than any other Latino group in the U.S.
There have even been ideological and partisan shifts resulting from this cultural transition. In 1976 Hispanic precincts in Dade County were significantly less likely to vote Democratic and to support the Carter presidential candidacy; this put Blacks and Hispanics at opposite end of the political spectrum for the first time (Portes and Mozo 1988). Republicans consolidated their strength in Miami under the political direction of Cuban-Americans during the 1980s (Crawford 1992; Moreno and Rae 1992; Portes and Stepick 1993). It is said that the candidacy of Ronald Reagan, his foreign policy agenda concerning Cuba, and the willingness of the Republican Party to support Cuban American candidates are the factors that prompted Cubans in Miami to become citizens and register to vote (Perez 1992; de los Angeles Torres 1999), making Miami Cubans the largest active Hispanic voting bloc in the United States. This Republican support at the national level was also reflected at the state level (Moreno and Rae 1992). It is ironic, however, that a Hispanic candidate (Martinez-R) received the least amount of support in his gubernatorial bid, when compared to the other candidates, from the Cuban American voters in Miami.19

While it is clear that Cubans in Miami tend to vote as a bloc, Cubans are a heterogeneous group divided by race, class, and status, unified only by their Cuban descent and their dislike for Castro (Croucher 1997; de los Angeles Torres 1999; Pérez

---

19 It is important to note that Bob Martinez, the candidate being referred to here, is not from the Miami-Dade area. Martinez is from the Tampa Bay area. Cuban Americans living in the Bay area have distinctly different political views from those in Miami-Dade, which is largely attributed to the fact that they are not part of the exile migration. The majority of Cuban Americans living in and around Tampa immigrated to the U.S. long before Castro took power in Cuba, typically before the turn of the twentieth century.
Further, this capacity to vote en bloc for Republicans is a peculiarity of the region. For example, while Republicans garnered more than 90% of the Miami Cuban American vote in the 1984 Presidential elections, they did not fare as well with Cuban Americans in northern and midwestern cities (de los Angeles Torres 1988).

Cleavages within Miami's Cuban American community are beginning to form as the number of immigrants increases (Grenier 1992; Portes and Stepick 1993). Some parts of the Cuban American community are being alienated and discriminated against by other Cubans. For example, the business class, which is composed of recent immigrants, is increasingly ousting older Cuban families (Portes and Stepick 1993). Further, with the increase in citizens comes an increase in the span of ideologies, further creating cleavages within the community. If this trend of division persists, Cuban American progress (economically and politically) could be in jeopardy.

The Native Reaction

The first waves of Cuban arrivals, the golden exiles, were Hispanics of European stock, light-skinned, and largely from the professional classes. For example, this group included attorneys, doctors, educators, politicians, and so on. Proud of their language and culture, they brought with them education and job skills, if little available cash. Many important measures were taken to help Cuban exiles settle in the United States, and given their concentration in south Florida, the actions taken by local government in
Miami-Dade are of particular importance. The State of Florida helped many of those who had taught school in Cuba become recertified, and generous subsidies were available through the federal Cuban Refugee Program for others. To serve what Crawford (1992a) calls a “politically favored group,” the Dade County Public Schools provided English as a Second Language (ESL) instruction and, in 1961, initiated "Spanish for Spanish speakers" classes. Two years later the district established a full-fledged bilingual program, probably the nation's first since the 1920s. The bilingual program was initiated at the Coral Way Elementary School and was open to both English and Spanish speakers. The objective was fluent bilingualism for both native English and native Spanish speakers. Pauline Rojas and Ralph Robinett, English as a Second Language (ESL) specialists who had worked in Puerto Rico, directed the effort with the help of well-trained Cuban educators (Crawford 1992a, 1992b).

Beginning in September 1963, Coral Way's 350 students in the first through third grades were grouped by language proficiency. Cuban children received their morning lessons in Spanish and their afternoon lessons in English; for English-speaking children, the schedule was reversed. During lunch, music, and art, as well as on the playground, the two groups were mixed. Results were immediately promising, as students appeared to progress academically and in both languages.

A 1966 report by the district concluded: "The pupils in Coral Way are rapidly becoming 'culturally advantaged.' They are learning to operate effectively in two

---

20 There were many efforts by local, state, and federal governments to relocate the exiles outside Miami-Dade, but they were largely unsuccessful.
languages and two cultures." In English reading, both language groups did as well as or better than their counterparts in monolingual English schools, and the Cuban children achieved equivalent levels in Spanish. Thus, Coral Way was in many respects a success. The one disappointment was among Anglo students; as a group, they never reached national norms in Spanish reading achievement. The Cuban children had an advantage because, unlike their English-speaking peers, they received high-quality exposure to the second language outside as well as inside the classroom (Crawford 1992a, 1992b).

At the local level, an official bilingual ordinance was passed which formally stated that there were two official languages in the county: English and Spanish. According to several reports by the *Miami Herald* during that period, the ordinance was intended to be a largely symbolic action. It was one of many ways in which the local government and community attempted to decrease or avoid the growth of racial and ethnic tensions. This type of approach characterized the first stage of the language debate in Miami-Dade.

---

21 Federal and state bilingual education laws soon followed. Government intervention changed the focus of the Coral Way experiment, however, from an enrichment model aimed at developing fluency in two languages, to a remedial effort designed to help "disadvantaged" children overcome the "handicap" of not speaking English. From its outset, federal aid to bilingual education was regarded as a "poverty program," rather than an innovative approach to language instruction. This decision would shape the development of bilingual programs, and the heated ideological battles surrounding them, over the next three decades (Crawford 1992a, 1992b).

22 The *Miami Herald* is the largest newspaper in Miami-Dade County with the largest audience. There is now a Spanish-language newspaper called *El Nuevo Herald* that is produced by the same company, however the stories reported in each paper are vastly different in terms of content and style. Nevertheless, the *Herald* is considered the largest printed political news media source in the area.
In 1973 Metro-Dade County was declared the first bilingual and bicultural county in the United States. This declaration designated Spanish as the second official language of the county (Tatalovich 1995). The resolution stated, “Our Spanish-speaking population has earned, through its increasing share of the tax burden, and active participation in community affairs, the right to be serviced and heard at all levels of government.” This formal acceptance of bilingualism was in reaction to the growing number of Cubans in Miami-Dade and was thought to be a “welcome mat” from public officials. Given this, Miami Cubans simply had not had the same experiences of Mexican Americans, for example, regarding the issue of language. In general, Cubans and Cuban Americans did not have the experience of being humiliated at school for speaking their native language or chastised to teach their children only English. In fact, most Cubans were slow to recognize the stigma that monolingual English-speakers have attached to minority languages. Thus, Cubans were relatively unprepared for the distaste others had for Spanish and there were many questions surrounding language etiquette.23

Language as a Weapon: Pulling The Welcome Mat?

In reaction to the rapid Latinization of Miami-Dade through the 1960s and 1970s, and eventually the Mariel boatlift and riots of the 1980s, a backlash emerged in the form of the Official English/English Only Movement. This backlash on the part of Anglos and African Americans alike impacted the Cuban American community in that it caused the emergence of a Cuban American political consciousness. Cuban Americans felt as

---

23 By language etiquette, we are referring to the norms of language use in public spaces such as speaking a foreign language in front of people who do not speak or understand that language. So one of the questions
though they were targeted, as an ethnic group, for the first time since their arrival. One of the focus group participants summed up the feeling within the community well when she stated that for the first time since coming to the United States she felt that “they all hated us and wanted us to leave.” This feeling of being targeted led to a sense of ethnic and political solidarity among Cubans and Cuban Americans in Miami-Dade that was soon translated into an active and cohesive voting bloc. Cuban Americans became the foundation of Republican strength in the region and soon began electing members of their community to local and statewide positions. Therefore the result of the backlash was Cuban American political empowerment. Unfortunately, however, this empowerment did not hamper the development of the English Only movement. This is the focus of the subsequent chapter.
CHAPTER 3

LANGUAGE POLICY

There are four main objectives for this chapter. The first objective is to discuss the broader experience of Latinos in the United States and the issue of language policy. We will then elaborate on the description of the backlash in the Anglo American community in the form of English Only sentiment in Miami-Dade County, including an analysis of the reaction by the Cuban American community, particularly elite members of the community, and elaborate on the unique characteristics of this issue for Cuban Americans. The final objective is to begin a theoretical conversation, applying Browning, Marshall, and Tabb's (1997) theory of political incorporation to the case of language.

The Latino Experience

Debates surrounding the issue of language usually evoke strong reaction. For example, roughly 80-90% of non-Latino citizens in the United States favor the establishment of English as their state's official language (de la Garza, et al 1992:97; Tatalovich 1995). Conversely, opponents of English Only legislation view the policy as xenophobic and view the threat to bilingual voting ballots as a devastating blow to
Latino political participation (Crawford 1992a; Garcia 1996; Portes and Stepick 1993; Torres 1996). Further, although Miami-Dade was the first U.S. county to adopt English Only language policies, the language debate is not limited by its boundaries. The phenomenon has reached various Latino communities across the country. In addition to Florida, California, Arizona, Colorado, and Texas, five of the nine states with the largest population of Latinos, have all had to come to grips with language policy issues. In particular, legislative efforts to codify the English language in California date back to the late 1970s. In this section we will elaborate on the case of bilingual ballots in California to demonstrate the effects of the language debate on other Latinos before moving on to a more in-depth analysis of language policy in Miami-Dade.

California and Florida

Demographically, the Latino population in California is largely Mexican and Mexican American, although there have been recent waves of immigration from Central and South America. The accounts of the language policy debate in California begin in San Francisco in 1983 with the issue of bilingual ballots (Crawford 1992a). San Francisco supervisor, Quentin Kopp, a conservative Democrat from a white, upper-middle-class district, initiated a referendum requesting that the federal government change the law so that cities would not have to provide election information in any language except English. Kopp’s organization, U.S. English, gathered 14,400 signatures
in less than a month, working primarily at shopping centers in white, middle class areas. The initiative shortly became known as Proposition O.¹

The vast majority of Kopp’s fellow partisans were quick to oppose him on this issue – keeping in mind that Hispanics in the area were overwhelmingly Democrats. The San Francisco Democratic Central Committee endorsed bilingual elections and referred to the 1848 Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo as the basis for its position (Baron 1990). In addition, then mayor Dianne Feinstein, and virtually every other city supervisor, publicly opposed Kopp’s efforts (Tatalovich 1995). Further, gay and African American civic groups also opposed Kopp and U.S. English. Finally, the Mexican American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF) called Proposition O an effort to disenfranchise the Hispanic community (Tatalovich 1995, 107). Nevertheless, Kopp was able to garner and mobilize support from the Republican and Anglo communities in San Francisco. On Election Day, 1983, Proposition O passed with 62% of the vote, carrying the Black vote as well as the Anglo vote (Crawford 1992a, Tatalovich 1995). This English Only legislation victory re-energized various local and statewide efforts to codify English Only policy, and thus direct democracy was put to use by the citizens of the State of California.

The California Committee for Ballots in English, later called U.S. English, was the major backer of this referendum. In opposition, civic and political leaders such as Cesar Chavez, leader of the United Farm Workers (UFW), and three powerful Democratic members of U.S. House of Representatives, launched a campaign to defeat

¹O indicates the letter, not the number zero.
their efforts. Organizations such as the National Council of La Raza (NCLR) and the League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC) also entered the fray in opposition to the referendum. The judicial system was utilized by a coalition of Hispanic and Chinese citizens in an attempt to block the secretary of state from counting the ballots. Nonetheless, Proposition 38, California’s English Only referendum, qualified for the subsequent year’s ballot with more than 625,000 petition signatures (Tatalovich 1995). Californians went on to approve this measure with a 71% favorable vote (Crawford 1992a). Again, the vote was divided along racial and ethnic lines in the state.

There are several key points to identify in this account. First, from the initial success of their English Only movement, there were clear partisan lines drawn between supporters of English Only policies, mainly Republicans, and those in opposition, largely Democrats. In many ways, these lines shaped the context of the language debate and opened the door for grassroots and organizational mobilization. Second, every possible avenue of political action was exhausted by members of the Hispanic community in San Francisco and in California more generally. For instance, community elites and organizations devoted time, money, and other resources to the battle, mobilized their citizenry, and gained media coverage. Further, litigation was also used as a tool of resistance. Third, even in the aftermath of local disappointment, Hispanic community leaders continued to battle English Only policies in other localities as well as at the state level. With these political actions in mind, we turn to an analysis of the English Only movement in Miami-Dade County, Florida.
Miami Cubans and the Emergence of Language Policy

Despite the many accomplishments of Miami Cubans in the business sector and the electoral arena that have been previously highlighted, Cuban Americans have faced formidable obstacles (Crawford 1992a; Portes and Stepick, 1993); the language issue is one of them. Although Cuban Americans have the growing numbers and concentration needed for mobilization in Miami-Dade and hence the numbers and concentration for empowerment, according to traditional scholars of political incorporation (McAdam 1982), Hispanic population growth did not deter English-Only adoption in their county or in the State of Florida (Castro 1992; Perez 1992; Santoro 1998).

While 92% of Cuban Americans, who are overwhelmingly concentrated in south Florida, believe that U.S. citizens and residents should learn English, they are stronger opponents of English as the official language than Mexicans, Puerto Ricans and Anglos living in the United States (de la Garza et al, 1992, 99). Moreover, of these aforementioned groups, Cuban Americans are the strongest supporters of bilingual education and overwhelmingly believe that the objective of bilingual education is to learn two languages (de la Garza et al. 1992, 99). Supporting evidence for this claim can be seen in a poll where 98% of the Hispanics living in Florida believe that their children should learn English (Crawford 1992a). At the same time, the overwhelming majority of Cuban Americans believe that public services should be provided in Spanish and 73% oppose businesses requiring English language during working hours (de la Garza et al 1992, 97-98).
Language became the focus of political and social movements in Miami-Dade County in 1980. The movement’s formation was solidified by “public concern about the crime wave and rioting that resulted after criminals and asylum inmates released by Fidel Castro in the 1980 Mariel boat-lift began arriving in Miami” (Tatalovich 1995, 86). On July 8, 1980 Ms. Marion Plunske heard Ms. Emmy Shafer, a Russian-born immigrant who claimed to be fluent in six languages, on a WNWS radio talk show. The theme of the radio show was that Cubans needed to realize that they were not in Cuba, but Miami – they were in the United States and thus should learn to speak English. In short, the sentiment was that if people wanted to speak Spanish, they should go back to Cuba. The day following the radio program the English language campaign began with the creation of an organization called Citizens of Dade United (CDU), which was registered as a political action committee within two weeks. With Emmy Shafer and Marion Plunske at its helm, the CDU demanded that the Metro-Dade County commissioners repeal the 1973 bilingual and bicultural resolution. When the majority Anglo Board of County Commissioners refused to do so, the organization collected more than enough signatures for a ballot initiative. By the end of August, 1980 the CDU gathered 44,166 signatures (nearly twice as many as they needed to put the ordinance on the ballot).

Those who supported the ordinance were part of an odd coalition of citizens: people who wanted to preserve a common language and avoid ethnic strife, bigots seeking to roll back civil rights advances for language-minority groups, political conservatives hoping to impose a sense of national unity and civic responsibility,
political liberals who feared that bilingual education and bilingual voting discourage assimilation, nativists trying to fan animosity toward immigrants and build support for tighter quotas, Euro-ethnics who resented what they perceived to be "unfair advantages" enjoyed by Hispanics and Asians, other minority group who felt threatened by the economic and political inroad Cuban Americans were making, politicians attempting to exploit a mood of isolationism and xenophobia, racists who equate multiculturalism and ethnic separatism, and Americans who felt threatened by diversity. Many of these categorizations overlap, but the point that should not be missed is that voters who supported the ordinance came from every corner of life and for a whole host of reasons. To illustrate the point more clearly, almost half of African American voters, along with a majority of Anglo voters, supported the ordinance.

The relationship between the Cuban American and African American communities has intensified as competition for limited resources such as employment and government benefits increased over the years. In a tight economy, an economic or political gain for Cuban Americans is understood by some as an economic or political loss for African Americans. For example, the 1980 riot demonstrated the strain on the African American-Cuban relationship and resulted in $80 million in property damage and 1,100 arrests (only 25 of which involved Hispanics) (Porter and Dunn, 1984). Furthermore, the migration of Cubans to Miami had quite an impact on the quality of life for African Americans (Grenier, 1992). The progress that Blacks in Miami had made

\[2\] See Porter and Dunn, 1984; Dunn and Stepick, 1992; Portes and Stepick, 1993 for more information regarding Cuban-Black relations in Miami, FL.
was substantially stifled, particularly in regard to employment in service and clerical positions. The contentious intergroup relationships with Blacks in Miami-Dade narrows the possibility of creating a biracial coalition between Cuban Americans and Black Miamians (Dunn and Stepick, 1992).

This period of backlash against Cuban immigration was the first Cuban Americans had experienced during their time in the United States. Thus any action regarding this movement would have to be led from the top by the elites of the Cuban American community. Numerous scholars have documented the role of Cuban and Cuban American institutions and leaders in helping to formulate and transmit opinions and ideas within their community (de los Angeles Torres 1988; Didion 1987; Portes and Stepick 1993; Tatalovich 1995). Whether the issue is English-Only policy, immigration, or relations with Castro's Cuba, Cuban American elites and organizations have shaped, refocused, and significantly influenced how and what Cuban Americans think about political issues.

As with leaders of any ethnic or racial group, Cuban American community leaders set the agenda and channel political actions of the masses (McAdam 1982). Leaders devise a strategy for dealing with the issues they deem to be important and execute those strategies with the goal of reaching a predetermined end. Thus a key component of this analysis is studying the community’s leadership and its ability to mobilize the masses around the issue of language policy.

\(^3\) The 1980 Riot was sparked by police violence in the city.
Unified political action by elites did not occur. Unlike the situation in California, where partisan lines were clearly drawn, it was unclear who was targeting Cuban Americans. The partisan lines were blurred, as were racial lines — there were supporters among other minority populations. The opposition was simultaneously Republican and Democrat, Anglo and Black, wealthy and impoverished. Business and political elites were dependent on “the establishment” (Anglo businesspeople and politics) for monetary and political resources; therefore there was a severe lack of action by Cuban American elites within the community.

In addition, the major civic organizations representing Cuban and Cuban American interests such as the Cuban American National Foundation were principally preoccupied with issues of foreign policy relating to the island. Those community organizations that were working on domestic issues were preoccupied with other important issues such as the resettlement of Marielitos. Finally, there were internal divisions among elites as well as among the masses. There were various political and economic camps within the community that were being run by several different individuals or families. Each camp developed its own following thereby creating factionalization within the community.

Further, socio-economic status, race, and wave of immigration divided the masses — particularly after Mariel. Cuban Americans who were already established did not want to be associated with these refugees because of their lower socio-economic status and negative image. Therefore, a unified Cuban American domestic agenda did not exist; there was a lack of organization, a lack of unified leadership, and very little
grassroots activity in opposition to the referendum. The only apparent grassroots political action that was taken by Cuban Americans was to vote against the ordinance, however their numbers were not sufficient.

The key provisions of Miami-Dade’s English Only referendum known as Ordinance 80-128 follow:

Section 1: The expenditure of county funds for the purpose of utilizing any language other than English, or promoting any culture other than that of the United States, is prohibited.

Section 2: All county governmental meetings, hearings, and publications shall be in the English language only.

Section 3: The provisions of this ordinance shall not apply where a translation is mandated by state or federal law.

Section 4: If any section, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase, words or provision of this ordinance is held invalid or unconstitutional, the remainder of this ordinance shall not be affected by said holding.

Section 5: It is the intention of the people of Dade County, Florida, that the provisions of this ordinance shall become and be made a part of the code of Metropolitan Dade County, Florida.

Section 6: This ordinance shall take effect on the day after the election approving this ordinance, November 5, 1980.

On November 4, 1980 Metro-Dade County voters passed Ordinance 80-128 by a 59.2 to 40.8 percent margin. An analysis by the Miami Herald determined that 71% of non-Hispanic whites favored the proposal, while 56% of non-Hispanic blacks and 85% of Hispanics opposed it. No other factor, such as age, educational attainment, political

---

ideology, gender, or choice of presidential candidate, seemed to affect how people voted on the ordinance, clearly demonstrating that this was an ethnic conflict (Schmid 1992). In fact, among whites who voted for it, a majority indicated that they would be pleased if the referendum "would make Miami a less attractive place for Cubans and other Spanish-speaking people." Moreover, over three-quarters said they would leave Dade County "if it were practical."

The impact of this ordinance, once approved by the voters, was to bar the use of public funds to support bilingualism, bar the use of any language except English in all public meetings, and force all public documents to be in English only. Thus information about bus routes, job openings, or recreational opportunities would be printed in English only. Although 911 emergency services were not affected, signs throughout Dade County were posted in English only, the county stopped allocating money for the annual Spanish Heritage Week festival, and advertisements to lure Latin American tourists and businesses had to be printed in English even though they appeared in Central and South American newspapers (Crawford 1992a). Unmistakably, when compared to the case in California, little effort was put into mounting an opposition to the referendum. Our goal is to examine why mobilization did not occur. However, the immediate question is, was there a post-election opposition movement?

Reactions to Being Targeted

Since the 1980 vote on language policy, the Miami-based Cuban American community has built a foundation for political empowerment and political incorporation via electoral success. Despite the passage of the local ordinance, everyday forms of
resistance to the English Only ordinance have been present in the community (Colburn 1989; Crawford 1992a; Portes and Stepick 1993). For example, in a 1984 County Commissioner’s meeting, the minutes clearly show that both English and Spanish, and at times Spanglish,\(^5\) were spoken (Didion 1987). As I conducted focus groups with residents of Miami-Dade, which will be discussed below in much more detail, I learned that there was great misconception on all sides in regard to the meaning of the county’s ordinance. Residents of Miami-Dade were simply unclear about the specifics; some interpreted the ordinance as a way of forcing people to speak only English all the time while others believed the ordinance to be irrelevant in that it only applied to official or legal proceedings such as commission meetings. Many Cuban American residents of Miami-Dade that I spoke with stated that this was the first time during their U.S. experience that they felt targeted and discriminated against.

One repercussion of the referendum vote was a rise in reported anti-Hispanic incidents across south Florida. Citizens and businesses seemed to take matters into their own hands and they tried to legislate language policies on their own. For example, in 1988 a Miami supermarket cashier was suspended for speaking Spanish to fellow employees. In statements made to the media the supermarket chain denied that the suspension was due to the use of Spanish, pointing instead to a “store policy that prohibits personal conversation between employees during work hours,” a policy that would seem to be unenforceable in the average grocery store (Baron 1990).

Beyond incidents such as this, people in the region began to question if the policy would have any impact. According to Crawford (1992), "Spanish has thrived in Miami while banned as a language of government" (91). He goes on to state, "Living and working in Spanish, many Cubans felt little urgency about learning English . . ." (95). Correspondingly, members of Dade Americans United to Protect the English Language were incensed that their work would be chalked up to a symbolic policy that could not be enforced (Tatalovich 1995).

Despite the feeling among the masses in opposition to English Only policies, the leadership of the Cuban American community did not react, with one exception. In 1984, the only Hispanic Metro-Dade Commissioner, Jorge Valdes, campaigned against the "Antibilingualism" Ordinance. Through a series of meetings, compromises, and an eventual vote, Valdes, a Cuban American, got the ordinance amended to allow translations for tourism promotion, emergencies, and public services to the elderly, handicapped, or ill, and he also added a section declaring English to be the official language in Dade County. While many saw this amendment as great progress, Valdes always favored the ordinance's repeal. He concluded, "What we have left is a piece of paper that says we are anti-bilingual and anti-bicultural. Basically, what this ordinance does is hurt the feelings of a large segment of the population. All I want to do is say Dade won't be pro-bilingual or anti-bilingual" (Bell 1987).

The controversy on the subject of official English became more intense in 1987, when Commissioner Valdes announced that he would propose the repeal of the 1980 English Only ordinance. His actions were prompted by what the commissioner
perceived to be unfair treatment of a monolingual, Spanish-speaking vendor who came before the Board of County Commissioners to discuss complaints that were made against him by local residents. The zoning director, Rafael Rodon, attempted to translate for the vendor since the English Only ordinance did not allow for full-time interpreters, but the translation was uneven. In the end, the commissioners voted 6-1 against the vendor.

Commissioner Valdes, who thought the entire situation was unjust, was unable to get his rescindence campaign off the ground because of opposition from Cuban American community leaders. An organization known as the Hispanic Coalition was the major opponent of Valdes' action. The organization was an umbrella for 18 of the most powerful Hispanic groups and organizations in the region such as the Latin Chamber of Commerce, the Coalition of Hispanic American Women, the Cuban American Bar Association, the Cuban American CPA Association, the Cuban American National Foundation (CANF), Facts About Cuban Exiles (FACE), the Latin Builders Association, the Cuban Municipalities of Exile, and the Spanish American League Against Discrimination (SALAD) (Gillis and Feldstein-Soto 1987).

There are several possible explanations for the opposition by members of the Hispanic Coalition. Organizations such as the Latin American Builders' Association and the Cuban American Bar Association may have been concerned that any opposition on the language front would cause a break down in their business relationships with the dominant Anglo business interests. Alternatively, CANF and FACE may have wanted to avoid any appearance of "un-American" behavior that would shed doubt on the
patriotism of the Cuban American community. In attempting to reach their objectives, these groups are dependent on the image of Cuban Americans as a productive and deserving community. Therefore countermobilization against the English Only movement may have jeopardized that representation and thus was abandoned.

Contrary to expectations, the Hispanic Coalition requested that Commissioner Valdes halt all oppositional activities, thereby creating a non-mobilizing force in the community. Commissioner Valdes heeded the organization’s request and the issue was dropped from the Commission’s agenda within less than one minute (Gillis 1987). This pattern of elite action followed by non-mobilization was repeated as Commissioner Valdes revisited the issue of language policy during his second term, therefore further demonstrating that there was a lack of consensus among Cuban American leaders that this issue deserved attention. Perhaps a more pertinent question here is why there was a non-mobilizing force promulgated by Cuban American elites. Perhaps Cuban American political officials are “practical” or “ambitious” politicians, thus mobilizing the masses around this issue would push them into the pitfalls of politics.

The basic facts of Cuban American leadership in the early 1980s are that there were very few Cuban Americans elected to public office. Further there were many Cuban American exiles who had previous political experience prior to arriving in the United States. Moreover, some Cuban Americans, as individuals and as families (not as a community), were gaining monetary resources in the form of business ownership. Finally, the Republican Party of South Florida was willing to run Cuban American
candidates. These factors demonstrate the potential for economically well-off Cuban American exiles and those who had political experience to become a part, at least marginally, of Miami-Dade's political power structure. The awareness of this potential led to a renewed interest among Cuban Americans in entering the fray; Cuban American elites had to be practical in deciding which issues to concentrate on if they wanted to maintain or further their political careers thus creating the "practical" or "ambitious" politician.

Reports and interviews provided by major media sources during the 1980s clearly demonstrate that Cuban American elites did not see any point in pursuing an oppositional attack against English Only policies at the state or local levels. A *Miami Herald* article by Andres Vigucci (1988) provides a good summary of the sentiments about the language debate among Cuban American elites: "We all think it's a losing battle," said banker Raul Masvidal. "I don't see the practical effects of leaving the ring with a black eye after getting punched around for the two months" (IB). Masvidal further stated that he was too busy with his business and a United Way campaign to help lead a fund-raising effort for groups opposing the Official English movement.

In addition, lawyer and co-chairman of the George H. Bush campaign in Dade County, Al Cardenas, stated "I just don't see it as productive to those efforts to get involved in that. We just can't muster all of our resources for this one battle and sacrifice everything else." Finally, Eduardo Padron, the former Vice President of

---

^ With an ever-growing and changing population base, the party needed an edge to gain and maintain political power in the region. Given that Cuban Americans were considered to be social conservatives.
Miami-Dade Community College (MDCC), stated that “Many of the Cuban leadership, including myself, have not taken this issue seriously . . . . That doesn’t excuse the leadership from participating.” These types of comments were frequently quoted in the *Miami Herald*, and were discussed on Cuban Radio in Miami-Dade.⁷

A well-known Cuban radio commentator, from WQBA-AM, Fernando Penabaz even invited the chairman of the Florida English Campaign (FEC) on his radio program in an attempt to mobilize the local Hispanic community. Penabaz is quoted as saying that he “thought sparks would fly” (Vigucci 1988). However, his thought was never realized – sparks simply didn’t fly. Penabaz credited Mark LaPorta, the chairman of the Florida English Campaign, for the lack of hostility. LaPorta spoke Spanish and made only “mild” comments while on the air. None of the Cuban American politicos or business elites appeared on the show to debate Mr. LaPorta, thus once again the masses were not provided with a mobilizing leader to follow.

