

Understanding the ABC's of Ugly Betty:
A Rhizomatic Analysis of the Illegal Immigrant Narrative in Ugly Betty, the Political
Economy of Latino(a) Television Audiences, and Fan Engagement with Television Texts

A dissertation presented to
the faculty of
the Scripps College of Communication of Ohio University

In partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree
Doctor of Philosophy

Cynara M. Medina

March 2011

© 2011 Cynara M. Medina. All Rights Reserved

This dissertation titled
Understanding the ABC's of Ugly Betty: A Rhizomatic Analysis of the Illegal Immigrant
Narrative in Ugly Betty, the Political Economy of Latino(a) Television Audiences,
and Fan Engagement with Television Texts

by
CYNARA M. MEDINA

has been approved for
the School of Media Arts and Studies
and the Scripps College of Communication by

Mia L. Consalvo
Associate Professor of Media Arts and Studies

Gregory J. Shepherd
Dean, Scripps College of Communication

ABSTRACT

MEDINA, CYNARA M. Ph.D. March 2011, Mass Communication

Understanding the ABC's of Ugly Betty: A Rhizomatic Analysis of the Illegal Immigrant Narrative, the Political Economy of Latino(a) Television Audiences, and Fan Engagement with Television Texts.

Director of Dissertation: Mia L. Consalvo

From 2006 to 2010, ABC broadcast *Ugly Betty*, a one-hour dramedy based on one of the most popular telenovelas of all time. This dissertation examines *Ugly Betty* from a rhizomatic perspective that brings together the areas of representation, political economy, and fandom studies. In this sense, *Ugly Betty* is considered as the jumping off point to examine contemporary television as complex system. It produces and circulates representations of social life, which are also industrial commodities in economic exchanges, and catalysts for fan activity and participation. A rhizomatic perspective would argue that all of these processes are intertwined, and that accounting for these connections acknowledges the complexity of social life.

Textual analysis is the method used in this dissertation. In textual analysis, the goal is to uncover the most likely interpretation for a particular text, which is why emphasis is placed on understanding the context in which this text is produced, circulates, and is interpreted by its audiences. In this dissertation, the author conducted three such textual analyses. The first one looks *Ugly Betty* as an industrial commodity that came to

the screen as the consciousness industries as a whole turned their attention to Latinos(as), and the television industry began producing more Latino(a) themed content. The chapter also looks at the challenges of producing and broadcasting television shows in a post-network era (Lotz, 2007), characterized by rapid technological change, audience erosion, and widespread fragmentation. The second analysis focus specifically on *Ugly Betty* as an example of Latino(a) representation, by looking at the illegal immigration storyline that aired during the first and second seasons of the show. This chapter utilizes the concept of the myth, and posits the melting pot as a myth that allows *Ugly Betty* to normalize illegal immigration, by incorporating illegal Latino(a) immigrants into a broader narrative of nationhood and identity. The final textual analysis addresses fan textual production, as present on the Television without Pity, a popular site for television fans.

The concluding chapter of this dissertation presents the author's reflections about the process of writing from a rhizomatic perspective. As an approach, it supports the constant need to re-assess assumptions.

Approved: _____

Mia L. Consalvo

Associate Professor of Media Arts and Studies

*To my grandmother, Elida Leiva de Matus.
Mamita, I did become a doctor,
just not the kind you thought I would.*

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

How can I even begin to thank all the people who have been involved in this project? I know I would have never completed it on my own, and I'm ever so grateful to everyone for their support, comments, suggestions, inspiration, and for putting up with me for the past four years.

My mother always encouraged me to learn and to think critically. She has always supported my academic endeavors, which have often led me far from the family home in Jinotepe. Mom has been with me the longest, and though she never would have guessed that I'd end up as a television scholar, she has never made me feel that what I do now is less worthy than what I would be doing had I not dropped out of medical school. For that, I am eternally grateful.

Ohio University has been my home away from home for six years now, and I have had the privilege of working and learning from a fantastic group of people, both faculty and staff, including Paula Carpenter, Janet Williams, Roger Cooper, Greg Newton, Karen Riggs, Beth Novak, Eric Williams, and the members of my committee, Dr. Brad Jokisch and Dr. Jerry Miller.

I'm especially grateful to Mia Consalvo, my advisor, and to Jenny Nelson. Mia took me on as a student, mentored me, read through multiple drafts of this dissertation, and reeled me in when I went overboard. Jenny introduced me to Deleuze and Guattari,

and my last summer in Athens would have not been the same without her. I know that watching the World Cup would not have been nearly as fun.

My time in Athens, Ohio would have been very different without all the friends who made this small Appalachian town feel like home. Thanks Todd Harper, Nate Dutton, Melissa Hendricks, Virginia Lacayo, and Tiffany Teofilo. Even more thanks to the gang at Smiling Skull Saloon. Only one word can describe the Smiling Skull crowd: You are family, and I will never forget any of you. I could never forget a bar where you can take your mother to hang out with bikers, celebrate your birthday, your graduation, and even host a baby shower.

Finally, I am ever thankful for Sarah Harrelson. She changed my life for the better, and I am proud to call her my partner.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	III
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	VI
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
WATCHING <i>UGLY BETTY</i> : PRODUCTION, REPRESENTATIONS, AND FANS.....	4
ADDRESSING THE QUESTIONS: CHAPTER ORGANIZATION.....	8
CHAPTER 2: METHODOLOGY	13
RESEARCH DESIGN	22
CHAPTER 3: THE POLITICAL ECONOMY OF UGLY BETTY	31
THE COMMODITY AUDIENCE: A POLITICAL ECONOMY PERSPECTIVE	33
<i>The Political Economy of the Latino(a) Audience.....</i>	<i>36</i>
<i>The Latino(a) Audience: Creating a Desirable Demographic.</i>	<i>38</i>
<i>Refining the Latino(a) Commodity Audience: the Language Preference</i>	
<i>Debate.....</i>	<i>40</i>
<i>Creating Latino(a) Content: the A.K.A Pablo Experience</i>	<i>44</i>
BRINGING LATINO(A) CONTENT TO PRIMETIME: THE CASE OF UGLY BETTY.....	46
<i>From YSBLF to Ugly Betty.</i>	<i>51</i>
<i>The Narrative of Ugly Betty: an Experiment in Glocalization</i>	<i>54</i>

A RHETORIC OF AUTHENTICITY: UGLY BETTY AND THE US-LATINO(A)	
EXPERIENCE.....	59
<i>The Rhetoric of Beauty, and Ugly Betty's General Audience Appeal.</i>	61
LIFE AFTER THE FIRST SEASON: UGLY RATINGS, SYNDICATION, AND	
CANCELLATION.....	63
<i>The End of the Cycle</i>	65
CONCLUSIONS	70
CHAPTER 4: ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION IN THE MELTING POT: A	
TEXTUAL ANALYSIS OF UGLY BETTY.	73
MYTHS: CONSTRUCTING THE PAST AND PRESERVING THE FUTURE.	74
AMERICAN MYTHOLOGIES: WHAT THE MELTING POT TEACHES US ABOUT	
IMMIGRATION.	77
<i>The Melting Pot as a Recurrent Narrative in American history.....</i>	78
<i>Critiquing the Melting Pot.....</i>	82
LEARNING FROM “THE GOLDBERGS” AND “THE COSBY SHOW”	86
<i>Latinos(as) in the Melting Pot: a Brief History of Representations</i>	87
<i>Redefining Latinos(as) on Television: Creative Control and Storytelling</i>	90
“OH MY GOD! WE HAVE AN ILLEGAL ALIEN! TURN THE TV OFF”	93
<i>“La Familia” in Ugly Betty.....</i>	99

<i>Baseball, Oprah and Amnesty: The Immigrant Rite of Passage in Ugly Betty</i>	105
<i>Into the “Labyrinth of Solitude”: Images of Mexico and Mexicans and Rites of Passage</i>	112
<i>“Sometimes, I miss my flan:” The Telenovela Connection</i>	117
<i>Citizenship After the Writer’s Strike</i>	120
CONCLUSIONS	123
CHAPTER 5: SAVVY FANDOM: CRITICAL VIEWING ON TELEVISION	
WITHOUT PITY, A CASE STUDY OF UGLY BETTY	127
SPARING THE SHARK: TWoP’S BRAND IDENTITY AND SITE DESIGN	129
<i>Savvy Fandom: Critical Engagement on TWoP</i>	134
THE TWoP EXPERIENCE: WATCHING UGLY BETTY WITH SAVVY FANS.....	137
<i>“Will the Real Betty Please Stand Up”</i>	140
<i>Spoiling Betty: “Collective Intelligence in Practice”</i>	146
<i>TWoP at the End of Ugly Betty</i>	151
CONCLUSIONS	158
CHAPTER 6: FINAL THOUGHTS	163

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

This project began almost four years ago, as a question about Latino(a)¹ immigrant identity and its representation in American television. Over the years, it evolved into its present form, which brings together the original question, the political economy of television, and fandom's engagement with television. All three elements are intertwined. They are mutually dependent as there would be no television as a text without television as an industrial system of production and distribution. Moreover, there can be no discussion of television's cultural significance without referring to television viewers, whether or not they self-identify as fans. Recognizing the enmeshment of these three areas acknowledges that, "Television is not just a simple technology or appliance – like a toaster – that has sat in our homes for more than fifty years" (Lotz, 2007). On the contrary, television is "dense, rich, and complex" (Newcomb & Hirsch, 2000, p. 571). *Ugly Betty* provides a starting point to explore the intricacies of production, representation, and popular reception from a rhizomatic perspective.

Rhizomatic thinking reflects Deleuze and Guattari's insights about knowledge, and its production (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1988). For them, Western modes of inquiry discourage innovation, experimentation, and complexity. Rather, they foster linear thinking, academic monism, repetition, and reductionism. However, social life is not simple. It is complex, messy, and often surprising. Deleuze and Guattari recognized as much, and described it through the metaphor of the rhizome.

In nature, rhizomes are very resilient plant roots that are able to survive underground, lying dormant through the winter months and bursting forth with new

growth each spring. Their offshoots can generate new plants, spreading themselves in surprising and unexpected directions. For Deleuze and Guattari, these qualities aptly describe innovative thinking and a new way to generate knowledge. They encourage their readers to “Follow the plants.”

You start by delimiting a first line consisting of circles of convergence around successive singularities; then you see whether inside that line new circles of convergence establish themselves, with new points located outside the limits and in other directions. Write, form a rhizome, increase your territory by deterritorialization, extend the line of flight to the point where it becomes an abstract machine covering the entire plane of consistency (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1988, p. 11).

Following the rhizome describes television in multiple dimensions, which is what the present work aims to do. Indeed, this dissertation presupposes that television shows, the industry that produces and distributes them, and the audiences that watch, enjoy, and sometimes critique them, are rhizomatic. In other words, a show like *Ugly Betty* embodies inter-related processes of meaning making, production, and media use that are occurring within the rapidly changing context of “post-network era” television (Lotz, 2007, Introduction & Ch. 1).

Lotz (2007) describes contemporary television as having evolved from the network era into a post-network era. In the network era, three networks dominated the American airwaves, and television was truly a mass medium. In the post-network era, this is no longer the case. Television is more aptly described as a niche medium, in which

choice has fragmented the audience into smaller segments. These audiences, furthermore, can avail themselves to new technologies like the Internet, DVRs, smart phones, and tablets, which increase their control over what, how, when, and where they watch television. These changes warrant new ways of thinking about television and its cultural significance. Indeed, some scholars, like Lotz, have proposed revising well-established theories about television.² A rhizomatic approach to television studies, as developed in this dissertation attempts to deal with a rapidly-changing industry as it considers new audience segments to produce content for, experiments with different forms of content delivery, wrestles with the complexities of audience measurement and the challenges of advertising, and re-evaluates the significance of audience engagement with popular culture. *Ugly Betty*, in this sense, is a vehicle to explore a moment in the post-network era. The questions that guide the research are as follows:

1. How does *Ugly Betty* work within structures of technology, economics, and institutions of television production and distribution?
2. How does *Ugly Betty* help us understand the complexities of national identity, ethnicity and citizenship, though the narrative of immigration and assimilation?
3. How do television fans re-appropriate *Ugly Betty* through critical engagement that expands the pleasure of watching television?

Culture emerges in two arenas: in the mind of individuals, and as public manifestations, which are “made available through social life by particular people, to particular people” (Hannerz, 1992, p. 7). *Ugly Betty* is a public manifestation of American culture, and this

project seeks to untangle what it can tell us about life, social-cultural, industrial, and technological change in contemporary America.

Watching *Ugly Betty*: production, representations, and fans

In May of 2006, ABC announced to viewers and advertisers that its fall lineup would include a one-hour comedy called *Ugly Betty*. The new show was the American adaptation of *Yo soy Betty, la Fea* (YSBLF), a hugely popular Colombian telenovela, produced and broadcasted by Radio Cadena Nacional (RCN) in the late 90s (Égüez, 2006). YSBLF's creator, Fernando Gaitán, had conceived this telenovela as a commentary on Colombian's obsession with beauty (De la Fuente, 2006c), and made its heroine, Beatriz "Betty" Pinzon Solano, purposefully *ugly*.³ However, Betty's heart, brains, and moral character made her an audience favorite. She struggled and prevailed against the odds, recovered from heartbreak, rose to the top of the corporate ladder in the fashion industry, and eventually married the leading man. It was an unlikely turn of events in real life, but Betty's Cinderella story was typical for a telenovela.

And audiences loved it. Colombians, for example, flocked to RCN during YSBLF original run, and international audiences also responded to the story once it reached international syndication. However, YSBLF's most impressive achievements came from its sale as a format that could be remade locally. Indeed, by the time *Ugly Betty* premiered, nine localized versions were already airing in over 70 countries (Breton, 2007; De la Fuente, 2006c). This makes YSBLF "the first telenovela to have been remade worldwide" (Bellos, 2007). ABC did not choose *Ugly Betty* at random. It was a strategic decision, and a response to the context. The network, in other words, took a chance on

one of the most popular telenovelas of all time in hopes to attract Latino(a) viewership. But why Latinos(as)? Addressing this question necessitates looking back to the first years of the millennium, and to the 2000 Decennial Census.

In 2001, the US Census Bureau began publishing the results of the Decennial Census, and Americans learned that the demographic make up of the nation was changing dramatically. According to the Census Bureau, Latinos(as) were the youngest and fastest growing demographic group in the United States (Guzman, 2001). Soon after, independent research corroborated and expanded on the Census' findings.⁴ The research painted Latinos(as) in a different light. Many were assimilating, joining the middle class, and generally speaking, they were becoming a political and economic force (Bean, Trejo, Crapps, & Tyler, 2001; Pew Hispanic Center, 2004; 2006). American television networks acknowledged these changes, and responded as they had before. They revised their representations, and developed new content and characters (Dow, 1996). This is especially true when it comes to minority representations, as networks assume that minority viewers want to see themselves on television. In this sense, developing a show like *Ugly Betty* was a reasonable choice for ABC, at least according to Stephen McPherson, one of its top executives:⁵

We're a broadcast network and we're trying to reach out to as many people as we can. You look at the Hispanic marketplace, and it's exploding. It's absolutely an advantage for us to have people in front and behind the camera who reflect a multicultural society (Adalian, 2006a, p.A2).

This quote reflects the reality of commercial television production. It is a highly competitive business in which networks seek any advantage they can get. Adapting *YSBLF* had built in advantages when it came to Latinos(as) in general. The original telenovela was familiar to them, and it had proven successful. However, ABC was not aiming for Latinos(as) broadly defined. The network wanted to establish itself among acculturated Latino(a) viewers, which is why its version of *YSBLF* recreated the experiences of Latinos(as) who had grown up in America, but more importantly, it humanized an illegal immigrant and his family. Indeed, Betty's father, Ignacio Suarez, starts off as an illegal immigrant, yet proves himself worthy and receives American citizenship.

Ugly Betty had other advantages, though. It is a story about upward mobility, and the search of the American dream. Furthermore, it often addressed contemporary issues of concern, placing them within a campy, escapist narrative. In this sense, *Ugly Betty* exemplifies how television can act as a "cultural forum" (Newcomb & Hirsch, 2000). As such, television brings issues of concern to the public. It is a medium in which "the raising of questions is as important as the answering of them" (Newcomb & Hirsch, 2000, p. 565).

In terms of upward mobility, *Ugly Betty*'s heroine, Betty Suarez (*America Ferrera*) is another homely, young woman, determined to rise to the top of her field. This time, Betty works at a fashion magazine (*Mode*), and she is the odd person out. In the superficial world of fashion, she is short, stumpy, and has curves. She is absolutely devoid of a fashion sense whatsoever, at least when judged against contemporary

standards. Yet Betty manages to land a job, as the assistant to the editor in chief at *Mode* magazine. His name is Daniel Meade (*Eric Mabius*), and he is a notorious playboy. Daniel, though, only sleeps with super models, which is why his father, Bradford Meade (*Alan Dale*), decides to hire Betty. As the owner of *Mode*, Bradford wants to avoid a sexual harassment suit. He hires Betty because Daniel would never sleep with an ugly woman. He is proven right, as Daniel balks at Betty's appearance. He tries to make her quit by humiliating her and making her life miserable. However, Daniel soon realizes Betty's worth. She is resourceful and extremely loyal. Both characters develop a deep bond. They become friends and allies, and together, they face the challenges of running a successful fashion publication.

On the other hand, *Ugly Betty's* treatment of contemporary issues was wide ranging. To begin, *Ugly Betty* could be considered as a backlash to the *beauty myth* (Wolf, 1991) because Betty is not a conventional beauty. She is Latina, curvaceous, and short, and even after a gradual transformation, she remains Latina, curvaceous, and short. Betty, furthermore, is assertive in spite of her outward appearance and regardless of how much she is mocked for it. Her co-workers, Marc St. James (*Michael Urie*) and Amanda Tannen (*Becky Newton*), for example, are particularly cruel to Betty. They often make fun of her eating habits, her culture, and her social standing. *Mode's* creative director, Wilhelmina Slater (*Vanessa Williams*) looks down on Betty as well. However, the constant mockery only makes Betty's values stand out more.

Ugly Betty offers a rich representation of American life, albeit one cloaked in campiness. In terms of narrative, its intertwining plot twists could be fun to watch, but

also very frustrating. For instance, Daniel's transgendered brother, Alexis (*Rebecca Romjin*) returns from the dead as a woman. His mother, Claire Meade (*Judith Light*), kills a romantic rival while under the influence of a toxic perfume, and his nemesis, Wilhelmina Slater, constantly hatches elaborate schemes to take over *Mode*. Viewers reacted to these developments with a mixture of admiration and dismay. In the end, though, *Ugly Betty* became too farfetched even for devoted fans. The show hemorrhaged audience, and it was cancelled in the spring of 2010. This dissertation traces the rise and fall of *Ugly Betty*, through a three-pronged analysis, described in the following section.

Addressing the questions: Chapter organization

As stated previously, this dissertation takes on a rhizomatic perspective. Chapter two expands on what this means in terms of developing a research methodology. Textual analysis is the primary approach. Textual analysis is a common method in cultural studies. However, the method is often misunderstood. It is regularly confused with discourse analysis and with content analysis, as both of these methods deal with the interpretation of texts. Chapter two provides a definition of the method, traces its origins within cultural studies, links its theoretical foundation to the work of Stuart Hall, and describes its procedures. The chapter also outlines the research design that was used for each of the individual analytical chapters that make up this study.

Radway (1991) argues that, in order to understand how people interpret texts, one should grasp the “social and material” context (p. 11) in which these texts are produced. Accordingly, chapter three reconstructs the context that led to *Ugly Betty*. Specifically, the chapter examines the political economy of the show from the perspective of the

Latino(a) audience as a commodity. This perspective tells us that in a commercial television system, television shows are the “free lunch” (Smythe, 1981/2006, p 242). Their role is to entice viewers, with promises of entertainment, information, and/or education. Yet the key relationship is not between viewers and networks; it is between networks and advertisers. Networks derive their revenue from their ability to pull in desirable demographics. More importantly, networks need to objectively demonstrate that they can attract these segments of the population. The Nielsen ratings allow networks to do so. Yet the ratings have several flaws that hamper their ability to measure the audience in general. Chapter three describes the ideological and technological challenges of audience measurement, and the industrial, economic, and social factors that led to a redefinition of the Latino(a) audience as a condition for *Ugly Betty*.

It should be noted that Nielsen did show much interest in Latinos(as) at all until the 1990s, when it began measuring Spanish-speaking Latinos for Univision and Telemundo through a separate ratings system. Since the assumption was that Latinos(as) did not speak anything other than Spanish, it did not make much sense to include them in the National Television Index (McManus, 1989; Rodriguez, 1997). With demographic change, though, a new rhetoric about Latinos(as) has developed. Arlene Davila (2008) describes it as the Latino(a) spin, which is a purposeful attempt at cleansing the Latino(a) image from negative representations. Chapter three reviews examples of Latino(a) spin, inasmuch as they justify the production and broadcast of Latino(a) themed television content like *Ugly Betty*.

Though chapter three introduces the problem and challenges of Latino(a) representation, chapter four deals with a specific case thereof, by looking at the illegal immigration storyline in *Ugly Betty*. To be certain, *Ugly Betty* followed *YSBLF* up to an extent. In other ways, though, it was its own show, with stories that reflect an American viewpoint, cultural sensitivity, and experience. One of the ways in which *Ugly Betty* acknowledges the American experience is by addressing illegal immigration.

Immigration in general is embedded into the American consciousness. After all, the nation describes itself as a melting pot and as a land of opportunity for immigrants. Chapter four addresses the immigrant experience from the perspective of the myth, and examines the inclusions and omissions intertwined within the myth of the melting pot. In this sense, *Ugly Betty* is a groundbreaking representation of the immigrant experience. The show takes up one of the most controversial subjects in contemporary America, and creates a storyline whereby an illegal immigrant becomes an American. In this idealized narrative, the illegal immigrant cleanses himself, by re-enacting the same journey that has transformed immigrants into Americans since the times of the Mayflower and the Arabella. This chapter discusses the myth as the inspiration for American stories about immigration, and as an encouragement for immigrants to assimilate. The chapter also addresses the negotiations and limits of representation by looking at an example of the narrative of Latino(a) incorporation into the melting pot.

Chapter five deals with critical reception and textual production from the perspective of the fans. They are paradoxical figures in popular consciousness. In fact, the word *fan* usually evokes images of excess, of *Trekkies* and *Potterheads*, who are

socially inept, but possess wide knowledge of irrelevant trivia about popular culture. Fans have been described as “poachers”, as rogue, oppositional readers, who derive pleasure from re-appropriating texts to fit needs and expectations (Jenkins, 1992). That said, not all fans are oppositional. Furthermore, as the media landscape becomes more complex, fandom’s relationship to popular culture follows suit, which is why Jenkins (2007), among others, has called for a redefinition of the ways in which scholars view and characterize fandom.

Chapter five examines fan critiques of *Ugly Betty* as present on Television Without Pity (TWP), which is a very popular destination for television fans. TWP’s popularity stems from its unique take on television. Unlike other fan sites, TWP encourages its users to mock popular shows with relish. Previous research about the site has noted this quality, and several authors have suggested that it fosters critical viewing (Andrejevic, 2008; J. Gray, 2005; Stilwell, 2003). Chapter five builds upon this pre-existing literature. It examines TWP discussions about *Ugly Betty* utilizing the concept of savvy fandom to describe the nature of fan engagement in the era of the Long Tail (C. Anderson, 2006). Savvy fandom is defined as a critical awareness of the constructed quality of television, which individuals can use to present themselves publicly as knowledgeable media consumers. This chapter explores the relationship between savvy fandom and new technologies of communication. It argues that, choice increases some fans may be less willing to remain loyal to shows they initially like. Chapter five traces the rise and fall of *Ugly Betty* on TWP as an example of savvy fandom.

Chapter six offers general conclusions and lessons that the author has derived from the process of writing a rhizomatic dissertation, and about the role popular culture plays in everyday life. Indeed, shows like *Ugly Betty* reflect the society in which they emerge. Their systematic study can help us understand what a society values at specific points in time, how and why cultural products reflect these values, and how people engage and use them to develop idiosyncratic relationships, structures, and identities.

CHAPTER 2: METHODOLOGY

The study of mass communication is an interdisciplinary field; its methods and approaches are those prevalent in sociology, political science, and psychology (Lu, 2007). According to Lu, the use of quantitative methods has increased in sociology and psychology since the 1940s, a shift linked to the development of scientific disciplines in general. Cooper, Potter, and Dupangne also reported the prevalence of quantitative approaches in mass communication research. They indicate that the editorial policies of the major journals could suggest that quantitative research is preferable to qualitative approaches (1994). However these authors also remind media educators that:

It is incumbent upon mass media programs to offer a diversity of research methodology courses, including statistics, ethnography, critical/cultural studies, law, and history, because the range of research topics within our field appears to be broadening rather than narrowing (Cooper, et al. 1994).

Quantitative studies have the advantage of being replicable and generalizable. However, researchers who cannot reconcile the study of human nature with the positivist-empiricist tradition are more drawn to qualitative methodologies. Paradoxically, many qualitative researchers rarely explain their methods in detail (Pauly, 1991). Indeed, they often fail to disclose basic ontological and epistemological assumptions that serve as the basis to define method, theory, and object of inquiry.

In the spirit of disclosure, here are the assumptions for this project. First, the grand theories of communication, such as Agenda Setting, Framing, or Uses and Gratifications have limited explicatory power for studies that consider production,

distribution and social uses of meaning making as intertwined processes, therefore such theories might not take us beyond exploring communication as the linear “transmission of a pre-existing message,” rather than as a process in which people “compete and collaborate in constructing reality” (Pauly, 1991, p. 3). Second, because of the limitations of grand theories, we should think of research not so much in terms of finding the *right* theory, but in terms of assembling a theoretical framework. The building blocks for such an assemblage can be found in any discipline, not just the one in which we are trained. Third, we need to acknowledge our personal position and biases, rather than place all our faith on our ability to uncover “specific truths about which all reasonable people can at least temporarily agree” (Law, 2004, p. 9). This is a matter of acknowledging that “there is a world out there and that knowledge and our other activities need to respond to its ‘out-thereeness’” (Law, 2004, p. 7).

Following these assumptions, this project is inspired by the concept of the rhizome. Rhizoanalysis has been applied to different fields of study, including education (Alvermann, 2000; Gough, 2006; Honan, 2007), migration (Bottomley, 1998), and media studies (Bosch, 2003; Carpentier, 2008). What these examples have in common is that they move away from simplicity and lineal thought, into complexity and interconnectedness. Rhizonalysis encourages research that looks at different sides of a social phenomenon; it seeks connections between diverse disciplines, and challenges researchers to find new and creative ways of conducting scholarly inquiry.

The rhizome is a metaphor proposed by Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari in *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia* (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1988). It is

an epistemology, since it deals with alternative ways of producing knowledge. Western traditions consider that knowledge is like a tree from which the roots grow in only one direction to provide a firm and deep anchor. However, roots do not behave in this way in nature: “Roots are tap roots with a more multiple, lateral, and circular system of ramification” (p. 5). By adopting a rhizomatic outlook, Deleuze and Guattari encourage us to think of knowledge as a living being that materializes as multiple and surprising incarnations:

Plants with roots or radicles may be rhizomorphic in other aspects altogether: the question is whether plant life in its specificity is not entirely rhizomatic. Even some animals are, in their pack form. Rats are rhizomes. Burrows are too, in all of their functions of shelter, supply, movement, evasion, and breakout. The rhizome itself assumes very diverse forms, from ramified surface extension in all directions to concretion into bulbs and tubers (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1988, p. 6-7).

In the tradition of Western academic inquiry, arboreal thinking has been the prevalent metaphor and method for knowledge construction. Arboreal thinking, as opposed to rhizomatic thought, constructs knowledge by building over the work of the authorities in a particular field. Hence, inquiry becomes a matter of latching on to *the right theory* and exploring it deeply, to the exclusion and silencing of other perspectives. The right theory can lead us to *the truth*, a singular and verifiable explanation that emerges if we correctly apply a research method. A textbook example of arboreal thinking is what Edward Said described in *Orientalism*. The Orient, Said argues, is a European invention. European

popular texts, travel narratives, scientific works, letters and diaries created a discourse that was eventually canonized in scholarly works. Sacy, Renan, and Lane, all of whom Said discusses at length, became the authorities of Orientalism:

What Sacy, Renan, and Lane did was to place Orientalism on a scientific and rational basis. This entailed not only their own exemplary work but also the creation of a vocabulary and ideas that could be used impersonally by anyone who wished to become an Orientalist. Their inauguration of Orientalism was a considerable feat. It made possible a scientific terminology; it banished obscurity and instated a special form of the Orientalist as a central authority *for* the Orient [...]; above all, the work of the inaugurators carved out a field of study and a family of ideas which in turn could form a community of scholars whose lineage, traditions, and ambitions were at once internal to the field and external enough for general prestige (Said, 1978/1979, p. 122).

Generations of orientalist scholars have referred back to the founders, privileging authority over “actuality” (Said, 1978/1979, p. 177). The risk of repetition is inherent, as Said points out, because writing becomes re-writing, instead of creating new discourses or even reporting anything different grasped from observation and reflection. Academic monism follows, since arboreal thinking trains us to seek a primary cause, a root, a fountain, and a canonical explanation that is fixed within a particular discipline.

Rhizomatic thinking, on the other hand, stresses multiplicity because “We do not have units (*unités*) of measure, only multiplicities or varieties of measurement” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1988, p. 8). Indeed, neglecting multiplicity merely replicates known

answers to social phenomena, rather than searching for alternatives. This is what Deleuze and Guattari refer to as “overcoding” (1980/1988, p. 8).

Deleuze and Guattari suggest that rhizomes “never allow themselves to be overcoded” (1988, p. 9). Rhizomatic thinking constantly reassesses itself, steering away from the singular and the canonical, from binary logics, and from linear thought. In their place, rhizomatic thinking favors experimentation. It proposes that there can be multiple explanations for social phenomena (Alvermann, 2000; Honan, 2006), we should not canonize a particular explanation as the ultimate and unquestionable truth. In this sense, rhizomatic thinking recognizes diverse viewpoints, entryways, and paths, which we take as we construct meaning. In fact, Deleuze and Guattari compare rhizomes to maps, suggesting that they can be read in any direction. A map is “open and connectable in all of its dimensions; it is detachable, reversible, susceptible to constant modification” (Deleuze and Guattari, 1980/1988, p. 12).

Though these ideas may seem completely anti-authority, Deleuze and Guattari are not advocating the total overthrow of the structure of Western thought. On the contrary, they remind us that even though we are creating maps, not tracings, we should place the tracing back onto the map. By doing so, we are able to discover breaches, disruptions and inconsistencies that may lead us to new questions. Furthermore, such breaches indicate the need to find connections between different disciplines because concepts “deterritorialize” and “reterritorialize” (1980/1988, p. 13).

One very promising application of rhizomatic thought is textual analysis. Rhizoanalysis does not consider texts as “signified or signifier” (Deleuze and Guattari,

1988, p. 4), and they are not isolated units of meaning. Rather, texts are assemblages that function within a context or contexts, connect with other texts, institutions, contexts, and audiences, and change through these connections. Consequently, instead of asking what a text means, rhizomatic textual analysis would look at how it functions and what connections and multiplicities it embodies. It would consider the text as a living entity that “can be connected to anything other, and must be” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1988, p. 7). The analysis forges these connections to produce an interpretation of a social phenomenon that would not have any material form otherwise. Indeed, a rhizomatic outlook would suggest that social reality becomes meaningful inasmuch we are able to represent it through language (Hall, 1997).

Textual analysis is widely used in cultural studies, media studies and other disciplines. Nevertheless, it is often ill defined, as the term “textual analysis” has been applied to different qualitative methods for the study of texts, including discourse analysis and qualitative content analysis (Curtin, 1995; Fursich, 2009; McKee, 2003). Textual analysis is neither of these. Rather, it is “a type of qualitative analysis that, beyond the manifest content of media, focuses on the underlying ideological and cultural assumptions of the text” (Fursich, 2009, p. 240). In other words, textual analysis considers the text as a means to understand how ideology and power operate within specific contexts and cultures to influence the social construction of reality.

Though different disciplines have influenced textual analysis, Stuart Hall’s work offers a significant theoretical basis for the method (Curtin, 1995; Fursich, 2009; McKee, 2003). For Hall (1980/2006), media do not relay reality; they represent it. This suggests

purposeful activity, since representation entails selecting, editing, framing, composing, and other practices that produce meanings. Representation furthermore, implies acts of exclusion, as media producers, consciously or unconsciously, “operate only within the limited range of dominant ideology, which permits a narrow diversity of meaning but no alternative readings” (Curtin, 1995, p. 9). “Signifying practices” is the term Hall uses to refer to these processes, adding that they make it necessary for scholars to go beyond manifest messages, and into the analysis “ideological structuration” (Hall, 1988, p. 64).

Hall describes communication is a process that involves the stages of “production, circulation, distribution/consumption, [and] reproduction” (Hall, 1980/2006, p. 163), through which meanings are produced. These moments are linked and interdependent, but also distinctive, since each site has its own modalities of operation. At the site of production, translating events and/or ideas into a discursive form (“encoding”) creates messages. Such messages result from framing, production routines, technical, organizational and institutional factors, professional practices, and assumptions about the nature of the audience. Such assumptions determine how, and which, stories will be told and distributed to the audiences. At the site of reception, audiences “decode” the messages they receive, that is, they re-translate the code “into social practices” or “meaning” without which “there can be no “consumption”, need satisfaction, use, or effects (Hall, 1980/2006, p. 164-165). However, producers are not ensured that decoding will mirror encoding. Dominant, negotiated and/or oppositional readings of the message are possible because the relationship between message producers/encoders and

audiences/decoders, as well as their understandings and uses of the code, are asymmetrical.

In the same vein, audiences are very likely to adopt a “dominant reading” of the text. This may be a consequence of the pervasiveness of certain codes within particular communities and/or cultures, which “has the (ideological) effect of concealing the practices of coding which are present” (Hall, 1980/2006, p. 167). In other words, receivers are likely to follow the dominant reading – also termed “preferred” reading -- not because an unseen hand imbues media texts with a magical persuasive power, but because receivers are habituated – that is, socialized – to recognize the code without challenging it. This is very significant for the praxis of textual analysis, since it allows a definition of a clear goal for the method: uncovering the most likely interpretation of a text (McKee, 2003, p. 63).

Textual analysis begins by choosing a suitable text, which for Curtin (1995) depends on the text’s potential to “reveal the larger cultural implications of its production” (p. 24). Next, the analyst must “decenter” the text (p. 9-10), which implies acknowledging texts as merely the means for an analysis of social practices of meaning construction. Decentering the text leads to an examination its production, its context, and the historical development of the discourses that it embodies. Furthermore, it should be followed by deconstruction, in order to identify ideological assumptions, and explore the mechanisms used to convey meanings. These mechanisms may be literary devices (metaphors, metonym, and synecdoche), syntactic structures, or narrative forms (genre, etc). However, the analysis should also address what is not being said (structured

absences) because if encoding sets some limits to decoding, the voices and stories that are shut out, or limited, set the boundaries of what is considered legitimate and acceptable. The final step in the textual analysis process is to reconstruct the text, in order to present observations as a coherent argument that can identify the most likely interpretation. Only then can the analysis be considered complete (Curtin, 1996; McKee, 2003).

Textual analysis cannot be conducted effectively without an understanding of the context in which the text is produced, circulates, and is consumed. An examination of the context, which can be conducted by looking at the “relevant intertexts” (McKee, 2003, p. 114), can help us identify the most likely interpretations. Intertexts are public texts that relate, interpret, critique, describe, or transform the text being analyzed. Intertexts are not meant to be an absolute reflection of how texts are received, but do provide “ways of thinking about texts in order to make sense of things” (McKee, 2003, p. 98). By engaging relevant intertexts, we become familiar with the sense-making culture where these texts originate, which strengthens the legitimacy of our arguments (McKee, 2003).

This study analyzes *Ugly Betty* as a cultural product that is specific to the United States. The show is a text, an artifact produced by the cultural industries, from which we can derive meaning (McKee, 2003). Textual analysis is not the only method that can be used to address the questions of this study. Many audience researchers, for example, claim that their methods provide a better picture of sense-making practices through interaction with real people. However, focus groups, interviews, and surveys have their own disadvantages. On the one hand, these methods produce texts — representations of “reality” requiring interpretation. On the other hand, informants may be influenced by

their perception of what the researcher wants to hear, may not be aware of the issues under study until the researcher brings them up, and their responses could be constrained by the questions asked (McKee, 2004, p. 84-89).

Downing and Husband (2005) indicate that text-based approaches, both qualitative and quantitative, dominate research about race, ethnicity and media. For these researchers, text-based strategies are preferred because they recognize that communication, in praxis, is symbolic. Hence, “Deciphering [symbols] has pride of place” (p. 26). Moreover, text-based research, including textual analysis, has the added advantage of accessibility. Indeed, as researchers, we often have little or no access to the site of production, and/or to “how users interpret and act upon the text” (Downing & Husband, 2005, p. 26). For these reasons, textual analysis offers a valid alternative for interpretative and critical work that, “whatever its value to the reader, articulates the interests of the arguer first” (Dow, 1996, p 3).

Research design

Television texts reflect cultural assumptions about social life. They are also the result of a process, which organizes decision-making, production, and distribution to serve the needs of an industry. In this sense, a television series is a commodity. In a commercial system, it acquires value inasmuch as it can draw an audience that can be measured, and whose attention can be sold to advertisers (Smythe, 1981/2006; Meehan, 2002). For the audience itself, though, television has no inherent commercial value. Indeed, some would argue that audiences assign value to any form of media inasmuch as it fulfills a function, satisfies a need, or provides some gratification (Katz, Blumer &

Gurevitch, 1974). In this sense, audiences may value a show because it entertains, educates, or informs them (e.g. Lemish, 1985; Levy, 1978; Rubin, 1981; Papachrissi & Mendelson, 2007). However, a series can also be valued for enabling the pleasures and frustrations of critique, which is the perspective that this dissertation takes.

In this sense, in this study of *Ugly Betty* I analyze three dimensions of the show. First, I consider the political economy of the text. Secondly, I look at the text itself, and the cultural assumptions about Latino(a) immigrants that it brings forth. And finally, I examined the interpretative work that fan communities produce from the text. Each chapter has a separate theoretical framework, and the process that eventually crystalized them in their present form is the subject of the following paragraphs.

To begin, this study addresses the political economy of *Ugly Betty* from a perspective that considers the impact of demographic change, which motivated re-definition of the image of Latinos(as). In terms of the television industry, this demographic group came to be seen as an underserved commodity audience (Smythe, 1981/2006), which justified the production and circulation of Latino(a)-oriented content like *Ugly Betty*. However, it was also important to understand the “wider public context” (McKee, 2001, p. 146) in which *Ugly Betty* came to life, circulated, and eventually went off the air, which required an expansion of the original impetus for writing this chapter. Indeed, the more I researched Latino(a) representations, and explored their evolution from niche audience to commodity audience, the more I realized that the post-network era could not be examined without asking questions about the technologies of the home, the industry of audience measurement, the international format trade, the intricate

reasoning behind network decision-making processes, and the rhetoric and channels that are used to communicate these decisions to the public. Texts provided an avenue to explore these questions. However, it was important to establish what would count as a relevant text.

Indeed, the popular, trade, and academic presses, and even private individuals publish and circulate news reports, commentary, and analysis about television, both as an industry and as a series of representations. Such texts provide a substantive basis to discuss *Ugly Betty* from a political economy perspective because they address network operations, decisions, strategies, and changes in the technological environment, which are topics that eventually became part of this chapter. However, the writing process did not start out as broad. It began by looking at discourses about Latinos(as) circulating around the time of *Ugly Betty's* debut. In practical terms, the concept of the commodity audience informed this part of the process; it provided a basis to establish relevance, and helped narrow down the scope to the areas of marketing and advertising, and their likely impact on television industry operations. A commodity audience is basically a group of desirable consumers (Smythe, 1981/2006; Meehan, 2002; 2005). Academic literature, though, suggests that Latinos(as) were not considered desirable consumers, that is, until very recently (see Davila, 2008). The chapter explores this re-definition of the Latino(a) as the catalyst for the production of Latino-themed content.

The Latino(a) commodity audience, however central it was to the initial conceptualization of the chapter, proved insufficient, mainly because of changes in how Nielsen measures the audience in general, and the Latino(a) audience in particular. New

technologies and services have become widely available in the last five years. This availability has had a significant impact on audience measurement, and on the entire business of television. In this sense, *Ugly Betty* provided an avenue to explore the new environment, as it was on the air as Nielsen rolled out a new set of audience metrics, and its freshman season coincided with the phasing out of the Nielsen Hispanic Television Index (NHTI). With these issues in mind, I examined the reporting in the industry trade press (e.g. *Broadcasting & Cable*, *The Hollywood Reporter*), newspapers (e.g. *The New York Times*), established online sources (e.g. *Salon.com*), and widely read television columns (e.g., *Ask Ausiello*). These sources were selected for their reputation and reach.

The original time-frame was meant to include only articles that had been published between 2006 and 2010. However, it became clear that such a strict delimitation isolated *Ugly Betty* from on-going processes that began long before Fernando Gaitán even wrote *YSBLF*. For example, it was important to insert *Ugly Betty* within a wider history of Latino(a) representations on television, which predates the medium itself. While researching representative examples, I began to examine the mainstream reporting about Latino(a) shows. *A.K.A. Pablo*, a failed Norman Lear show from the 1980s, came to my attention not because of its Latino(a) representations, but for what it suggested about network operations. Indeed, *A.K.A Pablo* exemplifies network truisms about what works on television, which tend to be axiomatic (see Gitlin, 1983). The original time frame would have prevented me from finding information such as this, and would have limited my ability to examine *Ugly Betty* from a rhizomatic perspective.

After discussing *Ugly Betty* as an industrial commodity, the project shifts its focus to *Ugly Betty* as a form of Latino(a) representation. The research that led to the first draft of this chapter was originally conducted in the fall of 2006. At the time, the first season of *Ugly Betty* was still underway. As a regular viewer, I was becoming familiar with *Ugly Betty*'s narrative, yet watching was also becoming a close reading (Brummett, 2010). Brummett (2010) defines a close reading as a "mindful, disciplined reading of an object with a view to deeper understanding of its meanings" (p. 9). He adds that close readings often lead to "*criticism or critical analysis*" which is meant to be "shared with others" (p. 9). My close reading of *Ugly Betty* during those weeks in the fall of 2006 familiarized me with the show itself. More importantly, it led me to question how popular television created and circulated a discourse about illegal immigration, which is the storyline I decided to use as an example of Latino(a) representation.

I became interested in the illegal immigration aspect of *Ugly Betty* for two reasons. The first was a self-reflexive maneuver that acknowledged my own political leanings, experiences, feelings of solidarity, and questions about identity.⁶ The second reason emerged from the context. Indeed, 2006 was a year of mass mobilization, as Congress wrestled with immigration reform. *Ugly Betty* addresses this national concern with immigration. However, rather than focusing on the controversies of immigration, the show reassures its viewers through a representation of a good immigrant.

As with the previous chapter, I found it necessary to assemble a theoretical framework to guide the study, which helped identify the texts that could illustrate how *Ugly Betty* represents illegal immigration. The concept of myth was one of the first ideas

that I explored, though I also considered approaching the research question through the lens of the representative anecdote (Burke, 1945), and of the ideograph (McGee, 1980). Nevertheless, I repeatedly returned to myths. More specifically, I returned to a Barthesian view of the myth as an obfuscation of history, and to the idea of the melting pot as an American myth. To be certain, the melting pot evokes images of Ellis Island, and of the great wave of European immigration, which landed on American shores at the turn of the nineteenth century. In fact, the idea of a melting pot, and the popularization of the term, come from this period of American history. However, the melting pot is an incomplete account of immigration. For one, it leaves out the experiences of non-European groups, including Latinos(as). Could a story about illegal immigration pull Latinos(as) into a wider narrative of nationhood and ultimately identity?

To address this issue, I returned to a close reading of *Ugly Betty*, in order to trace the evolution of the narrative of illegal immigration. The buildup begins with the pilot episode, but the actual conflict is revealed at the end of the episode *The Lying, The Watch, and the Wardrobe* (Horta & Todd, 2006). The story arc subsequently evolves until it reaches a climax during the episode *A Tree Grows in Guadalajara* (Horta & Lawrence, 2007), which is the first season finale, and reaches resolution in episode *A Nice Day for a Posh Wedding* (Horta & Pennette, 2007), during the second season. After the illegal immigration arc concluded officially, though, I continued watching the remainder of the series for an aftermath to the story. I found it in the episode *Ugly Berry* (Horta & Wrubel, 2008), which aired just one week before the 2008 general election.

Recognizing voting as one of the rights that distinguishes citizens from non-citizens, I decided to include this episode in the analysis.

The analysis considers individual scenes, but not full episodes. I selected these scenes for what they reveal about Ignacio Suarez (the illegal immigrant), or for how they influenced overall plot development. For example, Ignacio's interactions with his family reveal his family orientation, and lead to an analysis of the representation of Latino men as model immigrants. On the other hand, scenes that show him negotiating the obstacles to legalization advance the overall plot. Both types of scenes reveal assumptions about illegal immigration itself, and about the process of immigrant legalization, which give us an understanding of the representational strategies used in *Ugly Betty*.

