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Introduction

A timeless debate in the tradition of democratic theory has centered upon the question, "is the public rational?" From the beginning, checks have been placed on democratic publics to make up for their limited capacity to reason. Plato invoked the philosopher king, Rousseau introduced the lawmaker and our own founders created an unelected Supreme Court and Senate. Scientific polling, introduced by George Gallup in 1936, confirmed previous theoretical suspicions by empirically demonstrating Americans' lack of political knowledge. For instance, Gallup found that 56% of Americans could correctly answer the question "in a criminal trial, it is up to the person who is accused of the crime to prove his innocence" and that 23% of Americans could describe the Bill of Rights (Delli Carpini & Keeter 1996, 307).

And yet, for those who have a firm faith in the rationality of the American people, the notion that the public is irrational remains unconvincing. Many have questioned the importance of factual information to a rational public and have argued that individuals in a low information environment are in fact efficient at coming to rational decisions. Others have argued that as a collective, the public behaves more rationally than the simple sum of its members – that individuals who vote against their interests negate one another when there are large numbers of voters. Still others have argued that in fact information is important and that elites can manipulate low information environments and the mathematics of aggregation to steer the public in a particular direction.

Alongside this debate is another debate over how we should envision rationality in an ideal democracy. Beginning with Jürgen Habermas's The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society, a new democratic ideal developed that was steeped in discourse. Habermas and democratic theorists in his tradition have
questioned the degree to which levels of factual information can be equated to rationality, arguing that in fact discursive processes produce a rational democratic public. In the 1990s, public sphere scholars, led by Nancy Fraser, developed a normative argument for a rational public that addressed hegemony in the public discourse. By contracting into counterpublics, hedged individuals formed counterdiscourses which they could discursively use to have democratic recourse in the mass public.

Despite the normative value of public sphere theory and the interesting ethnographies that have been produced of several counterpublics, little has been done to empirically test the limits of public sphere theory in an effort to analyze the rationality of the American public. This thesis tests the limits of a rational public by analyzing the Tea Party movement. I situate what has been commonly portrayed as the most irrational political group in the U.S. into public sphere theory. In so doing, I question whether the Tea Party lives up to the discursive muster proposed by Habermas, Fraser and other public sphere theorists. Though this thesis does not definitively answer the research question “is the American public rational,” it drives at an important empirical gap Nancy Fraser identified in the public sphere literature in 2005: without understanding “empirical communication flows… who participates and on what terms… [and] influence over the state… the concept loses its critical force and its political point” (1). More importantly, this thesis puts the public sphere literature into conversation with the debate over a rational American public such that we can better understand the American public.
Literature Review

In the following section, I review the body of scholarly literature that answers the following question: Is the American public rational? Three unique schools of thought stand out in response to this question. In the first school of thought, which I name Heuristic Rationality, scholars argue that most individuals in the public make efficient use of heuristics, or mental shortcuts, to make quick political judgments based on limited information. In the second school of thought, which I name Aggregational Rationality, scholars concede that while most individuals make efficient use of heuristics, many use heuristics to lead them in a direction that is counter to their true political views. They address this problem by using the Condorcet Jury Theorem, which states that in large populations, random errors in individual opinion negate one another such that a public in which some members are uninformed nevertheless appears rational. Both of these schools of thought have dominated the public opinion literature for the past half-century.

Throughout the debate over whether heuristics and aggregation produce a rational public, public opinion scholars have overlooked a critical cog in the production of rational thought – the individual. Having given up on the individual after performing poorly on polling data for the past half-century, scholars have shifted their focus to the collective; individuals may be rational, but as a collective they behave differently. Yet while language of the collective is critical to understanding public opinion, I believe that scholars turn away from grassroots individual rational development at the expense of fully understanding public opinion. To return the public opinion literature’s focus to the individual, I put the literature in conversation with a third school of thought, which I name Public Sphere Rationality. Traditionally not widely used in the public opinion literature, scholars in this school of thought structure their conception of public
rationality through Jürgen Habermas’s public sphere, in which discourse produces rational thought. Though these scholars do not necessarily affirm a rational public, they construct an ideal rational public against which one can test the current American public.

The structure of this section is straightforward: First, I will lay out what is agreed upon in the literature regarding the public’s knowledge of politics. I will then analyze how Heuristic and Aggregational Rationality scholars address the issue of an uninformed public, how critics have refuted these arguments, and finally how Public Sphere Rationality scholars provide a more productive frame for considering a rational American public.

State of Public Knowledge

“If six decades of modern public opinion research have established anything, it is that the general public’s political ignorance is appalling by any standard.” (Ackerman and Fishkin 2004, 2) These are the words with which Bruce Ackerman and James Fishkin preface their invention of Deliberation Day, a holiday remedy for a critical problem they see in America – that most individuals utterly lack political knowledge. When answering the question of how the public remains rational, almost no scholar doubts that most individuals lack political knowledge. This much is well documented. In The Rational Public, Benjamin I. Page and Robert Y. Shapiro point out that “most peoples’ knowledge of politics is quite meager” and rattle off a list of statistics to prove it: 52% of Americans know that there are two U.S. Senators from each state, 46% could name their Congressman, 30% knew the length of a U.S. House member’s term, and 38% knew that the Soviet Union was not a member of NATO (1992, 9).

These grim statistics haven’t improved with education levels or time either. Page and Shapiro point out that over the past 40 years, when education levels have increased among a broad portion of the electorate, the public’s level of political knowledge “remains low and
largely unchanged.” (9) W. Russell Neuman, author of *The Paradox of Mass Politics: Knowledge and Opinion in the American Electorate*, additionally observes that “findings derived from the voting studies do not support” the hypothesis that “more sophisticated members of the citizenry have more numerous, stable, and structured opinions and a more clear-cut ideological position” (1986, 5). In sum, the consensus among almost all public opinion scholars for the past half-century has been that individuals continue to know very little about politics (Campbell et al. 1960; Neuman 1986; Page & Shapiro 1992; Delli Carpini & Keeter 1996; Lewis-Beck et al. 2008).

When George Gallup released the first scientific poll in 1936, which for the first time demonstrated a clear lack of political knowledge among the American public, a consensus developed in the academic community that if voters were factually deficient they were rationally deficient as well. As Paul M. Sniderman writes in a literature review on public opinion research from 1950 to 1970, “minimalism as it has been called – dominated the work of the two decades. Mass publics, it was contended, were distinguished by (1) minimal levels of political attention and information; (2) minimal mastery of abstract political concepts such as liberalism-conservatism; (3) minimal stability of political preferences; (4) and quintessentially, minimal levels of attitude constraint” (1993, 219). To be sure, as Sniderman points out, there were differences in where scholars placed the blame on the uninformed public. The two major public opinion schools in the country, Columbia University and Michigan University, differed in whether they viewed voters as mimicking peers’ political views or as being predisposed to certain political views based on their demographics (Glynn et al. 1999, 258). In 1954, Columbia professors Bernard R. Berelson, Paul F. Lazarsfeld and William McPhee published *Voting: A Study of Opinion Formation in a Presidential Campaign*, in which they found that because
citizens paid such limited attention to politics, the only statistically significant influence on voting decisions was demographic characteristics (i.e. age, region, income). For instance, they found that younger and lower income households tended to vote for Democrat candidates, while older and higher income households tended to vote for Republican candidates. In their groundbreaking book *The American Voter*, Michigan professors Angus Campbell, Philip E. Converse, Warren E. Miller and Donald E. Stokes used 1948 Survey Research Center data to conclude that because voters do not stay current on political developments, there existed a strong correlation between voting preferences and long-standing “partisan commitments” (558). Converse additionally found in his article “The Nature of Belief Systems in Mass Publics” that not only was the public uninformed, its opinion on issues was unstable over time and incoherent between demographics (1964). Initial public opinion studies commonly assumed causality between deficits of factual knowledge and irrationality.

**Heuristic Rationality**

Unsatisfied with the academic consensus on the poor state of American public opinion, V. O. Key, Jr. published *The Responsible Electorate* in 1966, the first attempt to salvage the public after the release of Gallup’s grim polling data. As a rebuttal of Berelson et al., Campbell et al. and Converse’s arguments, Key pushes back against the claimed factual incompetence of voters. Key argues that indeed voter competence can only be measured by the quality of the candidates presented to them. He writes, “If the people can choose only from among rascals, they are certain to choose a rascal” (3). Using the same Gallup polling data studied by the Columbia and Michigan scholars, Key finds that citizens’ policy preferences were seemingly unclear and unsophisticated only because there was no discernable ideological difference among candidates in the years studied, such as 1956. In years where ideological differences among candidates were
discernable, particularly in 1964, Key finds significant correlation between voting preferences and policy preferences.

However, moving beyond quarrels over factual information, Key's most critical contribution to the public opinion literature was his observation that factual information is inconsequential to a rational public. Key writes that uninformed individuals make use of "cues" to determine whether "they like or don't like the performance of government" (150). In other words, citizens can look at their surroundings on Election Day, decide whether the current politician is performing well based on how they feel about the country and vote accordingly. Rather than contest whether the population was informed or not, Key shifted the discussion to the public's ability to use cues, or heuristics, to determine policy preferences.

Since Key's observation on the importance of mental cues, many scholars have followed suit in exploring the potential of heuristics to produce rational public opinion. Numerous metrics have been identified as providing useful heuristics for voters to develop rational opinion (party identification, Robertson 1976; evaluation of the economy, Fiorina 1981, Lupia 1994; opinions of policy experts, Neuman 1986; opinions of like-minded citizens and groups, Page & Shapiro 1992). In the instance of evaluating the economy based on heuristics, Morris P. Fiorina writes in *Retrospective Voting in American National Elections* that while most people want low unemployment, "what policies politicians follow is their business; what they accomplish is the voter's... people generally are not terribly concerned about whether the government fights unemployment via public-works projects, tax rebates, or business tax credits. Whatever succeeds" (13). In other words, citizens want results, which Heuristic Rationality scholars argue are easy to deduce. If the unemployment rate is high, then clearly the incumbent has not been doing his/her job. The voter can use this knowledge to decide whether to keep the incumbent in
office or throw the bum out. As Page and Shapiro remark, “cues from like-minded citizens and
groups (including cues related to demographic characteristics and party labels) may be sufficient,
in an environment where accurate information is available, to permit voters to act as if they had
all the available information” (387-388). Indeed, as Heuristic Rationality scholars contend, all
that is required of voters who make efficient use of heuristics is a minimal understanding of the
candidates and an ability to make use of readily available cues to align policy preferences with a
certain candidate.

Some of the examples of heuristics even seem comical. To begin his influential book on
heuristics, *The Reasoning Voter*, Samuel L. Popkin tells the infamous story of a gaffe committed
by President Ford at a political rally in San Antonio, Texas. Because San Antonio is famous for
its Mexican food, the rally organizers served tamales to the President after the rally finished.
With reporters and cameras fixed on the President, he “proceeded with gusto to bite into the
tamale, corn husk and all” (1994, 1). The very next day the *New York Times* printed on its front
page a photo of the President eating the tamale with the following caption: CAMPAIGNING IN
TEXAS: President Ford starting to eat a hot tamale during a visit to the Alamo yesterday. The
snack was interrupted after the first bite so that his hosts could remove the corn shucks which
serve as a wrapper and are not supposed to be consumed” (2). Beyond being a humorous
mistake, Popkin views President Ford’s gaffe as being a critically important cue to the average
Mexican American voter. Popkin contends that the average Mexican American voter would
interpret an image of the tamale fiasco as an indication that “the President had little experience
with the Mexican-American culture” (2). And, at a time when delicate negotiations over the
Panama Canal were at the forefront of the average Mexican American voter’s mind, Popkin
concludes that the President’s cultural gaffe was a helpful heuristic because it gave “gut” insight
into the President’s ability to negotiate with Latin American leaders and how he would “ease the
group’s way into the mainstream” (3).

Of course, there are some problems with heuristics that scholars within this school of
thought readily accept. In particular, though Heuristic Rationality scholars argue that heuristics
play a major role in individuals’ understanding of politics, they also accept that sizable portions
of the electorate often misuse heuristics such that they arrive at a decision that is not aligned with
their vote had they hypothetically been fully informed. As Page and Shapiro write, “it would be
unrealistic to expect the average American to hold well-worked out, firmly based preferences
about a wide range of public policies” (14). To address this rationality gap, as it were, many
Heuristic Rationality scholars invoke the notion of statistical aggregation, in which voters who
vote against their true interest negate one another such that the mass public appears rational. To
articulate this aggregational process, Heuristic Rationality scholars turn to the second major
school of thought I identified in response to questioning why the American public holds rational
political views: Aggregational Rationality.

Aggregational Rationality

In his 1986 article “Information, Electorates, and Democracy: Some Extensions and
Interpretations of the Condorcet Jury Theorem,” Nicholas R. Miller is intrigued by the
“discrepancy between inferior ‘micro-level’ performance and apparently superior ‘macro-level’
performance” in the voting population. As Miller notes, despite the sustained criticism held
against the inferior political knowledge of individuals in the mass public, “sophisticated
observers of politics might be hard put to name a single recent national election in which the vote
division plausibly would have been substantially different, even if all voters had in fact made
more complete use of the information potentially available to them” (178). To resolve this
discrepancy, Miller suggests that aggregational mathematics plays a substantial role in the seemingly “mystical” (174) phenomenon of a rational mass public. Central to his mathematical articulation of Aggregational Rationality is 16th century French mathematician Marquis de Condorcet’s jury theorem. Condorcet created the original theorem in 1785 to prove that more judges on the bench would provide more accurate judicial decisions. Extending its application from juries, Miller argues that aggregating mass publics using the same formula and variables similarly produces more rational public opinion. Whereas there are n voters with a probability p of holding rational opinion (p > .5), q = 1 − p and x is the number of individuals who vote correctly, Miller uses the following theorem to determine as a function the probability that a group of size n would hold rational opinion: 

\[
P_n = \Phi\left(\frac{p - 0.5}{\sqrt{pq/n}}\right)
\]

where Φ(z) is the area under the normal curve (175).

As can be seen from the table of values in Table 1, as n increases the probability of arriving at a rational opinion as a collective increases as well. The logic for this is simple; as n increases, an increasing number of higher p is added to the function, which results in \(P_n\) approaching 1, or perfectly rational opinion.

A probability of .5 is used here under the assumption that there are two candidates. A probability rate greater than .5 would indicate rationality because it is greater than a simple guess rate. Likewise, if there are three candidates, a probability of .33 would be used.
In light of Miller's work on aggregation, in 1990 Converse updated his original findings in *The American Voter* and "The Nature of Belief Systems in Mass Publics." Converse concedes that when polling data was first released, "it was initially hard to see the voter as making any very rational contribution to democracy or to the representation process" (377). However, given the compelling applicability of the Condorcet jury theorem, Converse writes that "the power of aggregation... conceals the scaterration of estimates from one voter to another. It turns out that this scaterration is vast in the mass sample by comparison with the elite sample" (381). In other words, opinion in aggregate is equal to the opinion of that public were it hypothetically informed.

To confirm this view borrowed from jury theorem, Converse reexamines a data set he collected of French voters' views and voting choices in National Assembly elections throughout the 1960s. Converse notes that despite the fact that there were 10 parties from which to choose, voters in aggregate were surprisingly efficient at aligning their political views with their choice of political party. When the public was separated into elites (informed voters) and relatively uninformed voters, however, there was significantly more dissonance between political views and voting choice among uninformed voters as compared to elites. Nevertheless, the errors seemed to negate one another in aggregate such that both elite and uninformed voters correctly aligned their political views with their vote 97% of the time (383). As James A. Stimson wrote in his 1991 book *Public Opinion in America: Moods, Cycles, & Swings*, "if our topic is people, then this abstraction as individuals is relatively harmless... for it is the aggregate that matters in politics" (2). Stimson, along with Miller and Converse, remind us that public opinion is by nature public and that research of individual irrationality doesn't necessarily translate to collective irrationality.
Incorporating Miller and Converse's work into their analysis of heuristics, Page and Shapiro fill the gaps created by individuals who incorrectly use heuristics to develop their political views. Figure 1 is a hypothetical model Page and Shapiro offer of how they view statistical aggregation at work. At the bottom on the graph are the opinion curves of individuals regarding how many MX missiles they would like the U.S. to produce. As is clear in the graph, each individual curve is distributed across a range of numbers from 7 to 93, and each individual opinion can fluctuate along the given individual opinion curve. What is critical to this model is the shape of the aggregate curve. Points on the aggregate curve range from 1 to 100, but average opinion is at its peak at the center. This is the principle of aggregation: while there may be many individuals at both extremes of an opinion, and while individuals may wildly change their personal opinions, public opinion in aggregate negates individual fluctuation.

Additionally, Page and Shapiro find that aggregational negation of erring political views produces stable public opinion. Data collected from 1,128 survey questions that were asked with identical wording at two or more time points by five survey organizations (NORC, Gallup, SRC/CPS, Harris or OPOR) indicated that 58% of the repeated policy questions showed no significant opinion change (6% or less) (44). These questions covered a broad range of domestic and foreign issues including government spending, taxes, laws, regulations, court decisions, officials' actions, executive, legislative and judicial policies at all levels of government, nuclear weapons, military alliances, foreign aid, education, health, highways, rights of the accused,
school desegregation and abortion (43). Among these examples, Page and Shapiro remind the reader that mass public opinion is not always situated in the moderate center; aggregation can produce stability at many points on the political spectrum. Again, however, Aggregate Rationality scholars argue that the political orientation of public opinion is inconsequential in terms of demonstrating rational public opinion. It is the fact that such aggregation is guided by heuristics that stability at any location on the political spectrum is reliably rational (Stimson 1991; Page & Shapiro 1992; Miller & Shanks 1996; Lupia & McCubbins 1998)

Regarding the 13% of survey responses in which there was significant change (30% or more), Page and Shapiro argue that these changes could almost always be explained by “changes in information and changes in reality” (53). For instance, the two authors argue that the public became increasingly “in support of civil liberties for Communists, Socialists, and atheists” between 1950 and 1970 because increasing numbers of individuals had access to formal education, which exposed them to public speeches of Communists, Socialists and atheists in public libraries and schools. In addition, Page and Shapiro write that “the decline of the Cold War and the fading of religious commitments were more fundamental causes” that caused people at all education levels to change opinion (327). In this case, individuals certainly varied in whether they supported more civil liberties for Communists. We can also be confident that many individuals even made these decisions in spite of a reality more conducive to their political views (i.e. an individual who was against the expansion of civil liberties because he conflated Communism with a conspiracy theory that the Soviets would occupy the U.S.). However, due to the power of heuristics in guiding many individuals to rational opinion in addition to the aggregate effect of averaging irrational voters with oppositely oriented irrational voters, Page
and Shapiro contend that the public as a collective behaves as if its members were all well informed.

Regardless of where a particular Aggregational Rationality scholar stands on the particular causes of changing mass opinion (i.e. war, migration, cultural), what is common is their view that changes in opinion are the result of changing information or reality that is interpreted through heuristics. Aggregational Rationality scholars contend that while individuals use heuristics in varyingly efficient ways to develop opinion, when measured in aggregate, individual variances average one another out such that the mass public appears to be rational.

**Criticisms**

The framework of a mass public guided by heuristics and managed by aggregation rests upon certain ideals that do not necessarily reflect reality. For this reason, Page and Shapiro devote the final chapter of *The Rational Public* to analyze whether the public can be misled using the very heuristics and principles of aggregation that *prima facie* produce rational public opinion. They conclude that “if politicians or others regularly deceive and mislead the public, if they manipulate citizens’ policy preferences so as to betray their interests and values, democracy may be a sham” (389). While the two authors believe this not to be the case, many critics of the Heuristic and Aggregational Rationality school of thought have identified this assumption as a fundamental flaw.

A series of studies beginning with Larry Bartels’s 1996 article “Uninformed Votes: Information Effects in Presidential Elections” have demonstrated major shortcomings of heuristics and aggregation. In fact, most of these studies have found that heuristics and aggregation are counterproductive to producing rational public opinion (Bartels 1996; Kuklinski & Quirk 2000; Achen & Bartels 2006; Wolfe 2006; Shenkman 2008). In his 1996 article, Bartels
tests the joint heuristic-aggregation hypothesis that “uninformed voters successfully use cues and information shortcuts to behave as if they were fully informed. Failing that, individual decisions from fully informed voting cancel out in a mass electorate, producing the same aggregate election outcome as if voters were fully informed.” Bartels performs this test by comparing actual voting choices with “hypothetical ‘fully informed’ vote choices... using the observed relationship between political information and vote choices for voters with similar social and demographic characteristics” (194).  

Bartels finds that there is on average a 2-5% deviation between actual vote choices and the hypothetical fully informed vote choice. Among certain demographics, Bartels finds that this deviation is even more pronounced. For instance, among women and Catholics, there is over 20% deviation between actual and informed vote choice. Taken in aggregate, this deviation becomes heavily diluted, as Aggregational Rationality scholars predicted. Nevertheless, Bartels finds substantial residual deviation; incumbents performed 5% better and Democrats 2% better than they would have if they faced a fully informed electorate. Bartels concludes his article by questioning whether these discrepancies suggest “systematic biases in aggregate preferences on specific policy issues,” particularly in the way the mass media and politicians manipulate the portrayal of policy (220-1). Indeed, Bartels’s findings in this study strike at the heart of heuristic and aggregate scholar’s arguments; 2-5% deviation from actual voting preferences can easily change the outcome of an election. Subsequent repetitions of Bartels’ experiment using different metrics have indicated similar deviation between actual and informed vote choice. In their 2006 study, Richard R. Lau and David P. Redlawsk again tested the difference between voters’ true preferences and their actual votes.

---

2 This comparison is estimated by “probit analysis of data from National Election Study surveys conducted after the six most recent United States presidential elections” (194). Fully informed voters here are interpreted as fully informed in a “narrow factual sense” in addition to being “more interested in and sophisticated in thinking about politics” (204).
choice and their choice had they been fully informed, this time operationalizing the variables differently. While Lau and Redlawsk were "pleasantly surprised" to find that on average 72% of voters vote as they would have if they were fully informed, Bartels responded by questioning "the extent to which 'incorrect' votes skew election outcomes" (2008, 47).