The pattern of inaction outlined above demonstrates that the leadership of Miami-Dade County’s Cuban American community thought they were behaving in a practical manner. These elites clearly felt that the political and economic costs were too great and the odds of making any substantive change were too long to devote a significant amount of time and resources to what they perceived to be a losing battle. In this case it seems as though inaction on the part of elites was enough to promote inaction with a focus on family values, and were staunch anti-communists, the party began to slowly and cautiously bring them into their organization.

⁷ Cuban radio is acknowledged as a powerful influencing force in the community, particularly among the elderly who comprise the largest voting bloc in the Cuban American community.
amongst the masses – thereby creating an atmosphere of non-mobilization. Thus, minimal efforts to reverse the language referendum were made by local Cuban American politicians, and even these efforts slowly died out (Portes and Stepick 1993).

The Cuban American community in Miami-Dade relived its local battle with language policy at the state level in 1988 with similar results. The State of Florida adopted English as its official language with little opposition from Cuban-American business elites in Miami-Dade. The newly adopted language of the Florida Constitution read:

Section 9. English is the Official Language of Florida.

(a) English is the official language of the state of Florida.

(b) The Legislature shall have the power to enforce this section by appropriate legislation.

Although Hispanic legislators were among the leading opponents of English Only when the issue was before the state legislature, there were few efforts to reverse the referendum locally in Miami-Dade, or at the state level once the constitutional amendment was approved by the voters (Crawford 1992a; Portes and Stepick 1993; Tatalovich 1995). In Florida, 85% of Latinos (largely Cuban Americans) voted against the local English Only ordinance in Dade (Castro, Haun & Roca 1990), but as Tatalovich (1995) points out there was an “I-don’t-give-a-damn attitude” among Cuban

---

8 Ironically, 1988 is also the year that a new Spanish-language newspaper, *El Nuevo Herald*, was created.

9 Nevertheless, state-level Cuban American legislators helped to ensure that seven of the English Only proposals introduced in Florida’s Senate and House died in legislative committee.
Americans who felt that they would simply continue speaking Spanish anyway.\textsuperscript{10} It seemed as though Spanish speakers had learned to live with the ordinance and the state law would not worsen their situation.

There is some evidence that a deal was made between Cuban American Republicans in the state house from Miami-Dade and the Democratic leaders of the legislature to prevent enactment of any enforcement provisions of the new law. However, effective or not, the symbolism of "English-Only" remained. Thus there was very little electoral leadership, which was concentrated in the hands of County Commissioner Jorge Valdes, available in the 1980s to mobilize a mass movement against the English Only campaign of Emmy Shafer. Even so, there have been political and social movements in this country, particularly at the state and local levels, which have been organized without elected community leaders, such as the Suffragette Movement of the early 1900s and the Black Civil Rights Movement of the 1950s, 60s, and 70s.

Given that we are analyzing the political behavior of Cuban Americans, it may also be important to note that this trend of mass mobilization via the activists of a particular group, its middle class, or bourgeoisie can also be found across Latin America (Skidmore and Smith 1997). More to the point, nor was the Citizens for Dade United campaign, which was formed to give life to the English Only Movement in Miami-Dade, the impetus of elected leaders. These examples demonstrate that elected leadership is

\textsuperscript{10} Deep south states have been more likely to adopt English-Only regulations despite the fact that many southern states have small Spanish-speaking populations (Santoro, 1998).
not a necessary condition for mass mobilization; political action can and has taken place in its absence.\textsuperscript{11} The center of power in the Cuban American community at the time was to be found in two areas: the business sector and politicos behind the scenes.

Naturally, we have to ask why language policy was not a part of the Cuban American agenda. There are several possible responses that we will investigate: 1) Elites thought that the policy would not have an impact, or impact only a small number of community members; 2) Perhaps there were more pressing issues that elites had to tend to at the time such as foreign policy or the resettlement of Marielitos; 3) It is also possible that the elites wanted to avoid causing dissension in the community; 4) Elites may have been employing ambitious or practical politician strategies; or 5) Elites thought indirect action, rather than a direct attack, was the best course to pursue.

\textbf{Theoretical Implications}

Now that we have a rather comprehensive historical account of English Only policy in Miami-Dade, we can begin a theoretical discussion about the political incorporation of Cuban Americans in the area. Our goal is to evaluate the effects of language policy on the political incorporation of Cuban Americans in Miami-Dade. Miami-Dade's English Only referendum of the 1980s, which required, that all business be conducted in English and, in turn, cut many of the county-level bilingual

\textsuperscript{11} While it is clear that a critical mass of elected officials is not necessary to mobilize the their citizens, in order to test Browning, Marshall, and Tabb’s (1997) theory of political incorporation we cannot analyze the political behavior of the Cuban American community around the issue of language before there are elected officials from the community — which they consider a necessary but not sufficient condition for political incorporation. Thus, we will utilize current data and current elites throughout the rest of this study.
programs, led to the development and emergence of a political consciousness among Cuban Americans and therefore provides a fertile ground to analyze the dynamics of political incorporation (Castro 1992; Cockcroft 1995; de los Angeles Torres 1988; DeSipio 1996; DeSipio and de la Garza 1998; Lawrence, 1999; Moreno 1997; Portes and Mozo, 1988).

In theorizing about minorities' struggles to gain entry into the political process, Browning, Marshall, and Tabb (1997) state that,

As important as representation is . . . it does not guarantee a group control over city government. The mere presence of people of color in office does not ensure that they will try to realize a particular vision of group interests or that they will be able to influence their governments. Even a large minority on a city council may have little or no influence over city government in the presence of a resistant and united majority (8).

The work of Nelson (2000) in Black Atlantic Politics: Dilemmas of Political Empowerment in Boston and Liverpool supports this statement. Nelson points out that racial politics have prevented the Black community from translating its control over city council seats into effective access and power because the council in Boston is dominated by a conservative, White coalition that is largely unresponsive to the policy preferences of the Black community (79).

Political incorporation, according to Browning, Marshall, and Tabb (1997), therefore is more than electoral success and involves the "extent to which group interests are effectively represented in policy making . . . the extent to which it is represented in a coalition that dominates city policy making on issues of greatest concern to the group" (9). In other words, it is not just whether or not they have entered the power structure,
but rather have they coalesced with other groups to both gain access to and benefits from the system. Two strategies for reaching the aforementioned ends are outlined: the successful protest strategy and the successful electoral strategy. The historical account provided above indicates that the latter strategy is most relevant for this case:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Competition</th>
<th>Group representation</th>
<th>Governmental responsiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mobilization</td>
<td>for elective office</td>
<td>and incorporation</td>
<td>on policy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group mobilization is a function of group organization and coalition formation. The logic of this operationalization is that because none of the racial and ethnic minority groups in the cities examined had electoral majorities, electoral victory depended on the support of liberal whites. By employing this reasoning, Hero (1992) points out, the authors falsely presume symmetry between the interests of communities of color and the ideology of Anglos thereby completely ignoring historical, social, and political contexts. Thus this operationalization presents a dilemma. To improve this measure, I will examine each of these contexts to determine the relative level of political mobilization.

In order for there to be political incorporation and social uplift according to Browning, Marshall, and Tabb (1997), Miami Cubans must have not only electoral success but there must be an underlying cohesiveness amongst Miami Cubans that binds them under one identity or one consciousness which is assumed to be important and present by theorists of political incorporation. Moreover, according to Browning,

---

12 Liberal whites are not a likely coalition partner for Cuban Americans, but conservative Anglos would be.
Marshall, and Tabb (1997) cohesiveness is needed to influence policy. Therefore, it is necessary to determine whether it is appropriate to speak of one cohesive Cuban community in Miami. There are myriad possible divisive forces in this community, such as racial identity, class cleavages, and immigration history. White ethnic groups such as the Italians and Irish, as well as African Americans, simply did not have to deal with these divisions during their respective ascendancies in the political arena. While Italian, Irish, and African American groups, respectively, are able to unite as one racialized ethnic group, Latinos, and Cubans in particular, may be struggling with the race divide. Are the members of the community cohesive enough to endure conflicts and disagreements? Cuban Americans may not have realized the potential for the type of unity that other racial and ethnic groups have displayed.

Further, Browning, Marshall, and Tabb (1997) state that the political goal of a minority group is to enter and become part of a dominant governing coalition to influence policy outcomes. Thus, it is assumed that one dominant governing coalition exists in urban areas. Is this is case for Miami? It may be necessary to determine whether it is appropriate to speak of one cohesive, dominant governing coalition at work in Miami. The structure of Miami-Dade's government may not allow for a cohesive, dominant governing coalition to emerge and maintain power. The question becomes

---

13 Stone's (1989) and Ferman's (1996) analyses factor into this dilemma because they suggest that this political incorporation has only benefited particular segments of minority communities. Reed, Jr. (1999) also agrees that this emphasis on electoral participation has led to a shift in ideology and strategy among minority elites that pushes certain interests to the periphery.

14 Some would say that this is a problem for the Hispanic community in general; a pan-ethnic Hispanic identity does not exist in the United States.
whether it is necessary to have one united governing coalition that groups can enter in order to reach political incorporation. Perhaps there are various arenas of power in which different actors exert influence in different arenas. Additionally, both inter- and intra-group coalitions are difficult to develop and sustain because of the often-conflicting values and goals of the participating groups. It is clear that bi- or multi-racial coalitions can be successful, but perhaps a less complex solution is available. With whom outside their community could they coalesce? Given the history of Cuban-Black relations, a long-standing, non-issue or candidate related coalition between these groups is not feasible.\textsuperscript{15}

Political incorporation, as defined by Browning, Marshall, and Tabb (1997) is more than being part of a governing coalition where the group and/or its leadership can be co-opted, given only symbolic representation, or remain a junior partner;\textsuperscript{16} incorporation involves substantive representation in the governing coalition and the policy-making process. Accordingly, political incorporation is measured on a continuous scale in which the fully incorporated influence substantive policy outcomes that lead to social and economic improvement for group members; a continuum of possible levels of political incorporation embedded in this theory (Browning, Marshall,

\textsuperscript{15} See Porter and Dunn, 1984; Dunn and Stepick, 1992; Portes and Stepick, 1993 for more information regarding Cuban-Black relations in Miami.

At the lowest level there are no elected officials from the group or participation in a coalition that controls city government, in essence, no representation. At the middle level there is some representation but the coalition is resistant to minority interests. The strongest form of incorporation occurs "when a group has an equal or leading role in a dominant coalition that is strongly committed to minority interests (1997, 9)," therefore affording substantial influence over policy. Is this the best continuum to employ when trying to measure political incorporation? It is not necessarily the case that having group members elected increases that group's political influence. Therefore it may be necessary to alter this continuum of political incorporation to focus on substantive representation on policy issues rather than on numbers elected into office or coalition-building.

We have laid the groundwork to build a series of questions. As some scholars have stated, has the Cuban American community in Miami-Dade reached the highest level of political incorporation? These are a few of the questions I hope to examine in the subsequent sections employing the hypotheses outlined below.

According to Browning, Marshall, and Tabb (1997), we need to determine whether the group has entered the power structure via a coalition with other groups to gain access and benefits. While it is clear that Cuban Americans have had electoral success, it is not clear that they have utilized a coalition to do so. Nevertheless, the end

---

17 By pluralist we mean to indicate that these scholars believe the political system is open and that all who decide they want to participate have the opportunity to do so.

18 The authors measure governmental responsiveness as a function of political incorporation.
result of gaining access to the political system via electoral success has been achieved in
some measure. Browning, Marshall, and Tabb (1997) posit that electoral success is not
even enough for the achievement of political incorporation and ask whether group members
are able to translate their electoral gains into increased socio-economic and political
status for their community. This is a crucial question in this analysis. In order to
investigate this question, using the case of language policy, I will explore the
relationship between the masses and their elites. Are elites actively seeking to advance
the socio-economic and political status of the community? Are elites aware of the issues
that the community is most concerned about? Do elites believe the language issue is a
barrier to the community’s progress along socio-economic and political lines? Are
Cuban American elites independent and cohesive enough to pursue policies that favor
their constituencies? How does exile politics play a role in domestic policy-making?

EXPECTATIONS

Given this brief history of Cubans in the Miami-Dade area, the aforementioned
theory regarding political incorporation does not adequately explain the political reality
for Cubans in Miami. Using language policy as the dependent variable, we will further
examine this claim. First, divisions within the Cuban community may cause political
cleavages to trump group cohesion — which is a necessary condition of traditional
theories of political incorporation. Therefore we expect to find that when the
community is focused on domestic policy, specifically language policy, there will be
significant differences by race, gender, age or generation, and length of time in the U.S.
within the Cuban community in Miami-Dade. Second, while scholars have shown the
process of political incorporation to be incremental in nature, Cuban Americans seem to have reached some level of political incorporation rather quickly. Despite the relatively short amount of time Cubans have been living in Miami en mass, they have reached some level of electoral success. We investigate the level of political participation of members of the Cuban American community in Miami-Dade at the mass and elite levels and examine its effects on language policy. We expect to find that voting is by far the form of political participation employed by most members of this community, and that other forms of participation such as endorsing a candidate, contributing time and/or donations to a candidate or political party, and belonging to a political club or organization will be rare. This is significant because previous research has touted this community to be the most politically active minority group in the country, hence a lack of participation beyond the voting booth is important to note.

Thirdly, scholars have concentrated on the role elites and organizations play in the overall political scheme. Thus, the examination of the political strategies and behaviors of Cuban elites is the focal point of this part of the analysis. We expect to find two phenomena at work in Miami's Cuban community: first, we hypothesize that there are too many leaders vying for political power in the community, thereby causing political chaos and a lack of a unified agenda. In short, it may be that there are so many Cuban American leaders in Miami-Dade that the community does not consolidate their support behind one candidate or regime — because so many people have some power,

---

19 While this is the case for most groups, Browning, Marshall, and Tabb's (1997) theory of political incorporation posits that we should expect Cuban Americans to participate in some additional ways in
nobody has power because no one can pull it all together. It is also crucial to note that we anticipate that divisions among elites on policy issues are not on the surface. We expect to find agreement on broad goals among elites. Nevertheless, we expect to find a measure of disagreement in the strategy each will want to employ to deal with a given issue. For example, a vast majority of Cuban Americans believe that Cuba is being hurt by the actions of the Castro regime, yet there are conflicting opinions on how to remove him from power. Some want to assassinate him, others support a stronger U.S. embargo against Cuba, and still others believe that ending the embargo will create an atmosphere conducive to insurgency on the island. We expect that the same type of ideological conflict can be found in regard to domestic policy, specifically language policy.

Further, this study offers something new in that past investigations have been conducted in bi-racial political environments where only two racial groups were competing against one another for power. This case includes a multi-polar version of this story, where there are at least three major racial and ethnic groups vying for power: Anglos, African Americans, and Cuban Americans. In this type of political atmosphere gains and losses are usually seen in a zero sum context, particularly in light of the fact that coalitions are difficult to develop and sustain because of the often-conflicting values and goals of the participating groups. Given the history of Cuban-Black relations, a long-standing, non-issue or candidate related coalition between these groups might not be feasible. As Cuban Americans in Miami-Dade have managed to

response to the English language movement.
maintain their electoral success for over a decade, a political gain for Cuban Americans may be understood as a political loss for African Americans. We expect to find that there are some coalition-building efforts between racial and ethnic groups at the elite level, but the opportunity to do so is limited at the mass level. Finally, Miami-Dade’s structure of metropolitan government complicates both the internal and collective Cuban American struggles for political incorporation. We expect to find that the organizational structure of local government, in and of itself, contributes to the divisive nature of politics in South Florida.

CONCLUSION

With the theoretical framework of political incorporation provided by Browning, Marshall, and Tabb (1997) many questions are left unanswered by the discussions and debates in the Latino politics and urban politics literatures regarding Cubans in Miami. Do the Cuban masses in Miami think these elites and organizations represent them? If not, to what extent is it possible to build a grassroots movement in this community? Is language the issue to build it upon? While Cubans in Miami are significantly represented in the electoral coalition, we posit that they have not been able to break into the governing coalition nor have they been able to produce tangible benefits for Cubans as a whole community. According to Stone and Pierannuzzi (1997), “Gains for some do not necessarily contribute to the advance of all” (175-76).

Jews, Haitians, and other Latinos groups such as Nicaraguans and Puerto Ricans could also be included here.
In response to the questions posed above, we expect to find that the leadership of the Cuban American community is severely divided, in terms of ideology, opinions of English-Only, as well as by the strategies they employ to reach the intended political ends. Fortunately or unfortunately, the three factors mentioned are very likely to be highly correlated among the elites in the Cuban community whereas that may not be the case among the masses. Also, we expect to find that Cuban American elites have not reached the highest level of political incorporation where they have an equal or leading role in a dominant coalition that is strongly committed to Cuban American interests. We contend that a select group of Cuban Americans in Miami-Dade, rather than the community as a collective, do have substantial influence over policy – which may or may not be in the community’s best interest. Given these possibilities, we can now turn to a discussion of our data, hypotheses, and analyses.
While the most common method of researching public opinion is telephone surveying, this method may not provide enough information to grasp the complexity of the issues involved in studying political incorporation; therefore, I pursue this examination using a multi-method approach that includes focus groups, a mail survey, face-to-face interviewing, and official aggregate data. Focus groups provide us with the in-depth information needed to gain a thorough understanding of the mass perceptions of the power dynamics among Miami Cubans. They provide us with a better-defined focus in terms of capturing the most important issues in the community, the general feelings and thoughts toward English-Only policy, and a description of power relations in the city. Finally, this type of research enables improvements to be made on both mail and face-to-face survey instruments that are part of the larger dissertation project; thus, focus group research is an integral part of this project.

Focus Groups

There are both strengths and weaknesses to this methodological approach. Morgan (1997) suggests that "both the strengths and weaknesses of focus groups flow directly from their two defining features: the reliance on the researcher’s focus and the
group's interactions" (13). In other words, the researcher conducts focus groups because she or he is inherently interested in this topic, and the focus group participants already have had to come to grips with language policy issues. Thus while the researcher's interests determine subject matter, focus groups allow researchers to quickly and efficiently gather data on their topic of interest. Further, the reactions group members have to each other's comments result in a more complex picture. These characteristics also serve as the inherent weakness of this method. The fact that the researcher's interests guide group discussions may affect the natural flow of conversations that would normally develop in private. This is probably doubly true in relation to more volatile topics such as politics. This leads to the second major weakness. The mere presence of the researcher or moderator may inhibit participants' willingness to be forthcoming on private or controversial topics. To avoid other potential weaknesses, this project uses Morgan's (1997) rules of focus group research: it relies on relatively structured interviews with a moderator and 6-10 participants per group.¹

I recruited focus group participants in several ways. First I passed out fliers asking for volunteers on Election Day 2000 at various voting precincts in Cuban-populated areas in Miami-Dade. This was effective in getting populations of Cuban Americans together who are not familiar with one another but are able to gather together more conveniently and in close proximity. I also recruited at several of the colleges and universities in the area. Second, I used a variation of focus groups by using peer group conversations (Gamson 1992). These differ from traditional focus groups in that they

¹ Also, people may not feel that they cannot voice attitudes that conflict with majority views.
are smaller (usually 4-6 participants), held in the participants' natural environment, and involved people they have invited. In view of the fact that there are limited resources for this project, I relied on participants who were willing to help in the recruiting efforts. While there may be some criticism that those people who would be willing to volunteer for this activity are somehow different from "ordinary people," similar claims could be made about people who take the time to answer extensive questionnaires or surveys.2

Survey Research

Survey research in Latino politics is relatively new and extremely limited, thus full attention has not been given to this particular group of Latino citizens. It is particularly difficult for social scientists to analyze the power structure among Cuban elites because of various cultural norms as well as language barriers (Marin and Marin, 1991).

While focus groups can provide description, direction, and context, I found it necessary to conduct a mass survey to provide more variance and representativeness for the analysis (Weisberg, et al 1996). A mail survey with a sample size of 250 is an effective and cost efficient way in which to reach these ends. The expectation is to have a response rate of 35%-45%, therefore leaving approximately 100 responses.3 The survey instrument was provided in English and Spanish thereby creating an objective

---

2 However, random sampling issues vary from the problems associated with interviewing. It is the magnitude and implications of the strengths and weaknesses that are most important. For this project, the researcher believes that the magnitude of the strengths of this research method outweigh those of the weaknesses because it is imperative to provide a fuller context in analyzing a complicated set of issues, such as those involved in language policy.

3 A low response rate is somewhat expected when using this method of survey research and is exacerbated by the fact that Hispanics have notoriously low response rates when compared to other racial and ethnic groups.
measure of response language as well as minimizing the costs of bilingual telephone interviewers. A mail survey also allows for a larger sample size to be taken with less cost than face-to-face interviews. The sample was limited to only those living within the boundaries of Miami-Dade County. A letter with institutional affiliation and explaining the importance of the survey was sent out prior to mailing the survey instrument. The first mailing of the survey was followed by three additional mailings in order to ensure maximum returns. I developed and implemented the survey instrument because it enabled me to ask new and different types of questions; I was better able to control the focus and neutrality of the questions as well.

As I stated earlier, I mailed 250 bilingual surveys to residents in Miami-Dade county who were listed in the Miami-Dade telephone book. I randomized the page numbers of the telephone book and chose every fourth residential listing. From that sample I categorized the addresses by zip code and oversampled addresses from the City of Hialeah and the area of Little Havana in order to allow as many Cubans and Cuban Americans into the sample as possible. I also oversampled zip codes from the City of Coral Gables in order to provide socio-economic variance. A letter explaining the project and the importance of returning a completed survey was mailed to each address

---

4 Unfortunately, the financial restrictions of this project did not allow me to purchase a mailing sample. Further, a criss-cross or street directory is not available for Miami-Dade, thus this was the best sampling alternative given the time and resources. The number of unlisted telephone numbers are somewhat high in Miami-Dade.

5 Precincts in the City of Hialeah and an area in the City of Miami known as Little Havana have the highest proportion of Cuban American voters in the county.

6 Coral Gables is one of the wealthier incorporated areas in Miami-Dade that also has a substantial Cuban and Cuban American residential population.
on official letterhead. Approximately one week later the second mailing of the survey, which included a cover letter, questionnaire, and stamped-addressed envelope, was mailed. Within the next seven days, respondents received a postcard reminding them about the questionnaire. The postcard also included a toll-free number to call if they had any questions about the project or had not received the cover letter and questionnaire. The final mailing of the survey was sent within three weeks of mailing three. It included another cover letter, questionnaire, and stamped-addressed envelope (Dillman 1978; Salant and Dillman 1994).

This four-step process yielded a response rate of 28%, which is lower than had been expected. Nevertheless 42% of the sample was born in Cuba, thus providing us with a substantial number of Hispanics – Cubans in particular. Additionally approximately 31% moved to Miami-Dade since 1980, 82% are U.S. citizens, 52% are married and 71% are parents. Further, 51% are registered Republicans, 37% are registered Democrats, while 12% are Independents. On a three-category ideology scale, 41% consider themselves to be conservatives, 20% are moderates, and 39% are liberals (see Table 4.1 for a more detailed demographic profile of the respondents).

7 It is important to note that an English and Spanish language version of all of the information was sent to each potential respondent simultaneously.

8 I received two telephone calls. During each the respondent simply asked for additional information about the project. Each caller was provided with the same explanation of the project and assured of the confidentiality they would have if they chose to respond.

9 See Appendix for instrumentation.

10 This profile is a relatively representative sample with a bit of a skew in terms of higher income levels and citizenship levels, which are to be expected given the nature and method of this research.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent from:</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Education:</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>No more than H.S.</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hialeah</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami Beach</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Associate’s Degree</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coral Gables</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4 Yr Degree</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Miami</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Professional/Master’s</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami Springs</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ph.D./M.D.</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Bay Village</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language of completed survey:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Gender of Respondent:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent’s language proficiency:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Household income:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English Only</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Less than $25,999</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual in Eng/Spanish</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>$26,000-$45,999</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>$46,000-$65,999</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish Only</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$66,000 and above</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak additional language</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>101%</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anglo</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuban</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1: Demographic Profile of the Mail Survey Respondents
Given that this is both quantitative and qualitative analysis, I make use of descriptive and elementary statistics. The dependent variables are political and ethnic/racial group consciousness, political knowledge, and the Cubans' position on the language issue. The independent variables include demographic variables such as socio-economic status, immigration status measured by year of immigration, and racial identity within the Cuban American community. Further the analysis includes more complex independent variables such as the relationship Cuban Americans have had with non-Cuban whites, blacks, and Hispanics. In addition, we examine the perception of the struggle for status and respect inside Miami-Dade's political and economic systems in an attempt to more fully understand the dynamics of ethnic politics in the American system.

**Elite Interviews**

I also conducted in-depth personal interviews with elites, which provide primary information about the Cuban American political agenda. Respondents for the elite portion of the survey research were interviewed face-to-face. They were selected using criteria based on 1) their position in Miami-Dade County politics and/or Miami-Dade County's business sector and 2) the amount of perceived influence the masses believe they hold or the amount of influence that is attributed to the position they hold. Since there has been some evidence that focus groups augment exploratory analysis of data, the latter was determined by analyzing the focus group data (Morgan 1997). Top elected and appointed officials, for instance, were included in the potential respondent pool.

---

The data are comparable to the demographic profile of the county as a whole. There are a few notable differences. The population of Coral Gables is larger than that of Miami Beach, the gender ratio is a bit.
made the initial contact with potential respondents via telephone or mail at least one month prior to requesting their participation in this study.\textsuperscript{12}

During the spring of 2001, I was able to conduct interviews comprising 71%\textsuperscript{13} of the elites currently serving in elected, appointed, or organizational capacities in Miami-Dade.\textsuperscript{14} Once again, an in-depth profile of the sample is essential. The mean age of this sample was 46 years old with an average of 7 years of electoral political experience.\textsuperscript{15} A majority of these officials, 75\%, were men and they were largely white, Republican, and Hispanic.

An overwhelming majority of these elites were married with children and possessed at least an Associate Degree. The largest category represented individuals from the business sector (rather than the legal, educational, or public service occupations) and who were born in Miami-Dade County. Twenty years ago, the profile was much more Democratic, Anglo, and more law occupation oriented. Further, as the leadership of each ethnic group is examined separately these characteristics tend to vary. For example, the Cuban American contingent is a bit younger, slightly more male, with an average of an additional year's experience. This group was heavily Republican,

---

\textsuperscript{12} See appendices for instrumentation.

\textsuperscript{13} This is the response rate. There was only one refusal, I was unable to schedule an appointment with others.

\textsuperscript{14} Here I am referring to city, county, and state level elites; N=52. As was stated earlier, these individuals were chosen because of their position in government and organizational entities such as City and County Commissioners, or high-ranking organizational leaders.

\textsuperscript{15} The median age was calculated in August of 2001.
about 94%, far more likely to be foreign-born, and entering the political arena from the business sector (see Table 4.2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Birthplace</th>
<th>Partisanship</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Miami-Dade</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24% (12)</td>
<td>38% (18)</td>
<td>53% (27)</td>
<td>37% (19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo American</td>
<td>Other Florida</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2% (1)</td>
<td>6% (3)</td>
<td>2% (1)</td>
<td>23% (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuban American</td>
<td>Other U.S.</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58% (29)</td>
<td>21% (10)</td>
<td>45% (23)</td>
<td>29% (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>Bahamas</td>
<td>Govt.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5% (10)</td>
<td>4% (2)</td>
<td>12% (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haitian American</td>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4% (2)</td>
<td>27% (13)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4% (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2: Overall Profile of Political and Economic Elites in Miami-Dade in 2001

Official Aggregate Data

I used U.S. Census data from 1960 through 2000 as a resource for demographic information. The data are readily available and provide a large number of cases for analyses. Election information is available from the city, county, and state. This data provides the most accurate information regarding the English-Only vote, which is broken down by partisanship, race, and gender. Once combined, these quantitative and

---

16 This population includes all the elected officials from the City of Miami Board of Commissioners, the Mayor of Miami, the Miami-Dade County Board of County Commissioners, state representatives from the districts representing Miami-Dade County, leaders of the Hialeah and Greater Miami Chamber of Commerce, and leaders of the civic organizations we discuss in chapters 5 and 6.
 qualitative data provide a well-rounded research approach that helps in explaining Cuban political participation in Miami through allowing tests of the hypotheses that follow.

Hypotheses

The hypotheses that are introduced below are designed to illuminate the difficulty of attaining political incorporation. I hope to shed some light on the questions raised in this and the previous chapter via seven hypotheses, which are delineated below.