In the final chapter, I examine television fans and their textual production on TWoP, as a manifestation of critical viewing practices. Originally, I had envisioned this part of the study as the follow-up to the textual analysis of the illegal immigrant narrative. In this sense, fan texts were to be relevant intertexts, which would ground my own interpretative work in *reality*. The rhizomatic approach led me away from this perspective. Indeed, after examining a number of fan boards, I realized that I expected fans to care about the same issues that I was interested in. However, fan discussions were far more varied, and the analysis of TWoP is intended to do justice to this diversity.

Between February and June of 2010, I surveyed several websites, including ABC, IGN, TV.com, and Television without Pity. These sites are all owned and hosted by media corporations, and they exemplify a re-conceptualization of fans as potential consumers (Jenkins, 2006; 2007). Academic interest in this aspect of fandom has

increased in recent years, as scholars examine the intersections of fandom and consumer culture (P. Booth, 2008; De Kosnik, 2009; S. Smith, Fisher & Cole, 2007; Stenger, 2006; Jenkins, 2006a). Corporate media utilizes the Internet as part of its strategies to engage consumers. While some critics view this as a threat to fandom itself (Hellekson, 2009), this chapter acknowledges that participating in such spaces does not make you less of a fan.

Choosing TWoP was the result of a lengthy process, which entailed a close reading of hundreds of messages. Initially, I intended to look at the *Ugly Betty* boards on ABC itself. I opted for TWoP for practical reasons. First and foremost, TWoP's interface is well designed and easy to navigate, with defined topics, and nested forums and sub-forums, hyperlinked individual posts, and search capabilities. Secondly, TWoP archives all its forums, even those that are no longer active. Finally, TWoP's detailed posting guidelines encourage writing from an informed, thoughtful, and critical perspective, a fact that other studies have pointed out (see Stillwel, 2003; Andrejevic, 2008). The ABC website did not offer any of these advantages.

From 2006 to 2009, *TWoP* hosted the *Ugly Betty General Gabbery* Forum, which has now been archived. In addition, TWoP continues to host the *Ugly Betty* forum, which remains open for posting, although has not been active since June of 2010. The study began with a general reading of all the messages in the *Ugly Betty* forum, and selected episode threads of the *General Gabbery* forum, which were chosen because (a) they matched episodes that were included in the textual analysis of the immigration storyline, or (b) they exemplified a noteworthy pattern of activity. For example, the spoilers thread

in the *General Gabbery Forum* was the most active thread overall. The sheer volume of post suggested that this was an area was one that users valued significantly, which led me to include it in the analysis. The general reading helped me identify recurrent themes that illustrated the construct of savvy fandom. In terms of organization, the messages were clustered to construct a chronological narrative that describes the reception and interpretation of *Ugly Betty* on TWoP.

The final chapter, as stated in the introduction, presents the general conclusions, but more importantly for me, it addresses the lessons learned from the process of researching and writing from a rhizomatic perspective.

CHAPTER 3:

THE POLITICAL ECONOMY OF UGLY BETTY

In the year 2001, the US Census revealed that Latinos(as) had become the fastest growing and youngest minority group in the United States (Guzman, 2001). Almost ten years later they account for approximately 16% of the US population (Edwards, 2010). These numbers indicate an important demographic shift. Yet they also highlight a clear discrepancy: television under-represents Latinos(as) (D. E. Mastro, 2005; Poniewozik, 2001; The Tomas Rivera Policy Institute [TRPI], 2000). Advocacy groups like the National Council of La Raza (La Raza) have protested against this disparity for years. La Raza called for a boycott against the major networks in 1999, and it used economics as their main threat. They would “take their collective \$380 billion in annual spending away from the offending networks’ advertisers,” if the networks failed to correct the situation (Frankel, 1999). La Raza was not alone in its efforts. The NAACP also threatened a boycott and legal action. As a result, the networks made some changes. They created minority recruitment and training programs, hired “diversity czars,” and recast several series to include minority characters. African-Americans benefited the most, as shows with all-African-American ensemble casts⁷ came to primetime. Latinos(as), on the other hand, still lagged behind (Poniewozik, 2001).

La Raza used economics as a threat against an industry that is in the business of selling audiences to advertisers. However, the networks did not encourage or schedule Latino(a)-themed television shows in any significant way until 2001. This chapter

analyzes the conditions that led to a change in attitude, by looking at *Ugly Betty* from the political economy perspective.

Political economy is a critical approach, heavily influenced by Marxism. Hence, most political economists argue that, under capitalism, the production of culture is an industrialized process driven by profit motives, which will override considerations about quality, critical acclaim, audience favor, or fan desires (Croteau & Hoynes, 2003; Gandy, 1992; Ott & Mack, 2010). Furthermore, as field, political economy has been prolific (Bermejo, 2009; Durham & Kellner, 2006). Its practitioners have produced works analyzing ownership and conglomeration (Aufheide et al. 1997; Bagdikian, 2004; McChesney, 1999), structure and operations (Gitlin, 1983; Lotz, 2004; Lotz, 2007), advertising, marketing, and commercialization (Davila, 2000; Davila, 2001; Pecora, 1995), production (Herman & Chomsky, 1988), globalization and international trade (2006; Moran, 2008; 2009; H. Schiller, 1991; Waisbord, 2004), and television audience ratings (Meehan, 1984; 1990; 2002; 2005; Rodriguez, 1997; Smythe, 1981/2006).

Following the assumptions of political economy, this chapter discusses *Ugly Betty* as a commodity that emerged under specific market conditions. First of all, the television industry has moved into a “post-network era” (Lotz, 2007), which does not mean that networks are disappearing, or becoming irrelevant. This has not been the case. However, viewers have more control over a wider array of choices, and television networks have experienced an erosion of audience share. In response, the industry has been forced to change its institutional practices of production, distribution, programming, advertising, and audience measurement (Lotz, 2007). Niche programming has become more common,

and it has created new opportunities for shows like *Ugly Betty*. Indeed, when the US Census Bureau reported on the nation's demographic shift, the television industry, among others, took notice. This chapter analyzes why and how Latinos(as) in general, and acculturated Latinos(as) in particular, became a "commodity audience" (Smythe, 1981/2006), by looking at the transformation of the telenovela *YSBLF* into *Ugly Betty*. This chapter deals with the conditions that lead to the development of *Ugly Betty*, its promotion, first as a Latino(a)-themed show, and subsequently as a woman-centric show that could appeal to a broader general audience. Finally, the chapter examines *Ugly Betty's* ultimate demise to the ratings, which suggests that the political economy argument still holds true.

The Commodity Audience: A Political Economy Perspective

Political economists regard television as a business in which networks, content producers, advertisers, retailers and producers of consumer goods seek to maximize profits while minimizing risks. However, television is also a cultural industry, where the creative processes coexist with business imperatives. Because of this, the outcomes of network decision-making processes "often defy rationality" (Lotz, 2007) since they take into account factors such as ownership, co-production, profit participation, and license fee costs. Nevertheless, the bottom line of the business of television is selling audiences to advertisers (Meehan, 2002; Smythe, 1981/2006; Webster, Phalen, & Lichty, 2006). Co-ownership and cheaper license fees may be less important than ratings as a lackluster performance can hurt a network "by eroding audience and reputation" (Lotz, 2007, p. 91).

Dallas Smythe (1981/2006) suggested that the audience, not the message, is the real product of the consciousness industries in a capitalist economy, and coined the term *commodity audience* to describe this phenomenon. Mass media, marketing and advertising manage the demand for goods and services. They provide spaces to market the tangible and intangible products of capitalist economies to an audience. The audience, though, does not really exist until it is defined in objective terms (*i.e.* age, gender, race, socio-economic status, etc), and packaged as *demographics* (*i.e.* 18-34 males). Once packaged, their attention is sold to advertisers. However, attention has no physical manifestation, although it is often conceptualized as exposure (Bermejo, 2009; Napoli, 2003; Webster et al. 2006). Moreover, advertisers do not purchase the certainty of audience behavior. They buy its likelihood based on statistical probability. Since the audience is regarded as an intangible mass of millions of individuals, advertisers and capitalist oligopolies can expect to accrue a profit even if only a fraction decides to purchase goods, services, or gadgets. Enough people will do so anyway, as they will always want or need something. As a consequence, media advertisements are meant to teach the audience how to choose between offerings, instead of brainwashing them into buying (Smythe, 1981/2006).

The concept of the commodity audience suggests that the key business relationship for the television industry is between advertisers and networks. Moreover, the ability to measure the audience quantitatively is critical in this arrangement. Measurement creates the audience (Webster et al. 2006). In the United States, television audience measurement is handled monopolistically by the A.C. Nielsen Company.

Nielsen's sample -- *circa* 25,000 homes as of 2010 (Nielsen, 2010) -- determines the ratings, which are used to set prices for programs. Top rated shows command a higher price because the Nielsen ratings demonstrate *objectively* that they pull a larger chunk of the audience, that is, of middle-class consumers who prefer and can afford brand names (Meehan, 2002; 2005; 2007). These individuals have the disposable income and access to routinely buy on impulse. They are the "commodity audience" (Smythe, 1981/2006), and their beliefs and world-views, packaged time and again as common sense, determine what plays on primetime television. The desire and need to please the commodity audience leaves little or no room for oppositional views, unless they are sanitized, co-opted or ridiculed (Gitlin, 1979; 1980; Meehan, 2002; Smythe, 1981/2006). As a consequence of monopoly, method, techniques, measurement instruments, industry dynamics, and ideology, *the audience* is practically divorced from the people who watch television (Bermejo, 2009; Meehan, 2005; 2002/2006; 2007).

Political economists have provided key insights into the inner workings of the television industry, and the significance of the measured audience. However, the industry has changed dramatically. In 2007, about 58% of American homes received 100 or more television channels, but viewers tend to watch between fifteen and twenty of these (Nielsen, 2008). This is a far cry from the time in which only three networks ruled the airwaves. In addition to more choice, technologies such as the remote control, the DVR, online streaming, DVD's, Youtube, and iTunes have revolutionized how people watch television. As a result, the praxis of audience measurement has become more complex (Bermejo, 2009; Jenkins, 2006a; Lotz, 2007).

In today's media environment the television audience is being re-conceptualized. It is no longer a collection of relatively homogeneous individuals, who can only choose between three networks. Instead, the excessive array of choices has fragmented the audience into smaller niches. With fragmentation, advertisers need to make greater efforts to reach the same number of eyeballs as fragmentation reduces average audience size (Lotz, 2007; Webster, 2005). Indeed, ABC, NBC and CBS combined only reached 29% of the audience during the 2002-2003 season. This is very significant, considering that those three networks commanded almost 70% of the audience in 1985. Abundance of choice has also led to audience polarization because newer networks tend to specialize in order to establish a brand identity (Webster, 2005). Consequently, the audiences can choose to watch only the content that is consistent with their worldviews and interests. Fragmentation and polarization are important developments. They have transformed television from a mass medium to a niche medium (Lotz, 2007). In such a context, the Latino(a) commodity audience becomes more relevant than it was before. With the right kind of promotion and marketing, it can be re-cast as a desirable new niche, which can be used to justify the production and distribution of Latino-themed content.

The Political Economy of the Latino(a) Audience

The definition of the commodity audience is not divorced from hegemonic views of what is good, desirable, profitable and normal. Thus, prejudicial beliefs about *otherness* plague its construction, and explain why it has been primarily defined as "white men aged 18 to 34" (Meehan, 2002/2006, p. 317). Any group outside this framework is

considered a niche audience that would be served by “networks that couldn’t draw *the* audience” (Meehan, 2006, p. 317, emphasis in the original).

Latinos(as) are examples of a niche audience. For much of the twentieth century, they were seen as a “foreign audience,” (Rodriguez, 1997, p. 287) concentrated around the US-Mexico border. Spanish-language newspapers would serve Latinos(as) in the early twentieth century. Later, radio programs created by immigrants would air in English-language stations, albeit never during peak listening time. It would have been a waste of valuable airtime, since Latinos(as) were not considered bona fide consumers. They were poor, they could be deported *en masse* as during Operation Wetback (Rodriguez, 1997), they could become targets of ethnic violence (e.g. the Zoot Suit Riots), and they did not speak English.

Unlike English-language media, Latin American entrepreneurs recognized the potential of the Latino(a) market in the United States. Emilio Azcárraga, owner of Mexico’s Televisa, pioneered this area. He founded the Spanish International Network (SIN), America’s first Spanish-language television network, in 1961. Speaking Spanish became an advantage to Azcárraga, as he flooded SIN with Televisa’s programs (Davila, 2001; Rodriguez, 1997). This would lead to “accusations of excessive and unlawful foreign control” (Davila, 2001, p. 26), which resulted in SIN’s court mandated sale to Hallmark/First Capital in 1986. The new owners renamed the network as Univision, and held on to the property until 1992. Univision has been resold once since, and is now privately owned. It remains the undisputed leader in Spanish-language broadcasting in the United States (Ballvé, 2004; Univision Communications, 2010).

As stated previously, a television audience does not exist until A.C. Nielsen sanctions and measures it. However, Nielsen was not measuring Spanish-speaking Latinos(as) at all until Univision and Telemundo, its closest competitor, stepped in. Both networks pushed, and eventually financed, a revision of Hispanic audience measuring techniques. As a result, the audience watching Spanish-language television *grew* 64% (Rodriguez, 1997). Univision and Telemundo were also behind the creation of the Nielsen Hispanic Television Index (NHTI), which remained in effect until 2007. The NHTI provided Spanish-language networks with certified numbers that could be used to court advertisers (Lenti, 1994; Tiegel, 2007; Wentz, 2006)

The Latino(a) Audience: Creating a Desirable Demographic.

In the first year of operation of the NHTI, Univision was able to land major national advertising from “Procter & Gamble, Reebok, Nike, U.S. Sprint, AT&T, Montgomery Ward, and others from the banking industry” (Lenti, 1994, p. 46). The Nielsen numbers were certainly important for this success. Nevertheless, numbers alone cannot redefine a segment of the population that has been traditionally seen as inferior. Accordingly, Spanish-language networks and the Latino(a)-oriented marketing and advertising industry crafted a new image for Latinos(as), one that highlighted their desirability as consumers by using language, culture, and market behavior (Davila, 2001; Rodriguez, 1997; 1999).

Traditionally, Latino(as) in the United States have been characterized as Spanish-dominant. There is a strong cultural and demographic component to this description, as the bulk of people from the Latin American region do, indeed, speak Spanish. However,

according to Arlene Davila, the Spanish-dominant paradigm is also the result the transnational linkages between the US and Latin American consciousness industries. Univision and Telemundo, for example, import programs produced in Latin America. Yet they also syndicate original programming to Latin American broadcasters. Concurrently, the Latino(a) marketing and advertising industry also has transnational ties. The industry's pioneers were Puerto Ricans or Latino(a) immigrants, and the major companies were still dominated by Spanish-dominant Latin American males in the early years of the millennium. Such a structure essentially reinforces the primacy of Spanish, which becomes a competitive advantage and a tool for market segmentation (Davila, 2001; Rodriguez, 1997).

Spanish is not the only trait Latinos(as) apparently share. Broadcasters, advertising, and marketing experts also emphasize the uniqueness of Latino(a) culture, without regard to national origin. Indeed, the prevailing message about Latinos(as) has been that they are essentially one group, and that they are different from mainstream America, at least for the most part (Ballvé, 2004; Davila, 2001; Fox, 1996; Rodriguez, 1997). Not surprisingly, Latino(a) marketing specialists tell their clients that Latinos(as) value *la familia* (family), *el respeto* (honor), and *la comunidad* (community), and that they tend to be conservative, and traditional. However, experts also indicate that US Latinos(as) do not shun mainstream American values, such as individualism and entrepreneurship (Davila, 2008; Fitch, 1989; Gross, 1989). The rhetoric, in other words, emphasizes positive attributes to counter the negative stereotypes. The ultimate message

is that Latinos(as) have much more in common with mainstream America than most people have been led to believe.

Market behavior is the last element of the Latino(a) image definition. This category emphasizes income, purchasing power, and shopping habits, to counter the stereotype of the “poor Mexican’s from the barrio with hangdog mustaches and no money” (Fisher, 1995, p. 30). Latino(a) marketing firms may use their own research to make these claims about Latinos(as). However, government-sponsored, corporate, and independent research has made these statements more credible (Davila, 2001). Data from the US Census Bureau, for example, is often cited to describe Latino(a) market potential because it consistently shows that Latinos(as) are younger, have larger families, and lead the nation in terms of demographic growth (Guzman, 2001). For market specialists, *young* translates into *more likely to become loyal to a brand*, and *larger families* means *likely to buy more food, diapers, school supplies, and toys* (Rodriguez, 1997). In terms of purchasing and shopping habits, the marketing message emphasizes issues of homeownership rates, entrepreneurship, annual market growth, and leisure activities (Moskowitz, 1995; Wells, 1996; ZBar, 1994).

Refining the Latino(a) Commodity Audience:

the Language Preference Debate

The monolithic Latino(a) image has never been unchallenged. Indeed, critics argue that people of Latin American origin are not homogeneous. They can come from any country in Latin America, be of any race and socio-economic class, and will not necessarily share a common history (Calderon, 1992; Oboler, 1992; Rodriguez, 1997).

Critics also indicate that since Spanish-language media and marketing strategists constructed the Latino(a) commodity audience, their vested interest in the primacy of Spanish oversimplifies the audience by disregarding acculturation (S. A. Hernandez & Newmann, 1992).

Acculturation⁸ has become very significant for the consciousness industries. It suggests that Latinos(as) are more diverse than previously thought. Acculturation challenges the Spanish-only paradigm while bolstering the case for Latino(a)-themed marketing, advertising, and media content in English. The television industry has been particularly receptive to this message.

Broadcast and cable networks began courting acculturated Latinos(as) in earnest shortly after the year 2000. Pressure from minority rights organizations, like the NAACP, the National Latino Media Council, and the National Asian/Pacific American Media Coalition, has played a role in increasing diversity in general (National Latino Media Council, 2009). However, the significance of the marketing discourse about acculturated Latinos(as) requires consideration. Without a doubt, the advocates of the acculturated Latino(a) market characterize this cohort as the new “it” consumers. Acculturated Latinos(as) are often described as younger, brand and fashion-conscious consumers with disposable income to spend (Armbruster, 2006; L. Foster, 2006; Lopez Negrete, 2005; Navarro, 2002). They do not necessarily speak Spanish (Montoya-Crawley, 2010; Rosenblum, 2005). Generally speaking, Latinos(as) tend to be avid television viewers (Huff, 2002) but younger Latinos(as) usually prefer English-language programming

(Haupt, 2006; Rose, 2005; Russell, 2005). All of this contradicts stereotypes about Latinos(as).

Whether it was a response to calls for greater diversity, or an effort to court acculturated Latinos(as), the television industry made changes to programming that favored Latino(a) visibility. First, they increased casting for Latino(a) actors and added more characters that were identifiably Latino(a).⁹ These gains, though, are relatively small, and Latinos(as) remain underrepresented (Children Now, 2004; National Latino Media Council, 2009). Secondly, media conglomerates and independent companies launched new networks like mun2 (NBC-Universal), LATV and SiTV (independent), and MTV Tr3s (Viacom) to target bilingual and/or English-dominant Latinos(as). And third, the networks planned and added Latino(a)-themed shows to an unprecedented degree, with entries like *Resurrection Blvd* (Showtime, 2000-2002), *Taina* (Nickelodeon, 2001-2002), *The Brothers Garcia* (Nickelodeon, 2000-2003); *The George Lopez Show* (ABC, 2001-2007), *Greetings from Tucson* (The WB, 2002), *Luis* (Fox, 2003), *Freddie* (ABC, 2005-2006), *Cane* (CBS, 2007), and *Ugly Betty* (ABC, 2006-2010)¹⁰ (Beale, 2009; Downey, 2007; Karrfalt, 2006a; Karrfalt, 2006b).

The interest in acculturation helped re-define the Latino(a) audience. Nevertheless, the new commodity audience still needed sanctioning from the A.C. Nielsen Company to justify the viability of Latino-oriented programming. The NHTI, which had been in operation for a decade, would not suffice. Critics, and even erstwhile supporters, lambasted it. They accused Nielsen of undercounting minorities in general, and US-born Latinos(as) in particular, thus legitimizing Latino(a) niche status and

marginalization in the culture industries (Rincon & Associates, 2004; TRPI, 2004). The Spanish-language networks, with Univision leading the charge, also complained about the NHTI undermining their ability to compete because the Spanish-language audience could not be compared directly to the English-language sample (Flamm, 2005; Learmonth, 2006b; Lisotta, 2006; Sutter, 2005b).

After years of debate about the NHTI, Nielsen changed its general audience sample to include more Latinos(as). In 2007, Nielsen would do away with its Latino(a) index altogether. The Spanish-language networks praised this decision (Chaffin, 2007; James, 2007). In anticipation, they began joining the National Television Index (NTI) to be counted alongside their English-language competition. Univision was the first, in 2005, followed by Telemundo and Azteca America, which would join in 2006 (Aurthur, 2005; De la Fuente, 2006a; Sutter, 2005a). Univision, in particular, was able to show its competitiveness in markets like Los Angeles, where its telenovelas consistently defeat the competition.

Though Nielsen is now measuring Latinos(as) along with English-speakers, the ratings do not consider acculturation, national origin, or language preference. One critic, Robert Rose,¹¹ launched a campaign asking Nielsen to change the sample. He argued that Nielsen undercounted US-born Latinos(as) by dividing its already small Latino(a) sample into five language-preference clusters. Since the US-born cluster was most likely to be English-dominant, Rose concluded that, “By the time the sample is sliced and diced, less than 100 national meters could conceivably represent “English-only” television viewing”(Rose, 2005). In the end, Spanish-language TV would be the overall winner, at

the expense of the entrepreneurs seeking to create and market English-language content for acculturated Latinos(as).

Creating Latino(a) Content: the A.K.A Pablo Experience

Creating and airing Latino(a)-themed content is not unprecedented. However, it has proven difficult. Before the premiere of *The George Lopez Show* in 2001, *Chico and the Man* was the last successful television series to feature a Latino(a) character in a leading role (Harmetz, 1984; Schneider, 2003). After *Chico* went off the air, the networks tried again, with entries like *Viva Valdez* (ABC, 1976), *Popi* (CBS, 1976), *Condo* (ABC, 1983), and *A.K.A Pablo* (ABC, 1984) (Reyes & Rubie, 2000). This last example deserves attention because of what it suggests about how the television industry operates. It is a very fickle business, where individuals make decisions about production, programming, scheduling, and pricing in conditions of uncertainty. Nevertheless, the industry has institutionalized its practices to minimize risks while maximizing profits. It has developed a logic and a rhetoric that is used to justify decisions, and to persuade advertisers, network executives, critics, and special interest groups to support new programs. The rhetoric usually relies on “*genre, reputation, and imitation*” (W. Bielby & D. Bielby, 1994), axioms, testing, and ratings (Gitlin, 1983) as predictors for success.

In *A.K.A. Pablo*’s case, industry insiders welcomed the series as the return of Norman Lear to primetime television. Lear was the show’s executive producer, and he also co-authored the pilot (Unger, 1984). In typical Lear fashion, *A.K.A. Pablo* was a half-hour sitcom that was meant to be topical like *All in the Family*. It featured comedian Paul Rodriguez, who played up-and-coming comedian Paul Rivera. Each week, Rivera

would struggle between his desire to succeed as an entertainer and his family's expectations. In his act, Rivera relied on ethnic humor to make his audience laugh. At home, though, he constantly had to contend with his father, who chastised Pablo for turning Latinos(as) into a punch line (Hill, 1984). Unfortunately for Lear, the Latino(a) cast, and ABC the television audience did not take to *A.K.A Pablo*. The series departed primetime after six episodes.

The failure of *A.K.A Pablo* is more noteworthy than the fact that it was even on television to begin with. The logic of television decision-making justified airing it. It had Norman Lear at the helm, and even after “interesting failures” and “disasters” (Harmetz, 1984, p 18),¹² he remained an influential trendsetter and a respected producer. Furthermore, Lear predicted that the audience would embrace *Pablo* because the time for issue-oriented shows had ended in the 1970s, and viewers yearned for something different. Lear believed he knew what it was. Indeed, his gut told him that people just wanted “to be part of a big family again” (Harmetz, 1984, p. 18). *A.K.A. Pablo* would give them this with the Rivera family, which included sixteen people altogether — Paul, his parents, “a flock of brothers, sisters, in-laws, nephews, and nieces” (Hill, 1984, p 5), and a parrot named Ramón (O'Connor, 1984). However, Lear had “no special designs on the Hispanic market” because Nielsen had yet to measure it. Indeed, appealing specifically to Latinos(as) “would [have been] a horrendous mistake” (Ingwersen, 1983). The situation was obviously different when *Ugly Betty* premiered on ABC in 2007. Nevertheless, industry logic remained remarkably consistent. If anything, axioms, genre, reputation, and ratings worked in favor of *Ugly Betty*.

Bringing Latino(a) Content to Primetime: The case of *Ugly Betty*

Ugly Betty did not come to ABC by chance. It was a matter of the right context. The context includes the re-definition of the Latino(a) audience, the promotion of telenovelas the key to the Latino(a) audience, and the rise of the television format trade. A reputable production team harnessed these elements to transform *YSBLF* into an American comedy, and ABC threw its considerable muscle into promotion. In the end, *Ugly Betty* was the ideal show for an industry that believes that “nothing succeeds like success” (Gitlin, 1983, p. 63).

Undeniably, the US adaptation of *YSBLF* had been a long-standing project before ABC, and its parent company, Disney, became involved. Interest began in 2001 when NBC purchased the rights from RCN. When NBC abandoned the idea after trying to develop it into a sitcom, Ben Silverman, of Reveille Productions, bought the rights. Silverman, a former William Morris Agent, became one of the pioneers of reality TV in the United States with *Who Wants to be a Millionaire*. On the scripted side, he is also behind Showtime’s *The Tudors* and the U.S. version of *The Office*. Silverman has been described as an entrepreneur with great intuition about adapting international formats for American audiences (Adalian & Sutter, 2001; Adalian, 2006b; Carter, 2006).

Silverman’s involvement would add clout to *Ugly Betty*, and partnerships with other producers would strengthen it. With Marco Pennette, James Hayman,¹³ and James D. Parriott on board, *Ugly Betty* could be associated with shows like *Grey’s Anatomy* (Parriott), *Joan of Arcadia* (Hayman), and *Caroline in the City* (Pennette). Silverman’s partnership with Salma Hayek and Ventanarosa Productions, furthermore, would add a

star aura to *Ugly Betty*. During the first season, Hayek made cameo appearances in *Vidas de Fuego*, the telenovela usually playing in the background of scenes in Betty's home, and she would also guest star as editor Sophia Reyes during the November 2006 sweeps.

Hayek's behind-the-scenes role significantly boosted the track record of the show. ABC press releases gave top billing to her accomplishments as producer and director. Her work in *Frida* had earned Hayek nominations for the Oscar, the Golden Globes, the SAG awards, and BAFTA. She also had an Emmy for *The Maldonado Miracle*, which she produced and directed, and her company had produced Arturo Ripstein's¹⁴ film *No One Writes to the Colonel*, which was an official selection at Cannes in 1999 (ABC Medianet, 2007). Network promotion consistently reminded the audience and the advertisers of these accomplishments.

Though Silverman and Hayek initiated and nurtured *Ugly Betty*, they were not in charge of the day-to-day decision-making. That role went to Silvio Horta, a Cuban-American writer, who was in his early thirties when *Ugly Betty* premiered. Horta had been the creator and show runner¹⁵ for *Jake 2.0* and *The Chronicle*, two short-lived, but "well received" science fiction shows (Fogel, 2006), and he had also written the script for *Urban Legend*. In spite of his short record, Hayek and Silverman hired him to write the pilot and serve as show runner. Like them, he wanted to keep the lead character Latina, which set him apart from other people bidding for the job (Blundell, 2007; Fogel, 2006).

In terms of content, *Ugly Betty* benefited from conventional wisdom that touted telenovelas as the shows that Latinos(as) like to watch. According to Gitlin (1983), such an assertion would be considered an axiom. Axioms establish "precedents," they justify

choices that network executives make, based on instinct or experience. Though axioms are not “necessarily rules that work” (p. 23), industry insiders repeat them like mantras. Chiqui Cartagena,¹⁶ for example, credited telenovelas for the success of *Desperate Housewives*, the fifth top rated show among Latinos(as) in 2005 (Advertising Age, 2005):

Why do you think Latinos love “Desperate Housewives”? Not because of Eva Longoria, whose character continues to perpetuate negative stereotypes of Latinas. It’s because the ABC hit is the closest thing to the adored telenovela format on English-language TV! (Cartagena, 2006).

In so many words, Cartagena advocated the importance of cultural proximity (Straubhaar, 1991). Cultural proximity suggests that, when it comes down to preference, audiences tend to gravitate to media fare and genres that are locally and/or nationally produced. If these are unavailable, then audiences will often opt for content that is similar in terms of language and/or culture. Telenovelas fulfilled this premise for the Latino(a) audience.

Telenovelas play a significant role in Latin American culture, and its importance has not declined among Latinos(as) in the United States. These shows are primetime appointment television¹⁷ for everyone, not just housewives (Lopez, 1995), though they are produced with a popular audience in mind, and are often dismissed as lowbrow entertainment (Acosta-Alzuru, 2003; Martin-Barbero, 1995).

Acosta-Alzuru identifies two kinds of telenovelas, the traditional and the *telenovela de ruptura* (2003). The traditional telenovelas are the best-known sub-genre. Generally speaking, they are Manichean melodramas about upward mobility, which can be described as “high opera in low-cut clothing [that] might be filmed in the real world,

but [is] in no way whatsoever about it” (Barrientos, 2006). Traditional telenovelas are stories about a heterosexual couple from different social classes, whose happiness is mired by obstacles. These may include social class, love triangles, scheming villains, amnesia, pregnancy, and/or near-fatal accidents, among others. However, goodness prevails in the end. Villains are punished, and true love prevails. In contrast, *telenovelas de ruptura* address contemporary social and political issues, including drug trafficking, corruption, machismo, and the cult of physical beauty (Acosta-Alzuru, 2010). Because they draw from issues of the day, they can generate significant public debate at all levels of society. *YSBLF*, for example, became the talk of the town in Colombia when the heroine was offered a bribe:

First, every major columnist in the country weighed in, urging the fictional character not to be bought. It was as if William Safire, George Will and David Broder, with great gravity, decided to advise Chandler of “Friends.” At the same time, two major corruption cases were playing out in the nation’s newspapers. But Betty’s dilemma held far more sway over the public imagination – President Andres Pastrana wrote Gaitan expressing his concern over the situation. And Vice President Gustavo Bell called the writer, urging him to have Betty do the right thing. At the end, she did (S. Wilson, 2001).

On the financial side, telenovelas are the bedrock of the Latin American television industry. Networks anchor their primetime schedule around them, with powerhouses like Mexico’s Televisa, Brazil’s Rede Globo, and Venezuela’s Venevision deriving significant revenues from advertising and exports (Antola & Rogers, 1984; Mato, 2005).

Associated merchandising, furthermore, can spin the telenovela into other business opportunities, such as launching pop music groups, magazines, radio shows, and merchandising (O'Boyle, 2006).

US domestic ratings are yet another reason to look closely at the telenovela. In important Latino(a) markets like Los Angeles, Univision's telenovelas often outperform the Big Four on primetime (James, 2007; 2010; Goodwin, 2009), and Univision is firmly established as America's fifth broadcast network (McClellan, 2010)¹⁸. *YSBLF* in particular, proved very successful for Telemundo, which aired the Colombian original version (Forero, 2000), and Univision, which broadcast the Televisa remake (De la Fuente, 2006b). Following television industry logic, an English-language version of *YSBLF* could have a built-in audience among acculturated Latinos(as). If they lived in a Latino(a) household, they were likely to have watched it since telenovela viewing is a multigenerational "family affair" (Barrera & D. Bielby, 2001).

The final element that ushered *Ugly Betty* into primetime is the format trade. To be certain, networks are more likely to copy previous hits than to try out something completely new. Accordingly, a series' track record is like currency. It predicts likelihood of success. It follows that adapting *YSBLF* was an attractive proposition.

Program adaptation is not a new practice (Moran, 1998), yet program formats are relatively new. They are "a cultural technology which governs the flow of program ideas across time and space" (Moran, 1998, p. 23). Generally speaking, formats are "a template or set of invariable elements in a programme out of which the variable elements of individual episodes are produced" (Moran, 2004). Formats allow television producers to

(1) establish a price, based on objective characteristics like previous ratings, genre, etc; (2) copyright program ideas; (3) bypass local importation restrictions; and (4) minimize language and cultural sensitivity concerns, since the format's ultimate purpose is to be remade locally (Waisbord, 2004). Formats also create additional revenue streams, derived from licensing agreements and joint ventures (Moran, 2008). Beyond these advantages, a format is attractive because it "offers some predictability in terms of its potential commercial success" (Waisbord, 2004, p. 365).

The degree of predictability worked in favor of *YSBLF*. In its original run, it was a hit for RCN. Ratings soared to "a peak viewership of 3.3 million and a 72% market share, 230% above broadcaster RCN's slot average" (De la Fuente, 2006c). This translated into an estimated \$124,000 per episode in ad sales (Mato, 2005, p. 428). After its original run, *YSBLF* went into international syndication with great success. It garnered between 41.5% and 58.9% share in South America, and propelled Telemundo's ratings in the United States (De la Fuente, 2006c).

From YSBLF to Ugly Betty.

When it comes to telenovelas, the name Fernando Gaitan is associated with two of the most successful Colombian exports, *Café con Aroma de Mujer* and *YSBLF*. *Café* is considered a *telenovela de ruptura*, particularly because of its heroine, Gaviota. She is a strong, stubborn character, described by Gaitán a woman "of the nineties, who is fine with or without a man" ("Las historias," 1999). Though Gaviota triumphs on her own merits, *Café* remains a Cinderella story that ends with the marriage of the two title characters. *YSBLF* follows on *Café*'s footsteps. However, there are important differences

in terms of setting and social class. Indeed, *Café* is set in the rural coffee growing region of Colombia, whereas *YSBLF* is an urban story. Furthermore, where Gaviota is a poor, semi-literate coffee picker with an attitude, Betty is meek, middle class, and highly educated. Unfortunately, in a society where you are still expected to include a photograph with your resume (Forero, 2000), Betty's looks quash her hopes for employment in lower or middle management, in spite of her qualifications. She attributes her failure to find a job to "a casting problem" (Gaitán, 1999) that overshadows her accomplishments. For Gaitán, though, the problem is not Betty. It is the Colombian obsession with physical appearance:

Women in Colombia were and still are obsessed about their appearance, and will go to extreme lengths to look good – even plastic surgery [...]. We have a saying here: There are no ugly women, only poor women or women with poor husbands (cited in De la Fuente, 2006c).

After much trying, Betty Pinzon will find a job as a secretary at *Ecomoda*. It is a fashion house, and the most unlikely place for a comely woman to get ahead. Indeed, almost everyone at work mocks her looks openly. Yet her boss, Armando Mendoza, hires her. A notorious womanizer, he needs a docile gatekeeper to prevent his fiancé, Marcela Valencia, from spying on him. To this end, he puts Betty in charge of his personal affairs, for which she earns his trust. Soon enough, Armando gives her more responsibilities, but also manipulates her into suborning tax evasion. When he decides to seduce her to ensure her loyalty, the heartbroken Betty leaves to find herself. She returns more confident, after a makeover and a summer romance. Furthermore, after Armando's scheme backfires,

Betty takes over the company and saves it from ruin. Now, the tables are turned, and it is Armando who pines and grovels, until she forgives and marries him. Though Gaitán was criticized for the makeover and the marriage (Beeson, 2006; S. Hernandez, 2001), he argued that it was what the fans really wanted to see (Mcgirk, 2001). Yeidi Rivero's (2003) study of *YSBLF* fans supports Gaitán's assessment to an extent. Indeed, Rivero's upper-middle class informants wanted to see Betty change into a beautiful woman. Yet this desire could have been the result of social class setting up behavioral expectations. For Gaitán, though, fans expect no less from a telenovela. Working class viewers relish the triumph of the underdog. This is because telenovelas are "made for poor people in countries where it's hard to get ahead in life" (quoted in Hodgson, 2000), and viewers live vicarious fantasies through their characters. In this sense, Betty's physical transformation re-states the significance of traditional telenovela conventions.

Gaitán's creation was also rooted in Colombian culture. Its humor was ripe with colloquialisms, and its interactions reflected the patriarchal and hierarchical structure of Colombian society. Betty's father, Hernán, insists on keeping a close watch on her virtue. He frets about what people will think if she's un-chaperoned around men. Armando and his best friend, Mario, furthermore, are skirt-chasers who leer at, catcall, and use women for sexual pleasure. All three men are deeply homophobic. Armando and Mario, in particular, abhor the only gay character in the show, fashion designer Hugo Lombardi. He is arrogant, unpleasant, and judgmental. Often, Lombardi plays into the stereotype of the predatory gay man, by leering at Armando, Mario, and other men. What is worse, ugly people offend Hugo's sensitivities, since he believes himself an aesthete. In *YSBLF*, his

role is to provide comic relief. He victimizes Betty and any other characters labeled ugly, with a relish that reveals “disrespect and intolerance of otherness” (Ulchur, 2000)(Ulchur, 2000, para 6, my translation).

Regarding class, *YSBLF* associates social standing with race, beauty, body type, and sexual behavior (Rivero, 2003). Indeed, Betty and her friends -- Nicolás Mora, and the seven women of the *cartel de las feas* – are geeky (Nicolás), black (Mariana), fat (Berta), old (Inés), hypersexual (Aura María), too tall (Sandra), or too short (Sofía). In contrast, the owners of *Ecomoda*, its shareholders, and all key executives are white, thin, well-mannered, coiffed, and impeccably dressed. According to Rivero, the upper class characters impose their aesthetic judgments upon the lower-class ones, which is a dynamic that *Ugly Betty* replicates (Esch, 2010).

The Narrative of Ugly Betty:

an Experiment in Glocalization

Transforming *YSBLF* into *Ugly Betty* exemplifies glocalization (Robertson, 1992; 1995), and it reiterates the rising popularity of television formats. In *Ugly Betty*’s case, the original concept remains, stripped to its bare essence. It is a story of upward mobility, in which a homely heroine moves up the ranks of the fashion publishing business. Betty Suarez begins as the assistant to Daniel Meade, the editor in chief of *Mode* magazine. He is another notorious Lothario, who initially underestimates Betty for her appearance. However, Daniel also learns to appreciate the real beauty of Betty Suarez. He admires her values, loyalty, and work ethic. Still, there are important differences between *YSBLF* and *Ugly Betty*.

The first major change transformed a telenovela into a dramedy. To begin, *Ugly Betty* would run once a week, instead of being stripped Monday to Friday. Moreover, where *YSBLF* was a melodrama with comedic elements, *Ugly Betty* became a comedy with melodramatic ones. For example, the characters suffer tragic losses -- Betty's sister, Hilda, loses her fiancé to gunfire at the end of the first season, Daniel loses his wife to cancer at the end of the third -- and they also want to find true love. However, in *Ugly Betty* the characters always bounce back, and their true soul mate is someone unexpected. In Hilda's case, it is an old flame from high school, and in Daniel's case, it could be Betty.

Though it is not a telenovela, *Ugly Betty* pays frequent homage to its origins through its implausible plot twists, occasional cliffhangers, and outlandish supporting characters. Telenovela villains like Catalina Creel were the template for *Ugly Betty*'s villainess Wilhelmina Slater. Creel was famous in the 1980s for wearing a black eye patch on Televisa's *Cuna de Lobos* (Rohter, 2007), and for her constant scheming. Slater is essentially Catalina without the eye patch. Wilhelmina constantly tries to take over the magazine through elaborate plots, including a botched attempt to marry into the Meade family. Indeed, Wilhelmina seduces Bradford Mead. However, he collapses at the altar and dies without completing the ceremony. Wilhelmina, undeterred, steals his sperm and impregnates a surrogate with a Meade heir. This is merely one example of how *Ugly Betty* re-appropriates telenovela tropes for comedic and narrative effect.

In terms of character development, the American Betty has little in common with her Colombian counterpart. She is working-class, younger, less experienced and less

educated. Yet the most obvious difference is that Betty Suarez is “a stronger, more independent character – someone who is more Rosie the Riveter than Dawn Wiener” (Beeson, 2006). For one, she does not recoil into a shell when mocked for her appearance. However, the putdowns in *Ugly Betty* are not nearly as caustic as those of *YSBLF*, which may account for Betty’s response to mockery. Indeed, when Marc and Amanda make fun of her looks or her eating habits, Betty shrugs it off. Sometimes she rolls her eyes at the duo, as though responding was pointless anyway. Furthermore, when Betty Suarez goes through a makeover, the results are not nearly as dramatic as in *YSBLF*. The makeover¹⁹ accentuates her move up *Mode*’s corporate hierarchy (Ausiello, 2009b), but does not make her any more assertive.

Ugly Betty’s approach to romance is also quite different. The show gives Betty Suarez romantic options, which is something that *YSBLF* did not do for Betty Pinzón. The American Betty dates several men, and even has two suitors compete for her attentions. Indeed, the love triangle between Betty Suarez, Henry, the accountant, and Gio, the sandwich guy, became an important plot point during season two, at the end of which she leaves both of them to go find herself. Furthermore, Betty Suarez is categorically uninterested in Daniel. She mocks him for even suggesting as much, by retorting “oh yes Daniel, I want to be your bagel just so I can get in between your beautiful teeth” (Shakman, 2008). She obviously finds his suspicion absurd, yet has enough confidence on their friendship to joke about it. In fact, the friendship between these two characters is strong and mutually supportive. As the series drew to its

conclusion, though, the possibility of a romantic relationship between them was left open, presumably as groundwork for an *Ugly Betty* movie (Yances, 2000).

Ugly Betty also focuses significantly on Betty's family, which was not as important in the original story. Betty Pinzon's support system at work is the *cuartel*. At home, she confides in her friend Nicolás. In *Ugly Betty*, the *cuartel* disappears entirely and the family takes over its role. In a sense, *Ugly Betty* purposefully fuses the workplace comedy with the family sitcom. The family becomes the site to explore Latino(a) issues (see Chapter 4), whereas the workplace becomes the stage for Betty's story of upward mobility.

The American workplace has evolved significantly in terms of what behaviors are considered acceptable, and can be excused for the sake of television realism. Consequently, the atmosphere of *Ecomoda* could not be replicated at *Mode* without crossing lines that would be considered harassment in the United States. Daniel, for example, never tries to seduce Betty. Rather, he creates opportunities for her to learn the magazine trade, and is receptive to her ideas. Betty Suarez, on the other hand, is very pragmatic about what she can do, and needs to do, to further her career. She had hoped to break into the magazine publishing business by writing for a publication that covered the serious topics of the day. Yet her only opportunities depend on Daniel and whatever magazine he happens to run. When it is *Mode*, she pitches him an article about the hot fruit (Horta & Wrubel, 2008). But when he is ostracized momentarily to *Player* magazine, she convinces him to leak an embarrassing video of her crashing a motorcycle into a mud-wrestling pit because "it will appeal to our demographic, 18 to 39 year-old

males who respond to that kind of humor” (Horta, 2008). By *Ugly Betty*’s finale, it seems that Betty has learned the trade, which makes her transformation into a full-fledged editor an expected development.

In a sense, *YSBLF* presents Betty Pinzón as another pragmatist, albeit a subversive one. She has a vision of equality and fairness, and her takeover at *Ecomoda* provides her the opportunity to enact it. As president, she re-brands the company as the fashion house for the average woman because it will help expansion. Nevertheless, her rhetoric of economics is intertwined with a message of social justice. The marginalized can’t afford, or even fit into an *Ecomoda* exclusive design, which is why they can never be beautiful. Betty Pinzón, though, believes that they should, and she makes it happen. Nothing of the sort would have ever occurred in *Ugly Betty* because class struggle does not lead to the American dream. Hard work within established institutions does.

There are two additional changes that give *Ugly Betty* an American feel. First, the show normalizes homosexuality and treats homophobia as a deviance, mainly through the characters of Marc St. James and Justin Suarez. Marc is a very flamboyant gay man, but he also helps young Justin as he comes to terms with his sexuality. For example, Marc advises Justin to be true to himself, in spite of how much he is teased at school for being different. Then, when Justin admits being gay, Marc supports his decision to wait to tell his family, and he tempers down their enthusiasm – The Suarez clan decides to throw Justin a coming out party to show their support – when they find out. Marc’s relationship with Justin, more than anything, reveals a greater depth of character. It keeps him from being a gay caricature, like Hugo Lombardi is in *YSBLF*.

Strictly speaking, the decision to keep *Ugly Betty*'s title character Latina is not a change. Yet it is worth noting that the American version is the only instance in which the Betty has a different ethnic background than most of the people that surround her. Betty's ethnicity is not inconsequential. It makes *Ugly Betty* into one of the few shows that can provide a representation of Latino(a) life. The presence of Latino(a) characters also allowed for the promotion of *Ugly Betty* as a Latino(a) themed show.