Upon closer examination of the remaining 28% of the public who misaligned their informed voting choice with their actual choice, Bartels finds reason to be concerned. He observes that the Condorcet jury theorem is nothing more than a mathematical ideal that doesn't reflect reality. Bartels writes, "real voters' errors are quite unlikely to be random and statistically independent, as Condorcet's logic requires. When thousands or millions of voters misconstrue the same relevant fact or are swayed by the same vivid campaign ad, no amount of aggregation will produce the requisite miracle" (47). Several other scholars have highlighted unfair campaigning and biased media coverage as explanations for how gaps in information produce public opinion that is inconsistent with a fully informed public (Delli Carpini & Keeter 1996; Frank 2004; Achen & Bartels 2006; Shenkman 2008). As Alan Wolfe writes in *Does American Democracy Still Work?*, "priming was brought to fruition by Republicans during the George W. Bush presidency. Whatever the policy, whether the war in Iraq, Social Security privatization, confirmation of judges, or tax cuts, the administration began with a simple but dramatic narrative of crisis... Facts were cherry-picked and exaggerated to add credibility to the narrative." And, while Wolfe agrees that priming does not always work, he writes that nothing "detracts from the success of priming in President Bush's first term" (2006, 36) Though Wolfe's depiction of

---

3 Unlike Bartels, they did not operationalize the fully informed choice by comparing voters to their demographic peers. Instead, Lau and Redlawsk set up mock elections that mimicked past eight Presidential elections, except with fantasy candidates running instead of the real candidates. During both mock elections, subjects were presented with "scrolling campaigns," (291) in which the subject was presented what amounted to a 20 minute condensed campaign with artificial speeches, debates, and newspaper articles. Subjects were asked to vote in primary and general elections. After the voting was finished, the subjects were fully briefed on both candidates' policy positions and were politely asked if they would change their vote.
President Bush’s legacy can be disputed, what is important is his observation is that deliberate exaggerating or changing of facts can have significant impact on public opinion. Even more unsettling to the negative effects of heuristics and aggregation are findings that public opinion in aggregate can be skewed by circumstances that are outside the elected official’s control, such as natural drought, flu outbreaks, shark attacks and a candidate’s good looks (Achen & Bartels 2002; Ballew II & Todorov 2007; Lenz & Lawson 2009).

The literature has evolved such that there is currently little reason to think that the public is rational. While scholars were initially intrigued by the power of heuristics and aggregation at amassing public rationality among poorly informed individuals, the ability of biased mass media, disproportionately powerful political campaigns and even shark attacks to lead aggregate publics astray has raised significant concerns regarding their affect on a rational public. And yet, despite the criticisms of Heuristic and Aggregational Rationality, many scholars still feel that the public is by and large rational. For all of Wolfe’s arguments that the political dynamics of the U.S. are changing, he is still at a loss to explain why the American public was rational until President Bush was elected. He writes, “Americans have been lucky for quite some time. Despite their lack of information about politics, they have done a fairly good job evaluating candidates and the public policies they support” (30). And although Bartels, Frank, Shenkman and other critics have identified situations where public opinion has been irrational, they don’t fully explain the strong evidence put forth by Page and Shapiro in their survey data that demonstrates the public’s stability on most issues for the past half-century. So, if not heuristics or aggregation, what is the invisible hand that has produced a stable public? Surely the public cannot have been stable until now by sheer “luck.”
To begin to understand this invisible hand that guides the public toward rational opinion, the literature's mistrust of individual political knowledge, which began with Key, must be reconsidered. By seeking to excuse the individual for performing poorly in polling data, Key effectively began a tradition in the public opinion literature of sharply reducing the agency of individual Americans. The individual does not need to actively study his policy preferences and develop rational opinion; cues and heuristics guide him to rational opinion. The individual doesn't need to worry about voting against her interests; the Condorcet jury theorem negates her uninformed vote with the uninformed vote of others. While critics to these two schools of thought have targeted inconsistencies in how heuristics and aggregation function, at a more fundamental level, neither critics nor proponents of a rational public have destabilized the notion that individuals are inconsequential to the development of public opinion. To develop a normative argument that relocates the individual as playing a critical role in the development of rational public opinion, I turn to Habermas's conception of the public sphere.

Public Sphere Rationality

Since Habermas's *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere* was first translated into English in 1989, a rich conversation on the rational and democratic power of discourse has taken place. Scholars have named Habermas the "keeper of the flame for the Enlightenment and guardian of an emphatic, 'uncurtailed' concept of reason" (Steinhoff 2009) and the "most intellectually powerful philosopher in the Federal Republic of Germany" (Horster & Van Reijen 1992). Known for years in the German-speaking community as an "effort to reground the Frankfurt School project of critical theory in order to get out of the pessimistic cul

---

4 Habermas originally published *Strukturwandel der Öffentlichkeit. Untersuchungen zu einer Kategorie der bürgerlichen Gesellschaft* in 1962. Though his works may not appear chronologically in their English publications, I keep them chronological based on their German publication.
de sac in which Horkheimer and Adorno found themselves in the postwar era” *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere* has become in the English-speaking community a normative ideal for how to democratically produce rational thought (Calhoun 1992, 5).

Central to this ideal is the public sphere, which functions as a meeting place for representatives of the state and members of civil society. Among its democratically productive functions, the public sphere holds the state in check through earnest discussion of the general will of the people. In his historical account of the bourgeois public sphere in 17th and 18th century England, France and Germany, Habermas writes,

> “the bourgeois public sphere may be conceived above all as the sphere of private people come together as a public; they soon claimed the public sphere regulated from above against the public authorities themselves, to engage them in debate over the general rules governing relations in the basically privatized but publically relevant sphere of commodity exchange and social labor. The medium of this political confrontation was peculiar and without precedent: the people’s public use of their reason” (1989, 27).

Unlike previous engagement with the nobility that was regulated by the “prevailing climate of honnête,” the gradual alignment of cultural interests by the bourgeoisie and nobility in addition to the political self-actualization of a bourgeois public produced new discursive spaces in coffee houses, *salons* and *Tischgesellschaften* (1989, 31). Unlike previous public spaces, which were dominated by the nobility and select members of the bourgeoisie, coffeehouses admitted individuals regardless of class status so long as they were current on the topic of discussion. Habermas contends that because these discursive spaces were class-neutral and distinct from economic markets, sincere arguments on the general will were possible. Moreover, not only were sincere arguments possible, the best arguments would predictably be the product of deliberation in the public sphere. Most importantly to political structures, these arguments fell upon the ears

---

5 As will become apparent in later critiques of Habermas, there is an inherent class bias in admitting individuals who are current on topics of discussion because it is typically the upper class that is current on such topics. Nevertheless, Habermas’s principle of equality should be noted here – that individuals should be admitted into the public sphere regardless of their class.
of representatives of the state, who attended but remained distinct from discourse in the public sphere. Though the bourgeois public sphere ultimately disintegrated because of a convergence between the political interests of the state and civil society and the expansion of the public sphere to too many members for productive discussion, a historical framework for democratically influencing the state through discourse was realized. Habermas calls the deliberative process that takes place within this framework “communicative action” (1984).

In later works, Habermas elaborates on the “general presuppositions of communicative action” in what he calls the “ideal speech situation” (1979). The notion of ideal speech situation is straightforward: in order to establish reciprocal discourse in the public sphere, the speaker must attempt to reach understanding with the hearer. To do this, Habermas identifies four unavoidable “universal validity claims” to the speaker’s utterance. By speaking, the speaker claims 1) that the utterance can be understood; 2) that there is some truth to the utterance; 3) that the speaker “must want to express his intentions truthfully;” and 4) that the speaker and hearer can potentially come to consensus on the content of the utterance (1979, 2-3). By pursuing these claims in earnest, participants in the public sphere have at their disposal the ideal mechanisms for pursuing rational truth.

However, even as an ideal theory, Habermas’s bourgeois public sphere contains significant problems, particularly regarding its exclusionary nature. In her 1992 essay “Rethinking the Public Sphere: A Contribution to the Critique of Actually Existing Democracy,” Nancy Fraser challenges four distinct assumptions made by Habermas, which have served as the major points of criticism against The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere (Fraser 1992; Gamson 1992; Benhabib 1992; Hauser 1999; Dawson 2001; Harris-Lacewell 2006, Wallace 2009): 1) “it is possible for interlocutors in a public sphere to bracket status differentials
and to deliberate as if they were equals;" 2) the proliferation of a multiplicity of competing publics is necessarily a step away from, rather than toward, greater democracy;” 3) “discourse in public spheres should be restricted to deliberation about the common good;” and 4) “a functioning democratic public sphere requires a sharp separation between civil society and state” (1992, 117-8).

Regarding the first criticism, Fraser writes that “protocols of style and decorum” were themselves “correlates and markers of status inequality” because women, people of color, gays and other marginalized groups were often not practiced in such decorum (119). Indeed, Fraser argues that “in most cases it would be more appropriate to unbracket inequalities in the sense of explicitly thematizing them” so as to ensure equal participation regardless of stuffy procedure or decorum. Regarding the issue of discrimination in deliberative bodies, Fraser identifies a problem that has been discussed extensively among discursive spaces (town halls, Glynn et al. 1999; deliberative polling, Ackerman & Fishkin 2004)

On a more fundamental level, however, Fraser responds to a well-noted observation that in both stratified societies and egalitarian multicultural societies, there has been a shift from overt repression of marginalized groups to hegemonic repression: from “rule based primarily on acquiescence to superior force to rule based primarily on consent supplemented with some measure of repression” (117; Gramsci 1971; Eley 1992). To combat hegemony in mass discourse, Fraser argues for a multiplicity of “subaltern counterpublics,” or “parallel discursive arenas where members of subordinated social groups invent and circulate counterdiscourses to formulate oppositional interpretations of their identities, interests, and needs” (123). In stratified societies, counterpublics provide a protected space in which oppositional counterdiscourses are developed using similar discursive mechanics (ideal speech situation) to Habermas’s bourgeois
public sphere. These oppositional counterdiscourses provide the discursive recourse marginalized publics require in order to participate in the public sphere on equal terms. As a historical example of a counterpublic, Fraser points to the feminist movement, in which women marginalized from the mass public enacted counterdiscourses in journals, bookstores, publishing companies, film and video distribution networks, lecture series, research centers, academic programs, conferences, conventions, festivals, and local meeting places (123). Within these counterpublic spheres, women could talk about issues that lay outside the accepted norms established in the hegemonic public sphere, such as domestic abuse and other issues pertaining to sexual life.

Fraser’s second contribution to rethinking Habermas’s public sphere is reordering the relationship of civil society and political society. Habermas intends for the public sphere to have influence on political decision-making, but he clearly delineates civil society and political society. The nobility (political society) may have attended 18th century coffeehouses to participate in discussion, but they did so at equal footing with their fellow countryman. In this sense, Fraser writes, “the public sphere, in short, is not the state; it is rather the informally mobilized body of nongovernmental discursive opinion that can serve as a counterweight to the state” (1992, 134). Because democratic influence here is restricted (the state is not obligated to act on the product of discourse), Fraser labels this sphere a “weak public.” By contrast, there also exist “strong publics,” in which “discourse encompasses both opinion formation and decision making” (134). The typical example of a strong public would be a sovereign parliament, because the product of its discourse is law. Contra Habermas, Fraser argues that the “blurring of the separation between (associational) civil society and the state represents a democratic advance over earlier arrangements” because “the force of public opinion is strengthened when a body
representing it is empowered to translate such ‘opinion’ into authoritative decisions” (134-5). However, while this new constellation of weak and strong publics is surely a democratic advance, Fraser raises an important question regarding “what institutional arrangements best ensure the accountability of democratic decision-making bodies (strong publics) to their (external, weak, or, given the possibility of hybrid cases, weaker publics)” (135). Fraser leaves this question unanswered, leaving open the possibility for future scholars to texture weak and strong publics that fully detail the nature of a rational public into this new multifaceted public sphere framework.

Since the publication of “Rethinking the Public Sphere: A Contribution to the Critique of Actually Existing Democracy,” several scholars have begun the project of identifying and texturing the multiplicity of publics that exist in the U.S. and abroad, particularly in the study of black politics. In “A Black Counterpublic?: Economic Earthquakes, Racial Agenda(s), and Black Politics,” Michael Dawson first adopted Fraser’s language of counterpublics to mark a black counterpublic, which he argues existed “as recently as the early 1970s” but no longer (1995, 201). Like Fraser, he ends his essay questioning the existence of a black counterpublic, but unsure given the lack of empirical data marking specific spheres of counterdiscourse. Since Dawson’s essay, several scholars have answered his question, using new black polling data and more detailed ethnographies of black counterpublic spaces (Dawson 2001; David & Brown 2002; Brooks 2005; Harris-Lacewell 2006).

In particular, Dawson revisits his 1995 essay in Black Visions: The Roots of Contemporary African-American Political Ideologies by presenting a detailed analysis of differentiable ideologies in black political thought. Similar to Fraser, who argues that the feminist counterpublic formed out of opposition to male hegemony in the mass public, Dawson
writes that the black counterpublic formed “to challenge such characterizations of the nation’s propensity for tolerance” (14). However, contrary to Fraser’s depiction of feminists freely contracting into a feminist counterpublic, Dawson describes contracting into the black counterpublic as being particularly illiberal and exclusionary. He writes that despite scholarship that has compared black political thought to American liberalism, the “political tradition within black politics has been the consistent demand that individual African Americans take political stands that are perceived by the community as not harming the black community.” Even today, when there is “considerably less consensus on the ‘black’ tradition,” membership in the black counterpublic is strongly policed and controlled based on claims to black authenticity. Dawson describes the black community’s reaction to Glenn Loury, a prominent black conservative, who was “ostracized and treated as [a] traitor by other African Americans because of his conservatism.” Loury and other black conservatives do not pass the test of “strongly deemphasizing the privileged nature of private property” that crosses through the tradition of black political thought (31). In this regard, membership in the black counterpublic is contained through discourse; verbal attacks on Glenn Loury expelled him from the black mainstream while individuals who espouse more communitarian political views can more easily align themselves with mainstream black discourse.

Once constituted, political thought in the black counterpublic cannot be generalized to simple appeals to the black community. Dawson identifies six critical and distinct ideologies that contribute to the black counterdiscourse: Radical Egalitarianism, Disillusioned Liberalism, Black Marxism, Black Conservatism, Black Feminism and Black Nationalism (15). Radical Egalitarianism, in the tradition of Frederick Douglass and Ida B. Wells, promotes a vision of America in which the country “lives up to the best of its values, and support for a radical
egalitarian view of a multiracial democratic society” (16). It is typified by Martin Luther King, Jr.’s “I Have a Dream” speech, which envisions an America that becomes racially unified by bringing justice to African Americans. Disillusioned Liberalism stems from the thought of “post-1930 Du Bois and Dr. King in his last years” (17). It takes a more pessimistic view of the possibilities of America, instead accepting the potential need for segregation as a realistic means for achieving some semblance of racial equality. Black Marxism adapts Marxist critiques of capitalism into the black context by “emphasizing race as a fundamental category and spirituality to a degree not found in traditional Euro-American Marxism” (18). Black Conservatism, albeit marginal in black political thought, traces its roots to Booker T. Washington. It emphasizes the importance of self-help and non-discriminatory markets and presents “an attack on the state as a set of institutions that retard social process in general and black progress in particular” (20). Black Feminism stems from the unique oppression of “the intersection of gender with race and class” – that black women’s duel unsettling position as women among African Americans and African Americans among women creates a need for a dialectical response to racism and sexism. Black Nationalism is one of the oldest ideologies in black political thought and promotes varying degrees of autonomy from white America. All of Black Nationalism emphasizes race as “the fundamental category for analyzing society, and America is seen as fundamentally racist” (21). Black Nationalists often view Africa as the “motherland” for all humans of African ancestry, which creates a certain amount of cross-national solidarity with all black communities.

While each ideology promotes a distinct “strategy for the advancement of black racial interests” (23), all are the product of “historically imposed separation of blacks from whites” and the active “embracing of the concept of black autonomy as both an institutional principle and an
ideological orientation” (27). The black counterpublic may have had no choice in leaving the public sphere, but its counterdiscourse is reinforced and historically informed by the separation between blacks and whites. This is not to say that black ideologies tacitly consent to one another; on the contrary, Dawson writes that “the core concepts of black political thought have, as noted, been the object of fierce debate and conflict within the black community” (23). This fierce debate then works upon the political minds of individuals in the black counterpublic. Ideologies that have been produced by discourse between individuals in the black counterpublic have the cyclical effect of “fixing the meanings of key concepts across time and context” among the same individuals (6). Equipped with common understandings of certain concepts, such as the black counterpublic’s historical opposition to American liberalism, members of the black counterpublic use ideological counterdiscourses to develop oppositional worldviews to white American discourse. Contrary to scholars who “worry that ideologies seek to establish bonds that prevent the ‘rational’ deliberation deemed necessary for democratic processes and institutions,” in this sense Dawson argues that black ideology has “generative” power to promote greater understanding of black identity in the American public (9).

Building upon Dawson’s work to map the ideological contours of the black counterpublic, Melissa Harris-Lacewell in *Barbershops, Bibles, and BET: Everyday Talk and Black Political Thought* textures these contours with ethnographies done at Orange Grove Missionary Baptist Church in Durham, NC and Truth and Soul Barbershop in Chicago, IL. Recognizing the different ideological divisions that exist within the black counterpublic, Harris-Lacewell provides a topographical analysis of the black public sphere. Positioning her study within the theoretical model of Fraser, certain aspects of the black counterpublic match well.

---

6 Harris-Lacewell uses four of the black counterpublic ideologies Dawson identifies: Black Nationalism, Black Conservatism, Black Feminism and Liberal Integrationism (2001).
On the notion of reasonable intent to participate in a discourse for the collective, Harris-Lacewell harkens back to Dawson’s comment on black opposition to American liberalism by writing, “public opinion among blacks is not just an aggregation of individual, self-interested individuals; black opinion is connected to assessments of the welfare of the collective” (112). Harris-Lacewell explores one of these collectives in an ethnography of the Orange Grove Missionary Baptist Church of Durham, NC. Unlike most studies that view the black church as a either a space of religious social control or a space led by “an influential and political vocal minister... [with] members in full agreement with his beliefs,” Harris-Lacewell proposes an alternative study of the black church that “reveals the tensions inherent in spaces of black political dialogue, where members, despite their engagement with the church and its minister may share, reject, contest, or revise the opinions proposed in the pulpit” (39). She is interested in the grassroots beliefs of its members and how discourse between them contributes to a more complex and democratic black counterpublic. To explore the nuances of the black church as a generative space for counterdiscourse, Harris-Lacewell interviews at length eight distinct members of Orange Grove on their experiences in the church and their “views on a variety of social, political, racial, and religious questions” (44).

Through her interviews, Harris-Lacewell finds that in broad strokes, the ideological narrative of the congregation is similar to the ideology of Reverend Kennedy, the pastor at Orange Grove. She writes that “[the congregation] too recognize[s] that white racial animosity and institutionalized discrimination play a significant role in creating and perpetuating black inequality” and that the church plays an important role in generating social action to address these inequalities. In this regard, an outside observer who listened to one of Kennedy’s

---

7 Harris-Lacewell refers to this as the “opiate model,” in which “religion works as a means of social control offering African Americans a way to cope with personal and societal difficulties and undermining their willingness to actively challenge racial inequalities” (36).
politically charged sermons and the accompanying “chorus of Amens” (66) would assume that Orange Grove is simply another “bastion of traditionalism, filled with a few male leaders and largely pliant, resilient, and agreeable women followers” (39).

However, upon closer examination of the grassroots interactions with Kennedy’s ideological sermons, Harris-Lacewell writes that the congregation’s “narrative differs from Reverend Kennedy’s because they place more blame on African American individuals. Taking a harsher line on individual accountability, the congregation locates some of black America’s problems in the pathological behavior of individuals.” Some of the individuals she interviewed “referred to government and social programs as solutions to these problems [facing African Americans],” while others said that “individuals have a personal responsibility to succeed despite their obstacles.” Indeed, while there is broad consensus on structural racism in the U.S., there is significant difference in how members address such racism. On what it means to be black in America, Harris-Lacewell similarly finds substantial differentiation in views. While longer-term members define blackness as “vulnerability to social and economic racism,” newer members define it as “being part of a community that faces specific, individual problems like family ethics or family health concerns” (50).

These differences in ideologies, while important to the constitution of the black counterpublic, are also played out on the bodies of its members. The politicized space of the black church compels members to negotiate how they situate competing “visions for the future” of black America into their own lives (76). Ideologically charged messages in Reverend Kennedy’s sermons and the everyday talk in which members engage inspire a discourse that informs “what it means to be black... the relative political significance of race compared with other personal characteristics... the extent to which blacks should ‘solve their own problems’ or
look to the system for assistance… [and] the required degree of tactical separation from whites necessary for successful advancement of group interests” (46). Through discourse, each member of the congregation constructs a unique constellation of views based on where he/she fits into the contestation of ideology within the black church.

Most significant to how the contestation of ideology among members of the black church affects the black counterpublic is that such contestation is uniquely possible within the black counterpublic. Discussion over institutionalized racism and what it means to be black could not achieve the same level of nuance of differentiation if it were located in the mass discourse. As Harris-Lacewell writes, “it is these interactions [between African Americans that develop collective definitions of political interests] that help build black common sense and that give African Americans the opportunity to determine the credibility of elite authenticity claims” (249). Blackness as a politically contested claim could not exist without counterdiscourses distinct from the mass discourse. It is only within these safe and protected discursive arenas that blacks can freely engage in everyday talk.

Her ethnography of the Truth and Soul barbershop on the south side of Chicago locates another historically and spatially specific public sphere in which members are equal in status, access to information and pursuit of developing an understanding of blackness. Similar to the members of Orange Grove, visitors to Truth and Soul come because they “unanimously agree that race matters” and that “racial inequality makes black people more vulnerable to either the neglect or the malice of powerful whites.” However, the men of Truth and Soul “do not always agree on the ways that race articulates itself in the lives of individuals and communities” (181). As Harris-Lacewell writes, “barbershops are safe racial spaces, but they are ideologically contested terrain” (202). By discussing different views on the importance of race in relation to
the question of black women, the boundaries of sexual identity, class divisions, self-help or government assistance, and tactical separation from whites, "those engaging in this barbershop discourse come to understand their identity and how they are situated in the complex world around them" (202). Many controversial questions in the black counterpublic, such as how gay visitors are "silenced as agenda setters within the shop," remain unanswered (188). However, Harris-Lacewell writes that it is the "daily upkeep of their 'soul,' which becomes made and remade in their experiences in the shop" that allows for the possibility of such unanswered questions to be revisited. In other words, discourse is never final; it is through the constant practice of everyday talk that gives the black counterpublic its character.

While counterdiscourses are constantly reshaped and kept protected in the confines of the counterpublic, there are certain occasions when counterdiscourses are highly publicized. It is during these moments when black counterdiscourses are disclosed to the broader American public that hegemony of black issues in America is addressed. In this regard, Harris-Lacewell's discussion on the 2002 movie Barbershop is of particular note. "Filmed on Chicago's Southside with a cast of popular black entertainers," Barbershop portrayed a narrative of "rivalry, irreverence, learning, and hilarity" that was strikingly similar to the lived experiences and the "relevance of public spaces to the development of everyday black talk and the expression of black political heterogeneity" (251). If it were any other movie, Barbershop would be a standard comedy that starred some A-list actors. However, Barbershop was not just any other movie. Within two weeks of its premier, Barbershop was the number one movie in the U.S. and grossed $21 million its opening weekend, "a figure that is commensurate with the total gross of other, similar, contemporary African American films like Love and Basketball, Kingdom Come, and
"The Best Man" (251). The huge response it received caused "a flurry of journalistic accounts about the ways that barbershops operate as gathering places in black communities" (251).