H1: The leadership of the Cuban American community is a cohesive political actor.

Survey respondents were asked if they perceived the Cuban American community to be a cohesive group. This provides a subjective measure on group cohesiveness. In addition, there are three objective measures of group cohesiveness that will be employed: Overall policy agreement, perceived community divisions, and voting records. I expect to find some level of group cohesiveness of each measure. However I also expect to find divisions on policy preferences, as well as divisions along demographic lines such as racial status and socio-economic status. In turn, these results should demonstrate that the Cuban American community, while not a monolith, pulls together when it is necessary (i.e. voting).

H2: The Cuban-American community has been negatively impacted by discrimination.

Here we employ data from focus groups within the community as well as secondary data resources. The data reveals the complex relationship between the Cuban American
community and the broader Miami-Dade community. We can examine the social status of Cuban Americans in the county in the areas of education, income distribution, and business ownership. I expect to find that Cuban Americans are slightly behind in terms of education and income distribution, but are over-represented in terms of business ownership thereby demonstrating that discrimination has unevenly impacted the community.

**H3:** Business interests overpowered early political representatives from the Cuban American community surrounding the issue of language policy.

Historical analyses of the language debate provide the primary evidence for this hypothesis. I expect to find that members of the business elite overtly thwarted the efforts of political leaders.

**H4:** Civic groups are relatively weak in the area of political, domestic policy issues such as English Only.

A random sample of Miami-Dade residents was asked who they believed held the political power in the county. This provides a subjective measure of the distribution of political power in Miami-Dade. Further, the historical context also sheds light on the nature of civic organizations in Miami-Dade, their goals, and their role in the language policy debate. I expect to find that civic groups are not considered to be political powerhouses in terms of domestic issues by Miami-Dade residents. I also expect to find that few civic organizations have focused on language policy and those that have not been very powerful.
**H5:** There was no mobilization by community elites regarding the English Only movement.

Data gathered via face-to-face interviews are used to demonstrate the perception of language policy among political elites that existed in the 1980s as well as today. I expect to find that this lack of mobilization created a lack to grassroots activity around the issue.

**H6:** There was a lack of grassroots mobilization surrounding English language policies.

Finally, the language policy debate, while having specific outcomes, is part of a larger problem in Miami-Dade County. Citizens and elites alike are engaged in symbolic politics thereby excluding some groups from the policy-making arena and limiting the level of political incorporation that they can reach. Using the measures created by Browning, Marshall, and Tabb (1997), I expect to find that Cuban Americans have not reached the highest level of political incorporation because they are engaged in symbolic politics.

**H7:** Miami-Dade elites were and are engaged in symbolic politics.

It is with this data and the aforementioned hypotheses that we move toward an analysis of the Cuban American community and an examination of language policy.
CHAPTER 5

THE SOCIAL CONTEXT OF LANGUAGE POLICY

The social context of the language policy movement in Miami-Dade is a key factor in this discussion of political mobilization and therefore of political incorporation. By social context, we are referring to the measure of within-group cohesiveness and the community's relative standing in the broader society in areas such as education, income distribution, and business ownership. These are key variables that Browning, Marshall, and Tabb's (1997) theory of political incorporation do not take into account. Therefore, we are building a more comprehensive examination of political incorporation by including these factors.

Four dilemmas exist within Browning, Marshall, and Tabb's (1997) theory of political incorporation in terms of the social context variable. First, the authors limit their analysis by assuming, without examination, that group cohesiveness exists and is rather constant. This assumption may not hold for all racial and ethnic groups, therefore a fuller analysis is necessary. Second, the authors assume that discrimination has had a severe impact on all racial and ethnic groups' ability to be upwardly mobile. Given the unique nature of Cuban immigration to the United States, further inquiry is necessary to
flesh this out. Was there ethnic discrimination to overcome? Did discrimination affect the community’s progress in the areas of education or business ownership? How does language policy fit into this context?

Third, Browning, Marshall, and Tabb (1997) do not discuss the transformation of a social issue, like language policy, into a political issue. Who have been the key players? How was the situation shaped by early efforts to mobilize? What has been the process for those who have attempted to keep this issue salient in the Cuban American community? Finally, Browning, Marshall, and Tabb (1997) do not follow the process of political incorporation through because they do not extend their conversation to include the impact of the social context on the political process. For example, how has the transformation of this social issue into a political issue affected the social status of the Cuban American community? How does this affect the broader political context? We will respond to each of these dilemmas in this chapter.

Hispanics and Cohesiveness

Group cohesiveness is not defined, but is assumed to exist in Browning, Marshall, and Tabb’s (1997) theory of political incorporation. This is one of great deficits in their theory. For while the Metropolitan Miami area includes more than 1.2 million Hispanics, mostly Cuban Americans, who comprise approximately 57 percent of Miami-Dade’s population (http://quickfacts.census.gov),¹ and Cuban Americans comprise the largest minority group in the county, there are scores of characteristics that
divide the community. Of those that could be discussed, we will highlight divisions in terms of wave of immigration (exile status), socio-economic status, and race within the Cuban American community. The claim here is that group cohesiveness cannot be assumed, but must be shown to exist.

As stated in Chapter 2, the members of each wave of immigration brought a distinct set of characteristics with them. The earliest waves were members of the social, political, and economic elite. The middle waves were their family members, who were largely members of the middle class. The most recent waves were comprised of what Americans considered Cuba’s “underclass.” Racial and socio-economic status also varied by wave of immigration. The earliest waves of immigration were white and wealthy and subsequently “browned” over time. Each successive wave of immigration from the island was poorer than its predecessor.

To examine these, along with other potential divisions within the community, I turn to my survey data. To procure both objective and subjective measures, residents of Miami-Dade County were asked a series of questions, two of which are relevant here. First, residents were asked whether they thought the Cuban American community was a cohesive group or a divided group. A four-point response scale was offered ranging from “very cohesive group” to “very divided group.” For this subjective measure, 72% of the entire sample indicated that they believed the Cuban American community in Miami-Dade to be a very cohesive or somewhat cohesive group while 28% felt that they

\[1\] The statistics provided by the Census are divided into separate racial and ethnic categorizations. Approximately 73% of Hispanics claim a white racial identity while approximately 13% claim a black
were a somewhat divided or very divided group. Thus, on the surface, it appears that Cuban Americans are at least perceived by all respondents to have a sense of group cohesiveness.

The second, more objective measure asked respondents what divided the Cuban community in Miami-Dade. Every survey respondent who replied to this question chose at least one divisive factor. In terms of the demographic factors that were discussed above, 21% said exile status divided the Cuban community, 23% stated classism, and an additional 27% said racism divided the Cuban community. Therefore, the historical account is supported by the continuation of mass perceptions regarding the divisions within the Cuban American community in Miami-Dade along demographic cleavages. This evidence demonstrates that the Cuban American community is not perceived to be nor is it a monolith, but what does it say about actual group cohesiveness? These perceived divisions may affect group cohesiveness in terms of policy as well as affecting the attitudes individuals have about the group.

To test this hypothesis I ran several sets of bivariate correlations on the data I collected through the mail survey. I began with an analysis of the dichotomous, independent variables, perception of intra-community divisions of race, class, and exile racial identity. For more information see http://www.floridacensus.com/census/tables/fl_tab_4.PDF.

Respondents who categorized themselves as having Cuban descent were less likely to say the Cuban American community was cohesive (64% said very or somewhat cohesive) than were Non-Cuban American respondents (79% said very or somewhat cohesive. There is no statistically significant difference between these two ethnic groups on this measure.

N=62. The remaining 31% did not indicate that any of these divisions existed.
status. After satisfactorily determining that these items are indeed highly correlated and should be used to form the same additive scale, I constructed a multi-item index that combined these variables (see Table 5.1). The measure was created by adding the variables together and allows me to create more comprehensive measures. Scholars suggest that multi-item measures are more useful than single-item measures because they measure more complex concepts as are most problems in the real world (McIver and Carmines, 1981).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classism</th>
<th>Racism</th>
<th>Exile Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exile Status</td>
<td></td>
<td>.481***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
*** Correlation is significant at the 0.001 level (2-tailed).

Table 5.1: Bivariate Correlations of Perceptions of Demographic Divisions

I then ran bivariate correlations between our multi-item index and the subjective cohesive measure in order to assess the relationship between the perception of demographic divisions within the Cuban American community and the perception of

---

4 This measures the number of divisions each respondent indicated on the survey. Some respondents did not check any of the available response categories. These respondents were included in the analysis and the number of divisions used was zero.

5 Classism, racism, and exile status were dichotomous measures; the responses were either 1=yes or 0=no.
cohesiveness within the community. The relationship approached the traditional level of statistical significance reaching a p value of .084 and having a correlation of .524 and the relationship is in the expected direction: as respondents perceive more divisions within the community, their perceptions about the intensity of group cohesiveness diminish.⁶

In addition to perceived demographic divisions, respondents were also asked about perceived policy divisions. Questions were asked about local policies, state level policies, national level policies, as well as policies directed toward Cuba. Fully 71% of survey respondents indicated that they thought the Cuban American community was divided about policies towards Cuba. Further, 55% of all respondents indicated that they believed policies in Miami-Dade County divided the Cuban American community.⁷

Perhaps perceptions of policy divisions significantly impact the perception of cohesiveness. To explore this possibility, I ran bivariate and multivariate analyses employing the subjective cohesiveness measure as the dependent variable and the two policy measures as independent variables controlling for gender, age, education, and ethnicity. Neither of these relationships approached statistical significance in bivariate or multivariate analyses. These findings are further supported when we specifically examine language policy.⁸ None of these measures are statistically significant in relation to cohesiveness.

---

⁶ We would suspect, given a larger N, that the divisions would significantly impact respondents' perception about group cohesiveness.

⁷ These policy variables are not statistically correlated (p=.245).

⁸ Respondents were asked whether they thought English Only language policies were 1) important, 2) discriminatory, and 3) whether they thought the policy was excellent, good, fair, or poor.
to the subjective cohesiveness measure in bivariate and multivariate analyses. These findings indicate that survey respondents’ perception of cohesiveness is not significantly related to the number of divisions they say exist within the Cuban American community.

A final objective measure of group cohesiveness can be found in the potential for bloc voting by Cuban Americans. In Miami-Dade’s multi-ethnic socio-political environment the concept of ethnic voting is a fundamental concept to comprehend and take into account. In “The Development of Ethnic Voting,” Wolfinger (1965) posited:

The strength of ethnic voting depends on both the intensity of ethnic identification and the level of ethnic relevance in the election. The most powerful and visible sign of ethnic political relevance is a fellow-ethnic’s name at the head of the ticket, evident to everyone who enters the voting booth (905).

This theory of ethnic voting seems to be applicable to Miami-Dade’s Cuban American voting bloc. Survey respondents were asked whom they voted for in the 2000 presidential election. If a majority of Cuban American respondents voted for the same candidate, it can be said that they have demonstrated cohesiveness on this measure. Not surprisingly, 81% of the Cuban American respondents indicated that they cast their vote

9 The findings may be a result of a small N.

10 This finding may be effected by the low N. A larger sample size would yield improved results. Further, the division measure does not allow us to discuss the strength respondents attach to each of the divisions they say exist.

11 This concept is particularly important given the non-partisan nature of countywide politics. Studies have suggested that nonpartisan municipal elections may only substitute ethnic pressures for those of
for the Bush/Cheney ticket in the last election. This finding is supported by previous research that demonstrated the strength of the Cuban American voting bloc (Pérez 1986, Portes and Mozo, 1988, de la Garza and DeSipio 1992, Hero 1992, DeSipio 1996). Also, nearly 100% of the time, Miami-Dade’s Latins vote for the members of their local community over and above any other candidates. This is a pattern that has been demonstrated repeatedly over the last twenty years.

From these analyses we can conclude that group cohesiveness exists within the Cuban American community, but perhaps is not as strong as previous studies have indicated. The perception of divisions within the community along racial, socio-economic status, and exile status negatively impacts the perception of the intensity of group cohesiveness. However, policy divisions, or the perceptions thereof, do not impact the perception of group cohesiveness. Finally, Cuban Americans have shown tremendous cohesiveness in their capacity for bloc voting. Thus it can be said that perhaps cohesiveness, like political incorporation, should be measured on a continuum ranging from not cohesive at all to very cohesive, each measure adding to the total. On a scale, ranging from not cohesive to very cohesive, Cuban Americans would be considered somewhat cohesive.


Note that Bob Martínez, the gubernatorial candidate discussed earlier, was not a member of the Miami-Dade community.

On the subjective cohesiveness measure, Cuban Americans are perceived to be cohesive. The group has demonstrated the ability to vote en bloc. However, the perceptions of demographic divisions within the community are significant, and while the perceptions that policy divisions exist they are not statistically significant.
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Beyond Intra-Group Relations

Beyond the apparent disconnects within the Cuban American community there is a broader society within which they reside. In a multi-ethnic community, such as Miami-Dade, it is extremely important to provide an analysis of the broader social environment. Browning, Marshall, and Tabb (1997) assume that there has been discrimination against minority groups and therefore their theory of political incorporation takes this for granted. While it is safe to infer that African Americans have been impacted by racial discrimination given the history of slavery in the United States as well as the visible examples and vast literature on the subject, the impact of discrimination cannot be assumed to have the same effect in Latino communities. Thus, we will examine the impact of discrimination on Cuban Americans on several general issues: education, income distribution, and business ownership. We can conclude that discrimination exists if we can determine that there is a lack of parity in all of the areas of examination. We will also include an analysis of language policy.

Education

The first category of interest in this analysis is education. Since 1985 there has been substantial growth and change in the population of students enrolled in Miami-Dade public schools. More importantly, there have been particular ethnic and racial

---

14 We look only at public schools because private school enrollment in Miami-Dade County is low, currently reaching only 11% of the total number of students in the county. Private school enrollment has not reached higher than 16% since 1985 and has gradually decreased over time. For more information on this topic see the Miami-Dade Public Schools website at http://dcps.dade.k12.fl.us/.
patterns to the overall growth in the area that may have some impact on policy outcomes. As can be seen in Table 5.2, both the numbers and percentages of Anglo students have steadily declined since 1985. This is attributable to "white flight" from public education as well as from residential areas in Miami-Dade County. Black student enrollment is more interesting, however, in that over time the numbers of students in this category have increased as their percentages have remained steady. In this case, growth in terms of numbers is not directly translated into having a larger proportion of the at-large student body.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic year</th>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anglo*</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-00</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(49245)</td>
<td>(115878)</td>
<td>(195079)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955-96</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(51936)</td>
<td>(112812)</td>
<td>(168696)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-91</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(59131)</td>
<td>(97298)</td>
<td>(135982)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985-86</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(62425)</td>
<td>(77241)</td>
<td>(96461)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes Alaskan Natives, American Indians, Asians, Multiracial, and Pacific Islanders categories. Source: Current year - membership as of October, 1999 (FTE week) obtained from the Miami-Dade County Public Schools student database system.

Table 5.2: Student Membership by Race/Ethnicity 1985-86 to 1999-00
Finally, Hispanic student numbers and percentages have progressively increased since 1985. According to a report by the Florida Department of Education (1999), Hispanics comprise the largest racial or ethnic group among students enrolled in Miami-Dade public schools, followed by Black students, and then Anglo students.\textsuperscript{15} Thus it is clear that growth trends in the county's population are directly translated into ethnic and racial group change in public schools at the local level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Miami-Dade</th>
<th>State of Florida</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anglo enrollment*</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(42414)</td>
<td>(127924)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black enrollment</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(115770)</td>
<td>(596924)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic enrollment</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(195079)</td>
<td>(428026)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian enrollment</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4503)</td>
<td>(43809)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(357766)</td>
<td>(1196683)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\* Does not include Alaskan Natives, American Indians, Asians, Multiracial, and Pacific Islanders.


Table 5.3: Public Education Enrollment in the State of Florida—A Comparison

As can be seen in Table 5.3, the distribution of students at the local level, racially and ethnically, is vastly different from the public school population of the State of Florida as a whole, where Anglo or white students are the majority, followed by Black

\textsuperscript{15} None of the reports generated by the Florida Department of Education provide ethnic group information about various categories of Hispanic ethnicity. Thus, there is no way to calculate how many of the students who are categorized as being Hispanic are Cuban American, Mexican American, Puerto Rican and so on.
and then Hispanic students. From this table we can extrapolate that Miami-Dade County is not a model of the State of Florida regarding population composition and vice versa; clearly the two entities do not mirror each other. Moreover, the population composition at the local level significantly changes the educational environment in terms of needs, programming, and outcomes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Miami-Dade</th>
<th>State of Florida</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Limited English Proficiency</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo enrollment</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2024)</td>
<td>(12582)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black enrollment</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7166)</td>
<td>(25584)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic enrollment</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(50882)</td>
<td>(122356)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian enrollment</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(585)</td>
<td>(6920)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(60657)</td>
<td>(167442)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Free/Reduced Lunch**        |            |                  |
| Anglo enrollment              | 5%         | 32%              |
| (9877)                        | (335657)   |                  |
| Black enrollment              | 38%        | 40%              |
| (82377)                       | (415376)   |                  |
| Hispanic enrollment           | 56%        | 26%              |
| (119999)                      | (267024)   |                  |
| Asian enrollment              | 1%         | 1%               |
| (1429)                        | (14008)    |                  |
| Total                         | 100%       | 99%              |
| (213682)                      | (1032065)  |                  |


Table 5.4: Special Program Data for Miami-Dade v. Florida
For example, looking at Table 5.4, you can see that differing proportions of the population at the state and local levels of analysis utilize programs such as Free/reduced lunch and limited English proficiency. Of particular interest here is the enrollment of students in these programs. Approximately 17% of the student body in Miami-Dade is categorized as having limited English proficiency, which is more than twice as many as there are at the state level (approximately 7%). Thus given the information in Table 5.4, we can observe that Hispanic students overwhelmingly contribute to the disparity in this area.

Moreover, in Miami-Dade County 60% of all enrolled public school students partake in the Free/reduced lunch program, compared to a lesser 43% at the state level. Here again, Hispanic students overwhelmingly contribute to this disparity. Unlike the case of limited English proficiency, there is a substantial gap between Hispanic student enrollment in the Free/reduced lunch program at the state and local levels, 26% and 56% respectively. Also notable is the sizeable gap between Anglo student enrollment at the state and local levels in the opposite direction, 32% and 5%, respectively. Thus Table 5.4 indicates that shifts in the makeup of the population cause the need for different levels of programming in Miami-Dade.

The data in Table 5.4 indicates that Anglos are enrolled in the Free and Reduced Lunch program less than we would expect given that Anglo students comprise 12% of the students body in the county. Black and Hispanic students are enrolled in the Free and Reduced Lunch program slightly more often than we would expect given that they comprise 32% and 56%, respectively, of the student population in Miami-Dade. The
data provided in this table does not indicate that discrimination exists in these programs, only that Hispanics have a much higher percentage of students enrolled in the language proficiency program than we would expect given their numbers in the student population and that the proportion of Hispanics enrolled in the Free and Reduced Lunch program are about what we should expect.

Further, according to computation by the Office of Education Planning in Miami-Dade County, graduation rates vary by ethnic and racial group membership. From 1993-94 to 1997-98 graduation rates in the county have remained rather constant.\textsuperscript{16} Over this five-year period, Hispanic students have had the highest rate of high school graduation in the county with an average of 90.8%. Anglos follow Hispanic graduation rates with an average of 89.6%, and Black students proceed with an average graduation rate of 85.6% (http://www.dade.kl2.fl.us/eema/abstract/Outcomes4Jitm#128a). Notice that there is a 5.14% margin between the highest and lowest averages. Correspondingly, from 1996-97 to 1997-98, higher percentages of Black students are not promoted than any other group, with 6.9% of Black students in Miami-Dade public schools being left behind; however, Hispanics follow quite closely with 6% being left behind.

There is another trend in regard to incidences of disciplinary action taken during the 1997-98 academic year; Black and Hispanics students were involved in 48% and

\textsuperscript{16} Graduates include students receiving regular and Exceptional Student diplomas but exclude Certificates of Completion.
43%, respectively, of all incidences of disciplinary action. It is important to note that given the data in the tables above, we should expect Hispanics to have a higher percentage of incidences of disciplinary action than Blacks because they comprise a larger proportion of the student body.

How does this relate to measuring the impact of discrimination? Perhaps the change in the public educational system in Miami-Dade had a disproportionate, negative affect on Cuban Americans. While Cuban American students seem to have access to programs in Miami-Dade public schools, it seems as though these students are being targeted by the use of disciplinary action more than Anglos students, but less than Black students. This, in turn, may affect the educational environment and therefore the quality of education that Cuban American students receive, thereby limiting their potential for higher education. Through the use of a means comparison test, the responses to the questionnaire demonstrate that, on average, non-Cuban Anglos have slightly higher levels of education than Cuban Americans. Clearly this finding is not conclusive, but it does provide some limited support for the discrimination hypothesis.

Income Distribution

The next social context variable we will consider in terms of discrimination is income distribution. The inequality we see in the public education arena translates very

---

17 Computed by the Department of Management Analysis from Survey 5 data collected in October 1998 for the Florida Department of Education, and based on student membership in each ethnic/gender category as of October 1997. Total incidences for 1997-98 including the summer term.

18 To ensure that there were no other possible inferences to be made about this finding, I conducted several additional analyses that show the Cuban and non-Cuban samples have about the same average age and had about the same average length of time in Miami-Dade.
easily into disparities in income distribution both between groups and within groups. While the 2000 U.S. Census reports the median yearly income for county residents as $30,000, this does not provide us with enough information about the distribution of income for racial and ethnic groups in the area. However, research by Grenier (1992) and Coucher (1997) demonstrate that the migration of Cubans to Miami had quite an impact on the quality of life for Black Miamians (Grenier 1992).

The progress that Blacks in Miami had made during the 1970s was substantially stifled, particularly in regard to employment in service and clerical positions. By 1980 Blacks constituted 24 percent of Miami-Dade’s unemployment rolls, compared to only 17 percent in 1970 (Dunn and Stepick 1992). Further, Blacks were hit the hardest during the recession of the early 1980s, and in 1983 Black unemployment achieved a new postwar high.

Thus there was and continues to be an economic hierarchy operating in Miami-Dade in which Anglos are the most well off, followed by Hispanics, and then Blacks. Accompanying this overall pattern of inter-group competition for the top spot in the hierarchy is a pattern of differential poverty within the Cuban American community as well. Recall Table 2.6 where it was demonstrated that as the Cuban American population in Miami grew in absolute and relative terms, there was increased economic stratification (see page 26).

---

19 The average household size is 2.84 and the average family size is 3.35. Approximately 57% of Miami-Dade resident own their homes, while approximately 42% are renters.
This stratification may have a corollary in occupational diversity. Also recall Table 2.7, which demonstrated that blue-collar employment such as skilled and unskilled labor among Cubans rose in conjunction with population growth across gender categorizations (see page 27). The development of an occupation niche by this ethnic group, therefore seems to have occurred over time. These findings may be indicators of employment discrimination against Cubans and Cuban Americans, but this argument is not very compelling.

While there may be discrimination along economic lines, businesses continue to cater to Hispanics. For instance, restaurants with Latin American cuisine, clothing stores, grocery stores, music stores and stores with a variety of musical instruments, Spanish-language media outlets, and businesses engaging in trade with Latin American countries have opened and thrived in this tri-ethnic environment. According to the Greater Miami Chamber of Commerce, Miami-Dade is the gateway for Latin American and Caribbean imports and exports. In 2000, exports and imports through U.S. Customs' Miami District exceeded $51.9 billion.

**Business Ownership**

The relationship between Miami-Dade and Latin America is also affected by the domestic business environment, particularly when we examine who owns domestic capital. Thus it is important to profile minority owned businesses in Miami-Dade. If discrimination has an impact in this arena, we would expect to find low numbers and percentages of Cuban or Hispanic-owned business in the area. A historical context is
provided by Portes and Stepick (1993) who provide a statement about the economic situation of Miami in the 1960s made by Monsignor Bryan D. Walsh, a longtime civic leader in the area:

"Two things happened in the next years that caused all money for development of tourism in South Florida to dry up. One, Disney World started operating . . . nobody would drive further south [than Orlando]. The second factor was the jet plane. It became just as cheap to fly to Jamaica or Puerto Rico . . . Had it not been for Cubans, Miami would have been a dead duck. We had an economic depression in 1959; 1960 was a total disaster . . . The Cubans moved into the vacuum; the place was full of empty stores" (144).

However, many scholars dismiss the fact that the Black civil rights movement was just gaining momentum in South Florida and many African Americans resented the governmental subsidies that were given to Cuban exiles to start businesses in Miami-Dade regardless of the dire economic situation at the time.

For example, according to a report by the Miami-Dade County Planning Department and the Beacon Council (2001), there are seven times as many Hispanic owned businesses than Black owned businesses and two times as many Hispanic owned businesses when compared to female owned businesses in the county. The disparity is even more pronounced when we examine business ownership by industry division (see Table 2.5 on page 25). This evidence, therefore, does not support the discrimination hypothesis.

---

20 It is important to note that Black-owned businesses tend to be geographically concentrated while Hispanic-owned businesses tend to be more dispersed across the county.
Language Policy

Given the composition of Miami-Dade's population, as well as the racial and ethnic structure of the business community, it should not be unexpected that Spanish is spoken in the corporate and political spheres in Miami-Dade. This is a unique factor of that community that bridges the social and political contexts in the county. But the question becomes, how does this occur? Browning, Marshall, and Tabb's theory does not address this issue. The transformation of a social issue into a political issue is shaped by at least two important factors: key players and early definition of the issue.

The language issue in Miami-Dade has had a plethora of key players, most importantly the Metro-Dade Board of County Commissioners, the founders of the CDU, Jorge Valdez, and the Hispanic Coalition. Each of these individuals and organizations was able to define the issues surrounding English Only policy early on in the movement and therefore set the stage for the initiation or deterrence of mass mobilization. The Metro-Dade Board of County Commissioners, which was comprised of only Anglo commissioners in 1980, set the tone of the debate by largely ignoring pleas from citizens to repeal the official bilingualism ordinance of the 1970s. A more pro-active strategy in either direction would have led to the emergence of a very different English-Only movement and possibly an altered policy outcome.

Clearly Shafer and Plunskie, the founders of the CDU, shaped the social and political contexts of the anti-bilingual/English-Only side of the debate. They were able to couch their movement in the language of symbolism and patriotism very early on.
thereby enabling them to garner support for their cause in both the Anglo and African American communities. This was quite an accomplishment given the negative history between these two communities in Miami-Dade over the last fifty years.

Once Jorge Valdez was appointed to the Metro-Dade Board of County Commissioners to fill a vacancy and began focusing more resources on the language policy debate, he began to frame the issue for the Cuban American community. This shift caused action— the Cuban media began discussing the issue and organizations were established to deal with the controversy. However, members of the Hispanic Coalition quickly approached Valdez and encouraged him to halt his opposition, thereby quashing any further action on his part. This transaction was one of the first displays of power by the Cuban American business community and it became rapidly clear that they held the power rather than elected and appointed politicians from the community. Those, like Valdez, who attempted to keep this a salient issue in the Cuban American community have had to face an uphill battle within their community as well as against non-Cubans. To pursue this issue was to align yourself and/or your organization against the Cuban American business community and therefore the major institutions of political power in the community. The fact that an oppositional movement was never allowed to establish itself and the inherent threat to any pro-active movements provided by the business class helps explain the final outcome: English Only legislation was passed in the county. The series of actions and reactions explained above produced the transition of language policy from a social to political issue.
This transition has affected the social status of the Cuban American community in several significant ways. First, the Cuban American business community was given political recognition. This set in motion the establishment of a political hierarchy that mirrors the socio-economic patterns within the community and implied that Cuban American officials were weak and unable to make decisions for the community. This initiated a pattern of political interaction in which Cuban American officials were discredited and therefore excluded from the policy making and decision-making processes. Over time, the Cuban American business sector would overtly join the political sector by running for office themselves.

Second, the politicization of the language issue on the part of Anglos led to the emergence of a political and ethnic group consciousness in the Cuban American community. Eventually, as community members mobilized more voters, this political and ethnic consciousness was translated into political action. This indicates that there is a direct connection between social and political contexts and issues fought in each of these arenas. This type of analysis is lacking in Browning, Marshall, and Tabb's (1997) theory and is therefore another major failure of their theory. Further, the authors do not provide an analysis of available resources and the affect they have on the political capacity of the community, which is the topic to which we turn in Chapter 6.