A Rhetoric of Authenticity:

Ugly Betty and the US-Latino(a) Experience

With a new version in place, ABC set out to promote *Ugly Betty*. The network began by emphasizing its Latino(a) roots. Latino(a) involvement in front and behind the scenes was an important part of the strategy. It made it possible to position *Ugly Betty* as an authentic representation of Latino(a) culture, but more importantly, of a universal experience. Indeed, ABC hailed *Ugly Betty* as a show that “was developed from Hispanic roots, [with] people behind the scenes [...] that understand that” (Knolle, 2006). Moreover, Salma Hayek's commitment to producing Latino(a)-themed entertainment, would become part of the media blitz. Hayek told the media that she “[had] been trying to get a Latin-themed show on television for six or seven years,” albeit unsuccessfully (Munoz, 2007). But she had persevered, to “[fulfill] her ambition to open “a back door into Hollywood” for actors who until now ha[d] concealed their Hispanic identity” (Devlyn & Harlow, 2007). The press also reported about Hayek's insistence in keeping the main character Latina (Karrfalt, 2006c), and on her role in hiring Silvio Horta and America Ferrera (Adalian & Schneider, 2008; B. Wilson, 2007).

Horta and the Latino(a) cast became the spokespersons that best tied together the Latinidad of the show. They would describe it as a realistic and positive representation of Latino(a) family life (Wides-Munoz, 2010). Horta and America Ferrera, furthermore, could speak to the experience of growing up Latino(a) in the United States. Horta likened *Ugly Betty* to “[his] story, living at home and switching between languages,” and watching telenovelas (quoted in Fernandez, 2006), and he described the Betty Suarez as “a first-generation [sic] Latino American, like myself, trying to straddle two new worlds” (quoted in Karrfalt, 2006c). America Ferrera made similar statements on her connection with Betty Suarez. As a first-generation American, she had always felt between two worlds because she was neither “Hispanic enough,” nor “white enough” (quoted in Marrs, 2007). Moreover, Ferrera did not match conventional standards of beauty, which had been an obstacle for her acting career. This was a further connection to Betty, who was also “short and not blonde and blue-eyed” (quoted in Fernandez, 2006), and had to struggle to fit in.

In terms of reception, Latino(a) viewers agreed about the positive impact of *Ugly Betty*. The Suarez family was wholesome. They were not in a gang, worked as maids or gardeners, or sold drugs on a street corner. Latinos(as also appreciated the fact that Betty was “not blonde-haired and blue-eyed,” and that she was “smart” and “ambitious”. Even Latino(a) public officials took notice. Rep. Hilda Solis praised Ferrera on the floor of Congress, and called her a “role model” for young Latinas (Barney, 2007). All of this worked to further promote the show through a mediated word of mouth.

Clearly, *Ugly Betty* had tapped into Latino(a) consciousness. However, the positive reception did not translate into ratings. Indeed, Latino(a) interest would ebb and flow, but it was highest when *Ugly Betty* was relatively new. By March 2007, it was pulling about 850,000 Latino(a) viewers (Barney, 2007), and it remained among the top ten rated shows for Latinos(as) 18-49 throughout its first season (Toledo, 2007). However, it never outperformed Univision's most popular telenovela, Televisa's *La Fea mas Bella*, which was another *YSBLF* remake. Yet *Ugly Betty* performed well with the general audience. By October of 2006, it was drawing between 14 and 16 million viewers per episode, second only to *Survivor* in its time slot. ABC renewed it just before the November 2006 sweeps (Schneider, 2006).

The Rhetoric of Beauty, and Ugly Betty's General Audience Appeal.

In the first 3 years of a television series, international sales are the most important revenue source (Havens, 2002), and *Ugly Betty* provided a unique opportunity for ABC because of its association to *YSBLF*. However, the show needed strong domestic ratings in order to strengthen its track record for international syndication. It had been aggressively promoted to the Latino(a) community as true to their roots, but the real test was the general audience. Originally, ABC meant to schedule *Ugly Betty* on Friday nights. But the pilot's positive reviews pushed the show into ABC's female-centric block, on Thursday nights. *Ugly Betty* would be the lead in for *Grey's Anatomy*, and serve as counter-programming to *Survivor* (Adalian, 2006b; Oldenburg, 2006).

Ugly Betty's focus on beauty anchored the promotion for the general market, which was aimed at women. The network and the media hailed it as a show that

challenged the *beauty myth* (Wolf, 1991). Indeed, the media “pegged” *Ugly Betty* “as part of a larger cultural shift away from the unreal perfection of stick-thin and airbrushed models and fashion fetishism of *Sex and the City*” (Esch, 2010). When *Ugly Betty* premiered, awkward movies, television shows, and social experiments, involving celebrities, hidden cameras, and fat suits were not uncommon (Brioux, 2009; Hiscock, 2001; Morrissey, 2007), and Dove’s *Campaign for Real Beauty* was well underway. In this climate, Betty Suarez was a perfect role model for young women.

The beauty myth backlash opened up new opportunities for ABC. In 2006, the network yanked *Extreme Makeover* off the air, and declared that “redefining beauty [was] the new cultural zeitgeist”, because “ugly [was] the new beautiful” (Oldenburg, 2006). On December 30, 2006 ABC launched *Be Ugly 07*, a public service campaign in the spirit of Dove’s “Campaign for Real Beauty.” *Be Ugly 07* was the product of a partnership with *Cosmo Girl* and the non-profit organization *Girls Inc.* ABC planned to launch it in style, with a new song by Jason Mraz, and Betty look-alikes who would descend on Times Square, Walt Disney World and the Rose Parade to distribute Ugly Betty masks. America Ferrera would appear on the cover of *Cosmo Girl*’s February issue (Oldenburg, 2006).

Promoting positive messages about beauty was one of the goals of *Be Ugly 07*. More importantly, though, public service and fundraising coalesced with consumerism and ratings imperatives. ABC hoped to drum up interest on its new show (Oldenburg, 2006) and more traffic through its website, through a combination of repurposed video content, slogans, and confessionals that touted self-empowerment. In terms of its message, *Be Ugly 07* tried to redefine the meaning of ugly, which became an empowered

attitude (Esch, 2010). In regards to fundraising, Girls Inc received the proceeds from sales of a t-shirt and the “EmpowerRing”, which were promoted on *The View* and could be purchased through the ABC website, and a portion of the sales of the Jason Mraz song, which was available from iTunes (ABC Medianet, 2007). *Seventeen*, similarly, combined socially-responsible messages with the sale of cosmetics by accompanying Ferrera’s comments against Hollywood’s “anorexic trend” (“Miss America!,” 2007) with beauty tips and a detailed list of the cosmetics used for Ferrera’s make up, under the headline “Get America’s Look” (“Get America’s look,” 2007).

Be Ugly 07 is best described as a sidebar that disappeared as swiftly as it emerged. It was meant to promote “feminist consumerism,” that is, to encourage women to “channel dissent by engaging with corporate marketing campaigns”(Johnston & Taylor, 2008) , and buying consumer commodities. The campaign generated modest buzz in the blogosphere, where bloggers would either praise it for its positive spin, or belittle it as rampant commercialism and Hollywood hypocrisy (Blessington, 2007; Oestreicher, 2007; Quillao, 2007). Furthermore, there is no evidence to suggest that *Ugly Betty*’s ratings improved as a result of it. What does become clear from the press coverage of the show, and from *Be Ugly 07*, is that the promotional focus shifted from an emphasis on Latinos(as) to the general market audience.

Life After the First Season:

Ugly Ratings, Syndication, and Cancellation

During its first season, *Ugly Betty* was one of ABC’s signature shows. Its ratings, though not stellar, were satisfactory, and the show was in close competition with CBS for

the 8 p.m. slot of Thursday nights. The other networks, though, were far behind. Fox, for example, only topped *Ugly Betty* with the World Series (“Nielsen Oct,” 2006), and a Thursday night episode of *American Idol* (“Nielsen Feb,” 2007), whereas NBC, Univision and the CW always lagged behind in the national sample ratings. With these numbers, ABC was able to boast having the “most watched new comedy of the [2006-2007] season” (Adalian, 2007b).

For *Ugly Betty*, this translated into an even larger promotional effort, aimed at international syndication. In its annual report, ABC’s parent company, Disney, listed it along with *Grey’s Anatomy*, *Lost* and *Desperate Housewives* as examples of “high quality content,” which bore the Disney Brand. They were all co-produced by ABC Studios,²⁰ broadcast through ABC, and distributed by Buena Vista International Television (Disney Investor Relations, 2006). These shows were also credited in tandem for ABC’s \$2.1 billion total ad sales during the 2007 upfront. Furthermore, they were positioned across platforms, as viewers could find them and ancillary content associated to them on the Internet iTunes, cell phones and Video on Demand (Keveney, 2006; Learmonth, 2006a; Whitney, 2007). However, Disney would go even further to promote *Ugly Betty* to international buyers. It made *Ugly Betty* into the centerpiece of the 2007 upfronts,²¹ where a musical number with the show’s cast opened Disney-ABC’s presentation, and in the LA screenings, where the network treated international buyers to an *Ugly Betty* evening (Guider, 2007; Learmonth & Schneider, 2007). The pageantry was meant to benefit the Disney-ABC brand in general, which is one of the functions of syndication fairs and trade shows (Havens, 2003).

The End of the Cycle

In every sense of the word, *Ugly Betty*'s first season was the most successful one. It garnered awards, ratings, and significant media attention. Furthermore, it was promoted aggressively to Latinos(as) and the general market, and it also went into international syndication, where it was sold to 130 countries worldwide (Guider, 2007). *Ugly Betty* premiered strongly in England, for Channel 4 (4.5 million viewers), in Australia, for Channel 7 (2 million viewers), and in Canada (Elsworth, 2007; Moodie, 2007; Strachan, 2006). With this in mind, the second season looked auspicious. However, the television networks were about to face major challenges, which would impact every show on television. DVR penetration and the writers' strike of 2007 slowed down *Ugly Betty*, and though they are not the only factors that led to the show's eventual cancellation, they were not unsubstantial.

It goes without saying that networks and advertisers were very concerned about the impact of the DVR on the viewing habits of the American audience. However, this is a question that exceeds the scope of the present study, and that has been treated elsewhere with far more depth (e.g. S. M. Smith & Krugman, 2009; S. M. Smith & Krugman, 2010; Wilbur, 2008). A more relevant issue, though, is the impact DVR had on audience measurement practices. Indeed, DVR penetration reshuffled the way in which Nielsen calculates the ratings to include time shifting (Levingston, 2005; Stelter, 2007). However, Nielsen excluded DVRs from the National People Meter Panel until 2006.²² At the time, approximately 5% of the sample had DVRs. By January 2008, though, penetration had reached 22.3%, mostly because cable and satellite providers were bundling the

technology into their set top boxes (Nielsen, 2009). DVR adoption sparked conflicting demands, as networks and advertisers hoped to use DVR metrics to their advantage in negotiations. Advertisers preferred live+same day viewing, whereas the networks favored the live+7 day metric (Lotz, 2007). As a compromise between networks and advertisers (Guthrie, 2007), Nielsen launched the C3 ratings, which measure “the commercials watched both live and three days DVR playback” (Nielsen, 2009). C3 are now the industry standard, even though they provide lower numbers than live+7 ratings (Kissell, 2010; Learmonth & Littleton, 2007). That said, the C3 numbers were not much different from the overnight ratings (Guthrie, 2007; Lafayette, 2007).

The big test of the DVR metrics came at the start of the 2007-2008 season. Networks, accustomed to having the numbers almost immediately, had to wait up to fourteen days for the live+7 numbers, and up to three weeks for the C3 ratings (De Moraes, 2007b). The overnight ratings for premiere week revealed a decline in television viewership overall. *Ugly Betty* dipped 24% in the 18-49 demo, and *Grey's Anatomy* posted a similar loss (Consoli, 2007). ABC, though, hoped that the live+7 numbers would boost their ratings (Adalian & Schneider, 2007). The network's hopes were justified in both cases. For the week of Oct 1-8, *Grey's Anatomy* topped the live+7 ratings, by adding 3.7 million viewers. *Ugly Betty* added a modest 1.5 million, which was about a million less viewers than *Survivor China* (Gorman, 2007). Since C3 is the basis for advertising sales, *Ugly Betty's* gain was meaningless. If anything, it was symbolic because it placed the show among the top twenty time-shifted programs for premiere week. Indeed, time shifting boosted the value of shows like *Gossip Girl*, and *The Office* (Levin, 2007), it

delayed the cancellation of *Dollhouse* (Hibberd, 2009), and it is also credited in part for the renewal of *Southland* on TNT (Hibberd, 2010). *Ugly Betty*, unfortunately, would not be able to claim time shifting bragging rights for long. Had this happened, network rhetoric would have likely emphasized the DVR-friendliness of the show.

The significance of DVR viewership is not unsubstantial. It is one of the most popular explanations for audience erosion. However, during the 2007-2008 season, there were other reasons for this phenomenon. Among these was the Writers Guild of America (WGA) strike (Levin, 2008). The strike began in November of 2007, and extended into February of 2008. It forced *Ugly Betty* into hiatus in January of 2008. Upon returning, just before May sweeps, *Ugly Betty* garnered a 2.5 rating in the 18-49 (Kissell, 2008). It was the season's lowest point, and the show would not recover. Still, ABC renewed it for a third season, which would be filmed in New York City (Ryan, 2008).²³

As the second season concluded, Silvio Horta and the network began reassessing *Ugly Betty*. Horta suggested that the show had lost its narrative focus, which became mired by pointless storylines and guest stars. He described one particular episode in the following terms: "Betty was talking to a ghost in a fridge, there was this dwarf, and Betty and Daniel were going to break someone out of rehab" (Martin, 2009). Horta, though, was not the only one to suggest that Betty was losing its focus.²⁴ Television critics asked, "Where's the old beauty in Betty?" (Bianco, 2008), wrote about "irritating subplots and secondary characters," that "weighed down" the show (Ryan, 2008), and wondered "if the writers watched a marathon of CBS' 'Two and a Half Men' and decided 'Hey we

can dress up the same tired script for the 17th time, too, and no one will notice” (Perigard, 2008).

It was obvious that *Ugly Betty* needed re-engineering, and Horta and ABC were determined to get the show back on track. First, the network fired James Hayman and Marco Pennette (Andreeva, 2008), a move that led one blogger to suggest that ABC was “getting rid of the dead wood” (Trechak, 2008). In practical terms, the firing consolidated Horta’s role in the creative direction of the show. He phased out several characters, including both of Betty’s love interests, and Alexis Meade. He also cut storylines that took too much attention away from Betty. Daniel, for example, had learned that he had a son (Daniel Jr.), and the father-son relationship would develop during the third season. However, this plotline was cut short, and it is one of the best examples of what Horta meant by re-focusing on Betty.

The critics received the changes well, but the audiences did not flock back to *Ugly Betty*. Ratings would never reach season one levels again, and the network began losing confidence on the show. Indeed, the highlight of the 2008-2009 season was ABC’s sale of syndication and repurposing rights to the *TV Guide Network* (Levine, 2009). In March of 2009, though, ABC announced that *Ugly Betty* was going into hiatus. Two new comedies, *Samantha Who* and *In the Motherhood*, would take its spot. According to ABC, the Thursday night spot provided “a good opportunity to launch these comedies” (Ausiello, 2009a). Arguably, *Ugly Betty*’s lackluster ratings were the cause. However, the replacements did worse. The network brought *Ugly Betty* back, cancelled *In the Motherhood*, but kept *Samantha Who*. ABC would also renew *Ugly Betty* for a fourth

season, albeit on Friday nights. Speaking to this decision, ABC's president Stephen McPherson made it clear that it was all about the ratings:

I love the show [and] *America* [Ferrera] is one of our biggest stars. [But] you look at [*Betty's* declining ratings on] Thursday night and we think we have a big opportunity with *Flash Forward*.²⁵ You have to make some bold moves sometimes. To me, I'd love to see [*Betty*] have a great run on Friday night the way *Ghost Whisperer* has [for CBS]" (Ausiello, 2009b).

The move to Fridays was ABC's response to changes in audience behavior, which have created both challenges and opportunities. Without a doubt, the overall audience for primetime has dropped over the years, even for the most popular programs on the schedule. Even the unstoppable *American Idol* is feeling the crunch, as its total audience dropped from 30 million to 24 million viewers between 2006 and 2009 (Herrera, 2010). Audience erosion, though, became an opportunity to re-shuffle network schedules. Fox decided to do this in the spring of 2009. It counter-programmed *Bones* against *Ugly Betty*, and then announced it would move *Fringe* to the 9 p.m. slot, against *Grey's Anatomy* and *CSI*. When asked about the reasons for the move, Fox's Entertainment President, Kevin Reilly, stated that with *Grey's* and *CSI* suffering ratings erosion, "the door's more open than it has been in a long, long time" (Goldman, 2009).

Unfortunately, the move to Fridays would hurt *Ugly Betty's* ratings even further. ABC tried to revive it, by moving it to the Wednesday night comedy block, to no avail. ABC finally cancelled it in 2010. The network also reduced its episode order, from 22 to

20 episodes. Neither decision came as a surprise. The show was barely averaging a 1.7 rating in the 18-49 demographic (Schneider, 2010), and ABC was ready to move on.

Conclusions

Where was the Latino(a) audience as *Ugly Betty* struggled in the ratings? It had arguably justified bringing the show to the United States. However, after the first season, the Latino(a) elements were not directly relevant to the plot. If anything, the Latino(a) elements took a symbolic character. They represented ethnicity through food, telenovelas, and the occasional Spanish word. In comparison, the first season had introduced illegal immigration as a storyline (see chapter 4), arguably to relate to the Latino(a) viewer. By 2007, though, the idea of an acculturated Latino(a) audience was harder to support. For one, acculturated Latinos(as) are not sufficiently differentiated from the mainstream audience because Nielsen does not take into account national origin in forming its sample. Indeed, language remains as the key factor that makes Latinos(as) distinct. In the emphasis on language is still reflected the new ratings, which now measure Univision and Telemundo alongside the English-language networks.

Ugly Betty indicates the value of political economy as an analytical perspective. From this vantage point, the promotional shift that transformed *Ugly Betty* into a female-centric show makes sense because it reiterates the primacy of the general market audience over the niches. As a result, an un-differentiated niche audience, such as the acculturated Latino(a), can justify the introduction of Latino(a)-themed content, but is not enough to sustain it. ABC, for example, cancelled *The George Lopez Show* barely months after *Ugly Betty's* renewal. Its ratings had dropped, which tends to happen as shows age.

Ironically, the network replaced it with *Cavemen* (Huff, 2007), a show that ABC described as “a hilarious and thought-provoking commentary on race relations in today's America” (Braxton, 2007b). This was a puzzling statement, in defense of a show criticized for repurposing African-American stereotypes, and for reducing the number of Latino(a) leading characters on primetime (Braxton, 2007b; Fish, 2007; Huff, 2007). Yet perhaps the most scathing indictment towards ABC came from Lopez himself as he ironically declared: “So... a Chicano can't be on TV, but a caveman can?” (Huff, 2007, p. 87).

Such is the nature of television, though. Television networks make judgments about the value of their products. These judgments do not necessarily reflect issues of quality, equity, or fandom. Nevertheless, it is too easy to assume that the ultimate demise of a show is all due to its ratings. New technologies complicate audience measurement, and audience erosion has lowered the bar of what is considered a hit. Perhaps *Ugly Betty* would have survived longer in a smaller network, but not on ABC. In fact, had *Samantha Who* or *In the Motherhood* pulled higher ratings than *Ugly Betty*, ABC would have pulled the plug or reshuffled its schedule much earlier. Networks have little patience with underperforming shows, and they think strategically about their competition. Scheduling, for example, is like a chess game, where networks constantly try to outmaneuver each other. As a consequence, Fox's decision to re-vamp its Thursday lineup, prompted a response from ABC. The network moved *Ugly Betty* to a less competitive night.

Ugly Betty, though, remains a groundbreaking show. It is the first successful adaptation of a telenovela, and it also made significant strides in terms of Latino(a) and GLBT representations. This is what *Ugly Betty* will be most remembered for.

CHAPTER 4:
ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION IN THE MELTING POT:
A TEXTUAL ANALYSIS OF UGLY BETTY.

All societies have storytellers, who weave tales about places, times, and people, for very diverse audiences (Barthes & Duisit, 1975). Some of these stories fulfill important functions. They preserve collective memories, entertain, educate, and caution. As such, they are special. They explain the world around us, and our place in it. Moreover, we learn appropriate behavior and values from them. We call these stories myths, and they provide our “imagined communities” (B. Anderson, 1983) with an identity. Even so myths include as much as they exclude.

The melting pot is a particular American myth, and it is mostly accepted at face value. The melting pot explains who immigrants are, why they choose America, and what they need to do to become Americans. In every sense, the melting pot is the story of the American dream. Yet it only tells us a partial story. This chapter explores the political, cultural, and social significance of the melting pot, its assumptions, inclusions and exclusions, by looking at the illegal immigration storyline in *Ugly Betty*.

The illegal immigration storyline in *Ugly Betty* spanned the first and second seasons of the show. It focuses on Ignacio Suarez (*Tony Plana*), a Mexican illegal immigrant who had lived undetected in the United States for over 30 years. Ignacio has two daughters, Hilda (*Ana Ortiz*) and Betty, and a grandson, Justin (*Mark Indelicato*), who are American citizens. Ignacio is an individual, who models appropriate behavior, by being morally strong, hard-working, devoted to his family, apolitical and willing to

follow the rules and laws of the United States. However, his illegality thwarts his full incorporation because illegal immigrants are only eligible for American citizenship under circumstances covered by immigration law. These include family reunification, special skills, or amnesty (Baker, 1997; Coutin & Chock, 1997; Coutin, 1998; Waldinger, 2006).

Nevertheless, the melting pot goes beyond legalities. It creates an expectation of worthiness, which is fulfilled primarily through a rite of passage that pushes the immigrant towards assimilation. In this chapter, textual analysis helps us uncover how *Ugly Betty* uses melting pot themes to transform Ignacio Suarez from Mexican illegal into an American citizen, thus positioning him and his family within a wider narrative of nationhood. In doing so, Ignacio and his family become a proxy for Latinos(as) in general, and illegal immigrants in particular.

Myths: Constructing the Past and Preserving the Future.

The study of myths has a long history, involving authors that range from Aristotle to Barthes. Such a multiplicity makes it impossible to pinpoint an ultimate definition or any sense of agreement about myths' social significance. Rather, we are left with a plethora of partial and mutually exclusive characterizations, which arise from specific disciplines (Doty, 1980; Douglas, 1953; Frye, 1954; Malinowski, 1948; Schorer, 1959). In its popular sense, a myth equates a falsehood, a legend (Cohen, 1969; Douglas, 1953), a traditional story, or a folktale (Frye, 1954; Von Hendy, 2002). In other contexts, however, a myth suggests a timeless archetype (Campbell; 1959), the deep, often pathological, workings of the unconscious mind (Freud, 1899/1967), or a life force that

balances our spiritual and physical sides (Jung, 1959/1970). On the other hand, myths imply otherness (Baeten, 1996). They are exotic narratives, typical of the magical-religious thinking of a primitive society. In this sense, myths are anachronisms; we collect and describe them, but have outgrown them because they cannot be “factualized” (Campbell, 1993).

In essence, myths are stories that have social significance, which can be assessed by virtue of their recurrent use (Csapo, 2005). They are road maps for life because they “establish a sociological charter” (Malinowski, 1948, p. 120), and justify social order, rules, beliefs, ceremonies, and rites, by granting them “antiquity, reality, and sanctity” (Malinowski, 1948). Myths can also preserve and transmit knowledge from one generation to the next (Levi-Strauss, 1966), and provide societies with foundational narratives that establish a common identity (Cassirer, 1946). Indeed, every society has foundational myths. They can be cosmological or hagiographical, purely fictional, or loosely based on actual events. Yet regardless of their character, a society’s hopes, identity, expectations, and beliefs are inscribed in its myths. They instill pride, encourage loyalty, and exemplify proper behavior.

However, there is something manipulative about myths. They can be used to exert social control over the masses. This manipulative quality has been a recurring theme in the literature on myths (Barthes, 1957/1972; Fontenelle, 1724/1972; Machiavelli, trans. 1996; Wharburton, 1738/1972). Barthes provides one of the most cited examinations of the subject.

For Barthes, myths are “*a second-order semiological system*” (Barthes, 1957/1972, p. 114, italics in the original). They are “a type of speech,” that symbolically represents an “object, a concept, or an idea” (1957/1972, p. 109). As such, myths are not natural facts of life; they are neither timeless, nor brought about by a subconscious yearning for wholeness and meaning. Instead, they evolve from history, which is a human creation that has to be written, crafted from selected events and pieces of information to even matter. Ironically, the act of selection “deprives” objects, events, and people of their “history” (p. 96), replacing it instead with a “metalanguage”, a system of meaning in which nothing is what it seems. Words and images, or signifiers, cease to have a relationship with an immediate signified, which matters less than the pre-existing “semiological chain” (p. 114).

In addition, myths are pervasive, and they obscure the distinction between truth and falsehood. Everything, from wrestling to an election, is a spectacle, and the public is an unwitting participant, who is “completely uninterested in knowing whether the contest is rigged or not” (Barthes, 1957/1972, p. 15). Myths also define identities, and instill conformity, because they are considered as common sense. The French, for example, find *veritas*, — in this case true recognition of each other — in *vino*, and wine inculcates “conformity:”

Society calls anyone who does not believe in wine by *names* such as sick, disabled or depraved; it does not *comprehend* him [...]. Conversely, an award of good integration is given to whoever is a practicing wine-drinker: knowing *how* to

drink is a national technique which serves to qualify the Frenchman (1957/1972, p. 59).

Just like the French find themselves in their wine, other communities define themselves through their own mythologies. In this sense, the study of a myth takes us down the rabbit's hole and into the intricacies of collective identity. Nations and states derive their cohesiveness not just from their institutions. They find it through their stories.

American Mythologies:

What the Melting Pot Teaches us About Immigration.

The melting pot myth has helped Americans make meaning out of immigration by explaining who immigrants are, why they choose America, who can become an American citizen, and how to acquire identity and citizenship. The myth essentially describes a journey akin to the crossing of the *Mayflower*, or westward expansion, both of which are important historical landmarks. Melting pot stories presuppose that the promise of America draws individuals from places where poverty and/or oppression deny them the dream of prosperity, upward mobility, and self-sustainability. As a consequence, migration becomes a free and rational choice that takes individuals from a less-developed region to a better life in the United States. By choosing America over other nations, immigrants re-state the nation's worthiness, which strengthens the magnetic pull even more (Honig, 1998). However, the American dream is not an automatic right. It must be earned, which means that immigrants must go through a rite of passage before they can be considered Americans. The rite purifies them. It prepares them for acceptance into the receiving community (V. W. Turner, 1969; Van Gennep, 1909/1960). To ensure

acceptance, though, immigrants need to follow the rules, and adopt the prevailing values of the American system. Citizenship is something immigrants must earn, and those who desire it must demonstrate that they are worthy of it by *assimilating*. They cannot enter a territory without permission, represent a threat, undermine any of the established institutions, or hang on to their foreign ways and traditions. If any of these premises is not carried out the transformation from immigrant to American does not happen.

The Melting Pot as a Recurrent Narrative in American history

The melting pot myth is a recurrent narrative, which reflects a particular understanding of the significance of immigration in American history. Though the term “melting pot” has been the essential metaphor for American immigration since the nineteenth century (Gleason, 1964), the myth predates the term. It begins with “the idea of America” (Muller, 1999, p. 2) as an exceptional place. To begin, America was portrayed as empty and pristine wilderness (Denevan, 1992; Sluyter, 2006). Adventurers came first. But permanent settlement required “the common man [...], to whom life in old England had become, for one reason or another, joyless and burdensome” (Andrews, 1934, p. 53). In North America, British commoners hoped to better their lot in life. Others like the Puritans hoped to establish a “Citty upon a Hill” (Winthrop, 1630/1999, p. 42) that would be an example to Europe. Invariably, though, America challenged and tested those who crossed the Atlantic (Andrews, 1934; Boorstin, 1958; Miller, 1956). It was “a sobering experience” (Boorstin, 1958, p. 1) that transformed and unsettled Europeans, their beliefs, and their ways. Yet by mid-seventeenth century, the British had established prosperous colonies on the North American eastern seaboard, mainly because they had

adapted to the exigencies of the land. Their success “was the measure of God’s protecting care” (Andrews, 1934, p. 519), and further proof of exceptionalism.

The promise of prosperity is an important theme in melting pot mythology. It is the magnet that draws immigrants to America. Michel-Guillaume Hector St John de Crevecoeur states as much. In one of the earliest examples of American immigrant literature, Crevecoeur describes a prosperous, organized, and law abiding society that attracted the poor of Europe, and regenerated them through new institutions, laws, and a way of life. However, the transformation was neither automatic, nor inevitable. It was a matter of personal choice, made by free individuals who were willing to work hard, and respect American institutions and laws (Crevecoeur, 1782/1981). About a century later, Frederick Jackson Turner would follow up on this premise, using the frontier as a theme.

Turner believed that the crucible of westward expansion created the American character. In other words, exploring, conquering, and taming the *wilderness* forced Europeans to change. They became more inquisitive, practical, inventive, individualistic, adventuresome, and resourceful. For Turner, these were “the traits of the frontier, or traits called out elsewhere because of the existence of the frontier” (F. J. Turner, 1893/1996, p 37). Turner also felt that the frontier *Americanized* new immigrants by making them re-enact the saga of colonization. This was their rite of passage, and it plunged immigrants into liminality.

Indeed, liminality is an essential part of any rite of passage (Van Gennep, 1909/1960; V.W. Turner, 1969). It purifies individuals, and prepares them for a higher purpose, a different stage in life, or for incorporation into a receiving community. For

Victor Turner, liminality presupposes isolation, as liminal beings are “betwixt and between the positions assigned and arrayed by law, custom, convention, and ceremonial” (V.W. Turner, 1969, p. 95). They are weak, nameless, passive, subservient, voiceless and malleable as clay so that society can mold them. However, liminal beings are not isolated from each other. They can always find support from other liminal beings (W.W. Turner, 1969).

In Frederick Jackson Turner’s scheme, though, immigrants could find their way out of liminality, by learning from the experiences of preceding immigrant generations²⁶ (Dorsey & Harlow, 2003), and from American-born individuals trekking alongside them to the frontier. This reflects a common concern of his time. Unprecedented immigration levels threatened national identity, especially if newcomers failed to assimilate.

Pieces of the melting pot myth emerge through the writings of Crevecoeur and Frederick Jackson Turner. However, the melting pot myth comes forth fully formed through the work of Oscar Handlin (Handlin, 1973). In *The Uprooted*, Handlin recounts the European immigrant experience at the turn of the nineteenth century. He begins with a description of the average European emigrants. They were peasants, living through the transition from a traditional to an industrial society. As the transition developed, the old ways emphasizing solidarity, community and social fixidity were eroded. Once peasants became unable to support themselves off the land, news about America drew them to emigrate. Thousands left. Inexperienced, they were subjected to a series of shocks, starting with the journey to the seaports and continuing throughout to their final destination somewhere in America. Most immigrants would never make it beyond the

industrial city slums, and every moment of the journey stripped away the *old* ways, until they realized that the key to America is assimilation. Assimilated immigrants could succeed, be upwardly mobile, and influence institutions and society. Naturalization enabled them to vote, but a deep understanding of how Democracy works empowered them. Hence, the American-born generations would “[wear] their nativity like a badge that marked their superiority over their immigrant elders” (Handlin, 1973, p. 226).

Handlin also urges the American-born generations to cherish the immigrant journey of their forefathers. It is “a platform from which to launch new ascensions that will extend the discoveries of the immigrants whose painful break with their past is ours” (Handlin, 1973, p. 273).

Though the melting pot has endured for many generations, it reflects immigration as it was once. Until 1965, American laws favored Northern and Western European immigrants, while race, ethnicity, national origin, religion, political affiliation, and physical and mental health were used to exclude certain immigrants since the late 19th century (Pastor, 1984; Reimers, 1992). This preference relates to ease of assimilation. Northern and Western Europeans immigrants share similar languages, culture, phenotype and beliefs with US-born individuals (Dorsey & Harlow, 2003), whereas undesirable immigrants do not. Yet even the undesirable would be welcome in times of labor scarcity, only to be rejected, discriminated against, accused of society’s ills, barred and/or deported once the need subsided (Carrasco, 1998). Moreover, failure to assimilate, purposeful or not, would be used to cast immigrants as a threat (Flores, 2003; Huntington, 2004a; 2004b; MacKaye, 1990).

With the passage of the Immigration and Naturalization Act of 1965, though, immigration has become far more diverse, thanks to the abolishment of national origin quotas and the adoption of a family reunification policy (Pastor, 1984; Reimers, 1992). The melting pot was not meant to accommodate such diversity, which makes it a myth that is “in perpetual evolution and subject to persistent critique” (Muller, 1999, p. 2).

Critiquing the Melting Pot

The melting pot, as any myth, has assumptions and limitations. First of all, it assumes immigration is a voluntary and rational choice. Secondly, it suggests that immigrants are a huddled mass of impoverished individuals, who come to America in search of opportunity. Thirdly, it presupposes that assimilation is a unidirectional process linked to upward mobility. And finally, it equates assimilation to Americanization.

The first assumption obviously excludes African slaves, the most cited example of forced immigration. However, about 60% of the Europeans that migrated to the American colonies were indentured servants (Takaki, 2008). The experience of Mexican-Americans in the Southwest is also conspicuously absent when we presuppose voluntarism and rational choice. The states of Texas, California, New Mexico, Arizona, Nevada and Utah were part of Mexico, but were lost after the crushing defeat of Santa Ana in the Battle of San Jacinto, in 1836, and the ratification of the Guadalupe Hidalgo Treaty of 1848 (Acuña, 1972; Huntington, 2004b). In theory, Mexicans who lived in these territories were granted American citizenship, should they choose to stay. In reality, they became “*foreigners in their own land*” (Takaki, 2008, p. 165). In the nineteenth century, Anglo-Americans disenfranchised many Mexicans, especially those without

means, using biased laws against them to deprive them of their lands, and their civil and political rights (McWilliams, 1968; Takaki, 2008). Such practices continued into the twentieth century, as thousands of Mexican-Americans were deported unconstitutionally (Balderrama, 2005; Balderrama & Rodriguez, 2006; Boisson, 2006). All of these omissions lend credence to Barthes' words: Myths are a denial of history through selection (1957/1972).

The second assumption is that immigrants are a homogeneous, huddled mass of impoverished individuals. Research, though, indicates that this is far from the truth. To begin, poverty may be a deterrent to emigration since individuals in the lowest socio-economic strata lack resources, information, and contacts to attempt the journey (Becerra et al. 2010; Bodnar, 1985; Jacoby, 2004; Nee & Alba, 2004; Portes & Rumbaut, 2006). Access to informal migration networks, in particular, can influence migration decisions. These networks help individuals cope with migration and settlement. They provide information and resources to prospective migrants and new arrivals, and connect immigrants with non-migrants, settlers, sojourners, and native-born individuals (Boyd, 1989; Castles & Miller, 1993). In addition, migration to any country may not always be permanent. Target earners, for instance, may stay long enough to improve their households through their earnings (Castles & Miller, 1993). This defies the assumption that successful immigration leads to eventual assimilation and upward mobility.

The third assumption conceptualizes assimilation as an inevitable, one-way process, leading to upward mobility. This idea is not without merit. It reflects the experiences of immigrants at the turn of the nineteenth century and into the early

twentieth century. Furthermore, it is the basis for the first scholarly descriptions of assimilation (Alba & Nee, 2003). Indeed, Chicago School sociologists described immigrant settlement patterns and linked gradual assimilation to upward mobility. Accordingly, new immigrants would populate areas that were close to their jobs in the industrial area, but would move up and out of the enclaves as they assimilated (Alba & Logan, 1991; Alba, 1999; Burgess, 1925; Handlin, 1973; Massey, 1985; Zelinsky, 2001). This is the original model of assimilation.

More recent scholarship, though, has challenged this original model. Instead, ideas like segmented assimilation (Portes & Zhou, 1993; Portes, 1997; Portes, 2007; Portes, Fernandez-Kelly, & Haller, 2009), heterolocalism (Zelinsky, 2001), and transnationalism (Basch, N. Schiller, & Blanc, 1994; N. Schiller, Basch, & Blanc, 1995) have gained acceptance in the academic community. Immigrants, in other words, have different options. They may assimilate and move up, as in the traditional model, but they can also assimilate downward, or not at all, as in segmented assimilation. Moreover, immigrants are not necessarily replicating the pattern of upward residential mobility. The heterolocalism thesis, for one, suggests that they may begin moving beyond the ethnic enclaves as soon as possible after their arrival. Transnationalism, on the other hand, holds that access to transportation and communication technologies sustains ties and habitual activities across national borders.

Finally, the fourth assumption treats American culture as a static entity, from which immigrants can learn, but should not try to alter. Huntington (2004a; 2004b) advocates this view. He believes that American values have not changed significantly

since the time of the Anglo-Saxon Puritan settlers. From them, Americans inherit their language, religion, individualism, work ethic, legal and political system, “and the belief that humans have the ability and the duty to try to create a heaven on earth” (Huntington, 2004b, p. 32). Immigrants, on the other hand, can enrich the nation, but they haven’t contributed much to the belief system. If anything, they should accept what America has to offer, and assimilate completely.

However, even the early proponents of assimilation recognized that immigrants influenced the receiving culture (Zelinsky, 2001; Alba & Nee, 2004). Park and Miller, for example, argued that assimilation strengthened democracy. But they saw it as a mutual process whereby immigrants and American-born individuals would create a common culture. They urged immigrants and American-born individuals to learn about and from each other, since both groups already shared many “attitudes and values” (1921, p. 280)

Immigrant incorporation has historically led to greater cultural diversity because immigrant groups often create and re-affirm ethnic identities while living in the United States. In fact, the first step towards incorporation usually involves building communities and organizations to pursue common social and political goals. Such activities do not necessarily hinder assimilation. They may even help it along (Handlin, 1973; Portes & Rumbaut, 2006; Zhou, 2004). Zhou (2004), for example, found that immigrant enclaves provide standards social support to immigrants as they adapt to life in the United States. Furthermore, the second generation may choose a hyphenated identity “for empowerment” (Zhou, 2004, p. 153) when they feel discriminated against.

The assumptions of the melting pot have endured over time. The story itself is recurrent, and continues inspiring popular representations of the immigrant experience, including media representations. The following section reviews immigrant representation in popular culture, and discusses Latino(a) representation as a special case.

Learning from “The Goldbergs” and “The Cosby Show”.

As seen previously, the melting pot has strong historical roots, but also several flaws. That said, the myth has inspired many stories with similar themes. For example, Israel Zangwill’s popular play, *The Melting Pot*, and Emma Lazarus’ poem, *The New Colossus* reiterate the promise of America and the immigrant hope for a better future. Upton Sinclair, on the other hand, tells a story of failure. In *The Jungle*, the immigrant hero and his family come to America full of hope. Yet they never assimilate and their dreams are crushed. Sinclair’s title character, alienated by the harshness of America, eventually becomes socialist. Betty Smith’s *A Tree Grows in Brooklyn*, in contrast, focuses on second and third-generation immigrants who do assimilate. At the end of the book, the heroine leaves Brooklyn to attend the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor to pursue her American dream (Lazarus, 1994; B. Smith, 1943; Zangwill, 1914).

Popular culture utilizes melting pot tropes to represent the immigrant experience, and television has not been an exception. Indeed, the ethnic sitcoms²⁷ of the twentieth century established a blueprint that uses melting pot mythology to encourage assimilation, while blurring out its controversial difficulties. For example, anti-Semitism does not affect sitcom families like *The Goldbergs*. Unhindered, they celebrate Yom Kippur, speak with heavy Yiddish accents, and eventually move to the suburbs, just like

many other Americans did during the 1950s. Paradoxically, anti-Jewish sentiment was just as pernicious in the United States as in Europe when *The Goldbergs* debuted in 1929, and would remain strong during the show's entire run. At the time, Jews were still barred from many educational institutions, social clubs, fraternities, housing, and employment (Dobkowski, 1977; Greenberg & Zenchelsky, 1993; Lesser, 1941). Nevertheless, *The Goldbergs* were radio darlings for about 16 years. They then leaped effortlessly to television on CBS, where they remained for an additional six years.

Several authors have explained *The Goldbergs* success. Lipsitz (1986), for example, sees it as a timely addition to the new medium of television. American society was undergoing a transition between the frugality of the Great Depression, and the prosperity of the post-war era. The Goldberg family helped ease this process, by teaching Americans the value of consumerism. Weber (1998; 2003), on the other hand, credits Gertrude Berg, the creator, producer, head writer, and star, for much of the show's success. As a fully assimilated, middle class Jewish woman, she created a family that *happened to be Jewish*, but whose concerns and daily struggles could resonate with a general audience. Berg also recognized melting pot mythology, and was able to create characters that re-enacted the assimilation paradigm. By the time they move to suburbia, their Jewish identity was limited to the accent and the malapropisms (Bial, 2005; Brook, 1999; 2003). Obviously they learned along the way and assimilated.

Latinos(as) in the Melting Pot: a Brief History of Representations

Understanding how Latinos(as) have been portrayed on American television necessitates looking back at media representation of minorities in general. The culture

industries, through mass production and distribution, play a key role in disseminating ideas and images about immigrants, and in the case of non-white ethnic groups the record is overwhelmingly negative. Between 1900 and around 1930 one could safely assume that any non-white minority in a Hollywood movie would be villainous, idiotic, or hapless (Cortés, 1997). However, representations have changed over time. For example, Jews, Irish, and Italians were originally cast in a negative light, but the balance shifted to positive portrayals. Creative control, especially in the Jewish case, played an important role. On the other hand, Asians, Arabs, and Latinos(as) have borne the brunt of stereotypical portrayals for longer, and even now remain underrepresented in front and behind the scenes.

White supremacy informs the most common and enduring stereotypes about Latinos(as). For instance, Mexican greasers of the silent film era were depraved and violent. In *The Cowboy's Baby* (1910), the greaser shows his propensity to violence by attacking a helpless child, whom he throws into a river, and *A Western Child's Heroism*, he demonstrates deviousness when he turns against "the Americans who had previously saved his life" (Woll, 1980, p. 55). However, even bandits could find redemption if they demonstrated their "loyalty to the North American Heroes" (Woll, 1980, p. 55). This was, though, a rare occurrence, especially in the early days of Hollywood. Moviegoers grew accustomed to stereotypes, such as the Bandit, the Half-Breed Harlot, the Male Buffoon, the Female Clown, the Latin Lover and the Dark Lady (Berg, 1997). According to Berg, only the Latin lover and the dark lady are "positive stereotypes" (p. 115) because they highlight characteristics that the mainstream culture desires but doesn't possess.

Accordingly, these mysterious dark-skinned characters fascinated the bland Anglo-Americans, who could neither dance the tango like Valentino, nor be as sensual and unattainable as Dolores del Rio. Neither Latin Lovers nor Dark Ladies, though, can be considered as a change of direction, or as symbols of greater tolerance towards Latinos(as). They were idealized and marginalized simultaneously (Berg, 1997).

Not surprisingly, there has been an abundance of Latino(a) characters who are violent, lazy, hypersexual, and not very intelligent, such as Sergeant García (*El Zorro*), Chihuahua (*My Darling Clementine*), Calvera (*The Magnificent Seven*), and the Lady in the Tutti Frutti Hat in every movie that featured Carmen Miranda. On the other hand, there are not many complex characters like Helen Ramírez (*High Noon*) or Esperanza Quintero (*Salt of the Earth*). The practice of casting actors of European descent to play non-white minorities certainly did not help, since it meant that the more desirable roles would go to the likes of Paul Muni, who played Benito Juarez, Marlon Brando, who sported a deep tan for his role as Emiliano Zapata, and Natalie Wood, who felt pretty as Maria. This state of affairs would remain in effect until the 1980s, which is when Latinos(as) began taking on greater roles in front and behind the camera (Berg, 1997).

Television followed suit, with one notable exception: *I Love Lucy*, but only because Desi Arnaz and Lucille Ball prevailed over pressures to cast a white actor to play Lucy's husband. Still, even with a hands-on Latino producer on board, Ricky Ricardo remained a stereotypical character. He would lunge into lightning fast tirades in Spanish whenever he was frustrated with Lucy's antics, and every so often he would chide his wife, telling her "*Lucy, you got some 'splainin' to do!*" in a thick, Cuban accent. In this

sense, Ricky Ricardo continued the pattern of the Hollywood Golden Era. His accent was a punch line, and he broke no new ground as far as acceptable occupations go. He was an entertainer (Beltran, 2006; Berg, 1997; Jones, 1992).

With the cancellation of *I Love Lucy*, in 1956, Latino(a) protagonists practically disappeared from the small screen. This trend echoes the state of Latino(a) representation in general, as suggested by numerous studies on the subject (Gerbner & Signorielli, 1979; Harwood & Anderson, 2002; Mastro & Stern, 2003; Mastro, 2005; Stevenson & McIntyre, 1995; Wilkes & Valencia, 1989). Lack of representation on screen reflects under-representation behind the scenes (Braxton, 2007a; TRPI, 2000), and may suggest that Latinos(as) are a small and unimportant segment of the population (Harwood & Anderson, 2002). Organizations like the TRPI have repeatedly denounced the persistence of stereotyping. In 2000, the TRPI reported Latino(a) actors were still expected to be brown-skinned and have brown eyes, speak broken English, be docile, “look like a criminal” or be hyper-sexualized (2000, p. 5). Unsurprisingly, Latino(a) representations have remained fairly consistent over time (see Mastro & Stern, 2003; Mastro & Behm-Morawitz, 2005).