However, not everyone in the black community agreed with the portrayal of blacks in the movie. Traditional elites led by the reverends Al Sharpton and Jesse Jackson began a public campaign against the movie for some negative comments on Martin Luther King, Jr. and Rosa Parks, a controversy that exposed the inner workings of the black counterpublic to the broader American public. As Harris-Lacewell writes, "newspapers, radio, and television reported the controversy immediately. Op-ed columns were busting, and experts weighed in on the debate... the movie, its content, and its controversy brought into stark relief the centrality of political discussion and dissent within the lives of ordinary African Americans" (252-3). The movie stirred significant controversy within the mass public and began a national discussion on the black community. It "offered a national audience a front row seat on the internal contestations in African American thought" and indeed had discursive consequences in how African Americans were portrayed in the media during a contentious 2002 Congressional election (255).

Through this movie, counterdiscourses formed in black barbershops were disclosed to the national discourse. Black concerns such as questions of blackness and structural racism, which were traditionally hedged from the mass discourse, were thrust upon Americans of all backgrounds. In line with Fraser's argument that counterdiscourses must have a recursive political effect on the mass and strong publics, Barbershop and the controversy surrounding it compelled Americans who had never considered certain concerns in the black community to begin to think about them. In this moment, major newspapers, talk radio, everyday talk and other forums of American discourse incorporated concerns of the black counterpublic. In part, hegemony was addressed.
Since Dawson and Harris-Lacewell’s texturing of Fraser’s analysis of the public sphere, critics of the public sphere have used counterpublics to deconstruct the coherence of the American public. In *The New Accountability*, Michael Mason describes how publics can form around the common harm done to its members by environmental damage. He writes that the “far-reaching transformation of material environments and organisms by industrial technologies” has affected individuals without respect to national borders (2005, 1). Mason identifies four types of environmental risks that disregard national borders: 1) border-impact risks that “affect populations or ecosystems in the border area on both sides of the political boundary”; 2) point-source transboundary risk that “involve one or several clear point sources of potential pollution and accident-related discharges threatening at least one adjoining country or region”; 3) structural/policy transboundary risks that are “diffuse pathways of harm associated with state policies or the structure of the economy”; and 4) global environmental risks that “involve human activities in any given region or country, or set of regions and countries, that register their effects on other areas through changes to globally functioning biogeochemical systems” (7).

In these situations of harm caused by foreigners who do not occupy the same public sphere, hegemony is caused by factors entirely external to the public sphere. Habermas, and in part Fraser’s original analysis of the subaltern counterpublic, assume that national borders delineate the public sphere, and that the realm of discursive possibility is thus confined to those borders. However, as Mason reminds us, a discursive system confined to national borders is inherently hegemonic because foreigners, by nature of their foreignness, cannot participate in national discourse. Mexicans who no longer receive water from the Colorado River because of extensive damming in the U.S. cannot appeal to the U.S. government or the U.S. discourse
because they are not U.S. citizens. In this regard, hegemony is perpetuated in ways that traditional counterpublics cannot counteract.

Some critics of national borders delineating public spheres have gone further than Mason to argue that in fact national publics are fictional. In his article “Aliens and Citizens: The Case for Open Borders,” Joseph H. Carens writes, “think of the differences between New York City and Waycross, Georgia, or between California and Kansas. These sorts of differences are often much greater than the differences across nation-states. Seattle has more in common with Vancouver than it does with many American communities” (1987, 266-7). In other words, national borders create fictional publics. Carens argues that in fact there is no American public—that the U.S. is simply a collection of smaller communities that has arbitrarily drawn a border around these communities. The thick social relationships that create and are reinforced by discourse in fact do not exist.

However, traditional counterpublic scholars have certain mechanisms in their arguments that already refute these criticisms. In her 2005 article “Transnationalizing the Public Sphere,” Fraser critiques scholars who take an “excessively externalist approach that invokes ideal theory to condemn social reality, as that approach sacrifices critical traction” while acknowledging the need to overcome the “mismatch of scale between Westphalian-state-based citizenship, post-Westphalian communities of fate or risk, national and transnational publics, and subglobal solidarities” (6). In other words, she grants that in a globalized era, mass publics must adapt to the needs of publics united across national borders. Nevertheless, she affirms that theoretical approaches such as Carens overanalyze the state of the American public without acknowledging empirical realities of the connectivity of its members.
Conclusion

In his New York Times Bestseller What’s the Matter with Kansas?: How Conservatives Won the Heart of America, Thomas Frank writes of the nightmare scenario that has befallen Kansas – that Republicans have tricked the public into voting for economic policies that are against their interests. He writes that they did this by distorting information markets in the same way critics of heuristics and the miracle of aggregation describe; rather than earnestly explain what their true policies are, conservative candidates create an illusionary dichotomy between a visibly appealing quality and a hidden unappealing quality of their platform. As Frank writes, “leaders of the backlash may talk Christ, but they walk corporate... vote to stop abortion; receive a rollback in capital gains taxes. Vote to make our country strong again; receive deindustrialization.” Frank continues that this paradox of winning on cultural values has created “a political trap so devastating to the interests of Middle America that even the most diabolical of string-pullers would have had trouble dreaming it up” (6-7). In other words, this is the story of a perfectly reasonable public that has been tricked in the worst way into voting against their true interests.

Frank’s view on the state of the American public is a recurring theme in the public opinion and public sphere literature. Bartels warns that heuristics and aggregation can be manipulated to lead voters astray. Habermas argues that the public sphere no longer exists because of the incorporation of greed and private spheres into the media. However, if critics charge that publics are led astray and manipulated by the media and elites, to what extent do counterdiscursive practices liberate the alleged manipulated publics such that rational thought is produced? Once liberated, how do these counterpublics use counterdiscourses in the mass and strong publics? Following the tradition of scholars who have tested Fraser’s framework of a
public sphere against a patchwork of counterpublics, the following sections of this paper will test and analyze the potential for counterdiscursive practices to constitute a rational public.
Research Design

To return to the original question posed in the literature review – is the American public rational? – it is now clear that we have a theoretical framework with which to judge the rationality of the American public. When individuals perceive hegemony in the mass discourse, they contract into counterpublics to produce counterdiscourses that address opposition to hegemony. Counterdiscourses range from physically carving out political space for speech, as feminists did when women were barred from public forums, to discussing topics that are missing or rejected from the mass public discourse, as African Americans did when affirmative action was not discussed in the broader public. Counterdiscourses may seem unsavory or plainly irrational to the mass public, but it is not at this point in the process of rational discourse where counterdiscourses are to be judged by the mass public; counterdiscourses are by definition secluded and protected from hegemony in the mass public. Until members of the counterpublic deem counterdiscourses appropriate to publicize, they are protected as such. Once these counterdiscourses are developed, they are disclosed to the mass discourse, whereby they are judged by the mass public. Through the process of discursive recourse, in which counterdiscourses interact with the mass discourse in public forums, counterdiscourses are exposed and picked apart by the mass public. Sometimes, as was the case with affirmative action, practices affirmed in the counterdiscourse are adopted into the mass discourse. Other times, as was the case with Black Nationalism, aspects of the counterdiscourse are rejected by the mass public and returned to the counterpublic for rearticulation or outright. As scholars have pointed out, if the American public is presented with a variety of opinions, it tends to choose the more reasonable option (Page & Shapiro 1992; Delli Carpini & Keeter 1996).
Scholars of Habermas’s public sphere have developed a new concept of democracy in which discourse is central. In particular, Fraser has expanded the theoretical notion of the bourgeois public sphere to include marginalized counterpublics, both through overt and subtextual practices, and publics that permeate national boarders (1992; 2005; 2008). Many other scholars have located counterpublics among the working class, women, the environmentally affected, African Americans, and gays (Gamson 1992; Benhabib 1992; Mason 2005; Harris-Lacewell 2006; Wallace 2009). However, while the work of public sphere scholars has given tremendous insight into the ethnographic contours of weak publics, less has been done to show how these counterpublics contribute to a rational mass public discourse. Fraser may have identified the democratic importance of slippage between the strong and weak publics, but this slippage has not been explored at great length. As Fraser writes in “Transnationalizing the Public Sphere”:

Numerous scholars in cultural studies are ingeniously mapping the contours of [discursive] arenas and the flows of images and signs in and through them... [However] the concept of the public sphere was developed not simply to understand empirical communication flows but to contribute to a normative political theory of democracy... A public sphere is supposed to correlate with a sovereign power, to which its communications are ultimately addressed. Together, these two ideas – the validity of public opinion and citizen empowerment vis-à-vis the state – are essential to the concept of the public sphere in democratic theory. Without them, the concept loses its critical force and its political point (2005, 1).

Thus, there is a gap in the public sphere literature – the counterpublic has become a frequent subject of empirical study, but its potential as a democratic and rationalizing force among the broader public has not yet been realized.

While several scholars provide us with a rich and textured understanding of certain counterpublics, our understanding of the discursive recourse counterpublics have on the mass public is vague. To begin to understand how counterpublics have democratic and rational
significance in the mass public, further empirical work must be done to texture this discursive recourse, all along continuing the work of “mapping the contours of [discursive] arenas and the flows of images and signs in and through them” (Fraser 2005).

Hypothesis Formulation

Hegemony can exist in the mass and strong publics. When it does, hedged individuals may contract into counterpublics, which are distinct and protective discursive spaces from the mass public. By contracting into groups under certain conditions conducive to Habermas’s ideal speech situation, members form a counterpublic sphere in which the most rational argument (within the context of the counterpublic) wins. Rational arguments thus produced are then brought back to the mass and strong publics. This discursive recourse contributes to political change that is aligned with rational opinion.
Definition of Concepts

1. Hegemony: Geoff Eley links hegemony in the public sphere with Antonio Gramsci's conception of the hegemony in developed capitalist societies:

   an order in which a certain way of life and thought is dominant, in which one concept of reality is diffused throughout society in all its institutional and private manifestations, informing with its spirit all taste, morality, customs, religious and political principles, and all social relations, particularly in their intellectual and moral connotation" (1992, 322).

Eley follows Gramsci’s distinction between hegemony and ideological manipulation by the ruling class, writing that:

hegemony comprises ‘not only the conscious system of ideas and beliefs [i.e., ‘ideology’ in a commonly accepted sense] but the whole lived social process as practically organized by specific dominant meanings and values,’ ‘a sense of reality for most people in the society, a sense of absolute because experienced reality beyond which it is very difficult for most members of the society to move, in most areas of their lives’ (322).

Hegemony is thus a saturation of political, economic, religious or social norms to the point that these norms dominate the discourse.

2. (Subaltern) Counterpublic: Coined by Fraser, counterpublics are “parallel discursive arenas [to a hegemonic mass discourse] where members of subordinated social groups invent and circulate counterdiscourses to formulate oppositional interpretations of their identities, interests, and needs” (1992, 123). Counterpublics serve two functions which allow them to “offset, although not wholly to eradicate, the unjust participatory privileges enjoyed by members of dominant social groups in stratified societies.” Fraser writes, “On the one hand, they function as spaces of withdrawal and regroupment; on the other hand, they also function as bases and training grounds for agitational activities directed toward wider publics” (124). However, counterpublics do not only consist of subaltern groups; there is also a more general category of “weak publics,” or “publics whose deliberative practices consist exclusively in opinion formation and does not also encompass decision making” (134). An example of this
would be Habermas's historical account of the bourgeoisie, which by nature of their proximity to the ruling class were not subaltern.

3. **Strong Public**: In contrast with weak publics, strong publics are publics “whose discourse encompasses both opinion formation and decision making” (134). An example of this would be the U.S. Congress, because it is a deliberative body that produces law.

4. **Mass Public**: The mass public is the public in its entirety. Though Habermas traditionally understands mass publics to be delineated by Westphalian national borders, other scholars have demonstrated that membership in the mass public often cuts across national borders (i.e. foreign firms running campaign advertisements)

5. **Contract**: On the founding of subaltern counterpublics, Fraser writes that members of subordinated social groups “constitute” alternative publics (123). While the act of constituting a public is not detailed in Fraser’s analysis of the counterpublic, the notion that members constitute themselves as such presumes contract. Of course, because ideology within the public sphere is “contested terrain,” a more inclusive contract that maintains the protective boundaries of the counterpublic is in order (Harris-Lacewell 2006, 202).

6. **Public Sphere Discourse**: Following the scholarly tradition of criticizing the structural limitations of Habermas’s bourgeois public sphere while borrowing the discursive mechanisms that allow for rational discourse, I take ideal discourse in the public sphere to be the set of practices and conditions Habermas defines as the ideal speech situation: “all participants attempt to seek the truth; do not behave strategically; and accept a norm of equality” (Sunstein 2007, 144-45). Regarding the “norm of equality,” as per scholars’ critique of the often exclusionary character of norms of equality (Fraser 1992; Dawson 2001; Harris-Lacewell 2006), I understand this final component of ideal speech situation to mean
the active pursuit of equality. By this I refer to Fraser’s remark that interlocutors in a public sphere must “unbracket inequalities in the sense of explicitly thematizing them” (127). In other words, interlocutors address practices that perpetuate inequalities by being attentive to them and disclosing them when they are present.

7. **Discursive Recourse:** I use this term to mean the process by which counterpublics disclose counterdiscourses developed within the counterpublic to the mass or strong public. Discursive recourse is the “vehicle for mobilizing public opinion as a political force. Thus, a public-sphere is supposed to correlate with a sovereign power, to which its communications are ultimately addressed” (Fraser 2005, 1). For discursive recourse to function properly, these counterdiscourses must be received by the mass or strong public and then judged through a broader discourse.

8. **Rational:** I assume Habermas’s procedural approach to rationality:

Habermas’s belief in rationality does not imply a dogmatic faith in any established set of substantial knowledge. On the contrary, all knowledge is in principle fallible and conclusions must therefore be regarded as revisable. Habermas’s perspective rather implies a *procedural view of rationality*, where it is not our conclusions but the manner in which we arrive at them which are permanent and in a way above criticism. The procedure involves maintaining a form of openness around the conclusions; they can always be challenged, criticized and tried again. What is rational, then, is that position or claim which is supported by the weightiest arguments. A procedural approach to rationality does not guarantee that we will arrive at the right answers in all cases, but it guarantees that we can continuously test the answers again if there is reason to doubt their correctness (Eriksen & Weigård 2004, 4)

**Case Selection**

To begin the project of analyzing how counterpublics contribute to a rational American public by identifying hegemony in the mass or strong public spheres, initiating counterdiscourses, and discursively producing recourse to the mass public, we must empirically test the limits of this normative theory. Regarding such testing, no better case study comes to mind than the Tea Party movement, which has been widely criticized for being irrational and
damaging to a rational public. If the Tea Party movement does indeed contribute to a rational mass and strong public discourse, than broad analytical space will be opened up to studying more easily identified rational counterpublics.

To test my hypothesis, I will analyze the Tea Party movement as a whole, while texturing this analysis with ethnographic/discourse studies of the Delco Patriots and We Surround Them. These groups were chosen for several key differences that exist in the broader Tea Party movement. In terms of location, whereas the former is located in a suburban setting twenty minutes outside of Philadelphia, the latter is located in a rural setting in north-central Maryland. In terms of timing in the movement, whereas We Surround Them began when Glenn Beck began the 9.12 Project (March 2009), the Delco Patriots entered the movement later in the year (September 2009). They were also chosen because they represent different affiliations within the Tea Party movement; whereas the We Surround Them is affiliated with Glenn Beck’s 9.12 Project, the Delco Patriots is loosely affiliated with the Tea Party Patriots.

Using Nancy Fraser’s framework of a federated “nexus” of public spheres (1992; 2005; 2008), I will test whether the Tea Party follows the normative ideals for which she argues. Does the Tea Party movement form out of opposition to hegemony in the mass public? Do discursive practices follow Habermas’s ideal speech situation? Do counterdiscourses have recourse in the mass public sphere? These questions can be answered by critically examining the historical, structural and political elements of the Tea Party movement.

**Measurement of Variables**

Variables are measured using two types of sources: original empirical research and secondary research from the news media. My original empirical work is done with the Delco
Patriots and We Surround Them and consists of discussion groups, group-wide surveys, and written documents provided by the group.

In both chapters, I conduct discussion groups with 6-12 individuals representing the full spectrum of views in the particular Tea Party chapter. The spectrum is confirmed through discussion with the leader of the Tea Party chapter and comparisons with surveys of political views within the entire chapter. Discussion groups take place during the group's monthly meeting at a point when members typically converse with one another (i.e. before, intermission or after). During discussion, I prompt participants with questions pertaining to their involvement in the group. Each issue raised in the discussion is pursued until saturation, or the point at which participants have no more to say on the topic. Through engaging a well-represented sampling of Tea Partiers in an extensive discussion group, perceptions of hegemony in the mass public and the nature of counterdiscourses can be measured. Hegemony is descriptively present or not based on whether participants make claims upon an understanding that hegemony exists in the mass public. In terms of the development of counterdiscourses, it is also in discussion groups where I observe if Habermas's ideal speech situation is practiced in common discourse, how members negotiate differences in ideology (if there are differences), if hegemony is replicated in the counterpublic and what the substance of counterdiscourses is.

Though discourse rarely takes place during meetings, I examine it when it takes place (i.e. during Q&A sessions). My observations during meetings are consistent with my observations during discussion groups; I test the rationality of the Tea Party counterdiscourse by mapping Habermas’s mechanisms of proper discourse onto actual discourse. Is the ideal speech situation practiced? Are claims based on an understanding of hegemony in the mass public? Is there contestation of ideology, or is hegemony replicated in the counterpublic?
Another important source for measuring discourse is the online discussion board on the chapter’s Meetup.com website. Given the increasing use of online space as a site of discourse, discussion boards have discursive potential. Nevertheless, their usefulness in measuring discourse within the entire chapter or the entire counterpublic is conditional on how many people use it, which is tested for in question three of the survey below.

In addition to discussion groups and discussion boards, I also conduct chapter-wide surveys with both groups. I randomly distribute 100 surveys to the members before the meeting begins and reiterate the instructions listed at the top of the survey. Members are then asked to return the surveys to me at the end of the meeting. Surveys are intended to substantiate observations made during discussion groups, gather basic data on the chapter’s background and structure and measure counterdiscourses.

Before analyzing if counterdiscourses shape the views of counterpublic members, it is first important to test if there is statistical difference between new and older members. I therefore run a t-test using responses from questions 2, 4 and 5, which indicate the respondent’s political beliefs, amount of discussion with other people and timeframe of membership respectively. A t-test measures the degree to
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8 I choose 100 because both the Delco Patriots and We Surround Them typically have around 100 members attend each meeting.
which the means of two variables are statistically different. Here the variables tested are the responses of questions 2 and 4 (political beliefs and sources of information) against the responses of question 5. If my hypothesis is correct, then the results of this test should indicate opinions on issues narrow the longer one is a member.

Based on question three, the survey provides information on how often members use discussion boards to test if online spaces can be sites for discourse. Based on question four, the survey measures if hegemony is replicated in the counterpublic, which is a concern often cited by critics of the Tea Party movement. If everyone in the group lists only Glenn Beck as a source of information, then the Tea Party as a rational site of discourse can be put into question, since in that scenario there would be no differentiation of information or argument.\(^9\)

Written materials provided by the chapter are also important sources of data with which variables are measured, particularly how prospective members contract. Given that most Tea Party chapters have tangible contracts, either on Meetup.com or in paper at the entrance of meetings, I will use these contracts as a means to measure contracting in the movement. With attention to the wording of contracts, I test how contracting controls for prospective members who are hedged from the mass public and the extent to which contracting leaves open the possibility for discourse by examining the content of contracts.

In addition to my personal empirical research, I also refer to the four major surveys that have been done on the Tea Party movement: The New York Times/CBS, Gallup, CNN and Quinnipiac. Polls vary on whether they measure supporters or activists; while the Times/CBS and Gallup polls measure respondents who “support” the movement, the CNN and Quinnipiac polls measure respondents who consider themselves “activists” or a “part” of the movement. Granted the different populations that polls study, polling is used to provide basic data on the national
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\(^9\) Full information about the procedure of t-tests can be located in “Appendix C: Survey and T-Tests.”
movement’s background and structure. In addition, polling data on how Tea Party views interact with the general population’s views is used to measure the degree of discursive recourse. If my hypothesis is correct, there should be some correlation between Tea Party views (i.e. emphasis on the Constitution) and change in mass public opinion over the timeframe of the Tea Party’s existence.

In part because national polling data on the Tea Party movement is limited, I also make use of reporting from the news media to texture my analysis of discursive recourse. More broadly, while discursive recourse can be measured in part through polling, the language that mass media uses to frame and substantiate public debates is critical to understanding how counterpublics recursively affect the mass public through discourse. I look at broad samples of the news media’s reporting on issues of concern to the Tea Party, and observe if Tea Party counterdiscourses have any influence on the framing and/or substance of debates. Have issues relating to the 10th amendment or government spending received more attention in the news media since the start of the Tea Party movement?

Discursive recourse also connotes influence on the strong public. In that regard, I also turn to reporting from the news media to analyze if public officials aligning their votes and positions with Tea Party opinion and if this change has been caused by increased mobilization from the Tea Party.

Accuracy of Measurements

Hegemony can be reliably measured without controls because its presence or absence is clearly marked in the discourse and initial contract (i.e. “I came to this meeting because everyone thinks I’m crazy to talk about 10th amendment issues). Whether there is a legitimate claim to hegemony must be controlled by analyzing a broad range of views in the news media that either
confirm, refute or complicate hegemony in their reporting (i.e. how often does reporting consider 10th amendment issues). To my knowledge, there are no empirical studies that measure hegemony of the Tea Party movement in the mass or strong publics. Future study can shed more light on valid claims to hegemony. In terms of validity, discourse is indeed the only way to measure understanding of hegemony in the counterpublic, because it is through this web of discourse that the counterpublic exists.

Membership in the Tea Party movement is most often managed through Meetup.com, where there is an explicit contract for joining. Contractual statements by members are then posted on the Meetup.com website, which indicates their reasons for joining. These contracts are reliable in terms of the broad section of groups they record and valid in terms of their explicit nature as contracts.

To control for proportionality between smaller focus groups and the chapter as a whole, I work with the leaders of each chapter to construct focus groups as a fair representation of the group. To confirm fair representation, I use data collected from surveys distributed to the entire group that measure political views. Because focus groups are fair representations of the entire chapter, measurements of discourse in particular focus groups are reliable within the chapter. They are valid because 1) discourse is explicitly thematized and constructed in these groups and 2) they take place during points in the meeting where discussion between members typically takes place. I control for reliable analysis of discourse in the movement as a whole by using a broad range of views in the news media.