Conclusion

Throughout this chapter we have demonstrated the importance of social issues in the context of ethnic politics, particularly in the context of Cuban American politics in Miami-Dade County. An accurate representation of the group's political status cannot be
determined without some discussion of social issues and the environment in which social issues emerge. In providing a discussion about the social context of Cuban Americans, we allow for a more comprehensive examination of the internal dynamics as well as the external status of the community. Thus it is necessary to account for the social context in which groups reside because it directly affects the political position of Cuban Americans, thereby impacting their capacity for political incorporation.
CHAPTER 6

THE POLITICAL CONTEXT AND CONSEQUENCES OF LANGUAGE POLICY

The status of language policy in Miami-Dade County has not been static, but has evolved from a substantive social issue to one that is profoundly political. The transition of language from a social issue to a political issue has implications for the political context and consequences of language policy, as well as for the Cuban American community. By political context, we are referring to the political environment that shapes the political behavior and power potentialities of the Cuban American community. There are several pertinent questions that need to be addressed here: What is the relative power of Cuban Americans in comparison to other racial and ethnic groups in Miami Dade County? Is there a history of electoral or grassroots political activity or success by Cuban Americans in the county? Are civic organizations established and operational in the Cuban American community on issues such as English Only? What do these items mean for the nature of Cuban American politics? These are key questions that Browning, Marshall, and Tabb's (1997) theory of political incorporation does not taken into account. Therefore, we are building a more comprehensive examination of political incorporation by searching for reasonable explanations.
Four dilemmas exist within Browning, Marshall, and Tabb's (1997) theory of political incorporation in terms of the political context variable. First, the authors do not discuss the political involvement of civic organizations and the role they play in political incorporation. The existence or non-existence of activist civic organizations may alter the ability of racial or ethnic groups to engage in substantive policy making. For example, powerful civic organizations in a given community may have the effect of bolstering the community's position as an organized and mobilized racial or ethnic group, thereby enhancing its capacity to influence the political process. Alternatively, weak civic organizations may hinder a group's capacity for influencing substantive policy, thereby limiting the group's ability to become fully incorporated into the political environment.

Second, the authors assume that elite members of racial and ethnic groups will mobilize their community around social and political issues such as language policy, but never consider the possibility that non-mobilization strategies would be employed.Non-mobilization strategies have been used by elites for multiple reasons: constraints on their ability to reach the desired outcome; mobilization may limit the potential for personal gain; lack of knowledge about community mobilization; co-optation by outside groups; and dependency on other groups for economic or political support. Given the status of Cuban Americans in the 1980s as political newcomers, many of the reasons for non-mobilization listed above need to be explored.

Next, Browning, Marshall, and Tabb (1997) do not make any clear connection between the political actions of elites and those of the masses. This possibility that
grassroots mobilization is a function of pro-active elite behavior needs to be explored.

Finally, the authors do not include the actions of extra-governmental actors in their theory. Throughout the previous chapters, we have discussed the relevance of the business sector and have alluded to its prominence in the political arena in Miami-Dade. It is necessary to expand their theory to allow for the analysis of the business sector to be included.

**Miami-Dade Government**

Before dealing with these questions, it is essential to expand upon the information provided in Chapter 1 about the political context such as the structure of government in Miami-Dade. Since its formation in 1957, Miami-Dade County has had a two-tiered system of government. Under this system, Miami-Dade encompasses a large unincorporated area and 30 incorporated areas or municipalities. Each municipality has its own government and provides services such as police and zoning protection. The City of Miami is the largest municipality in the county, followed by the cities of Hialeah, Miami Beach, North Miami and Coral Gables.

Until the early 1990s, eight county commissioners were elected under an at-large, plurality election system. This electoral structure made it exceedingly difficult for people of color to employ a successful electoral strategy in terms of the county commission. In 1990, only three people of color were elected to the Board of County Commissioners— one Cuban American and two African Americans. During the election of 1992, however, the structure of the electoral system at the county level was modified to a district rather than at-large system and several seats on the county board of
commissioners were added. Thus in 1992, thirteen county commissioners were elected via a district election system, adding five new Cuban American and three additional African American county commissioners to the list of elected officials.

Language as a Structural Factor

The metropolitan governmental structure in Miami-Dade is a complex political, legal, and social arrangement where countywide policy-making authority is vested in the Miami-Dade Board of County Commissioners (Stack and Warren 1992). The reform tradition, as applied in Miami-Dade, provided for the establishment of a council-manager form of government in which the county manager is hired and fired by the commissioners. In Miami-Dade, while the county manager holds the administrative authority to run Miami-Dade's bureaucracy, he or she does so at the behest of the mayor and the Board of County Commissioners (Stack and Warren 1992).

Historically, partisan politics in Miami-Dade have been a series of contests among Democrats; the Republican Party was weak and severely factionalized (Portes and Stepick 1993). This environment led to a shift in the election process from one based on partisan loyalties to one that was candidate-centered (Wattenberg 1991, Portes and Stepick 1993). In the 1950s, the outcome of local elections depended on temporary, shifting coalitions in which the farmers, developers (lobbyists), insurance industry, and special-interest groups participated but which no one group dominated. The arrival of Cuban exiles to south Florida drastically affected the "normal flow" of politics and

1 These changes were forced by a court order.
political relationships in the area, particularly in the aftermath of the Bay of Pigs debacle which led to the solidification of Republicanism in the Cuban American community. The emigration of Cubans to Miami-Dade altered the structure of partisan politics in the county, as well as in the state, by providing the Republican Party with a foundation of support which translated into electoral victories by the 1980s (Moreno 1996). The county mayor and county commissioners are the major power brokers in government, and the political parties and lobbyists are the major power brokers outside government.

However, the initiative and referendum processes that were employed to address the language sidestepped Miami-Dade County’s power brokers. The voters forced political institutions, such as the Board of County Commissioners and the Office of Mayor of Miami-Dade County, into action after the local ordinance was approved in the early 1980s. As the language issue emerged it was processed by these entities in two distinct ways. First, the mayor and Board of County Commissioners were responsible for the implementation of the policy. Second, the issue re-emerged on several occasions since the 1980s and the Board has had to deal with the issue, in its various forms, over the years. What kind of linkage existed between Miami-Dade’s political institutions and the masses regarding the issue of English Only legislation? Stephen P. Clark, the county’s mayor from 1972 to 1996, did not make any public statements about the English Only ordinance, although he was a member of the Metro-Dade Board of County Commissioners. Mayor Clark, along with his colleagues, refused to address the anti-

---

2 At the time of my survey, the Miami-Dade Board of County Commissioners consisted of four African Americans, two Anglos (one was Jewish), and seven Cuban Americans.
bilingualism ordinance. This action led to the employment of the initiative and referenda processes by Citizens for Dade United.\textsuperscript{3} Once voters approved the ordinance, the Board went about the business of implementing the policy. For example, foreign language advertisements were pulled off the air waves and out of newspapers, funding for the Calle Ocho Latin festival was reallocated, funding for bilingual education programs was reassigned, and translations services in many areas were phased out. All of these changes occurred incrementally over time, slowly changing the amount and types of services that residents could expect to utilize. In 1984, as the implementation process was nearly completed and the masses had started to come to terms with the ordinance, Commissioner Jorge Valdes made an announcement that he wanted to repeal the anti-bilingualism ordinance.

Valdes's intentions, once made public, did two things. First, the comments garnered an immediate response from anti-bilingual advocates, particularly Shafer's organization -- Citizens' for Dade United (CDU). Shafer vowed to fight any efforts to repeal or amend the ordinance and claimed to have Mayor Clark's support (Fisher 1984b).\textsuperscript{4} Shafer conducted a poll asking the Mayor and County Commissioner what their stance was on the anti-bilingual ordinance in 1984 without identifying herself to Board members (Fisher 1984b). The results of her survey indicated that three incumbents, Mayor Clark, Commissioner Phillips, and Commissioner Redford, gave ambiguous answers.

\textsuperscript{3} Refer to Chapter 2 for more on this.
The second result of Valdes's action was to alter the agenda of the Metro-Dade Board of County Commissioners to allow them to address the issue of language policy (Gillis 1987). Again, Mayor Clark remained silent on the issue, refusing to comment on the language policy. Further, none of the commissioners would provide a second to the motion that would permit Valdes to discuss the issue. Eventually, amendments were passed by the Board allowing bilingualism in county-operated medical facilities, public safety services, and foreign language promotions abroad. The role of political institutions again turned to implementation: hiring translators, providing funding for bilingual travel advertisements and medical and safety information. However, Mayor Clark and the Metro-Dade Board of County Commissioners avoided the language debate at all costs fearing that the debate would cause them to lose support and eventually their positions.

Political parties adopted a similar practice. Democrats and Republicans alike avoided the issue. Neither of the political parties provided information about the issue nor was it included in either of the parties’ platforms. Both of the two major political parties were caught in a catch-22. The Democrats needed to maintain the support they had traditionally had from the African American community. However, the Black community was divided on the language issue. The Republican Party was in the process of balancing the interests of the Anglo business sector with those of Cuban Americans, who were gradually being brought into the party. Any decisive statement by the

---

4 No statements supporting or denying these claims are available. Clark repeatedly refused to comment to the news media at the time.
Democratic Party would have diminished Black support, and any decisive move by Republicans would have endangered Anglo or Cuban American support.

In sum, language was a structural factor in that government served as an intermediary between policy and Miami-Dade residents and because political parties did not enter the fray. The linkages that existed between political entities and the masses included implementing and amending language policy. This reflected the political status of Cuban Americans in that there was little or no strong pressure for political parties, or the politicians therein, to mobilize in any other way.

**Elected Officials**

In the early 1980s, when the anti-bilingualism movement began, there was a very small number of Cuban Americans serving in elected capacities at the city and county levels, and none at the state level of government. Over time the profile of elected officials representing the area changed, Cuban American officials were gradually gaining strength in terms of numbers of elected and eventually a few appointed offices such as County Manager (see Figure 6.1).\(^5\)

It is important to note that the electoral gains of Cuban Americans in local government were the result of a structural change in government; the electoral system was altered from an at-large to a single-member district electoral system in the early

---

\(^5\) I provide only county level information here for two reasons. First, it is the level at which the English Only Movement emerged. Second, the figures for the state and city levels closely mirror these trends.
1990s. Thus there were very few elected leaders available in the 1980s available to mobilize a mass movement against the English Only campaign launched by Shaver and Plunks. There are several factors that exist in the Cuban American community that would facilitate political mobilization outside of the electoral process. First, many of the members of the first two waves of immigration were heavily involved in government abroad and have compiled years of political experience. This experience could easily translate into motivation for political action in the United States because it is probable that a political consciousness had developed in this sector of the community.

![Figure 6.1: Number of County-level Elected Officials by Race/Ethnicity and Year](image)

Figure 6.1: Number of County-level Elected Officials by Race/Ethnicity and Year

6 Electoral changes can be attributed to changes in the composition of the population in the area that were...
In addition, civic organizations and governmental entities reduced the barriers to political participation by eliminating the citizenship issues that plague most exile and immigrant communities in the United States. Finally, Cuban Americans fled a politically suffocating environment in Cuba and entered an environment in which the symbols of freedom and liberty reigned supreme. This new environment encouraged political participation. These factors allow us to assume that Cuban Americans would pursue political avenues of change outside the electoral process.

It is clear by the many challenges faced by the Cuban American community that domestic concerns need to be carefully addressed. There were two major political issues that took center stage in the 1980s, the time at which the English Only movement began to pick up momentum at the local level: the Mariel boatlift and the election of Cuban American political officials. Consequently, one could argue that the community’s leaders were tending to other, more pressing matters.

Further, at the time of the backlash to official bilingualism, Cuban American politicians were relative newcomers and therefore may have been influenced by their neophyte status. For example, the predominantly Anglo political system suppressed the local election of Cuban Americans for many years. It was not until the numbers and concentration of Cuban Americans in the Miami-Dade grew to such staggering proportions that Anglo elites sought to bring Cuban Americans into the political system. The choice for Anglo politicians was clear: bring Cuban Americans into the political process as a junior partner or be incrementally pushed out of the political arena. In discussed earlier.
addition, both Anglo and Cuban American politicos had to consider the relationship between the African American and Cuban American communities. As was stated in Chapter 5, Black-Cuban American relations have intensified as competition for limited resources such as employment and government benefits increased over the years; the only viable coalitional partner for Cuban Americans was the Anglo community. There is also a historical relationship between Anglos, downtown development interests, and the Cuban American business community on a range of issues such as the Calle Ocho Festival, the candidacies of Cuban Americans supported by the local Republican Party during the 1980s and '90s, and the Downtown River Development Project. Language policy may be a continuation of this pattern.

Thus, one possible explanation of Cuban American elite behavior is that they were acting as "practical politicians" who were attempting to remain in office and maintain political power while simultaneously maintaining the favorable image of the Cuban American community. A practical politician is one who optimizes his or her opportunity for reelection by carefully strategizing his or her actions, publicly and privately. The key for a practical politician, in this study, is the maintenance of political power. Alternatively, an ambitious politician (Schlesinger 1966, Rhode 1979, Ehrenhalt 1991) would create a strategy to gain power, not simply maintain it. It is reasonable, via either of these theories of individual political actors, to believe that the vulnerable

7 While it is important to point out that the Jewish population also has considerable political clout in Miami-Dade, it is quite likely that the Cuban community did not recognize Jews as a viable coalitional partner because of the vast differences in each community's political ideology. Jews in the United States have a lengthy history of being liberal Democrats, while Cubans in Miami-Dade have been noticeably
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position of Cuban American elites at the time caused them to avoid such a potentially explosive issue with a fairly unpredictable conclusion. It is also reasonable to consider that there were other, more pressing domestic policy issues that deserved their attention at the time.

While any of these explanations are plausible, Browning, Marshall, and Tab (1997) posit that in order to achieve political incorporation, politicians had to provide strong ethnic-consciousness to produce effective insurgency. In this case, it seems that Cuban American elites chose to limit the emergence of insurgency in the Cuban American community by employing the strategy of non-mobilization. This strategy was problematic for the few politicos who wanted to pursue strategies of mass mobilization in a couple of ways. First, there was a lack of Cuban American control in the Republican Party. Cuban American elites played a role of a junior partner thereby limiting any possibility of mobilizing the party apparatus against English Only policy (Watts 1996). Second, business interests were more influential than interested political elites. Despite the growing numbers of Cuban American voters in Miami-Dade County, business elites were actors in the political process from behind the scenes. These political realities are important and need to be taken into consideration. Two major conclusions can be drawn at this point. First, by not aiding the development of an oppositional movement at the elite, organizational, and grassroots levels, Cuban American elites sided with Anglos on the language issue in a de facto manner. Second,
the top-down nature of Cuban American politics is revealed in this case — movement from the top in any direction rapidly affected movement at every other level of the Cuban American community. To support these conclusions I will rely on personal interviews with current members of the Cuban American elite.

Miami-Dade Elites: A Profile

As was stated in Chapter 4, during the spring of 2001 I was able to conduct interviews, comprising seventy-one percent of the elites currently serving in elected, appointed, or organizational capacities in Miami-Dade. Once again, a review of their profile is valuable. The mean age of this sample was 46 years old with an average of seven years of electoral political experience. A majority of these officials, 75%, were men and they were largely white, Republican, and Hispanic. An overwhelming majority of these elites were married with children and possessed at least an Associate Degree. The largest category represented individuals from the business sector (rather than the legal, educational, or public service occupations) and was born in Miami-Dade County.

Twenty years ago, the profile was much more Democratic, Anglo, and more law occupation oriented. Further, as the leadership of each ethnic group is examined separately these characteristics tend to vary. For example, the Cuban American contingent is a bit younger, slightly more male, with an average of an additional year's

---

8 Here I am referring to city, county, and state level elites; N=52. As was stated earlier, these individuals were chosen because of their position in government and organizational entities such as City and County Commissioners, or high-ranking organizational leaders.

9 The median age was calculated in August of 2001.
experience. This group was heavily Republican, about 94%, far more likely to be foreign-born, and entering the political arena from the business sector.

Of the Cuban American elites who were interviewed, 92% said that they were at least somewhat familiar with English Only policies. They were able to define the current legislation as well as vaguely outline the history of the movement. However, 54% of the Cuban American elite respondents were indifferent about the policy, 31% of Cuban Americans had positive feelings toward the policy, and only 15% had negative feelings about English Only. This is a somewhat unexpected finding, particularly given the nativist thrust of English Only policies. Further, ninety-two percent of all Cuban American respondents said they did not believe the policy was discriminatory and 75% said that the Cuban American community was not negatively affected by English Only legislation. The leadership of the Cuban American community seems to be relatively unaffected by the English Only campaign and resulting legislation. Furthermore they also seem to be unmotivated to address the language issue. However, these numbers do not tell the whole story. Many of the elected officials I was able to speak with stated that they were indifferent toward language policies for numerous reasons. Some, such as Florida State Senator J. Alex Villalobos (R), felt the policy was unnecessary; others, such as State Representative Annie Betancourt (D), thought English Only was and is irrelevant and that the legislation is unenforceable; and still others believed nothing could be done to change the policy at this point.

Moreover, when asked if the policy was discriminatory many of the respondents reacted negatively to the phrase “discriminatory.” Some elites, such as an official from
Mayor Carollo’s office (City of Miami), went on to state that they thought the Cuban American community had been targeted by language policies because of the relative political and economic success it had achieved in a relatively short amount of time, but that discrimination was not the right word or concept to describe the phenomenon. Several others thought that Cuban Americans were not discriminated against because the community found ways around the policy. City of Miami Commissioner Joe Sanchez, county commissioners Jimmy Morales and Bruno Barreiro, and state representatives Rene Garcia and Manuel Prieguez all addressed the issue of “loopholes” when they discussed the allowances made for translation of official documents, as well as the availability of translators for legal procedures, etc. As one of the elites stated:

I think that we live in United States of America and our number one language or official language is English, right? There are certain geographical points in United States where you have all a lot of people that concentrate themselves from the other parts of the world and so they are able to operate and function in their language and sometimes, for example my father speaks very bad English, I mean he could not serve the jury and be able to understand what's happening, however he is a successful businessman where his business is only in Miami where there are so many other Cubans. Okay but the function of the government is to represent all and even if they don't happen to speak that language of the country in which they live, then I think the notice should be put on those people who are living here to learn English. That is not the case that consideration should be given except for those folks who for some reason cannot speak English. That is why I think you have translation in commission meetings. I think that it's adequate to have that mechanism to alleviate those in our community that don't speak English because perhaps they became very old and it would be difficult for them to learn at that point. But I think there are enough mechanisms in place where by, if you don't know English you can certainly go to a Spanish-speaking elected official. We have plenty of those here. So it is not like there is a closed door to those who don't speak English. There are plenty of ways to go around it (Personal interview, May 21, 2001).
Notably, just as many non-Hispanic elites mentioned the translation loophole referred to above. For instance, African American elected officials, such as State Senator Daryl Jones (D) and City of Miami Commissioner Arthur Teele, Jr. (R), discussed the necessity of being able to communicate via translator with their respective non-English-speaking constituents. City of Miami Commissioner Johnny Winton, an Anglo, took a similar position.

Additionally, a few leaders, such as City of Miami Commissioner Tomas Regalado, stated that Cuban Americans had not been discriminated against because a large percentage of the community speaks English and that the stereotype of Cuban immigrants, refugees and exiles living in Miami-Dade without English proficiency was simply inaccurate. Thus, according to their statements, the community was not impacted or negatively affected. In contrast, an elite member of the Cuban-American business community summarized many elites' opinions when he stated:

It is the responsibility of the individual to learn the languages and customs of the community you are going to because that country has the open arms to help them. [The] least they can do is try to learn that language. I do understand that there are barriers - economic barriers, social barriers - everything that the individual that come into this country do[es]n't have the time to study English or to study anything here and basically they have to start working . . . and I do understand that but I don't feel that the policy is discriminatory. Because of that it is the United States there is English (Personal interview, May 29, 2001).

While 62% of the Cuban American elites who were interviewed believe that the community is cohesive, they also discussed the necessity of being able to communicate
via translator with their respective non-English-speaking constituents. Therefore while
the above analysis demonstrates that Cuban American leaders are cohesive in terms of
their thoughts about language policy as unimportant, upon further examination it is clear
that this constitutes an erroneous conclusion. We can now states that hypothesis one has
been disconfirmed. This is a critical point to make because Browning, Marshall, and
Tabb (1997) find that cohesiveness is necessary in order to achieve political
incorporation, at least in terms of a group’s political agenda.

Recall Figure 6.1, which graphically displays the ethnic and racial composition
of local elected officials from 1980 to the present time. Clearly, Anglos dominated the
political scene. Early on, in terms of party politics in the county, Democrats have
dominated historically. However, there was a shift in power during the 1970s and ‘80s
and Republicanism was on the rise. Cuban Americans were able to use the shift in party
politics to join the Republican Party in a multifaceted manner. This trend of Cuban
American Republicanism was set into motion by anti-Castro sentiment and President
Kennedy’s Bay of Pigs debacle, and was bolstered in the 1980s by the party’s
willingness to run Cuban American candidates, and continues still today.

The 1980 elections marked a turning point in Cuban American politics because it
was one of the first times that the Republican Party ran a candidate from their
community. At this point in time, Cuban Americans were thought of as the ideal
immigrants: white, educated, hard working, foreign policy oriented, and temporary
residents. The image that Cuban Americans portrayed played a substantial role in the
Republican Party’s disposition towards them. However, that image was threatened by
the Mariel boatlift in that it threatened the relationship Cuban American elites were building with Anglos and the Republican Party because Marielitos were considered to be the political and social opposites of the exile community: black, uneducated and unskilled, lazy, criminals, and draining the economy.

Cuban American elite non-mobilization on the language issue was motivated by elite efforts to safeguard business relations with the Anglo community. Moreover, the political and economic costs of pursuing action in opposition to English-Only were more than the substantive benefits that would be garnered by the possibility of change. Thus, using a cost-benefits analysis of sorts, Cuban American leaders determined that it was simply more practical to abstain from future political action on this matter.

In examining hypothesis five, which states that non-mobilization strategies have been employed by Cuban American elites with regard to English-Only policies, we can find evidence of non-mobilization among elites. Both pro- and anti-bilingual elites had the opportunity to organize and mobilize around English Only policy, particularly given Commissioner Jorge Valdes’s initial pro-active, anti-English Only approach to the issue. However as Commissioner Valdes attempted to supply ammunition to strengthen an opposition, he was called upon to participate in a meeting with an organization called the Hispanic Coalition (Gillis and Feldstein-Soto 1987). In this meeting, members of the Hispanic Coalition made it clear that they did not want language policy to divide the broader Miami-Dade community. They stated that the best course of action that the Cuban American community and its leaders could pursue was to do nothing; they thought that mounting an oppositional campaign would be detrimental to the political
and economic interests of the community. This could be interpreted in one of two ways. First, one interpretation is that Cuban American elites were simply protecting their individual interests. Perhaps Cuban American elites opted to pursue a non-mobilization strategy in order to safeguard their economic and political ambitions. An alternative interpretation is that Cuban American elites were being practical politicians. Using this perspective, it is plausible to say that Cuban American elites had to engage in a cost-benefits analysis of the language policy issue and determined that other issues such as foreign policy, economic development and refugee resettlement were more important for the empowerment and incorporation of the community into Miami-Dade. This interpretation suggests that Cuban American elites engaged in a trade-off and that other issues trumped language policy.

Civic Organizations

Civic organizations and interest groups can and have played a major role in the policy making process in the United States (Van Horn, Baumer and Gormley 2001). In the Cuban American community, specifically, there are three civic groups or organizations that are relevant for this analysis: the Catholic Church, the Cuban American National Foundation (CANF), and the Spanish American League Against Discrimination. Each of these organizations have either 1) had a long-standing relationship with the broader Cuban American community in Miami-Dade or 2) has particular relevance to the English Only debate.

The Catholic Church has been involved in the immigration, resettlement, and establishment of the Cuban American community in Miami-Dade (Tweed 1997). On
several occasions the Church has taken political action to aid the Cuban American community, thereby challenging the position of the Vatican about the Church’s involvement in the political arena (http://www.vatican.va/phome_en.htm). For example, the Catholic Church was instrumental in establishing and administering Operation Peter Pan. Further, the Church has aided families with issues of citizenship, housing, unemployment, and so on, thereby becoming an advocate for the community on several counts. The Church also runs several private schools in the area with high enrollment of Cuban American students, therefore providing the educational and social skills that are needed in the community (Levine and Asis 2000). However, while providing social services and mass in Spanish, the Church has remained relatively silent on the issue of official language policy. There has been no action on the part of the Church to form or bolster an opposition to English Only legislation, only the provision of social services to parishioners.

The Cuban American National Foundation (CANF) is by far the most influential and best-known Cuban American organization. CANF was established in Florida in 1981 and is a non-profit organization dedicated to “advancing freedom and democracy in Cuba.” According to various publications by CANF, the focus of the organization is on foreign policy:

10 Refer to Chapter 2 for a broader discussion of this event.

11 Many of the churches I contacted in Miami-Dade refused to discuss the issue at all thereby limiting any stringent analysis of the actions taken by the Church on this issue.

12 The term Cuban American was rarely used prior to 1980, but was very common by 1981 (Portes and Stepich 1993)
CANF supports a non-violent transition to a pluralistic, market-based democracy in Cuba - one fostering economic prosperity with social justice - grounded in the rule of law, and constitutionally guaranteed protection for fundamental human rights as well as the social, political, and economic rights of the Cuban people. CANF seeks to engage, support, and empower the Cuban people in ways that do not aid or legitimize the Castro regime. To that end, we advocate measures in direct support of Cuban civil society that fulfill the Cuban people's historic political aspirations and legitimate humanitarian needs, while maintaining international political and economic pressure and isolation of the Castro regime (http://www.canfnet.org).

Additionally, CANF aims to “dispel prejudice and intolerance against Cubans in exile and promote Cuban culture and creative achievements” (www.canf.org). The language policy issue was not excluded by the expressed objectives of the Cuban American National Foundation, and we could therefore expect the organization to allocate time and resources to dealing with English Only legislation.

During an interview with a top CANF official, however, we found that there was a lack of attention to the issue for several reasons. First, CANF leaders thought that the only people who opposed English Only policies were those “who feared disenfranchisement” (Interview, May 25, 2001). The respondent went on to state that CANF did not have to fear disenfranchisement because they felt that Cuban Americans were making progress on the economic and political fronts. Further, members of CANF believed that the promotion of English-Only legislation was the “promotion of ignorance” because they believed that the policy could not been enforced. Without the potential for enforcement of English Only legislation, there was no reason to spend
precious resources, such as time and money, to deal with a non-issue. To illustrate this point, CANF's official provided an analogy: if a tree falls in the forest and there is a cry for help, no one hears the cry in Miami unless it is in Spanish. The final point that was made during the interview is that Cuban Americans are not seeking to define themselves by the domestic issues that they have to deal with. CANF officials continue to believe that the Cuban American community is different because of its exile status — Cuban Americans are not immigrants who were given a choice to leave their country, but were removed from their society because of issues that were beyond their control. In sum, Cuban Americans “came in large numbers to this place and brought their society with them, therefore they have redefined Miami” (Interview, May 25, 2001).

The Spanish American League Against Discrimination (SALAD) was created as a response to the English Only movement. According to Crawford (1992a), “Though its name suggested a civil rights organization, SALAD was the vehicle of a new Cuban American elite, young professionals seeking traditional positions of power: local judgeships, college vice-presidencies, school-board seats, and offices in county government” (95). As Cuban Americans began to feel that they were being discriminated against by the language debate, SALAD employed the “vocabulary common to all downtrodden minorities: complaints about discrimination, demands to be included and not marginalized from local decision-making, and support of affirmative action programs” (Ported and Stepick 1993). As a result, SALAD led mass mobilization in the Cuban American community around the language issue but these occurred on a
very small scale, while elected county officials continued to make language policy a non-issue (Stack and Warren 1992).

Throughout the language debate, SALAD advocated a compromise between English Only legislation and those opposed to becoming monolingual English-speakers: English Plus (Combs 1992). As Crawford (1992a) explains,

SALAD's revisionist ethnicity, though sometimes hard to distinguish from the rhetoric of cultural pluralism, differs in...[that] it expects reciprocity - which makes the language connection essential. Linguistic pluralism offers more than lip service to diversity; it becomes a mechanism for ethnic leveling. SALAD expresses the idea as 'English Plus'...a doctrine that concedes the primacy of English in the United States but opposed an exclusive franchise, stressing the economic, social, and educational benefits of multiple language skills (97-98).