Redefining Latinos(as) on Television:

Creative Control and Storytelling

Challenging negative representations is a daunting proposition. However, the experiences of the past indicate certain elements that can work in favor of positive portrayals. Creative control²⁸, for one, allows ethnic groups to take charge of their own stories. In the movie industries, creative control allowed Latino(a) producers to make

films like *Zoot Suit*, *Stand and Deliver*, and *the Milagro Beanfield War* (Berg, 1997; 2007). This echoes the experiences of Gertrude Goldberg and of Bill Cosby, in regards to Jewish and African American stereotyping respectively.

Gertrude Berg purposefully avoided the negative stereotypes about Jews, choosing instead to highlight positive qualities, such common sense and familial devotion. Her show also popularized aspects of Jewish culture like Yom Kippur, Seder, and keeping Kosher. Though these elements are symbolic, they were important for the Jewish and the mainstream audience (Bial, 2005; Pearl & Pearl, 1999; Weber, 2003). According to Bial (2005), these strategies “defused” the threat of Jewishness (p. 46). Nevertheless, Berg also had to fulfill her role as a spokesperson for the advertisers, and as a bankable star for the network. The ratings chase led to the ultimate undoing of *The Goldbergs*, as they were stripped completely of the ethnic elements that had made them so relatable in the first place.

When it comes to challenging stereotypes, Bill Cosby is another example of what creative control can achieve (H. Gray, 1995; Inniss & Feagin, 1995; Merritt, 1991). Cosby conceived *The Cosby Show* as a “corrective to previous generations of television representations of black life” (H. Gray, 1995, p. 80). Not surprisingly, the Huxtable family is upper-middle class, successful, nuclear, cohesive, and respectful of each other, as opposed to snarky working-class individuals from broken homes. Furthermore, the Huxtables are not isolated, but surrounded by extended family and friends. More importantly, the Huxtables are not caricatures; they are people “who are resourceful, intelligent, sensitive, and yet have human fragilities” (Merritt, 1991, p. 97). These

qualities attest to Bill Cosby's "personal style" (Merritt, 1991, p. 100), that is, his vision as to what African American representations *should* be like.

On the other hand, Cosby's vision imposed limits to the show. Since he purposefully avoided previous stereotypes, *The Cosby Show* failed to address real social problems that many African Americans faced, and continue to face, such as social inequality, poverty, violence, and discrimination. Instead, *The Cosby Show* focused on upward mobility, turning it into matter of personal choice, hard work, and perseverance. In this sense, *The Cosby Show* champions an assimilation-driven narrative that excuses institutional racism (H. Gray, 1995; Jhally & Lewis, 1992; Inniss & Feagin, 1995). As Inniss and Feagin suggest "the overall impression is that the American dream is real for anyone who is willing to play by the rules" (p. 709).

Berg and Cosby also highlight the relevance of family on American television. Indeed, the family has been a staple since the beginning (Marc, 1992; 1996). Television families provides "reassurance" (Himmelstein, 1994, p. 124) because they represent a stable world where adults are reasonable and wise, children are cute and mindful of their parents, neighborhoods are clean and safe, and no one is cruel to animals, disrespectful, lazy, or disorderly. In this sense, a focus on functional, positive, and loving families can be used to challenge negative stereotypes.

Ugly Betty shares commonalities with *The Goldbergs* and *The Cosby Show*. It has Latino(a) producers, with Silvio Horta, Salma Hayek, and José Tamez,²⁹ who can use television to tell new stories, and to challenge stereotypes. The illegal immigration storyline does this. Since this story line focuses on Ignacio, the challenge redefines

masculinity. Yet it also addresses family life, and civic responsibility. Its ultimate goal is to bring Latinos(as) into the melting pot.

“Oh my God! We have an Illegal Alien! Turn the TV off”

Public opinion is divided about illegal immigration, but the overall sense is that Americans are concerned about it and its impact on public services, security, and jobs, and about the federal government’s handling of immigration policy (Segovia & Defever, 2010). This is clearly a wedge issue, since many Americans support stricter border security, employer sanctions, and immigration law enforcement (Connelly, 2006; Pew Research Center for the People & the Press, 2010), and others favor amnesty for illegal immigrants, provided that they speak English, are employed, and pay taxes (Igbunugo & Williams, 2008). The problem is, though, that no one has been able to reconcile these conflicting interests. Congress took on immigration reform during George W. Bush’s second term. At the same time, the grassroots level erupted with massive rallies, for and against immigration reform proposals. One side supported immigration restriction (Lizama, 2006; Mangaliman, 2006), while the other side advocated for the legalization of illegal immigrants already in the country (Aizenman, 2006; Bernstein, 2006; Milbank, 2006). Between February and May of 2006, the pro-immigration movement staged marches in over 150 of America’s cities (Benjamin-Alvarado, DeSipio, & Montoya, 2009). These included *A Day without Immigrants*, which aimed to show the impact that illegal immigrants have on the United States economy (Glaister & Macaskill, 2006; McCarthy, 2006), and were the “the largest mass mobilizations in the United States since the Vietnam War” (Cordero-Guzman, Marin, Quiroz-Becerra, & Nik, 2008, p. 599).

Though social mobilization remained high, by the summer of 2007 a comprehensive immigration reform bill failed to pass in the Senate, thus shelving legislative action until after the 2008 general election (Chaddock & Bowers, 2007; Pear & Hulse, 2007).

Immigration reform remains unresolved as of this writing.

The immigration debate played out just as ABC was preparing to launch *Ugly Betty*. In this context, the decision to address illegal immigration was very timely and also very risky. The audience was clearly a concern, as *Ugly Betty*'s producers faced the conundrum of balancing social commentary and ratings. Unsurprisingly, once the illegal immigration storyline aired, the show received hate mail. For Salma Hayek, the critics were hypocritical: "You have characters on TV who kill other people, but they [audiences] are fine with it. That's illegal, too, but, oh my God, we have an illegal alien! Turn the TV off" (Devlyn & Harlow, 2007). Nevertheless, the producers continuously kept an eye on the Internet chatter to assess the audience's reaction (Fernandez, 2006), and introduced the storyline in a way that would build up sympathy for the characters, and most importantly, for Ignacio Suarez. Indeed, *Ugly Betty* separated Ignacio from the problematic illegal immigrants who threaten the state. He would not be anything like the uncivilized savages who hang on to outdated values and beliefs, the opportunists who seek jobs and benefits without contributing to the common good, the criminals who endanger national and local security, and/or rabble-rousers who demand rights they haven't earned.

During the first six episodes of the series, illegal immigration was never mentioned. The producers chose instead to build up Ignacio Suarez into one of the most

beloved characters of *Ugly Betty*. The audience learns, for example, that he is a widower, who has raised two daughters and is helping raise a grandson on his own. From his mechanic's attire, the audience also realizes that he is working class, even though they never see him outside the home. As far as his personality goes, Ignacio is an affectionate man, who likes to cook, drink coffee, and smoke cigars. There is nothing in his personal life, his interactions, or his habits to make him stand out.

To be certain, Ignacio shares commonalities with many viewers. He could be a proxy for the average working man. For example, Ignacio is one of individuals who have problems with their HMO. When it refuses to pay for his heart medication, Betty pleads unsuccessfully on Ignacio's behalf. He is a "real person, not a case number". Ignacio, hearing about her efforts, thanks her for her determination and help, and admits being bad at "bureaucratic stuff" (Horta, 2006b). The incident, though innocuous, will snowball quickly. In the episode *The Box and the Bunny*,³⁰ Ignacio appears as a bad patient who is forced to give up cigars and coffee. Betty, while urging him to take his medication, lets him know that she's "finally got to a real person at the HMO, and not some stupid recording" (Horta, 2006a). Ignacio does not respond; instead, he sips coffee, prompting Betty to take the cup away from him. The action effectively postpones the HMO conversation until the episode *Fey's Sleigh Ride*,³¹ when a pharmacist tells Betty that Ignacio's prescription coverage has been stopped pending an investigation of his insurance file. Later, when Betty informs Ignacio, he asks about the price for refills, and seems resigned to the fact that they can't afford it. He affectionately kisses Betty and then proceeds to take the last remaining pill.

At this point, the problem still seems like an arbitrary injustice against the working man. Nevertheless, that initial impression will change dramatically. To begin, Ignacio cancels an appointment that Betty had finally scheduled. He inexplicably says that “it won’t be necessary.” Though the HMO representative indicates his claims have merit, he hangs up and cuts her off. In the next scene at the Suarez residence, though, the incident seems forgotten. Ignacio appears mildly annoyed while watching the evening’s telenovela. He tries to listen to the dialogue over Justin’s excited chatter. When the doorbell rings, Ignacio visibly leans in forward, as if to block distractions out. With this, the focus rapidly shifts to Betty’s work. Mark and Amanda, have arrived unexpectedly. The magazine is in crisis after a leak compromises its holiday feature spread, and all three co-workers seem involved. During a networking party, they had discussed crucial parts of the holiday-spread with a staffer for a rival magazine *Isabella*, which had “stolen” *Mode*’s concept for a post-apocalyptic Christmas. Given the importance of the holiday issue, all employees are warned that, “By noon on Thursday, someone’s head will roll.” To keep their jobs, Mark and Amanda cajole Betty into silence. Since the shoot was far more elaborate than what all three of them disclosed, Mark and Amanda believe none of them were at fault. Betty, though, wants to confess. She does not “like lying,” but will go along to protect her coworkers’ jobs. She seems more concerned for them than they are for her (Horta & Lawrence, 2006).

Nevertheless, Betty cannot stop questioning herself. She had tried to confess to Daniel, but he would not hear her out. It would mean her termination, and Daniel does not want to fire his trusted assistant. When Mark and Amanda decide to blame another

co-worker, Betty is conflicted. “This is why I hate secrets, because they turn into lies, which are much worse,” she tells them, adding that “I didn’t realize that keeping so many secrets was such a big part of my job description.” Ignacio, who overhears the conversation, advises her: “you know Betty, sometimes we have to keep secrets to survive.” Though, directed at Betty, this comment aptly describes Ignacio’s quandary, and how trapped he feels by it. For Betty, on the other hand, the secret gnaws at her sense of right and wrong. When she confesses, she frees herself, while suffering no consequences (Horta & Lawrence, 2006).

Ignacio, though, holds on to his secret. He is terrified of the consequences, which would be far direr than job loss. Nevertheless, the secret cannot be kept hidden for long. In the following episode,³² the HMO tells Betty that, “Ignacio Suarez is 117 years old, and dead” (Horta & Todd, 2006). She informs her father and sister of this. Yet Ignacio is unfazed. He deflects Betty through jokes and pranks, and finally pretends to cut himself while carving a pumpkin. As fake blood gushes, he boasts of successfully pulling the same trick on the paperboy. Betty is unimpressed. She urges Ignacio to go to the HMO to prove his real identity. Hilda also demands an explanation, which makes Ignacio snap, “Did you come home to help me, or to question me?” The constant avoidance delays the inevitable, but does not make it disappear. Ignacio finally confesses to Betty: “I’ve been using someone else’s social security number for years because I don’t have one. You can’t get one if you’re in this country illegally, and I am” (Horta & Todd, 2006).

Ignacio’s storyline, up to this point, has not explained why he left Mexico. In melting pot mythology there would only be one reason. He was seeking better

opportunities. However, not every illegal alien crosses the border to find employment, and *Ugly Betty* makes it clear that Ignacio's case is different. He was already employed, as personal chef for Ramiro Vasquez, a wealthy Mexican businessman. Ramiro was an abusive drunk, who often beat his wife Rosa. Ignacio, though, is gentle. He falls in love with Rosa, and she reciprocates. Nevertheless, Ignacio was powerless. He would often hear Rosa scream and cry, as her husband brutalized her. Finally, Ignacio cannot take it anymore. He confronts Ramiro and kills him in self-defense, and then flees with Rosa. They reach the United States, marry, start a family, and settle in Queens until her untimely death from cancer. Ironically, *Ugly Betty* uses justifiable homicide to explain away illegal immigration. The show would deal with this matter later, as Ignacio's journey to legalization comes near its end.

Though *Ugly Betty* introduced illegal immigration, it stops short on social commentary on reasonable measures to improve immigration control, or on the victimization of illegal immigrants. Ignacio's bogus social security number, for example, allows him to go undetected in the United States for thirty years. Yet it also connects him to an illicit underground economy, usually linked to organized crime. In 1977, for instance, *The New York Times* reported that for about \$600, illegal immigrants could get a "professional smuggler" to take them all the way to Los Angeles, and provide them with "bogus, back-dated documents, such as rent receipts, utility bills, Social Security cards and American work permits" (Holles, 1977). In 2006, price ranged anywhere from \$40 for documents alone to \$2,000 with smuggling included, and some of the most notorious Latino gangs, like Vatos Locos, profit heftily (Montgomery, 2006; Shifrel, 2005). In

Ignacio's case, neither killing Ramiro Vasquez, nor possession of fraudulent documents can be construed into a full-blown criminal past. Rather, both actions are isolated and justifiable. They are acts of love, committed by a man who would do anything for his family. In this sense, Ignacio's strong sense of family becomes a proxy for worthiness.

"La Familia" in Ugly Betty

In *Ugly Betty*, the redefinition of Latino(a) representations extends to family life. This is not surprising, since Latinos(as) are considered to have a firm sense of *familismo*, or strong attachment, loyalty, reciprocity and solidarity towards members of the nuclear and extended family. Familismo has been linked to resilience and willingness to sacrifice for the sake of the children (Antshel, 2002; Parra-Cardona, Bullock, Imig, Villarruel, & Gold, 2006). Yet Latino(a) families are also considered patriarchal. Fixed gender-structures and relationships elevate the father to the apex, placing women and children under male authority (Saracho & Spodek, 2007; Zapata & Jaramillo, 1981). In *Ugly Betty*, though, the Suarez family embodies the positive qualities associated with familismo, while eschewing traditional gender roles and spheres associated with machismo. Widowed Ignacio works outside the home until his immigration status is discovered. He then becomes entirely dependent on his daughters for financial and emotional support. However, even when he held a job, Ignacio cooked for his daughters and grandson. He is much better at it than Hilda, who doesn't know how to use the oven (Horta & Martino, 2007), and refuses to ruin her nails while making stuffing (Horta & Pennette, 2006). Ignacio also has more time to care for the family than Betty, whose demanding job often interferes with family obligations.

Sitcom portrayals of fathers have evolved from the reasonable, principled, and inexpressive patriarch (J. E. Foster, 1964), to the foolish dad (Scharrer, 2001), and, finally, to the nurturing and expressive father (Dail & Way, 1985). Ignacio would fit in the later category. Every interaction with his family reinforces how affectionate and caring he is. He counsels Hilda and Betty about relationships, jobs, and goals. He also tries to spare them financial hardship, by suggesting that he could just stay undetected to save the family the expense of repatriating him to Mexico (Myers, 2007). The devotion is mutual, as Betty and Hilda are both willing to do anything to prevent his deportation. Betty agrees to sell herbal supplements at *Mode*, though she considers it demeaning, and she also tries to earn extra money by riding a mechanical bull. But Hilda makes a greater sacrifice by approaching Santos, her son's absentee father, to ask for a loan to help her father. In doing so, she acts as the good girl who went wrong, when she had Justin out of wedlock, and makes amends by devoting herself to family. She "is willing to protect [those she loves] by placing her body between the bullet/sword/posse/violence intended for [them]" (Merskin, 2007).

Ignacio is also the surrogate father and male role model for his 12-year old grandson Justin. Obsessed with fashion and musical theater, Justin is portrayed as an effeminate boy, albeit one who has yet to discover and declare his sexual orientation. According to Silvio Horta,³³ a twelve year-old boy is too young to be so self-aware. Hence, he described Justin as "a kid who's different than other boys," and as a great complement to Betty since both share a "wonderful sweetness and optimism" (Ryan, 2006), and rely on each other for support and advice.

Justin, though a supporting character, is very important for the redefinition of Latino(a) images. He would not thrive without the Suarez family and its open and accepting attitude. Ignacio, in particular, seems more concerned with what other people might do to the boy, than with how Justin's demeanor reflects on the family itself. In the episode *Four Thanksgivings and a Funeral*, for example, when Justin dresses up in a white sailor costume for Halloween, his disguise is not that "of a proud member of America's Navy," as Ignacio suggests. Instead, he is "Gene Kelly from *On the Town*." As Justin taps away, Hilda advises him to "just say you're a sailor." Ignacio merely shrugs. He addresses Hilda, not Justin, and says, "Better hope he can sing and dance, and throw a punch" (Horta & Pennette, 2006). He does not, in any way, disparage Justin's behavior, or tries to teach him to fight.

Ignacio's comment shows concern, but his passivity counters the stereotype of the heterosexual, Latino macho. At his worse, the macho embodies sexual prowess, physical strength, hyper-masculinity, and male chauvinism (Baca-Zinn, 1994; Madsen, 1973; Rubel, 1966); at his best, he is chivalrous, brave, generous, stoic, ferociously protective, and devoted to the family (Anaya, 1996; Mirandé, 1997). The negative stereotype is better known, and widely accepted by Latinos(as) and non-Latinos(as) of both genders. Nevertheless, many other Latinos(as) reject the simple reduction of masculinity to cartoonish images of bad boys, absentee fathers, or violent chauvinists (Castañeda, 1996). The family dynamic in *Ugly Betty* shows Latinos(as) as "whole person[s]" (Abalos, 2001, p. 7), which means that the characters are complex individuals, who constantly struggle with conflicting beliefs, and behavioral expectations. Creative control, and a uniform

public message are crucial aspects of this process because they imply agency to actively reconstruct identity (Martínez, 2004). We should, in other words, expect *Ugly Betty*'s Latino(a) producers and writers to re-define Latino males as “respectful sons, devoted husbands, [...] caring brothers, [or] committed fathers” (Zazueta-Martinez, 2004, p. 166), instead of hoodlums, bumbling clowns, and Latin lovers (Berg, 1997).

Though there is no link behaviors and culture, stereotypical representation of Latino males usually emphasizes their machismo in the negative sense of the term. Such representation is demeaning. It reinforces the binary opposition between the inferior Latino(a) culture, and the superior American one (Berg, 1997; Berg, 2002; Mastro & Behm-Morawitz, 2005). One of the consequences of this duality is left unstated: we can assume that immigrants from the inferior culture should learn and adopt behaviors associated with the superior culture as part of the assimilation process. When they do, they reiterate that the melting pot transforms and regenerates immigrants. In Ignacio's case, though, the process is different. *Ugly Betty* emphasizes that he had nothing to learn because he was not a stereotypical macho to begin with. When he interacts with *real* Americans, they either try to take advantage of him, or often end up learning valuable lessons. In *Four Thanksgivings and a Funeral*, for instance, an unscrupulous lawyer cons the Suarez family by pretending that she will handle Ignacio's immigration case, and then disappearing with the money she had been paid in advance (Horta & Pennette, 2006). In the following episode, Daniel experiences a Christmas tradition for the first time, when he helps the Suarez clan decorate their Christmas tree. Daniel admires the hand-made ornaments, and admits he has never decorated, or been allowed to touch anything, on his

family's tree (Horta & Goldstick, 2006). Clearly, the privileged life of a dysfunctional WASP family does not measure up to the tight knit Suarez clan. They are the immigrant outsiders that reinvigorate the nation through their presence, their traditions, and their values (Honig, 1998).

Ugly Betty de-emphasizes the patriarchal elements of the Latino(a) family. The portrayal of masculinity, in particular, questions the fixidity and validity of gendered roles and the behavioral expectations associated with these roles. Furthermore, the show's treatment of sexual orientation sets *Ugly Betty* apart from other Latino(a)-themed comedies³⁴ which avoid, defuse, or use sexual orientation as the punch line for awkward jokes. Because of this, GLBT rights groups and media praised and embraced *Ugly Betty* consistently. In contrast, Latino media has shown little interest in the sexual orientation aspect of the show. If anything, outlets like the prominent *Latina Magazine* comment on how Ignacio, "TV's favorite *papi*," eschews machismo whenever he cooks, cleans, and offers advice to his daughters ("Ugly Betty's Tony Plana," 2008), but do not bring up his role as Justin's grandfather. This is consistent with the types of stories that *Latina Magazine* covers, as the publication rarely brings up sexual orientation. In its coverage of *Ugly Betty*, the magazine only mentioned it once, stating that homosexuality was one of the "real life issues" that made the show appealing to "audiences" (Rosario, 2009). De-emphasizing sexual orientation in *Ugly Betty* most likely reflects conservative Latino(a) attitudes and sexual mores. Homophobia, latent or overt, tends to be the norm in Latin American countries, but in United States it is more pronounced among recent immigrants than among more assimilated Latinos(as) (Suro, Escobar, Livingston, & Hakimzadeh,

2007). The latter group is the key demographic for *Latina Magazine*, and it was also the justification for airing *Ugly Betty* in the first place. By ignoring it, *Latina Magazine* reiterates Latino(a) traditional views about appropriate gendered behavior.

However, in terms of the melting pot, the show's treatment of sexual orientation demonstrates worthy qualities, which is especially relevant for the portrayal of Ignacio. According to Tony Plana, for example, Ignacio undergoes a transformation in regards to Justin "from a being afraid for [Justin] and wanting to change him to a place of acceptance and support and nurturing, encouragement" (G. Hernandez, 2007). Plana also spoke about Ignacio's transformation to the online publication *After Elton*, suggesting that it was not as "difficult" for his character because:

Ignacio's a chef by profession. He loves the kitchen, he loves to cook. He's an artist in his own right. And he has an artistic sensibility, a feminine side, nurturing, mothering type of father. He had to because he's a widow and I think the shift for Ignacio is not so radical, is not so big, to see a little bit of himself in the kid or the kid in him (Jensen, 2007).

The idea of a "nurturing" father, with a "feminine side" contradicts the stereotype of the Latino macho. Instead, it exemplifies a different version of machismo, one that values "dignity and honor" (Anaya, 1996, p. 69), over chauvinism. Indeed, the illegal immigrant may bring something positive into the melting pot after all. He can teach America about tolerance.

Baseball, Oprah and Amnesty:

The Immigrant Rite of Passage in Ugly Betty

In melting pot stories, even worthy immigrants like Ignacio must undergo a rite of passage. Indeed, immigrants who come to America leave everything they cherish behind. By enduring hardship, they follow in the footsteps of previous immigrant generations, and re-enact the founding of the nation. For Ignacio Suarez, impending deportation initiates the rite of passage. The crucial scene that starts the journey plays out at a lawyer's office, where Ignacio, Hilda, and Betty go for immigration advice:

Betty: He could be deported?

Lawyer: Very strong possibility, yes.

Betty: But he has a family; he pays taxes; he is a Mets fan.

Hilda: He's in the Oprah's book club (Horta & Rodriguez, 2006).

Ignacio's daughters are shocked. Their father is a model American. He pays taxes; he has forsaken the Mexican soccer league for the *Mets*, and he is also a typical consumer through his affiliation to Oprah's Book Club, which also indicates his bilingualism. What else could preclude him from enjoying all the privileges that he has obviously already earned through his assimilation?

In terms of the rite of passage, Ignacio cannot be assimilated because he never sought permission to enter in the first place. Indeed, according to Van Gennep, (1909/1960) when a group settles within a territory and establishes borders, the territory itself becomes sacred, and all native-born inhabitants acquire specific rights as long as they remain within territorial boundaries. Strangers, on the other hand, could only enjoy similar rights if the receiving community granted them, and only after completing the

required ceremonies. Should strangers enter the territory without permission, they would be considered impure and sacrilegious. Plunging them into liminality, though, could rectify the wrong, as it would force transgressors to prove their worthiness.

In Ignacio's case, liminality has to be re-introduced, and *Ugly Betty* links it to his lack of involvement with the immigrant community:

Lawyer: Mr. Suarez, there's something I have to ask. You've been here for what, thirty years? All that time, you never applied for a Green Card. Never began the citizenship process. What about the Amnesty in the 80s?

Ignacio: I was a little busy providing for my family. Is that such a problem? (Horta & Rodriguez, 2006).

In the 1980s, Ignacio could have legalized through amnesty but didn't. Once more, when directly questioned, he calls on familismo, which had taken precedence. Later, when Betty questions him again, Ignacio's answer is "I missed it." The problem, though, is that *this* particular amnesty was very hard to miss or pass up. It was part of the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986 (IRCA), which was the first major revision of US immigration law since 1965. IRCA was meant to deal with illegal immigration. Amnesty provisions would benefit those who could prove continuous residence in the United States since before January 1982. Beneficiaries would become eligible for citizenship after ten years. IRCA also increased funding for enforcement, and made it illegal to hire undocumented migrants. Though IRCA did little to discourage illegal immigration, it did increase the naturalization rate most notably among Mexicans (Bean, Brown, & Rumbaut, 2006; Chiswick, 1988; Durand, Massey, & Parrado, 1999; Orrenius &

Zavodny, 2003; Reimers, 1992). Eligible immigrants were more likely to seek IRCA amnesty when:

(1) Their U.S. households include U.S citizens; (2) they are employed; (3) they exhibit weak home country ties; (4) they receive U.S. public benefits; and (5) they live in communities with well-elaborated institutions (e.g. social services and media) that facilitate awareness of and assistance with naturalization (Baker & Espitia, 2000)

With the exception of public benefits, Ignacio Suarez meets the predictors and legal requirements for IRCA naturalization, which is why “missing it” would not be the expected response. Benefits aside, IRCA received massive media coverage in English and Spanish. The law also coincided with a moment of heightened political activity in the Latino(a) community.³⁵

However, “missing it” is consistent with melting pot mythology because immigrants going through the liminal stage of the rite of passage should not be engaged in activism or show political savvy. If they are undocumented, the situation is even direr, more conducive to vulnerability. In this sense, Ignacio Suarez fits well into the role of the harmless immigrant, who just wants to live his life without causing any trouble. He remains aloof and apart, isolated even from the “migrant civil society” (Theodore & Martin, 2007), which is an integral part of social movements that advocate immigrant rights (Benjamin-Alvarado et al. 2009; Cordero-Guzman et al. 2008; Gleeson & Buttimer, 2005).

The problem, though, is that lack of involvement renders Ignacio powerless. He cannot benefit from the counsel of the immigrant networks that could help him, or be empowered by groups seeking his active participation in the quest for immigration reform. Consequently, when the US Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) finally catches up, he has already tried and failed to retain legal representation twice. He is detained, released, and assigned to a caseworker, Constance Grady,³⁶ with whom he checks in daily. Nevertheless, he feels wronged:

Ignacio: Look, I've been living in this country for 30 years now. I have two kids; my wife is buried here. For the last two hours you've been grilling me non stop like I'm some kind of...

Constance: A criminal? Mr. Suarez, in the eyes of the ICE that is exactly what you are. Let me remind you, you are in this country illegally. My department is the one thing standing between you and deportation (Horta, 2007).

Constance is initially portrayed as a committed professional. Distant and gruff, she approaches her job without sentimentality. Ignacio complains that she “has no respect” (Horta, 2007) for him, or his family, yet he has no choice but to bear it. Following advice from Hilda, he tries to smooth things over, apologizes, and gives Constance a mug on which he has painted the words “Best Immigration Case Worker Ever.” After that, Constance is smitten; she goes from a true professional, to an emotional wreck. In the episode *I'm coming out*, she acts erratically and finally breaks down in tears in front of Ignacio. Her boyfriend, Toussaint, has ended the relationship, and the breakup is affecting her professional performance. When Ignacio tries to comfort her, Constance wonders why all men can't be like him. She takes his hand, and leans closer, to which his response is to back away, in utter confusion. She then crosses the line between

caseworker and client by coming to his house, bringing him chocolate, and then offering to cook dinner “as a thank you” for “being so sweet the other night.” Ignacio, though very unsettled, feels he has no choice but to allow it. He tells Betty’s boyfriend, Walter, “She’s my immigration caseworker; I piss that woman off, I end up on the other side of that fence.” To this, Walter suggests reminding her that, “she works for the government” and that she “could lose her job.” Yet Ignacio is too afraid to complain, either to Constance, or to her superiors. He decides that the best course of action is to reunite her with her boyfriend (Horta & Parriott, 2007).

Toussaint Duvalier, as it turns out, was one of Constance’s cases. She is not a professional, according to him, but a devious vamp who takes advantage of her position to extort illegal immigrants for affection. He describes her *modus operandi* to Ignacio:

Toussaint: First, she starts showing up three times a day. Then, she starts moving her chair closer and closer. Before you know it, she is crying about the last guy who dumped her.

Ignacio: Exactly! How does she get away with this?

Toussaint: She is the one step between denied, or approved (Horta & Parriott, 2007).

Though Ignacio does not think that he “can play that game.” He feels like he has no choice. Toussaint tells him that he either does Constance’s bidding, or he can forget about a green card. Her erratic behavior escalates, just like Toussaint had predicted. Ignacio tries to keep her on track, by bringing up the immigration case. However, she tells him “we have time, your court case is not for weeks.” She tries to kiss him, begins stalking him, and even gives Justin a dollar to “call her grandma.” When Hilda offers to help,

though, Ignacio refuses, saying that he will manage until the court date comes. Hilda is undeterred, and but instead of reporting Constance, she decides to let her down easy by telling her that Ignacio is already seeing someone else. Constance seems to take the news well while Hilda is around, but that is a façade (Horta & Parriott, 2007).

When Constance mistakes Claire Meade for Ignacio's girlfriend, she flies in a jealous rage. Ignacio finally tells her that they're not a couple, and asks, "Why are you stalking me?" Constance then slaps an ankle bracelet on him. "I'm not stalking you – she says – I'm monitoring a dangerous illegal immigrant who is a flight risk" (Horta & Rodriguez, 2007). The tracking device renders Ignacio even more helpless, but his desire to get his green card prevents him from reporting Constance. For their part, Betty and Hilda don't question the fact that he is under house arrest. They go along with their father's desires, and keep quiet. They do not seem to mind that Constance has obliterated the equal protection clause, the due process clause, and the Fourth Amendment. These rights are guaranteed to everyone, regardless of immigration status (American Civil Liberties Union [ACLU], 2000; Neill, 2002). However, the show's dramatic tension benefits because Constance's abuse is an obstacle for Ignacio to overcome.

Constance also breaks the public trust by behaving in a manner that does not befit a public servant. Yet she is able to get away with it because the Suarez family fail to assert their rights, or are simply unaware of them. It should be noted, though, that Constance doesn't always behave erratically. In the episode *Punch Out*, she removes Ignacio's tracking device, and lets him know that she's over him. Again, she seems to behave professionally, by setting up a meeting with Ignacio's immigration lawyer, albeit

at her house, and after office hours. Using this excuse, she lures him to her apartment, where she finally tells him “you deserve to be a US citizen, so as soon as we finish dinner, we’ll head out to Atlantic City and get married” (Goldstick, 2007).

Ignacio is shocked. He had believed Constance to be a bona fide immigration caseworker. However, she turns out to be a mentally unstable employee, who had been fired from her job, as the family finds out when another immigration official shows up at their house. Even worse, they learn that Ignacio never made it into the system, so his gamble to trust is rendered meaningless by a disappointed caseworker. “I help you put your life back together; I hold your hand while you walk into that big scary courthouse; I get you to the finish line, and then I never hear from you again,” (Goldstick, 2007) she says, indicating that all she wants is appreciation. Her job thoroughly dehumanized her, and the people she helped ignore her.

Ignacio’s plight serves to increase sympathy for him because of his helplessness, but it also shows his kindness. Constance has deceived him, and possibly cost his legalization, but he forgives her, rising again as more human and worthy. He has understood the meaning of compassion, by choosing not to report Constance to the police. Instead, he says “she’s been punished enough” (Goldstick, 2007). In contrast, the immigration bureaucracy emerges as a machine that victimizes everyone. Constance breaks down after years of thankless, repetitive work, and Ignacio, already vulnerable, is preyed upon because the bureaucracy is too large to notice.

To be certain, the Department of Homeland Security, which oversees immigration and naturalization, is hopelessly backlogged, and there is also no doubt that case workers,

federal judges, and immigration attorneys are overburdened. According to the *New York Times*, the immigration crackdown that began in 2006 increased the load on immigration courts, as the number of deportation appeals and applications for political asylum surged (Preston, 2009a; Preston, 2009b). Naturalization procedures, furthermore, are lengthy because of an increase in applications, and of FBI criminal background checks.

Appearing before the House Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration in 2008, the director of Citizenship and Immigration Services, Emilio T. Gonzalez, stated that legal residents who apply for citizenship might wait for about 18 months before receiving a decision (Preston, 2008; U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, 2008). These are some of the real challenges facing the American immigration system today.

Unfortunately, in *Ugly Betty*, the real problem with immigration is whether or not its employees can keep their hormones and disappointments in check.

Into the “Labyrinth of Solitude”:

Images of Mexico and Mexicans and Rites of Passage

“To live” — wrote Octavio Paz — “is to be separated from what we were in order to approach what we are going to be in the mysterious future (Paz, 1950/1985).

Loneliness is an inescapable fact of human existence, yet it is not insurmountable.

Human beings are constantly striving to escape it, to commune with others, and to return to a primeval state in which they were not alone. In this sense, solitude is “a test and a purgation, at the conclusion of which our anguish and instability will vanish [...]. It is a punishment but it is also a promise that our exile will end” (p. 196). Though Paz was describing Mexico’s yearning for a national identity, his words aptly describe the last

stage of Ignacio Suarez' journey. Alone, he needs to re-enact the ritual that has made immigrants into Americans by going into the wilderness. The problem is, though, that contemporary America no longer has a physical frontier, a wilderness where men and women undergo a profound spiritual transformation. In lieu, the frontier has become a rhetorical space, either in the non-physical sense of experiencing isolation, or in the physical sense, which for immigrants specifically implies returning to where they came from. In Ignacio's case, he has no choice but to leave "voluntarily"³⁷ to Guadalajara.

In symbolic terms, American media assumes that no one goes to Mexico voluntarily. Rather characters are pushed south of the border by circumstances. Some are on the lam, while others seek hedonism. A third group desires solace after a traumatic event, and there are others who long for stress relief. A fourth category includes those who go to Mexico to rescue the natives from their exploiters, and thus demonstrate their technological and moral superiority. Finally, there are those who seek transformation, and leave for Mexico to complete a rite of passage into adulthood (Berg, 2002; Dell'Agnese, 2005). All of these individuals end up in an imagined Mexico, which is exotic, but dangerous, innocent, but lawless. Television, following on Hollywood's footsteps, has provided similar representations. Some of the most recent ones include *The Real World Cancun*, *NCIS*, *Criminal Minds*, *The O.C.*,³⁸ and *Ugly Betty*.

How does *Ugly Betty's* depiction of Guadalajara fit with the general trends of media narratives about Mexico? Consistent with Dell'Agnese (2005) and Berg (2002), Guadalajara becomes a wilderness inhabited by *the others*. Unlike the frontier, though, Guadalajara is not untamed space, waiting to be civilized. It is the state capital of Jalisco,

and the second largest city in Mexico. It is a cultural landmark, which was named American Capital of Culture in 2005, and it is also a city that combines Spanish colonial and modern architecture. Yet *Ugly Betty* transforms Guadalajara into a wilderness, which merely reinforces the idea that no one goes to Mexico for cultural reasons (Berg, 2002). Indeed, *Ugly Betty* gradually strips the city from its modern character, which the audience never sees. Instead, we are regaled with a pan of the historic city center, featuring a large Mexican flag, which quickly follows a glimpse of the Zapopan Basilica. Then, the focus moves to a non-descript narrow street, which is typical of Spanish colonial urban planning. Finally, the action shifts to the Suarez home in Guadalajara, a nice-looking adobe house, framed by cacti. There is absolutely no modern architecture, no skyscrapers, and no major freeways. Swiftly, Guadalajara evaporates. It is replaced by a barren countryside, which appears during a bus ride Betty and Hilda take to search for their maternal grandmother. Left stranded in the middle of the road, they have to make their way back to the next town. It turns out to be a run-down hamlet, with unpaved streets, where chickens roam around freely and men sell “dirty fruit” (Kinalli & Poust, 2007). The barren land is a cinematic convention that expresses danger, anticipation, and suspense. It becomes, “a crucible that the Anglo protagonist enters to test his [sic] mettle” (Berg, 2002, p. 51). In this case, *Ugly Betty* uses this convention to convey otherness.

Ignacio Suarez, however, is not a conquering Anglo pioneer. He is a returning native. Betty, Hilda, and Justin, on the other hand, are second and third-generation Americans, and *Ugly Betty* uses this to set up a contrast. Indeed, Ignacio appears to be in

his element. He reminisces about the past with his sister, and reminds her not to drink too much. His daughters and grandson, on the other hand, are out of place. Betty, for example, tries to communicate with her relatives, but ends up telling them, unwittingly, that she is “muy embarazada” (very pregnant), for not knowing their names (Kinalli & Poust, 2007). But she is also pleasantly surprised by her large extended family that seems unconcerned with the ideal weight and body mass index. They repeatedly insist that she is skinny. Finally, Betty fits in. Her body, and that of the other Latinas in the scene, does not need to be hidden away, or altered to accommodate “American bottomphobic attitudes” (Negron-Muntaner, 1997). If anything, the environment at the Suarez residence celebrates the display of the curves that Puritanism finds abhorrent, and that make the contemporary fashion industry balk. However, the Guadalajara episode’s depiction of the extended family is not without contradictions. When it comes to style and taste, *Ugly Betty* reverts to mocking the “incomprehensible excess” that the Anglo-dominant culture associates with Latinos(as) (Negron-Muntaner, 1997, p. 189).

In the media, beauty and fashion sense often go hand in hand (Esch, 2010), and *Ugly Betty*’s has never challenged this trend in spite of Betty’s questionable choices in attire. As columnist David Graham suggests, she is a far cry from Mimi, of the *Drew Carey Show*. In fact, Betty is “a cunning creation,” and almost every piece of her usual ensembles could be found in some of the most trendy stores in Toronto and London, as well as on the ABC website (Graham, 2007). In Guadalajara Betty is a fashionista compared to her cousin Clara (*Justina Machado*). When Hilda, seeking for the perfect wedding dress for her upcoming wedding to Santos, agrees to try on Clara’s gown, Hilda

and her family are appalled with the ruffles, the white embroidery over blue chiffon, the puffy sleeves, and the train. Betty, politely, calls it “fancy,” Justin wonders if there was “any fabric left for the bridesmaids,” and Hilda, at a loss for words, states she would rather be more traditional, “like one or two colors.” Clara, though, says she felt “like a fairy princess” when she wore it (Kinalli & Poust, 2007).

Ugly Betty, though willing to question stereotypes about Latinos(as) who live in the United States, reverts to stereotypes to represent actual Mexicans *in Mexico*. In Clara’s case, garishness legitimizes the assumed inferiority of Latino(a) culture, which she cannot escape. Ironically, Hilda and Betty share this characteristic. Other Americans judge them by their appearance. In the episode *Brothers*, for instance, an irate woman scoffs at Hilda by asking her “why don’t you try dressing like a mother?” (Horta & Lawrence, 2007). Similarly, Betty’s signature poncho, a bright red piece, emblazoned with the word Guadalajara, makes her the target of ridicule at *Mode*. Nevertheless, Betty and Hilda’s fashion idiosyncrasies indicate their independence. In Betty’s case, being unfashionable speaks of her character because fashion, or lack thereof, is, “just an extension of who [Betty] is. And it’s not about trying to fit in. It’s about expressing what’s inside via what you’re wearing”³⁹ (quoted in Devlyn, 2008).

Clara’s gaudiness, on the other hand, stands for lower social status. She exemplifies what Bourdieu wrote about taste. It classifies, and it classifies the classifier (Bourdieu, 1984/1987). Yet Clara’s taste is but an example of excess, lack of self-control, and unruliness that Anglo-centrism associates with Latin American cultures. Mirta (*Rita Moreno*), Ignacio’s sister, cannot control herself when she drinks excessively. Hence, she

constantly blurts out family confidences. Clara, on the other hand, believes in the powers of a curandera, a healer who “knows things, and can do things,” like heal warts, and prognosticate the future. Mexican men fare worse, as the show resurrects the Latin Lover and the Mexican Bandit through the characters of Antonio, a bartender who unsuccessfully tries to seduce Hilda, and Ramiro Vásquez, who is not dead after all. Hilda quickly dismisses Antonio, but Ramiro Vásquez comes back seeking revenge (Kinalli & Poust, 2007).

“Sometimes, I miss my flan:” The Telenovela Connection

At the end of *A Tree Grows in Guadalajara*, Ignacio Suarez has to say goodbye to his children and grandson. The United States has denied him a visa, and he must remain behind in Mexico indefinitely. Waiting does not come easy, though. Back in Queens, matters have taken a bad turn. Hilda and Justin deal with heartbreak, after Santos is gunned down and killed, and Betty is left to keep the family going on her own. These matters weigh heavily on Ignacio, who finally decides to cross the border illegally again with Clara’s help. However, before he sets this plan in motion, Ignacio must face his past. It is Ramiro Vasquez.

As implausible as it may seem, *Ugly Betty* resurrects Ramiro Vásquez, in a plot twist that is atypical in a comedy, but all too common telenovelas. Granted, *Ugly Betty* is not a telenovela, yet Silvio Horta often cited the genre as a source of inspiration (Rohter, 2007). Indeed, he told the New York *Daily News*, that he wanted *Ugly Betty* to “bring the over-the-top addictive quality of a telenovela to [American] TV,” hoping to “attract both mainstream American and Hispanic viewers” (Dominguez, 2006). Telenovelas often play

in the background at the Suarez home, and Salma Hayek, even made a cameo appearance, as a telenovela character in the pilot episode of the show (Bianculli, 2006). Yet the connection to telenovelas is also evident in the narrative strategies that *Ugly Betty* adopts from this genre. The show's handling of Ramiro Vasquez is a very explicit example. Blogger Ann Hagman Cardinal, in a re-cap of the episode *Betty's Wait Problem*, recognized the telenovela factor. She summarizes part of the episode as follows:

We pick up Ignacio where we left him last week, in Mexico with a gun in his face, facing down his rival, Ramiro Vasquez. Ramiro — significantly less dead than previously thought — forces Ignacio to make his special flan at gunpoint, because sometimes he misses his wife, and sometimes he misses Ignacio's flan. After consuming the custard he orders his son to shoot Ignacio anyway and leaves (*classic mistake in these kind of plots... you'd think after watching telenovelas Ramiro would be smarter than that*) (Cardinal, 2007, italics mine).

Erin Martell, reviewing the same episode for *TV Squad*, also described Ramiro's return as a typical melodrama device. According to Martell, "It's common knowledge that, in a soap, you can never assume that anyone is truly dead" (Martell, 2007). Martell also brings up cliffhanger, which is another common narrative technique that telenovelas inherited from melodramas and serialized novels (Martin-Barbero, 1988). Though it is not exclusive to the genre, *Ugly Betty* uses cliffhangers extensively, and not only at the end of the season.

As *Dallas* demonstrated, a cliffhanger can significantly boost the ratings of a series. In *Ugly Betty*, though, this particular cliffhanger leads to the cleansing of Ignacio's criminal past. He is not a murderer after all, and even if he were, the show re-states that his actions were entirely justified. Thus far, the audience had only heard of Ramiro Vasquez from Ignacio, but now Ramiro speaks for himself. He tells Ignacio how humiliating it had been to be beaten up by "a cook." He also defends spousal abuse, since a man has the right to do whatever he wants to his wife and children. Indeed, Ramiro Vasquez is essentially an irrational and violent Mexican bandit (Berg, 2002). He is a sadist. He cannot be trusted because he doesn't abide by the same rules and laws as other "normal" people would. Rather Ramiro Vasquez uses violence to control those around him, and eschews the rule of law by seeking revenge. The rule of law is considered a characteristic of the modern state, and if the citizenry chooses to bypass it altogether, this would suggest weak institutions. *Ugly Betty*, through Ramiro Vasquez, re-creates Mexico as a primitive state, which is not inconsistent with other recent representations of Mexico.⁴⁰ Indeed, Ramiro Vasquez reminds us of what we could, and should, expect from Mexicans. His ultimate demise, on the other hand, suggests a telenovela approach to narrative. He is the villain, and he needs to be punished so that the hero can emerge triumphant. Ramiro Vasquez never gets to have his revenge. His own son, Hector, kills him.

We never find out what happens to Hector. He is, according to Erin Martell, a character we "only saw for five minutes or so. [However], the important thing is that Papa Suarez is back in Queens with his family" (Martell, 2007). He no longer has to

worry about the criminal past he never had. Ignacio also does not have to attempt another border crossing because Wilhelmina Slater agrees to use her connections — her father, as it turns out, is a United States Senator — to expedite Ignacio's visa, in exchange for Betty's silence. Betty has uncovered an affair between Wilhelmina and her bodyguard, and the disclosure would thwart Wilhelmina's scheme to take over *Mode* by marrying into the Meade family (Horta & Wrubel, 2007).