I control for reliability in measuring discursive recourse by using a broad range of views in the news media and polling on the mass public’s views on the Tea Party movement.
It is important to keep in mind that my studies only take place with two groups at a single time point. Due to time constraints, I could not do repeated surveys or discussion groups. Further empirical work could expand the time frame and the number of participants in this study. Nevertheless, by triangulating my original empirical work into the broader context of the movement as measured by national polls and reporting from the news media, it should be clear whether my research has been with atypical chapters or if it fits the norm of the movement.

In terms of discursive recourse, more definitive research could be done regarding the frequency with which legislative hearings on Tea Party issues are held, how often legislators refer to Tea Party concerns in their public statements, and whether more legislation has been introduced to address Tea Party concerns. Despite the potential expansion of empirical research in this regard, reporting from the news media of legislators appealing to or arguing against Tea Party concerns is sufficient enough to paint with broad strokes a picture of how the Tea Party discursively enacts recourse on the strong public.
Tea Party Background

If we are to think of the Tea Party as a counterpublic, it is first necessary to understand its history. As a new phenomenon, the Tea Party movement has not been the subject of any significant academic analysis to date. Nevertheless, there is no shortage of reporting from the news media, and it is from this reporting in addition to information provided by the Tea Party movement that I will piece together a more comprehensive understanding of the Tea Party public. After outlining this history, I then explore how a convergence of support from conservative media and activist groups alongside political changes after the 2008 elections and the 2008 recession created a unique opportunity for the Tea Party counterpublic to form.

A Brief History

In terms of the catalyst who ignited the Tea Party movement, almost all reporting in the news media points to CNBC On-Air Editor, former futures trader and former Drexel Burnham Lambert vice-president Rick Santelli's “rant of the year” (Hirsh & Gross 2/8/10; McGrath 2/1/10, 43; Von Drehle 2/18/10; Zernike 2/28/10). On a live February 19, 2009 CNBC broadcast from the Chicago Stock Exchange, Santelli bemoaned the government of passing the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009, particularly sections of the act that address underwater mortgages. Santelli explains that the Recovery Act only “rewards bad behavior” by encouraging Americans to spend tax rebates rather than save money and pay off their mortgage. In addition to criticizing the substance of the Recovery Act, Santelli chided President Obama for ignoring the American public by rhetorically asking, “President Obama, are you listening” (Rick Santelli and the “Rant of the Year” 2/19/09, 1:20)? Most notably with regard to the creation of the Tea Party movement, Santelli invoked the term “Tea Party” in the context of a political movement for the first time by calling for a Chicago Tea Party in July 2009. Santelli invited “all you capitalists
who want to show up to Lake Michigan... to dump in some derivative securities,” alluding to the Boston Tea Party of 1773, in which American colonists dumped tea into the Boston Harbor in protest of a 25% tax on tea without sufficient political representation (2:11).

Video recording of Santelli’s rant quickly became a YouTube (over 1 million views) and internet sensation. Within hours of the initial broadcast, Santelli launched a website that institutionalized his remarks: OfficialChicagoTeaParty.com. New Yorker contributor Ben McGrath reports that within a week, “dozens of small protests were occurring simultaneously around the country” (2/1/10, 43). Santelli’s video and message spread like wildfire.

Along with Santelli, Seattle activist and blogger Keli Carender is another important founding figure of the Tea Party movement. In fact, Carender came “a week ahead of Santelli in voicing her dissent” of increased government spending. Though Carender is a powerful activist able to “summon protesters on short notice,” her email list is only 1,500 out of the hundreds of thousands of active Tea Party members across the country (2/1/10, 43). In contrast with major voices in the Tea Party movement, such as Glenn Beck, Sarah Palin and Rush Limbaugh, Carender has become a powerful symbol because of her unique liberal appearance. In a February 28, 2010 New York Times article profiling Carender’s rise to prominence, Kate Zernike paints a picture of Carender that doesn’t fit with the typical image of a Tea Party member: she “has a pierced nose, performs improve on weekends and lives here in a neighborhood with more Mexican grocers than coffeehouses.” This image of Carender as a “not the stereotypical Tea Partier” has become ubiquitous in all political circles (Zernike 2/28/10; Kaste 2/2/10; Fields 2/10/10). In fact, not only does Carender look like a stereotypical liberal, she is “the daughter of Democrats who became disaffected in the Clinton years” (2/28/10). As one admirer put it, Carender is just a “random woman... from Seattle, of all places” (McGrath 2/1/10, 43).
These two activists are significant to the movement, but not because of their organizational abilities. Indeed, with a daily audience of up to three million people who are overwhelmingly against the policies of President Obama, it was only a matter of time that Beck, Fox News and other powerful conservative voices would tap into the deep socioeconomic anxieties caused by the recession. Instead, these activists are significant because of the narrative they represent; unlike the mainstream cohort of conservative elites – the Ailes, Limbaughs and Becks – Santelli and Carender were of a different breed. Santelli’s affiliation with NBC News and Carender’s rebel looks waxed liberal. It is only fitting that the two figures who are attributed with founding the movement were rebel outsiders.

On April 15, 2009, the date when federal taxes returns are due, Tea Party protests took place around the country, in which protestors demonstrated against high taxes. By summer, “scores at local Tea Party gatherings turned to hundreds, and then thousands, collecting along the way footloose Ron Paul supporters, goldbugs, evangelicals, Atlas Schruggers, militiamen, strict Constitutionalists, swine-flu skeptics, scattered 9/11 “truthers,” neo “Birchers,” and, of course “birthers” – those who remained convinced that the President was a Muslim double agent born in Kenya” (McGrath 2/1/10, 43). In addition to the diversity of members in the movement Time contributor David Von Drehle reported on the sprawling use of space by local groups: “Tea Party meetings are being convened in restaurants and living rooms and libraries and office buildings – and online” (2/18/10). With people pouring into the movement, Congress’s August Recess, during which members return to their districts and states to speak with constituents, provided an opportunity to exercise the Tea Party’s newfound voice. CNN, MSNBC and Fox News Channel provided day-long coverage of town hall meetings across the country, in which Tea Party members disrupted and protested the gatherings. In some instances, town hall protests took on a
more insidious nature. On July 28, 2009 Freshman Congressman Frank Kratovil (D-MD-1) came to a town hall meeting to find his effigy hung by a noose. During the same month, protesters tarred and feathered an effigy of Congressman Alan Boyd (D-FA-2) (Thrush 6/28/10). Violent imagery comparing President Obama to Adolf Hitler and Joseph Stalin became commonplace at Tea Party protests.

Despite these criticisms, and in part because of them, the Tea Party continued to grow into the fall and winter. On September 12, 2009, the 9.12 Project organized a rally on the Mall in Washington, D.C. that 60 thousand (ABC) to two million people attended (Fox News Channel). Though these numbers are of significant controversy, many news outlets consider there to have been hundreds of thousands of people in attendance (McGrath 2/1/10, 43; Barstow 2/16/10; Von Drehle 2/18/10). Two months later, hundreds of thousands more arrived at the Capitol to protest an upcoming vote on health care reform legislation. By December, a Wall Street Journal/NBC News poll reported that “41% of respondents said they had a very or somewhat favorable view of the Tea Party movement, while 24% said they had a somewhat or very negative view of the group.” This is in contrast with the Democratic Party, which had a 35% positive/45% negative rating and the Republican Party, which had a 28% positive/43% negative rating (Davis 1/13/10). On a three-way Generic Ballot test, the December 9 Rasmussen Reports national telephone survey found that “Democrats [attract] 36% of the vote. The Tea Party candidate picks up 23%, and Republicans finish third at 18%.” That number stayed steady at 21% in a similar March 15 Rasmussen Reports poll.

In light of these numbers and electoral gains in New Jersey, Virginia and Massachusetts, the Tea Party movement in 2010 has shifted gears to become heavily active in political campaigns for state and national elections. Jay Newton-Small of Time reported that on February
5, 2010 “the organizers of the National Tea Party Convention announced that they will be forming a 501(c)4 corporation and related political action committee to raise money to support 15-20 candidates for Congress or the Senate in the 2010 elections” (2/5/10). At the February National Tea Party Convention in Nashville, Tennessee Newton-Small similarly reported that many sessions were “overtly political” and were led by candidates and current lawmakers (2/5/10). Other types of political activity range from inviting candidates to speak at local meetings to actively vetting candidates through interviews to ensure ideological consistency with the Tea Party movement (Carey, Stoddard and Morgan 3/18/10).

Such huge numbers of protesters begs the question: how did the movement grow so rapidly? In fact, a convergence of four factors helped spur what became one of the largest political forces in the U.S. in 2009: media support, organizational support, economic turmoil and heavy political losses in the strong and mass publics

Media Support

Despite efforts to portray itself as a highly disorganized movement begun by outsiders, the Tea Party is in fact to a large degree bound to a tightly knight web of conservative programs on Fox News Channel. The April 12, 2010 New York Times/CBS poll found that 63% of Tea Party supporters watch Fox News Channel most for information about politics and current events compared to ABS, CBS, NBC, CNN and MSNBC.

Indeed, an entire body of literature has formed in recent years on the rise of conservative media and political elites, often criticizing the group for manipulating and misleading large sections of the American public (Frank 2004; Jamieson & Cappella 2008; Phillips-Fein 2009; Schneider 2009). In Echo Chamber: Rush Limbaugh and the Conservative Media Establishment, Jamieson and Cappella describe the rise of Rush Limbaugh, the Wall Street Journal editorial
page and Fox News. With the introduction of satellites to radio technology that provided greater audio quality for speech, talk radio “emerged in force in the United States in the 1990s” (44). Taking advantage of the new opportunity to talk politics in a burgeoning media market, Limbaugh began his radio show in 1988. By 2004, he reached an estimated 13.5 to 20 million listeners (46). While Limbaugh made a name for himself in radio, Fox News channel began its 24-hour television news service in 1996. When Roger Ailes became chief executive and chairman of the channel, he sought to “transplant some of the important characteristics of talk radio to cable” by seeking out a conservative audience “with content more hospitable to right-of-center views than mainstream media” (47). The results were a “meteoric” rise in the ratings, attracting 1.67 million viewers in primetime in 2004, compared to CNN, MSNBC and CNBC’s combined viewership of 1 million (48).

Jamieson and Cappella propose that the close relationship between Limbaugh, the Wall Street Journal editorial page and Fox News “insulate[s] their audiences from persuasion by Democrats by offering opinion and evidence that makes Democratic views seem alien and unpalatable” (xiii). Using survey data from listeners of Limbaugh’s radio program, Jamieson and Cappella find that along with a growing audience, the individuals within the audience who “once paid more attention to mainstream broadcast and cable news... [are] now less likely to turn to such sources, and more likely to turn to... Fox News” (xiii). This is not to say that audiences ignore mass media; survey data suggests that instead listeners “take from the mainstream (as it is generally termed) that which is compatible with their conservative ideology” (xiii). The implication of a “mass-audience, ideologically coherent, conservative media” is its influence as “an important venue for reinforcing the tenants and values of Reagan conservatism” (4).
Recent scholarship has named this concept of reinforcing the ideological views of a media’s audience the “echo chamber.” Jamieson and Cappella explain the feedback loop echo chamber as an informal (and sometimes formal) connection between conservative media and conservative public officials, in which conservative media “lay down assumptions about the character and temperament of the presumptive Democratic nominee on which the Republican candidates can build” (19). Though they point out that the Fox News viewers and Limbaugh listeners are already prone to vote Republican (in 2004 Fox viewers were by median age 49, 85% white, 46.6% weekly churchgoers and 38.6% from the South), Jamieson and Capella argue that Fox News programs reinforce and augment conservative views by regularly using frames that misrepresent or omit Democratic arguments. In addition, Jamieson and Capella find that the programs are more likely to report conservative opinions in greater detail and in with a more positive spin. The “protective shelter” of Fox News has tangible political implications as well; Jamieson and Capella note that programs are used to vet conservative candidates for office (105) and mobilize voters come Election Day (126).

In fact, while it is often unclear the extent to which conservative media operate in concert with Republican Party operatives (McPherson 2008; Phillips-Fein 2009), mainstream members of the conservative media are thickly interconnected. On Limbaugh, Ailes and The Wall Street Journal Editorial Board, Jamieson and Capella make clear the extensive connections between the three:

Fox chief executive and chairman Roger Ailes produced Limbaugh’s short-lived television program. Former Fox analyst John Fund helped author Limbaugh’s best seller The Way Things Ought to Be, has served on the Journal’s editorial board, and writes the weekly ‘Political Diary’ for WSJ.com. Before signing on as press secretary to President George W. Bush, Tony Snow both was featured on Fox and subbed for Limbaugh while Limbaugh was in rehab for addiction to narcotic pain killers. Both Limbaugh and Ailes have written opinion pieces for the Journal (43).
Though they do not operate formally in concert, their “shared commitment to Reagan conservatism, a common ideological ancestry, and a network of related kin” bring the three together in such a way that a broad echo chamber is created. Sometimes this echoing is literal, such as when Limbaugh reads excerpts from The Wall Street Journal editorial page or when Limbaugh defended Ailes from sending private communications to President Bush (76). However, just as often these media outlets provide a “bounded, enclosed media space” because listeners frequently return to them in order to confirm preexisting views (75). In this way, listeners’ views are “amplified” and “insulated from rebuttal” (76).

At this point, the literature has not incorporated Glenn Beck into the Fox News narrative. However, given the preliminary reviews of Washington Post columnist Dana Milbank’s upcoming book Tears of a Clown: Glenn Beck and the Tea Bagging of America, one can expect to find even more accentuated criticism of the echo chamber effect. Now known as one of the major voices in the Tea Party movement, Beck began his career in the media as a disk jokey performing comedy routine. However, in an interview with New York Times columnists Ben Stelter and Bill Carter, Beck explains that “the times are so serious now that I find myself sometimes being the guy I don’t want to be — the guy saying things that are sometimes pretty scary, but nobody else is willing to say them” (3/30/09). Worried about the direction of the country, Beck joined CNN’s Headline News in 2006. However, in part because his show was taped, “denying viewers some of the what-will-he-say-next quality of his live program,” (Stelter & Carter 3/30/09), in part because the country had not yet faced the financial crisis, and in part because CNN didn’t attract the typical Beck viewer, Beck wouldn’t speak to a significant audience until he moved to the Fox News Channel in January 2009.
Beck situated the content of his new show into the growing concerns of the Tea Party movement. As David Von Drehle described it, Beck is “a gifted entrepreneur of angst in a white-hot market” (9/17/10). Like conservative commentators before him, Beck speaks to an audience that widely considers his program the source for news. In addition to the 63% of Tea Party supporters who get most of their political information from Fox news, the April 12, 2010 New York Times/CBS poll found that 53% of Tea Party supporters believed shows hosted by people like Glenn Beck were uniquely news shows. An additional 11% believed they were a combination of news and entertainment. However, unlike Rush Limbaugh who “found his place as the triumphant champion of the Age of Reagan” and “Macho Sean Hannity [with] the cocky vibe of the early Bush years,” Beck has built his reputation on fear. As he often says on his show, “I’m afraid. You should be afraid too” (9/17/09).

As a former disk jockey and a “gifted storyteller with a knack for stitching seemingly unrelated data points into possible conspiracies,” Beck’s bombastic language has attracted a large audience. By March 2009, two months after he started his show on Fox News, Beck’s show drew about 2.3 million viewers, “more than any other cable news host except Bill O’Reilly or Sean Hannity” and “despite being on at 5 p.m., a slow shift for cable news” (Stelter & Carter 3/30/09). By August, when Beck’s unsavory comments calling President Obama “a guy... who has a deep-seated hatred for white people, or the white culture” (Franklin 11/23/09) caused several advertisers to boycott Beck’s show, average viewership spiked to 3 million per show (Gold 8/27/09). In similar ways that Fox News “either produces [a polarized view of political phenomena] directly... or draws in audiences and reinforces their dispositions” (2008, xiv), Beck’s program does interesting work merging these two actions with his audience. When
introducing a new topic to his viewers, Beck often leaves the viewer with more questions than answers and makes implications that he revisits in later episodes.

For example, on his September 18, 2009 show, Beck introduces his viewers to Richard Cloward and Francis Fox Piven as social progressives who are at “the roots of the tree of radicalism and revolution.” He briefly explains Cloward and Piven’s strategy to enroll millions of citizens who are eligible for welfare onto the welfare rolls in an effort to strain the welfare system such that the government would have to provide more services for the poor. Similar to other “slow news days” such as an episode when Beck “feared that the Rockefeller family installed communist and fascist symbols in the public artwork of Rockefeller Center” (Von Drehle 9/17/09), it seemed as though Beck’s reference to Cloward and Piven was filler for a slow news period. However, in the months that followed, Beck made repeated references to his September 18 show in order to make broader points about Cloward and Piven’s critical role in establishing the progressive movement and contributing to the economic downfall of 2008. On his January 5, 2010 show, Beck uses video recording from the September 18 show to claim that “this isn’t some conspiracy theory we’re throwing out here.” The use of previous footage as if it were a source independent from Beck’s show gives this comment an air of authenticity, despite the fact that he’s only citing himself. Though the scholarship has yet to situate Beck in the conservative media, given his popular show on Fox News Channel and close relationship with Roger Ailes (Stelter & Carter 3/30/09), it is clear that he fits into the group well.

Organizational Support

Though his show on Headline News always had a libertarian bent (Jamieson & Cappella 2008, 43), it was only once he moved to Fox News Channel that Beck began to blur the line
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10 Jamieson and Capella briefly mention Beck as an increasingly popular conservative host on Headline News (43)
between conservative commentator and Tea Party activist. On March 13, 2009, Beck announced the 9.12 Project, the organizational arm of his show that provided an online forum to advertise face-to-face meetings between individuals who followed his guiding values and principles. The organization of one online space on which 9.12 chapters could advertise meetings and events was helpful for fledgling groups to attract members, but it was particularly helpful because of the publicity Beck provided. After his announcement of the 9.12 Project, Beck regularly encouraged viewers of his program to visit the website and get involved in a local 9.12 chapter. Several shows featured webcasts of Tea Party chapters, in which members have a chance to speak with Beck directly. 

Given the popularity of his show and its active involvement in providing organizational and publicity support to local Tea Party chapters, it was no surprise that the announcement of the 9.12 Project coincided with a burgeoning Tea Party movement. Throughout 2009 and into 2010, 9.12 and We Surround Them groups⁠¹¹ around the country organized group viewings of his show, monthly meetings between members and frequent public demonstrations.

However, even before the 9.12 Project traditional conservative and libertarian advocacy groups have been involved in organizing, fundraising and providing information for local Tea Party chapters. The two major groups that are most often credited for their organizational support are Americans for Prosperity (AFP) and FreedomWorks. The two groups are reported to have “nurtured the Tea Party movement in its early days, offering training and logistical support” (Von Drehle 2/18/10). As mainstream libertarian advocacy groups based in Washington, D.C. (FreedomWorks is run by former House majority leader Richard Armey), AFP and FreedomWorks were well situated to help the fledgling movement. McGrath notes that employees at FreedomWorks “provide logistical support and tactical know-how, like the dreaded

¹¹ “We surround them” is another term Beck often uses on his show. Who he refers to by these pronouns is vague; it is most often used in the phrase, “they don’t surround us. We surround them.”
community organizers mocked by Rudy Giuliani, to a network of some four hundred activists scattered around the country" (2/1/10, 47). In many cases, AFP and FreedomWorks "funneled funds" to groups so they could rent out rooms in which to meet, advertise and organize trips to events like the march on 9/12/09 (Stone 8/20/09).

Despite their known influence in the Tea Party movement, not much is known about some of the two group’s organizational tactics because they often deny overt association with the movement. Much of this has to do with the fact that in many cases there is fear that Tea Party groups would be "hijacked" the GOP or conservative organizations (Barstow 2/16/10; Carey et al. 3/18/10). To address this concern, AFP and FreedomWorks provide behind-the-scenes logistical work to help Tea Party Chapters. Both groups send email blasts to Tea Party group leaders, who then forward the emails to their members. Emails contain information on political updates, events in the area, etc.

Though it is a contested claim, strong evidence suggests that FreedomWorks is also involved in a Tea Party organization previously thought to be independent: the Tea Party Patriots. The Tea Party Patriots began as a "centralized Web destination for decentralized malcontents" (McGrath 2/1/10, 43) by providing a common space for local Tea Party groups to advertise their meetings, meet other Tea Party groups, raise money and organize national events (Tea Party Patriots 3/19/10). While the website provides no contact information or detailed information about the organization, private email correspondence obtained by Rolling Stone magazine reveals that in fact FreedomWorks manages the group and its web space. Correspondence contains directions from FreedomWorks director of federal and state campaigns Brendon Steinhauser to keep the Tea Party logo when there was discussion of change. The correspondence also contains a memo from Steinhauser on how to disrupt town-hall meetings.
The memo explains that “the goal is to rattle [the Congressman]. Yell out and challenge the Rep’s statements... have someone else follow-up with a shout-out. Set the tone for the hall as clearly informal and free-wheeling. It will also embolden others who agree with us to call out” (Dickinson 9/16/09).

Political/Economic Foundation

In addition to the publicity provided by conservative media and the logistical support of conservative activist groups, one of the more fundamental causes of the Tea Party movement was the changing political and economic forces that took place during 2008. The 2008 recession that later became known as the “Great Recession” produced a tightening of credit that negatively impacted almost all economic indicators: tightening of credit, fall in home value, rising unemployment, etc. (Samuelson 1/4/10). And while the recession officially ended in July 2009, lagging indicators, particularly high unemployment (9.7%), have a residual affect among many Americans (Gross 7/14/09; Andrews 8/13/09). Even among Americans who haven’t lost their job, shorter workweeks, job insecurity and falling home prices have tightened many more Americans’ wallets. In the April 12 New York Times/CBS poll, 14% of Tea Party supporters claimed “the recession has been a hardship and caused major life changes” and 55% said “the recession has been difficult but not caused any major life changes,” compared to 19% and 50% respectively of all Americans.

In the aftermath of the recession, it became clear that this recession was not purely the result of a normal capitalist economic cycle; this recession was at least in part caused by “a fast-growing corner of the financial markets known as derivatives, so called because they derive their value from something else, such as bonds or currency rates.” However, derivatives are not traded on an exchange that the government can regulate. As a result, there were “no transparent records
of who was trading what” despite the dramatic increase in trading and the growing risk that while derivatives have a way of giving reassurance of stability in good times,” they end up “exacerbating market downturns in bad” (Faiola, Nakashima & Drew 10/15/08). In this case, the greed of a few derivative traders contributed to a particularly devastating recession. This greed has been most recently confirmed by the Securities and Exchange Commission lawsuit brought against Goldman Sachs for setting up hidden firms, dumping worthless derivatives in them, and betting against the hidden firm’s losses (Dash 4/21/10). The image of a few greedy Wall Street traders crippling the entire economy contains the potential for anxieties that are unique to this recession. This economic downturn was ostensibly the result of a small segment of the population as opposed to general economic trends. Here there is a great potential for anxieties to be produced that target political elites for not preparing for the downturn and economic elites for contributing to it.