SALAD attempted to build an opposition to the English Only movement and was thereby acting against the desire of the business community. The members of the Hispanic Coalition were able to publicize their disapproval of SALAD's efforts. Thus the organization was weakened in terms of size of its membership as well as political power. By 1987 their opposition to official language legislation had slowly diminished (Crawford 1992, 110). Eventually, SALAD joined the Hispanic Coalition. Thus, the effects of three factors permitted the predictability of the final outcome: 1) the composition of the organization's membership and their goals, 2) the small percentage of

---

13 Other nationally recognized civic organizations such as the League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC) now support the English Plus framework. For more on this see: http://www.lulac.org/issues/English/PlusOnly.html

14 Only 14% of the Miami-Dade survey respondents believe that special interests and civic organizations, when compared to other potential politically powerful institutions, hold the most political power in the county.
the population that believes civic groups are politically powerful, and 3) the lack of any substantive impact because of non-mobilization. The organization was handicapped by these factors in that they limited SALAD's ability for insurgent action and therefore its ability to successfully address the issue of language policy. Finally, according to Santoro (1998), when analyzed separately neither Latino organizational strength nor overall levels of Latino protest significantly affected English Only policy adoption.

Cuban Americans are now perceived to be the most politically powerful ethnic group in the area by political and economic elite respondents (see Table 6.1). This perception is also present among the masses. For example one focus group respondent stated that Cuban Americans are the most politically powerful group because they have been a very strong supporter of not only Cubans but also Hispanics in general. Other focus group participants agreed with her statement and then she went on to note that:

They [Cuban American politicians] have helped out a lot of immigrants [by helping them] become citizens and become legal residents even though many immigrated illegally. Basically [Cuban American political elites] are beyond the mayors and the council and the city management. They are truly beyond all of them and give our (the Cuban American community's) input into the nation, you know along with the congressman from L.A. or Chicago or Texas. They think of their constituents in national level not only as Miami Dade residents. (Focus Group, April 6, 2001).

As the problems of limited resources have diminished, the major disincentives to political mobilization around language policy have been eliminated or at least minimized. Therefore, another question could be posed: why haven't elites revisited the issue since the 1980s? During each of the personal interviews with Cuban American elected
officials, I asked the respondents what their future plans were. Would they stay in politics or move on?

Cuban American Elites' Perception of Power in Miami-Dade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Political Power</th>
<th>Economic Power</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anglos</td>
<td>15%&lt;sup&gt;15&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cubans</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coalition</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All Miami-Dade Elites Perception of Power in the County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Political Power</th>
<th>Economic Power</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anglos</td>
<td>8%&lt;sup&gt;16&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cubans</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(21)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coalition</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.1: Perceptions of Local Political & Economic Power in 2001

All of the respondents indicated that they planned to continue to serve the public in an elected capacity; over 80% of these respondents also indicated that their plans would involve moving from a city to county, county to state, or state to national level of

<sup>15</sup> Cell entries demonstrate that Cuban American elites think they control the political arena in Miami-Dade and think Anglos control the economic arena in Miami-Dade.

<sup>16</sup> Cell entries indicate that all elite respondents perceive Cuban Americans as the most powerful political group, and Anglos as the most powerful economic group in Miami-Dade.
government. This evidence supports the ambitious politician theory, but how does this ambition affect elites' ideas about language policy? Unfortunately, I am unable to get a clear sense of this. None of those who were interviewed indicated whether there was any relation between the two factors, despite much probing on my part.

Further, according to the data I gathered via focus groups, the leadership within the Cuban American community of Miami-Dade is splintered into three or four machine-like groups of elites. Each of these groups is said to be centered on one emergent leader or set of leaders. For example, one of the focus group participants explained that the Mayor of Miami, Joe Carollo, has a large power base from which he can mobilize the community and influence policy. Similarly another participant stated that Alex and Renier Diaz de la Portilla are the center of a second circle of influence and power in local politics.

A third cluster of power and influence was said to be focused around Cuban Radio, which has an enormously powerful influence over Miami-Dade Cubans particularly among elderly voters. The last power node was created as an alternative to the three aforementioned groups. Apparently this last group of elites is comprised of leaders who disagree with the political behaviors, strategies, and future plans of Mayor Carollo, the Diaz de la Portilla Brothers, and Cuban radio. As the participants discussed the various factions, it became clear that there is a disconnect that is largely attributable to demographic factors such as wave of immigration and age that, in turn, may affect their ideologies and political strategies. An analysis of bivariate correlations revealed that age, in numbers of years, is significantly correlated with partisanship ($r=.685$).
relationship is negative, thus each additional increase in age corresponds to a movement from Democrat to Republican.\(^\text{17}\) Further, we found that political ideology is negatively and significantly correlated with the length of time each subject has spent in Miami-Dade.\(^\text{18}\) Thus, the longer the length of time in Miami-Dade, the more conservative elites are (see Table 6.2).\(^\text{19}\)

While interesting, these findings do not focus on the most pertinent relationships amongst Cuban American elites. There is very little variance within these variables. Of our sample, 94% consider themselves to be ideological moderates and over 85% are members of the Republican Party. This lack of variance, however, should not be mistaken as a measure of cohesiveness, particularly in terms of public policy. Recall the first hypothesis that was outlined earlier, it did not focus on party membership or political ideology, but policy: the leadership of the Cuban American community is internally fractured, in terms of the importance of and feeling towards domestic policy, particularly language policies. First, it is useful to turn to elite and masses perceptions within the Cuban American community about Marielitos.

---

\(^{17}\) Political ideology and partisanship are not significantly correlated.

\(^{18}\) We will use the .05 level of statistical significant to determine the relationship between variables because that is the traditional level used within the field of political science.

\(^{19}\) Length of time in the U.S. is not interchangeable with wave of immigration because it is confounded with age for young people born in the U.S. Also age is not significantly correlated with feelings towards language policy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partisanship, Ideology, Age in Years, Time in Miami-Dade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partisanship</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ideology</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age in Years</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(25)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.2: Bivariate Correlations of Cuban American Elite Demographics

During personal interviews, several of the elected officials volunteered negative information about the immigrants of Mariel, pointing out they many of them are "children of the revolution" who are not used to working. For instance, one state representative said:

These are people that have . . . done all the standing in the line all day for bread, they just make things happen, they make due by what little they have . . . That is how they become experts at saying the ends justifies the means - they are stealing from the [Cuban] government, they are stealing as an acceptable form. I don't mean to degrade, but I know couple of Cubans, recent immigrants, and it's a very difficult adjustment for them to come here whereas in Cuba everybody steals because you steal from the government in order to survive. Everybody, you steal, you are working at a gas station and you steal a gallon of gas to put in your car because you can't buy it - you don't have dollars. If you work at store, you steal candy because you can't buy it if you don't have dollars. But here, all of the sudden you are expected to work for your money. Its very difficult to come from a society that you don't have anything and the things that you have are given to you . . . abortion rates in Cuba are tremendous, divorce rate are high, religion is not playing the role in the people's life as it plays here [in Miami]. They have not celebrated Christmas officially in over 40 years" (Personal interview, May 24, 2001)
These negative sentiments continue to flourish; some of the younger focus group participants spoke of Marielitos with disdain. For example one participant stated:

I was brought up [to believe that] you have to work hard, you can make the American dream yours if you go to school, if you work hard, if you don't get into trouble, these people - they are here today you know its different. They are like ‘what are you going to do? Oh don't worry, I will go to welfare.' That is not the attitude you should have (Focus group, April 6, 2001).

In spite of the substantial gains that Mariel refugees have made since 1980, these types of generalizations persist. For example, a 1983 article by a Miami Herald staff writer, Ana Veciana-Suarez, points out that just three years after arriving in Miami-Dade, 80% of the Cubans who came through Mariel had “integrated” into the system. They had already caught up with U.S. fashion, were learning English and vocational skills, and developed self-help networks. The remaining 20%, the non-integrated Mariel refugees, were already segments of marginal communities in Cuba and continued that pattern upon arriving in the United States. This group includes “young singles, the elderly, the physically and mentally handicapped, the unemployed, and the criminals” (Veciana-Suarez 1983, 1B). The “unsuccessful” 20% maintain a stigmatized status from within their own ethnic group as well as from Non-Cubans thereby continuing to threaten the socio-political status of some community members who attempt to build a wall of separation between themselves and Mariel refugees.

This evidence supports the hypothesis which states that Cuban American elites defined their political agenda around the Mariel boatlift in terms of resettling new
immigrants as well as maintaining and furthering their socio-political status. However, we need to determine if the political agenda of the 1980s was successful. In other words, were Cuban American elites able to attain the two goals they set for themselves: achieving electoral success and distancing themselves, socially and politically, from Marielitos?

Recall Table 6.1 and notice that only two of the at least five possible racial and ethnic groups (African Americans, Anglos, Cuban Americans, Haitian Americans, and Non-Cuban Hispanics) are recognized as holding political and economic power and influence in the local politics of Miami-Dade. Thus the simple absence of other groups is a significant finding because these dynamics cause Anglos and Cuban Americans to compete with each other for political and economic dominance in the region, as well as cooperate to maintain the power they have already acquired simultaneously thereby creating a constant and ever-changing battleground. Thus while it is clear that Anglos have a history of political and economic advantage in the area and that the Cuban American community was aided by that advantage in that there was a necessary dependency on Anglos to reach the goals set forth by the Cuban American agenda, there may be some kind of co-dependency that has emerged as Cuban Americans have gained access to elected positions and monetary resources. In turn, we can answer in the affirmative that Cuban Americans have achieved electoral success.

The second portion of the agenda question that was raised above asks whether elites have been able to distance themselves and the community from the inferior reputation attributed to Marielitos. Again, we can answer in the affirmative. The
absence of Marielitos from the community’s leadership is a good indicator that they have been shunned. Further, only one of the officials I spoke with even mentioned the members of this wave of immigration, who were perceived to be of a lower socio-economic status, in a non-negative light. A non-Hispanic assistant from County Commissioner Barbara Carey-Shuler’s office acknowledged the barriers the Marielitos face within their ethnic community. She stated that when discussing intra-group relations many Cuban Americans point out that you can go anywhere in Miami-Dade and see Cubans or Cuban Americans of every race and class eating at the same restaurant - but she went on to say that you do not see them eating together at the same table.

Grassroots Activity

Contemporary social science scholars consider the Cuban American community to be one of the most politically active racial or ethnic groups in the United States. (Moreno 1996). Some have gone to extensive lengths to demonstrate that Cuban American voters have a voting turnout percentage of over 80%, and that Cuban Americans in Miami-Dade have voted as a bloc, supporting the Republican Party and its candidates, since the 1980s. With this level of political participation, at least in the form of voting, this analysis would be incomplete without studying the role that the Cuban American masses have played in shaping the issue of language policy from the 1980s to the present time. We now turn to an examination of attitudes towards public policy, the English Only language issue in this case.
The findings of non-mobilization among civic organizations and political and economic elites most likely accounted for the lack of grassroots activity either for or against English Only legislation. According to Browning, Marshall, and Tabb (1997) such activity would have been necessary for political incorporation to occur. Further, mass-based grassroots organization around language policy does not seem to be a goal of Cuban American elites in Miami-Dade. We can conclude that Cuban American leadership did not mobilize around the issue of language policy because they believed that language issues do not affect the members of the elite leadership structure.

There was also a lack of mass involvement on the part of organizations, such as the Cuban American National Foundation (CANF) and Spanish American League Against Discrimination (SALAD), in the Cuban American community. This is demonstrated in the failure of these organizations to recruit across socio-economic groups for leadership positions; the leadership of a given community is often more affluent than the population it represents. Further, during interviews, representatives from civic organizations said that they were not focusing their efforts around language policy, therefore the agenda did not allow the issue to be addressed in any formalized manner. The ability of these organizations to represent the Cuban American community, "the people," regarding socio-political, domestic issues was compromised by the composition of the organizations' leaders and the lack of a clear agenda regarding English Only legislation. Therefore the failure of these organizations to represent "the

---

20 For more on the importance of these issues see McAdam (1982).
people,” led to a failure to successfully deal with language policy issues. Who, then, could direct and organize an oppositional movement? Activist groups, such as the Catholic Church, that represent the poor and elderly of the Cuban American community, would have had to carry this issue. These groups, however, were overburdened with issues such as resettlement of newly arrived exiles and refugees at the time.

Ironically, there has not been any viable resistance by the masses against the policy preferences of Cuban American elites; they seem to be more concerned with meeting the basics such as food, shelter, clothing, and personal economic development. For too many, dealing with political matters may be a luxury they cannot afford. These findings reflect class conflict within the community and represent a failure of linked fate (Dawson 1994).

It has been demonstrated, for myriad reasons, that the Cuban American political agenda has shown priority to business interests and has relegated socio-political issues such as language policy to the bottom of their agenda. Unfortunately, language policy is a serious issue that will not diminish over time because of the continuing immigration from Cuba to Miami-Dade. Therefore this issue has implications for the social status of the Cuban American community in terms of employment opportunities, educational attainment, and inter-community relations, and the like.

The overarching theme regarding language policy among the Cuban American masses is vagueness. Two accompanying themes are frustration and tension, thus this

---

21 While this was SALAD’s initial goal, the organization is no longer functional.
issue is threatening the community and its relations with other groups in Miami-Dade’s geopolitical environment (Key 1949; McConahay 1982). Even before the implementation of English Only policies at the county level, confusion loomed. Cuban Americans did not seem to understand the nuances of the policy. According to a 1983 article in the *Miami Herald*, Cuban Americans in the area believed that the anti-bilingualism ordinance hampered the efficiency of local government in handling issues of public health, safety, and welfare.

Cuban Americans thought that local government ought to be committed to its duties in terms of the administration of services, and that the anti-bilingual ordinance prohibited the local government from doing so. Of course there was a complimentary view among Miami-Dade’s non-Spanish-speaking residents who felt that they were being overtaken by Hispanics in the area and that they would eventually be alienated in their own hometown. There were also members of the Hispanic community who wanted to avoid this type of divisive issue. For example, on October 15, 1983 a *Miami Herald* columnist, Roberto Fabricio, published a few of the responses he received in reaction to a column he had written opposing the English Only ordinance. One Hispanic named W. Garcia wrote:

“I am writing to you in hopes that you will do something about all this nonsense of bilingualism and other activities in the Cuban circles that are not only polarizing this area, but also affecting me, my family and friends as well as the Cubans. Let’s forget about this bilingual nonsense and get together as a community... Togetherness is the answer.”

---

22 See Maslow’s hierarchy of needs.
Apparently this is the sentiment that characterized the Hispanic community's "fight" against the anti-bilingualism ordinance, despite the evident impact the policy was having in the community.\textsuperscript{23} There was a serious lack of insurgency surrounding this issue at the local level.

As the issue of official language policy resurfaced in the late 1980s at the state level, a different approach was employed by the masses. Rather than pointing to calls for unity and community, a campaign began in hopes of demonstrating that the Hispanic community in Miami-Dade was "Americanized" and spoke English, thus there was no need for a constitutional amendment to legislate the matter.

In an October 16, 1988 article by Dave Von Drehle and Stephen K. Doig published in the \textit{Miami Herald}, the authors focused on the fact that residents in south Florida agreed on the need for English primacy. They stated, "Spanish speakers and English speakers declare in a unified voice that citizenship, the right to vote and the chance to hold public office should be reserved for people who know English" (1B). The article went on to describe the frequent use of English among young Hispanics and the value placed on English proficiency by community elders. For example, Von Drehle and Doig (1988) demonstrated that most young Hispanics got their news and entertainment primarily in English, including television, newspapers, and the radio. Further the journalists declared that, "Nine of 10 Dade Hispanics think it is important

\textsuperscript{23} The impact we are alluding to here includes the problems that monolingual Spanish-speaking Cuban American citizens were having because bilingual services were cut by the local ordinance as well as the budget cuts that effected bilingual education programs.
that their children speak English, according to the survey; nevertheless 75 percent of all registered voters believe an Official English amendment is necessary" (1B).

The themes of confusion and frustration re-emerge in this article, which states that two-thirds of older Hispanics (who are mostly likely to be monolingual Spanish speakers) say language determines where they live and 8 of 10 say that they worry that they will need emergency help and no one will understand them. Further, they stated that virtually all of the respondents felt that job opportunities hinged on knowing English. (Von Drehle and Doig 1983). Concurrently, these types of articles appeared in The St. Petersburg Times, as well as The New York Times.

The first strategy that was employed by the Cuban American masses was to call for unity and community. The next strategy that was exercised was a pro-American campaign in which Cuban Americans attempted to demonstrate the level of patriotism and American pride that existed in the community. These strategies were not successful because the participants were not representative of the Cuban American community at-large and because they were unable to convince a majority of Cuban Americans and non-Cuban Americans of their ability to launch a successful campaign. Therefore it is not surprising that there was not a mass movement against the county and state level legislation.

However, there was an exception to this rule that occurred in October of 1988. Opponents of the state initiative to make English the official language in the State of Florida, known as Amendment 11, filed suit in early October of 1988 to have the proposed amendment taken off the upcoming ballot. The issue of contention was that
the petitions, which had been circulated throughout the state, were available only in English, and according to the Voting Rights Act some counties had a high enough population of Spanish-speakers that the petitions should have been available in Spanish. The filers requested that the signatures from these counties, approximately 63,000 of them, be invalidated. They argued that without these signatures the proposed amendment would no longer qualify for the ballot. The case, number 88-6068, was assigned to U.S. District Judge James Kehoe, from Florida’s Southern District. The four registered voters who filed the complaint, Pedro Delgado, Elia Gregorio, Marcelo Llanes and Marta R. Torres, were unhappy with the court’s decision, which allowed the signatures to stand.\(^\text{34}\) The district court found that the involvement by state officials in the initiative process did not constitute state action and it therefore refused to enjoin a vote on the amendment. The plaintiffs quickly filed for an expedited appeal with the United States Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit in early November of the same year, which was heard and this court upheld the lower court’s decision. The initiative remained on the ballot and was approved by the voters in the State of Florida by a margin of over 15 percent.

**Language as a contemporary political issue**

Throughout this chapter we have demonstrated the importance of the language issues in the context of ethnic politics, particularly in the context of Cuban American politics in Miami-Dade County. An accurate representation of the group’s level of

\(^{34}\) Of the four plaintiffs: two Americans born in Cuba, an American born in Mexico, and a Puerto Rican. Therefore, despite its importance, this litigation is not considered a mass insurgent movement.
political incorporation cannot be determined without some discussion of political structures, civic organizations representing group interests, political leadership, and the political behavior at the grassroots level.

Despite the minimal efforts to mobilize against English Only legislation, there has clearly been no insurgency regarding the issue of language policy within the Cuban American community. The highest level of political incorporation cannot be achieved without political movement, therefore the question becomes: why didn’t an opposition materialize around the language issue? Did the community feel targeted? What can explain this lack of political participation regarding an issue that is central to Cuban Americans in Miami-Dade, particularly given the high value placed on political action and freedom in the community? These are a few of the questions we hope to cover in the next chapter through a discussion of symbolic politics.
CHAPTER 7

THE SYMBOLIC IMPORTANCE OF LANGUAGE POLICY

For most Americans, the English language is a given and not a choice. Language is an extremely important part of our daily lives. It is our principal mode of communication and allows people to be expressive. The Spanish language holds the same type of considerable symbolic value for many Latinos living in the United States. For this particular ethnic population, the Spanish language symbolizes the homeland that many immigrants have left behind and, in many instances, allows for the diverse Latino cultures in the U.S. to be retained and passed on to future generations (Marin and Marin, 1991). Further, Spanish may allow some community members to develop an ethnic identity and, therefore, an ethnic group consciousness. Language simultaneously uses symbols and is a symbol itself and therefore can be exploited as an offensive weapon (Leibowicz 1985). According to Carlos Alberto Montaner (1992),

A language is much more than a way to communicate. By one’s own language . . . one masters reality; one takes oneself and understands all that exists . . . ‘Language,’ said the Spanish writer Miguel Unamuno, ‘is the blood of the spirit.’ He was right. We cannot do without our own tongue without brutally mutilating our individual consciousness, without being left without blood (164).
Given the strong attachment to the Spanish language in the Miami Cuban community, English Only policy appears to be out of step with the basic values of the community. Logically such a policy should generate strong political opposition in the Cuban American community because of its symbolic value as an issue that specifically targets the Cuban American community in Miami-Dade. Language policy continues to be an important issue because of its symbolism and because it may have been used to specifically target the Cuban American community in Miami-Dade.¹

Cuban Americans as Targets?

While it may seem obvious to some scholars that Cuban Americans were specifically targeted by language policies in Miami-Dade, we do not want to make that assumption. In examining whether the Cuban American community felt targeted we will address four questions. First, we will assess the level of knowledge in the community regarding English Only policies. If the community was not informed or aware of the issue, it seems impossible that they would have felt targeted by it. The second factor involves the level of salience the issue had among the Cuban American community. If Cuban Americans were informed about English Only policy but the issue was not salient, then we could not expect them to feel targeted. Third, we can assess the relative impact the policy had by asking survey respondents if the policy affected their daily

¹ Historically, the maintenance symbols such as the Confederate flag or English Only language policies demonstrate who is in control of political power in a locality or state. The recent battle over the Confederate flags in South Carolina is another example of this type of political issue—one that triggers an innate positive or negative reaction. Most people, whether they support the flying of the Confederate flag or not, know immediately what they feel about the issue. The attainment of a vast amount of information is unnecessary because everyone has an opinion regarding the symbolism of the flag. I argue that language policy in Miami-Dade is a similar type of issue and has a similar effect.
lives. This will provide a somewhat more objective measure that we can later compare to more subjective measures. Finally, we will determine if community members felt that the English Only ordinance was a discriminatory policy.

A majority of Miami-Dade residents who responded to our mail survey stated that, on a four-point scale, they were somewhat or very familiar with language policy issues. This percentage varies minimally when the responses of Cuban American respondents are examined: 63% for Cuban Americans and 68% when all respondents are included. These percentages provide some evidence that respondents thought they were informed about the language policy debate. I found additional supporting evidence via the focus group research. All of the participants were able to vaguely outline the current policies and provide an example of how the policy functioned in practical situations such as the allowance of translators during legal proceedings. Thus we can conclude that Miami-Dade residents were relatively well informed about English Only legislation.

The next question addresses the level of salience or importance the issue had and continues to have for the masses. When asked if English Only language policies were important, approximately sixty-six percent of all respondents replied that they were important or very important. Interestingly there is a fourteen-percentage point difference when the salience of the issue among Cuban Americans and Anglos is compared: 69% of all Anglo respondents and 55% of all Cuban American respondents stated that the

---

2 Cuban Americans and Anglos are the only ethnic groups that were singled out throughout the analysis because they are the only two groups in which there are enough respondents in the sample to examine separately.
issue was important or very important to them. During a focus group session, one of the Cuban American respondents who is a college student explained why the issue of language, and specifically the maintenance of Spanish proficiency, is important to her and to the community she belongs to:

I think it's important because you shouldn't forget your roots - just like for example a French person. I have a French girl in my class, she is like every other word that she says, it comes out French because she is adapting and when I talk to my friends every other word that comes out of my mouth is Spanish because that is just my way of communicating, if I can't find it in English I will say it in Spanish. If I don't remember it in Spanish, I will say that in English, we all understand each other. I also remember the time when I must have been seven or eight years old, I just, I got here when I was five, I just turned five and I must have been seven years old and I couldn't remember how to say cow in Spanish and now I tell my mom 'cow' and she wouldn't understand what cow is. I was like cow how do you say that in Spanish and then I goes moo. She got traumatized because it had only been three years and I already knew Spanish but I was already forgetting words I mean I know that in early child development I was learning Spanish and that was the only language that I had learned in my life... I think to me its very important to learn the language... it be embarrassing if [someone] would have asked you something about your country and they ask you the question in Spanish and you are like 'umh'... I'm like yeah I am going to make a complete fool of myself... it (Spanish) made me in touch with what is going on there (in Cuba) and... I am very aware when I talk to the older generation in Spanish [because they are] very focused on how I speak my words because they are going to criticize - like you have Americanized yourself (Focus group, April 6, 2001).

The difference in the level of salience across ethnic groups is further exacerbated by the groups' respective feelings toward the issue. On a four-point scale from with

---

3 The four-point response scale included the following categories: Very important, Somewhat important, Not very important, Not important at all.

4 When asked, none of the focus group participants provided an explanation as to why language policy was not important to a number of community members.
response categories ranging poor to excellent, 69% of Anglo respondents stated that they thought the policy to be good or excellent while 57% of Cuban American respondents thought the policy to be poor or fair. A young Hispanic, male focus group participant summarized the Hispanic community’s negative sentiments concerning English-Only policies well he when responded to a question asking if the policy affected the community. He stated, “As I see it, many Hispanic people feel threatened by the fact that you know our state is strongly into only English and ... [we are] something of a targeted group ...” (Focus group conducted April 7, 2001). This evidence indicates that the issue of language policy was somewhat salient and in the expected direction: a majority of Cuban Americans saw the policy in a negative light.5

In order to investigate the merits of the statement above, survey respondents were asked a series of questions about the impact of English Only legislation in their work and home environments, as well as in public spaces. Overall, respondents acknowledged feeling the impact of language policies in all settings to varying degrees. The largest percentage of respondents felt impacted in public spaces; 47% of all respondents said they sometimes or frequently were affected by these policies while engaging in their daily activities. Approximately 40% of all respondents acknowledged the impact of language policies while at work, and 27% stated an impact was felt at home. These percentages change when race and ethnicity are considered (see Table 7.1)

---

5 When asked, none of the focus group participants stated that they favored the language policy, or thought language legislation was a good idea. Only one focus group respondent said that she felt the legislation was unnecessary because Cubans and Cuban Americans have learned to speak English without being told to do so by government.
As can be seen in the above table, the most affected environment, regardless of ethnicity, is public spaces. However, it is important to note that the data suggest that a larger proportion of Cuban Americans felt that they were affected by language policies in the workplace as well as in their homes. Therefore, we can respond to the third question posed above in the affirmative: although the majority states that they are not affected, many Cuban Americans claim that their daily routines were affected in some way by language policies.  

Given the disparities outlined in the above table, some would argue that Cuban Americans felt discriminated against by the adoption of county and state-level English Only policies. To consider this possibility respondents were asked if they thought the

---

48.2% of the entire sample say that at least one of these areas is affected sometimes or frequently. When only Hispanics are included in the analysis, 46% say at least one of these areas is affected sometimes or frequently.
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policies were discriminatory. Overall, 60% of all respondents believed language policies to be somewhat or very discriminatory. However, the results change drastically once ethnicity is taken into account (see Table 7.2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>None at All/Not Very</th>
<th>Somewhat/Very</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anglos</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuban Americans</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(14)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.2: Level of Discrimination of Language Policies by Ethnicity

As can be seen above, Cuban Americans and Anglos view the policy in very distinctive ways. Clearly, a larger percentage of Cuban American respondents perceived English Only legislation to be a discriminatory policy while an overwhelming percentage of Anglos did not. A statement made by a Cuban American focus group participant further supports this finding. She stated that the language policy was:

... unfair and I think it is discriminatory. I think that by doing this they can conquer some communities. Let's say, okay, that the people staying here are Indians and that they want English as the official language and they operate in their spare time for those who speak another language. I mean that's fine ... but it's very hard to sit here and demean different languages. (Focus group, March 3, 2001).

7 Respondents were asked "Do you think Florida's Official English policy is: very discriminatory, somewhat discriminatory, not very discriminatory, or not discriminatory at all?"
Alternatively, one Hispanic male who participated in the focus group disagreed with this statement and said:

I don’t think [language policy] is discriminatory because people who come to live in the U.S. already learn to speak English. Even though it isn’t a law everyone knows you have to do it, so what is the difference if it is a law? Also, it is a law that applies to everyone, not just Hispanics or Spanish-speakers. I guess I just don’t see how it is discriminatory (Focus group, April 7, 2001).

Given this sample and the above analyses, we can make a few conclusions. Thus far can generalize that:

- Miami-Dade residents are reasonably well informed about language policies, regardless of ethnicity.

- English Only policies were important to the majority of our respondents. Consequently we can, with caution, state that this is the case in the broader context among Miami-Dade residents. The ethnic group differences here are statistically significant when the bivariate relationships are examined.

- In terms of feelings toward English Only legislation, Cuban Americans were more critical of the policy whereas Anglos found it to be more favorable.

- Generally speaking, residents in Miami-Dade felt that the policy affected their daily activities more in public places rather than in the workplace or at home. However, ethnicity is a significant variable here in that Cuban Americans felt relatively more impacted than Anglos in all three environments.

- As a general rule, a large minority of Miami-Dade residents in this sample found English Only policies to be discriminatory (approximately 40% of the respondents). Once again, ethnicity is a significant variable in that Cuban Americans were more likely to perceive the policies as discriminatory than were Anglos.