Following Ignacio's return, early in the second season, *Ugly Betty* concludes the illegal immigration storyline very quickly. Ignacio, in fact, barely makes an appearance, as the show switches its focus to Betty's love life, Wilhelmina Slater's ploys for *Mode* domination, the relationship between Daniel Meade and his transgendered sister Alexis, and the murder trial and acquittal of their mother Claire. All of these storylines began during the first season, and they became the main themes of the second season. Nevertheless, *Ugly Betty* does not neglect the final act of the immigrant transformation. Ignacio takes the citizenship oath, which simply shows that once you have emerged on the other side of liminality, the rest is easy.

Citizenship After the Writer's Strike

Though Silvio Horta hoped to develop more stories for Ignacio during the second season of *Ugly Betty*, his plans were put on hold. On November 3, 2007, the Writer's Guild of America went on strike (Booth, 2007). Horta and the cast of *Ugly Betty* joined the picket lines, and Horta retreated from his executive producer role with one script left to shoot (Dos Santos, 2007). In January, *Ugly Betty* ran out of new episodes, and planned storylines were either dropped, or postponed indefinitely. Horta particularly lamented

having to put Ignacio on hiatus. He had envisioned sending Ignacio back to work (Keck, 2008a), and having him “perhaps [...] seriously date for the first time since the death of Betty’s mother” (Keck, 2008b). Both arcs would be the natural progression of the character, as he continued his life in the United States as a citizen.

Horta’s plans would not come to fruition until the third season. In the premiere episode, *The Manhattan Project*, Ignacio is employed at a fast food restaurant, and feels very good about “being back in the workforce.” Later in the season, he will also suffer and recover from a heart attack, and will begin dating his nurse. However, the most significant event in terms of Ignacio’s transformation into an American citizen is voting for the first time. In the episode *Ugly Berry*, which aired days before the presidential election of 2008, Ignacio can hardly contain his excitement:

Ignacio: It’s the first time I get to vote. The first time!

Hilda: Papi, last year you voted five times on *Dancing with the Stars*.

Ignacio: Only because that Kristie Yamaguchi is an Asian ball of fire. But, this is for the President. I dreamt about it for a long time (Horta, 2008).

Ignacio is not the only member of the Suarez family who is excited about the election. Hilda is thrilled too, but for a very different reason. She has just opened a beauty salon, and she’s hoping to drum up business. She plans to send out Justin, dressed as Uncle Sam, to hand out flyers promoting the shop, and to offer discounts to customers who have voted. “I think it’s going to be a great day for Hilda’s Beutilities” (Horta, 2008), she says, while Ignacio reminds her that it will be a great day for *democracy* as well. The contrast between them is thus established. Ignacio views the election as an exercise in democracy,

whereas Hilda considers it a business opportunity. Later in the episode, this contrast will provide dramatic tension, as Hilda upsets her father by refusing to vote. Ignacio reminds her of her civic duty:

Ignacio: Mija, Do you realize how important your vote is? Mija, you are an American.

Hilda: Ay Papi! Spare me the civics lesson. You know what's American? Making money. I'm not about to slow down on the best day of business this salon has ever had to vote on something that I don't care about. It has nothing to do with me (Horta, 2008).

Ignacio is unable to convince her. He sighs in frustration as Hilda returns to her customers. However, the civics lesson does not end with Ignacio's words. It takes a practical turn when Hilda, unwittingly, admits that she never obtained a business license for her salon. One of her customers, councilman Archie Rodriguez (*Ralph Macchio*) tells her she cannot operate without one. In fact, she could be fined and shut down. Hilda, incensed at the news, lashes out. She has six weeks of solid bookings, which are now at risk. The councilman succinctly retorts, "What can I say? Next time, you can vote me out" (Horta, 2008). Hilda is speechless. She must now recognize her mistake. She has taken America for granted by neglecting the vote. Ignacio, on the other hand, understands and embraces America's values, demonstrating not only his full assimilation, but also that immigrants are like a balsam against Hilda's material cynicism. They are, as Randolph Bourne stated, a defense against stagnation and complacency (Bourne, 1916/1964).

The episode *Ugly Berry* can be considered the last direct appeal from *Ugly Betty* to the Latino(a) demographic. The show had given them an illegal immigrant, whose quest for citizenship, had shown them how to achieve the American dream. Now, *Ugly*

Betty was telling their Latino(a) audience in particular that voting mattered because it had tangible consequences. Though this message was limited to one episode, the overall sentiment mirrored the actions of the Latino(a) cast, and the concerns of Latino(a) activists throughout the United States. In real life, Tony Plana, America Ferrera, and Ana Ortiz were all out in support of presidential candidates and issues. All three opposed California's controversial Proposition 8, which banned gay marriage in the state. Ferrera, furthermore, stomped for Hillary Clinton, while Plana supported Bill Richardson's bid for the democratic nomination, and lent his talent to *Voto Latino*, a non profit organization that works to encourage young Latinos(as) to vote.⁴¹ After the episode aired, though, *Ugly Betty* would no longer use the airwaves to address Latinos(as) on political matters. Instead, it would shift its focus to other storylines, and according to some of its critics, it would lose its original charm (Strachan, 2008; Yahr, 2009). This is not to say, that *Ugly Betty* lost its penchant for social commentary. By the end of its four-year run, the Suarez family had also taught America about tolerance, with a story arc about Justin coming to terms with his sexual orientation.

Conclusions

Ugly Betty broke new ground in terms of Latino(a) representations, and specifically in regards to illegal immigrants. It did not focus on their illegality, vulnerability, and poverty as procedurals like *Law & Order* have done repeatedly in the past. Procedurals, though, are not the only television shows that have emphasized these three aspects of the illegal immigrant condition. *Eli Stone*, another comedy-drama that aired on ABC during the 2007-2008 season, also looked at illegal immigration. In the

episode *Freedom*, lawyer Eli Stone represents a couple suing their employer, an agricultural firm, for worker's compensation. They are illegal immigrants, but after being conned by an unscrupulous lawyer, they believe their status has been legalized. At the end of the episode, Stone makes a passionate closing statement about freedom, democracy, and the rights of illegal immigrants who, clearly, know more about the US Constitution than most of the native born. They have demonstrated as much by answering questions from the naturalization exam while under oath. Unlike *Eli Stone*, *Ugly Betty* does not treat illegal immigration as the subject for a single episode. It creates an on-going narrative that introduces a rich family life. Indeed, the show uses the family to highlight positive attributes, and challenge negative stereotypes about Latinos(as).

The focus on family follows the trend of previous shows, in which the family becomes the proxy for ethnic life. Because of this, the Suarez family represents the value of familismo, which is strongly associated with Latinos(as). On the other hand, *Ugly Betty* also uses the family to make a statement against patriarchy and machismo, which is why Ignacio shows feminine qualities. He is nurturing, cooks, cleans, and takes care of the household. He is also very supportive of his grandson, whom he accepts unconditionally. This aspect of this personality is diametrically opposed to the macho stereotype, with its emphasis on hypermasculinity, sexual prowess, power, and control. Instead, Ignacio's gentle demeanor suggests a positive version of Latino(a) masculinity, which centers around the idea of nurture, loyalty, honor, and protectiveness.

In terms of the melting pot myth, *Ugly Betty* utilizes themes from this enduring story of American immigration. In particular, the show places great emphasis on the rite

of passage aspect of the journey. The rite fulfills two functions. First, it provides dramatic tension to the show by constantly placing obstacles between the immigrant hero and his ultimate goal. Secondly, it re-states the worthiness of the immigrant. The choices Ignacio makes, especially in terms of following the law, establish his willingness to make amends to the nation, and his trust in the fairness of its institutions.

Ultimately America and the immigrant benefit from each other. Ignacio's absolute devotion to his family, his tolerance for difference, and his unbridled enthusiasm and faith in democracy are qualities that the nation values and needs. They are a shelter against cynicism, materialistic consumption, and outright greed, which the show often associates with the Anglo-American characters, and with Wilhelmina Slater. Ignacio himself also benefits from his assimilation. He can now vote, work, and achieve more than he would have, and he is safe once citizenship has been granted. Indeed, Ignacio fulfills his journey. He demonstrates his assimilation and worthiness, and he makes up for his transgression by overcoming all obstacles in his way. This narrative, once again, shows that foreigners can be changed, and that assimilation pays off.

Unfortunately, no representation can fully re-define every assumption. Mexico, for one, becomes a wilderness, inhabited by primitive people. This suggests that *Ugly Betty's* willingness to re-define Latinos(as) only applies to the ones who live in the United States, and who are assimilated. Everyone south of the border is *the other*, and becomes a prop in the melting pot narrative. After all, there is no transformation without a journey to the wilderness. It has always been part of the story of how immigrants become American.

The end result of the illegal immigrant storyline in *Ugly Betty* is to show how the transformation happens. In the aftermath, *Ugly Betty* also reiterates good civic qualities. Its message is that Latino(a) immigrants, regardless of their legal status, can be a positive addition to the polity. America should not retreat in fear. It should continue embracing the immigrant who is willing to change.

CHAPTER 5:

SAVVY FANDOM: CRITICAL VIEWING

ON TELEVISION WITHOUT PITY, A CASE STUDY OF UGLY BETTY

Traditionally, fans have been derided. They have been described as obsessive, pathological, out-of control, and unintelligent because they equate Star Trek to Shakespeare (Baym, 2000; Fiske, 1992; Grossberg, 1992; Jenkins, 1992; Jenson, 1992). Even the media industries, which produce and distribute the most popular objects of fandom, mock fans (Jenkins, 1992). However, the same industries recognize them as viewers, consumers and potential advocates (Jenkins, 2007; Muniz & O'Guinn, 2001). For television, fans may represent the future (Jenkins, 2007) in view of audience fragmentation and polarization (Lotz, 2007). The Internet has become a key space in which the chase for elusive audiences and for fans, in particular, plays out.

The Internet, though, has altered the character of fandom. To begin, the Internet defies the constraints of the physical world, which until very recently restricted media content choices. Now, choice seems virtually boundless (C. Anderson, 2006). The Internet's lack of physicality also expands fandom's acceptable objects. For television fans this means options extend beyond shows that can draw a significant fan base (Jenkins, 1992). Mega-sites like Television without Pity (TWoP), for example, house forums to discuss anything, from cult classics to short-lived series. Indeed, TWoP's commercial model depends on attracting traffic. Established fandoms obviously generate more unique page views and participation than new and/or obscure shows. Nevertheless,

“Most of us want more than just the hits” (C. Anderson, 2006, p. 18). On TWoP, television enthusiasts can access content and participate as they please.

TWoP fosters the emergence of new fandoms, but more importantly, it promotes critical distance. In fact, TWoP has built up its brand identity upon its acerbic style of criticism. Its slogan -- “spare the shark, spoil the networks” -- encourages users to be ruthless when it comes to critiquing television. Following Andrejevic (2008), this chapter uses the term *savvy* to describe the type of fandom that TWoP nurtures. Savvy implies deep knowledge about television itself, as well as emotional and critical investment on particular television shows. However, savvy fans are painfully aware of the limits of their influence. For the most part, they do not expect the networks to cater to their desires. They know too well that the television industry often neglects fan wishes (Andrejevic, 2008). As a result, TWoP users (TWoPpers) often blame networks and producers alike for their lack of responsiveness, which fans usually link to the demise of promising shows. Since they are emotionally engaged, these savvy fans can be just as disappointed as anyone else when they realize that a show they love is no longer lovable. The difference is that their savvy helps them rationalize the demise of a series, but will not necessarily prompt them to mobilize to save it. In other words, if the series loses their respect, savvy fans will complain vocally, yet they are just as likely to move on. After all, they *know* that they have multiple options. This certainly was the case with *Ugly Betty*, as this chapter will illustrate. If anything, TWoPpers seemed more attached to the pleasures of critique, than to the show itself. This chapter explores the role of TWoP as a space for savvy fandom.

Sparing the Shark: TWoP's Brand Identity and Site Design

Branding is inseparable from just about any product or service. Indeed, a brand is more than a name or a logo. For better or worse, a brand is a “reputation” (Calkins, 2005, p. 2). In a competitive environment, branding helps businesses distinguish themselves from their competition. More importantly, brands influence how people perceive a product or service, and successful brands inspire customer loyalty (Calkins, 2005; Blacket, 2003).

Gobé (2001) suggests that a brand “is brought to life for customers first and foremost by the personality of the company behind it” (p. xv). TWoP is no exception. The site's founders, Sarah Bunting and Tara Ariano established TWoP's personality early on. Both were avid television viewers, who frequented fan chatrooms and boards. However, Bunting and Ariano enjoyed mocking television. They founded TWoP's precursor, Dawson's Wrap in 1998 to mock *Dawson's Creek*, and engaged Ariano's husband, David Cole, to help with site design. Soon, the trio expanded their scope to “the kind of show where you get a lot of your friends together, sit around and make rude remarks about” (Bradberry, 2003). They renamed the site *Mighty Big TV (MBTV)* in 1999 and stated their goal as “to say funny things about shows that aren't intentionally funny” (“MBTV FAQs,” 1999). As a result, *MBTV* would not recap⁴² sitcoms in its early days, because “good,” comedies were already funny in their own right. “Bad” comedies, on the other hand, were even less worthy of a recap because “shows like that [were] just sad.” Accordingly, “the less attention they get, the sooner they'll be off the air, making more room for the good shows” (“MBTV FAQs,” 1999). When Bunting, Ariano, and Cole

renamed the site *Television Without Pity* in 1992, their cynical stance towards television was already more than clear (Stilwell, 2003).

The original TWP was minimalistic. It was built around two key features, recaps and discussion forums. Both account for TWP's popularity among its users. Indeed, when *Bravo* purchased TWP in 2007, there was concern about the direction the site would take under a subsidiary of NBC-Universal. The blog *Give me my Remote*, for example, wondered if the acquisition would mean that, "we get more *Real Housewives of Orange County*... because really, we get more of that show and world peace won't be far behind" (Skerry, 2007, para 2). In similar vein, a writer for *The Slate* pondered whether *Bravo* would keep the "rambling recaps [...], talmudic forum commentary [...], and rigid forum moderation" that had made TWP into a destination website for television fans (Stevens, 2007). *Bravo* countered that TWP would retain its characteristic snark, and would have "complete editorial independence" (Adalian, 2007a).⁴³ Under new management, TWP added blogs, links to full episodes, original videos, cast and producer interviews, photo galleries, links to social networking sites, and several apps. However, the recaps and the forums remain TWP's staples.

The recaps express TWP's editorial voice. These write-ups can be several pages long, are extremely detailed, peppered with wit, and often combine admiration with outright contempt (Andrejevic, 2008; Sella, 2002). One of *Ugly Betty*'s recappers, for instance, characterized the show's third season as "watching somebody blindfolded assembling episodes of *Ugly Betty* following the oral instructions of somebody else. Somebody who's actually seen the show, but is maybe not so gifted at verbal

communication” (Jacob, 2009, para. 1). This particular recapper was extremely displeased with *Ugly Betty*, and stopped recapping it altogether. Nevertheless, others have been equally sardonic, even while writing glowing reviews.⁴⁴

As of June 2010, TWoP recaps over fifty television shows. These are classified as *active*, whereas shows that are not being recapped are placed *on permanent hiatus* (PHd).⁴⁵ There are several reasons for shows to be PHd. Cancellation is one of them. However, shows are also PHd’ to cut costs, since paid freelancers write the recaps. TWoP will also stop recapping a show for lack of interest from the site’s “demographic” (TWoP, Editorial, nd)⁴⁶. In every case, TWoP provides a short paragraph to elaborate on why shows are PHd’. These explanations always highlight TWoP’s editorial slant. Sometimes PHd’ shows are simply the worse examples⁴⁷ of what the industry has to offer, at least according to TWoP. *CSI: Miami*, for one, was PHd’ because its main character, Horatio Caine, was “a supercilious blowhard who made damn near every scene on every show irritating” (TWoP, *CSI Miami*, n.d.). *Ugly Betty* fared no better. It was PHd’ because “It is better to be beautiful than to be good, but it is better to be good than ugly” (TWoP, *Ugly Betty*, n.d.).⁴⁸

TWoP’s other salient feature is the forums where users can read/post comments about specific shows. Forums use a hierarchical navigation structure, with nested categories, topics, subtopics, and messages. Site visitors can also navigate them using a search function. Every active show has a dedicated discussion forum, usually moderated by the recapper (Stillwell, 2003). Moderators are primarily responsible for enforcing TWoP’s rules of conduct, and any forum specific policies.

The forums host one or more sub-forums, which are further divided into separate discussion threads. For example, the *Ugly Betty* forum hosts three subforums. *General Gabbery* includes threads for individual episodes, spoilers, ratings and scheduling, suggestions for show improvement, games, and media coverage, among others. The *Manhattan* subforum, on the other hand, includes threads about the characters that work at *Mode*, including Daniel Meade, Wilhelmina Slater, and Marc St. James. Finally, the *Queens* forum is dedicated to discussing Betty, her family, and any character from her neighborhood. *Ugly Betty*, though, was put on permanent hiatus on August 24, 2009 for lack of interest (Strega, 2009). As a consequence, TWoP closed and archived the forums, and directed TWoPpers to the *Other Shows* category. There, posters could continue the discussion on a single thread.

TWoP has also established forum rules of conduct. The site's *Frequently Asked Questions* page houses general rules, but moderators may develop forum-specific practices to address special cases. In *Ugly Betty*'s case, the forum includes a more detailed spoiler⁴⁹ policy to deal with discussions about the international versions of the show (Jessica, 2006). Though moderation on TWoP is more stringent than in most forums, TWoPpers overwhelmingly appreciate the guidelines, and many are active in policing the site (Stilwell, 2003).

Regardless of specificity, TWoP's rules manage common issues associated with computer-mediated communication (CMC). Negative behaviors, such as trolling and flaming, impact the quality of online exchanges, though some CMC users enjoy trolling (Hardaker, 2010). Others disregard writing mechanics altogether, and depending on the

CMC platform that they use, many are hard-pressed to follow turn taking rules (Weger & Aakhus, 2003). TWoP's rules remind users to save their snark for the shows. *Ad hominem* attacks and trolling are major offenses that may lead to being "shown the door" (TWoP, "Posting Manners," para 1). Nevertheless, the rules also address minor offenses, such as posting in the wrong forum, duplicate threads, using internet shorthand, and writing in all caps. TWoPpers are encouraged to report trolls to the *Troll Patrol*, while minor offenses are dealt with in the *Forum Traffic Court* (Stilwell, 2003). Reports must include a link to the objectionable post. Forum moderators have the final say.

TWoP also encourages its users to focus on the quality of their contributions. For one, they are expected to read the previous 15 pages, or 15 full days of posts *prior* to posting. This is known as the 15/15 rule:

The idea here, basically, is for you to have read enough of the thread to give you a solid feel for what people have already said, so that you don't repeat things people have mentioned twenty times already or derail the discussion by interrupting with a random question. It's a *conversational-manners issue*. We know it's a lot to read on some forums. Tough beans. Show your fellow posters the courtesy which you expect, and read what they've written to make sure you aren't repeating what dozens of other people have already said (TWoP, "Posting messages, question 6," n.d.).

TWoP has carefully crafted its brand to attract critical viewers. The site encourages them to think about the television that they watch, and to discuss it from an informed perspective. In this sense, TWoP does not necessarily foster loyalty to the shows

themselves. Shows come and go. However, the ability to voice a critical and informed opinion about television is the constant that keeps TWoPpers coming back to the forums. If anything, TWoP has built its brand upon the critical practices of fandom.

Savvy Fandom: Critical Engagement on TWoP

Andrejevic (2008) describes TWoP users as savvy television fans, noting also a high level of skepticism among site users. For example, most of them recognize the limits of their influence on The Powers That Be (TPTB)⁵⁰, because they have their own agenda. Interestingly enough, though, savvy fans cannot be simply described as oppositional. They seem to derive pleasure from putting themselves in the place of the producer. Many of them enjoy dissecting television to “identify problems in continuity, in plot and character development, in makeup and lighting, and even in publicity and promotional material” (Andrejevic, 2008, p. 40). However, savvy fans know that they are not making these decisions. They merely utilize their know-how to create a public identity. Indeed, “post primarily for each other,” (Andrejevic, 2008, p. 36) because they do not wish to appear as dupes. Furthermore, they feel that their active involvement on TWoP makes them different from average viewers, who *are* dupes.

Lembo (2000) also refers to this desire for savvy among television viewers. He links it to higher forms of critical reception. For Lembo, all viewers judge television programs in terms of plausibility, which he compares to Ien Ang’s concept of emotional realism (1985). Plausible programs “ring true” enough to real life (Lembo, 2000, p. 168), or to mediated experiences. In fact, most people expect television to represent “social life in a realistic way and thereby engage the viewer in meaningful communication *about*

social life” (2000, p. 190, italics in the original). This is not to say, though, that everyone agrees on what is plausible, or that viewers will invariably choose programs that *they* judge to be plausible. On the contrary, Lembo singles out a group of viewers who prefer implausible programs because they lend themselves to “the game of television” (p. 191). This is a very informal game, in which participants identify failures in plausibility, critique them, and share their insights with others in a group-viewing situation. The game itself increases the pleasure that comes from watching television. Moreover, those who play it constantly recreate “an awareness that they were not taken in, or duped, by the unreality of television” (p. 191).

Savvy also reflects the critical practices people use to judge television. Lembo identified three types. The most basic one happens when people judge specific aspects of a show (i.e, a single character, plot development, etc) in terms of their plausibility. In the second mode, viewers recognize and critique general trends of implausibility, which persist throughout different episodes, shows, or genres. Finally, the highest level of critical viewing occurs when viewers identify and critique formula. In this final mode, viewers tend to refer to commercial imperatives that shape television programming. These imperatives constrain the types of shows available, and also tend to sacrifice originality to predictable formulas to minimize the risk of commercial failure.

Recognition of formula may be the highest order of critical viewing; however Lembo does not necessarily link it to “resistant” readings (p. 196), or to the re-crafting of the televisual text to fit the viewers’ identities. On the contrary, the recognition of formula is likely to disengage the television text from social realities, as individuals focus

more on its constructedness. In other words, viewers who recognize formula do not appear to use reality, or personal experiences as immediate referents to judge plausibility. Rather, they construct meanings *intertextually*, based on “their previous involvement with television itself” (p. 197). For Lembo, this type of engagement creates “practical knowledge [...] regarding the commodification of meaning,” which does not depend on “the identities that viewers *bring to* television from other social locations” (2000, p 197-198, italics in the original). Moreover, since television itself provides the referents for critical recognition of formula, this type of viewing highlights how it can shape common bonds. Disparate individuals come together through shared understandings of the television experience.

The concept of plausibility helps describe the interpretative practices people use when watching and assessing television. However, it may be better to speak of how they make judgments according to their *expectations*, especially regarding fans. They may expect a plausible depiction of lived or mediated experiences, and will assess television accordingly. Nevertheless, their judgments can also refer to a *meta-text*.

A meta-text is an idealized version of a television series. It indicates fans’ profound knowledge of the popular culture texts that comprise their preferred fandom. Meta-texts reflect discussions about any television series, and the shared interpretations that emerge from them (Jenkins, 1992). Though fans can also utilize extra-textual information (i.e. media coverage, producer and cast interviews), these are often secondary because they do not explain character behavior “within the fiction” (Jenkins, 1992, p. 102). In other words, casting changes may explain the departure of a particular

actor, but they do not necessarily explain the ultimate fate of a character. Furthermore, fans expect “continuity, consistency, and completeness” (Jenkins, 1992, p. 102), and if they don’t get it, they will offer their own theories to fill in the gaps.

On TWP, savvy emerges as a public identity that TV fans adopt to present themselves. Their contributions to the forums, furthermore, indicate differing levels of critical awareness, and are often enriched through the use of intertexts and metatexts. In the following section, the *Ugly Betty* forums are used to develop a case study of savvy fandom.

The TWP Experience:

Watching Ugly Betty with Savvy Fans.

TWP has established itself as a gateway for savvy television fans, and the site caters to established and emerging fandoms alike. Indeed, TWPPers take up television shows as soon as the networks announce their fall schedules. Such was the case of *Ugly Betty*. TWPPers began discussing the show on June 13, 2006, just a few weeks after ABC announced its fall schedule. The initial post contained a link to the *Futon Critic’s*⁵¹ review, which began with ABC’s official description:

In the superficial world of high fashion, image is everything. Styles come and go, and the only constants are the wafer-thin beauties who wear them. How can an ordinary girl – a slightly plump plain-Jane from Queens – possibly fit in? If you took a moment to get to know Betty Suarez, you’d see how sweet, intelligent and hard-working she is (Sullivan, 2006, para 4).

The Futon Critic's reviewer was acerbic. He described *Ugly Betty* as that “one show that makes you wonder “how the hell did this get made?”” (Sullivan, 2006, para. 5). The cynical tone was ideal for TWP. For one, it encouraged snark, which came through in the original post. Its author wrote, “Ouch! Is this show DOA?” (Ugly Betty [UB], post # 1, 2006) and used “ouch” as the hyperlink to the review. Within two hours, another TWPper followed suit. This contributor added “I’d rather watch this show than *Brothers & Sisters* incredibly enough. At least with this show it’d make for some decent snark” (UB, post # 9, 2006). Both posters doubted that *Ugly Betty* would last on American primetime. Yet they felt it warranted attention because it would be bad. Without this perceived mediocrity there was little incentive to watch.

The prevailing attitude throughout the first weeks of discussion was one of guarded skepticism. Even those that welcomed an American adaptation of *YSBLF* were careful to qualify their support through statements that revealed a savvy understanding of television, both as a narrative and an industry. In terms of the narrative, TWPers made references to formula. They recognized that it was an ugly duckling story, which was an appealing concept to develop because it was “proven”. Nevertheless, there was a risk in following formulas: They made shows repetitive. *Ugly Betty*, for example, could devolve into “Someone does something mean to Betty, Betty gets her feelings hurt, audiences feel bad for Betty,” thus becoming stale soon, or, as one TWPper put it, *Ugly Betty* could be “kinda like *Urkel*”⁵² (UB, post # 32, 2006). Consequently, low expectations were common. One poster even anticipated that *Ugly Betty* would be “fun for a few episodes” (UB, post # 7, 2006), but would quickly fade away.

In terms of the industry, TWoPers extrapolated from their understandings of how television networks operate. For example, when ABC announced that *Ugly Betty* was moving from Friday to Thursday nights, the discussion turned to issues of scheduling, competition, and viewing preferences. One contributor wrote that ABC must be confident that their new show was “good enough to stand the competition.” However, others felt that the move did not suggest confidence on *Ugly Betty*. Rather, it indicated lack of confidence on “*Big Day* and *Notes from the Underbelly*”⁵³ (UB, post # 20, 2006), the two sitcoms originally slated for the time slot. The consensus, though, was that the network had made a mistake:

That sucks [...]. That puts it against two shows that I already watch. I was looking forward to seeing this Friday [at] 8 (or recording it), but now I don’t think I’ll see it unless they re-air it over the weekend or on ABC Family (UB, post # 17, 2006).

I was looking forward to this, but they are putting it against *The Office*! Nothing beats *The Office* for me, unfortunately (UG, post # 22, 2006).

Ditto [I watch *The Office*]. I think ABC shot itself in the foot with this move. They may have confidence in the show but you have *Survivor* on CBS and then *My Name is Earl* and *The Office* on NBC, which are leading into *Studio 60*. Sorry, but that’s not going to work (UB, post # 24, 2006).

Bummer that *Survivor* is mandated viewing in my household. Looks like I’m going to have to record this on the upstairs TV, since there will be no tearing the male half of my household away from *Survivor* (UB, post # 19, 2006).

As for the scheduling issue, I think moving it to Thursday was a bad idea. I would have at least tried it on Fridays (because I have no life). But there is absolutely no way I would give up on *The Office* or *My Name is Earl* to watch this (UB, post # 28, 2006).

I’ll watch it. I’ve stopped watching *Smallville*, I don’t like *My Name is Earl* or *The Office*, I dislike *Survivor* and the Fox sitcoms look horrible (UB, post # 23, 2006).

This exchange shows an awareness of competing options, but it also reiterates that television viewing “overall exposure to television is determined less by a “desire” for specific content than by factors of habit, availability, and access to the medium” (Cooper & Tang, 2009). Indeed, structured routines may keep people from watching new shows. Arguably, viewers can bend their routines. A DVR and repurposing, for instance, allow people to exercise some personal choice. Overall, though, most of the TWoPpers in this exchange are unwilling to break their habits for an untested show. Only one participant is willing to try *Ugly Betty* on its time slot. This individual lacked a viewing routine, at least as far as network programming goes.

“Will the Real Betty Please Stand Up”

Familiarity with *YSBLF* and two of its remakes, Mexico’s *La Fea Más Bella* [LFB] and Germany’s *Verliebt in Berlin* [VB] informed discussions about *Ugly Betty*. That said, not all TWoPpers had seen the source material, or the two international variations. Those who did, voiced their views on a thread in *Ugly Betty General Gabbery* sub-forum. This thread opened up almost as soon as TWoP began recapping the show. Its title, *Will the Real Betty Please Stand Up* (WRB), suggests TWoPpers elaboration of a meta-text, which would set the bar for *Ugly Betty*. The initial post reiterates the significance of an idealized version. It also introduces the producers and writers, in their role as decision-makers:

I thought it would be interesting to discuss comparisons and differences between the new ABC version and the original Colombian telenovela *Yo Soy Betty la Fea*. From what I’ve read so far the show’s producers are expecting to keep the show

true to its roots although there will no doubt be differences since the original show was set in Colombia and the new series is set in the U.S. with different plot lines, characters and objectives. [...] To me, it doesn't really matter if the writers change things around (since I've never seen the original version) but that it stays faithful to the basics established in *Betty la Fea* but also becomes in a sense it's own show much like the US version of *The Office* (sic) (Will the real Betty please stand up?: Comparisons and contrasts to the original [WRB], post # 1. 2006).

This poster identified *YSBLF* as a key source for *Ugly Betty*'s meta-text. However, the author left it up to the producers to determine the story's indispensable elements. Setting, for example, was quickly deemed irrelevant. In fact, the setting change, from a fashion house to a fashion magazine, was seen qualified as positive. The new setting could capitalize on the success of *The Devil Wears Prada* (TDWP), since American audiences would be familiar with the movie and the book. Once the pilot aired, TWoPpers quickly pointed out the similarities. One poster described it as ““The Devil Wears Prada” on acid!” (1-1: “Pilot” 2006.09.28, post # 238, 2006)

Consistent with Andrejevic (2008), TWoPpers took on the standpoint of the producers to discuss *Ugly Betty*. The most significant differences they noted were in terms of casting and characterization. Both issues impacted plot development, which prompted speculation about the route that *Ugly Betty* would take. To begin, Betty's makeover had been part of every version of the story. In *YSBLF*, though, the actress who played Betty was “still modelesque” in spite of “the glasses, braces, and horrible bangs,” so “you could tell she had the potential to be really hot even under all that frump”.

America Ferrera, on the other hand was “pretty but [...] not so stunning,” which made her “a better choice” especially if *Ugly Betty* meant to follow *YSBLF* closely. Betty’s eventual makeover would be more believable, and “rewarding” (WRB, post # 20, 2006). Following suit, another poster described America Ferrera as “a beautiful woman but [...] definitely not the standard Hollywood type.” This was an advantage, because “she will always look different than the fashion world norm.” Furthermore, if the producers decided to keep the makeover, Ferrera’s Betty would not “betray the show’s message of loving and accepting yourself” (WRB, post # 108, 2007).

TWOPpers also noted absent characters. Indeed, some posters pointed out that in *YSBLF* Betty’s support system came from her best friend, Nicolás, and from the women of the *Cartel de las Feas*. This was not the case in the American version, as the family takes on the primary support role. In addition, TWOPpers commented on the absences of Marcela, Armando’s fiancé, and Mario, his best friend. More than anything, Mario’s absence introduced a different dynamic to *Ugly Betty*. For one, several TWOPpers could not imagine that Daniel would seduce, use, and betray Betty without a sidekick to egg him on. Daniel was “not in the same jerk category as the other Armandos.”⁵⁴ Without the seduction plot, it was hard to predict what *Ugly Betty* would do for “Angst.” The show would have to “add another element to bring [it] back.” (WRB, post # 43, 2006). Another TWOPper speculated about Daniel’s character development without the seduction plot:

The seduction was so central in the original that I can’t imagine how they’re going to do it. Armando being forced to get close to Betty in that way and get to know the real her was necessary for his transformation, otherwise it would never

have happened. But everyone here is right about Daniel being written as much less flawed. I would've wondered if they could afford to go the seduction route even before the show started, simple because I don't think this audience would be as forgiving. But now that they're distinctly making him pretty much a nice guy, I REALLY can't see the audience forgiving him something like that, nor do I see it being in character. Hopefully they have a plan (WRB, post # 74, 2006).

Other TWoPpers brought up the theme of Daniel's evolution as well. For them, Daniel's redemption was just as important as Betty's growth into self-assurance and her ultimate triumph. It had been so for Armando in *YSBLF*. In *Ugly Betty*, though, Daniel started off on more favorable ground, and several posters could not understand how, or if, the character would become a better man. Being "nicer," in other words, undermined Daniel because the producers would not be able "to show people what an ass he is before you can start working on his redemption" (WRB, post # 29, 2006). Another poster characterized Daniel as "still a hound dog [who] needs to find his way, but he doesn't really need reformation." This individual, however, believed that the change would appeal to American audiences, because it introduced the title characters as friends first. Indeed, American television handled romantic tension differently: "Most people's favorite ships⁵⁵ were less Moonlighting and more buddies. Mulder/Scully, Josh/Donna, Luke/Lorelei [...] were all honestly friends first... and the tension was still there." (WRB, post # 32, 2006). As a result, a more likeable Daniel worked in favor of overall plot development.

In similar vein, the differences between Betties garnered considerable attention. Repeatedly, TWoP posters stated that the American Betty was not as dark as the original one. She is also less educated, and more naïve:

For what I've read in the recaps of Ugly Betty, they've changed a lot about the character of Betty [...]. [The] fact that they changed the profession of the character may seem like no big deal, but it is very important in the original that she is an economist [...]. I don't know how are they going to get to [Betty's takeover of EcoModa] on Ugly Betty (sic) (WRB, post # 65, 2006).

I think the main difference between the original Betty and Ugly Betty is that Betty Suarez has lived an easier life than Beatriz Pinzón. The original Betty was older and we learnt (via GREAT flashbacks) that her childhood had been very hard. She did not have any friends and all the kids mocked her just because she was ugly [...]. As you can see, the original Betty was very unhappy and was psychologically affected by a difficult childhood. On the other hand, Betty Suarez lives in a bubble, she is too naïve and happy and seems not to realize or care [that] most people despise her because of the way she looks (WRB, post # 78, 2006).

ITA.⁵⁶ Beatriz Pinzón had serious self-esteem issues. Betty Suarez seems to be well-balanced, if clueless. Also Beatriz P was an outstandingly bright woman, while Betty S comes across, in my opinion, as a creative young woman, but nothing terribly out of the ordinary, brains-wise (WRB, post # 79, 2006).

[...] They haven't exactly painted Betty as anything but a glorified secretary and I can't figure out why exactly anybody would give her a job as anything but a secretary. Just because someone is a nice person doesn't make her right for a job at the top (WRB, post # 90, 2006).

I don't know what talents or abilities American Betty has. If it's going to be about her learning and growing and emerging, that's fine. Let's see her learn and grow. Stop making her a ditz (WRB, post # 124, 2009).

TWOPpers who identified themselves as *YSBLF* fans were very critical of the changes introduced into the American version. One poster described feeling “bitter to *Ugly Betty*” because “the writers [...] don't really have a clear idea of the long story arc for their show” (WRB, post # 89, 2006). This post prompted a long response, by a fan of *VB*. Its

author wondered what *Ugly Betty* was about because “it obviously isn’t about the Betty/Daniel relationship. It also isn’t about Daniel changing for the better. [...]. Nor is it about an exceptionally bright young woman who makes her way to the top because of her great education.” Rather the producers were intent on leaving out “the darker stuff [i.e. the seduction plot and the cruelty towards Betty] that comes with all versions.” Without these elements, there was little left of the original premise, and the producers were left to “working themselves from one episode to the next without a real idea [of] what they want the show to be about” (WRB, post # 90, 2006). Other contributors were just as harsh. One Colombian viewer observed that “the American [version was] the most distant from the original plot [...]. On one side I find Ugly Betty hilarious and absurd, just like the original, on the other I feel the writers didn’t really like the original plot and decided to dump it in the trash” (WRB, post # 121, 2008). Another contributor added, “I’m willing to accept that the American Betty is a completely different show. I just wish it were a Betty show” (WRB, post # 124, 2009)

Consistent with Jenkins (1992), discussions on this thread of TWoP created a meta-text, which drew primarily from exposure to *YSBLF*, *VB*, and *LFB*. However, this meta-text was not merely meant to fill in gaps, or to explain character behaviors within the fiction, as Jenkins argues. Rather, it enabled TWoPpers to question producer intent and the resulting changes. In this sense, TWoPpers were more open to change when they could recognize intent. Indeed, connections to *The Devil Wears Prada*, cultural sensitivity, and premise explain the change in setting, the decision to drop the seduction storyline, and America Ferrera’s casting. Yet TWoPpers expected TPTB to have a long-

term vision for the show, and to be mindful of character growth. *YSBLF* had established a route for character development. It had given Betty Pinzón obstacles to overcome. *Ugly Betty*, on the other hand, had made its heroine too inexperienced and too naïve to follow on Betty Pinzón's shoes. Daniel, as well, lacked Armando's abrasiveness and ill temper. Though *Ugly Betty* needed these changes to establish its own identity, they left the show without an identifiable long-term plan.

Spoiling Betty: "Collective Intelligence in Practice"

It is safe to say that most TWoPpers were unfamiliar with *YSBLF* and/or any of its adaptations. In fact, the comparison thread was not the most popular discussion on the *Ugly Betty General Gabbery Forum*. The *Spoilers and Speculation: Work Idea* (SSWI), on the other hand, was the most active thread overall. TWoPpers posted over twelve hundred messages to this thread, while there were only 125 replies to the comparison thread.

Jenkins (2006a) defines spoiling as "collective intelligence in practice" (p. 28). Spoilers collect, analyze, and share information from different sources with a larger group. Sharing itself creates a "knowledge community" (p. 28) through play. In this sense, spoiling is a game that teaches critical learning and problem solving skills. Furthermore, spoiling empowers the spoilers. It implies breaking network monopoly over information, as people try to discern future developments before an episode airs. This makes spoiling into an "adversarial" (p. 43) process. It is a contest between the networks, who wish to keep plot developments a secret, and the spoilers, who want access to sensitive information.

In every sense, spoiling exemplifies savvy. The community comes together to outsmart the networks, and to assess the quality of television on an on-going basis. Reputation and access to direct sources and/or material makes information more credible (Jenkins, 2006b). Casting sides, for instance, generate some of most credible spoilers as they are portions of actual scripts that are given to actors so that they can prepare for their roles. However, judgments about quality also depend on shared knowledge and understanding of how things work. In TWoP's case, contributors challenge the validity of a spoiler if it doesn't fit the overall pattern of network operations. In this post, for instance, a just-tuned in⁵⁷ TWoPper offers a spoiler from an Albanian source:

OK guys so I have MAJOR SPOILER NEWS... I have a friend in Albania who has seen episodes of Betty far FAR in advance.... PLEASE READ THE FOLLOWING AT YOUR OWN RISK because I dont (sic) know when these episodes will air but I assume its way way into the season almost finale close...Betty somehow gets her hands on all of Mode's stocks and for a short while owns the Magazine!!!! OH BUT IT GETS BETTER.. Amanda tells Daniel to sleep with Betty to get the stocks back SO HE DOES AND IT WORKS!!!!

WOAH! (Spoilers and speculation: Work idea [SSWI], post #46, 2006).

Since this contributor was a relative newcomer, there was reason to doubt the validity of the information. However, this was not what TWoPpers questioned. Rather, they focused on the intent behind the original post. The most vocal respondents quickly dismissed it as misinformation planted deliberately on the boards "to create a scene so some pranksters can laugh at how gullible we all are" (SSWI, post # 47, 2006). If this was the case, TWoP

was the wrong forum, as site users were not about to be taken for fools. Accordingly, they turned the tables on the original poster. As one contributor put it, “I don't know why people even bother. We know the deal here. Try selling bs (sic) someplace else” (SSWI, post # 50, 2006). The original author never contributed to SSWI again.

On the other hand, credible spoilers prompt lengthy discussions, in which TWoPpers interpret the significance of the spoiler itself. This spoiler, from the episode *Four Thanksgivings and A Funeral*, sparked a discussion about producer intent:

Daniel goes to the lavish Thanksgiving party his parents give. His AbFab⁵⁸ mom is trying not to drink and keeps her snarky attitude about their guests. Sophia, the woman Daniel was after in the previous episode, attends the party with her nearly perfect boyfriend. Daniel is humbled a lot by failing to measure up to the boyfriend thru a series of gaffs ending in Daniel claiming to be a great dancer merely bc (sic) the boyfriend said he was a lousy dancer. Turns out Daniel was grossly exaggerating his abilities and he finally ends up drinking up a storm...to the point where Betty has to be called to get him home (SSWI, post # 17, 2006).

TWoPpers discussed intent from two critical standpoints. The first focused on the fiction itself. This contribution, for instance, discusses character behavior as a set up for plot development:

I'm beginning to see an unsettling pattern here. The revelations about Daniel's mother have me looking back at the scene in “Queens for a Day,” where he glups (sic) down a glass of wine under pressure, with suspicion, and connecting it up with his behavior in *Four Thanksgivings and A Funeral Spoilers*, where he “ends

up drinking up a storm...to the point where Betty has to be called to get him home,” because of his embarrassment (sic) and disappointment re: Sophia. *Are they setting up a future problem with the devil's water for Daniel, I wonder? Or have I watched too many episodes of The O.C.? (Kirsten Cohen's long alcoholic descent started with funny, pressure-induced wine drinking, too!)* (SSWI, post # 25, 2006).

In contrast, the second standpoint looks outside the fiction and into overall production strategy. This post is a response to the previous contribution. Unlike the preceeding author, this one describes plot developments in terms of holding viewer interest:

Here's wilder speculation [...] Daniel is drunk and feeling rejected in one of the last episodes of November sweeps and it is Betty who goes to get him and take him home. *To me, that set up is designed for some inappropriate drunken boss-assistant behavior that would be awkward the next day when sober. Maybe just a little something to start up the shippers?*⁵⁹ (SSWI, post # 26, 2006).

This author would post a follow-up, adding that, “Something like that would set up some romantic tension in their relationship and based upon how the other versions have gone, I could see them putting something like that in during their first sweeps to let fans of the other versions know that they are eventually going to go there” (SSWI, post # 30. 2006). Clearly the post identifies an ulterior motive, which is to capture pre-existing fandom.

Contributions like the ones presented above suggest the pleasure that comes from speculating, and reiterate Jenkins' observations about fans. They expect characters to act in ways that are consistent with their personalities (see Jenkins, 1992). However, the

TWoPpers in this exchange also recognize the constructed nature of the shows that they watch, which reflects a high level of critical awareness and savvy. Often, TWoPpers refer to TPTB. Though TPTB have the upper hand, TWoPpers are not shy about calling them out. For example, when they learned about the extension of a story arc involving Daniel, and a character named Sofía, TWoPpers were extremely vocal against it:

The Sofia and Daniel storyline already overstayed its welcome in my book. So it's very distressing to know this will be dragged out into the future (SSWI, post # 90, 2006).

Agreed. And here I thought I couldn't hate Sofia "Mary Sue"⁶⁰ Reyes anymore than I did when she first showed up and propped her boobs up in Daniel's face (SSWI, post # 92, 2006).

Didn't someone say Sofia was only staying 5 episodes? Well, even if that is 5 too many, at least it means she'll be out after the 30th [of November]. Thank God (SSWI, post # 93, 2006).

Ugh! Not happy to hear that Salma will be sticking around even longer than originally anticipated; she's starting to suck the life out of the show. The Daniel/Sofia stuff is becoming so tedious. Silvio Horta better stay true to his word that there is indeed an end in sight to this stuff, or I'm going to have to re-evaluate my Ugly Betty love (SSWI, post # 130, 2006).

At this stage of *Ugly Betty*, most TWoPpers are still willing to bear with objectionable developments. The last quote, though, illustrates the fickle nature of savvy fandom. Its author threatens to abandon *Ugly Betty* altogether if the executive producer extends the questionable story-arc. The attitude is quite common on TWoP. It is a reflection of the competitive landscape of television. Since fans have choices, they may not feel compelled to invest their time and energy on shows that fail to live up to their expectations. If *Ugly Betty* stalled or grew stale, savvy fans would move on.

TWoP at the End of Ugly Betty.

On TWoP, *Ugly Betty* started off as a promising show. Most posts about the pilot episode were very enthusiastic. One TWoPper, observing consistent praise, noted that “it’s awesome/weird how similar the language we’re all using to comment on the show: “I loved it” “adorable.” Guess we have almost a consensus! Or a limited vocabulary. *-*” (“Pilot”, post # 27, 2006). The episode *Fey’s Sleigh Ride* was equally praised, as TWoPpers sent “Kudos to the show’s writer’s! Great Job!” (“Fey’s Sleigh Ride”, post # 18, 2006), and declared *Ugly Betty* as “The greatest show that has ever existed” (“Fey’s Sleigh Ride”, post # 23, 2006). Nevertheless, a crucial aspect of TWoP is that it fosters opposing viewpoints. This is neither surprising, nor exclusive to the site. Rather, it is a characteristic of fandom in general (Jenkins, 1992).