As traditional economic structures shifted during 2008 recession, shifts in political attitudes shifted as well. In an eerily foreshadowing New York Times article, contributor and George Mason University economics professor Tyler Cowen pointed to the “complex picture of social change [the recession] is bringing” (1/31/09). Though Cowen focused his attention on young people in particular, his remarks on massive economic change in terms of the accompanying human suffering – job loss and insecurity, falling home prices, rising health care costs – help set the subtext for increased social and political anxiety. Since April 2008, the economy and jobs have consistently polled as being the most important problem facing the country (New York Times/CBS 4/12/10). Among Tea Party supporters in April 2010, these two issues were similarly of highest importance (23% and 22% respectively).
Regarding how the recession impacted Tea Party members, it is helpful to turn to Barstow’s comment on the term “awaken.” The idea of being awakened by the recession is a strikingly common theme in the Tea Party movement. It is predictable to find Tea Party members citing their awakening as inspiration for joining a local group. At the National Tea Party Convention, *Examiner* contributor Glenn Reynolds referred to the entire movement as the “third Great Awakening,” referencing the two Great Awakening religious revival movements of the 18\textsuperscript{th} and 19\textsuperscript{th} Century. The cause of this third Great Awakening: “bottom-up reassertion of faith, and independence” and “red-meat attacks on overspending” (2/7/10). While the April 12, 2010 *New York Times*/CBS poll found that Tea Party supporters tend to be more affluent than the rest of the population, it is not clear that the same is true for activists. *New York Times* contributor Kate Zernike reported that in fact many activists “have been jolted into action by economic distress” and that activists “often tell a similar story in interviews: they had lost their jobs, or perhaps watched their homes plummet in value, and they found common cause in the Tea Party’s fight for lower taxes and smaller government” (3/27/10).

To date, the Tea Party movement is an evolving and growing political force. Recent activities indicate that its organization is shifting to active involvement with government, in contrasts with earlier protests and activism against government. To make sense of this shift in the context of the theoretical model outlined in the Research Design, in the next section I examine the structure of the Tea Party movement that correlates with this historiography.
Tea Party Structure

The notion that this section is entitled “Tea Party Structure” would appear a paradox to many individuals on the left and right. On the right, the Tea Party movement is perfectly unstructured — just as our government should be. On the left, the movement is a chaotic blend of enraged extreme conservatives who don’t have a point other than to be enraged and sound off the typical Republican talking points — cut spending and lower taxes. However, despite claims on both sides that the movement is unstructured, the movement does hold certain core principles, and it does exist within a certain institutionalized framework. Particularly interesting to the notion of a counterpublic, the Tea Party uses common principles indicative of the subaltern to attract disenfranchised members and creates open and safe discursive spaces within a decentralized institutional framework.

Constituency and Principles

Though Tea Partiers pride themselves as being difficult to generalize, there also exists one major document that is particularly salient among Tea Partiers: the mission statement of Glenn Beck's 9.12 Project. On his March 13, 2009 show, Beck asked viewers to remember “that person you were the day after 9/11.” He describes how in the days after the terrorist attacks on 9/11, “we promised ourselves that we would focus on the things that were important... the eternal principles that allowed America to become the world’s beacon of freedom.” Asking his viewers to “renew that promise,” Beck collects the emotion circulating in America on September 12, 2001 into the following 9 principles and 12 values (Burguiere & Beck 3/13/09; The 9.12 Project):

9 Principles
1. America Is Good.
2. I believe in God and He is the Center of my Life. God “The propitious smiles of Heaven can never be expected on a nation that disregards the eternal rules of order and right which Heaven itself has ordained.” from George Washington’s first Inaugural address.

3. I must always try to be a more honest person than I was yesterday. Honesty “I hope that I shall always possess firmness and virtue enough to maintain what I consider to be the most enviable of all titles, the character of an honest man.” George Washington

4. The family is sacred. My spouse and I are the ultimate authority, not the government. Marriage/Family “It is in the love of one’s family only that heartfelt happiness is known. By a law of our nature, we cannot be happy without the endearing connections of a family.” Thomas Jefferson

5. If you break the law you pay the penalty. Justice is blind and no one is above it. Justice “I deem one of the essential principles of our government... equal and exact justice to all men of whatever state or persuasion, religious or political.” Thomas Jefferson

6. I have a right to life, liberty and pursuit of happiness, but there is no guarantee of equal results. Life, Liberty, & The Pursuit of Happiness “Everyone has a natural right to choose that vocation in life which he thinks most likely to give him comfortable subsistence.” Thomas Jefferson

7. I work hard for what I have and I will share it with who I want to. Government cannot force me to be charitable. Charity “It is not everyone who asketh that deserveth charity; all however, are worth of the inquiry or the deserving may suffer.” George Washington

8. It is not un-American for me to disagree with authority or to share my personal opinion. On your right to disagree “In a free and republican government, you cannot restrain the voice of the multitude; every man will speak as he thinks, or more properly without thinking.” George Washington

9. The government works for me. I do not answer to them, they answer to me. Who works for whom? “I consider the people who constitute a society or a nation as the source of all authority in that nation.” Thomas Jefferson

12 Values
1. Honesty
2. Reverence
3. Hope
4. Thrift
5. Humility
6. Charity
7. Sincerity
8. Moderation
9. Hard Work
10. Courage
11. Personal Responsibility
12. Gratitude
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Noticeably absent from this list are major political postures with which people would disagree. The only two exceptions are the second (religious) and seventh (redistribution) principles. Indeed, while most Americans don’t support welfare, certain redistributive programs, such as Social Security and Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, are relatively popular (Page & Shapiro 1992; Schram 2006; Morgen, Acker and Weigt 2010). The notion that Beck would include strong opposition to welfare redistribution on a list of broadly universal principles indicates the degree to which it is a strongly felt view.

However, beyond these two exceptions, there are almost no controversial principles, and certainly no controversial values on Beck’s list. There is no doubt that Beck intended for these principles to be inclusive (Burguiere & Beck 3/13/09; McGrath 2/1/10; Barstow 2/16/10). As McGrath points out, “inclusiveness was the point” (2/1/10, 43). And yet, there is a certain irony that such an inclusive document would be the centerpiece of such a partisan movement. Much of this has to do with the notion that Tea Partiers are attracted to an imaginary in which their movement could be mainstream. Just as Tea Partiers turn to atypical conservatives Rick Santelli and Keli Carender as the founders of their movement, Tea Partiers flock to a set of *prima facie* nonpartisan principles to represent their movement. Indeed in the April 12 *New York Times* CBS Poll, 84% of Tea Party supporters believed “the views of the people involved in the Tea Party movement generally reflect the views of most Americans” compared to 25% of all respondents. In this vein, the movement makes a significant attempt in the movement to ground principles in the founding of the U.S. Of note in Beck’s 9 principles and 12 values are the quotations that appear after each principle; each principle (with the exception of the self-explanatory “America is good”) is qualified by a quotation from George Washington or Thomas Jefferson. Introducing these principles to his show’s viewers, Beck consistently links the 9.12 Project principles and
values with the U.S. Constitution and other quotations by some of the U.S. Founding Fathers (Burguiere & Beck 3/13/09, 0:20). Beck in fact performs the show in front of a blown-up image of "We the People" from the Constitution.

The vigor with which Tea Party groups have responded to this mission statement attests to its currency in the movement. Up to 2 million Tea Partiers gathered on the Mall in Washington, D.C. on 9/12/09 at the instruction of the 9.12 Project (McGrath 2/1/10, 43). Hundreds of local Tea Party groups explicitly name themselves after the 9/12 Project (Barstow 2/16/10; The 9.12 Project). And indeed, these two pillars have been widely acknowledged in the news media as being the unifying tenants of the movement (Von Drehle 9/17/09; Clift 1/29/10; McGrath 2/1/10; Barstow 2/16/10).

Despite the relative vagueness of the 9.12 mission statement, polling data has given concrete insight into the beliefs and constituency of the Tea Party. In spring 2010, a number of polling organizations conducted polls of the Tea Party movement. However, as Gallup Editor in Chief Frank Newport points out, within the collected data there is "not an accepted or universally agree-upon standard for defining participation in the Tea Party Movement" (4/6/10). While the Gallup and CBS News & New York Times polls measured Tea Party "supporters," the CNN and Quinnipiac University polls measured Tea Party "activists." This difference is notable, given that supporter could mean "either physical support (going to a rally) or financial support" or simply passively agreeing with the Tea Party, whereas activists play a more active role in the movement (Newport 4/6/10). Because of this discrepancy, comparing polling data must be done carefully so as to separate organizations that measure supporters and organizations that measure activists (Brown; CBS News & New York Times Poll: The Tea Party Movement; CNN Opinion Research Poll; Saad).
The February 17, 2010 CNN Opinion Research Poll and March 24, 2010 Quinnipiac University Poll both indicate that the movement is overwhelmingly white (80%; 88%) and Protestant (68%; N/A). A majority are middle-age or older (40% 30-49, 29% 50-64, 12% 65+; 20% 35-49, 31% 50-64, 24% 65+) and live in rural (50%; N/A) or suburban (41%; N/A) areas. Despite recent reporting that many members in the movement are unemployed (Zernike 3/27/10), CNN reports that only 6% of the movement is unemployed. In fact, according to the same poll, 34% make more than $75,000 compared to 25% of Americans in general. Tea Party supporters tend to be slightly less educated than Americans in general, but most polling data is inconsistent on this. Politically, we know that supporters of the Tea Party movement are overwhelmingly conservative (77%; N/A) and plan on voting for a Republican candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives (87%; N/A). Extremely few describe themselves as Democrats (4%; 12%), while the majority define themselves as Independent (52%; 38%) or Republican (49%; 44%). Among Independents, Quinnipiac University reports that 74% lean Republican while 16% lean Democrat (Brown; CNN Opinion Research Poll).\footnote{The Quinnipiac Poll has a margin of error of ±6.2%. The CNN Poll has a margin of error of ±9%. Quinnipiac conducted a survey of 253 “voters who say they are part of the Tea Party movement” (Brown). CNN conducted 124 interviews with respondents of a national phone survey who indicated that they had “given money to any organization associated with the Tea Party movement,” “attended a rally or meeting held by any organization associated with the Tea Party movement,” or “took any other active steps to support the Tea Party movement, either in person or through e-mail or on the internet.” Results in the affirmative were respectively 2%, 5% and 7% (CNN Opinion Research Poll).}

The February 11, 2010 CBS News & New York Times Poll and April 5, 2010 Gallup Poll provide more detailed opinions of Tea Partiers, but the reader will recall that membership here is defined as a general supporter of the movement. The CBS News & New York Times Poll indicated that, while 34% of Americans in general personally view President Obama unfavorably, 80% of Tea Partiers view the President unfavorably. Supporters are three times more likely to be “angry” toward government in Washington than the public at-large (45%
compared to 17%). 33% of supporters “think the Obama administration favors the poor” compared to 18% of the public at-large. In terms of particular facts, 44% of Tea Partiers believe President Obama raised taxes, 46% believe he kept them the same and 2% believe he lowered them. On who to blame for the federal deficit, 19% hold the Obama administration responsible, 16% the Bush administration, 33% Congress and 15% all three. On economic policy, Tea Party supporters are more likely to express opposition to increased bank regulation (48% say no to more regulation, 42% say yes) (CBS News & New York Times Poll). The Gallup Poll also indicates that 87% of Tea Party supporters “consider passage of healthcare reform a bad thing” compared to 50% of all Americans and 66% consider themselves pro-life, compared with 46% of all Americans (Saad). \(^{13}\)

Two months later, The April 12, 2010 New York Times/CBS poll found that Tea Partiers, like Americans in general, view the economy and jobs as the two most important problems facing the U.S. today. However, unlike most Americans who have a strong mistrust of government, Tea Partiers have an overwhelming mistrust of government. Tea Party supporters are far more likely to believe that the country is headed in the wrong direction. Compared to 59% of Americans who believe “things have pretty seriously gotten off on the wrong track,” 92% of Tea Party supporters believe the U.S. is on the wrong track. Compared to 23% of Americans who think the economy is getting worse, 42% of Tea Party supporters believe the economy is getting worse. Compared to 73% of Americans who disapprove of the way Congress is handling its job, only 96% of Tea Party supporters disapprove of Congress. Compared to 33% of the country who views President Obama unfavorably, 84% of supporters view him unfavorably. And compared to 78% of Americans who believe “you can trust the government in Washington to do

\(^{13}\) The CBS News & New York Times Poll has a margin of error of ±3%. The Gallup Poll has a margin of error of ±4%. CBS and The New York Times conducted interviews over land-lines and cell phones using a random sample of 1084 adults nationwide. Gallup used the same methodology with 1,033 adults.
what is right only some of the time or almost never,” 94% of Tea Party supporters trust government only some of the time or never.

In terms of non-economic issues, there is significant division among the views of Tea Party supporters, albeit a division that leans conservative. The one exception is illegal immigration; 82% of supporters believe illegal immigration is a very serious problem for the country compared to 60% of Americans in general. However, on Roe v. Wade, 40% of Tea Partiers claimed the decision was a good thing compared to 53% bad. However, in terms of economic issues, Tea Party supporters are angrier and hold categorically different ideological views than most Americans. While 19% of Americans are angry about the way things are going in Washington, 53% of Tea Party supporters are angry and another 41% are dissatisfied but not angry. The three leading reasons for the anger are health care reform, not representing the people and government spending. In general terms, 92% of supporters would rather have a smaller government providing fewer services than a bigger government providing more services compared to 50% of the entire country. 92% believe President Obama’s policies are moving the country toward socialism compared to 52% of Americans. On what socialism means to the respondent, 49% of Tea Party supporters, by 40 percentage points the largest, claimed that socialism meant government ownership. Among all Americans, 26% understood socialism as government ownership, while 30% didn’t know what socialism meant.

National Movement, Local Organization

In terms of structure, the Tea Party movement at present is extremely decentralized; local chapters are run autonomously from national organizations (McGrath 2/1/10; Barstow 2/16/10). In an article outlining the growth of the Tea Party movement New York Times contributor David Barstow reports that most Tea Party members “are frequently led by political neophytes who
prize independence and tell strikingly similar stories of having been awakened by the recession” (2/16/10). While research on this is limited, in a self-study of the Tea Party movement, conservative activist group Sam Adams Alliance found that 46.9% of local Tea Party organization leaders said that they were “uninvolved or rarely involved in politics prior to the Tea Parties of 2009” (O’Keefe 2010, 4).

Following the mantra “all politics is local,” the Tea Party movement is highly localized and “influenced by the peculiarities of local history” (Barstow 2/16/10). Meetings take place everywhere from firehouses to restaurants to wedding halls to private homes. Of all the reporting that has been done on individual Tea Party groups, no two groups look exactly alike. Barstow followed the Friends for Liberty of Liberty Lake, Washington. Close to the Idaho border, the Friends for Liberty have more of a survivalist tinge, deeply concerned that “governments and economies are controlled by networks of elites who wield power through exclusive entities like the Bilderberg Group, the Trilateral Commission and the Council on Foreign Relations” (2/16/10). Other groups, like the Scottsdale, Arizona Tea Party Patriots hold more mainstream Republican concerns, such as illegal immigration and pork barrel spending (O’Leary 1/31/10). The differentiation between groups is apparent in the countless profiles done of Tea Party chapters across the country (Beam 4/15/09; Davis 1/13/10; O’Leary 1/31/10; McGrath 2/1/10; Barstow 2/16/10; Altman 3/12/10). Local Tea Party chapters form on their own, and while they sometimes receive organizing advice and funding from national advocacy groups, they are largely independent from those groups.

Case Studies

One of local Tea Party groups which will be used to texture more general remarks about the Tea Party movement is We Surround Them of Frederick, MD. Located about 10 minutes
outside of Frederick in Thurmont, We Surround Them takes its name from Glenn Beck, who often encourages viewers of his show to fight against the “few people pressing the buttons” because “they don’t surround us at all. We surround them” (The 9.12 Project). Certain themes prominent in the group are familiar to Beck followers; the principles of the group are Beck’s 9 principles of the 9.12 Project, the “spirit of the group” is to “bring us back to the place we were on September 12, 2001, and the first purpose listed on their website is to “advance our understanding of the ‘how & why’ related to the founders original intent of our government” (We Surround Them). The group was founded in March 2009 (when Glenn Beck first announced the 9.12 Project) by Mark Kreslins, a former Congressional staffer for two Maryland Representatives, and Joshua Lyons, a former member on the Germantown Citizens Association Board.

Unlike how its name suggests, We Surround Them meets in the Thurmont Firehouse in Thurmont, MD, about a 15 minute drive north of Frederick, MD. The firehouse in which We Surround Them meets is discretely located behind several buildings along the town’s main street. Thurmont a small semi-rural town of 5,588, of which 98% is white. The household medium income is $49,530, 20% of the population is between 45 and 64 years old, and 10.3% are over 65 (“American FactFinder”). Stepping into the Thurmont Firehouse for the first time, one gets the sense that these statistics are an exact match of the group membership. Almost all members are white and either middle-aged or elderly. From the hallmark Marylander pronunciation of “water” ("wuder"), one gets the quick impression that most members grew up in the area. Indeed, as Lyons points out, while in the beginning members came from Maryland, Pennsylvania, Virginia and West Virginia, now most members are from the area. This relates to an increasing number
and broader dispersal of Tea Party groups around the country; as groups form closer to members’ homes, there is less need to travel long distances.

About another 15 minutes north of Thurmont is Mount Saint Mary’s College, and during meetings one gets the sense that the Thurmont Firehouse is a satellite college facility. Meetings are structured as if one were in a classroom. Upon entering, organizers have a table set up at which visitors make name-tags, color-coded to mark new members and old members. After signing up and making their name tag, members new and old mingle in clusters of around 5-10 people to discuss personal updates from the past month and, most of all, politics. Because organizers suggest that visitors agree with at least six of Beck’s 9 principles, conversations are usually eased, knowing that other members agree on principle. After about 15 minutes to a half-hour of mingling, meetings begin by reciting the Pledge of Allegiance. Once everyone is seated at their cafeteria tables, organizers of the group, often led by Kreslins and Lyons, discuss different issues relating to current events for around two hours, separated by intermission (mingling and conversation resumes during intermission). Over the past year, the group has focused on issues relating to the Constitution (typically against common interpretations of the 10th amendment, the 14th amendment, the commerce clause and the general welfare clause), the federal deficit and health care reform. The organizers speak in front of a projector that displays PowerPoint slides that correspond with their presentation and encourage members to take notes during the presentation. Between the classroom projector and the radio personality of Kreslins and Lyons (both now run their own radio program, The Forgotten Men), We Surround Them bears strong resemblance to Beck’s program, which similarly makes use of a classroom theme (i.e. the hallmark blackboards and textbook props). After the presentations, organizers typically
leave about a half-hour for questions from members. Members usually stay around for 15 minutes after the meeting to converse again.

The other group I study is the Delco Patriots of Media, PA. Unlike We Surround Them, the Delco Patriots hold their meetings in a classically suburban neighborhood about 20 minutes outside of downtown Philadelphia. Like We Surround Them, almost all of the Delco Patriots are white and either middle-aged or elderly, though Media’s population of 37,684 is 81.02% white, 23.0% age 45 to 64, and 20.6% age 65 or older. The Delco Patriots meet in the Kings Mills Inn, a banquet hall built on the compound of two stone mills that were erected in 1747 (Kings Mills Inn). The Delco Patriots were founded by Deb Hughes and Lisa Esler, both Delaware County natives, who together were members of several other Tea Party groups before founding the Delco Patriots. Neither had any experience with politics before creating the Delco Patriots – Hughes explains that she scarcely paid attention to current events – but describe being awakened by God to the dangers of the moment. Their experience in other groups ended poorly, and politics had a good deal to do with it. Hughes and Esler describe their frustration with leaders from other groups who attempted to control the direction of the group too strongly.

Their change of course is evident given the low profile they play in meetings. Esler often introduces meetings, but the microphone is always handed over to candidates or other speakers. Hughes is even less visible during meetings, with the exception of various credits accorded to her. Instead, the two along with other organizers are preoccupied with set-up and welcoming guests at the door. Structurally, like We Surround Them, the Delco Patriot meetings are set as informative educational affairs. While organizers don't give presentations, politicians, candidates and policy experts are invited to give presentations with Q&A afterwards. Presentations focus on similar issues: original intent interpretation of the Constitution, the deficit and health care. Often
because local politicians attend the event, local issues are discussed as well, such as state pensions and extraction of natural gas from the Marcellus Shale.
Testing the Hypothesis

With a better understanding of the Tea Party's background and structure I now turn to testing my hypothesis that subaltern counterpublics, when facing hegemony in the mass and strong publics, form counterdiscourses, the products of which are discursively returned to the mass and strong publics where opinion is adjusted toward rationality. This section will be divided into the four sections of my hypothesis: hegemony, contract, counterdiscourse, discursive recourse. Analysis of the Tea Party movement in general will be supplemented and textured with analysis of We Surround Them and the Delco Patriots.

Hegemony

Nancy Fraser defines the subaltern in the context of the public sphere as “subordinated social groups marginalized in hegemonic discourse.” The examples she gives include “women, workers, people of color, and gays and lesbians,” who have been historically denied access to deliberative spaces through hegemonic practices (1992, 123). Counterpublics provide the necessary space for “withdrawal and regroupment” precisely because hegemony in the mass and strong publics cloud clear thought and opportunity to raise objection (124). Only in the counterpublic could feminists in the late-twentieth-century “invent new terms for describing reality, including ‘sexism,’ the ‘double shift,’ ‘sexual harassment’ and ‘marital, date, and acquaintance rape’” (123). The scholarship, including Habermas, has widely recognized the aforementioned examples as counterpublics withdrawn from the mass and strong discourses because of hegemony in the mass and strong publics (Mason 2005; Warner 2005; Fraser 2008; Habermas 2008). However, it is only because of the extensive “historiography” that documents and records hegemony and the creation of these counterpublics that they have been widely accepted as such (Fraser 1992, 123).
The Tea Party, by contrast, has no dominant historiography upon which claims of hegemony can be made. Therefore, an effort must be made to document the hegemony Tea Partiers interpret. Turning back to the imaginary Rick Santelli has embodied in the Tea Party, we know from analysis in the news media that Tea Partiers are attracted to Santelli because of his identity as atypical Tea Partier (McGrath 2/1/10; Barstow 2/16/10; Von Drehle 2/18/10). He is also central to this imaginary because of the hegemony he defines. In one of the most often quoted excerpts of Santelli’s rant, he proclaims to a background of cheers from traders on the floor of the Chicago Stock Exchange, “President Obama are you listening?” (Rick Santelli and the “Rant of the Year” 1:20). On a literal level, he is referring to an argument that most Americans don’t support the President’s policy on subprime mortgages. On a more powerful level that has stuck with Tea Partiers ever since is the notion that government (the strong public) ignores the Tea Partier’s concerns.