Thus we can infer that many Cuban Americans felt targeted by the English Only movement and therefore by the language policy itself; this confirms hypothesis two.

However, the feeling of being targeted did not translate into the development of political
consciousness on this issue. Blalock (1967) provides a plausible explanation when he states that political mobilization on the part of a racial or ethnic group will not materialize if group members do not perceive that success is achievable. It seems clear that language policy was not seen instrumentally. As we have demonstrated in earlier chapters, there was no pressure on elites from the masses to mobilize around English Only language policy because Cuban Americans did not believe that a successful opposition could be mounted. This demonstrates that political mobilization is both a physical and psychological phenomenon; the mental part of mobilization simply did not materialize in this case. Browning, Marshall, and Tabb’s (1997) theory of political incorporation does not deal with the importance of political consciousness, the psychological impetus that is necessary for the development of physical political mobilization and therefore political incorporation. The question becomes, did the language issue become a potent symbol? If not, why not?

A Theory of Symbolic Politics

According to Edelman (1964), “Every symbol stands for something other than itself, and it also evokes an attitude, a set of impressions, or a pattern of events associated through time, through space, through logic, or through imagination with the symbol” (6). In his description of the symbolic uses of politics, Edelman (1964) defines two types of symbols: referential symbols and condensation symbols. Referential symbols are economical ways of referring to the objective elements in objects or situations that are identified in the same way by different people.
The second type, condensation symbols, evoke emotions associated with the situation in that they condense into one or some combinations of symbolic events, signs, or acts of patriotic pride, anxieties, remembrances of past glories or humiliations, or promises of future greatness. Given the social, political, economic, and historical contexts that have been provided in this analysis, it is this type of symbol that is relevant for this discussion.

As Edelman (1964) states, "Practically every political act that is controversial or regarded as really important is bound to serve in part as a condensation symbol . . . The meanings, however, are not in the symbols. They are in society and therefore in men" (7-12). Therefore, by its very existence language policy prompted a visceral reaction from those it affected and became a condensation symbol for elites as well as the masses. The question becomes how and by whom these symbols are utilized in the political process.

Language policy has been a controversial issue, defined by historical, socio-economic, and political contexts. It was adopted by Shafer and Plunske’s organization, Citizens for Dade United (CDU), as a symbol of patriotism and as a way to embolden the line between what they considered American and un-American behavior. For other community members who supported the CDU and the anti-bilingual ordinance, the language debate symbolized their fears and frustrations about dealing with a new and different group of people who they believed threatened their way of life. Moreover, the adoption of English as the official language in Miami-Dade County, and eventually in the State of Florida, symbolized a victory over the Cuban American community, its
language, culture, and economic success. Survey respondents, in a space that was provided for their additional comments, voluntarily expressed these sentiments. One respondent wrote:

I feel that Cubans came here as immigrants. This country especially Miami welcomed them with open arms. Instead of appreciating this by accepting English as the language of this land, the Cubans have become very clannish, created ghettos where only Spanish is tolerated, and are trying to run local politics and economics by requiring bi-lingual abilities for jobs and having only Cubans whenever and wherever possible.

Another respondent who replied to the mail survey wrote:

This is America, not Cuba. English is the primary Language. If an American were to visit Cuba, they would of course be expected to speak Spanish in [an] effort to communicate. Why is it an issue to Latins that immigrate to America to speak the American language of English? I cannot get a decent job in Miami Dade County for the simple reason that I am not bi-lingual. Therefore, I work in Broward County. America has given these immigrants their freedom. Now they should adapt to the laws and language of our country. Without complaint. Be sure to include my info in your survey. It’s not in Spanish but nevertheless, it’s important too . . .

A resident from the City of Miami provided an additional example:

The political situation in Miami has never been as bad as it is since the corrupt Cuban politicians have taken over. Elections are a scam with dead people voting and Cubans illegally voting in every election. It is a disgrace and it is embarrassing to the Anglo long time residents.

Although an immediate response from the Cuban American community did not materialize, over time language policy became a symbol of past discrimination, of a political and social learning experience, and as a reminder that, to some, they will never be Americans. A Cuban American women who participated in one of the focus groups
reflected on the language debate and stated that it took years for the Cuban American community to feel accepted in Miami-Dade and that many of the raw emotions that had emerged in the 1980s as a response to English Only policies resurfaced during the Elián Gonzales situation. She went on to state that she has lived in Miami-Dade for over forty years, and that her daughter was born in Miami, but that many people hear her accent, or hear her speak Spanish, and give her dirty looks. Some people even reprimand her for speaking her native tongue in public. These experiences and others like it have led her to conclude that she will never be “American enough” to be accepted by Anglos and some Blacks in Miami-Dade, but that has not deterred her from being politically active. The respondent said that she has voted during every election and recently opened a political consulting business for Cuban American Democrats (Focus Group, conducted on March 3, 2001).

In the political arena, however, language policy reflected the non-mobilization of political leaders and the relative inability of the Cuban American voting bloc to substantively impact the policymaking process in general. The multifarious nature of language policy has been demonstrated in that it has had a variety of uses at strategic points in time because of the political actions of anti-bilingual and anti-English Only advocates alike. More important, however, is the role that symbolic reassurance has played throughout the debate. Some issues provide symbolic reassurance to the masses while simultaneously providing substantive goods to elites. In The Uses of Symbolic Politics, Edelman (1964) stated that “the pattern of political activity represented by lack of organization, interests in symbolic reassurance, and quiescence is a key element in the
ability of organized groups to use political agencies in order to make good their claims on tangible resources and power, thus continuing the threat to the unorganized" (23). In other words, symbols can be used to suppress emotion and give people the idea that everything is okay, thereby limiting mass reaction and mobilization while elites are able to gain benefits. This may explain the behavior of Cuban American elites regarding the language policy issue in that they were acting as buffers or gatekeepers between the Cuban American community and the political arena. The messages that Cuban American elites were sending to the Cuban American community involved two paramount components. First, the Cuban American community was told the English Only debate provided them with the opportunity to demonstrate that they were becoming Americanized and that the Americanization process was a symbol of pride in the community. Second, the involvement of elites from the business sector reassured the community members that any threats that language legislation posed to the economic environment were under control. These reassurances, according to Edelman (1964), were the only means by which groups not in a position to analyze a complex situation could rationally adjust themselves to it (40-43).

Business and political elites were able to gain tangible benefits, such as personal political and economic capital with the Anglo political and economic elites, in return for successfully reassuring the Cuban American community that an opposition to language legislation should not be mounted. The non-mobilization strategy employed by Cuban American elites improved their standing in the Republican Party, which translated into increases in financial support for Cuban American candidates working within the party.
Additionally, this strategy enabled Cuban American elites to strengthen their relationships with the Anglo-dominated business arena and downtown development interests. Finally, non-mobilization allowed Cuban American elites to continue to focus their efforts on influencing foreign policy at the national level of government. Therefore, non-mobilization was employed so that Cuban American elites could procure substantive benefits while the needs of some of their fellow community members were ignored.

Language and the Political Process

In *The Symbolic Uses of Politics*, Edelman (1964) encouraged scholars to undertake a two-prolonged analytical approach. He requests that scholars examine: 1) how political actions get some groups tangible things they want from government and 2) to explore what these same actions mean to the mass public and how it is placated or aroused by them (12). Thus far, we have described and examined the behaviors of proponents and opponents of English Only policies, particularly in the Cuban American community of south Florida. We have also explored the effect language policy has had on the political process. In doing this, we have considered the meaning that language policy has had to Miami-Dade residents and officials and how those meanings have translated into political action or apathy by assessing the psychological aspects of political mobilization. In large measure, we have been able to fill many of the gaps of Browning, Marshall, and Tabb’s (1997) theory of political incorporation by improving upon a few weaknesses of their theory.
Browning, Marshall, and Tabb (1997) measure political incorporation as a function of the relative number of elected officials from the Cuban American community, civic organizational involvement in the political process, and whether they took part in a coalition (23). While these factors are significant in determining a group’s level of political incorporation, we have demonstrated that political consciousness and political mobilization must occur on two fronts. Support for particular individual candidates and, consciousness and mobilization around particular issues are conditions that must be satisfied in order for a racial or ethnic group to reach political incorporation. We also demonstrated that symbolic reassurance was a major factor in shaping the political behavior of Cuban American elites and the masses they represent. By providing symbolic reassurance to the Cuban American masses, Cuban American elites were able to gain tangible benefits without losing support within the community. While the electoral strategies of Cuban American elites were not compromised by the tactics of non-mobilization that were employed regarding language policy, we can conclude that Cuban Americans, as a community, were not fully politically incorporated into the political system in Miami-Dade. There was no significant political mobilization around the issue of language policy in the 1980s; political mobilization on this issue did not occur because political consciousness had not been developed in regard to this issue and because community leaders provided symbolic reassurance to the Cuban American masses.
CHAPTER 8

CONCLUSIONS

In this study I have evaluated the Cuban American community in Miami-Dade County, Florida, and specifically assessed language policy and its political impact on them. In Chapter 1, we introduced the “Model Minority” theory and discussed how scholars have applied it to the Cuban American community through the “Cuban Political Model.” In examining the “Cuban Political Model,” we pointed to a few problems in the theory and application that we were able to address via Browning, Marshall, and Tabb’s (1997) theory of political incorporation. This led into a discussion about the contributions this study could provide by applying Browning, Marshall, and Tabb’s (1997) theory of political incorporation to the case of language policy in the Cuban American community of south Florida. We then ended this chapter by providing an outline for the remaining chapters of the dissertation.

In Chapter 2, we discussed the formation of the Cuban American community in Miami-Dade. I employed a historical analysis to provide a context within which to begin our examination. This chapter included a discussion about immigration, as well as a brief introduction to the political and economic environments into which Cubans
entered. The concepts of the English Only movement were also introduced. This chapter established a foundation of basic information that was necessary to move forward to Chapter 3, which had four objectives:

1. Discuss the broader experience of Latinos in the United States and the issue of language policy;
2. Elaborate on the description of the backlash in the Anglo American community in the form of English Only sentiment in Miami-Dade County;
3. Elaborate on the unique characteristics of the language issue for Cuban Americans; and
4. Begin a theoretical conversation.

We addressed these objectives by providing a historical account of the development of language policy in Miami-Dade County as well as in California. This enabled us to talk more broadly about the Latino experience regarding language policy in addition to discussing the unique nature of the language issue in Miami-Dade County. We defined the major players in Miami-Dade’s language debate and described their political behavior regarding the issue. We found that the language issue was handled very differently in California and Florida (see Table 8.1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>California</th>
<th>Florida</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business sector support</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Group mobilization</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courts used</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grassroots mobilization</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Coverage</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>SOMEWHAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partisan lines clear</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political elite mobilization</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.1: Comparison of Language Policy Action in California and Florida
In California, we noted that from the initial success of their English Only movement, there were clear partisan lines drawn between supporters and opponents of English Only policies, which shaped the context of the language debate and opened the door for grassroots and organizational mobilization. We also found that every possible avenue of political action was exhausted by members of the Hispanic community in San Francisco and in California more generally (i.e. courts, grassroots mobilization, media, elites were all active participants in the opposition).

Finally, we found that Hispanic community leaders continued to battle English Only policies in other localities as well as at the state level even after they had been defeated at the local level. We would expect there to be a similar reaction in the Cuban American community, particularly because, as was the case in California, English language legislation organizers singled out Hispanics. According to Browning, Marshall, and Tabb (1997), mobilization should have occurred around this issue because the issue was contentious and targeted the Cuban American community. However, very little of this occurred in the Cuban American community in Miami-Dade: partisanship lines were blurred, economic and political leadership did not develop around the issue, and civic groups did not mobilize the masses. These comparisons led us into a more in-depth discussion of Browning, Marshall, and Tabb's (1997) theory of political incorporation. In this section we outlined the concepts employed by Browning, Marshall, and Tabb (1997) and provided a discussion of how we would begin to apply their theory to this case.
In Chapter 4 we described the multi-method approach to data collection; a combination of focus group data, a mail survey, and personal interviews was used. We defined the independent and dependent variables as well as the data sources we would employ throughout the analysis. Finally, we outlined the seven hypotheses we planned to pursue and discussed what we expected to find for each of the hypotheses:

**H1:** The leadership of the Cuban American community is a cohesive political actor.

**H2:** The Cuban-American community has been negatively impacted by discrimination.

**H3:** Business interests overpowered early political representatives from the Cuban American community surrounding the issue of language policy.

**H4:** Civic groups are relatively weak in the area of political, domestic policy issues such as English Only.

**H5:** There was no mobilization by community elites regarding the English Only movement.

**H6:** There was a lack of grassroots mobilization surrounding English language policies.

**H7:** Miami-Dade elites were and are engaged in symbolic politics.

In Chapter 5 we examined the social context of language policy. By social context, we referred to the measure of within-group cohesiveness and the community’s relative standing in the broader society in areas such as education, income distribution, and business ownership. These are key variables that Browning, Marshall, and Tabb’s (1997) theory of political incorporation does not take into account. We analyzed four
dilemmas of Browning, Marshall, and Tabb’s (1997) theory of political incorporation in terms of the social context variable. First, the authors limit their analysis by assuming, without examination, that group cohesiveness exists and is rather constant. This assumption may not hold for all racial and ethnic groups, therefore a fuller analysis is necessary. Thus we examined various measures of diversity within the Cuban and Cuban American communities such as racial identity, gender, age, immigration cohort, political ideology, and partisanship. We concluded that the Cuban American community is not a monolith. Thus, we are able to disconfirm hypothesis one. There are cleavages within the community along the lines of political and cultural identity, and in terms of opinions about domestic and foreign policy concerns. Moreover, we found that similar rifts exist in the upper echelons, among business and political elites – particularly in the initial stages of deciding what action to take concerning language policy. In many ways these divisions translate into the development of a weak connection between the Cuban American masses and the elites who represent them, thereby weakening the level of cohesion that exists in the community.

Second, the authors assume that discrimination has had a severe impact on all racial and ethnic groups’ ability to be upwardly mobile. Given the unique nature of Cuban immigration to the United States, further inquiry is necessary to flesh this out. We concluded that, on several subjective and objective measures, Cuban Americans feel discriminated against. However, on several of the more objective measures, such as graduation rates, income distribution, and business ownership in the community, there is only limited support for the discrimination hypothesis.
Third, Browning, Marshall, and Tabb (1997) do not discuss the transformation of a social issue, like language policy, into a political issue. We discussed the transformation of the language issue from a social to a political issue by defining the key players from the Cuban American community. We concluded that the major players were business elites who were able to shape the situation early on, in that they discouraged the formation of an opposition and employed a strategy of non-mobilization. Business elites were also able to continue to employ this strategy to deter civic organizations from pursuing the issue, therefore making it socially, politically, and economically costly to keep this issue salient in the Cuban American community. This analysis allows us to confirm hypothesis three.

Finally, Browning, Marshall, and Tabb (1997) do not follow the process of political incorporation through because they do not extend their conversation to include the impact of the social context. How has the transformation of this social issue into a political issue affected the social status of the Cuban American community? How does this affect the broader political context? We responded to these questions by demonstrating that ethnic consciousness was developed in the Cuban American community as a result of the language issue.

In Chapter 6 we addressed the political context and consequences of language policy. By political context, we referred to the political environment that shapes the political behavior and power potentialities of the Cuban American community. We asked: What is the relative power of Cuban Americans in comparison to other racial and ethnic groups in Miami Dade County? Is there a history of electoral or grassroots
political activity or success by Cuban Americans in the county? Are civic organizations established and operational in the Cuban American community on issues such as English Only? What do these items mean for the nature of Cuban American politics?

Again, we addressed four dilemmas from Browning, Marshall, and Tabb's (1997) theory of political incorporation in terms of the political context variable. First, the authors do not discuss the political involvement of civic organizations and the role they play in political incorporation. The existence or non-existence of activist civic organizations may alter the ability of racial or ethnic groups to engage in substantive policy making. Second, the authors assume that elite members of racial and ethnic groups will mobilize their community around social and political issues such as language policy, but never consider the possibility that non-mobilization strategies would be employed for some issues. Next, Browning, Marshall, and Tabb (1997) do not make any clear connection between the political actions of elites and those of the masses. This possibility that grassroots mobilization is a function of pro-active elite behavior needs to be explored. Finally, the authors do not include the actions of extra-governmental actors, such as business elites, in their theory.

In this chapter we demonstrated the importance of the language issue in the context of ethnic politics, particularly in the context of Cuban American politics in Miami-Dade County. We concluded that the status of language policy in Miami-Dade County has not been static, but has evolved from a substantive social issue to one that is profoundly political. Through a thorough analysis of the political behavior of political and economic elites, civic organizations, and the masses, we concluded that Cuban
American civic groups were relatively weak political actors regarding English Only policies. In addition, we concluded that there was a strategy of non-mobilization of the part of Cuban American elites as well as a lack of grassroots mobilization surrounding English language policies.

Therefore, in Chapter 6 we conclude that the transition of language from a social issue to a political issue has implications for the political context and consequences of language policy, as well as for the Cuban American community. These findings confirm hypotheses four, five, and six. We also concluded that the political consequences of language legislation were both substantive and symbolic in nature, thereby allowing us to continue to pursue an analysis of hypothesis seven.

Explanation

In Chapter 7 we defined the symbolic importance of language policy. Edelman’s (1964) symbolic politics theory was used to assess the effect of language policy on the political process and on the political incorporation of Cuban Americans in Miami-Dade County to bridge the gap between Browning, Marshall, and Tabb’s (1997) theory of political incorporation and this case. We demonstrated that Cuban Americans felt targeted by language policy, therefore bolstering the evidence to support the second hypothesis, but that political consciousness regarding this issue did not emerge.

Browning, Marshall, and Tabb (1997) measure political incorporation as a function of the relative number of elected officials from the Cuban American community, civic organizational involvement in the political process, and whether they took part in a coalition (23). While these factors are significant in determining a group’s
level of political incorporation, we have demonstrated that political consciousness and
political mobilization around issues, in addition to political mobilization supporting
particular candidates, are necessary conditions that must be satisfied in order for a racial
or ethnic group to reach political incorporation. In sum we can conclude that Cuban
Americans, as a community, were not as politically incorporated into the political system
in Miami-Dade as was previously thought by the proponents of the “Model Minority”
theory because there was no significant political mobilization around the issue of
language policy in the 1980s; political mobilization did not occur because political
consciousness had not been developed in regard to this issue. These findings confirm
the final hypothesis, which states that Miami-Dade elites were and are engaged in
symbolic politics.

Methods

In employing a multi-method approach, I had varying degrees of successes with
each method. It was difficult to recruit participants for the focus groups. Understandably, Cuban Americans in Miami-Dade were hesitant to volunteer to discuss
controversial issues while being surrounded by others and being video taped – just as
most other people would. Nevertheless, the focus groups were an integral part of this
research. Once I was able to recruit volunteers, the focus group discussions enabled me
to better understand the internal workings of the Cuban American community. Focus
group participants shared their thoughts, feelings, and personal experiences, which added
quite a bit of depth to this research.
I found that elites were, generally speaking, willing to participate and were candid in their responses to the questions that were asked. However, access to certain elites was a problem because a few elites were not willing to be interviewed. Nevertheless, this methodological approach was essential for completing my research. The political and economic elites I interviewed were able to provide me with information that enhanced the quality of this research. In other words, conducting personal interviews with elites allowed me to fill in many of the gaps that were left in the literature and after conducting my focus groups.

I also employed survey research methodology via mail survey in order to assess public opinion in Miami-Dade County regarding English language legislation. This was a time consuming and costly approach, but given the resource restraints on this project, it was necessary. Mass survey data with a large sample of Cuban Americans is unavailable or out-dated. I expected to garner a larger sample, and to have a higher response rate. Nevertheless, the mail survey data was adequate for analyzing language policy. I think survey research methodology at the mass level could be more effective if a telephone survey, rather than a mail survey, was utilized, though a phone survey would require more financial resources than did the mail survey.

Discussion

There are several stories that emerge from this research. The first is that the divisiveness within the Cuban American community along demographic and policy preference lines has prohibited the Cuban American community in Miami-Dade from reaching the highest level of political incorporation in Browning, Marshall, and Tabb's
(1997) theory. It has been argued that these internal cleavages, at the mass and elite levels, impeded the community’s progress towards political incorporation in this case.

A second story is that Cuban American civic organizations were overloaded because they were already dealing with the resettlement of Marielitos, and therefore were unable to address the language issue. This was demonstrated in the analysis of the Catholic Church in Miami-Dade.

A third story is that language policy was not a mobilizing issue because there were overriding concerns such as foreign policy and the Mariel emigrants. The idea here is that political elites in the Cuban American community made trade-offs. First, a non-mobilization strategy was employed around language policy in order to make gains in the area of foreign policy. Second, economic elites were not willing to risk the progress that was being made in their relations with Anglos, downtown business interests in order to deal with language policy. Further, these economic elites had political aspirations. This was demonstrated when business elites formed a coalition to stop Jorge Valdes from mobilizing an opposition to English language legislation. Any pursuit of the language issue on the part of Cuban American economic elites would have caused the leadership of the Republican Party to question their loyalty to the party, as well as their loyalty to the United States because language became a symbol of patriotism, citizenship, and civic duty. In doing so, economic and political elites were able to impede the process of psychological preparedness that was needed for political mobilization to occur. In both of these instances, there were tangible benefits that elites gained as language policy became entrenched in symbolic politics.
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In sum, the findings of this study are a combination of these three stories. This research indicates that political consciousness is necessary for political mobilization to occur and therefore for the achievement of political incorporation. While the "Cuban Political Model" may have been a successful strategy in dealing with issues of foreign policy, which have dominated the Cuban American political agenda, it was not useful in negotiating the barrier of English Only legislation. This model deterred economic and political elites from openly confronting the issue, thereby allowing a social issue to compromise their economic and political status in the broader Miami-Dade area. It seems clear that other minority groups with similar ties to foreign policy, such as Haitians and other Latino immigrants, could adopt the "Cuban Political Model" but it seems that it may not be an effective strategy in coping with socio-political issues because these groups have not and probably will not get the same kind of support from the U.S. government as Cuban Americans.

Future Research

While this research focuses only one case, language policy, this research has enabled me to elaborate on the nature of political incorporation and public policy. We were able to assess the connection between the tools and nature of political power in Miami-Dade, which has allowed us to formulate a better understanding of the concepts of political power and incorporation. This research should lend itself to future research in order to improve the types of questions social scientists ask, as well as what groups

1 It is also important to note that every Cuban American elite respondent stated that foreign policy is no longer the most important issue in the Cuban American community, except the representative from the
we choose to include in our analyses. This analysis has demonstrated a need for more large-scale, quantitative research.

Further, this research helps social scientists to more fully understand differences within the Cuban American community and forces us to question the level of cohesiveness among people of color. As a discipline we have not acknowledged the diversity that exists within the Hispanic population. All of this suggests that there is much to be learned about the language issue in the Latino community, as well as about how we examine socio-political issues within and across racial and ethnic groups.

Cuban American National Foundation. Therefore, we can say that foreign policy no longer trumps other issues.
APPENDIX A

FOCUS GROUPS

I. Pre-Discussion Survey

English Version

Thank you for your participation in our small group discussion. Before we begin, it is important for our research to know some information about you. All of the information you provide will be kept anonymous and will only be used for demographic purposes. The questions are provided in both Spanish and English for your convenience. Please circle the correct response when it is provided.

1. What is your gender? Male or female?
2. What is your date of birth?
3. What racial group do you identify with most strongly?
4. What is the highest level of education you have achieved? Less than 12 years, some college, 2-year college degree, 4-year college degree or what?
5. What is your marital status? Single, married, divorced or what?
6. Are you a parent? Yes or no?
7. Are you a U.S. citizen? Yes or no?
8. If not, in what year did you arrive in the U.S.?
9. What is your origin in Cuba?
10. In what year did you arrive in Miami, Florida?
11. Are you registered to vote? Yes or No?
12. What political party do you most strongly identify with? Republican, Democrat, or what?
13. What political ideology you most strongly subscribe to? Conservative, liberal, or what?
14. What annual income bracket does your household belong to?
   a. Less than $16,000
   b. $16,000 - $25,999
   c. $26,000 - $35,999
   d. $36,000 - $45,999
   e. $46,000 - $55,999
   f. More than $56,000
Gracias por su participación en nuestra discusión pequeña del grupo. Antes de que comencemos, es importante que nuestra investigación sepa una cierta información sobre usted. Toda la información que usted proporciona será mantenida anónima y utilizada solamente para los propósitos demográficos. Las preguntas se proporcionan en español e inglés para su conveniencia. Circunde por favor la respuesta correcta cuando se ofrece.

1. Cuál es su género? Varón o hembra?
2. Cuál es su fecha de nacimiento?
3. Con qué grupo racial usted se identifica?
4. Cuál es el nivel de la educación más alta que usted ha alcanzado? Menos de 12 años, alguna universidad, años de la universidad, cuatro años de la universidad. Explique.
5. Es casado/a, divorciado/a, o soltero/a?
6. Es usted un m/padre? Sí o no?
7. Es usted un ciudadano de los estados unidos? Sí o no?
8. Si contesta no, en qué año usted llegó a los estados unidos?
9. De donde es su origen en Cuba?
10. En qué año llegó usted a Miami, Florida?
11. Esta registrado/a para votar? Sí o no?
12. A qué partido político usted identifica? Republicano, Demócrata, qué?
13. Con qué política su identifica usted? Conservativo, liberal, o qué?
14. Qué grupo de ingresos pertenece anualmente a su casa?
   a. Menos que $16,000  b. $16,000 - $25,999
   b. $26,000 - $35,999  d. $36,000 - $45,999
   e. $46,000 - $55,999  f. Más que $56,000
II. Consent Form, English Version

Protocol # 00E0292

CONSENT FOR PARTICIPATION IN SOCIAL AND BEHAVIORAL RESEARCH

I consent to participating in research entitled: Discussion Groups: Miami Politics

The discussion group you have volunteered to participate in is part of a larger research project on Miami politics. Through this discussion group, the researchers want to learn about your opinions regarding politics in Miami. In particular, they want to learn about your opinions regarding English Only language policies, your perceptions about the Miami Cuban community, and who you think makes political decisions in and for the city. Your opinions and ideas are extremely important to this research and we thank you for your participation in advance. Please be aware that all of the group discussions will be audio and video taped. All of the information you provide will remain confidential. You will never be identified by name in any report on this research.

Professor William E. Nelson, Jr. or his/her authorized representative has explained the purpose of the study, the procedures to be followed, and the expected duration of my participation above. Possible benefits of the study have been described, as have alternative procedures, if such procedures are applicable and available. It has also been explained to me that my participation in this discussion group will be recorded on audio and video taped.

I acknowledge that I have had the opportunity to obtain additional information regarding the study and that any questions I have raised have been answered to my full satisfaction. Furthermore, I understand that I am free to withdraw consent at any time and to discontinue participation in the study without prejudice to me.

I understand that I can contact the Ohio State University researcher(s), toll fee, at 1-800-899-7845 #82 if I have questions or concerns.

Finally, I acknowledge that I have read and fully understand the consent form. I sign it freely and voluntarily. A copy has been given to me.

Date: ___________________________  Signed: ___________________________
    (Participant)

Signed: ___________________________  Signed: ___________________________
    (Principal Investigator or his/her authorized representative)  (Person authorized to consent for participant, if required)

Witness: ___________________________
AUTORIZACIÓN PARA LA PARTICIPACIÓN EN UNA REBUSCA

Doy consentimiento para participar en una rebusca, titulada: Grupos De Discusión: Política De Miami.

El grupo de discusión que usted se ha voluntariamente ofrecido a participar es parte de un proyecto de investigación, sobre la política de Miami. A través de este grupo de discusión, deseamos aprender sus opiniones con respecto a política de Miami. Particularmente, deseamos aprender sus opiniones con respecto a la políticas del lenguaje del inglés solamente, sus opiniones sobre la comunidad cubano de Miami, y en quién usted piensa decisiones políticas de las marcas y para la ciudad. Sus opiniones e ideas son extremadamente importantes para esta investigación y le agradecemos por su participación por adelantado. Esté por favor enterado que todas las discusiones del grupo serán audio y video golpeado ligeramente. Toda la información que usted proporciona seguirá siendo confidencial. Por nombre le nunca identificarán en cualquier informe sobre esta investigación.

William E. Nelson, Jr. o su representante autorizado de profesor ha explicado el propósito del estudio, de los procedimientos de ser seguido, y de la duración prevista de mi participación. Las ventajas posibles del estudio se han descrito, como tienen procedimientos alternativos, si tales procedimientos están aplicables y disponibles. También se ha explicado a mí que mi participación en este grupo de discusión será registrada en el audio y el video golpeados ligeramente.