Unlike other fans, though, TWoPpers can be a lot more skeptical and less loyal to the shows that they critique. This certainly was the case with *Ugly Betty*, but it is not a general occurrence on TWoP. For example, TWoPpers joined the campaign to save *Jericho* from cancellation. The show had been floundering in the ratings, but when its fans flooded CBS with emails, letters, and 40,000 pounds of peanuts, the network reconsidered and decided to keep *Jericho* on the air (Menon, 2008). Yet *Ugly Betty’s* cancellation did not rally TWoPpers. They seemed too savvy, too cynical, and too disappointed to believe that the show was worth fighting for.

Though *Ugly Betty* remained in *active* status until the third season finale, TWoPpers were becoming tired with the show’s antics. Posting on the episode threads began dropping in the second season, and it reached an all time low in the third season,

when the episode thread for *The Born Identity* received only 32 replies. TWoPpers, en masse, excoriated this episode. This quote summarizes most of their main complaints:

This entire episode was Ugly Betty at its worst -- retcons⁶¹ on developments only a few episodes old, smart people acting stupidly because the writers are on crack and do not watch their own show -- stupid simplistic moralizations, monstrous acts justified because someone “felt it in their heart”... just, gah. I used to love the show now I loathe Ignacio, hate Hilda, and worst of all, dislike Betty herself. In any realistic universe here, Betty would have gone to jail and/or been fired. It was the worst thing she’s done yet on the show⁶² (“The Born Identity”, post # 32, 2009).

Other TWoPpers echoed these sentiments. They described the episode as repetitive “bullshit” because “Betty, yet again, saves the day” (“The Born Identity”, post # 2, 2009). Even costume design was becoming unbearable and inconsistent. Indeed, one post even wondered, “How is Betty’s “ugly” look supposed to stand out if the whole rest of the cast dresses just like her?” (“The Born Identity”, post # 14, 2009).

Ultimately, TWoP’s most serious criticisms were aimed at TPTB. Their decisions had ruined *Ugly Betty*. For one, TPTB had fired a number of writers, and two of the original executive producers (Trechak, 2008). As a result, the overall quality of the writing had suffered. *Ugly Betty* had become predictable since the writers “seem to know nothing but other old sitcom plots (vs. the kind of telenovela style duh-duh-DUUUNNNH twists that were over the top, but in the write way (sic); and they have no idea what’s true to character, or what’s really funny” (“Rabbit Test”, post # 59, 2009). It

was very disappointing, especially considering how well TWoP received the first season. By season three, though, *Ugly Betty* had squandered its potential. Characters acted inconsistently, and Betty herself was becoming cartoonish. She was no longer a young woman who prevailed against the odds.

TWoPpers repeatedly blamed the writers for Betty's lack of character development. They wanted her to learn something, especially after two years on the same job. But the writers expected viewers to believe that Betty could be "an editor in a "serious" magazine" even when "almost every writing assignment she's been given has gone terribly" ("Rabbit Test", post # 46, 2009). For other TWoPpers, Betty was not only incompetent; she had become downright unlikeable. Betty had devolved from "a "real" person in a shark tank" into "a passive-aggressive coward who thinks she deserves things she hasn't worked for" ("Rabbit Test", post # 46, 2009). TWoPpers further criticized Betty for still looking "like a twelve-year old" ("Rabbit Test", post # 40, 2009). They disliked her being "still grossly and embarrassingly naïve" ("Rabbit Test" 2009.04.30, post # 4. 2009), and an "immature, incompetent, petty brat" (UB, post # 196, 2009).

Lack of character development, questionable clothing choices, and inconsistent writing frustrated most TWoPpers. By the end of season three, many were unwilling to watch anymore. Those who were still watching felt that the *Ugly Betty* had lost its way, as did this TWoPper:

My biggest issue with the show is that I'm not even sure what it's about anymore.

It was supposed to be about a girl struggling to be accepted, but every guy in New York City falls in love with Betty (or wants to fall in love with her). And she was

also supposed to be a fish out of water – she’s swimming quite comfortable at the moment. It’s not that I didn’t want her to be in a relationship, and it’s not that I don’t want her to be successful. I’m just not sure where the show is trying to go, and I’m not entirely sure the writers know (UB, post # 62. 2009).

The writers had failed to match the heroine’s development to the show’s premise. Betty was an ugly duckling, which meant she was expected to overcome odds and evolve. In practice, though, Betty could get everything she wanted with relative ease. She was supposed to exemplify inner beauty, yet the writers had kept her from growing up, and even forced her to be childish. TWoP, by and large, seemed ready to let her go, and no one appeared particularly surprised by the cancellation notice.

Paradoxically, the cancellation news brought TWoPpers back to the boards, but mostly to speculate about Betty’s end game. Indeed, by then the community had rationalized and accepted the inevitability of *Ugly Betty*’s demise. It was a deserved cancellation. One TWoPper was actually relieved, since cancellation would keep writers from completely ruining the show just as it was experiencing a creative resurgence. Unfortunately, though, the writers were not going to get much credit for the improvements. On the contrary, they could not be trusted to keep it up:

Despite the fact that we’re getting great storylines, I’m sort of glad the show is ending. This way the show will (hopefully) be going out on a high note, rather than run the risk of having these wonderful storylines be totally trashed by crappy writing-which, let’s face it, they probably would be (UB, post # 1087. 2010).

In terms of the resolution, TWoPpers were mostly interested in what would happen to Daniel and Betty (Detty). In every other version of the show, the two title characters had ended up together. However, Silvio Horta had been against Detty since early on.

TWoPpers were aware of this, and many argued that Horta had hurt the show by ignoring fan wishes. He had “decided to screw the fans and to continue on to tell a non-story” (UB, post # 1257. 2010), which only showed his lack of understanding of how television works. Didn’t he know that “the “will they, won’t they” usually keeps fans hooked when shows are creatively struggling ?” (UB, post # 1256. 2010).

In the end, Horta retracted his original objection, perhaps under pressure from ABC. One poster suggested that the network “was like what in the actual fuck are you talking about with this no Daniel and Betty thing?” (UB, post # 90. 2009). However, most TWoPpers were skeptical about Horta’s ability to come up with a satisfying Detty ending. The show had spent three seasons shooting the relationship down, and with the cancellation notice, *Ugly Betty* had only a few episodes left to make the two title characters show any romantic feelings for each other. Consequently, an open ending would be the best thing. It would appease Detty and non-Detty fans, as both camps would be able to speculate about the characters’ lives after the series. This is what *Ugly Betty* delivered, and those who advocated the open ending were satisfied. They felt that the writers had kept the finale in character, which made it plausible. As one poster described it, “They hinted at a future for Betty and Daniel, but didn’t have them in Loooooooooooooooooove” (UB, post # 1160. 2010).

This is not to say that TWoPpers reached a consensus about *Ugly Betty* and how it should end. Rather, they behaved as an “institution of theory and criticism” (Jenkins, 1992, p. 86). TWoPpers shared competing interpretations, and debated the merits and missteps of *Ugly Betty*’s finale. Some felt that the ambiguous Detty ending was rushed “at the last minute as a nod to demand” (UB, post # 1298. 2010). TPTB had always been aware of a strong Detty camp. However, they had not relinquished control of the show to the “Detty shippers.” On the contrary, “TPTB went to great pains to make sure that the show was *not* dependent on Detty shippers for ratings” (UB, post # 1288. 2010).

Internal consistency and plausibility were two key points of contention for many TWoPpers, who felt that the ending had undermined the campiness of the show:

All this “ending organically” talk makes me barf. If I wanted *organic* I’d go to Whole Foods and shove some arugula down my pants. The DVD sales for this one, so gonna bomb internationally. Why should they buy this show? they got the real thing everywhere else; we got “organic” and “ambiguous” and “realistic” (sic). Shit, if that kind of stuff made me happy, I’d go back to my own life and never watch TV (UB, post # 1193, 2010).

This is TeeVee. I’m willing to take a leap of faith and suspend some disbelief for a good ending. We see real life every day. I don’t need TV to be real life. Especially on a fantasy-based show (UB, post # 1201, 2010).

For all the crazy random shit that has happened on UB them deciding that **Detty** had to be the one organic, realistic thing, drives me nuts. Seriously? That’s where they draw the line? Betty’s whole career has been one great big fantasy but she has to go slow with Daniel? Right (UB, post # 1208, 2010).

It’s so frustrating. This show has always been over-the-top: back-from-the-dead transsexuals, stolen sperm, Lindsay Lohan as a fast food employee, braces being removed in the middle of a museum, you name it. But an overt, verbal acknowledgement of friends taking their relationship to another level is just *too out there* for Silvio. UGH (UB, post # 1221, 2010).

For the authors of these posts, *Ugly Betty* had always been an escapist fantasy. The show had crafted the most implausible scenarios throughout its four-year run. Yet at the last possible moment, TPTB turned the tables around and opted for more realism. This was considered nonsense that undermined the pleasures that came from watching *Ugly Betty*. It also undermined its earning potential, since fans would not invest on something that failed to provide a payoff.

On TWoP, though, fans recognized that the ending was not up to them. Showrunners create the characters, and are ultimately in charge of developing them. In other words, fans may wish for a particular outcome, but “[if] the showrunner isn't willing to go there” (UB, post # 1219, 2010) they will disappoint the fans. Disappointment can steer savvy fans away from further engagement. This was certainly the case for these *Ugly Betty* fans:

I'm not willing to make the extra effort to read into every glance or circumstance or pretend there is a potential Daniel/Betty relationship. It is over and I'll leave it at that (UB, post # 1219, 2010).

Got to say that, I'll never participate in a campaign for a tv movie for *Ugly Betty*. I'm never helping put any more money into Horta's pocket (UB, post # 1262, 2010).

According to Jenkins (1992), fans establish complex relationships with the shows they love. They waver between deep emotional engagement and critical distance. Yet fans can often be disappointed. Favorite shows may fail them, because producers are “unable or unwilling to deliver” a satisfying payoff (p. 146). Throughout the discussions of *Ugly Betty*, this was a recurrent theme. However, were Jenkins described a show's cancellation as a new beginning for the fan community, savvy fans may not see it as such. Their

disappointment may run too deep, and because they have other options, they are just as likely to move on.

Conclusions

Generally speaking, fans are deeply invested in the objects of their fandom. Many create fan fiction, fan art, detailed commentary, spoilers, and contribute to the meta-texts. They can also mobilize to save favorite series, and they repeatedly challenge producers and networks over the soul of their preferred series and characters (Jenkins, 1992). All of this suggests that fans are very loyal viewers. Even when they complain, their goal is to improve the series, and to protect it from corporate greed. Savvy fans, though, can take up criticism for its own sake, and with countless options, they appear to be more mobile than ever before.

Gray (2005) identifies TWoP as a site where anti-fandom is likely to occur. This is definitely an observable phenomenon, as many TWoPpers are not shy about expressing their disgust with any television text. However, their “textual dislike” (J. Gray, 2005) accentuates the fact that the most active TWoPpers are quite knowledgeable about the shows that they critique, and/or about the television industry that produces and airs them. Because of this, perhaps it is better to describe TWoPpers as savvy fans than as anti fans. They use the site primarily to demonstrate that they are not dupes (Andrejevic, 2008), and they espouse savvy as an identity.

Savvy, though, is not merely a personal identity for the fan. It is part of the corporate identity of the site. In this sense, TWoP benefits from fan labor by embracing a “collaborative approach” towards fandom (Green & Jenkins, 2008, para 9). Yet

collaboration does not mean that fandom and corporate interests are on equal footing. On the contrary, companies select the aspects of fandom that can boost promotional and branding efforts and foster fan loyalty (Green & Jenkins, 2008; Russo, 2009). The results can be contradictory. On the one hand, they represent corporate appropriation of fan practices (Scott, 2009), which undermines the “moral economy” (Thompson, 1971) of fandom. E.P Thompson introduced this concept to explain why crowds would protest and riot. It was not simply the result of a mob mentality, which led people to act irrationally and destructively. Rather, Thompson recognized a legitimate basis for protest. People would riot when they felt that “they were defending traditional rights or customs; and, in general, that they were supported by the wider consensus of the community” (Thompson, 1971, p. 78). Henry Jenkins utilized the moral economy argument to describe fans’ shared understandings of their rights and responsibilities as members of a community, and vis a vis the objects of their fandom. Poaching, for instance, is morally justified as “rescuing” popular culture texts from corporate abuse (Jenkins, 1988). On the other hand, the free circulation of fan fiction and fan art is a kind of communal responsibility, as these products of fandom have always been shared without any expectation of monetary gain (Green & Jenkins, 2008). Though most fandom scholars seem to share this view of the moral economy of fandom, we must recognize that not all fans are transgressive or anti-corporate (De Kosnik, 2009). Indeed, on TWoP, many savvy fans take on criticism from the standpoint of the producers (Andrejevic, 2008), and the site’s popularity did not seem to decrease once *Bravo* took it over in 2007.

Nevertheless, the scholarship on fandom, essentially up to the publication of *Textual Poachers*, has celebrated fans' transgressive ethos (J. Gray, Sandvoss, & Harrington, 2007), and transgressiveness is still an important object of study. A key notion in this type of scholarship is that fandom is essentially about shared pleasures that come from re-appropriating popular culture, one of which is being part of "a community" (Hellekson, 2009). Obviously, though, corporations do not share this view of value, which is why corporate encroachment is seen as such a threat to fandom itself.

Yet viewing the relationship between fans and corporations as a binary opposition could suggest that fans are disempowered dupes. This is not quite the case. Fans can derail the best-laid business plans (Green & Jenkins, 2008; Hellekson, 2009). The case of FanLib.com exemplifies this. FanLib.com set out to become a distributor for fan fiction, but failed. Arguably, FanLib.com folded because it did not understand the moral economy of fandom. That is, the site's owners and backers did not realize that writing fan fictions, creating fan art, and devoting time to sharing information and contributing to the ever expanding meta-texts of fandom are activities that fans do for pleasure and without expecting monetary gain. FanLib.com never considered the pleasures of fandom as part of its business plan, which made it subject to harsh criticism (Green & Jenkins, 2008; Hellekson, 2009). It must be noted, though, that the company managed to attract 18,000 users before it closed in 2008 (Green & Jenkins, 2008, para. 7). This suggests that fans aren't inherently anti-corporate (De Kosnik, 2009). It further suggests that the pleasures of fandom might not be affected when corporations step in to manage the spaces in which fans interact.

Jenkins has characterized fandom as the future of the television industries (2007). Indeed, as networks face increasing audience fragmentation and erosion, shows that can build up a loyal following may have an advantage over those that fail to do so. However, the same abundance of choice that erodes a network's share of the audience can undermine fan loyalty. The way in which TWoP discussed *Ugly Betty* certainly seems to suggest this. Perhaps, then, it would be best to expand the definition of fan loyalty to highlight the attachment to the pleasures of fandom.

Mobility should be considered, and even expected of savvy fans. These individuals know too much about television. They are intimately acquainted with its narrative forms and genres, and with its constructed and formulaic character. Furthermore, they know they have options, and they seem less likely to stay with a show that fails to live up to their expectations. In the case of *Ugly Betty*, the savvy fans on TWoP expected character growth. They hoped for a plausible evolution of the show's key relationships and storylines, but they did not get any of it. They bitterly blamed TPTB, and they eventually lost any hope that *Ugly Betty* could ever recover from the ineptitude of its writers and producers. This is not to say, though, that savvy disempowers fans. Rather, it should suggest that savvy makes them challenge TPTB by moving on to shows that are more satisfying.

However, greater mobility does not mean that savvy fans are no longer loyal to specific texts. It just highlights that some shows and producers are more successful than others in courting their loyalty. On TWoP itself, one of the most active forums is devoted to *Buffy the Vampire Slayer*, which was cancelled in 2003. As of this writing, TWoPpers

had posted over two hundred thousand messages to this forum. Not every show develops such a devoted following. *Ugly Betty* certainly exemplifies a case in which loyalty evaporated, and mobility took its place. Mobility, in other words, could also be a practical manifestation of the power of fandom.

Mobility is another way to enact the familiar struggle for meaning, which links media producers and consumers. Yet, fan mobility often goes unacknowledged, as usually the resistive activities of fans, and their efforts to organize and mobilize to lobby for their favorite shows, receive more attention. Nevertheless many television fans just move on and sometimes they do so with relief. TWoP encourages this greater mobility, as much as it fosters critical interpretations of television texts.

CHAPTER 6: FINAL THOUGHTS

When *Ugly Betty* bowed out, in May of 2010, several publications were quick to point out the cultural significance of the show. Most of them recognized its knack for the absurd, which did not prevent *Ugly Betty* from touching upon socially sensitive topics. Indeed, *Ugly Betty* raised questions about illegal immigration, citizenship, corporate ethics, civil equality, and body image, among others. One columnist went as far as linking his coming out as a gay man in part to feeling “comfortable with myself after watching the silly, yet steeped-in-reality portrayals of gay people on *Ugly Betty*” (Stransky, 2010). *Latina* magazine, for its part, characterized *Ugly Betty* as one of the decade’s highlights, right along with the appointment of Sonia Sotomayor to the Supreme Court (Rosario, 2009).

In this sense, *Ugly Betty* reiterates television’s role as a cultural forum (Newcomb & Hirsch, 2000). We glimpsed into the lives of illegal immigrants and their families, and watched them pursue their American dream. That said, we could settle with comparing *Ugly Betty* to *The Cosby Show*. Both had strong minority leads, and they normalized minority characters by turning them into our neighbors. In reality, though, television is far more complex. It does not present us with “firm ideological conclusions [as much as it] *comments on* ideological problems” (Newcomb & Hirsch, 2000, pp. 565-566). Indeed, the cultural forum allows for competing interpretations of television, which become more complex as we move from the focus on individual texts, to a broader perspective that acknowledges the interplay between production, distribution, technological change, reception, and academic criticism.

Television has changed significantly in the past few years. It has entered into a post-network era (Lotz, 2007). Lotz advises scholars to be aware of the meaning of audience erosion and audience polarization. Indeed, the cultural significance of individual television shows has decreased because American viewers have a vast array of choices to pick from (Lotz, 2004). Lotz adds that the new landscape of television brings the “if a tree falls down” question into the work of the media critic.

This is an important question, and it exceeds the scope of the present study. As it was originally designed, this inquiry meant to deal with three aspects of *Ugly Betty*, and to insert the show into a wider context of production and reception. It began with a personal interpretation of what the show said about being a Latina(a) immigrant in the United States. However, as I wrote and linked the different spheres of analysis, it became clear that the Latino(a) experience was not the most relevant issue that the networks and audiences were focusing on. This should not have come as a surprise. Rather, it should have been expected. Yet I had fallen into a familiar pattern, one that plagues many of us who study television from a critical perspective. I was assuming “that viewers should understand” *Ugly Betty* in the same way that I did (Newcomb & Hirsch, 2000, p. 562). Ironically, in privileging my own interests, I had neglected an important aspect of rhizomatic thinking. The analyst should be vigilant of overcoding. Overcoding leads us to repetition. It focuses all our energy in proving a single point of view, instead of trying to understand how different aspects of a social phenomenon can work together. In this sense, understanding *Ugly Betty* as a Latino(a) text is just as important as understanding it as an industrial product, or as looking at the savvy engagement of a community of fans.

All three elements contribute to a broader understanding of the role and significance of contemporary television itself.

Ugly Betty came from YSBLF, arguably one of the most successful telenovelas of all time. Though telenovelas have always had a significant market, the format trade has ushered even greater opportunities. Indeed, the ability to incorporate specific cultural cues into a template transformed YSBLF into a global product. In the United States, the immigrant's journey into the melting pot was a key theme, and it allowed *Ugly Betty* to insert the Latino(a) experience into a greater narrative of nationhood.

Traditionally, the melting pot has excluded as much as it has included. It has obfuscated a history of displacement, segregation, marginalization, and exclusions that branded many Americans as second-class citizens. In the case of Latinos(as), history shows time and again that they have been marginalized. In terms of media representations, it would be pointless to deny that Latinos(as) have been victims of negative stereotyping.

It is not without irony that one of the most widely cited authors on Latino(a) representations, Charles Ramírez-Berg, ended up describing the Latin Lover and his female counterpart, the Dark Lady, as positive stereotypes. In the early days of Hollywood, as well as when television was in its infancy, Latinos(as) were hard pressed to find themselves portrayed positively. Nevertheless, the findings of this dissertation suggest that demographic change matters, and that creative control matters. Both impact the development of representations.

In this case, the demographic transformation that continuously brings Latinos(as) to the forefront of American social life, arts, and politics has also transformed them into desirable consumers, cultural producers, and voters. For the television industry, this justified the time, energy, and resources that were devoted to creating more content that acknowledged that Latinos(as) are more than maids, gardeners, and ganstas. *Ugly Betty* exemplifies this shift in representations.

Ugly Betty also indicates an oft-repeated axiom of television production, which is also part of the rhetoric of Latino(a) activism: Minorities will gravitate to shows that portray their experiences. And if the portrayal is positive, so much the better. Accordingly, television networks will schedule programs like *The Cosby Show*, or *Ugly Betty* in hopes to attract a specific type of viewer. But to do so reflects a process of commodification of the audience, which has a strong rhetorical component. In other words, to have Latino(a) content, or any minority representation for that matter, does not happen without persuasion. The rhetoric can come from the community itself, as it does whenever Latino(a) interest groups deploy communication strategies to mobilize other Latinos(as), to bring the problems of Latino(a) communities to the forefront, or to garner support for Latino(a) causes. However, the acts of persuasion can originate from the consciousness industries themselves, in which case the goal is to show that Latinos(as) are desirable consumers. Moreover, the consciousness industries have been trying to convince the American public that there is absolutely no difference between an acculturated Latino(a) and any other American.

Naturally, this rhetoric of inclusion goes against a legacy of discourses that emphasized the differences between Americans and Latinos(as). In their nativist form, such discourses dehumanized Latinos(as) by presenting them as inferior to whites. Yet identity politics and Latino(a) consciousness has also highlighted the distinctiveness of Latino(a) culture. It has elevated it into a source of ethnic pride, and as the glue that joins all Latinos(as) together regardless of national origin. This discourse has become ubiquitous enough to find its way into the commercial culture. Indeed, for a number of years, UNIVISION has been running a series of public service announcements that highlight the achievements of noteworthy Latinos(as). The viewers are encouraged to take pride in these achievements, as they are a source for *Orgullo Hispano*.⁶³

Much like UNIVISION's campaign, *Ugly Betty* sought to draw Latinos(as) in by reminding them of their positive contributions. The Suarez family became the proxy of what a good Latino(a) could be, and how he or she could achieve the American dream. Illegal immigration provided the most challenging aspect associated with Latinos(as), yet *Ugly Betty* wanted to sanitize it. If the show succeeded, it would reiterate the cosmopolitan quality of the American melting pot (Higham, 1988).

John Higham spoke of the melting pot as a cosmopolitan space. It attracted immigrants from all corners of the world, and it successfully transformed them into better versions of themselves. The United States was able to do so because cosmopolitan Americans themselves had faith in the transformative power of their national institutions. However, Higham reminds us that not all Americans are cosmopolitan. Some view immigrants as threats to the nation, and they put a great deal of time and effort into trying

to stop the hordes from taking over everything. For Higham, this is an essential tension throughout American history, and it is one that is likely to remain, unresolved.

Ugly Betty does not acknowledge this essential tension. Rather, it focuses on the cosmopolitan part of the equation. Accordingly, all that Ignacio Suarez has to do to become an American is to re-enact the melting pot rite of passage. He needs to follow the rules of incorporation, and let America take care of the rest. The transformation is like magic. It reiterates the denial of history and of context that is inherent to myths.

The transformation of Ignacio Suarez, furthermore, also suggests the limits of representation and creative control. Newcomb and Hirsh have described producers as individuals who make choices. They “work in certain generic forms, to express certain political, moral, and ethical attitudes” (Newcomb & Hirsch, 2000, p. 568). However, the power of producers is not absolute. For one, it is limited by their success in the industry, which may impact on their ability to negotiate with the network. Jhally and Lewis (1992) have pointed out as much. In their examination of *The Cosby Show*, these authors noted that when NBC objected to the display of an anti-apartheid flag, *Cosby* prevailed over network desires. The flag stayed, though it is hard to say whether or not anyone in the audience noticed.

Ugly Betty follows the pattern of *The Cosby Show* in its treatment of illegal immigration. In doing so, it defuses one of the most controversial issues of our times through the portrayal of an American in the making.

Perhaps it is a limitation of this study, but it was not designed to investigate audience reception through a traditional method of audience studies. Focus groups, for

example, can provide insights into what audiences take from television shows through an in depth discussion in which the researcher can act as a moderator. This dissertation, though, took a decidedly different path by looking at the textual production of fan communities on the Internet.

In the initial stages of inquiry, it was difficult to decide which community to analyze. ABC itself hosted fan boards for *Ugly Betty*, and part of the decision-making process entailed reading hundreds of messages that were posted to these boards. Interestingly enough, most of the messages came after the cancellation announcement, and they seemed to reiterate what scholars have been saying about fans for about two decades. Indeed, the contribution to the ABC boards, by and large, exemplified the devotion of the fanbase. Many mourned the show, and one fan would repeatedly post a one-line message: “Please bring my Betty back.”

Again, the rhizomatic perspective induced me to look for alternatives, which led me to *Television without Pity*. I had known about the site, and was aware of its reputation as relentless critics of television. What I had not expected was to immerse myself in a broader discussion about the meaning of fandom, or the meaning of *Ugly Betty* to television fans. In fact, I had originally hoped to compare and contrast my own interpretations of the illegal immigration storyline with the interpretations that were coming from fans. However, this would have put me right back to expecting audiences to take away the same meaning, and prioritize the same issues as I did. I decided instead to survey as much of the site as I possibly could, and to let the content itself determine the best direction to follow.

As it turned out, illegal immigration played a very small role in the final discussion of *Television without Pity*. Yet the chapter did show me that fan discussions on the site shared commonalities with my own interests, and with another chapter of this dissertation. TWoPpers were very inclined to discussing *Ugly Betty* from the producers' perspective. I utilized the concept of savvy to explain this phenomenon, and the ways in which TWoPpers construct a public identity as non-duped television viewers.

It should be said that this was the most challenging, albeit interesting chapter to write in this study. I would describe it as the most rhizomatic of them all. To begin, TWoP itself brings forth the rhizomatic aspect of contemporary television. Lotz (2007), for example, has argued that network schedules are no longer linear. Viewers can bypass these structures altogether by simply programming a DVR, or by streaming episodes online. However, the ways in which fans talk about television are also rhizomatic. Fans don't have to be physically present to participate in a forum. In fact, with asynchronous forums, they don't even have to be there at the same time. Megasites like TWoP, furthermore, foster the deterritorializations and re-territorializations that Deleuze and Guattari associate with rhizomes. In this sense, a TWoP forum is a "multiplicity connected to other multiplicities by superficial underground stems in such way as to form or extend a rhizome" (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1988, p. 22). Indeed, fan forums extend the life of a series, as much as syndication once did (Stenger, 2006). Yet on TWoP, these interconnected forums challenge the traditional notion of fan loyalty. There is just so much out there to be sampled and deconstructed, and TWoP makes it easy for television fans to make these connections, and to demonstrate their expert knowledge.

With TWoP and other similar sites, we need to re-think the concept of fan loyalty. It has become a truism, which is why I was expecting TWoPpers to fight for *Ugly Betty*. After all, that is what fans do. They send letters, peanuts, and Mars bars to unresponsive networks, and sometimes they succeed. TWoPpers, on the other hand, let *Ugly Betty* go quietly. If anything, watching the final episodes of the show seemed like a chess game in which TWoPpers used their savvy to guess what the endgame would end up looking like. This suggests that it might be time to re-evaluate the premium that is being placed on fan loyalty. It is not a given, especially as we have so many other choices that can be more satisfying.

The other issue that warrants further attention is the interplay between corporate media and fandom. *Television without Pity*, for instance, emerged from fandom. Its originators understood the moral economy of fandom quite well. They created a site in which people could go read snarky commentary, as well as contribute to the boards. Without probing into the founders' motivations, it is difficult to say whether or not they hoped their site would become a household commodity as it did. However, it should be noted that TWoP emerged as the dot.com boom was well underway. Unlike many other fan sites, TWoP survived. It reached a significant audience, and capture media and corporate attention. Perhaps TWoP's success suggests that the online gift economy might be a mixed economy after all (Barbrook, 2005). Cooptation, in other words, may not be the best way to describe what happens when corporations mingle with fandom. These are questions that exceed the scope of this dissertation, and they represent avenues for further research.

Newcomb and Hirsch described television as a rich text. It has to be if it hopes to “attract a mass audience in a complex culture” (p. 571). In this vein, *Ugly Betty* is far richer text than this dissertation could cover. Its treatment of homosexuality, for example, was barely explored, as it would have shifted the focus of the work entirely. Other issues were also left unaccounted for. These include the discourse of beauty, the representation of the work place, the role of African-Americans, and even corporate responsibility and its relevance in a country that is still reeling from economic depression. In terms of audience reception, furthermore, audience interpretations of the illegal immigration narrative would provide a valuable contribution to the discipline, and to our understanding of the processes of reception. Finally, the problem of audience measurement, as it impacts the marketability and the survival of television series, needs further examination. New technological developments present serious challenges to the ways in which we conceive and study television. These developments warrant sustained study.

As I write these words, I can’t help but look back at the journey I took with Betty. She grew up as a character, and I relate her growth to my own, as a researcher. I also think about everything I wrote about Ignacio, and how it describes my own journey as a Latina in the United States. I can’t help but wonder to what extent I have re-enacted the melting pot in my lifetime, and to what extent I will always hang on to the distinctiveness of my culture. I am, and will always be, Latina, but sometimes I’m not exactly sure what that means.

¹ Unlike the English language, Spanish assigns a gender to all nouns. As a native speaker, I use Latino(a) to recognize both genders.

² Lotz discusses Raymond William's concept of "flow," and Newcomb and Hirsch's idea of television functioning as a cultural forum as two theories that require a readjustment (see Lotz, 2007, chapter 1).

³ Ana Maria Orozco, the actress who played Betty, is nothing like the frumpy character she portrayed. Indeed, she is a celebrated beauty. However, as Betty she sported eyeglasses, braces, and atrocious hair style. These elements are signature traits of the character, and are part of the *YSBLF* show bible. Indeed, none of the actresses that have portrayed Betty are really ugly.

⁴ The Pew Hispanic Center releases its research findings to the public on a regular basis. The Center's reports are often cited as evidence of a changing Latino(a) demographic.

⁵ McPherson served as president of ABC Entertainment from 2004 to 2010.

⁶ In the 1980s I was one of the thousands of Nicaraguans who came to the United States. Unlike many of my countrymen and women, I never petitioned for asylum, was not eligible for IRCA legalization, and never meant to make a life in America. However, that one-year sojourn in San Francisco sparked an interest in the human costs of immigration, and with the socio-cultural processes of immigrant incorporation.

⁷ These shows include *Girlfriends* (2000-2008), *The Bernie Mac Show* (2001-2006), *My Wife and Kids* (2001-2005), *Everybody Hates Chris* (2005-2009), and *The Game* (2006-2009),

⁸ Acculturation, in this sense, refers to the traditional model of acculturation (see chapter 4).

⁹ Martin Sheen, for example, played fictional president Josiah Bartlet for seven seasons on *The West Wing*. The character was a New Englander, and one of his ancestors had signed the Declaration of Independence. In 2004, though, *The West Wing* added an identifiable Latino character. Jimmy Smits played Congressman Matthew Santos, the democratic presidential candidate. Santos was the perfect example of the acculturated Latino. He was highly educated, accomplished, and family oriented. In the series finale, Santos became president of the United States.

¹⁰ Additionally, Fox planned, but never scheduled *The Ortegas*, and launched MyNetworkTv, an upstart that experimented with a lineup of telenovela-inspired fare in English. CBS, furthermore, backed away from a deal to air Gregory Navas' *American Family*, a drama that ran on PBS from 2002 to 2004, and NBC aired *Kingpin*, a story about Latino(a) drug lord, as a miniseries.

¹¹ Robert Rose worked for Univision before starting his own production company, AIM-Tell-A-Vision in (year). AIMTV syndicates Latino(a)-themed shows in English.

¹² After hit shows, like *All in the Family*, *Good Times*, and *The Jeffersons*, Lear was also behind *Palmerstown*, *Hot L Baltimore*, *All That Glitters*, and *The Nancy Walker Show*. None of these shows lasted beyond a few episodes.

¹³ Pennette and Hayman were fired after the second season, presumably to re-focus the show (Martin, 2009).

-
- ¹⁴ Arturo Ripstein is a Mexican director, who began his career in the 1960's. His first film *Tiempo de Morir* (1966), was written by Gabriel García Márquez and Carlos Fuentes.
- ¹⁵ The person in charge of day-to-day operations of a television show.
- ¹⁶ Cartagena is managing director for multicultural communications at Meredith Integrated Marketing. She is considered an expert in Latino(a) marketing, and has written extensively on the subject for *Advertising Age*. She is also the author of *Latino Boom! Everything you Need to Know to Grow your Business in the US Hispanic Market*.
- ¹⁷ In cities like Rio de Janeiro, telenovelas set social scheduling, since “no one ever want[s] to meet up for a drink before 10 in the evening [...] because the day’s most important telenovela start[s] at nine” (Bellos, 2007).
- ¹⁸ Univision reached a significant milestone in the summer of 2010. It outperformed ABC, CBS, NBC, and FOX in the 18-34 demo for an entire week. Arguably, the broadcast networks do not usually air new original programming during the summer months. However, they had always managed to beat Univision in the ratings (“Ad revs,” 2010).
- ¹⁹ ABC conducted several focus groups to assess audience reaction to the makeover (Ausiello, 2009c). Colombian media speculated for months about what Gaitán would do with Betty Pinzón. One journalist even suggested that Gaitán had “free rein to do anything he wanted with the character” (Yances, 2000, my translation).
- ²⁰ Formerly Touchstone Television.

²¹ During the upfronts, networks present their fall lineups, and sell blocks of advertising space at a premium rate to major advertisers.

²² According to Lotz (2007), Nielsen had little incentive to include DVR in its sample. Device adoption was still relatively low during the first eight years of its existence. Furthermore, the DVR came into play as Nielsen was attempting to introduce the Local People Meter (LPM). LPM introduction was very controversial, as the device reported lower viewership numbers among Latinos(as) and African Americans.

²³ The move to New York gave *Ugly Betty* a more realistic visual style, as producers were able to shoot scenes on location. Narratively, as well, it brought about a change, as Betty Suarez moved out of the family home in Queens, and into her own apartment in Manhattan. The producers, though, would scrap this story arc, after a few episodes.

²⁴ See chapter x for fan reactions on TWoP.

²⁵ ABC cancelled *Flash Forward* in 2010, after 22 episodes.

²⁶ President Theodore Roosevelt advocated this view. In *The Winning of the West*, he described how immigrants from different parts of Europe endured the crucible of the frontier, and emerged as “one people” (Roosevelt, 1900b, p. 108). In *True Americanism*, furthermore, he urged new immigrants to learn “learn to talk and think and be United States” from the example of previous immigrant generations (Roosevelt, 1900a, p. 69).

²⁷ The ethnic sitcoms came to television directly from radio. Radio and television re-appropriated theatrical forms of immigrant representation.

²⁸ See chapter 3.

²⁹ See chapter 3

³⁰ Episode 2 (season 1).

³¹ Episode 4 (season 1)

³² *The lying, the watch, and the wardrobe* (Episode 5, season 1)

³³ Horta, as showrunner, set the public relations message echoed by the cast. In 2007, for example, Mark Indelicato told reporters that “It hasn’t been stated whether Justin is gay; it hasn’t been stated whether Justin is straight. It has nothing to do with me” (De Moraes, 2007a). Since Indelicato plays Justin, his statement not only reiterates the irrelevance of sexual orientation, but also separates the actor and the character. Ana Ortiz, in similar vein, described her television son as a well-adjusted boy, who just happens to be different. The family doesn’t care, so the audience should not either:

³⁴ Justin’s treatment indicates how atypical *Ugly Betty* is in comparison to other Latino(a) themed sitcoms that preceded it, or aired at the same time. The short-lived *Greetings from Tucson* (The WB, 2003) and *Freddie* (ABC, 2005-06) never addressed homosexuality in any way. *The George Lopez Show*, on the other hand, only dealt with sexual orientation once. In the episode *Sabes Gay, It’s George’s Fantasy Episode*, after drinking a shot of tequila, worm and all, George hallucinates that he and best pal Ernie are gay and about to be married. In contrast, *Ugly Betty* constantly hints at Justin’s sexual orientation through his mannerisms, interests, and tastes, while extra-textually dismissing it as irrelevant to the plot, or as inappropriate for the character’s age.

³⁵ Civil conflicts in Central America, extreme poverty in Haiti, and the Mariel boatlift created an influx of asylum seekers. Illegal immigration, furthermore, had reached unprecedented levels since the passage of the 1965 act. By the mid-nineteen eighties, undocumented aliens were staging hunger strikes against indefinite imprisonment ("Mariels in jail," 1985) and camp conditions (Illegal aliens go on hunger strike of camp's conditions. 1985). It is clear that political mobilization, by immigrants themselves, or on their behalf, was very common, which is why the movement for IRCA legalization is considered as a landmark in the history of Latino(a) activism (Ayon, 2009).

³⁶ Constance is an African-American woman, which problematizes her portrayal. However, this aspect of representation goes beyond the scope of the present study.

³⁷ Voluntary departure is a misnomer, in practical and symbolic terms. In practical terms, U.S Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) may offer the possibility of voluntary departure to illegal aliens who haven't committed other crimes aside from illegal entry. Voluntary departure does not bar an alien from applying for a visa to re-enter the country legally. Removal, on the other hand, can bar a non-criminal alien from legal entry for up to 20 years, not to mention possible fines, and incarceration (Dougherty, Wilson, & Wu, 2006). Obviously, when these choices are weighed, voluntary departure is the lesser of two evils, especially if immediate family members have American citizenship. If they are legally adults, they can petition for family reunification. With the backlog, the petition process can take years.

³⁸ In *The Real World Cancún*, and *The OC*, characters go to Mexico to party, engage in risky sexual behavior, and drink. In *NCIS*, on the other hand, the main character seeks solace in Mexico, and in *Criminal Minds*, a group of highly trained individuals demonstrate their technological and professional superiority by solving crimes that Mexican police cannot solve on its own.

³⁹ The quote is from America Ferrera.

⁴⁰ Recent journalistic coverage has focused on drug-related violence and its escalation. Reporter Sam Quinones, for example, describes this phenomenon for the readers of *Foreign Policy*. It used to be, he writes, that “the occasional gang member would turn up executed, maybe with duct-taped hands, rolled in a carpet, and dropped in an alley” (Quinones, 2009). Nowadays, though, decapitation and torture seem more commonplace, and decapitation, in particular, is used to send a message to everyone, whether they are involved in drug trafficking or not (Arteaga Botello, 2009).

⁴¹ Plana is also very active in the movement to repeal SB 1070 in Arizona.

⁴² Recap is short for *recapitulation*. On TWoP and other sites that review television

⁴³ All three founders of TWoP left the site in 2008, which led to speculation about the reasons for the departure. These discussions are beyond the scope of the present research project.

⁴⁴ A very positive review of *Mad Men* included the following line: “can you imagine how different this show would be if Don Draper's dick didn't function? He should take out an insurance policy on that thing” (Couch Baron, 2010).

⁴⁵ PHd' shows include cult favorites, such as *Buffy the Vampire Slayer*, *The X Files*, and *Star Trek*. The forums for these shows are still among the most popular destinations on TWoP.

⁴⁶ TWoP does not publish demographic data on the site. However, it is safe to assume that most TWoPpers are relatively young (see J. Gray, 2005).

⁴⁷ TWoP can be just as caustic when it places shows that are highly regarded as quality programming on the PHd list. *Buffy the Vampire Slayer* is among these. The entry for this show reads as follows: "Completely improbably, this little WB offering about a blonde teenage girl fighting vampires and saving the world turned out to be one of the best and most original shows on television. Just as improbably, the show's precipitous drop in quality in the last three seasons made us want to jam stakes in our eyes as well as our hearts. It was the best of shows, it was the worst of shows, but after seven seasons, Sarah Michelle Gellar had had enough, and so had we" (Television without Pity, All shows B, n.d.).

⁴⁸ The quote is from *The Picture of Dorian Gray*.

⁴⁹ Spoilers are information about specific aspects within a television show, movie, video game, etc, which gives away the ultimate conclusion. As a general rule, TWoP posters are expected to use spoiler tags, to hide spoilers, or to post on "spoiler-specific" threads.

⁵⁰ Fans often use the phrase TPTB to refer to "individuals, companies, and networks responsible for the production of a given canon product such as a television series or

film. They are typically the producers, the writing staff, network executives - whomever makes the major decisions behind how a series may progress and what will happen to the characters” (Fan History Wiki, n.d.). The phrase also refers to the supernatural beings that help the heroes in *Angel*, a spin-off of *Buffy the Vampire Slayer*.

⁵¹ *The Futon Critic* is a web site that covers the television industry. It came online in 1997, and it is considered one of the most reliable sources on American television.

⁵² Steve Urkel was a character in the *Family Matters*, an African-American sitcom that ran from 1989-1998.

⁵³ As it turned out, TWoPpers were right. Both shows were cancelled before the 2006-2007 season was over. Neither made it into Nielsen’s top 100 shows, whereas *Ugly Betty* ended its first season in the Top Forty (MindyTV, 2007).

⁵⁴ The other Armandos refers to David, of the German Version, and Fernando, from the Mexican version.

⁵⁵ In TWoP lexicon, ship is short for relationship.

⁵⁶ I totally agree.

⁵⁷ Refers to TWoP’s user categories, which are based on the number of posts that a person contributes to the site. “Just Tuned In” TWoPpers have less than ten posts.

⁵⁸ Refers to the British sitcom *Absolutely Fabulous*, in which the title characters are two alcoholics.

⁵⁹ In TWoP lexicon, shipper is short for “relationshipper,” which refers to individuals who want two characters to be romantically involved.

⁶⁰ A Mary Sue is a character that is too perfect to be believable.

⁶¹ Retroactive continuity.

⁶² In this episode, Christina, Betty’s best friend at work, kidnaps Wilhelmina Slater’s baby. She had been the surrogate mother for Wilhelmina, but now Christina suspects that the child is actually hers. She kidnaps the baby. When Betty finds out, she hides her at the Suarez home.

⁶³ Hispanic pride.

WORKS CITED

1-1: "Pilot" 2006.09.28, post # 238 [Online forum comment]. (2006, October 9). Retrieved

from

<http://forums.televisionwithoutpity.com/index.php?s=&showtopic=3146495&view=findpost&p=6256432>

1-1: "Pilot" 2006.09.28, post # 27 [Online forum comment]. (2006, September 28).

Message posted to

<http://forums.televisionwithoutpity.com/index.php?s=&showtopic=3146495&view=findpost&p=6170748>

1-4: "Fey's sleigh ride" 2006.10.1, post # 18 [Online forum comment]. (2006, October 19).

Retrieved from

<http://forums.televisionwithoutpity.com/index.php?s=&showtopic=3147391&view=findpost&p=6351054>

1-4: "Fey's sleigh ride" 2006.10.1, post # 23 [Online forum comment]. (2006, October 19).

Retrieved from

<http://forums.televisionwithoutpity.com/index.php?s=&showtopic=3147391&view=findpost&p=6351209>

3-20: "Rabbit test" 2009.04.30, post # 40 [Online forum comment]. (2009, May 2).

Retrieved from

<http://forums.televisionwithoutpity.com/index.php?s=&showtopic=3185115&view=findpost&p=11698911>

3-20: "Rabbit test" 2009.04.30, post # 46 [Online forum comment]. (2009, May 3).

Retrieved from

<http://forums.televisionwithoutpity.com/index.php?s=&showtopic=3185115&view=findpost&p=11701873>

3-20: "Rabbit test" 2009.04.30, post # 4 [Online forum comment]. (2009, April 30).

Retrieved from

<http://forums.televisionwithoutpity.com/index.php?s=&showtopic=3185115&view=findpost&p=11692907>

3-20: "Rabbit test" 2009.04.30, post # 59 [Online forum comment]. (2009, June 14).

Retrieved from

<http://forums.televisionwithoutpity.com/index.php?s=&showtopic=3185115&view=findpost&p=11870653>

3-21: "The born identity" 2009.05.07, post # 2 [Online forum comment]. (2009, May 12).

Retrieved from

<http://forums.televisionwithoutpity.com/index.php?s=&showtopic=3185373&view=findpost&p=11725841>

3-21: "The born identity" 2009.05.07, post # 14 [Online forum comment]. (2009, May 8).

Retrieved from

<http://forums.televisionwithoutpity.com/index.php?s=&showtopic=3185373&view=findpost&p=11729221>

3-21: "The born identity" 2009.05.07, post # 32 [Online forum comment]. (2009, May 7).