However, hegemony connotes much stronger subversion of particular discourses than simple ignoring; it is the utter domination of individuals’ “way of life” and “concept of reality” (Elcy 1992, 322). Tea Partiers’ understanding of such hegemony is perhaps best exemplified by a recurring critique of Frances Fox Piven and Richard A. Cloward on the Beck’s television program. Piven and Cloward are known for a political strategy they outlined in their 1966 article “The Weight of the Poor: A Strategy to End Poverty” that became known as the Cloward-Piven Strategy. Essentially, the strategy sought to create a “political crisis... that could lead to legislation for a guaranteed annual income and thus an end to poverty” by enrolling the approximately eight million people who qualified for welfare but weren’t receiving it (Piven & Cloward 1966). Beck situates the Cloward-Piven strategy as part of a broader agenda to create a “nanny state” in which individuals become dependent on government, which sets off a cascade
effect such that citizens are routinely regulated by their government (Burguiere & Beck 1/5/10). Of course, Beck isn’t just referring to the nanny state as the type of economic redistribution Piven and Cloward call for; he critiques all law that negotiates how citizens should behave. On his broadcasts and in his books, Beck has criticized sin taxes, zoning regulations, seatbelt enforcement laws and countless other “mini-tyrannies” that have been committed by the government. The argument goes, “even if a seemingly trivial ban on the sale of cheap cigars doesn’t affect you directly, eventually one of these mini-tyrannies will” (Beck 2009, 153).

While its roots began in the progressive movement, Beck claims that today the notion of a nanny state has become second nature to the entire American public. In the first sentence of his chapter on the nanny state in *Arguing with Idiots: How to Stop Small Minds and Big Government*, Beck writes, “if there’s one thing that liberals, conservatives, communists, capitalists, vegetarians, teetotalers, pet lovers, bureaucrats, Republicans, and Democrats can all agree on, it’s telling you how you should live your life” (Beck & Balfe 2009, 153). Hegemony here is the notion that all Americans unquestionably accept some government regulation as reasonable. While traditional conservatives may support less regulation, Beck argues that government involvement has grown to the point where certain regulations are universally acceptable. In other words, discussion over the reasonableness of tobacco taxes and other mini-tyrannies is hedged in the mass and strong publics.

This line of argument, that discourse around extremely limited government is hedged by the mass and strong publics, has currency at all levels of the Tea Party movement. Other elites similarly project the hegemonic exclusion of the Tea Party from the mass and strong discourses. In her keynote speech at the National Tea Party Convention, Sarah Palin consistently evoked

---

14 Ironically, this critique bears resemblance to Piven and Cloward’s critique that the state has historically surveilled and disciplined the poor into behaving in particular ways (Piven & Cloward 1993)
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images of Tea Partiers being left out of the national discourse by claiming that President Obama should “stop lecturing and start listening” and that the U.S. needs a “commander-in-chief” who isn’t “a professor of law standing at the lectern” (2/6/10). Among the ordinary talk of individuals at the grassroots level of the movement, hegemony is a consistent pretext for discussion. The term “like-minded” has been extensively used at the grassroots to carve out a safe-space outside of hegemonic discourse.

To be “like-minded” does not simply mean to share political views; it holds much stronger connotations of separation from the minds of typical citizens. During the Delco Patriots discussion group, Joanne Yurchak, a chemistry teacher at Widener University and grandmother of four, described group membership as the following: “we think that getting together just even on this tells us that we’re not alone. I mean I think a lot of us are so frustrated when we saw what was happening. We were just at our wits end and getting together in a group people with like-minded ideas even though we all might differ in a lot of things” (Delco Patriots Discussion Group). Yurchak’s comments that membership is valuable because it “tell us that we’re not alone” strikes at the heart of defining the hegemony the Tea Party faces. Yurchak’s language of isolation bears strong resemblance to Fraser’s description of the subaltern counterpublic as “spaces of withdrawal and regroupment” (1992, 124). Because she doesn’t get a receptive audience in the mass public, Yurchak turns to a counterpublic of like-minded individuals as a means of evading hegemony.

Yurchak is by no means unique in her use of “like-mindedness” to describe the felt hegemony. The Tea Party Patriots, which is the largest coalition of Tea Party groups, organizes groups as “like-minded” from a particular state (Tea Party Patriots). Though there is no central Tea Party group where understanding of hegemony can be clearly stated, any brief survey of the
mission statements of groups around the country reveal a similar use of “like-mindedness” to describe such hegemony. The Maryland Society of Patriots of Silver Spring, MD begins its mission statement by explaining that “tyranny has and always will exist; members of M.S.O.P. seek to protect themselves, their state and their country from it and allow life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness” (*Maryland Society of Patriots*). The Long Beach Patriots of Long Beach, CA describe that they were “created due to the lack of respect and acknowledgement that 'We The People' even exist, let alone matter” (*Long Beach Patriots*). In short, defining hegemony is a critical component of the Tea Party movement at all levels.

Of course, one can anticipate counterarguments to the Tea Party’s claimed hegemony as being nonexistent. In *What’s the Matter with Kansas: How Conservatives Won the Heart of America*, Frank argues that voters were distracted by hot-button cultural issues when conservatives constructed liberals as “intellectuals educated at European universities” who ignored the views of average Americans. Frank argues that while conservatives portrayed liberals as ignoring average Americans, in fact liberals were attentive to American’s economic concerns. Though Frank doesn’t understand the conservatives’ argument as constructing hegemony, conservative Kansans’ platform against liberals in 2004 certainly bears resemblance to Tea Partier’s arguments that hegemony exists in the mass public because their views are ignored and hedged. For this reason, one would expect Frank and others who have similar concerns over conservatives’ false portrayal of liberals (Wolfe 2006; Shenkman 2008) to argue that the Tea Party’s current understanding of hegemony is simply not true. They would argue that in fact Tea Partiers are being misled to think that there is hegemony when such hegemony does not exist.
However, an argument of this sort misses the point of hegemony's relation to the subaltern counterpublic. It does not matter whether hegemony is perceived or real. Counterpublics are constituted because members understand there to be hegemony in the mass or strong discourses. Feminists, blacks, gays, and the environmentally affected did not come to understand hegemony at the approval of the mass public; as Fraser writes, “this historiography records that members of subordinated groups... have repeatedly found it advantageous to constitute alternative publics” (1992, 123). Nowhere in Fraser’s sentence is the mass or strong public given agency in deciding where hegemony exists. It is the subaltern who decides the existence of hegemony.

**Contract**

Once hegemony is defined, hedged individuals may contract into a group, in which they can discuss issues that are relegated outside mass and strong public discourses. In large part, the public sphere literature has taken a vague posture on the substance of contract. Habermas describes a thick contract that is built upon the foundations of the bourgeoisie’s participation in the literary public sphere, in which literature and the arts were discussed in a public forum (1989), whereas Fraser describes a much looser “constituting” of a counterpublic in which individuals simply begin counterdiscourses to contract into a counterpublic (1992).

Unlike the theoretical imaginary in which contracting typically occurs through its founding members, the Tea Party continuously renews its contract with the promising made by new members. Groups typically have a formal application which prospective members complete on Meetup.com or the group’s website. Questions often ask why the prospective member is interested in joining, how many of Beck’s 9 principles the individual agrees with and if the individual would be interested in joining the leadership of the group. While some groups admit
prospective members automatically once they complete and submit the contract, in some cases group leaders choose whether to accept a prospective member. Completing the contract is critical to participation because meeting times are almost exclusively posted online. Unless a prospective member already knows someone in the group, there is usually no way to find out about meetings without joining the group’s website. Of course, if there is a member selection process, prospective members cannot access the website without getting accepted. It is important to mention that leaders almost never expel a member from a group unless the individual in question is acting against the group’s policies (i.e. consistently uses meetings as a forum for a political campaign). In this regard, nothing stops a persistent individual from joining a group. However, a formal online contract is typically enough to sort out individuals who truly agree with and want to participate in the movement. Tea Party groups use contracts to frame the possibility of debate in such a way that a typical Tea Partier is included and a non-marginalized individuals are kept out.

In addition to surveilling who becomes a member of the Tea Party group, contracts are also important to the creation of rationalizing counterdiscourses because of their promissory nature. At a basic level, prospective members are often asked to promise that they use only nonviolent measures to enact political change, thus reinforcing that Tea Party groups are for discussion and not incubators of violence. As a more indirect promise, a member’s contractual statements are disclosed to the entire group on Meetup.com through a random statement generator on the main page and a complete list on the member page. The act of disclosure promotes thicker social bonds that allow for more personal deliberation\(^\text{15}\) by making the entire group aware of the character of their peers. Leaders may have the ability to accept or deny

\(^{15}\) Fraser writes that deconstructing the barrier between private and public spheres provides a more democratic discourse that better reflects the true interests of its members (Fraser 1992, 128).
membership based on an individual's contractual statements, but contracts' most profound contribution to the possibility of counterdiscourse is their full accessibility to the group. Members can find out other member's background, their motivation for joining and their opinions on certain issues. In this regard, knowledge of other members is well distributed throughout the group, which decreases the need for small-talk and the awkwardness of talking with a stranger. For this reason, it should be no surprise that discourse develops so freely during meetings with hundreds of strangers; contracts narrow group membership to those who identify with certain core principles, and by disclosing contracts to the entire group, members are held accountable for their words and gain knowledge of and preliminary social bonds with other members.

In terms of where We Surround Them fits into the spectrum of Tea Party contracts, it takes a particularly hard line on accepting individuals. Kreslins, Lyons and other members of the group's leadership decide whether to accept individuals into the group. Like most groups, contracts are completed on the We Surround Them Meetup.com website, in which the prospective member must 1) introduce themselves; 2) explain "why [he/she] wants to join"; 3) check their email because leaders "may email [him/her] to complete group membership"; and 4) "go to our message board forum and read the posts in 'Information Every Member Must Read'" (We Surround Them).

Only once members are accepted into the group can they read this section. In the section Lyons explains that though he doesn't want to be "heavy handed," there are certain guidelines that all members must follow. Lyons writes that to stop other people from distorting the group's record, members must keep their remarks to the broader public "perfectly factual, non-aggressive, open and honest and tolerant of an opposing view." Lyons adds that official
messages can only come from Kreslins or himself. Regarding the purpose of the group, Lyons reminds newly accepted members that the group is for “likeminded citizens to advance our understanding of the ‘how & why’ related to the founders’ original intent for our government and how this relates to what we’re experiencing today” and to “come up with practical ways for us to begin discussions around these topics with friends, family, neighbors, etc. and invite them to join our group as appropriate.” He also reminds members that the group is “primarily educational in orientation” and a “policy incubator,” by which he means the group identifies policies with which members agree and promotes candidates who support those policies (*We Surround Them*).

The leadership of *We Surround Them* directly controls its membership. Kreslins and Lyons may accept or deny membership requests, and the contract requires members to keep “official” discussions within the group. In part, this has to do with the increasing publicity of the group. Kreslins and Lyons have appeared on Fox & Friends to talk about *We Surround Them*, and Kreslins appeared on the show on a different occasion after he criticized Senator Benjamin Cardin (D-MD) during a town hall meeting. Both have written numerous opinion pieces for various blogs and local newspapers. As Lyons writes, “we have a few exciting potential opportunities coming up and if they pan out as we hope, our group could, and we want to emphasize *could* become much more noticeable” (*We Surround Them*). As one of the first groups in Maryland with high visibility in the media, *We Surround Them* also has a larger member base. For these two reasons, the group is able to maintain a membership of 110 despite its more controlled contracting process. None of this is to say that Kreslins, Lyons and the rest of the group are cold people; on the contrary the rigor with which they craft the group creates a welcoming atmosphere of solidarity during meetings.
By contrast, the Delco Patriots have a much less rigorous contracting process. Anyone who applies to the group is accepted, and group information is available online to individuals who aren’t members (i.e. meeting location and time). Nevertheless, in order to get meeting reminders and have access to discussion boards, prospective members must complete an online application at Meetup.com in which they are asked 1) to introduce themselves, 2) if they are a resident of Delaware County, 3) if they swear to “use the power of our voices and our individual vote and NOT any type of violent action,” 4) if they plan to regularly attend meetings and 5) if they would like to be part of the leadership. The first question, like in most other groups, is the key disclosure question. On the Delco Patriots website, members’ names are listed beside a photo and a small quotation from their introduction. The other questions are similar to We Surround Them, with the exception that here violence is clearly renounced. This is not to say that We Surround Them condones violence; it is simply that the Delco Patriots found it important to include a clear denunciation of violence in the application. In addition to these questions, contracting occurs at the beginning of the meeting, when attendees are asked for a $5 donation and to sign their name and email address on an attendance sheet.

Counterdiscourses

With firm ideological barriers constructed through collective recognition of hegemony and collective contracting into a counterpublic, Tea Partiers consequentially construct the possibilities for counterdiscourse. Of course, as Habermas reminds us, rational discourse requires the principles of ideal speech situation: seeking the truth, not behaving strategically, and accepting a norm of equality (1979, 2). Contracting plays a large role in constructing this ideal discursive arena; online applications typically explain the purpose of groups to provide an education forum (seeking truth), typically ask members not to turn the meeting into a forum for a
political campaign (not behaving strategically) and emphasize the forum as a space for like-minded individuals (equality). In reality, most of these contracting promises are upheld. While there are concerns that Tea Party chapters would get “hijacked by the local Republican Party,” average groups are made up of “political neophytes” who want to learn more about the Constitution, the deficit and other Tea Party issues (Barstow 2/16/10). If they weren’t trying to seek the truth, they wouldn’t come to the meeting.

In terms of strategic behavior, political campaigns are a constant presence at Tea Party events (Newton-Small 2/6/10; Barstow 2/16/10; Von Drehle 2/18/10). While it is unlikely that average members do not behave strategically, given their desire to seek the truth, political operatives can and do distort discourse by engaging in conversations for the purpose of gaining votes. Strategic behavior is controlled to great degree by group policy. Often groups will explicitly prevent politicians or political operatives from participating in meetings (McGrath 2/1/10, 43). We Surround Them has this policy that the group is not “a platform for politicians or parties to spread their message” or “a party Recruitment Zone” (We Surround Them Website). Indeed, at meetings if a candidate stands up to speak about recruiting volunteers, Lyons and Kreslins ask them to stick to talking as if they were an average member. Other times, as with the Delco Patriots, groups will ask political operatives to speak, but only in the presentation portion of meetings. In this way, strategy is highlighted and separated from discourse. Finally, as has been discussed in how groups identify hegemony, the notion that members are like-minded enforces equality. Members are equal in their acceptance of certain core principles.

In addition to Habermas’s ideal speech situation, Fraser adds that for the counterpublic to produce rational counterdiscourses, they must not be “explicitly antidemocratic and antiegalitarian” and must not “practice their own modes of informal exclusion and
marginalization” (1992, 124). Instead discursive arenas should “unbracket inequalities in the sense of explicitly thematizing them” (120). In this quotation, Fraser is referring to the exclusionary aspects of dividing public and private spheres; discrimination based on gender, race and sexuality are cemented by such division because issues surrounding such discrimination are often private. The Tea Party appears *prima facie* to replicate the exact exclusions Fraser identifies. Tea Party supporters are typically concerned with unemployment, the deficit and government spending (*New York Times/CBS* Poll 4/12/10); private concerns are explicitly separated from the discourse. As George “Whitey” Coyne explained in the Delco Patriots discussion group, “you could have a whole bunch of things in your heads about conservatives; gun rights, most of us are pro-life. But that’s not the essence of what we’re about. So just those three principles [fiscal conservatism, pro-Constitution, and making a difference] the essence of what we’re all doing here” (Delco Patriots Discussion Group). In other words, concerns over private issues have no place in the movement. Indeed, polling suggests that private concerns, such as the right to abortion, are not primary concerns among Tea Party supporters (*New York Times/CBS* Poll 4/12/10). Of course, if members are concerned about issues in the private sphere, they may contract into a different counterpublic that explicitly blurs the line between public and private spheres, such as pro-life groups (Shields 2009).

However, while the possibilities of discourse are present, it is necessary first to test if there is a correlation between the views of new members and the views of old members. During their March 2010 monthly meetings, I randomly distributed 100 surveys to members of the Delco Patriots and We Surround Them, in which members were asked if they were 1) new and 2) what the most important problems facing the U.S. were. I then ran a t-test on the results, which is a statistical analysis that tests if the difference between new and young members was
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The second question was open-ended.
statistically significant. Because the sample size was very small, few issues were statistically significant. Nevertheless, certain differences were statistically significant between new and veteran members.

Among both groups, veteran members were more likely to respond that Constitutional issues were among the most important issues facing the U.S. (40% to 20%). This is to be expected considering the strong emphasis placed on Constitutional values in both groups. In the Delco Patriots, veteran members were less likely to respond that illegal immigration was among the most important issues facing the U.S. (0% to 11%). This result is likely due to the fact that illegal immigration is not an issue that is commonly discussed at Delco Patriot meetings. It is important to consider that while there is a discernable difference between new and veteran members, members in general did not consider illegal immigration an important issue. Among both groups, veteran members were more likely to respond that they talk about political issues at Tea Party meetings (9% to 0%). Veterans were also more likely to respond that they talk about political issues often (17% to 3%). These results were surprising considering how infrequently members responded that they talk to others about their political beliefs. In part, this likely has to do with the wording of my question. Because I asked where the respondent talked with others and with whom in the same question, respondents often only answered one part of the question. Additionally, because it was an open-ended question, respondents haphazardly named a collection of different places they speak. Had this test been performed again, I would have specifically asked if they talked at Tea Party meetings. Despite the shortcomings of the survey, the results nevertheless indicate that Delco Patriot and We Surround Them veteran members
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17 There were 72/100 responses among the Delco Patriots and 64/100 responses among We Surround Them.
18 The full list of results can be found in “Appendix C: Surveys and T-Tests.”
attending the March 2009 meeting were discernibly different in important areas compared to their newer counterparts.

Discourse typically occurs in Tea Party groups at three locations: in-person during meetings and protests and online on discussion boards. The most common location for discourse is meetings. Meetings usually occur once per month and are typically the only opportunity for the group to meet as a whole. Depending on the size of the group, meetings range from 20 to upward of 1,000 participants and generally last for two hours. The formal purpose of meetings is usually not to have discussion on issues; it is to teach members about issues facing the country. The leadership usually invites guest speakers (i.e. candidates, policy experts) to talk about a particular issue and sometimes the leadership simply speaks for itself (McGrath 2/1/10; Barstow 2/16/10). Despite meeting’s formal purpose to inform members, often times discourse breaks through these formal boundaries. Barstow describes an example at the Sandpoint Tea Party in Idaho when a member interrupted a presentation to explain that “private medical records were being shipped to federal bureaucrats.” After “gasps of rage… debate erupted.”

Another example of such discourse during meetings themselves occurred during the March 18, 2010 Delco Patriots Monthly Meeting in the Q&A session with Commonwealth Foundation representative Nathan Benefield. A member stood up to ask what the best way would be to increase transparency in the Pennsylvania House of Representatives. Benefield responded by urging members to contact their Representative and ask them to vote in favor of H.B. 1880, An Act establishing the Pennsylvania Government Accountability Portal that provides for portal requirements and for data requirements, confers powers and conveys duties on the Treasury Department and other State agencies and provides for exception to publication. Benefield explained that the bill would put all state spending online on one central website. After
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19 The Commonwealth Foundation is a Pennsylvania-based conservative advocacy group.
his response, another member asked a follow-up question in which he questioned whether putting state spending online actually increased spending because lobbyists would use spending information to pressure legislators to spend more money. A tempered debate unfolded in which some members wanted more transparency, while others wanted a reduction in spending. Nuanced difference between whether one emphasizes process (transparency) or economy (spending) was public and contested.

For the most part, however, discourse occurs before and after meetings. Informally members break into conversation before and after meetings or during intermission, often with complete strangers. As McGrath writes, Tea Partiers come to meetings “tired of talking to the TV,” and meeting hundreds of like-minded individuals provides a unique opportunity to vent out their frustrations, discuss their concerns about the country, and plan how they can enact change (2/1/10, 40). McGrath notes that his discussions with Tea Partiers occur “as the meeting was breaking up” (46). Barstow similarly notes conversations occurring “as the meeting ended” (2/16/10). Because “tea party meetings are being convened in restaurants and living rooms and libraries and office buildings — and online,” these informal settings often allow for ample time to converse before and after meetings (Von Drehle 2/18/10). David Clark of the Delco Patriots commented in the discussion group, “meetings are probably the basic venue to communicate because people get together at a meeting.”

Of course, discourse is not restricted to face-to-face interactions. In the age of the internet, Tea Partiers often discuss issues on group discussion boards and blogs. However, the notion that discourse can occur online is a contested one. In Republic 2.0, Cass Sunstein presents the most common argument against the possibility of online discourse, contending that not enough viewpoints are expressed on internet forums because people most often choose to go
where their views will be confirmed. He invokes a hypothetical “Daily Me” scenario, in which individuals can “filter what they want to read, see, and hear” such that no one “come[s] across topics and views that [they] have not sought out” (2008, 1). Sunstein argues that such a scenario has profound political implications because individuals “may want to restrict [themselves] to certain points of view by hearing only from people with whom [they] agree. In designing your preferred newspaper, [they] can choose among conservatives, moderates, liberals, vegetarians, the religious right, and socialists.” On the other hand, individuals who aren’t interested in politics become completely removed from the political process because they have the ability to “avoid news altogether” (2). The result is a digital republic in which groups are even more polarized than they are today. Similar critiques have aggregated into a body of literature that identifies the limits of “digital democracy” due to the internet’s tendency to narrow and confine people’s views such that they only see what they want to see (Sunstein 2008; Zittrain 2008; Hindman 2009).

The issue with critiques of the possibility of online discursive arenas is grounded in the imaginary Daily Me Sunstein constructs. While it may be true that “our communications market is rapidly moving in the direction of this apparently utopian picture” (Sunstein 2008, 3), we do not live in this dystopian world. Just as honest difference in emphasis and definition of “conservative” arise in face-to-face interactions, such differences arise in online forums as well. This should not be concerning as much as it is a productive opportunity for members of a counterpublic to escape hegemony in the mass and strong publics and have a discourse that is only possible with other individuals who share certain core principles. Moreover, online forums in some ways have even greater potential to replicate an ideal discursive arena. Regarding Habermas’s third ideal speech situation, accepting norms of equality, markers of difference are
in many ways concealed in online interactions. This can be counterproductive in some ways — concealing race, gender and sexuality can prevent certain issues around those identities from gaining publicity. However, at the same time, concealing difference also means equalizing shyness, individuals with powerful voices and a variety of other personal qualities that inhibit discourse in face-to-face interactions.