Reconozco que he tenido la oportunidad de obtener la información adicional con respecto al estudio y que cualquier preguntas que haya planteadio se han contestado a mi satisfacción completa. Además, entiendo que estoy libre retirar consentimiento en cualquier momento y continuar la participación en el estudio sin prejuicio alguno para mí.

Entiendo que puedo entrar en contacto con el researcher(s) de la universidad de estado de Ohio, honorario del peaje, en 1-800-899-7845 #82 si tengo preguntas o preocupaciones.

Finalmente, reconozco que he leído y entiendo completamente la forma del consentimiento. La firmo libremente y voluntariamente. Una copia se ha dado yo.

Fecha: ________________________  Firmado: ________________________  (Participante)

Firmado: ________________________  Firmado: testigo del ________________________  (persona autorizada a consentir para el participante, si esta requerido)

Testigo: ________________________
III. Briefing

English Version

To All Participants:

The discussion group you have volunteered to participate in is part of a larger research project on Miami politics. Through this discussion group, we want to learn about your opinions regarding politics in Miami. In particular, we want to learn about your opinions regarding English Only language policies, your perceptions about the Miami Cuban community, and who you think makes political decisions in and for the city. Your opinions and ideas are extremely important to this research and we thank you for your participation in advance. Please be aware that all of the group discussions will be audio and video tapped. All of the information you provide will remain confidential. You will never be identified by name in any report on this research.

Spanish Version

A todos los participantes:

El grupo de discussion, en cual usted es voluntario, es parte de un extensivo proyecto de investigación sobre la política en Miami. A través del grupo de discussion queremos conocer sus opiniones referente a política en Miami. Particularmente, deseamos saber sus opiniones referente a la política de la Lengua Inglesa, sobre sus opiniones acerca de la comunidad Cubana en Miami y sobre quién piensa usted toma las decisiones políticas en/para la ciudad.
Favor enterarse que todas las discusiones del grupo serán grabadas y filmadas y que toda la información provista por usted será confidencial. Usted nunca será identificado por su nombre en los reportes de está investigación.
Sus opiniones e ideas son sumamente importantes para está investigación y queremos agradecerle su participación anticipadamente.
IV. Discussion Guide

Good (morning/afternoon/evening), my name is _______________ and I am the moderator for this discussion group. I would like to thank all of you for coming and hope you find the discussion interesting. Before we begin I am passing out 3 sheets of paper. The first is a consent form that I must have each of you sign and the second is a short questionnaire. Please fill these out and turn them in to me, and then we can begin our discussion. All of the information you provide us with will be kept confidential; including what is said during the discussion. Your names will not be included in any report on this study.

(After questionnaires are finished) The purpose of the group discussion today/tonight is to reach several goals. First, we would like to hear your opinions about English Only language policy in Florida and its effects in Miami. Second, we would like to hear your opinions about the Cuban community, generally speaking. Third, we would like to discuss Cubans in local politics.

How many of you are familiar with English Only policy?

What to you know about it?

Proposition 11 was passed into law and, according to the Constitution for the State of Florida, Article II, Section 9, English is the official language of Florida. It reads: (a) English is the official language of the State of Florida, (b) The legislature shall have the power to enforce this section by appropriate legislation. History—Proposed by Initiative Petition filed with the Secretary of State August 8, 1988; adopted 1988.

Does the policy affect your day-to-day activities? At home? At work?

What are your feelings about English Only policy?

Now we’re going to switch to another related topic.

Do you think any particular person, organization, or group of people support/oppose English Only? Who? Why?

Do you think that there is one individual, group of individuals, or organization that holds political power and influence in Miami? Who or what group? Why?

What are your general perceptions about the Cuban community in Miami?

Is it a cohesive group, a divided group or what? Why do you think that?

What divides the community? Issues on policy?
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Is there classism within the community? (IF ASKED TO DEFINE: prejudice or discrimination against a group of individuals that occurs because they belong to a particular socio-economic class. For example, there are working class people, white-collar people, and so on).

There are Afro-Cubans, White Cubans and so on in the community in Miami. Is there racism within the community? (IF ASKED TO DEFINE: prejudice or discrimination against a group of individuals that occurs because they belong to a particular racial group.

Is there sexism (IF ASKED TO DEFINE: prejudice or discrimination against a group of individuals that occurs because of their gender, usually occurs most often to women) in the community?

Can anyone provide an example, a personal experience perhaps, of another Cuban discriminating against you because of your class, race, or gender?

What holds the community together?

A common cause?

A common nationality/ancestry?

A common language?

Is there any particular issue that we have not yet discussed that you believe is politically important and would like to discuss?

THANK YOU for you cooperation and participation in our small group discussion. Your participation was very important and valuable. Before you depart this (morning/afternoon/evening), please take a few moments to fill out another SHORT questionnaire. There is no rush, take your time. Feel free to visit refreshment table before you leave as well.
V. Post-discussion Survey

English Version

Thank you for your participation in the group discussion. Please answer the questions below to the best of your ability. We realize that some of these questions may be difficult to answer, however it is important that you respond to as many questions as possible. Please remember that all of the information you provide will remain confidential. Your name will not be included in any report on this study.

1. Who is the Mayor of Miami?

2. Who is the City Manager of Miami?

3. Name as many Dade County Commissioners as you can.

4. Who is the Governor of Florida?

5. Who are the senators from Florida?

6. What is a referendum?

7. What is the name of your U.S. Representative(s)?

8. Who is the Vice President of the United States?

9. Name at least one presidential candidate that ran as an Independent.
Gracias por su participación en nuestro grupo. Por favor conteste las siguientes preguntas a su mayor capacidad. Realizamos que hay preguntas que son difícil de contestar, es importante que usted conteste todas las preguntas que puede. Por favor recuerde que todas las contestas permanecerán confidenciales. Su nombre no incluido o incluso en este reporte.

1. Quién es el alcalde de Miami?

2. Quién es el encargado de la ciudad de Miami?

3. Nombre todo las comisionados del condado de Dade.

4. Quién es el gobernador de la Florida?

5. Quiénes son los senadores de la Florida?

6. Que un refere de voto?

7. Cuál es el nombre de representante en el congreso?

8. Quién es el vice presidente de los Estados Unidos?

9. Nombre por lo menos a un candidato presidencial que se ejecutó como independiente.
Dear Resident:

Within the next few days, you will receive a request to complete a brief questionnaire. We are mailing it to you in an effort to learn how residents of Miami-Dade feel about local politics and language policy in the State of Florida.

The survey is being conducted to better inform scholars about the political opinions and concerns of the Miami-Dade’s Cuban community.

We would greatly appreciate your taking the few minutes necessary to complete and return your questionnaire.

Thank you in advance for your help.

Sincerely,

Jessica Pérez-Monforti
Project Director
Estimado Residente:

En los días siguientes, usted recibirá una solicitud para completar un breve cuestionario. Se lo estamos enviando por correo en un esfuerzo para aprender cómo se sienten los residentes de Miami con relación a las políticas locales y de la política de la lengua en el Estado de Florida.

El estudio está siendo conducido para informar de mejor manera a los escolares acerca de las opiniones políticas e inquietudes de la comunidad Cubana de Miami-Dade.

Nosotros apreciaremos grandemente si usted toma los minutos necesarios para completar y regresar su cuestionario.

Gracias anticipadamente por su ayuda.

Sinceramente,

Jessica Pérez-Monforti
Directora del Proyecto
Dear Miami-Dade Resident:

As a resident of Miami-Dade, you may have heard about the impact of state and local language policies on Miami-Dade politics and the quest for political empowerment in the local Cuban community. Knowing how people view their community and the policies therein is vital to how scholars interpret the political environment.

Your household is one of the small number in which people are being asked to give their opinion on these matters. It was drawn randomly from the telephone book. In order that the results of the study truly represent the thinking of people in your community, it is important that each questionnaire be completed and returned in the envelope provided. We are not asking you for any money nor are we asking you to sign up for any program. We simply want to know what your opinions are about politics. Your opinions are extremely important and this questionnaire provides you with a way to express them. The questions are provided in both Spanish and English for your convenience.

You may be assured of complete confidentiality. The questionnaire has an identification number for mailing purposes only. This is so that we may check your name off the mailing list once your questionnaire is returned. Your name will never be placed on the questionnaire itself.

I would be happy to answer any questions you may have about this study. Please call me toll-free at 1-800-899-7845, access code number 82.

Thank you for your time, attention, and participation in advance. Please know that your participation is very important and valuable.

Sincerely,
Jessica Pérez-Monforti
Project Director
Opinions on Local Politics & Language Policy: A Survey Of Residents in Miami-Dade County

Spring 2001

If you have any questions, please call 1-800-899-7845, access number 82.

Please return your completed questionnaire in the enclosed envelope to: Research Office
c/o Jessica Pérez-Monforti
P.O. Box 6076
Spring Hill, FL 34611

Thank you for your help.
To begin, we would like to ask you a few questions regarding local politics and economics in Miami-Dade. There are no right or wrong answers in this section so please feel free to provide us with your opinion. Please circle only one response per question, unless instructed to do otherwise.

What group of individuals or organization(s) do you believe holds the most political power and influence in Miami?

1. Elected politicians/officials  
2. Cuban radio  
3. Political Consultants  
4. Political Parties  
5. The Miami Herald/El Nuevo Herald  
6. Voters  
7. The Wealthy  
8. Business Owners  
9. Special Interests

Of the groups listed below, what segment of Miami’s population do you think has the most political power?

1. Anglos  
2. Blacks  
3. Cubans  
4. Jews

What group of individuals or organization(s) do you believe holds the most economic power and influence in Miami?

1. Elected politicians/officials  
2. Cuban radio  
3. Political Consultants  
4. Political Parties  
5. The Miami Herald/El Nuevo Herald  
6. Voters  
7. The Wealthy  
8. Business Owners  
9. Special Interests
Of the groups listed below, what segment of Miami’s population do you think has the most economic power?

1. Anglos
2. Blacks
3. Cubans
4. Jews

What do you think is the most important political issue that needs to be addressed in Miami-Dade?

What do you think is the second most important political issue that needs to be addressed in Miami-Dade?

What do you think is the most important political issue that needs to be addressed in/by Miami’s Cuban community?

What are your general perceptions about the Cubans community in Miami? Do you feel

1. Very positive about them
2. Positive about them
3. No feeling about them
4. Negative about them
5. Very negative about them
Do you think the Cuban community in Miami is a cohesive group, a divided group or what?

1. Very cohesive group
2. Somewhat cohesive group
3. Somewhat divided group
4. Very divided group
5. Comments: 

In your opinion, what divides Miami's Cuban community? Please circle all that apply.

1. Issues on policy in Miami-Dade
2. Issues on policy in the U.S.
3. Issues on policy towards Cuba
4. Ideology (conservative v. liberal)
5. Sexism (men v. women)
6. Generational gap (old v. young)
7. Local relations with non-Cuban Hispanics
8. Local relations with non-Hispanic Whites
9. Local relations with non-Hispanic Blacks
10. Local relations with Aho-Cubans
11. Issues on policy in Florida
12. Local language policies
13. Views about Elian Gonzalez
14. Classism (rich v. poor)
15. Racism (Blacks v. Whites)
16. Exile status (1st v. Mariel)

Alternatively, what do you think holds the community together? Please circle all that apply.

1. Common Communist experience
2. Common language (ex: Spanish)
3. Common nationality (ex: Cuban)
4. A common immigration experience
5. A common enemy in Castro
6. Common ideology
7. A common cause
In your opinion, what segment of Miami’s Cuban community is left behind politically? Please check all that apply.

1. Afro-Cubans
2. Elderly Cubans
3. Cubans who speak only Spanish
4. Non-Spanish-speaking Cubans
5. Second generation Cuban-Americans
6. Cuban liberals
7. Cuban conservatives
8. Recent Cuban immigrants
9. Bilingual Cubans
10. Cuban Democrats
11. Cuban Republicans
12. Cuban Independents
13. Cuban moderates
14. Mariel immigrants

In your opinion, what segment of Miami’s Cuban community is left behind economically? Please check all that apply.

1. Afro-Cubans
2. Elderly Cubans
3. Cubans who speak only Spanish
4. Non-Spanish-speaking Cubans
5. Second generation Cuban-Americans
6. Cuban liberals
7. Cuban conservatives
8. Recent Cuban immigrants
9. Bilingual Cubans
10. Cuban Democrats
11. Cuban Republicans
12. Cuban Independents
13. Cuban moderates
14. Mariel immigrants

Now we would like to turn from questions regarding local politics to ask you a few questions about the Official English policy in Florida.

Are you familiar with the Official English policy in Florida?

1. Very familiar
2. Somewhat familiar
3. Somewhat unfamiliar
4. Not familiar at all
The following is information regarding Proposition 11, which was passed into law in 1988 via referendum (a popular vote). According to the Constitution for the State of Florida, Article II, Section 9, English is the official language of Florida. It reads:

A) *English is the official language of the State of Florida.*

B) *The legislature shall have the power to enforce this section by appropriate legislation.*

Does this policy affect your day-to-day activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At work?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At home?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In public?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What are your feelings about this Official English policy? Do you think the policy is

1. Excellent
2. Good
3. Fair
4. Poor

Do you think Florida’s Official English the policy is

1. Very Important
2. Important
3. Not very important
4. Not important at all
Do you think Florida’s Official English policy is

1. Very discriminatory
2. Somewhat Discriminatory
3. Not very discriminatory
4. Not discriminatory at all

Of the individuals listed below, do you think any support Official English policy? Please circle all that apply.

1. Afro-Cubans
2. Recent Cuban immigrants
3. Cubans who speak only Spanish
4. Non-Spanish-speakers
5. Republicans
6. Conservatives
7. Second generation Cuban-Americans
8. African Americans
9. Non-Cuban Hispanics
10. Black elected officials
11. White Cubans
12. Elderly Cubans
13. Bilingual Cubans
14. Democrats
15. Liberals
16. Moderates
17. Anglos
18. Haitians
19. Anglo elected officials
20. Cuban elected officials

Of the individuals listed below, do you think any oppose Official English policy? Please circle all that apply.

1. Afro-Cubans
2. Recent Cuban immigrants
3. Cubans who speak only Spanish
4. Non-Spanish-speakers
5. Republicans
6. Conservatives
7. Second generation Cuban-Americans
8. African Americans
9. Non-Cuban Hispanics
10. Black elected officials
11. White Cubans
12. Elderly Cubans
13. Bilingual Cubans
14. Democrats
15. Liberals
16. Moderates
17. Anglos
18. Haitians
19. Anglo elected officials
20. Cuban elected officials
In the next section, we have listed some of the things that people do that help a party or candidate win an election. I wonder if you could tell whether you did any of these things during the last election campaign. Please circle “Yes” or “No”.

Did you talk to any people and try to show them why they should vote for one of the parties or candidates?

YES NO

Did you give any money or buy tickets or anything to help the campaign for one of the parties or candidates?

YES NO

Did you go to any political meetings, rallies, dinners, or things like that?

YES NO

Did you do any other work for one of the parties or candidates?

YES NO

Do you belong to any political club or organization?

YES NO

Did you wear a campaign button or put a campaign sticker on your car?

YES NO
The next sequence of questions is asked in order to gauge your political knowledge. Please answer the questions below to the best of your ability. We realize that some of these questions may be difficult to answer, however it is important that you respond to as many questions as possible. Please remember that all of the information you provide will remain confidential. Your name will not be included in any report on this study.

Who is the Mayor of Miami?

Who is the City Manager of Miami?

Who is the Governor of Florida?

Who are the senators from Florida?

Who is the Vice President of the United States?

Who is the President of the United States?

In the final section, we would like to ask you a few questions about yourself.

What is your gender? Male or female?

What is your date of birth?
**What is the highest level of education you have achieved?** Less than 12 years, some college, 2-year college degree, 4-year college degree or what?

**What is your marital status?** Single, married, divorced or what?

**Are you a parent?** Yes or no?

**What is your place of birth?**

**Are you a U.S. citizen?**

**In what year did you move to Miami, Florida?**

**Are you registered to vote?** Yes or No?

**Who did you vote for in the last Presidential election?**

**What political party do you belong to?** Republican Party? Democrat Party? Other?

**What political ideology do you most strongly subscribe to?** Conservative, liberal, or what?

**What racial group do you identify with most strongly?**

1. Anglo/Caucasian
2. Asian
3. Black
4. Native American
5. Bi- or Multi-racial
What ethnic group do you identify with most strongly?

How often do you come in contact with people of a different race or ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>during work hours?</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>during leisure hours?</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>while at home?</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>____</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Would you say that you are

1. an English speaker
2. bilingual, able speak Spanish and English equally well
3. Spanish speaker
4. a speaker of some language other than English and Spanish

How often do you speak Spanish

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>during work hours?</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>during leisure hours?</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>while at home?</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>while in public?</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>____</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What annual income bracket does your household belong to?

1. Less than $16,000
2. $16,000 - $25,999
3. $26,000 - $35,999
4. $36,000 - $45,999
5. $46,000 - $55,999
6. $56,000 - $65,999
7. $66,000 - $75,999
8. More than $76,000

Thank you for your help.
Your comments will be appreciated. Please include them in the space provided below.
Please return your completed questionnaire in the enclosed envelope to:
Research Office
c/o Jessica Pérez-Monforti
P.O. Box 6076
Spring Hill, FL 34611
Spanish Version

Estimado Residente de Miami-Dade:

Como residente de Miami-Dade, usted puede haber oído acerca del impacto estatal y local de la política de la lengua en la política de la ciudad de Miami y la búsqueda por poder político en la comunidad local Cubana. Conociendo como la gente ve su comunidad y las políticas existentes es vital para que los escolares interpreten el ambiente político.

Su casa es uno de los pocos lugares en los cuales estamos preguntando su opinión en estos asuntos. Su nombre fue tomado al azar de la guía telefónica. Para que los resultados de este estudio verdaderamente representen los pensamientos de las personas en su comunidad, es importante que cada cuestionario sea completado y regresado en el sobre provisto. Nosotros no le estamos solicitando dinero ni tampoco le estamos pidiendo su firma para ningún programa. Nosotros simplemente queremos conocer su opinión referente a las políticas. Su opinión es sumamente importante y este cuestionario le provee una forma de expresión. Las preguntas son dadas en Español e Inglés para su conveniencia.

Usted puede estar seguro de su total confidencialidad. El cuestionario tiene un número de identificación solamente para propósitos de envío. Esto es solo para que nosotros podamos retirar su nombre de la lista una vez que su cuestionario sea regresado. Su nombre nunca aparecerá en el cuestionario.

Estaré feliz de contestarle cualquier pregunta que pueda tener referente al estudio. Por favor, llámeme gratis al 1-800-899-7845, extensión 82.

Anticipadamente muchas gracias, por su tiempo y participación. Por favor, sepa que su participación es muy importante y valiosa.

Sinceramente,
Jessica Pérez-Monforti
Directora del Proyecto
Opiniones sobre la Política Local y la Política de la Lengua: Un Estudio de los Residentes de Miami-Dade

Primavera 2001

Si usted tiene alguna pregunta, por favor llame al 1-800-899-7845, extensión 82.

Por favor, una vez completado su cuestionario envíelo en el sobre adjunto a:
Research Office

c/o Jessica Pérez-Monforti
P.O. Box 6076
Spring Hill, FL 34611

Muchas gracias por su ayuda.
Para empezar, nos gustaría preguntarle un poco acerca de la política y economía local en Miami-Dade. No hay respuestas correctas ni incorrectas en esta sección, por favor síéntase libre de darnos su opinión. Por favor, circule solamente una respuesta por pregunta, al menos que sea instruido de otra manera.

¿Qué grupo de individuos u organización (es usted cree que tiene el mayor poder político e influencia en Miami?  

1. Políticos, oficiales electos  
2. La radio Cubana  
3. Consultores políticos  
4. Partidos políticos  
5. The Miami Herald/El Nuevo Heraldo  
6. Votantes  
7. Los Ricos  
8. Los dueños de Negocios  
9. Intereses especiales

¿De los grupos mencionados a continuación, qué segmento de población de Miami piensa usted que tiene mayor poder político?

1. Anglos  
2. Negros  
3. Cubanos  
4. Judíos

¿Qué grupo de individuos u organización (es cree usted que mantiene el mayor poder económico e influencia en Miami?  

1. Políticos, oficiales electos  
2. La radio Cubana  
3. Consultores políticos  
4. Partidos políticos  
5. The Miami Herald/El Nuevo Heraldo  
6. Votantes  
7. Los Ricos  
8. Los dueños de Negocios  
9. Intereses especiales
¿Del grupo de individuos mencionados abajo, qué segmento de la población de Miami piensa usted que tiene el mayor poder económico?

1. Anglos
2. Negros
3. Cubanos
4. Judíos

¿Cuál piensa usted que es el asunto político más importante que necesita ser dirigido en Miami-Dade?

¿Cuál piensa usted que es el segundo asunto político más importante que debe ser dirigido en Miami-Dade?

¿Cuál piensa usted que es el asunto político más importante que necesita ser dirigido en / por la comunidad Cubana en Miami?

¿Cuáles son sus percepciones generales referentes a la comunidad Cubana en Miami? ¿Qué siente usted?

1. Sentimientos muy positivos acerca de ellos
2. Sentimientos positivos acerca de ellos
3. Ningún sentimiento acerca de ellos
4. Sentimientos negativos acerca de ellos
5. Sentimientos muy negativos acerca de ellos.
¿Piensa usted qué la comunidad Cubana en Miami es un grupo cohesivo, un grupo dividido? ¿O qué tipo?

1. Un grupo muy unido
2. Un grupo algo unido
3. Un grupo algo dividido
4. Un grupo muy dividido
5. Comentarios: _________________________________

¿En su opinión, que cree usted que es lo que divide a la comunidad Cubana en Miami? Por favor, circule todas las respuestas que aplican.

1. Asuntos en la política de Miami-Dade
2. Asuntos en la política de U.S.
3. Asuntos en la política hacia Cuba
4. Ideología (Conservadora v Liberal)
5. Sexismo (hombres v mujeres)
6. Espacio generacional (vejez v juventud)
7. Relaciones locales con otros Hispanos no Cubanos
8. Relaciones locales con los Blancos no Hispanos
9. Relaciones locales con Negros no Hispanos
10. Relaciones locales con los Afro-Cubanos
11. Estado legal del exilio (1st v Marielitos)

¿Alternativamente qué piensa usted que sostiene unida a la comunidad? Por favor, circules todas las aplicables.

1. Experiencia Comunista en común
2. Lengua en común, (Ej. El Español)
3. Nacionalidad en común (Ej. Cubana)
4. Experiencia inmigratoria en común
5. Castro un enemigo en común
6. Una ideología en común
7. Una causa en común
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¿En su opinión, cuál segmento de la comunidad Cubana en Miami se quedó atrás políticamente? Por favor, circule todas las respuestas aplicables.

1. Afro-Cubanos  8. Cubanos que inmigraron recientemente
2. Cubanos en la tercera edad  9. Cubanos bilingües
3. Cubanos que no hablan Ingles  10. Cubanos demócratas
4. Cubanos que no hablan Español  11. Cubanos republicanos
5. Segunda generación Cubanos  12. Cubanos independientes
6. Cubanos liberales  13. Cubanos moderados

Otros: ___________________________________________________

¿En su opinión, cuál segmento de la comunidad Cubana en Miami se quedó atrás económicamente? Por favor, circule todas las respuestas aplicables.

1. Afro-Cubanos  8. Cubanos que inmigraron recientemente
2. Cubanos en la tercera edad  9. Cubanos bilingües
3. Cubanos que no hablan Ingles  10. Cubanos demócratas
4. Cubanos que no hablan Español  11. Cubanos republicanos
5. Segunda generación Cubanos  12. Cubanos independientes
6. Cubanos liberales  13. Cubanos moderados

Otros: ___________________________________________________

Ahora nos gustaría cambiar de las preguntas sobre políticas locales hacia unas pocas preguntas acerca de la política del Inglés oficial en la Florida.

¿Está usted familiarizado con la política oficial del Inglés en la Florida?
1. Muy familiarizado
2. Algo familiarizado
3. Algo desfamiliarizado
4. Muy desfamiliarizado
La propuesta fue convertida en una Ley en 1988 y según la Constitución de la Florida, Artículo II, Sección 9, el Inglés es la lengua oficial de la Florida. Esta se interpreta:

A) El Inglés es la Lengua Oficial del Estado de la Florida.
B) La legislatura debe tener el poder para hacer cumplir esta sección por una apropiada legislación.

¿Esta política afecta sus actividades diarias

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frecuentemente</th>
<th>Algunas veces</th>
<th>Raramente</th>
<th>Nunca</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>En la casa?</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En el trabajo?</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En público?</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¿Cuáles son sus sentimientos referente a la política de la lengua oficial, el Inglés?
Usted piensa que la política es?

1. Excelente
2. Buena
3. Justa
4. Pobre

Piensa usted que la política del Inglés como lengua oficial es

1. Muy importante
2. Importante
3. No muy importante
4. No es importante del todo
¿Piensa usted que la política del Inglés como lengua oficial de la Florida es
1. Muy discriminatoria?
2. Algo discriminatoria?
3. No muy discriminatoria?
4. No es del todo discriminatoria?

¿De todos los individuos mencionados a continuación, cuáles piensa usted que apoyan la política del Inglés como lengua oficial? Por favor, circule todas las respuestas aplicables.
1. Afro-Cubanos
2. Cubanos que recientemente inmigraron
3. Cubanos que solamente hablan Español
4. Los que no hablan Español
5. Republicanos
6. Conservadores
7. Cubanos, segunda generación
8. Africanos-Norteamericanos
9. Hispanos no Cubanos
10. Oficiales negros electos
11. Cubanos blancos
12. Cubanos de la tercera edad
13. Cubanos bilingües
14. Demócratas
15. Liberales
16. Moderados
17. Anglos
18. Haitianos
19. Oficiales Anglos electos
20. Oficiales Cubanos electos

¿De los individuos mencionados a continuación, cuáles piensa usted que se oponen a la política del Inglés como lengua oficial? Por favor, circule todas las respuestas aplicables.
1. Afro-Cubanos
2. Cubanos que recientemente inmigraron
3. Cubanos que solamente hablan Español
4. Los que no hablan Español
5. Republicanos
6. Conservadores
7. Cubanos, segunda generación
8. Africanos-Norteamericanos
9. Hispanos no Cubanos
10. Oficiales negros electos
11. Cubanos blancos
12. Cubanos de la tercera edad
13. Cubanos bilingües
14. Demócratas
15. Liberales
16. Moderados
17. Anglos
18. Haitianos
19. Oficiales Anglos electos
20. Oficiales Cubanos electos
En la siguiente sección, hemos listado algunas de las cosas que las personas hacen para ayudar a un partido o candidato político para ganar una elección. Me pregunto si usted pudiera decir si hizo alguna de estas cosas durante la última campaña electoral. Por favor, circule “Sí” o “No.”

¿Le habló usted a algunas personas y les trató de demostrarle por qué deberían votar por uno de los partidos o candidatos?

Sí No

¿Usted dio dinero o compró boletos o otra cosa para ayudar a la campaña de uno de los partidos o candidatos políticos?

Sí No

¿Asistió usted a alguna de las reuniones políticas, asambleas, cenas o cualquier evento relacionado con la campaña?

Sí No

¿Realizó algún trabajo por alguno de los partidos o candidatos?

Sí No

¿Pertenece usted a algún club o organización política?

Sí No

¿Usó usted algún botón de la campaña electoral o colocó alguna propaganda en su carro?

Sí No
La siguiente serie de preguntas son para medir su conocimiento político. Por favor, conteste las siguientes preguntas lo mejor que usted pueda. Es de nuestro conocimiento que alguna de estas preguntas pueden ser difíciles de contestar, sin embargo es importante que usted responda tantas preguntas como le sea posible. Por favor, recuerde que toda la información que usted provea será confidencial. Su nombre no será incluido en ningún reporte de este estudio.

¿Quién es el Alcalde de Miami?

¿Quién es el Gerente de la Ciudad de Miami?

¿Quién es el Gobernador de la Florida?

¿Quiénes son los Senadores de la Florida?

¿Quién es el Vice-Presidente de los Estados Unidos?

¿Quién es el Presidente de los Estados Unidos?

En la sección final nos gustaría hacerle unas pocas preguntas acerca de usted.

¿Cuál es su género? ¿Masculino o Femenino?

¿Cuál es su fecha de nacimiento?
¿Cuál es el nivel más alto de educación que usted ha alcanzado? Menos de años, algo de Colegio, un título de años, un título de años de Colegio o qué?

¿Cuál es su estado civil? Soltero, casado, divorciado o qué?