Retrieved from

<http://forums.televisionwithoutpity.com/index.php?s=&showtopic=3185373&view=findpost&p=11744747>

Abalos, D. T. (2001). *The Latino male: A radical redefinition*. Boulder, Co: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

ABC Medianet. (2007). *Ugly Betty joins iTunes*. Retrieved from http://www.abcmmedianet.com/web/dnr/dispDNR.aspx?id=010507_01

ABC Medianet (2007). *Ugly Betty*. Retrieved from http://www.abcmmedianet.com/web/showpage/showpage.aspx?program_id=002094&type=lead

Acosta-Alzuru, C. (2003). Tackling the issues: Meaning making in a telenovela. *Popular Communication*, 1(4), 193-215.

Acosta-Alzuru, C. (2010). Beauty queens, machistas, and street children: The production and reception of socio-cultural issues in telenovelas. *International Journal of Cultural Studies*, 13(2), 185-203.

Acuña, R. (1972). *Occupied America: The Chicano's struggle toward liberation*. San Francisco, CA: Canfield Press.

Ad revs jump 14% at net. (2010, November 5). *Daily Variety*, p. 4.

Adalian, J. (2006a, March 9). Mirror on society. *Daily Variety*, p. A2.

Adalian, J. (2006b, August 9). 'Ugly Betty' sitting pretty. *Daily Variety*, p. 3.

Adalian, J. (2007a, March 14). Bravo snags snark site. *Daily Variety*, p. 5.

Adalian, J. (2007b, February 6). Marketing duo upped. *Daily Variety*, p. 5.

- Adalian, J. & Schneider, M. (2007, October 8). Nets play the rating game. *Variety*, pp. 14, 16.
- Adalian, J. & Schneider, M. (2008, March 12). ABC digs Horta culture. *Daily Variety*, p. 1.
- Adalian, J. & Sutter, M. (2001, September 20). NBC betting on Betty. *Daily Variety*, p. 1.
- Advertising Age. (2005). *Hispanic fact pack: Annual guide to hispanic advertising & marketing* New York, NY: Advertising Age. Retrieved from <http://adage.com/images/random/hispfactpack05.pdf>
- Aizenman, N. C. (2006, April 6). Immigration debate wakes a 'sleeping Latino giant.' *The Washington Post*, p. A1.
- Alba, R. (1999). Immigration and the American realities of assimilation and multiculturalism. *Sociological Forum*, 14(1), 3-25.
- Alba, R. & Logan, J. (1991). Variations on two themes: Racial and ethnic patterns in the attainment of suburban residence. *International Migration Review*, 26(4), 431-453.
- Alba, R. & Nee, V. (2003). *Remaking the American mainstream: Assimilation and contemporary immigration*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Alvermann, D. (2000). Researching libraries, literacies, and lives. In W. S. Pillow (Ed.), *Working the ruins: Feminist postructural theory and methods in education* (pp. 114-148). New York, NY: Routledge.
- American Civil Liberties Union. (2000). *The rights of immigrants: ACLU position paper*. New York, NY: ACLU. Retrieved from <http://www.aclu.org/immigrants-rights/rights-immigrants-aclu-position-paper>

- Anaya, R. (1996). "I'm the king": The macho image. In R. Gonzalez (Ed.), *Muy macho: Latino men confront their manhood* (1st Anchor Books ed. pp. 57-74). New York, NY: Anchor Books.
- Anderson, B. (1983). *Imagined communities : Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. London : Verso Editions/NLB.
- Anderson, C. (2006). *The long tail: Why the future of business is selling less of more*. New York, NY: Hyperion.
- Andreeva, N. (2008, February 12). 'Betty' drops 2 exec producers. *The Hollywood Reporter.com*. Retrieved from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.
- Andrejevic, M. (2008). Watching television without pity: The productivity of online fans. *Television & New Media*, 9(1), 24-46.
- Andrews, C. M. (1934). *The colonial period of American history*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Ang, I. (1985). *Watching Dallas: Soap opera and the melodramatic imagination*. London; New York: Methuen.
- Antola, L. & Rogers, E.M. (1984). Television flows in Latin America. *Communication Research*, 11(2), 183-202.
- Antshel, K. M. (2002). Integrating culture as a means of improving treatment adherence in the Latino population. *Psychology, Health & Medicine*, 7(4), 435-449.
- Armbruster, A. (2006, September 25). Add Hispanics into your ad mix; Spanish-language subsets segmented but viewers possess predictable values. *Television Week*, p. 11.

- Arteaga Botello, N. (2009). Decapitaciones y mutilaciones en el México contemporáneo. [Decapitations and mutilations in contemporary Mexico]. *Espacio Abierto: Cuaderno Venezolano De Sociología*, 18(3), 463-486.
- Aufherheide, P., Barnouw, E., Cohen, R.M., Frank, T., Lieberman, D., Miller, M. C., Roberts, G. & Shatz, T. (1997). *Conglomerates and the media*. New York, NY: The New Press.
- Aurthur, K. (2005, December 21). Nielsen to track Univision. *The New York Times*, p. 2.
- Ausiello, M. (2009a). *Breaking: ABC benches 'Ugly Betty'* [Web log post]. Retrieved from <http://insidetv.ew.com/2009/01/26/breaking-abc-be/>
- Ausiello, M. (2009b). *Scoop: ABC defends moving 'Ugly Betty' to Friday* [Web log post]. Retrieved from <http://insidetv.ew.com/2009/05/19/scoop-abc-defen/>
- Ausiello, M. (2009c). *'Ugly Betty' exclusive: Betty's glam new look under review at ABC* [Web log post]. Retrieved from <http://insidetv.ew.com/2009/07/30/abc-testing-ugly-Betty-glam-new-look/>
- Ayon, D. (2009). *Mobilizing Latino immigrant integration: From IRCA to the ya es hora citizenship campaign, 1987-2007*. Washington DC: Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars. Retrieved from <http://www.wilsoncenter.org/news/docs/AYON%20PAPER%20FINAL%20020309.pdf>
- Baca Zinn, M. (1994). Adaptation and continuity in Mexican-origin families. In R.L Taylor (Ed.), *Minority families in the united states: Comparative perspectives* (pp. 64-81). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

- Baeten, E.M. (1996). *The magic mirror: Myth's abiding power*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Bagdikian, B. H. (2004). *The new media monopoly*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Baker, S. (1997). The “amnesty” aftermath: Current policy issues stemming from the legalization programs of the 1986 Immigration Reform and Control Act. *International Migration Review*, 31(1), 5-27.
- Baker, S. G. & Espitia, M. (2000). From Latin American immigrants to “Hispanic” citizen: The role of social capital in seeking U.S. citizenship. *Social Science Quarterly*, 81(4), 1053-1063.
- Balderrama, F. E. (2005). The emergence of unconstitutional deportation and repatriation. *Radical History Review*, (93), 107-110.
- Balderrama, F. E. & Rodriguez, R. (2006). *Decade of betrayal: Mexican repatriation in the 1930s*. Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press.
- Ballvé, M. (2004). The battle for Latino media. *NACLA Report on the Americas*, 37(4), 20-25.
- Barbrook, R. (2005). The hi-tech gift economy. *First Monday* (Special Issue #3: Internet banking, e-money, and Internet gift economies) Retrieved from <http://firstmonday.org/htbin/cgiwrap/bin/ojs/index.php/fm/article/view/1517/1432>
- Barney, C. (2007, February 17). “Ugly Betty” es muy bonita - Hispanic viewers embrace show's positive role model. *Contra Costa Times*, p. D1.

- Barrera, V. & Bielby, D. (2001). Places, faces, and other familiar things: The cultural experience of telenovela viewing among Latinos in the United States. *Journal of Popular Culture*, 34(4), 1-18.
- Barrientos, T. (2006, 08/19). Telenovelas, the heavy-duty soapiest soaps. *The Philadelphia Inquirer*, p. C01.
- Barthes, R. (1972). *Mythologies*. (A. Lavers, Trans.). New York, NY: Hill and Wang.
- Barthes, R. & Duisit, L. (1975). An introduction to the structural analysis of narrative. *New Literary History*, 6(2), 237-272.
- Basch, L., Schiller, N. & Blanc, C. (1994). Nations unbound: Transnational projects, postcolonial predicaments, and deterritorialized nation-states. London: Routledge.
- Baym, N. (2000). Tune in, log on: Soaps, fandom, and online community. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Beale, L. (2009, January 14). Explosion of TV in English for Latinos. *New York Daily News*, p. 4.
- Bean, F. D., Brown, S. K. & Rumbaut, R. G. (2006). Mexican immigrant political and economic incorporation. *Perspectives on Politics*, 4(2), pp. 309-313.
- Bean, F. D., Trejo, S., Crapps, R., & Tyler, M. (2001). *The Latino middle class: Myth, reality and potential* (Report No. 1047). Claremont, CA: The Tomas Rivera Policy Institute.
- Becerra, D., Gurrola, M., Ayon, C., Androff, D., Krysik, J., Gerdes, K., Moya-Salas, L. & Segal, E. (2010). Poverty and other factors affecting migration intentions among adolescents in Mexico. *Journal of Poverty*, 14(1), 1-16.

- Beeson, E. (2006, 12/15). Made for America; "Ugly Betty" is adapted from a hit colombian telenovela, but it reflects American life and values. *Herald News*, p. D01.
- Bellos, A. (2007, January 7). Telenovelas: The story so far television 'Ugly Betty', now on Channel 4, brings a new style of soap to our screens - the Latin American 'telenovela', which has a worldwide audience of up to two billion. Alex Bellos tunes in. *The Sunday Telegraph*, p. 14.
- Beltran, M. (2006). Dolores del Río, the first "Latin invasion," and Hollywood's transition to sound. *Aztlan*, 30(1), 55-85.
- Benjamin-Alvarado, J., DeSipio, L. & Montoya, C. (2009). Latino mobilization in new immigrant destinations: The anti-H.R. 4437 protest in Nebraska's cities. *Urban Affairs Review*, 44(5), 718-735.
- Berg, C. (1997). Stereotyping in films in general and of the Hispanic in particular. In C. Rodriguez (Ed.), *Latin looks: Images of Latinas and Latinos in the U.S. media*, (104-pp. 120). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Berg, C. (2002). Latino images in film: Stereotypes, subversion, & resistance. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Bermejo, F. (2009). Audience manufacture in historical perspective: From broadcasting to Google. *New Media & Society*, 11(1-2), 133-154.
- Bernstein, N. (2006, March 27). In the streets, suddenly, an immigrant groundswell. *The New York Times*, p. 14.
- Bial, H. (2005). Acting Jewish: Negotiating ethnicity on the American stage and screen. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

- Bianco, R. (2008, May 23). The finale word on the TV season. *USA Today*, p. 9E.
- Bianculli, D. (2006, November 2). Hayek's making 'Betty' better. She sparkles in guest role. *New York Daily News*, p. 91.
- Bielby, W. T. & Bielby, D. D. (1994). "All hits are flukes": Institutionalized decision making and the rhetoric of network prime-time program development. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 99(5), 1287-1313.
- Blessington, H. (2007, January 25). "Be ugly" campaign not quite cutting it.
- Blundell, G. (2007, March 3). All about Betty. *Weekend Australian*, p. 24.
- Bodnar, J. (1985). *The transplanted: A history of immigrants in urban America*.
Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Boisson, S. (2006). When America sent her own packing. *American History*, 41(4), 20-27.
- Boorstin, D. J. (1958). *The Americans: The colonial experience*. New York, NY: Random House.
- Booth, P. (2008). Fandom 2.0: Beyond the Economic Binary. *Conference Papers -- National Communication Association*, 1. Retrieved from Communication & Mass Media Complete database.
- Booth, W. (2007, November 3). Writers strike set for Monday. *The Washington Post*, p. C03.
- Bosch, T. (2003). Radio, community and identity in South Africa: A rhizomatic study of Bush Radio in cape town (unpublished doctoral dissertation). Ohio University, Athens, OH.

- Bottomley, G. (1998). Anthropologists and the rhizomatic study of migration. *Australian Journal of Anthropology*, 9(1), 31-45.
- Bourdieu, P. (1987). *Distinction: A social critique of the judgment of taste* (R. Nice, Trans.). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, Ltd.
- Bourne, R. S. (1964). Trans-national America. In C. Reseck (Ed.), *War and the intellectuals: Essays, 1915-1919* (pp. 107-123). New York: Harper & Row.
- Boyd, M. (1989). Family and personal networks in international migration: Recent developments and new agendas. *International Migration Review*, 23(3), 638-670.
- Bradberry, G. (2003, January 5). Get a shave, Carter: Forget TV criticism - an obscure website for couch potatoes is making American programme makers sit up and listen. And shows like ER and the West Wing are even changing their scripts. *The Observer*, p. 11.
- Braxton, G. (2007a, October 2). Behind cameras, a familiar color; although there are minority characters in several new fall shows, most of the creative teams are white. *Los Angeles Times*, p. 1.
- Braxton, G. (2007b, June 6). White still a primary color; black, Latino and Asian groups feel multicultural momentum at the major networks has been lost. *Los Angeles Times*, p. 1.
- Breton, A. (2007, January 23). Feas sin fronteras (Ugly knows no boundaries). *El Universal*, Retrieved from <http://www.eluniversal.com.mx/espectaculos/74140.html>
- Brioux, B. (2009, October 14). Tyra Banks decides to be rich and thin. *The Toronto Star*, p. E01.

- Brook, V. (1999). The Americanization of Molly: How mid-fifties TV homogenized “the Goldbergs” (and got “berg-larized” in the process). *Cinema Journal*, 38(4), 45-67.
- Brook, V. (2003). *Something ain't kosher here: The rise of the “Jewish” sitcom*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Burgess, E. W. (1925). The growth of the city: An introduction to a research project. In R. Park, E.W. Burgess & R. D. McKenzie (Eds.), *The city* (47-62). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Burke, K. (1945). *A Grammar of motives*. New York, NY: Prentice-Hall.
- Calderon, J. (1992). “Hispanic” and “Latino”: The viability of categories for panethnic unity. *Latin American Perspectives*, 19(4), 37-44.
- Calkins, T. (2005). Introduction: The challenge of branding. In A. M. Tybout, & T. Calkins (Eds.), *Kellogg on branding :The marketing faculty of the Kellogg School of Management* (pp. 1-8). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Campbell, J. (1993). *Myths to live by*. New York, NY: Viking Press.
- Cardinal, A. H. (2007, October 16). Betty’s wait problem [Web log post]. Retrieved from <http://blogcritics.org/video/article/tv-review-ugly-Betty-Bettys-wait/>
- Carpentier, N. (2008). The belly of the city. *International Communication Gazette*, 3/4, 237-255.
- Carrasco, G.P. (1998). Latinos in the United States: Invitation and exile. In J. Stafancic (Ed.), *The Latino/a condition: A critical reader* (pp. 77-85). New York, NY: New York University Press.

- Cartagena, C. (2006, January 30). Love 'Wives'? No surprise, it's closest to a telenovela; English vs. Spanish debate missing point; it's all about the segment. *Advertising Age*, S6.
- Carter, B. (2006, September 17). The whole world is watching, and Ben Silverman is watching back. *The New York Times*, p. 1.
- Cassirer, E. (1946). *The myth of the state*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Castañeda, O. (1996). Guatemalan macho oratory. In R. Gonzalez (Ed.), *Muy macho: Latino men confront their manhood* (1st Anchor Books ed. pp. 35-57). New York, NY: Anchor Books.
- Castles, S. & Miller, M. J. (1993). The age of migration: International population movements in the modern world. New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Chaddock, G. & Bowers, F. (2007, 06/29). Immigration bill stalls amid calls for 'enforcement first.' *The Christian Science Monitor*, p. 1.
- Chaffin, J. (2007, August 28). TV ratings change highlights Hispanic power. *Financial Times*, p. 19.
- Children Now (2004). Fall colors 2003-2004: Prime time diversity report. Oakland, CA: Children Now.
- Chiswick, B. R. (1988). Illegal immigration and immigration control. *The Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 2(3), 101-115.
- Cohen, P. S. (1969). Theories of myth. *Man*, 4(3), 337-353.
- Connelly, M. (2006, April 14). In polls, illegal immigrants are called burden. *The New York Times*, p. 16.

- Consoli, J. (2007, October 1). DVR viewing delays clear ratings picture. *AdWeek*, 48(35), p. 6-7.
- Cooper, R. Potter, J. W. & Dupangne, M. (1994). A status report on methods used in mass communication research. *Journalism Educator*, 48(4), 54-61.
- Cooper, R. & Tang, T. (2009). Predicting audience exposure to television in today's media environment: An empirical integration of active-audience and structural theories. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 53(3), 400-418.
- Cordero-Guzman, H., Marin, N., Quiroz-Becerra, V. & Nik, T. (2008). Voting with their feet: Nonprofit organizations and immigrant mobilization. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 52(4), 598-617.
- Cortés, C. (1997). Chicanas in film: History of an image. In C. E. Rodriguez (Ed.), *Latin looks: Images of Latinas and Latinos in the U.S. media* (pp. 121-141).
- Couch Baron. (2010, September 19). All the real girls. Retrieved from http://www.televisionwithoutpity.com/show/mad_men/the_beautiful_girls_1.php
- Coutin, S. (1998). From refugees to immigrants: The legalization strategies of Salvadoran immigrants and activists. *International Migration Review*, 32(4), 901-925.
- Coutin, S. & Chock, P. (1997). "Your friend, the illegal:" definition and paradox in newspaper accounts of U.S. immigration reform. *Identities*, 2(1), 123-148.
- Crevecoeur, H. (1981). In A. E. Stone (Ed.), *Letters from an American farmer, and Sketches of eighteenth-century America*. New York, NY: Penguin Books.
- Croteau, D. & Hoynes, W. (2003). *Media society: Industries, images, and audiences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Csapo, E. (2005). *Theories of mythology*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Curtin, P. A. (1995). Textual analysis in mass communication studies: Theory and methodology. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (78th, Washington, DC, August 9-12, 1995). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED389018. Retrieved January 5, 2009 from ERIC Database.
- Dail, P. W. & Way, W. L. (1985). What do parents observe about parenting from prime time television. *Family Relations*, 34(4), 491-499.
- Davila, A. (2000). Mapping Latinidad: Language and culture in the Spanish TV battlefield. *Television & New Media*, 1(1), 75-94.
- Davila, A. (2001). *Latinos, Inc.: The marketing and making of a people*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Davila, A. (2008). *Latino spin: Public image and the whitewashing of race*. New York, NY: New York University Press.
- De Kosnik, A. (2009). Should fan fiction be free? *Cinema Journal*, 48(4), 118-124.
- De la Fuente, A. M. (2006a, August 30). Azteca's aboard Nielsen. *Daily Variety*, p. 6.
- De la Fuente, A. M. (2006b, October 9 -15). Battle of the 'Betty' beauties. *Variety*, p. 23.
- De la Fuente, A. M. (2006c, February 6 - 12). 'Ugly Betty' grows into swan around globe. *Variety*, p. 28
- De Moraes, L. (2007a, January 17). A golden day-after with 'Betty'. *The Washington Post*, p. C01.

- De Moraes, L. (2007b, October 3). Premiere week introduces confusion -- maybe ABC won. *The Washington Post*, p. C07.
- Deleuze, F. & Guattari, G. (1988). *A thousand plateaus: Capitalism and schizophrenia* (B. Massumi, Trans.). London: The Athlone Press. (Original work published 1980).
- Dell'Agnese, E. (2005). The US–Mexico border in American movies: A political geography perspective. *Geopolitics*, 10(2), 204-221. doi:10.1080/14650040590946548
- Denevan, W. M. (1992). The pristine myth: The landscape of the Americas in 1492. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 82(3), 369.
- Devlyn, D. & Harlow, J. (2007, May 23). Salma Hayek is changing the way Hollywood views the Latin world; the Mex factor. *Herald Sun*, pp. H03.
- Devlyn, D. (2008, May 7). The big ask America Ferrera - Ugly Betty. *Herald Sun*, p. 2.
- Disney Investor Relations. (2006). *Annual report 2006* (Report) Burbank, CA: The Walt Disney Company.
- Dobkowski, M. (1977). American anti-Semitism: A reinterpretation. *American Quarterly*, 29(2), 166-181.
- Dominguez, R. (2006, September 4). Make way for the supersoaps. Over -the- top, campy & compelling, the new American versions of Latin telenovelas. *New York Daily News*, p. 35.
- Dorsey, L. G. & Harlow, R. M. (2003). 'We want Americans pure and simple': Theodore Roosevelt and the myth of Americanism. *Rhetoric & Public Affairs*, 6(1), 55.
- Dos Santos, K. (2007, November 9). Strikewatch: Stars of Ugly Betty plead, "don't be petty" [Web log post]. Retrieved from

http://www.eonline.com/uberblog/watch_with_kristin/b3973_strikewatch_stars_of_ugly_Betty_plead.html

Doty, W. G. (1980). Mythophiles' dyscrasia: A comprehensive definition of myth. *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*, 48(4), 531-562.

Dougherty, M., Wilson, D. & Wu, A. (2006). *Immigration enforcement actions, 2005*

Washington DC: Department of Homeland Security, Office of Immigration Statistics. Retrieved from

http://www.dhs.gov/xlibrary/assets/statistics/yearbook/2005/Enforcement_AR_05.pdf

Douglas, W. W. (1953). The meanings of "myth" in modern criticism. *Modern Philology*, 50(4), 232-242.

Dow, B.J. (1996). Prime-time feminism: Television, media culture, and the women's movement since 1970. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Downey, K. (2007). The New World. *Broadcasting & Cable*, 137(10), 10-11.

Downing, J. & Husband, C. (2005). Representing 'race': Racisms, ethnicities and media. London: Sage.

Durand, J., Massey, D. S. & Parrado, E. A. (1999). The new era of Mexican migration to the united states. *The Journal of American History*, 86(2, Rethinking History and the Nation-State: Mexico and the United States as a Case Study: A Special Issue), 518-536.

- Durham, M. G. & Kellner, D.M. (2006). Introduction to part III. In M.G. Durham & D.M. Kellner, (Eds.), *Media and cultural studies Key Works* [Revised edition], (pp. 197-200). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Edwards, J. (2010, September 26). Minority majority. *AdWeek*, (Special issues: Diversity special). Retrieved from http://www.adweek.com/aw/content_display/special-issues/diversity-special/e3i386774579db7c203f1ba94ef1d467b04
- Égüez, R. (2006). Colombia: Una cultura bajo el signo de la ambivalencia (Colombia: A culture riddled by ambivalence). *Dialogos Latinoamericanos*, (11), 1-15.
- Elsworth, S. (2007, 02/20). Ugly start for 60 minutes as Betty takes it to the cleaners. *The Advertiser*, p. 3.
- Esch, M. (2010). Rearticulating ugliness, repurposing content: Ugly Betty finds the beauty in ugly. *Journal of Communication Inquiry*, 34(2), 168-183.
- Fan History Wiki. (n.d.). TPTB. Retrieved from <http://www.fanhistory.com/wiki/TPTB>
- Fernandez, M. E. (2006, September 17). Ugly Betty; well, that's the beauty of it all; just by being herself, the heroine of ABC'S comedy changes others. as she deals with cultural push-pull, she's gorgeous in her own way. *Los Angeles Times*, p. 8.
- Fernandez, M. E. (2007, January 31). Just the way you are; 'Ugly Betty's' young nephew has been embraced by those who don't `fit in. *Los Angeles Times*, pp. 1.
- Fish, S. (2007, 08/12). A fictional minority. *The New York Times*, p. 11.
- Fisher, C. (1995, January 23). Telcos lead Hispanic ad stampede; industry turns corner,' exec claims; world cup fuels segment growth industry turns corner,' exec claims. *Advertising Age*, 30.

- Fiske, J. (1992). The cultural economy of fandom. In L. A. Lewis (Ed.), *The adoring audience: Fan culture and popular media* (pp. 30-49). London: Routledge.
- Fitch, E. (1989, 03/27). Numbers game: New culture emerges from the melting pot. *Advertising Age*, p. 42.
- Flamm, M. (2005, November 21). Good ratings, si; more ads, no; Spanish-language stations draw bigger audiences, but lag in share of ad spending. *Crain's New York Business*, p. 1.
- Flores, L. A. (2003). Constructing rhetorical borders: Peons, illegal aliens, and competing narratives of immigration. *Critical Studies in Media Communication*, 20(4), 362-387.
- Fogel, M. (2006), Ugly duckling stays in the picture. *New York Times*, p. 30.
- Fontenelle, B. (1972). On the origin of fables. In B. Feldman & R. D. Richardson (Eds.), *The rise of modern mythology, 1680-1860* (pp. 10-18). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Forero, J. (2000, December 11). An ugly-duckling face wins TV-watchers' hearts. *The New York Times*, p. 4.
- Foster, J. E. (1964). Father images: Television and ideal. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 26(3), 353-355.
- Foster, L. (2006, 06/05). Wearing the American dream: The Hispanic market in the U.S. *Financial Times*, pp. 4-4.
- Fox, G. E. (1996). *Hispanic nation: Culture, politics, and the constructing of identity* / geoffrey fox. Secaucus, NJ: Carol Pub. Group.

Frankel, D. (1999, 07/28). Latino leaders call for “brownout”. *Entertainment Weekly*.

Retrieved from

http://www.eonline.com/uberblog/b38503_Latino_Leaders_Call_for_quotBrownout_quot.html

Freud, S. (1967). *The interpretation of dreams* (J. Strachey, Trans.), New York, NY: Avon.

(Original work published 1899).

Friedman, W. (2009). TV ratings erosion: Sports metaphors fit bill. *Media Post*, Retrieved from

http://www.mediapost.com/publications/?fa=Articles.showArticle&art_aid=106717

Frye, N. (1954). Myth as information. *The Hudson Review*, 7(2), 228-235.

Fursich, E. (2009). In defense of textual analysis. *Journalism Studies*, 10(2), 238-252.

Gaitan, F. (Writer), Ribero, M. (Director). (1999). Episodio 1 [Television series episode]. In

M.P. Fernandez (Producer), *Yo soy Betty, la Fea*. Bogota: RCN.

Gandy, O. H. (1992). The political economy approach: A critical challenge. *Journal of Media Economics*, 5(2), 23-42.

Gerbner, G. & Signorielli, N. (1979). *Women and minorities in television drama 1969-1978*.

Philadelphia, PA: Annenberg School of Communications, University of Pennsylvania.

Get America’s look. (2007). *Seventeen*. Retrieved from

http://www.seventeen.com/beauty/tips/america-cover-look?click=main_sr

Gitlin, T. (1979). Prime time ideology: The hegemonic process in television entertainment.

Social Problems, 26(3), 251-266.

- Gitlin, T. (1980). *The whole world is watching: Mass media in the making & unmaking of the new left*. Berkeley : University of California Press.
- Gitlin, T. (1983). *Inside prime time*. New York, NY: Pantheon Books.
- Glaister, D. & Macaskill, E. (2006, May 2). US counts cost of day without immigrants. *The Guardian*, p. 3.
- Gleason, P. (1964). The melting pot: Symbol of fusion or confusion. *American Quarterly*, 16(1), 20-46.
- Gleeson, D. T. & Buttner, B. J. (2005). 'We are Irish everywhere': Irish immigrant networks in Charleston, South Carolina, and Savannah, Georgia. *Immigrants & Minorities*, 23(2), 183-205. doi:10.1080/02619280500188237.
- Gobé, M. (2001). *Emotional branding; the new paradigm for connecting brands to people*. New York: Allworth Press.
- Goodwin, C. (2009, January 18). Latino TV station tops US ratings: Spanish language channel Univision topples major networks as viewing habits reflect a cultural shift. *The Observer*, p. 47-47.
- Goldman, E. (2009). Fringe moves to risky timeslot; dollhouse stays put on Fridays. *IGN*. Retrieved from <http://tv.ign.com/articles/983/983821p1.html>
- Goldstick, O. (Writer) & Arteta, M. (Director). (2007). Punch out [Television series episode]. In S. Hayek, J. Hayman, S. Horta & M. Pennette (Executive producers). *Ugly Betty*. Burbank, CA: ABC.
- Gould, J. (1964, December 7). New Nielsen study finds TV networks in three-way tie. *The New York Times*, pp. 1, 71.

- Gorman, B. (2007). Nielsen top broadcast TV shows via DVR, Oct 1-7, Nielsen DVR ratings for the office, heroes, reaper, bionic woman and more. Retrieved from <http://tvbythenumbers.zap2it.com/2007/10/22/top-timeshifted-broadcast-tv-shows-oct-1-8/1382>
- Gough, N. (2006). Sharing the tree, making a rhizome: Towards a nomadic geophilosophy of science education. *Educational Philosophy & Theory*, 38(5), 625-645.
- Graham, D. (2007, January 27). Betty represents a new standard for beauty. *The Toronto Star*, p. M02.
- Gray, H. (1995). *Watching race: Television and the struggle for "blackness"*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Gray, J. (2005). Antifandom and the moral text: Television without pity and textual dislike. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 48(7), 840-858.
- Gray, J., Sandvoss, C. & Harrington, C. L. (2007). Introduction. In J. Gray, C. Sandvoss & C. L. Harrington (Eds.), *Fandom: Identities and communities in a mediated world* (pp. 1-16). New York, NY: New York University Press.
- Green, J. & Jenkins, H. (2008). *The moral economy of web 2.0 (part one)* [Web log post]. Retrieved from http://henryjenkins.org/2008/03/the_moral_economy_of_web_20_pa.html
- Greenberg, M. & Zenchelsky, S. (1993). Private bias and public responsibility: Anti-Semitism at Rutgers in the 1920s and 1930s. *History of Education Quarterly*, 33(3), 295-319.
- Gross, A. E. (1989, September 25). 'Instrucciones' (how to do it). *Adweek*, promote.

- Grossberg, L. (1992). Is there a fan in the house? The affective sensitivity of fandom. In L. A. Lewis (Ed.), *The adoring audience: Fan culture and popular media* (pp. 50-65). London: Routledge.
- Guider, E. (2007, May 21). Chasing mouse tales. *Daily Variety*, p. 8.
- Guthrie, M. (2007, 10/22). Nielsen C3s, at long last. *Broadcasting & Cable*, 137(42), p. 28.
- Guzman, B. (2001). *The Hispanic population: Census 2000 brief* (No. C2KBR/01-3). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Commerce. Retrieved from the US Census Bureau website <http://www.census.gov/prod/2001pubs/c2kbr01-3.pdf>
- Hall, S. (1988). The rediscovery of 'ideology': Return of the repressed in media studies. In M. Gurevitch, T. Bennett, J. Curran & J. Wollacott (Eds.), *Culture, society, and the media* (pp. 52-87). London: Routledge.
- Hall, S. (1997). The work of representation. In S. Hall (Ed.), *Representation: Cultural representations and signifying practices* (pp. 13-74). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hall, S. (2006). Encoding/decoding. In M. G. Durham & D. M. Kellner (Eds.), *Media and cultural studies: Keywords* (Rev. Ed., pp. 163-173). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Handlin, O. (1973). *The uprooted* (2nd Ed., enlarged). Boston, MA: Atlantic-Little, Brown.
- Hannerz, U. (1992). *Cultural complexity :Studies in the social organization of meaning*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Hardaker, C. (2010). Trolling in asynchronous computer-mediated communication: From user discussions to academic definitions. *Journal of Politeness Research: Language, Behavior, Culture*, 6(2), 215-242. doi:10.1515/JPLR.2010.011.

Harmetz, A. (1984, 01/31). Norman Lear returning to sitcom land. *The New York Times*, p.

18.

Harwood, J. & Anderson, K. (2002). The presence and portrayal of social groups on prime-time television. *Communication Reports*, 15(2), 81-97.

Havens, T. J. (2002). 'It's still a white world out there': The interplay of culture and economics in international television trade. *Critical Studies in Media Communication*, 19(4), 377.

Havens, T. J. (2003). Exhibiting global television: On the business and cultural functions of global television fairs. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 47(1), 18.

Hellekson, K. (2009). A fannish field of value: Online fan gift culture. *Cinema Journal*, 48(4), 113-117.

Hernandez, G. (2007, November 7). The Tony Plana interview. Retrieved from

http://www.insidesocal.com/outinhollywood/2007/11/the_tony_plana_interview.htm

1

Hernandez, S. (2001). *The ugly truth about "Betty la fea"*. Retrieved from

<http://www.salon.com/life/feature/2001/06/01/Betty/index.html>

Hernandez, S. A. & Newmann, L. M. (1992). Choice of English vs. Spanish language.

Journal of Current Issues and Research in Advertising, 14(2), 35-45.

Herrera, M. (2010, May 29). A little pitchy. *Billboard*, 122(21), 24-25.

Hibberd, J. (2009, October 12). 'Dollhouse' draws big DVR numbers.

Hollywoodreporter.Com. Retrieved from Lexis-Nexis Academic.

- Hibberd, J. (2010, April 26). TNT renews 'Southland' for third season. *The Hollywood Reporter.com*. Retrieved from Lexis-Nexis Academic.
- Higham, J. (1988). *Strangers in the land: Patterns of American nativism, 1860- 1925*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Hill, M.E. (1984, 03/18). Paul Rodriguez playing his life for laughs on A.K.A. Pablo. *The Washington Post*, p. 5.
- Hiscock, J. (2001, 07/14). Hollywood's weight problem. *The Globe and Mail*, pp. R12-R12.
- Las historias de Fernando Gaitán (Fernando Gaitan's stories). (1999, September 12). *El Tiempo*. Retrieved from <http://www.eltiempo.com/archivo/documento/MAM-939972>
- Hodgson, M. (2000, September 18). Ugly Betty woos Colombian viewers night after night. *The Guardian*, p. 12.
- Holles, E. R. (1977, August 8). 200,000 at Tijuana wait to be smuggled into U.S. by deadline: Poor mexicans ready to pay for bogus papers before congress acts on carter amnesty plan. *The New York Times*, pp. 1, 21. doi:75679464.
- Honan, E. (2007). Writing a rhizome: An (im)plausible methodology. *Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 20(5), 535-546.
- Honig, B. (1998). Immigrant America? how foreignness "solves" democracy's problems. *Social Text*, (56), 1-27.
- Horta, S. (Writer), & Folkson, S. (Director). (2006a). The box and the bunny [Television series episode]. In S. Hayek, J. Hayman, S. Horta, J. Parriott, B. Silverman & J. Tamez (Executive producers). *Ugly Betty*. Burbank, CA: ABC.

- Horta, S. (Writer), & Shepard, R. (Director). (2006b). Pilot [Television series episode]. In J. Bigwood, S. Hayek, S. Horta, B. Silverman & J. Tamez (Executive producers). *Ugly Betty*. Burbank, CA: ABC.
- Horta, S. & Lawrence, S.R. (Writers), & Brock, T (Director). (2006). Fey's sleigh ride [Television series episode]. In S. Hayek, J. Hayman, S. Horta, J. Parriott, B. Silverman & J. Tamez (Executive producers). *Ugly Betty*. Burbank, CA: ABC.
- Horta, S. (Writer), & Hayman, J. (Director). (2007). Sofia's choice [Television series episode]. In S. Hayek, J. Hayman, S. Horta, J. Parriott, B. Silverman & J. Tamez (Executive producers). *Ugly Betty*. Burbank, CA: ABC.
- Horta, S. (Writer), & Nelli, V. (Director). (2008) The Manhattan project [Television series episode]. J. Beim, et al (Executive producers). *Ugly Betty*. Burbank, CA: ABC.
- Horta, S. & Goldstick, O. (Writers), & Whittingham, K. (Director). (2006). Lose the boss? [Television series episode]. In S. Hayek, J. Hayman, S. Horta, J. Parriott, B. Silverman. & J. Tamez (Executive producers). *Ugly Betty*. Burbank, CA: ABC.
- Horta, S. & Lawrence, S.R. (Writers), & Spiro, L. (Director). (2007). Brothers [Television series episode]. In S. Hayek, J. Hayman, S. Horta, M. Pennette, B. Silverman. & J. Tamez (Executive producers). *Ugly Betty*. Burbank, CA: ABC.
- Horta, S. & Martino, M. (Writers), & Spiller, M. (Director). (2007). In or out [Television series episode]. In S. Hayek, J. Hayman, S. Horta, M. Pennette, B. Silverman. & J. Tamez (Executive producers). *Ugly Betty*. Burbank, CA: ABC.

Horta, S. & Parriott, J. (Writers), & Stanzler, W.(Director). (2007). I'm coming out [Television series episode]. In S. Hayek, J. Hayman, S. Horta, M. Pennette, B. Silverman & J. Tamez (Executive producers). *Ugly Betty*. Burbank, CA: ABC.

Horta, S. & Meyer, H. A. (Writers) & Shakman, M. (Director). (2008). Burning questions [Television series episode]. In DeKeyser, D. Fields, J. Hayek, S. Silverman, B. & Tamez, J. (Executive producers). *Ugly Betty*. Burbank, CA: ABC.

Horta, S. & Pennette, M. (Writers), & Anderson, S.P. (Director). (2006). Four thanksgivings and a funeral [Television series episode]. In S. Hayek, J. Hayman, S. Horta, J. Parriott, B. Silverman & J. Tamez (Producers). *Ugly Betty*. Burbank, CA: ABC.

Horta, S. & Pennette, M. (Writers), & Hayman, J. (Director). (2007). A nice day for a posh wedding. [Television series episode]. In D. DeKeyser, S. Hayek, S. Horta, M. Pennette & J. Tamez (Executive producers). *Ugly Betty*. Burbank, CA: ABC.

Horta, S. & Rodriguez, D. (Writers), & Hayman, J. (Director). (2006). After hours [Television series episode]. In S. Hayek, J. Hayman, S. Horta, J. Parriott. B. Silverman. & J. Tamez (Executive producers). *Ugly Betty*. Burbank, CA: ABC.

Horta, S. & Rodriguez, D. (Writers), & Melman, J. (Director). (2007). Icing on the cake [Television series episode]. In S. Hayek, J. Hayman, S. Horta, M. Pennette, B. Silverman & J. Tamez (Executive producers). *Ugly Betty*. Burbank, CA: ABC.

Horta, S. & Todd, D. (Writers), & Flender, R.(Director). (2006). The lying, the watch and the wardrobe [Television series episode]. In S. Hayek, J. Hayman, S. Horta, J. Parriott. B. Silverman. & J. Tamez (Executive producers). *Ugly Betty*. Burbank, CA: ABC.

- Horta, S. & Wrubel, B. (Writers), & Nelli, V.(Director). (2007). Family/affair [Television series episode]. In D. DeKeyser, S. Hayek, J. Hayman, S. Horta, M. Pennette & J. Tamez (Executive producers). *Ugly Betty*. Burbank, CA: ABC.
- Horta, S. & Wrubel, B. (Writers), & Underwood, R.(Director). (2008). *Ugly Betty* [Television series episode]. In Beim, J. et al (Executive producers). *Ugly Betty*. Burbank, CA: ABC.
- Houpt, S. (2006, December 11). Producer battles Nielsens over missing Latinos. *The Globe and Mail (Canada)*, p. R1.
- Huff, R. (2002, August 20). Hispanics watch more, and different, TV. *The Philadelphia Inquirer*, p. 03.
- Huff, R. (2007, May 16). ‘Lopez’ is lopped off & it’s a big loss, says Latino leader. *New York Daily News*, p. 87.
- Huntington, S. (2004a) The Hispanic challenge. *Foreign Policy*, (141), 30-45.
- Huntington, S. (2004b). *Who are we? The challenges to America’s national identity*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.
- Igbanugo, H.A. & Williams, D. (2008). Comprehensive immigration reform: Inevitable solution or unlikely possibility? *Nexus: Chapman’s Journal of Law and Public Policy*, 13, 59-70.
- Illegal aliens go on hunger strike of camp’s conditions. (1985, May 28). *The Seattle Times*, p. A5.
- Ingwerson, M. (1983, December 20). First Blacks, now Hispanics star in TV’s prime-time spotlight. *Christian Science Monitor*, p. 6.

- Inniss, L.B. & Feagin, J. R. (1995). The Cosby show: The view from the black middle class. *Journal of Black Studies*, 25(6), 692-711.
- Jacob. (2009, January 22). TV is a medium [Web log post]. Retrieved from http://www.televisionwithoutpity.com/show/ugly_Betty/sisters_on_the_verge_of_a_nerv.php
- Jacoby, T. (2004). Defining assimilation for the 21st century, the new immigrants: A progress report. In T. Jacoby (Ed.), [*Reinventing the melting pot: The new immigrants and what it means to be an American*](#) (pp. 3-17). New York, NY: Basic Books.
- James, M. (2007, August 27). Nielsen ends separate Latino survey; the move is a nod to the clout of the Spanish language market. *Los Angeles Times*, p. C1.
- James, M. (2010, May 28). Univision no. 1 in L.A. ratings. *Los Angeles Times*, p D3.
- Jenkins, H. (1988). Star trek rerun, reread, rewritten: Fan writing as textual poaching. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, 5(2), 85-107.
- Jenkins, H. (1992). Textual poachers: Television fans and participatory culture. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Jenkins, H. (2006a). *Convergence culture: Where old and new media collide*. New York, NY: New York University Press.
- Jenkins, H. (2006b). *Do snakes of fireflies have longer tails?* [Web log post]. Retrieved from http://www.henryjenkins.org/2006/06/do_snakes_or_fireflies_have_longer_tales_part_one.html

- Jenkins, H. (2007). Afterword: The future of fandom. In C. L. Harrington (Ed.), *Fandom: Identities and communities in a mediated world* (pp. 357-364). New York, NY: New York University Press.
- Jensen, M. (2007, October 10). Tony Plana helps make “Ugly Betty” beautiful. Retrieved from <http://www.afterelton.com/people/2007/10/tonyplana?page=0%2C0>
- Jenson, J. (1992). Fandom as pathology: The consequences of characterization. In L. A. Lewis (Ed.), *The adoring audience: Fan culture and popular media* (pp. 9-29). London: Routledge.
- Jessica. (2006, October 4). Read me: Notes from your moderator [Online forum comment]. Retrieved from <http://forums.televisionwithoutpity.com/index.php?s=&showtopic=3146707&view=findpost&p=6209720>
- Jhally, S. & Lewis, J. (1992). Enlightened racism: The Cosby Show, audiences, and the myth of the American dream. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Johnston, J. & Taylor, J. (2008). Feminist consumerism and fat activists: A comparative study of grassroots activism and the dove real beauty campaign. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society*, 33(4), 941-966.
- Jones, G. (1992). Honey, I’m home! Sitcoms: Selling the American dream. New York, NY: Grove Weidenfeld.
- Jung, C. G. (1970). *Four archetypes: Mother, rebirth, spirit, trickster*. (R.F.C. Hull, Trans.). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

- Karrfalt, W. (2006a, September 25). Bilingual audiences fuel niche networks; diverse slates of programming keep emphasis on culture. *Television Week*, 25(36), p. 51.
- Karrfalt, W. (2006b, September 25). Hispanic viewers getting attention. *Television Week*, 25(36), 51-52.
- Karrfalt, W. (2006c, September 25). A novela approach to mainstream TV. *Television Week*, 25(36), p. 52-52.
- Katz, E. Blumler, J. G. & Gurevitch, M. (1973). Uses and gratifications research. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 37(4), 509.
- Keck, W. (2008a, April 24). 'Betty' spices up its salon, stories and guest stars; but strike delays Ignacio's job. *USA Today*, p. 3D.
- Keck, W. (2008b, January 17). Strike keeps writers in limbo, too. *USA Today*, p. 3D.
- Keveney, B. (2006, July 24). Get 'Lost Diaries' via cell phone. *USA Today*, p. 2D.
- Kinalli, J. & Poust, T.(Writers) & Spiro, L. (Director). (2007). A tree grows in Guadalajara [Television series episode].In S. Hayek, J. Hayman & Pennette, M. (Producers). *Ugly Betty*. Burbank, CA: ABC.
- Kissell, R. (2008, April 28). Nets take a beating. *Daily Variety*, p. 6.
- Kissell, R. (2010, August 27). Numbers game. *Daily Variety*, p. 1, 63.
- Knolle, S. (2006, September 28). Multi - authentic. *Daily Variety*, p. A1.
- Lafayette, J. (2007, October 8). Commercial ratings shuffle the deck. *Television Week*, pp. 1, 30.
- Law, J. (2004). After method: Mess in social science research. New York, NY: Routledge.

- Lazarus, E. (1994). The new colossus. In P. Levy (Ed.), *100 key documents in American democracy*, (pp. 213-214). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Learmonth, M. (2006a, January 4). Disney expands downloads. *Daily Variety*, p. 6.
- Learmonth, M. (2006b, April 10). Univision split vision. *Variety*, p. 15.
- Learmonth, M. & Littleton, C. (2007, September 7). New rules roil the ad biz. *Variety*, 407(7), p. 14-18.
- Learmonth, M. & Schneider, M. (2007, May 17). Upfronts go all the way. *Daily Variety*, p. 36.
- Lembo, R. (2000). *Thinking through television*. Cambridge, UK; New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Lemish, D. (1985). Soap opera viewing in college: A naturalistic inquiry. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 29(3), 275-293.
- Lenti, P. (1994, March 3). Univision snares big share in Nielsen Hispanic index. *Daily Variety*, pp. 46.
- Lesser, A. (1941). Anti-Semitism in the United States. *The Journal of Negro Education*, 10(3), 535-556.
- Levin, G. (2007, October 24). Viewers' shifting habits redefine 'TV hit'; 'gossip' speaks louder than ratings. *USA Today*, p. 1D.
- Levin, G. (2008, May 7). Top shows hit lows; was it the strike?; aging series, DVRs may also be culprits. *USA Today*, p. 1D.
- Levine, S. (2009, July 23). Picking up on 'Betty'. *Daily Variety*, p. 4.