Though the Tea Party movement relies heavily on Meetup.com to disseminate information, use of discussion boards varies depending on the group. For groups like We Surround Them, members are obligated to use the discussion boards during the contracting process. For this reason, We Surround Them members are more prolific discussion board contributors. By contrast, groups like the Delco Patriots never require members to participate on discussion boards, and so they are less used. Age is another important factor in limiting the use of discussion boards. Accessing boards is a complex process that requires significant knowledge of computers and the internet. Because the Tea Party has such a large constituency of elderly citizens who were not raised using computers and the internet, many tend not to use the discussion boards. Nevertheless, online discussion boards provide a similar space for members to converse with one another and build a counterdiscourse. Ideal speech situation even optimized in part because norms of equality are accentuated.

Regardless of whether discourse occurs in face-to-face interactions or online, as Fraser, Dawson and Harris-Lacewell reminds us, counterdiscourse fundamentally occurs at the grassroots — it is the members of the counterpublic who articulate their concerns that shape and define the counterpublic. Most importantly for the Tea Partiers themselves, discourse allows them to identify 1) what the oppositional arguments should be and 2) how they as Tea Partiers fit into America. Following the scholarship in addition to the number of sources that point to breaks
during Tea Party meetings as critical locations of discourse, I set up discussion groups at the beginning of the Delco Patriots meeting and at the end of the We Surround Them meeting in March 2010. In the Delaware County group, I spoke with Christy Herschel, Kathleen McGuigan, Joanne Yurchak, Pete Schettler, Gerry Schettler, William Scott Maxwell, David Clark, George “Whitey” Coyne and John Stufflet. In the We Surround Them group, I spoke with Deborah Catron, Philip Catron, Debby Catron, Jay Jones, John Chucoski, Lynn Chucoski, Annette Royster. The following is an analysis of my conversations with Tea Partiers from these groups.

Tea Partiers are united by mistrust of government. 94% of Tea Party supporters trust government “only some of the time or almost never” (New York Times/CBS Poll 4/12/10), conspiracy theories of mass government plots abound (Kay 2/9/10; Barstow 2/16/10), and Glenn Beck renamed his studio the “doom room” from its original name “the fear chamber” (Von Drehle 9/17/09). However, beyond the clever studio names and the conspiracy theories, Tea Partiers use everyday talk to negotiate the meaning of these fears.

One of the more complicated fears that Tea Partiers negotiate is whether cuts in Social Security should be made. While one of the clear principles of the Tea Party is cutting government spending, as a group that tends to be older and dependent on Social Security (New York Times/CBS Poll 4/12/10), cutting their own entitlements can be unsavory. Indeed, the New York Times/CBS Poll found that while 92% of supporters wanted a smaller government that provided fewer services, only 73% of those who wanted small government went on to say that they support “cuts on domestic programs such as Social Security, Medicare, education, or defense.” Follow-up interviews from respondents of the poll also indicate that “they did not want
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20 Biographies provided by each of these individuals along with transcripts from the conversation can be found in “Appendix A: Delaware County Discussion Group” and “Appendix B: We Surround Them Discussion Group.”
to cut Medicare or Social Security — the biggest domestic programs, suggesting instead a focus on ‘waste’” (Zernike 4/14/10).

To observe how Tea Partiers negotiate this dilemma through discourse, I asked the participants of both the Delco Patriots and We Surround Them discussion groups “what is your perception of Social Security?” Joanne, a grandmother of four and a retired chemistry professor, quickly responded, “you know, we paid into social security, you know. I mean we paid.” Kathleen, a middle-aged systems analyst for Comcast, added that while the government “shouldn’t have [taken money] to begin with… they’ve been taking money out of our paychecks for years, and it literally belongs to these people.” Gerry, a retired music teacher, pointed out another problem that “there’s a smaller population in the demographic” to pay for Social Security, which puts a higher tax burden on younger generations. And yet, everyone at the table knows that the conversation can’t end there. Everyone recognizes the potential contradiction between asking for cuts in all entitlements and protecting Social Security. Indeed, just a few moments later Christy, a grandmother and registered Democrat, brought up the point that “the problem with entitlements is that they are pushed in. People have to depend on them and you can’t withdraw them which is a part of progressive theory.” To this there was a smattering of “sure” and “yeah’s,” to which Pete added that the sum of entitlements over the years “creates a vast dependency class.”

At this point in the conversation, almost everyone has contributed to the discourse. Joanne begins the discussion with a brief anecdote of her life experience having to pay for an entitlement program that some consider should be cut. Kathleen crystallizes Joanne’s experience by introducing the principle that a program that “belongs to these people” should not be cut. Gerry brings information to the table about how a shrinking wage-earning population only
exacerbates the problem. The group clearly stakes out a position that there is a problem with Social Security. Through discourse, the group’s members decide that the program it is difficult to cut because its beneficiaries already paid their dues, and that costs are making an already difficult problem worse. Christy complicates things even more and brings the group to the heart of the matter — that a “vast dependency class” has been brought about and that the act of creating dependency is what makes entitlements unsavory.

Despite clearly defining the issue at hand, participants from this point had a difficult time identifying a solution. Christy continued to mention similar complicated entitlements such as SCHIP, Medicare and Medicaid and trails off by saying “we can’t get out from under it…” From this point, Gerry got the conversation off-track by bringing up recent news that the U.S. could lose its triple-A debt rating. There were more pauses in the conversation, indicating that participants were still stuck on Christy’s point that the participants in the group are the vast dependency class they so often critique. After several minutes go by, John, having introduced himself as “an extremist,” proposed to “cut all entitlements.” He continues, “our government should be run under the Constitution and Bill of Rights. That said, that means no entitlements.” Immediately, he is rebuked by several members of the group. Kathleen disagreed on a point he makes about the government’s role in taxation. Joanne asserted that this position takes too hard of a line on entitlements, explaining that “there are certain places where you must help people,” such as when “you have a child with cerebral palsy.” Though the solution is never resolved, discourse allowed for a certain balance to occur between John’s suggestion that all entitlements be cut and the Christy’s concern that too many entitlements creates a “vast dependency class” in which “government controls our lives.” At any rate, members who participated in this discussion understood that a certain balance has to be met regarding cuts in Social Security.
Another anxiety within the Tea Party movement is its image. Photographs of Tea Partiers holding signs comparing President Obama to Hitler have led House Speaker Nancy Pelosi (D-CA) and House Majority Leader Steny Hoyer (D-MD) to call the movement “an ugly campaign by angry mobs” who commit “simply un-American acts” (Ferrechio 8/10/09). These comments produce deep anxieties in the movement of how it is portrayed in the media. Indeed, while many in the movement believe Obama is comparable to Hitler, those who don’t subscribe to this conspiracy find it difficult to distance themselves from the conspiracy-driven part of the movement.

During the We Surround Them discussion group, the comparison between Obama and Hitler came up. John, a frazzled middle-aged man, interrupted a conversation about health care to bring up his “real serious reading of Obama’s books.” After hearing about a situation in which Obama “took a private plane to the Arab countries, Germany, Russia, and all that stuff... [and] brought back briefcases full of something that was locked up,” John explained his grave concern that “this was just payoff money for him to socialize and destroy the United States. Because Russia’s never been near it. No one’s been able to do it externally. It has to be done internally. And I think he is the person they’re looking for. He’s like Adolf Hitler, unfortunately.” He then continues for several minutes, explaining that the presidential election was a ploy to get control of the country and to establish a secret police force. After sitting through an awkward silence from everyone else in the group, Lynn interrupts the monologue to ask me “is this something that is getting away from what you need?” I then asked if “anybody else has anything to say about...
that," to which I received a long pause. Before John began his monologue again, Phillip hesitated, “I don’t necessarily... well, it doesn’t matter.” After I encouraged him to speak up, Phillip said, “it’s more flippant than anything. I don’t necessarily think that Barack Obama is comparable to Adolf Hitler.” When asked why, Phillip responded “he’s not as smart as Adolf Hitler was.” To this everyone breaks out in nervous laughter, with the exception of John who explains, “you don’t have to be smart. You have to be devious.” Phillip, along with Debby and Lynn conceded that “he’s got some people,” suggesting that Obama has advisors who have nazi aspirations, but concluded that “I don’t subscribe to those types of conspiracy theories.” To this there is hardy agreement, again with the exception of John.

This conversation is notably different from the discussion on Social Security in the Delco Patriots for two reasons. First, there was definitive agreement by the end of the conversation. Rather than deconstruct the problematic to address the heart of the question, here there was rapid consensus once Phillip contended that Obama was not comparable to Hitler. However, this brings the second point of departure from the Social Security discussion: discourse broke down at this point in the conversation. Before John brought up his Hitler conspiracy, participants were actively engaging in a conversation about the 10th amendment and states’ rights. However, as soon as John began his monologue, there was a noticeable silence in the group. No one wanted to challenged John’s assertion – indeed, had I not asked if anyone had anything to say about John’s comments and then pressed Phillip when he suggested he had something to say, a verbal consensus that John was wrong would not have been achieved. Moreover, even when participants recognized that they agreed with one another, they still did not come to a strong consensus; Phillip defended that Obama wasn’t a Nazi, but he asserted that some of the people who work for him are Nazis.
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The breakdown of discourse in this scenario points to a broader problem in the movement; while discourse helps members construct meaning on a broad range of issues, members disengage when racy conspiracy theories come up. Like Lynn and Annette, who suggest on two occasions that the conversation is getting off topic, Tea Partiers in general have not addressed the movement’s relationship with conspiracy theorists. During a meeting with a Tea Party group in Idaho that is associated with a local militia movement, Barstow writes about a speaker who attended one of the events: “gazing out at his overwhelmingly white audience, Mr. Mack felt the need to say, ‘this meeting is not racist’” (2/16/10). He then continues to write that while the movement has adopted a “big tent strategy” that welcomes conspiracy theorists, it has yet to successfully explain why conspiracy theorists should be a part of the movement. As professor of politics at the University of Virginia said, “in the near term, the mostly white movement faces a possible showdown with the religious right over divisive social issues. But its biggest challenge lies in tackling its extremist fringe, including those who equate Obama with Hitler” (Carens et al. 3/18/10).

Through the Delco Patriot and We Surround Them discussion groups, some of the difficulties and strengths of discursive relationships between Tea Partiers have been revealed. Oppositional discourses to policies on which Tea Partiers feel they’ve been hedged have great potential to draw upon the resources of counterpublic members. However, breakdown in discourse over conspiracy theories harkens to Harris-Lacewell’s discussion on the participation of gays in the black barbershop, in which there is a “broader failure of the African American community to recognize the specific concerns of gays and lesbians as legitimate items for the black agenda” (2006, 188). The silence that faced John’s remarks on Obama and Hitler point to broader problems Tea Partiers have on engaging conspiracy theorists.
Discursive Recourse

Finally, for a counterpublic to contribute to a rational discourse, the product of counterdiscourses must recursively have an impact on the mass and strong publics. Harris-Lacewell notes that the movie *Barbershop* was a defining moment for the mass discourse because it got a front-row seat to discourses in the black counterpublic. America as a whole became aware of issues discussed in the black public and the personalities of its members. Fraser defines feminist lecture series in universities as evoking a similar critical publicity. For the Tea Party movement, the past year has been a concentrated effort at bringing counterdiscourses to the foray of the mass and strong discourses. In particular, strong publics have picked up on certain themes prevalent in the Tea Party counterdiscourse. Much of this has to do with the fact that many individuals within the strong public are dependent on Tea Party members for votes. It is important to recall that in the April 12 *New York Times/CBS* Poll, 18% of the country personally consider themselves supporters of the movement. Among those who consider themselves supporters, 48% claim that they usually vote Republican and 18% claim that they always vote Republican.

It is therefore no surprise that Republican members of the strong public are eager to align themselves with aspects of the Tea Party counterdiscourse. Some members of the strong public have even become a part of the Tea Party movement. Senator Jim DeMint (R-SC) has become “a favorite of the grass-roots ‘tea party’ brigade.” He is known for “going right on everything, from the economy and health care to immigration and hot-button social issues like gay rights” (Hunt 12/14/09). The book he’s written, *Saving Freedom: We Can Stop America’s Slide into Socialism* details his opposition to socialism. 92% of Tea Party supporters believe Obama is moving the country toward socialism. DeMint supports cuts in all entitlement programs (except Medicare,
which he supports for citizens 65 and older) (Hunt 12/14/09). 92% of Tea Party supporters want a smaller government with fewer services, though 73% of those who say they want a smaller government support cuts in Social Security and Medicare. When journalists claim that DeMint is conservative on every issue, he is specifically adopting Tea Party discourses on every issue.

Of course, it isn’t just DeMint who has adopted Tea Party counterdiscourses into his platform. Many Republicans have begun to champion a strict view of the 10th amendment, an important aspect of the Tea Party counterdiscourse, and one that was present in both the We Surround Them and Delco Patriots discussion groups. In March 2010, Governor Mike Rounds of South Dakota and Governor Dave Freudenthal of Wyoming, both Republicans, signed bills into law that declare “the federal regulation of firearms as invalid if a weapon is made and used in South Dakota” (Johnson 3/16/10). Republican state attorneys general in Florida, South Carolina, Nebraska, Texas, Utah, Pennsylvania, Washington, North Dakota, South Dakota and Alabama are preparing suits against the federal government for federal health care insurance mandates in the recently passed health care reform law (Connor 3/22/10). Such action by Republicans within strong publics reflects a keen attention to aspects of the Tea Party counterdiscourse that affirm a strict view of the 10th amendment.

Beyond policies that have been put in place by the GOP to appease Tea Party concerns, the party itself has attempted to associate itself with the Tea Party movement. On February 16, 2010, Republican National Committee Chairman Michael S. Steele and other GOP operatives met with 50 leaders of Tea Party organizations from around the country. The occasion “marked the first time that a broad coalition of tea party organizers – who have railed against both the Democratic and the Republican establishments – will sit down with GOP leaders” (Rucker 2/16/10). As a recognition of the importance of the Tea Party to the GOP, RNC spokeswoman
Katie Wright explained, “the chairman believes it is extremely important to listen to this significant grass-roots movement and work to find common ground in order to elect officials that will protect these principles” (2/16/10). Indeed, it has been no surprise that in a year where “the momentum is away from the Democrats as they’re the party in power, so Republican candidates espousing Tea Party views in general have a better chance in the midterm” (Carey et al. 3/18/10).

Despite a number of eager supporters in the strong public, the Tea Party has yet to make significant headway regarding having a direct discursive influence in the mass public. In the April 12, 2010 New York Times/CBS Poll, 46% of respondents said they haven’t heard enough about the movement to decide whether they viewed it favorably or unfavorably. Since the February 12, 2010 poll, little had changed in terms of how much respondents had heard or read about the movement; 28% said nothing, 22% said not much, 31% said some and 19% said a lot. Nevertheless, the movement has made inroads regarding the framing of debate.

In August 2009, attentive citizens could not watch TV or pick up a newspaper without seeing an article about Tea Partiers disrupting town hall meetings (McGrath 2/1/10; Barstow 2/16/10). However, even if one were attentive to the Tea Party during this period, it would have been difficult to find discourse among the countless images of speechless angry activists and conspiracy theorists (Stone 8/20/09). Unlike many Tea Partiers who try to overlook extremist parts of the movement in their own counterdiscourses, the media actively exposed these parts. Reports with Tea Partiers holding “signs [that] dubbed Janet Napolitano ‘Obama’s Gestapo Queen’” (Beam 4/15/09) and screaming “death panels”\textsuperscript{21} at town hall meetings (Stone 4/20/10). Media outlets claimed they were “a fringe coalition of nativists and neo-Nazis” (Beam 12/7/09), “extremist mobs... evilmongers... [and] political terrorists” (Ham 1/20/10). While many Tea Partiers indeed support this part of the movement, the violent anger associated with such

\textsuperscript{21} Death panel refers to the section of the health care reform bill that provides for end of life care (Stone 4/20/10).
blindingly angry protesters limited the possibility of counterdiscourses to be disclosed to the mass public. No nuanced discourse regarding the rising national debt or cutting entitlements could pierce the cacophony of “a fringe coalition of nativists and neo-Nazis.”

Not surprisingly, among Americans who do pay attention to the movement, most are divided; while 21% have favorable views of the movement, 18% have unfavorable views and 14% are undecided. When asked whether they think the movement generally reflects the views of most Americans, 25% of respondents agreed, 36% said they do not reflect most and 38% could not answer the question. One explanation for this division may be that the attentive public actually does understand the Tea Party movement and has decided to agree or disagree with their political views accordingly. However, given the large number of respondents who claimed that they were unfamiliar with the movement, a more plausible explanation would be that members of the mass public have used heuristics based on the limited information they’ve seen from protests. In this circumstance, agreement and disagreement is more centered on the fringe elements of the movement than on more nuanced aspects of the movement’s message that have come about through discourse.

Though counterdiscourses within the Tea Party movement have had an effect on the strong public, they have had less of an effect on the mass public. This is likely related to the strong public’s preoccupation with getting votes and therefore being particularly attentive to counterdiscourses in mass movements such as the Tea Party. However, among the mass public, which has little incentive to decipher discourses in the Tea Party, counterdiscourses have yet to make a significant impact. The attempts by the movement to publicize itself through marches and protests have only highlighted the anger and fringe elements without any substantive discourse behind it.
Conclusion

Looking back at the historiography of other counterpublics, the Tea Party is unique in its rapid ascension to the national stage. The so-called “great recession” of 2008 had an immediate impact of isolating individuals in a manner that promoted fear of big business and the government. The media infrastructure of Fox News along with organizational support from FreedomWorks and Americans for Prosperity collected a growing anger and channeled it into a political counterpublic. Individuals were attracted to the movement because they felt hedged politically and economically. Many were fearful of government and the direction of the country, and felt that they had no say in the process.

With the help of Fox News FreedomWorks, Americans for Prosperity and grassroots activists, individuals contracted (and still contract) into Tea Party chapters in which they could learn more about this hegemony. Most importantly to the constitution of a counterpublic, members of the Tea Party conversed with one another. They constructed oppositional discourses that helped them make sense of their fears. Equipped with these oppositional discourses, Tea Partiers protested and disrupted town halls. To the eager ears of Republican members of the strong public, such discourses were adopted and often repeated as policy platforms. However, to the mass public who has no incentive to pay attention to the Tea Party, these counterdiscourses have had little effect. And even among those in the mass public who have paid attention to the Tea Party, voiceless images of Tea Partiers comparing President Obama to Hitler have prevented constructive discourse to occur.

Nevertheless, despite its quick ascension to the national stage, the Tea Party is not a dying counterpublic. On the contrary, it is a growing movement that builds on the residual economic and political isolation was caused by the 2008 recession. Monthly meetings across the
country continue to draw hundreds to thousands of Tea Partiers (Zernike 3/27/10), and the most recent poll indicated that 13% of those who consider themselves supporters of the Tea Party movement regularly attend meetings and protests (New York Times/CBS Poll 4/12/10). Moreover, the midterm Congressional Election in November 2010 will provide the largest opportunity yet to disclose counterdiscourses to the mass and strong publics. Many members of the strong public will have to run for reelection, and thus discuss the issues with their constituency. As many Republican members of the strong public have closely aligned themselves with aspects of the Tea Party counterdiscourse, the elections will be a significant opportunity for members of the mass public to sincerely engage with the Tea Party counterdiscourse, if indirectly.

On more broad terms, through viewing the Tea Party movement as a counterpublic, it is possible to imagine a rational public in a more productive context than simply measuring the factual information that the mass public posses. Individuals make sense of the world through discourse. In a country whose citizens hold radically different political views, ethnicities, religions, sexual orientations and a variety of other definitions of identity, discourse brings us together in ways that sheer factual understanding cannot. While hegemony is a constant threat productive discourse, the presence of counterpublics – black, feminist or Tea Party – help center the discourse in a way that maintains rationality and optimizes the potential for democratic politics.
Appendix A: Delaware County Discussion Group

Participants

1. Christy Herschel
   a. I grew up in a working class neighborhood outside of St. Louis, Mo. My father was a fire fighter and staunch union man and Democrat. After marrying and raising 3 children, I went back to school and obtained a Master's degree in Speech/Language Pathology, and I practice as a speech/language pathologist in the public school system today. Politically, I was a liberal Democrat, even participated in 1976 Missouri caucus, nominating Ted Kennedy in my district. After supporting Clinton twice, I became increasingly disenchanted with liberalism. I took time to review where the Democrat party stood with regard to my principles, and began to associate more with Conservatism. In '08, I believed it was necessary for me to campaign against Obama and his ideology. I am currently concerned with the negative effect the growing size of government will have on my grandsons' "life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness;" hence my association with the Delco Patriots.

2. Kathleen McGuigan
   a. I am a systems analyst. I am currently working for a major telecommunications company but have worked in the insurance and software industries. I am 36 years old, grew up in Upper Darby and went to Catholic grade and high schools. I now live in Drexel Hill. I have no children of my own but believe it is immoral to leave them my generation’s debts. I have voted for Democrats, Republicans and Independents over the years. I have been disappointed in most but some more than others. When I bothered to pay attention, I felt that their decisions had only minimal and indirect consequences to myself and my loved ones. I was wrong and should have been involved sooner.

3. Joanne Yurchak
   a. I had extreme misgivings about Obama, particularly considering his many disreputable associations (Ayers and Wright to name just two), his far-left record, his virtual non-experience, and his comments about “spreading the wealth around.” However, he was duly elected to be our president, and I really tried to give him a chance to govern as a centrist, as was my best hope. However, it wasn’t long before I realized that my worst nightmares about Obama were coming to fruition. Shortly after his inauguration it became obvious that he was attempting to fulfill his prediction of “fundamentally changing America,” as quickly as possible. I observed the “change” that his administration and many of their Democratic cohorts in Congress, were, and are, imposing upon our country—their reckless spending, the rapid deterioration of our freedoms by governmental takeovers, and the methods ("almost anything goes" Chicago-style tactics, lies, bribery, and criminal behaviors) that they’ve used to ram their destructive progressive agenda down the throats of the America people. My horror, frustration, and incredible anger at their abominable and tyrannical actions have fueled my determination to do whatever is in my power to peacefully and legally
stop what I considered to be the escalating annihilation of America as we know it.

4. Pete Schettler
5. Gerry Schettler
6. William Scott Maxwell
7. David Clark
8. George “Whitey” Coyne
9. John Stufflet

Transcript

Ben: Everybody’s talking about the tea parties and nobody really knows much about them and they’re making judgments anyway.

Joanne: They’re making pretty incorrect judgments.

David: Education is the first basic priority People understand what it is....

Joanne: Absolutely because they’re making some pretty incorrect statements.