¿Es usted padre o madre de familia? Sí o no?

¿Cuál es su lugar de nacimiento?

¿Es usted ciudadano de los Estados Unidos?

¿En qué año vino a Miami, Florida?

¿Está usted registrado para votar? Sí o No?

¿Por quién votó en la última elección Presidencial?


¿Cuál es su más fuerte ideología política, a la cual usted está suscrito? Conservador, liberal o cuál?

¿Con cuál grupo étnico se identifica usted fuertemente?

1. Anglo/Caucásio
2. Asiático
3. Negro
4. Nativo Norteamericano
5. Bi-racial ó Multi-racial
¿Con cuál grupo étnico se identifica usted fuertemente?

¿Cuán a menudo usted se pone en contacto con gente de diferentes razas o etnias?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frecuentemente</th>
<th>Algunas Veces</th>
<th>Raramente</th>
<th>Nunca</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Durante horas de trabajo?**

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Durante su tiempo libre?**

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Cuándo está en público?**

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

¿Diría que usted es

1. Habla Inglés solamente?
2. Bilingüe, que habla bien ambos idiomas, Inglés y Español?
3. Habla Español solamente?
4. Habla otra lengua en vez de Español e Inglés?

¿Cuán a menudo usted habla Español

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frecuentemente</th>
<th>Algunas Veces</th>
<th>Raramente</th>
<th>Nunca</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Durante horas de trabajo?**

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Durante su tiempo libre?**

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Mientras está en casa?**

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Cuándo está en público?**

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

¿A cuál de los siguientes ingresos anuales pertenecen los habitantes de su casa?

1. Menos de $16,000
2. $16,000 - $25,999
3. $26,000 - $35,999
4. $36,000 - $45,999
5. $46,000 - $55,999
6. $56,000 - $65,999
7. $66,000 - $75,999
8. Más de $76,000
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Muchas gracias por su ayuda. Sus comentarios serán apreciados. Por favor inclúyalos en el espacio provisto.

Por favor, una vez completado su cuestionario envíelo en el sobre adjunto a:
Research Office
c/o Jessica Pérez-Monforti
P.O. Box 6076
Spring Hill, Fl. 34611
TO:

FROM: The Ohio State University
Department of Political Science
c/o Jessica Perez-Monforti
Post Office Box 6076
Spring Hill, FL 34611
Last week, a questionnaire seeking your opinions about the impact of state and local language policies on Miami-Dade politics and the quest for political empowerment in the local Cuban community was mailed to you. Your name was drawn randomly from the telephone book.

If you have already completed and returned the questionnaire to us, please accept our sincere thanks. If not, please do so today. We are especially grateful for your help because we believe that your response is extremely important.

If you did not receive a questionnaire, or if it was misplaced, please call us, toll-free, at 1-800-899-7845, access code 82, and we will get another one in the mail to you today.

La semana pasada, le fue enviado por correo un cuestionario solicitando su opinión referente al impacto estatal y local de la política de la lengua en la política de la ciudad de Miami y la búsqueda por autoridad política en la comunidad Cubana local. Su nombre fue tomado al azar de la guía telefónica de Miami-Dade.

Si usted ya ha contestado y regresado su cuestionario, por favor acepte nuestros más sinceros agradecimientos. Y si usted todavía no lo ha hecho, por favor hágalo hoy.

Estamos especialmente grávidos por su cordial ayuda porque creemos que su respuesta será de mucha ayuda para los escolares.

Si usted no recibió un cuestionario, o si este fue extraviado, por favor llámenos gratis al 1-800-899-7845 y nosotros inmediatamente le enviaremos otro por correo.

Sincerely/Sinceramente,

Jessica Pérez-Monforti, Project Director
Research Office, The Ohio State University
May 2001

Dear Resident:

About three weeks ago, we wrote to you seeking your opinions about the impact of state and local language policies on Miami city politics and the quest for political empowerment in the local Cuban community. As of today, we have not received your completed questionnaire. We realize that you may not have had time to complete it. However, we would genuinely appreciate hearing from you.

The study is being conducted so that citizens like you can affect the interpretations scholars make about your political environment. We are writing you again because the study’s usefulness depends on our receiving a questionnaire from each respondent. Your name was drawn through a scientific sampling process in which—had an equal chance of being selected. In order for information from the study to be truly representative, it is essential that each person in the sample return their questionnaire.

In the event that your questionnaire has been misplaced, a replacement is enclosed. We would be happy to answer any questions you have about the study. Please call 1-800-899-7845, access number 82.

Sincerely,

Jessica Pérez-Monforti
Project Director
Opinions on Local Politics & Language Policy: A Survey Of Residents in Miami-Dade County

Spring 2001

If you have any questions, please call 1-800-899-7845, access number 82.

Please return your completed questionnaire in the enclosed envelope to: Research Office

c/o Jessica Pérez-Monforti
P.O. Box 6076
Spring Hill, FL 34611

Thank you for your help.
To begin, we would like to ask you a few questions regarding local politics and economics in Miami-Dade. There are no right or wrong answers in this section so please feel free to provide us with your opinion. Please circle only one response per question, unless instructed to do otherwise.

What group of individuals or organization(s) do you believe holds the most political power and influence in Miami?

7. Cuban radio 7. The Wealthy
9. Political Parties 9. Special Interests
10. The Miami Herald/El Nuevo Herald

Of the groups listed below, what segment of Miami's population do you think has the most political power?

5. Anglos
6. Blacks
7. Cubans
8. Jews

What group of individuals or organization(s) do you believe holds the most economic power and influence in Miami?

7. Cuban radio 7. The Wealthy
9. Political Parties 9. Special Interests
10. The Miami Herald/El Nuevo Herald
Of the groups listed below, what segment of Miami's population do you think has the most economic power?

5. Anglos  
6. Blacks  
7. Cubans  
8. Jews

What do you think is the most important political issue that needs to be addressed in Miami-Dade?

What do you think is the second most important political issue that needs to be addressed in Miami-Dade?

What do you think is the most important political issue that needs to be addressed in/by Miami's Cuban community?

What are your general perceptions about the Cubans community in Miami? Do you feel

6. Very positive about them  
7. Positive about them  
8. No feeling about them  
9. Negative about them  
10. Very negative about them
Do you think the Cuban community in Miami is a cohesive group, a divided group or what?

6. Very cohesive group
7. Somewhat cohesive group
8. Somewhat divided group
9. Very divided group
10. Comments: ____________________________________________________________

In your opinion, what divides Miami's Cuban community? Please circle all that apply.

11. Issues on policy in Miami-Dade
12. Issues on policy in the U.S.
13. Issues on policy towards Cuba
14. Ideology (conservative v. liberal)
15. Sexism (men v. women)
16. Generational gap (old v. young)
17. Local relations with non-Cuban Hispanics
18. Local relations with non-Hispanic Whites
19. Local relations with non-Hispanic Blacks
20. Local relations with Afro-Cubans

Alternatively, what do you think holds the community together? Please circle all that apply.

5. Common Communist experience
6. Common language (ex: Spanish)
7. Common nationality (ex: Cuban)
8. A common immigration experience
9. A common enemy in Castro
10. Common ideology
11. A common cause
In your opinion, what segment of Miami's Cuban community is left behind politically? Please check all that apply.

8. Afro-Cubans
9. Elderly Cubans
10. Cubans who speak only Spanish
11. Non-Spanish-speaking Cubans
12. Second generation Cuban-Americans
13. Cuban liberals
14. Cuban conservatives

Other: __________________________

In your opinion, what segment of Miami's Cuban community is left behind economically? Please check all that apply.

8. Afro-Cubans
9. Elderly Cubans
10. Cubans who speak only Spanish
11. Non-Spanish-speaking Cubans
12. Second generation Cuban-Americans
13. Cuban liberals
14. Cuban conservatives

Other: __________________________

Now we would like to turn from questions regarding local politics to ask you a few questions about the Official English policy in Florida.

Are you familiar with the Official English policy in Florida?

5. Very familiar
6. Somewhat familiar
7. Somewhat unfamiliar
8. Not familiar at all
The following is information regarding Proposition 11, which was passed into law in 1988 via referendum (a popular vote). According to the Constitution for the State of Florida, Article II, Section 9, English is the official language of Florida. It reads:

A) English is the official language of the State of Florida.

B) The legislature shall have the power to enforce this section by appropriate legislation.

Does this policy affect your day-to-day activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>At work?</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At home?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In public?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What are your feelings about this Official English policy? Do you think the policy is

5. Excellent
6. Good
7. Fair
8. Poor

Do you think Florida's Official English the policy is

5. Very Important
6. Important
7. Not very important
8. Not important at all
Do you think Florida’s Official English policy is

5. Very discriminatory
6. Somewhat Discriminatory
7. Not very discriminatory
8. Not discriminatory at all

Of the individuals listed below, do you think any support Official English policy? Please circle all that apply.

11. Afro-Cubans
12. Recent Cuban immigrants
13. Cubans who speak only Spanish
14. Non-Spanish-speakers
15. Republicans
16. Conservatives
17. Second generation Cuban-Americans
18. African Americans
19. Non-Cuban Hispanics
20. Black elected officials

11. White Cubans
12. Elderly Cubans
13. Bilingual Cubans
14. Democrats
15. Liberals
16. Moderates
17. Anglos
18. Haitians
19. Anglo elected officials
20. Cuban elected officials

Of the individuals listed below, do you think any oppose Official English policy? Please circle all that apply.

11. Afro-Cubans
12. Recent Cuban immigrants
13. Cubans who speak only Spanish
14. Non-Spanish-speakers
15. Republicans
16. Conservatives
17. Second generation Cuban-Americans
18. African Americans
19. Non-Cuban Hispanics
20. Black elected officials

11. White Cubans
12. Elderly Cubans
13. Bilingual Cubans
14. Democrats
15. Liberals
16. Moderates
17. Anglos
18. Haitians
19. Anglo elected officials
20. Cuban elected officials
In the next section, we have listed some of the things that people do that help a party or candidate win an election. I wonder if you could tell whether you did any of these things during the last election campaign. Please circle “Yes” or “No”.

Did you talk to any people and try to show them why they should vote for one of the parties or candidates?

   YES     NO

Did you give any money or buy tickets or anything to help the campaign for one of the parties or candidates?

   YES     NO

Did you go to any political meetings, rallies, dinners, or things like that?

   YES     NO

Did you do any other work for one of the parties or candidates?

   YES     NO

Do you belong to any political club or organization?

   YES     NO

Did you wear a campaign button or put a campaign sticker on your car?

   YES     NO
The next sequence of questions is asked in order to gauge your political knowledge. Please answer the questions below to the best of your ability. We realize that some of these questions may be difficult to answer, however it is important that you respond to as many questions as possible. Please remember that all of the information you provide will remain confidential. Your name will not be included in any report on this study.

Who is the Mayor of Miami?

Who is the City Manager of Miami?

Who is the Governor of Florida?

Who are the senators from Florida?

Who is the Vice President of the United States?

Who is the President of the United States?

In the final section, we would like to ask you a few questions about yourself.

What is your gender? Male or female?

What is your date of birth?
What is the highest level of education you have achieved? Less than 12 years, some college, 2-year college degree, 4-year college degree or what?

What is your marital status? Single, married, divorced or what?

Are you a parent? Yes or no?

What is your place of birth?

Are you a U.S. citizen?

In what year did you move to Miami, Florida?

Are you registered to vote? Yes or No?

Who did you vote for in the last Presidential election?

What political party do you belong to? Republican Party? Democrat Party? Other?

What political ideology do you most strongly subscribe to? Conservative, liberal, or what?

What racial group do you identify with most strongly?

6. Anglo/Caucasian
7. Asian
8. Black
9. Native American
10. Bi- or Multi-racial
What ethnic group do you identify with most strongly?

How often do you come in contact with people of a different race or ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>during work hours?</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>during leisure hours?</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>while at home?</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Would you say that you are

5. an English speaker
6. bilingual, able speak Spanish and English equally well
7. Spanish speaker
8. a speaker of some language other than English and Spanish

How often do you speak Spanish

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>during work hours?</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>during leisure hours?</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>while at home?</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>while in public?</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What annual income bracket does your household belong to?

1. Less than $16,000
2. $16,000 - $25,999
3. $26,000 - $35,999
4. $36,000 - $45,999
5. $46,000 - $55,999
6. $56,000 - $65,999
7. $66,000 - $75,999
8. More than $76,000

Thank you for your help.
Your comments will be appreciated. Please include them in the space provided below.
Please return your completed questionnaire in the enclosed envelope to:
Research Office
c/o Jessica Pérez-Monforti
P.O. Box 6076
Spring Hill, FL 34611
Estimado Residente:

Hace tres semanas, le escribimos solicitando su opinión acerca del impacto estatal y local de la política de la lengua sobre la política de la ciudad de Miami y la búsqueda por la autoridad política en la comunidad Cubana local. Hasta ahora no hemos recibido su cuestionario contestado. Hemos realizado que puede que usted no ha podido tener tiempo para contestarlo. Sin embargo, nosotros apreciaríamos saber de usted.

El estudio está siendo conducido de manera que ciudadanos como usted pueda afectar las interpretaciones que los escolares hacen acerca de su ambiente político. Nosotros le estamos escribiendo de nuevo porque la utilidad del estudio depende en que nosotros recibamos un cuestionario de cada persona solicitada. Su nombre fue adquirido a través de un proceso Científico de estadística, en el cual usted tuvo igual oportunidad de ser elegido. En orden para que la información del estudio sea verdaderamente representativa, es esencial que cada persona en el ensayo regrese su cuestionario.

En el caso que su cuestionario haya sido extraviado, adjuntamos un reemplazo. Estaremos felices de contestar cualquier pregunta que usted tenga referente al estudio. Por favor, llame al 1-800-899-7845, extensión 82.

Sinceramente,

Jessica Pérez-Monforti
Directora del Proyecto
Opiniones sobre la Política Local y la Política de la Lengua: Un Estudio de los Residentes de Miami-Dade

Primavera 2001

Sí usted tiene alguna pregunta, por favor llame al 1-800-899-7845, extensión 82.

Por favor, una vez completado su cuestionario envíelo en el sobre adjunto a:
Research Office
c/o Jessica Pérez-Monforti
P.O. Box 6076
Spring Hill, FL 34611

Muchas gracias por su ayuda.
Para empezar, nos gustaría preguntarle un poco acerca de la política y economía local en Miami-Dade. No hay respuestas correctas ni incorrectas en esta sección, por favor siéntase libre de darnos su opinión. Por favor, circule solamente una respuesta por pregunta, al menos que sea instruido de otra manera.

¿Qué grupo de individuos u organización (es usted cree que tiene el mayor poder político e influencia en Miami?)

6. Políticos, oficiales electos
7. La radio Cubana
8. Consultores políticos
9. Partidos políticos
10. The Miami Herald/El Nuevo Heraldo

¿De los grupos mencionados a continuación, qué segmento de población de Miami piensa usted que tiene mayor poder político?

5. Anglos
6. Negros
7. Cubanos
8. Judíos

¿Qué grupo de individuos u organización (es cree usted que mantiene el mayor poder económico e influencia en Miami?)

6. Políticos, oficiales electos
7. La radio Cubana
8. Consultores políticos
9. Partidos políticos
10. The Miami Herald/El Nuevo Heraldo
¿Del grupo de individuos mencionados abajo, qué segmento de la población de Miami piensa usted que tiene el mayor poder económico?

5. Anglos  
6. Negros  
7. Cubanos  
8. Judíos

¿Cuál piensa usted que es el asunto político más importante que necesita ser dirigido en Miami-Dade?

¿Cuál piensa usted que es el segundo asunto político más importante que debe ser dirigido en Miami-Dade?

¿Cuál piensa usted que es el asunto político más importante que necesita ser dirigido en / por la comunidad Cubana en Miami?

¿Cuáles son sus percepciones generales referentes a la comunidad Cubana en Miami? ¿Qué siente usted?

6. Sentimientos muy positivos acerca de ellos  
7. Sentimientos positivos acerca de ellos  
8. Ningún sentimiento acerca de ellos  
9. Sentimientos negativos acerca de ellos  
10. Sentimientos muy negativos acerca de ellos.
¿Piensa usted qué la comunidad Cubana en Miami es un grupo cohesivo, un grupo dividido? ¿O qué tipo?

6. Un grupo muy unido
7. Un grupo algo unido
8. Un grupo algo dividido
9. Un grupo muy dividido
10. Comentarios:

¿En su opinión, qué cree usted que es lo que divide a la comunidad Cubana en Miami? Por favor, circule todas las respuestas que aplican.

12. Asuntos en la política de Miami-Dade
13. Asuntos en la política de U.S.
14. Asuntos en la política hacia Cuba
15. Ideología (Conservadora v Liberal)
16. Sexismo (hombres v mujeres)
17. Espacio generacional (vejez v juventud)
18. Relaciones locales con otros Hispanos no Cubanos
19. Relaciones locales con los Blancos no Hispanos
20. Relaciones locales con Negros no Hispanos
21. Relaciones locales con los Afro-Cubanos
22. Estado legal del exilio (1st v Marielitos)

¿Alternativamente qué piensa usted que sostiene unida a la comunidad? Por favor, circule todas las aplicables.

5. Experiencia Comunista en común
7. Nacionalidad en común (Ej. Cubana)
8. Experiencia inmigratoria en común
¿En su opinión, cuál segmento de la comunidad Cubana en Miami se quedó *atrás políticamente*? Por favor, circule todas las respuestas aplicables.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Afro-Cubanos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Cubanos que no hablan Ingles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Cubanos que no hablan Español</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Segunda generación Cubanos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Cubanos liberales</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Otros: ________________________________________________________

¿En su opinión, cuál segmento de la comunidad Cubana en Miami se quedó *atrás económicamente*? Por favor, circule todas las respuestas aplicables.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Afro-Cubanos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Cubanos que no hablan Ingles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Cubanos que no hablan Español</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Segunda generación Cubanos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Cubanos liberales</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Otros: ________________________________________________________

Ahora nos gustaría cambiar de las preguntas sobre políticas locales hacia unas pocas preguntas acerca de la política del Inglés oficial en la Florida.

¿Está usted familiarizado con la política oficial del Inglés en la Florida?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Muy familiarizado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Algo familiarizado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Algo desfamiliarizado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Muy desfamiliarizado</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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La propuesta fue convertida en una Ley en 1988 y según la Constitución de la Florida, Artículo II, Sección 9, el Inglés es la lengua oficial de la Florida. Esta se interpreta:

A) El Inglés es la Lengua Oficial del Estado de la Florida.
B) La legislatura debe tener el poder para hacer cumplir esta sección por una apropiada legislación.

¿Esta política afecta sus actividades diarias

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>En la casa?</th>
<th>Frecuentemente</th>
<th>Algunas veces</th>
<th>Raramente</th>
<th>Nunca</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>En el trabajo?</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En público?</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¿Cuáles son sus sentimientos referente a la política de la lengua oficial, el Inglés?

Usted piensa que la política es:

5. Excelente
6. Buena
7. Justa
8. Pobre

Piensa usted que la política del Inglés como lengua oficial es:

5. Muy importante
6. Importante
7. No muy importante
8. No es importante del todo
¿Piensa usted que la política del Inglés como lengua oficial de la Florida es
5. Muy discriminatoria?
6. Algo discriminatoria?
7. No muy discriminatoria?
8. No es del todo discriminatoria?

¿De todos los individuos mencionados a continuación, cuáles piensa usted que 
apoyan la política del Inglés como lengua oficial? Por favor, circule todas las
respuestas aplicables.
11. Afro-Cubanos
12. Cubanos que recientemente inmigraron
13. Cubanos que solamente hablan Español
14. Los que no hablan Español
15. Republicanos
16. Conservadores
17. Cubanos, segunda generación
18. Africanos-Norteamericanos
19. Hispanos no Cubanos
20. Oficiales negros electos

¿De los individuos mencionados a continuación, cuáles piensa usted que se oponen a 
la política del Inglés como lengua oficial? Por favor, circule todas las respuestas 
aplicables.
11. Afro-Cubanos
12. Cubanos que recientemente inmigraron
13. Cubanos que solamente hablan Español
14. Los que no hablan Español
15. Republicanos
16. Conservadores
17. Cubanos, segunda generación
18. Africanos-Norteamericanos
19. Hispanos no Cubanos
20. Oficiales negros electos
En la siguiente sección, hemos listado algunas de las cosas que las personas hacen para ayudar a un partido o candidato político para ganar una elección. Me pregunto si usted pudiera decir si hizo alguna de estas cosas durante la última campaña electoral. Por favor, circule “Sí” o “No.”

¿Le habló usted a algunas personas y les trató de demostrarle por qué deberían votar por uno de los partidos o candidatos?

Sí  No

¿Usted dio dinero o compró boletos u otra cosa para ayudar a la campaña de uno de los partidos o candidatos políticos?

Sí  No

¿Asistió usted a alguna de las reuniones políticas, asambleas, cenas o cualquier evento relacionado con la campaña?

Sí  No

¿Realizó algún trabajo por alguno de los partidos o candidatos?

Sí  No

¿Pertenece usted a algún club u organización política?

Sí  No

¿Usó usted algún botón de la campaña electoral o colocó alguna propaganda en su carro?

Sí  No
La siguiente serie de preguntas son para medir su conocimiento político. Por favor, conteste las siguientes preguntas lo mejor que usted pueda. Es de nuestro conocimiento que alguna de estas preguntas pueden ser difíciles de contestar, sin embargo es importante que usted responda tantas preguntas como le sea posible. Por favor, recuerde que toda la información que usted provea será confidencial. Su nombre no será incluido en ningún reporte de este estudio.

¿Quién es el Alcalde de Miami?

¿Quién es el Gerente de la Ciudad de Miami?

¿Quién es el Gobernador de la Florida?

¿Quiénes son los Senadores de la Florida?

¿Quién es el Vice-Presidente de los Estados Unidos?

¿Quién es el Presidente de los Estados Unidos?

En la sección final nos gustaría hacerle unas pocas preguntas acerca de usted.

¿Cuál es su género? ¿Masculino o Femenino?

¿Cuál es su fecha de nacimiento?
¿Cuál es el nivel más alto de educación que usted ha alcanzado? ¿Menos de años, algo de Colegio, un título de años, un título de años de Colegio o qué?

¿Cuál es su estado civil? ¿Soltero, casado, divorciado o qué?

¿Es usted padre o madre de familia? ¿Sí o no?

¿Cuál es su lugar de nacimiento?

¿Es usted ciudadano de los Estados Unidos?

¿En qué año vino a Miami, Florida?

¿Está usted registrado para votar? ¿Sí o No?

¿Por quién votó en la última elección Presidencial?


¿Cuál es su más fuerte ideología política, a la cual usted está subscrito? ¿Conservador, liberal o cuál?

¿Con cuál grupo étnico se identifica usted fuertemente?

6. Anglo/Caucásico
7. Asiático
8. Negro
9. Nativo Norteamericano
10. Bi-racial ó Multi-racial
¿Con cuál grupo étnico se identifica usted fuertemente?

¿Cuán a menudo usted se pone en contacto con gente de diferentes razas o etnias?

Frecuentemente  Algunas Veces  Raramente  Nunca

Durante horas de trabajo?

Durante su tiempo libre?

Cuándo está en público?

¿Diría que usted es

5. Habla Inglés solamente?
6. Bilingüe, que habla bien ambos idiomas, Inglés y Español?
7. Habla Español solamente?
8. Habla otra lengua en vez de Español e Inglés ?

¿Cuán a menudo usted habla Español

Frecuentemente  Algunas Veces  Raramente  Nunca

Durante horas de trabajo?

Durante su tiempo libre?

Mientras está en casa?

Cuándo está en público?

¿A cuál de los siguientes ingresos anuales pertenecen los habitantes de su casa?

5. Menos de $16,000  5. $46,000 - $55,999
6. $16,000 - $25,999  6. $56,000 - $65,999
7. $26,000 - $35,999  7. $66,000 - $75,999
8. $36,000 - $45,999  8. Más de $76,000
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Muchas gracias por su ayuda.
Sus comentarios serán apreciados. Por favor inclúyalos en el espacio provisto.

Por favor, una vez completado su cuestionario envíelo en el sobre adjunto a:
Research Office
c/o Jessica Pérez-Monforti
P.O. Box 6076
Spring Hill, Fl. 34611
APPENDIX C

FACE TO FACE INTERVIEWS

Advance Letters

OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

Dear:

Within a week or so, we will be calling you to arrange an interview as part of a research study. This is a survey of the economic and political leadership in Miami-Dade in which we are seeking to understand the impact of state and local language policies on Miami-Dade politics and the quest for political empowerment in the local Cuban community. I will use this information as a part of my dissertation research for my Ph.D.

We are writing in advance of our call because I have found that many people appreciate being advised that a research study is in progress and that they will be contacted.

During the interview, you will be asked questions concerning Florida’s Official English policy and the relative political and economic power of the Cuban community in Miami-Dade. Altogether, the interview should take about fifty minutes.

Your help and that of other political and economic leaders being asked to participate in this project is essential to making the study a success. We greatly appreciate it.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to ask. You may call me at 1-800-899-7845, access number 82 or contact me by e-mail at perez-monforti.1@osu.edu.

Cordially,
Jessica Pérez-Monforti
Project Director

April 30, 2001
II. Call Script

Hello, I am calling to make an appointment with __________________ for an interview. My name is Jessica Pérez-Monforti, from Ohio State University, I sent a letter about a week ago explaining I am a doctoral candidate conducting my Ph.D. research on local politics in Miami-Dade and that I would call for an appointment. If it is possible, I need approximately fifty minutes of __________ time, perhaps during May. Thank you for your help/can I call back at another time.

III. Call Record

2001 Miami-Dade Elites Survey

Q1 Respondent ID# __________________________________________
Q2 Address __________________________________________

Call Record

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Call #</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>CONTACT</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Result Codes

Appointment not made:  
01 No answer 06 Refusal
02 Call back, specific time 07 Reschedule
03 Call back, time not specified 08 Interview completed

Appointment made but interview not completed:
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IV. Face to Face Interview Script

Good (morning/afternoon/evening), my name is Jessica Pérez Monforti. I would like to thank you for talking with me today. As I stated in the letter, the purpose of this interview is to discuss several issues. First, I would like to hear your opinions about language policy in Florida and its effects in Miami. Second, I would like to hear your opinions about the Cuban community, generally speaking. Third, I would like to discuss local politics.

Are you familiar with Florida’s Official English policy? What do you know about it?

Proposition 11 was passed into law and, according to the Constitution for the State of Florida, Article II, Section 9, English is the official language of Florida. It reads:
(a) English is the official language of the State of Florida, (b) The legislature shall have the power to enforce this section by appropriate legislation. History—Proposed by Initiative Petition filed with the Secretary of State August 8, 1988; adopted 1988.

Do you know the history of the amendment? (IF SO, GO ON). WERE THEY IN OFFICE THEN?
What are your feelings about English Only policy? Do you think Florida’s Official English policy is discriminatory?

What was your involvement with this legislation?

Do you think any particular person, organization, or group of people support/oppose English Only? Who? Why?

Do you think Miami-Dade’s/Miami’s population is negatively affected by this legislation? How? Why?

What group of individuals or organization(s) do you believe holds the most political power and influence in Miami?

What about economic power and influence in Miami?

What segment of Miami’s population do you think has the most political power?

What about economic power and influence in Miami?

What are your general perceptions about the Cuban community in Miami?

Is it a cohesive group, a divided group or what?
Why do you think that?

What divides the community?

Issues on policy?

Domestic policy?

Is there classism within the community?

There are Afro-Cubans, White Cubans and so on in the community in Miami. Is there racism within the community?

Is there sexism in the community?

What holds the community together?

A common cause? A common nationality/ancestry? A common language?

What do you think is the most important political issue that needs to be addressed in/by Miami’s Cuban community?

In your opinion, what segment of Miami’s Cuban community is left behind politically?

Left behind economically?

What do you think are the most important political issues that need to be addressed in Miami-Dade/Miami?

Is there any particular issue that we have not yet discussed that you believe is politically important and would like to discuss?

Finally, some personal demographic questions . . .

What racial group do you identify with most strongly?

What ethnic group do you identify with most strongly?

Would you say that you are a conservative, moderate, or a liberal?

THANK YOU for your cooperation. Your participation was very important and valuable.
V. Thank You Cards

Dear Representative *****,

Thank you for taking the time to participate in my dissertation research concerning language policy and Miami-Dade politics a few weeks ago. Your responses were informative and your participation was vital in that it will allow for a more accurate picture of local politics in South Florida to be depicted. I thoroughly enjoyed our conversation. Thank you again.

Sincerely,

Jessica L. Pérez-Monforti
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