- Levingston, S. (2005, December 22). Nielsen to begin tracking home use of DVRs. *The Washington Post*, p. D05.
- Levi-Strauss, C. (1966). *The savage mind* (G. Weidenfeld & Nicholson Ltd., Trans.). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. (Original work published 1962).
- Levy, M. (1978). Opinion leadership and television news uses. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 42(3), 402-406.
- Lipsitz, G. (1986). The meaning of memory: Family, class, and ethnicity in early network television programs. *Cultural Anthropology*, 1(4), 45-67.
- Lisotta, C. (2006, May 15). Solidifying its place as the new fifth broadcast net; Univision. *Television Week*, p. 24.
- Lizama, J. A. (2006, May 12). Border dispute comes to city: Minutemen's march against illegal immigration makes a stop here; opponents rally. *Richmond Times-Dispatch*, p. B1.
- Lopez-Negrete, A. (2005, 32). Marketers, don't assimilate your Hispanic ads. *Advertising Age*, p. 25.
- Lopez, A. M. (1995). Our welcomed guests: Telenovelas in Latin America. In R. C. Allen (Ed.), *To be continued: Soap operas around the world* (pp. 256-275). London; New York, NY: Routledge.
- Lotz, A. D. (2004). Using 'network' theory in the post-network era: Fictional 9/11 US television discourse as a cultural forum. 423-439.
- Lotz, A. D. (2007). *The television will be revolutionized*. New York, NY: New York University Press.

- Lu, A. (2007). The characteristics of introductory research methods courses in mass communication doctoral programs. *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator*, 62(3), 289-304.
- Machiavelli, N. (1996). *Discourses on Livy*. (H.C. Mansfield & N. Tarcov, Trans.). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- MacKaye, S. D. A. (1990). California proposition 63: Language attitudes reflected in the public debate. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 508, 135-146.
- Madsen, W. (1973). *The Mexican-American of South Texas*. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Malinowski, B. (1948). Myth in primitive psychology. In B. Malinowski, *Magic, science and religion, and other essays* (pp. 72-124). Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Mangaliman, J. (2006, 05/03). Amnesty foes respond. Opponents of illegal immigration plan counter rallies in Santa Clara. We represent mainstream, activists say. *San Jose Mercury News*, p. 1A.
- Marc, D. (1992). *Comic visions: Television comedy and American culture*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Marc, D. (1996). *Demographic vistas: Television in American culture*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Mariels in jail stage a hunger strike. (1985, August 27). *The Miami Herald*, p. 3B.
- Marrs, J. (2007, September 2). "I was so ugly I cried at my reflection". *The News of the World*, p. stars on Sunday. Retrieved from Lexis-Nexis Academic.

- Martell, E. (2007, October 12). Betty's wait problem [Web log post]. Retrieved from <http://www.tvsquad.com/2007/10/12/ugly-Betty-Bettys-wait-problem/>
- Martin, D. (2009, May 18). 'Ugly Betty's' life is in the balance. *Los Angeles Times*. Retrieved from <http://articles.latimes.com/2009/may/18/entertainment/et-uglyBetty18>
- Martin-Barbero, J. (1988). Matrices culturales de la telenovela [The cultural matrixes of telenovelas]. *Estudios Sobre Las Culturas Contemporaneas*, 2(5), 137-164.
- Martin-Barbero, J. (1995). Memory and form in the Latin American soap opera. In R. C. Allen (Ed.), *To be continued: Soap operas around the world* (pp. 276-284). London; New York, NY: Routledge.
- Massey, D.S. (1985). Ethnic residential segregation: A theoretical synthesis and empirical review. *Sociology and Social Research*, (69), 315-350.
- Mastro, D.E. & Behm-Morawitz, E. (2005). Latino representation on primetime television. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 82(1), 110-130.
- Mastro, D.E. & Stern, S. (2003). Representations of race in television commercials: A content analysis of prime-time advertising. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 47(4), 638-647.
- Mato, D. (2005). The transnationalization of the telenovela industry: Territorial references, and the production of markets and representations of transnational identities. *Television & New Media*, 6(4), 423-444.

- McCarthy, S. (2006, May 2). Millions jam U.S. cities to back illegal immigrants; day of protest aimed at pushing Congress to change laws for workers. *The Globe and Mail*, p. A12.
- McChesney, R. W. (1999). Rich media, poor democracy: Communication and politics in dubious times. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- McGee, M. (1980). The ideograph: A link between rhetoric and ideology. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 66(1), 1.
- McGirk, J. (2001, 03/01). Soap star's makeover outrages fans. *The Independent*, p. 18.
- McKee, A. (2001). A beginner's guide to textual analysis. *Metro*, (127/128), 138-149.
- McKee, A. (2003). Textual analysis: A beginners' guide. London: Sage.
- McManus, J. (1989, August 9). Nielsen gets set to rate Hispanic TV. *Ad Day*, p. 1.
- McClellan (2010, October 24). Univision's Spanish conquest. *Adweek.com*. Retrieved from http://www.adweek.com/aw/content_display/news/media/e3i1c1499752deb3a604fc967b1603c1946
- McWilliams, C. (1968). North from Mexico: The Spanish-speaking people of the United States. New York, NY: Greenwood Press.
- Meehan, E. R. (1984). Ratings and the institutional approach: A third answer to the commodity question. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, 1(2), 216-225.
- Meehan, E. R. (1990). Why we don't count: The commodity audience. In P. Mellencamp (Ed.), *Logics of television: Essays in cultural criticism* (pp. 117-137). London: BFI Press.

- Meehan, E. R. (2002). Gendering the commodity audience: Critical media research, feminism, and political economy. In E. R. Meehan, & E. Riordan (Eds.), *Sex and money: Feminism and political economy* (pp. 209-222). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Meehan, E. R. (2005). Why TV is not our fault: Television programming, viewers, and who's really in control. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Meehan, E. R. (2006). Gendering the commodity audience: Critical media research, feminism, and political economy. In D. Kellner, & M. G. Durham (Eds.), *Media and cultural studies KeyWorks* (Revised Ed., pp. 311-321). Malden, MA : Blackwell.
- Meehan, E. R. (2007). Understanding how the popular becomes popular: The role of political economy in the study of popular communication. *Popular Communication*, 5(3), 161-170.
- Menon, V. (2008, February 12). A nutty idea, but it worked. *The Toronto Star*, p. L08.
- Merritt, B. (1991). Bill Cosby: TV auteur? *Journal of Popular Culture*, 24(4), 89-102.
- Merskin, D. (2007). Three faces of Eva: Perpetuation of the hot-Latina stereotype in Desperate Housewives. *Howard Journal of Communications*, 18(2), 133-151.
- Mighty Big TV FAQs. (1999). Retrieved from the Internet Archive: Wayback Machine website
<http://web.archive.org/web/20000510214542/mightybigtv.com/index.html?/home.asp&0>
- Milbank, D. (2006, February 9). On the capitol grounds, grass roots rising. *The Washington Post*, p. A02

- Miller, P. (1956). *Errand into the wilderness*. Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- MindyTV. (2007, September 8). TV show ranking 2006-2007 season USA [Web log post]. Retrieved from <http://mindy-tv.blogspot.com/2007/09/tv-show-ranking-2006-2007-season-usa.html>
- Mirandé, A. (1997). *Hombres y machos: Masculinity and Latino culture*. Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press.
- Miss America! (2007). *Seventeen*. Retrieved from <http://www.seventeen.com/entertainment/features/america-ferrera-qa-dec06>
- Montgomery, D. & Bureau, I. W. (2006, May 21). Illegal immigration drives demand for forged documents; A Mexican family controls the trade through a ring whose scope a federal judge called breathtaking. *The Philadelphia Inquirer*, p. A02.
- Montoya-Crawley, D. (2010). How to market to Hispanics (like me) [Web log post]. *AdAge: The big tent*. Retrieved from http://adage.com/bigtent/post?article_id=143681
- Moodie, C. (2007, January 8). Why Ugly Betty looks beautiful to channel 4. *Daily Mail*, p. 11.
- Moran, A. (1998). *Copypat television: Globalisation, program formats and cultural identity*. Luton, Bedfordshire: University of Luton Press.
- Moran, A. (2004). Television formats in the world/the world of television formats. In M. Keane (Ed.), *Television across Asia: Television industries, programme formats and globalization* (pp. 1-8). London: Routledge-Curzon.

- Moran, A. (2008). Makeover on the move: Global television and programme formats. *Continuum: Journal of Media & Cultural Studies*, 22(4), 459-469.
- Moran, A. (2009). Global franchising, local customizing: The cultural economy of TV program formats. *Continuum: Journal of Media & Cultural Studies*, 23(2), 115-125.
- Moran, A. & Keane, M. (2006). Cultural power in international TV format markets. *Continuum: Journal of Media & Cultural Studies*, 20(1), 71-86.
- Morrissey, T. E. (2007). How to make a model cry: Dress her in a fat suit [Web log post]. Retrieved from <http://jezebel.com/321153/how-to-make-a-model-cry-dress-her-in-a-fat-suit>
- Moskowitz, E. (1995, July 13). Marketing to US Hispanics needs more than mariachis. *The Christian Science Monitor*. Retrieved from Lexis-Nexis Academic.
- Muller, G. H. (1999). New strangers in paradise: The immigrant experience and contemporary American fiction. Lexington, KY: The University Press of Kentucky.
- Muniz A. M., Jr. & O'Guinn, T. C. (2001). Brand community. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 27(4), 412-432.
- Munoz, L. (2007, August 30). Bridging cultures at the box office [News wire story]. *Los Angeles Times (LATWP News Service)*. Retrieved from Newsbank Access World News Database, record number: 200708301256LATWP__LA_TIMES_X8556
- Myers, H.A. (Writer), & Nelli, V. (Director). (2007). Secretaries day [Television series episode]. S. Paper, G.G. Stanton, & H. Werksman (Executive producers). *Ugly Betty*. Burbank, CA: ABC.

- Napoli, P. M. (2003). Audience economics: Media institutions and the audience marketplace. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- National Latino Media Council. (2009). *2009 TV report card*. Retrieved from <http://nhmc.org/sites/default/files/NLMC%20Diversity%20Report%20Card%20Overview%202009%20final-NLMC.pdf>
- Navarro, M. (2002, November 6). Promoting Hispanic TV, language and culture. *The New York Times*, p. C7.
- Nee, V. & Alba, R. (2004). Toward a new definition. In T. Jacoby (Ed.), [*Reinventing the melting pot: The new immigrants and what it means to be an American*](#) (pp. 87-95). New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Negron-Muntaner, F. (1997). Jennifer's butt. *Aztlan*, 22(2), 181.
- Neill, A. V. (2002). Human rights don't stop at the border: Why Texas should provide preventative health care for undocumented immigrants. *Scholar: St. Mary's Law Reviews on Minority Issues*, 4(2), 405-438.
- Newcomb, H. & Hirsch, P. M. (2000). Television as a cultural forum. In H. Newcomb (Ed.), *Television: The critical view* (6th ed. pp. 561-573). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Nielsen. (2008). *Average U.S. home now receives a record 118.6 TV channels, according to nielsen*. Retrieved from http://en-us.nielsen.com/content/dam/nielsen/en_us/documents/pdf/PressReleases/2008/June/Average%20U.S.%20Home%20Now%20Receives%20a%20Record%20118.6%20TV%20Channels,%20According%20to%20Nielsen.pdf

- Nielsen. (2009, October 14). C3 TV ratings show impact of DVR ad viewing [Web log post]. Retrieved from http://blog.nielsen.com/nielsenwire/media_entertainment/c3-tv-ratings-show-impact-of-dvr-ad-viewing/
- Nielsen. (2010, 2010, August 27). Number of U.S. TV households climbs by one million for 2010-11 TV season. Retrieved from http://blog.nielsen.com/nielsenwire/media_entertainment/number-of-u-s-tv-households-climbs-by-one-million-for-2010-11-tv-season/
- Nielsen Feb 26-Mar 4 ratings. (2007, 03/12). *Broadcasting & Cable*, 137(11), 18-18.
- Nielsen Oct. 16-22 ratings. (2006, 10/30). *Broadcasting & Cable*, 136(43), 35-35.
- Nielsen. (2009). *How DVRs are changing the television landscape*. New York, NY: The Nielsen Company. Retrieved from Nielsen Wire http://blog.nielsen.com/nielsenwire/wp-content/uploads/2009/04/dvr_tvlandscape_043009.pdf
- Oboler, S. (1992). The politics of labeling: Latino/a cultural identities of self and others. *Latin American Perspectives*, 19(4), 18-36.
- O'Boyle, M. (2006, February 6). 'Way' to go, Damian. *Variety*, p. 33.
- O'Connor, J. J. (1984, March 6). Norman Lear's 'Pablo'. *The New York Times*, p. 18.
- Oestreicher, M. (2007). *Ugly Betty and the "Be Ugly" campaign: A healthy pendulum swing?* [Web log post]. Retrieved from <http://whyismarko.com/2007/ugly-Betty-and-the-be-ugly-campaign-a-healthy-pendulum-swing/>
- Oldenburg, A. (2006, December 21). The fight for female self-esteem gets pretty ugly; ABC campaign urges girls to 'be real'. *USA Today*, p. 1D.

- Orrenius, P. M. & Zavodny, M. (2003). Do amnesty programs reduce undocumented immigration? Evidence from IRCA. *Demography*, 40(3), 437-450.
- Ostrow, J. (2010). *American idol ratings in decline* [Web log post]. Retrieved from <http://blogs.denverpost.com/ostrow/2010/05/27/american-idol-in-ratings-decline/3030/>
- Ott, B. & Mack, R.L. (2010). *Critical media studies: An introduction*. West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Papacharissi, Z. & Mendelson, A. L. (2007). An exploratory study of reality appeal: Uses and gratifications of reality TV shows. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 51(2), 355-370. doi:10.1080/08838150701307152.
- Park, R. E. & Miller, H.A. (1921). *Old world traits transplanted*. New York, NY: Harper.
- Parra-Cardona, J., Bullock, L. A., Imig, D. R., Villarruel, F. A. & Gold, S. J. (2006). "Trabajando duro todos los días": Learning from the life experiences of Mexican-origin migrant families. *Family Relations*, 55(3), 361-375. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3729.2006.00409.x.
- Pastor, R. A. (1984). U. S. immigration policy and Latin America: In search of the "special relationship." *Latin American Research Review*, 19(3), 35-56.
- Pauly, J. (1991). A beginner's guide to doing qualitative research in mass communication. *Journalism Monographs*, (125), 1-29.
- Paz, O. (1985). *The labyrinth of solitude: Life and thought in Mexico* [The Labyrinth of solitude and other writings] (L. Kemp, Y. Milos & R. P. Belash Trans.). New York: Grove Press.

- Pear, R. & Hulse, C. (2007, 06/29). Immigrant bill dies in Senate defeat for Bush. *The New York Times*, p. A1.
- Pearl, J. & Pearl, J. (1999). *The chosen image: Television's portrayal of Jewish themes and characters*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland & Co.
- Pecora, N. (1995). Children and television advertising from a social science perspective. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, 12(3), 354-364.
- Perigard, M.A. (2008, 05/22). 'Betty' struts out pale imitation of hit series with lackluster finale. *The Boston Herald*, p. 40.
- Pew Hispanic Center. (2004). *Survey brief: Bilingualism* (No. 7053). Washington, DC: Pew Hispanic Center & The Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation. Retrieved from The Henry H. Kaiser Family Foundation website
<http://www.kff.org/kaiserpolls/upload/Bilingualism-2002-National-Survey-of-Latinos-Survey-Brief.pdf>
- Pew Hispanic Center. (2006). *Hispanics and the 2006 election*. Washington, DC: Pew Hispanic Center. Retrieved from the Pew Hispanic Center website
<http://pewhispanic.org/files/factsheets/24.pdf>
- Pew Research Center for the People & the Press. (2010). *Public supports Arizona immigration law*. Retrieved from the Pew Hispanic Center website
<http://pewresearch.org/pubs/1591/public-support-arizona-immigration-law-poll>
- Poniewozik, J. (2001). What's wrong with this picture? *Time*. Retrieved from
<http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,999986,00.html>

- Portes, A. (1997). Immigration theory for a new century: Some problems and opportunities. *International Migration Review*, 31(4), 799-825.
- Portes, A. (2007). Migration, development, and segmented assimilation: A conceptual review of the evidence. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 610, 73-97.
- Portes, A. Fernandez-Kelly, P. & Haller, W. (2009). The adaptation of the immigrant second generation in America: A theoretical overview and recent evidence. *Journal of Ethnic & Migration Studies*, 35(7), 1077-1104.
- Portes, A. & Rumbaut, R.G. (2006). *Immigrant America: A portrait*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Portes, A. & Zhou, M. (1993). The new second generation: Segmented assimilation and its variants. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 530, 74-96.
- Preston, J. (2008, January 18). Legal immigrants facing a longer wait. *The New York Times*, p. 13.
- Preston, J. (2009a, July 11). Immigration judges found under strain. *The New York Times*, p. 11.
- Preston, J. (2009b, June 18). Study finds immigration courtrooms backlogged. *The New York Times*, p. 20.
- Quillao, S. (2007). *Be ugly in 2007* [Web log post]. Retrieved from http://www.backinskinnyjeans.com/2007/01/be_ugly_in_2007.html
- Quinones, S. (2009). State of war. *Foreign Policy*, (171), 76-80.

- Radway, J. A. (1991). *Reading the romance: Women, patriarchy, and popular literature*. Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press.
- Reimers, D. H. (1992). History of recent immigration regulation. *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, 136(2), 176-187.
- Reyes, L. & Rubie, P. (2000). *Hispanics in Hollywood: A celebration of 100 years in film and television*. Hollywood, CA.: Lone Eagle Pub.
- Rincon & Associates. (2004). *Latino television study*. Dallas, TX: Rincon & Associates.
- Retrieved from the League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC) website
<http://www.lulac.org/assets/pdfs/mediadiversity.pdf>
- Rivero, Y. M. (2003). The performance and reception of televisual “ugliness” in Yo Soy Betty la Fea. *Feminist Media Studies*, 3(1), 65-81.
- Robertson, R. (1992). *Globalization: Social theory and global culture*. London: Sage.
- Robertson, R. (1995). Glocalization: Time-space and homogeneity heterogeneity. In R. Robertson (Ed.), *Global modernities* (pp. 25-44). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Rodriguez, A. (1997). Commercial ethnicity: Language, class and race in the marketing of the Hispanic audience. *Communication Review*, 2(3), 283-309.
- Rodriguez, A. (1999). Creating an audience and remapping a nation: A brief history of US Spanish language broadcasting 1930-1980. *Quarterly Review of Film & Video*, 16(3), 357-374.
- Rohter, L. (2007, January 7). How ‘Ugly Betty’ changed on the flight from Bogotá. *The New York Times*, p. 4.

- Rosario, M. (2009). Slideshow: Our shining moments of the decade. *Latina Magazine*.
Retrieved from <http://www.latina.com/entertainment/celebrity/slideshow-our-shining-moments-decade?slide=6>
- Rose, R. G. (2005, 11/07). Latino viewers suffer under faulty sample. *Television Week*, p. 8.
- Rosenblum, K. (2005, October 10). Breaking down the market myths; to reach Latino viewers, separate fact from fiction. *Television Week*, p. 17.
- Roosevelt, T. (1900a). *American ideals, and other essays, social and political*. New York, NY: G. P. Putnam's Sons.
- Roosevelt, T. (1900b). *The winning of the West: Vol 1. From the Alleghenies to the Mississippi, 1769-1776*. New York, NY: G.P. Putnam's Sons.
- Rubel, A. J. (1966). *Across the tracks: Mexican-Americans in a Texas city*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Rubin, A. M. (1981). An examination of television viewing motivations. *Communication Research*, 8(2), 141.
- Russell, J. (2005, 09/12). Target demos: Moms, youths; marketers follow the money, set sights on young adults and Latina heads of household. *Television Week*, p. 11.
- Russo, J. L. (2009). User-penetrated content: Fan video in the age of convergence. *Cinema Journal*, 48(4), 125-130.
- Ryan, M. (2006, November 16). 'Ugly Betty' fans ask: What's up with Betty's sweet nephew? [Web log post]. Retrieved from http://featuresblogs.chicagotribune.com/entertainment_tv/2006/11/ugly_Betty_fans.html

Ryan, M. (2008, September 25). 'Ugly Betty's' big moment in the big apple [Web log post].

Retrieved from

http://featuresblogs.chicagotribune.com/entertainment_tv/2008/09/ugly-Betty-ny.html

Said, E. W. (1979). *Orientalism*. New York, NY: Vintage Books.

Saracho, O. & Spodek, B. (2007). Challenging the stereotypes of Mexican American fathers. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 35(3), 223-231.

Scharrer, E. (2001). From wise to foolish: The portrayal of the sitcom father, 1950s-1990s. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 45(1), 23.

Schiller, H. (1991). Not yet the post-imperialist era. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, 8(1), 13-28.

Schiller, N. Basch, L. & Blanc, C. (1995). From migrant to transmigrant: Theorizing transnational migration. *Anthropological Quarterly*, 68(1), 48-63.

Schneider, M. (2003, June 30). Latinos get leverage. *Variety*, p. 17.

Schneider, M. (2006, October 16). 'Betty' bops to full order. *Daily Variety*, p. 5.

Schneider, M. (2010, January 28). 'Betty' set to bow out. *Daily Variety*, p. 02.

Schorer, M. (1959). The necessity of myth. *Daedalus*, 88(2), 359-362.

Scott, S. (2009). Repackaging fan culture: The regifting economy of ancillary content models. *Transformative Works and Cultures*, (3) Retrieved from

<http://journal.transformativeworks.org/index.php/twc/article/view/150/122>

Sella, M. (2002, October 20). The remote controllers. *The New York Times*, p. 68.

Shifrel, S. (2005, December 8). Gang busted in id scam. *New York Daily News*, p. 34.

- Skerry, K. (2007, March 13). Bravo acquires TWoP. Retrieved from <http://www.givememyremote.com/remote/2007/03/13/bravo-acquires-twop-television-without-pity/>
- Sluyter, A. (2006). Humboldt's Mexican texts and landscapes. *Geographical Review*, 96(3), 361-381.
- Smith, B. (1943). *A tree grows in Brooklyn*. Philadelphia, PA: The Blakiston Company.
- Smith, S., Fisher, D. & Cole, S. (2007). The Lived Meanings of Fanaticism: Understanding the Complex Role of Labels and Categories in Defining the Self in Consumer Culture. *Consumption, Markets & Culture*, 10(2), 77-94.
doi:10.1080/10253860701256125.
- Smith, S.M. & Krugman, D.M. (2009). Viewer as media decision-maker. *International Journal of Advertising*, 28(2), 231-255.
- Smith, S.M. & Krugman, D.M. (2010). Exploring perceptions and usage patterns of digital video recorder owners. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 54(2), 248-264.
- Smythe, D. (2006). On the audience commodity and its work. In M. G. Durham & D. Kellner (Eds.), *Media and cultural studies KeyWorks* (Rev. Ed., pp. 230-256). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Spoilers and speculation: Work idea, post # 17 [Online forum comment]. (2006, October 11). Retrieved from <http://forums.televisionwithoutpity.com/index.php?s=&showtopic=3146535&view=findpost&p=6275768>

Spoilers and speculation: Work idea, post # 25 [Online forum comment]. (2006, October

19). Retrieved from

<http://forums.televisionwithoutpity.com/index.php?s=&showtopic=3146535&view=findpost&p=6350096>

Spoilers and speculation: Work idea, post # 26 [Online forum comment]. (2006, October

19). Retrieved from

<http://forums.televisionwithoutpity.com/index.php?s=&showtopic=3146535&view=findpost&p=6350245>

Spoilers and speculation: Work idea, post # 30 [Online forum comment]. (2006, October

20). Retrieved from

<http://forums.televisionwithoutpity.com/index.php?s=&showtopic=3146535&view=findpost&p=6357115>

Spoilers and speculation: Work idea, post #46 [Online forum comment]. (2006, November

4). Retrieved from

<http://forums.televisionwithoutpity.com/index.php?s=&showtopic=3146535&view=findpost&p=6496286>

Spoilers and speculation: Work idea, post # 47 [Online forum comment]. (2006, November

4). Retrieved from

<http://forums.televisionwithoutpity.com/index.php?s=&showtopic=3146535&view=findpost&p=6496388>

Spoilers and speculation: Work idea, post # 50 [Online forum comment]. (2006, November

4). Retrieved from

<http://forums.televisionwithoutpity.com/index.php?s=&showtopic=3146535&view=findpost&p=6496985>

Spoilers and speculation: Work idea, post # 90 [Online forum comment]. (2006, November 14). Retrieved from

<http://forums.televisionwithoutpity.com/index.php?s=&showtopic=3146535&view=findpost&p=6583652>

Spoilers and speculation: Work idea, post # 92 [Online forum comment]. (2006, November 15). Retrieved from

<http://forums.televisionwithoutpity.com/index.php?s=&showtopic=3146535&view=findpost&p=6593305>

Spoilers and speculation: Work idea, post # 93 [Online forum comment]. (2006, November 15). Retrieved from

<http://forums.televisionwithoutpity.com/index.php?s=&showtopic=3146535&view=findpost&p=6594300>

Spoilers and speculation: Work idea, post # 130 [Online forum comment]. (2006, November 20). Retrieved from

<http://forums.televisionwithoutpity.com/index.php?s=&showtopic=3146535&view=findpost&p=6641827>

Stelter, B. (2007, 10/08). A new ratings system stirs up the fall TV season. *The New York Times*, p. 3.

Stenger, J. (2006). The Clothes Make the Fan: Fashion and Online Fandom when Buffy the Vampire Slayer Goes to eBay. *Cinema Journal*, 45(4), 26-44.

- Stevens, D. (2007, March 23). Television without pity: Will corporate ownership ruin a cult website? *Slate*. Retrieved from <http://www.slate.com/id/2162470/>
- Stevenson, T. H. & McIntyre, P. E. (1995). A comparison of the portrayal and frequency of Hispanics and Whites in English language television advertising. *Journal of Current Issues & Research in Advertising*, 17(1), 65.
- Stilwell, J. M. (2003). *Fans without pity: Television, online communities, and popular criticism* (Master's thesis, Georgetown University). Retrieved from <http://cct.georgetown.edu/research/thesisdatabase/JessicaStilwell.pdf>
- Strachan, A. (2006, October 11). Ugly Betty ratings look good: Story of irrepressible, fashion-challenged heroine just trailed survivor last week. *The Gazette*, p. D9.
- Strachan, A. (2008, September 3). Ugly Betty and Heroes need to recapture their youth; originality and flair have been lost; five TV shows that need a course correction. *The Gazette (Montreal)*, p. D6.
- Stransky, T. (2010). 'Ugly Betty': Why it mattered [Web log post]. Retrieved from <http://popwatch.ew.com/2010/04/14/ugly-Betty-why-it-mattered/>
- Straubhaar, J. D. (1991). Beyond media imperialism: Asymmetrical interdependence and cultural proximity. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, 8(1), p 39-59.
- Strega. (2009, August 24). Ugly Betty PH'd [Forum post]. Retrieved from <http://forums.televisionwithoutpity.com/index.php?showtopic=3188397&pid=12092416&st=0&#entry12092416>

Sullivan, B. F. (2006, June 15). The futon's first look: Ugly Betty (ABC) [Web log post].

Retrieved from http://www.thefutoncritic.com/reviews/2006/06/15/the-futons-first-look-ugly-Betty-abc-21563/20060615_uglyBetty/

Suro, R., Escobar, G., Livingston, G., & Hakimzadeh, S. (2007). *Changing faiths: Latinos and the transformation of American religion* Washington, DC: Pew Research

Center. Retrieved from the Pew Hispanic Center website

<http://pewhispanic.org/files/reports/75.pdf>

Sutter, M. (2005a, December 22). Telemundo, too, to join Nielsen ratings ranks. *Daily Variety*, p. 4.

Sutter, M. (2005b, December 20). Univision will rate with big 4. *Daily Variety*, pp. 6.

Takaki, R. (2008). *A different mirror: A history of multicultural America*. New York, NY: Back Bay Books.

Television without Pity. (nd.). All shows, B. Retrieved from

<http://www.televisionwithoutpity.com/shows/index.php?page=2&&letter=B&&recent=>

Television without Pity. (n.d.). All shows, C. Retrieved from

<http://www.televisionwithoutpity.com/shows/index.php?letter=C>

Television without Pity. (n.d.). All shows, U. Retrieved from

<http://www.televisionwithoutpity.com/shows/index.php?letter=U>

Television without Pity. (n.d.). Editorial. Retrieved from

<http://forums.televisionwithoutpity.com/index.php?s=6319c90d86f033ee972d19a0a3b28bb6&act=Help&CODE=01&HID=3>

- Television without Pity. (n.d.). Posting manners and respect. Retrieved from <http://forums.televisionwithoutpity.com/index.php?act=Help&CODE=01&HID=26>
- Television without Pity. (n.d.). Posting messages, question 6. Retrieved from <http://forums.televisionwithoutpity.com/index.php?act=Help&CODE=01&HID=11>
- The Tomas Rivera Policy Institute [TRPI]. (2000). *Still missing: Latinos in and out of Hollywood* (No. 9004). Los Angeles, CA: Screen Actors Guild National Communications Department. Retrieved from The Tomas Rivera Policy Institute website http://www.trpi.org/PDFs/still_missing_in_action.pdf
- TRPI. (2004). *A policy paper assessing the Nielsen and Rincon study on Latino television viewing*. Los Angeles, CA: The Tomas Rivera Policy Institute. Retrieved from The Tomas Rivera Policy Institute website <http://www.trpi.org/PDFs/LatinoTVViewing.pdf>
- Theodore, N. & Martin, N. (2007). Migrant civil society: New voices in the struggle over community development. *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 29(3), 269-287.
doi:10.1111/j.1467-9906.2007.00343.x.
- Thompson, E. P. (1971). The moral economy of the English crowd in the eighteenth century. *Past & Present*, (50), 76-136.
- Tiegel, E. (2007, March 26). Leveling field in ratings game: One scale now fits all at Nielsen. *Television Week*, p. 15.
- Toledo, C. (2007, July 27). Alphabet spells hope for diverse America. *Daily Variety*, p. A1.
- Trechak, B. (2008). Ugly Betty axes two producers [Web log post]. *TV Squad*. Retrieved from <http://www.tvsquad.com/2008/02/12/ugly-betty-axes-two-producers/>

Turner, F. J. (1996). *The frontier in American history*. New York, NY: Dover Publications.

(Original work published 1893).

Turner, V. W. (1969). *The ritual process: Structure and anti-structure*. Chicago: Aldine Publication Company.

Ugly Betty, post # 1 [Online forum comment]. (2006, June 16). Retrieved from

<http://forums.televisionwithoutpity.com/index.php?s=&showtopic=3142213&view=findpost&p=5489421>

Ugly Betty, post # 7 [Online forum comment]. (2006, June 27). Retrieved from

<http://forums.televisionwithoutpity.com/index.php?s=&showtopic=3142213&view=findpost&p=5565564>

Ugly Betty, post # 9 [Online forum comment]. (2006, July 10). Retrieved from

<http://forums.televisionwithoutpity.com/index.php?s=&showtopic=3142213&view=findpost&p=5629288>

Ugly Betty, post # 17 [Online forum comment]. (2006, August 10). Retrieved from

<http://forums.televisionwithoutpity.com/index.php?s=&showtopic=3142213&view=findpost&p=5818345>

Ugly Betty, post # 19 [Online forum comment]. (2006, August 10). Retrieved from

<http://forums.televisionwithoutpity.com/index.php?s=&showtopic=3142213&view=findpost&p=5819395>

Ugly Betty, post # 20 [Online forum comment]. (2006, August 10). Retrieved from

<http://forums.televisionwithoutpity.com/index.php?s=&showtopic=3142213&view=findpost&p=5819569>

Ugly Betty, post # 22 [Online forum comment]. (2006, August 10). Retrieved from

<http://forums.televisionwithoutpity.com/index.php?s=4d786cf1b359be479cfe9ded72191cf1&showtopic=3142213&view=findpost&p=5820082>

Ugly Betty, post # 23 [Online forum comment]. (2006, August 10). Retrieved from

<http://forums.televisionwithoutpity.com/index.php?s=&showtopic=3142213&view=findpost&p=5820393>

Ugly Betty, post # 24 [Online forum comment]. (2006, August 10). Retrieved from

<http://forums.televisionwithoutpity.com/index.php?s=&showtopic=3142213&view=findpost&p=5820401>

Ugly Betty, post # 28 [Online forum comment]. (2006, August 13). Retrieved from

<http://forums.televisionwithoutpity.com/index.php?s=&showtopic=3142213&view=findpost&p=5837839>

Ugly Betty, post # 32 [Online forum comment]. (2006, August 15). Retrieved from

<http://forums.televisionwithoutpity.com/index.php?s=&showtopic=3142213&view=findpost&p=5847225>

Ugly Betty, post # 62 [Online forum comment]. (2009, October 3). Retrieved from

<http://forums.televisionwithoutpity.com/index.php?s=&showtopic=3142213&view=findpost&p=12217084>

Ugly Betty, post # 90 [Online forum comment]. (2009, October 10). Retrieved from

<http://forums.televisionwithoutpity.com/index.php?s=&showtopic=3142213&view=findpost&p=12262016>

- Ugly Betty, post # 196 [Online forum comment]. (2009, October 26). Retrieved from
<http://forums.televisionwithoutpity.com/index.php?s=&showtopic=3142213&view=findpost&p=12294477>
- Ugly Betty, post # 1087 [Online forum comment]. (2010, April 12). Retrieved from
<http://forums.televisionwithoutpity.com/index.php?s=&showtopic=3142213&view=findpost&p=12796621>
- Ugly Betty, post # 1160 [Online forum comment]. (2010, April 14). Retrieved from
<http://forums.televisionwithoutpity.com/index.php?s=&showtopic=3142213&view=findpost&p=12807756>
- Ugly Betty, post # 1193 [Online forum comment]. (2010, April 14). Retrieved from
<http://forums.televisionwithoutpity.com/index.php?s=&showtopic=3142213&view=findpost&p=12807890>
- Ugly Betty, post # 1201 [Online forum comment]. (2010, April 14). Retrieved from
<http://forums.televisionwithoutpity.com/index.php?s=&showtopic=3142213&view=findpost&p=12807948>
- Ugly Betty, post # 1208 [Online forum comment]. (2010, April 14). Retrieved from
<http://forums.televisionwithoutpity.com/index.php?s=&showtopic=3142213&view=findpost&p=12807996>
- Ugly Betty, post # 1219 [Online forum comment]. (2010, April 15). Retrieved from
<http://forums.televisionwithoutpity.com/index.php?s=&showtopic=3142213&view=findpost&p=12808081>

- Ugly Betty, post # 1221 [Online forum comment]. (2010, April 15). Retrieved from <http://forums.televisionwithoutpity.com/index.php?s=&showtopic=3142213&view=findpost&p=12808090>
- Ugly Betty, post # 1256 [Online forum comment]. (2010, April 15). Retrieved from <http://forums.televisionwithoutpity.com/index.php?s=&showtopic=3142213&view=findpost&p=12808638>
- Ugly Betty, post # 1257 [Online forum comment]. (2010, April 15). Retrieved from <http://forums.televisionwithoutpity.com/index.php?s=&showtopic=3142213&view=findpost&p=12808700>
- Ugly Betty, post # 1262 [Online forum comment]. (2010, April 15). Retrieved from <http://forums.televisionwithoutpity.com/index.php?s=&showtopic=3142213&view=findpost&p=12808835>
- Ugly Betty, post # 1288 [Online forum comment]. (2010, April 15). Retrieved from <http://forums.televisionwithoutpity.com/index.php?s=&showtopic=3142213&view=findpost&p=12809545>
- Ugly Betty, post # 1298 [Online forum comment]. (2010, April 15). Retrieved from <http://forums.televisionwithoutpity.com/index.php?s=&showtopic=3142213&view=findpost&p=12810295>
- Ugly Betty's Tony Plana: Our favorite TV dad (2008, June 16). *Latina Magazine*. Retrieved from <http://www.latina.com/entertainment/tv/ugly-bettys-tony-plana-our-favorite-tv-dad>

- Ulchur, I. (2000). Betty la Fea: La suerte de la inteligencia (Betty the ugly: Luck of intelligence). *Revista Latinoamericana de Comunicacion Chasqui*, (071). Retrieved from Revista Latinoamericana de Comunicación Chasquí website <http://chasqui.comunica.org/ulchur71.htm>
- Unger, A. (1984, 03/05). Two new sitcoms get tangled in ethnic stereotypes. *The Christian Science Monitor*, p. 25.
- Univision Communications, Inc. (2010). *Company overview: History*. Retrieved from Univision <http://www.univision.net/corp/en/history.jsp>
- Van Gennep, A. (1960). *The rites of passage*. (M. B. Vizedom & G.L. Caffee, Trans.) Chicago: University of Chicago Press. (Original work published 1909).
- Von Hendy, A. (2002). *The modern construction of myth*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Waisbord, S. (2004). McTV: Understanding the global popularity of television formats. *Television & New Media*, 5(4), 359-383.
- Waldinger, R. (2006). Immigration reform too hot to handle. *New Labor Forum*, 15(2), 20-29.
- Weber, D. (1998). Taking Jewish American popular culture seriously: The yinglish worlds of Gertrude Berg, Milton Berle, and Mickey Katz. *Jewish Social Studies*, 5(1), 124-153.
- Weber, D. (2003). Goldberg variations: The achievements of Gertrude Berg. In J. Shandler (Ed.), *Entertaining America: Jews, movies, and broadcasting* (pp. 113-123). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

- Webster, J.G. (2005). Beneath the veneer of fragmentation: Television audience polarization in a multi-channel world. *Journal of Communication*, 55(2), 366-382.
- Webster, J.G. Phalen, P.F. & Lichty, L.W. (2006). *Ratings analysis: The theory and practice of audience research*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Weger, H., Jr. & Aakhus, M. (2003). Arguing in internet chat rooms: Argumentative adaptations to chat room design and some consequences for public deliberation at a distance. *Argumentation & Advocacy*, 40(1), 23-38.
- Wells, M. (1996, March 21). Trying to tap a hot market, U.S. advertisers slowly learn to speak. *USA Today*, p. 1B.
- Wentz, L. (2006, 05/08). Timing of data annoys Hispanic agencies. *Advertising Age*, p. S-27.
- Wharburton, W. (1972). The divine legation of Moses demonstrated [selections]. In B. Feldman & R. D. Richardson (Eds.), *The rise of modern mythology, 1680-1860* (pp. 113-117). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Whitney, D. (2007, 05/14). ABC-Cox deal paves way for series on VOD. *Television Week*, 26(20), 26-26.
- Wides-Munoz, L. (2010, April 9). ABC's 'Ugly Betty' broke ground for Latinos, gays. *The Associated Press*.
- Wilbur, K. (2008). How the digital video recorder (DVR) changes traditional television advertising. *Journal of Advertising*, 37(1), 143-149.
- Wilkes, R. & Valencia, H. (1989). Hispanics and Blacks in television commercials. *Journal of Advertising*, 18(1), 19-25.

Will the real Betty please stand up? Comparisons and contrasts to the original, post # 1

[Online forum comment]. (2006, August 30). Retrieved from

<http://forums.televisionwithoutpity.com/index.php?s=&showtopic=3145353&view=findpost&p=5947070>

Will the real Betty please stand up? Comparisons and contrasts to the original, post # 20

[Online forum comment]. (2006, September 9). Retrieved from

<http://forums.televisionwithoutpity.com/index.php?s=&showtopic=3145353&view=findpost&p=6019373>

Will the real Betty please stand up? Comparisons and contrasts to the original, post # 29

[Online forum comment]. (2006, September 29). Retrieved from

<http://forums.televisionwithoutpity.com/index.php?s=&showtopic=3145353&view=findpost&p=6173661>

Will the real Betty please stand up? Comparisons and contrasts to the original, post # 32.

(2006, September 30). Retrieved from

<http://forums.televisionwithoutpity.com/index.php?s=&showtopic=3145353&view=findpost&p=6185854>

Will the real Betty please stand up? Comparisons and contrasts to the original, post # 43

[Online forum comment]. (2006, October 10). Retrieved from

<http://forums.televisionwithoutpity.com/index.php?s=&showtopic=3145353&view=findpost&p=6260750>

Will the real Betty please stand up? Comparisons and contrasts to the original, post # 65

[Online forum comment]. (2006, October 25). Retrieved from

<http://forums.televisionwithoutpity.com/index.php?s=&showtopic=3145353&view=findpost&p=6398718>

Will the real Betty please stand up? Comparisons and contrasts to the original, post # 74

[Online forum comment]. (2006, October 29). Retrieved from

<http://forums.televisionwithoutpity.com/index.php?s=&showtopic=3145353&view=findpost&p=6437003>

Will the real Betty please stand up? Comparisons and contrasts to the original, post # 78

[Online forum comment]. (2006, November 1). Retrieved from

<http://forums.televisionwithoutpity.com/index.php?s=&showtopic=3145353&view=findpost&p=6461108>

Will the real Betty please stand up? Comparisons and contrasts to the original, post # 79

[Online forum comment]. (2006, November 1). Retrieved from

<http://forums.televisionwithoutpity.com/index.php?s=&showtopic=3145353&view=findpost&p=6467387>

Will the real Betty please stand up? Comparisons and contrasts to the original, post # 89

[Online forum comment]. (2006, December 5). Retrieved from

<http://forums.televisionwithoutpity.com/index.php?s=&showtopic=3145353&view=findpost&p=6769847>

Will the real Betty please stand up? Comparisons and contrasts to the original, post # 90

[Online forum comment]. (2006, December 8). Retrieved from

<http://forums.televisionwithoutpity.com/index.php?s=&showtopic=3145353&view=findpost&p=6793370>

Will the real Betty please stand up? Comparisons and contrasts to the original, post # 108

[Online forum comment]. (2007, April 30). Retrieved from

<http://forums.televisionwithoutpity.com/index.php?s=&showtopic=3145353&view=findpost&p=7664812>

Will the real Betty please stand up? Comparisons and contrasts to the original, post # 121

[Online forum comment]. (2008, November 8). Retrieved from

<http://forums.televisionwithoutpity.com/index.php?s=&showtopic=3145353&view=findpost&p=11013306>

Will the real Betty please stand up? Comparisons and contrasts to the original, post # 124

[Online forum comment]. (2009, February 21). Retrieved from

<http://forums.televisionwithoutpity.com/index.php?s=&showtopic=3145353&view=findpost&p=11396050>

Wilson, S. (2001, February 26). Will 'Betty' betray Bogotá? Stay tuned; soap star's transformation has Colombia transfixed. *The Washington Post*, p. A01.

Wilson, B. (2007, September 29). How Ugly Betty turned into a swan the TV show about a plain, plucky fashion magazine PA has been a global success. *The Daily Telegraph*, p. 5.

Winthrop, J. (1999). A model of Christian charity. In M. Warner (Ed.), [*American sermons: The pilgrims to Martin Luther King, Jr.*](#), (pp. 28-43). New York, NY: Penguin Putnam. (Original work published 1630).

Wolf, N. (1991). *The beauty myth: How images of beauty are used against women*. New York, NY: W. Morrow.

Woll, A. (1980). Bandits and lovers: Hispanic images in American film. In R. M. Miller (Ed.), *The kaleidoscopic lens: How Hollywood views ethnic groups*, (54-71).

Englewood, NJ: Jerome S. Ozer, Publisher.

Written testimony prepared for Emilio T. Gonzalez, director of U.S. citizenship and immigration services, for a hearing on “naturalization delays: Causes, consequences and solutions: Immigration, Citizenship, Refugees, Border Security, and International Law, House Judiciary Committee, 110th, Cong. 1 (2008). Retrieved from the United States Citizen and Immigration Services website
http://www.uscis.gov/files/testimony/testimony_ETG_17jan08.pdf

Yahr, E. (2009, October 16). ‘Ugly Betty’ returns, back to its lovable roots. *The Washington Post*, p. C02.

Yances, G. (2000, November 12). Una heroína fea. *El Tiempo*. Retrieved from El Tiempo Archives <http://www.eltiempo.com/archivo/documento/MAM-1241266>

Zangwill, I. (1914). *The melting pot: Drama in four acts*. New York, NY: The Macmillan Company.

Zapata, J. T. & Jaramillo, P. T. (1981). Research on the Mexican-American family. *Journal of Individual Psychology*, 37(1), 72.

Zazueta-Martínez, K. (2004). Latina magazine and the invocation of a panethnic family: Latino identity as it is informed by celebrities and papis chulos. *Communication Review*, 7(2), 155-174.

ZBar, J. D. (1994, 11/04). Few targeting Hispanics: Gallup survey shows marketers ‘out of touch’ with 11% of populace. *Advertising Age*, p. 55.

Zelinsky, W. (2001). *The enigma of ethnicity*. Iowa City, IO: University of Iowa Press.

Zhou, M. (2004). Assimilation, the Asian way. In T. Jacoby (Ed.), [*Reinventing the melting pot: The new immigrants and what it means to be an American*](#) (pp. 139-153). New York, NY: Basic Books.