David: I saw something in the media just yesterday before I came. I went to the website of the Washington Post and CBS just to get a flavor of the mixed media review. One thing I noticed: the Lyndon Larouchies are the ones that have the Hitler picture. Osama bin laden. I’m sorry Obama with the Hitler moustache. That is not the Tea Party. That is the Lyndon Larouche organization, and they’re mixing that in and they’re not making distinctions. The thing that troubles me is that they know Lyndon Larouche. They know who he is. They know his organization. He has a long history of running for the Presidency of the United States. That is a group that has been highlighted by the mainstream media for quite a few years. They’re active with this. When the Tea Party shows up somewhere, you’ll see the Larouchy people with their magazines [of Hitler’s picture]. They’re the ones with this picture. And the media doesn’t make that distinction.

Ben: And of course the same people in the news media who don’t make the distinction with conservatives do make the distinction with liberals. So obviously there’s something wrong here when you have the same people criticizing conservative activists for clumping together and then you don’t see them do the same thing for liberals.

Christy: I personally feel – I consider myself a moderate – I’m just so sick of what’s going on that I felt that I had to be active. But I personally feel the mainstream media has been extremely unfair. I really do. I mean, when we went to Washington, on 9.12 they had in the paper we looked at it – my daughter and I went – and there were hundreds of... and I don’t exaggerate. I would under exaggerate rather than over exaggerate. There were hundreds of thousands of people. And I know because I have been to Penn State football games and there were hundreds of thousands of people there. And they barely reported it. Fox News did. But they barely reported it. And when they asked the administration about it, they said “oh we weren’t really aware this was going to be happening.” I have the article that says that. And I thought, “either this was either they’re totally incompetent because if they didn’t know that hundreds of
thousands of people were coming...” They come from literally all over the country. I mean we stayed overnight on Friday night. We met people from literally people from all over the country. They come on their own money. They weren’t being paid. And you would think that somebody would have praised these people because they felt so strongly about their country and what’s happening to their country but they almost totally ignored this. And it was very frustrating.

Ben: And I remember seeing that reporting. Before we start talking about things though, do you mind saying your names? Of course, everything is confidential.

Joanne: No. No. No. I agree. Do you want a background or anything?

Ben: Yeah, if you want to introduce yourself.

Joanne: My name’s Joanne Yurchak, and I was an academic too. I teach chemistry at Widener. I’m an engineer. I have two children and four grand children and I’m very concerned about what’s going on. I live in Media, PA.

Christy: I’m Christy Hershel and I’m a speech pathologist. I live in Haverford Township. I’m a grandmother with a 2 seven year old grandsons. I just became politically involved for fear of what kind of country my grandsons will inherit.

David: I’m a resident of Merion Lower County. I work in Swarthmore, PA. I’m a cult information specialist. I work with families that have cult problems. Being a resident of Delaware County, I’ve noticed changes epically with our local government. Taxes have grown. I’m a resident of Ridley Township. Our taxes are very high. But I think the issue of the Constitution is such a core basic commitment of our government and we’re going through such a change in our culture and society, and I think it’s extremely important to protect our rights. One of the things I’ve noticed in shifting the meaning of our Constitution is coming from these Civil Liberty types. But Constitutional protections that relate to how we’re represented I think is... We’re in a critical stage in our government when you think of the health care issue. I wanted to go to the 9/12 gathering. I wasn’t able to. But I did go to the health care bill... It had gone through the House, and I went to the event with Michelle Bachman. The Kill the Bill event.

Ben: Did you all go to that?

Christy: I couldn’t. I had to work.

David: I went to the Kill the Bill event at the South Capitol Lawn. I saw – this is the South Capitol – I had a hard time getting to where the speakers were. The thing that struck me was that afterwards they said go your local Representatives. I’ve been to Washington back and forth for the 37 years beginning when I went to the Doles gathering concerning cults back in 1976, so I’ve been back and forth a number of times for different things, but this was the largest crowd that I had personally seen with my eyes at the South Capitol Lawn. And the people waiting in line were blocks – as long as the eye could see. Just waiting to get in there. Just waiting to speak with their Representatives
Joanne: And that was smaller than 9/12. 9/12 was... because 9/12 we met in freedom Plaza and then it was the most incredible experience I have ever had. And what happened was we marched a mile down to the capital and people were merging in from all sides and it was so crowded. We were standing up because you couldn’t sit down it was that dense and that packed. There were just people, so many people.

David: But I just could not imagine the people that were waiting in line. We’re talking blocks – wrapping around – just waiting to get to their legislators to speak with them about their concerns. And the Pennsylvania offices said that I’d have to wait to hear back from them.

[Music interruptions]

Christy: Did you have any questions you wanted to ask?

Ben: I guess one of the critics of the Tea Party movement is that it’s just this one conglomerate of conservatives. And, you know, there’s no differentiation between the groups. Do you feel like oh...

[Whitey enters the group]

Hi, is your name Whitey? So I guess I was explaining to all of them that my name is Ben and I’m a senior at Haverford College and I’m doing a project on the Tea Party movement. It’s my final senior project. So I guess, first of all do you want to introduce yourself? Just the yeah.

Whitey: I’m Whitey Coin. Nick name Whitey. I’m a late comer to the movement, like middle of the summer. When I just started getting so fed up with what’s going on in Washington and the corruption and the ignorance of the Constitution that I had to do something. And so I joined this group here.

Ben: Great. So as I was beginning to explain, one of the criticisms of the Tea Party movement is that it’s a conglomerate of different conservatives.

[Kathleen enters]

Ben: Sorry! I was just asking if everyone wanted to introduce themselves before we start.

Joanne: Tell them what you do.

Kathleen: I’m Kathleen. I’m an analyst for Comcast.

Ben: I was also explaining to everyone that my name is Ben and I’m a senior at Haverford College and I’m doing my final senior thesis project on the Tea Party movement. So finally, one of the criticisms of the Tea Party movement is that it’s just this conglomerate of the same conservative people. I guess, do you see different parts of the Tea Party movement? I mean, what are the main, I guess if you could divide the Tea Party movement into people with different beliefs? You mentioned the Constitution – not to say that the Constitution doesn’t overlap with
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other issues — but with the huge deficit and the Constitution and other issues, do you see a lot of
different perceptions?

Whitey: I would say how do you define conservative? I think the essence of what we’re doing is
there are three basic principles. Return to constitutional principles, smaller, much much smaller
government and a lower the debt of this country. It’s gonna bankrupt the government. Fiscal
responsibility.

Joanne: Fiscal responsibility.

Christy: Fiscal responsibility.

Joanne: That is really it. I mean that is it. And then there are people okay you might have
people that are pro life but that is not what this is about. It’s not what it’s about. I’m pro choice.
You know, we are all under one umbrella so we do not advocate those different positions it’s just
what he said. Just htose three things. That’s where we’re at.

Whitey: You could have a whole bunch of things in your heads about conservatives; gun rights,
most of us are pro-life. But that’s not the essence of what we’re all about. So just those three
principles the essence of what we’re all doing here.

Ben: Do you feel that that’s all that you guys discuss at these meetings — these other issues —
social issues aren’t important?

Christy: Primarily, I’d say it’s the fiscal responsibility is the biggest motivator is what I have
heard the most.

David: I would still say pro-Constitution is still important.

Joanne: Yes, oh yes.

Christy: Yes.

Kathleen: Absolutely

[Stars and Stripes Forever begins to play on a loop in the background.]

Whitey: What we do is we discuss things to and make a difference.

Joanne: And how to change. How to change what’s happening and just slow down and reverse.
That’s what we’re trying to do.

David: I think the government officials need to be held accountable. It’s disgusting. It’s
absolutely disgusting. They are representatives. They are there to represent the voter. When
they’re totally ignoring major sectors of their constituents, that’s an insult and a slap in the face
for voters. It’s just irresponsible.
Kathleen: And believe me, they are.

Joanne: And believe me, they are. And they are essentially saying we know best. We know what's best for you. It's a very paternal type. They treat us like children and it's ... we resent it.

Whitey: You see, this is the essence of the Progressive movement. Are you familiar with the Progressive movement? It started with Woodrow Wilson and Teddy Roosevelt. And that's been underground since Wilson. Now it's coming back – it's been there all along – but it's coming back.

Joanne: Do you want more information from us? Have you been to our website?

Ben: Yeah, and I've talked with Deb and Lisa. Specifically about this chapter, but the entire Tea Party movement. I just wanted to get perceptions from people who joined the group. You aren't necessarily leading the movement. I want to see how you guys feel at the ground level. We have some new people.

[ Interruption by person passing out fliers on Sheriff Mack ]

Joanne: We're meeting. We're having an interview here, OK? I don't think you understand. So, thank you.

Ben: Thank you. We just have to finish this interview.

Christy: OK! We'll catch you later.

[Pete, Gerry and John enter]

Ben: For those of you who just joined us, would you like to tell us your names and a brief introduction?

Pete: I'm Pete Schettler. I'm a retiree living here in Middletown Township. I live in a senior retirement community and my wife Gerry is over here.

Ben: And did you want to introduce yourself?

John: I'm John Stufflet.

Ben: Now, for the three of you who just came, just briefly, I'm Ben and I'm a senior at Haverford College.

John: Hi Ben.

Ben: I'm doing my final senior project on the Tea Party. And so I want to talk with people and get their perceptions on a few issues. The next thing I wanted to bring up is the level of
discussion in the Tea Party movement, and how much you guys talk to one another? Where do you guys talk to one another about these things?

Christy: You mean like physical locations or events?

Ben: I mean like locations, who you talk to?

David: This is probably the basic venue to communicate because people get together at a meeting. Another would be phone calls. Another would be side meetings. Another would be protests. Different things come up – protests – I was at Baltimore Pike this past Sunday where 252 meets. We were right next to Rep. Lentz’s office. People were talking at the protest. They were picketing. We talked afterwards. So there was a lot of networking that takes place as a result of these interactions.

Gerry: And it crosses the population: professionals, seniors like us, retired professionals. I am a music teacher just for your information so I’m doing... You know I am a job besides even though I’m of senior status. What I wanted to ask you particularly is what got you interested. Was it something you talked about in high school?

Ben: I go to college.

Joanne: He’s doing his senior thesis.

Gerry: Oh wait college. I thought somebody said high school. I wondered if you did senior theses there. That makes more sense.

Joanne: We think that getting together just even on this tells us that we’re not alone. I mean I think a lot of us are so frustrated when we saw what was happening. We were just at our wits end and getting together in a group people with like-minded ideas even though we all might differ in a lot of things, we have those three basic principles.

Whitey: I wanted to add this – I think almost probably 90-100% of the groups are spontaneously formed. No net rational organization. We do cooperate with each other because we have similar principles and feel very strongly about them. It’s a bunch of spontaneous independent groups that rose for the same reasons.

Joanne: Right, exactly. We are not being directed by someone.

Christy: We communicate largely when we’re not having meetings through email. And we all most of us are on the internet. Most of us read all these different blogs, you know throughout the week and keep abreast of information and then come here and we’ll have a topic. And it’s just a way for people to compare notes, make plans.

David: The website makes it so easy just to know when the next meeting is. The website keeps just keeps me involved. Plus emails that are sent back and forth. It’s very effective to have that kind of communication.
Gerry: The people here... and they're very organized so this... when we leave here today we will know when the next meeting is. They’ll have the little poster things they distribute.

Kathleen: They’re very organized.

Gerry: I did want to say something about in our case July 4th we go downtown down to Center City and we always explore something new down there because we are very... We are all very patriotic and the last July 4th we heard that there was a Tea Party movement. And it was Herb Denenberg speaking and Dom Giordano.

Pete: Dom Giordano

Gerry: And so we make signs. There’s a sign contest. It’s cute because people march and it was very informative. Young people with speakers. And so from there then we found out about Delaware County having a local. And we were so proud because we didn’t even have to travel all the way downtown and that was... It was really... And then we went to Washington on September 12 and that was... As you were saying, like minded people. It was so...

Whitey: Don’t let anyone tell you there was less than a million people there.

[Laughter]

Joanne: Yeah. We’ve covered that.

Christy: Yeah.

David: Oh yeah!

Gerry: It was amazing!

Ben: Every person I talk to tells me this. One of the things that you brought up that was very interesting is the website. I was wondering what you’re thoughts were on the discussion board. Do you feel like that a useful place to exchange ideas?

Christy: What do you think about our huge Delaware county website- we don’t use that board that much for discussion. And it’s... I even go to the Huffington Post. I go all over the place and I follow blogs. It’s very interesting to see what other people think across the country.

David: I heard the wife of the Supreme Court – it wasn’t through a conservative outlet, it was through a liberal outlet.

Kathleen: Yeah, but it was a critism!

Gerry: You’re right Kathleen
David: She was a Tea Party organizer. She’s like, I was impressed with that. Wow! The wife of a Supreme Court justice understands this and she’s very much on the same page we are.

Christy: But you were saying about the blog? The Delco blog?

Kathleen: I just don’t visit it that much. I do look when I read the articles. I do read the comments to see what the majority of people feel. What the majority of people, whether they’re in a meeting like this or a group, is... I’ve got a ton of friends who don’t have time for this. They have kids and everything.

Gerry: Yeah.

Joanne: Yeah you’re right.

Christy: Yeah.

Kathleen: I told Sestak my mind last night in an email. They better be scared of us. They never pick up the phone. All’s they’re gonna do is they’re gonna show up to vote and they’re gonna be informed by me. You know so that’s the kind... I send out that kind of information and I’ll sum it up in one or two sentences.

David: I wish Sestak would’ve been at the protest signs in front of his office because the vast majority of people who drove past those signs were honking in favor of what we were saying. The vast majority.

Kathleen: They said over 200 people might show up here tonight. Maybe more because of what’s gonna happen this weekend.

David: Before I found out about this local Media group – this Delco Patriots – I went to the Tax Day last spring, and I honked at the signs. Then I went to Kennet Square – signs honk, honk, honk. Again a majority of people who drove by were honking. And that’s very encouraging to see that. It really is.

Kathleen: It is – it takes a lot of time and energy to be involved. If I had kids I probably wouldn’t be able to do this.

Pete: Speaking for myself, and probably most people at this table, I wouldn’t even think of carrying signs. But now I have to. And now I have to.

David: No definitely not.

Ben: And what was it that caused you to do that?

Pete: Seeing the direction of this country.

Kathleen: We have jobs.
[Laughter]

David: Yeah, and conservatives don’t protest.

[Laughter]

B: Speaking of the fact that you’re all so busy in your own lives, how do you find the time and where do you find the time to get informed to learn about…

Kathleen: We have to make the time. You can’t watch reality TV.

David: We have to. That’s the thing about the internet – we can plan. If you know ahead of time you can plan.

Gerry: I was going to say that the internet is a big reason that nothing is hidden. If you… You go to the right sources and there’s everybody has their own personal venues where they go.

John: I work myself. I have an 11 week old son. I have several children. On top of working full time, being on call, I still make the time to come here. This is where it sparks.

Gerry: Yeah.

Kathleen: Uh huh.

Christy: That’s right. Absolutely.

John: And when I leave here there will still be a network that you’re hearing.

David: I mean I’m going to the one on Saturday. I’m going on the bus ride. And the fact that it’s organized. I’ve paid my 30 bucks and I know about it ahead of time. You know and I can plan.

Gerry: We will be running over to Media. We will be there.

Joanne: Good.

Gerry: We decided that we are not going to be the stay at home seniors.

John: Anyone going to the tax day in Washington?

[Pause]

Christy: Too far away. I’m going to work that day.

Kathleen: I can’t take another day.
[Laughter]

Joanne: Things don’t change... then you are going to suffer, you know you’re going to pay for this. You are going to pay.

David: Things are gonna change.

Kathleen: Have you seen the national debt clock?

Christy: I think a lot of us feel.... It’s not us who so we’re taking up the mantle because we have to do it. And as you see a lot of over representation of older people it’s because we know what’s coming. We can look at history, we can look through experience

Gerry: We lived through a lot of things

Christy: We don’t want this for our children and our grandchildren and if not us, who?

Gerry: I am reading the Constitution.

Pete: You and people your age are going to bear the brunt of this.

Gerry: The heritage foundation has been putting out these little books on the Constitution. Somewhere you can get them at the Constitution Center but I am making a point this week to read it more carefully and cognitively because it is so dead-on to why we’re here. And people died for what they’re throwing away. We know what happens when you throw it away.

John: And you witness now the destruction of the Bill of Rights.

David: Yes.

Christy: Absolutely.

Ben: I just wanted to get to one point which is... part of my thesis is to explore areas that are contentious in the Tea Party movement and its relation with other movements and other political perspectives. You know, a lot of people look at the Tea Party movement and they say there are people who want cuts in entitlements, but when it comes to Social Security, a lot of them support Social Security. What is your perception of Social Security?

Joanne: You know, we paid into social security, you know. I mean we paid.

Kathleen: This is my philosophy: they’ve been taking money out of our paychecks for years, and it literally belongs to these people. And they made them count on it. And they shouldn’t have done that to begin with. And they shouldn’t have done it. They took so that people couldn’t spend it or invest it elsewhere and it was wrong. It was wrong then and it’s wrong now.

David: Money is another thing that they have to make right. They have to make it right.
Kathleen: When it was an insurance policy, it wasn’t so you could live that long. You weren’t supposed to live that long for it to kick in. I used to work in the actuarial dept. They messed it up and they need to fix it.

Gerry: Well there’s another factor here. The people that were on social security that were paying into it in those years now the people that have to pay into it now are not... there’s not enough. There’s a smaller population in the demographic to... so it takes...

David: The baby boomers.

Joanne: Yes, there are more older people

Gerry: ... three to one? I think it’s three to one to pay today and an onslaught of baby boomers that are going to be retiring.

Christy: One of the problems is when they take your money and you don’t have the extra money to invest on your own, you learn some people have to depend on social security. The problem with entitlements is that they are pushed in, people have to depend on them and then you can’t withdraw them which is a part of the progressive theory.

John: Sure

Gerry: Yeah.

Christy: People become dependent on it and it can’t be taken away. And we have social security, Medicare, Medicaid, we have S-Chips for the children. Everyone’s becoming dependent on that so when health care comes through, everyone will become dependent on that so government controls our lives.

Pete: And creates a vast dependency class.

Christy: And we can’t get out from under it.

Ben: So how do you see this problem being solved? What are your ideas on solving this?

Gerry: Self responsibility for one thing and to realize that there’s just... it’s not a bottomless pit.

David: Constitutional responsibility is another.

Christy: And we have to stop this now.

Gerry: And now they’re talking about the health care which is, we’re totally bankrupt. In case you didn’t know, we are bankrupt. They’re saying that we are. Last night I heard, I don’t know if it was on Glenn Beck or whatever, program on it if you want to get some insider information.
John: We’re getting ready to lose our triple A rating.

Christy: Our triple A rating.

Kathleen: Yeah, we’re gonna lose our triple A rating.

Gerry: So there’s no money we can borrow. China is putting the screws on us.

Kathleen: That’s another scary thing.

Ben: So, if you guys were Congresspeople, what would be some of the things you would do?

John: It would be a happier place.

[Laughter]

Kathleen: Just say no.

Christy: Right – just say no.

David: When it comes to the financial category, Ron Paul has his head on straight when it comes to the financial responsibility of this country.

Gerry: Stop spending. Stop spending.

David: Bring it back to its constitutional limits.

Christy: The first thing I would do is maybe make a constitutional amendment that you can not spend more – is that one of Ron Paul’s? – than you take in. And if you have to cut back, you have to cut back. If we have to rely more on charities, which is the American way. The charities come in to help people.

Kathleen: Families. Families have to help.

Christy: That’s why in Europe giving is so low because everybody knows that they don’t have to pitch in, government is there to bail you. Well in America, we bail each other out. We don’t want to depend on government. And that is another thing that’s being taken away from us. Kind of a moral compass that is leaving us now because everyone is looking to government. So cut the entitlements. Wean.

John: I’m more of an extremist. I think I would cut all entitlements. Our government should be run under the Constitution and Bill or Rights. That said, that means no entitlements. Our government was not – our government is set up to be a consumer not a producer. And they’re supposed to consume things from the public.

Kathleen: No, they’re supposed to tax us as much as it takes to run the government.
Joanne: Well see now I'm not sure. Now would you consider an entitlement somebody—say you have a child with cerebral palsy... I'm not sure if I agree with you, this is what I'm saying. I think there are certain places where you must help people so this is where I think I'm a moderate. If you have somebody that is unfortunate enough to say have cerebral palsy or something like that...

John: My son has cerebral palsy.

Joanne: Well, I think that they should be helped by the government. That's my opinion. In certain situations, but I think that somebody who can work should say okay. You know, there's too much...

John: Here's what I have to say. We're talking about the federal government, not the state government.

Joanne: OK, OK. OK, OK.

Kathleen: And there's a big difference there.

David: There's a huge difference.

John: We're talking about the federal government—limited government is a really different thing.

Gerry: But the federal government has mandated things that the required to do and therefore the states are going bankrupt because....

John: Exactly.

Joanne: OK, OK

Pete: And there are lots of examples of where the federal government oversteps. I meant that cartoon that you can use as an appendix in the paper.

David: That's a key area—the state constitution over the federal constitution. The state’s rights versus the federal right. And what you have is an encroachment of the federal over the states where they don’t have the Constitutional power to do so.

Kathleen: I just heard that New Jersey might be suing if this health care goes through.

Ben: I'm sorry if only one person could talk at a time. The issue is that I have to transcribe this afterwards.

[Laughter]
Ben: So this is all very interesting. I was wondering what your perspectives were on say the federal government to regulate interstate commerce.

William: The term regulate was used by our founding fathers to mean to make regular. It wasn’t intended for the government to regulate and control interstate commerce.

Gerry: Yeah.

William: It was to make regular, which meant that you couldn’t... so that states couldn’t charge each other tariffs. It was never meant to make the fed. Government get control.

Gerry: Thank you for that.

Kathleen: That was well said.

David: Wonderful.

Ben: I’m sorry, could you introduce yourself?

William: Yes, I’m William Scott Maxwell.

Ben: So, is everyone pretty much in agreement on that?

Christy: Pretty much, yeah.

Joanne: This is why I think in the health care they wanted to buy insurance over state lines. They thought that that would, that would help. The notion would be... but they’re not doing that.

William: As a matter of fact, because insurance companies cannot compete across state lines, doesn’t that preclude them from being under of the control and purview of the federal government because it’s not interstate commerce?

Kathleen: Yeah, that’s the opposite struggle.

Joanne: Good point.

David: But what I see and what creates these legal problems – it’s not the law, it’s not the Constitution. It’s pragmatism. Pragmatism is how they overreach with the power that they get. They do it through pragmatic arguments. And people give into the pressure of this pragmatism. And I think it’s dangerous.

William: Yes. Thank you.

Gerry: Do you know how much a billion dollars is? Does anybody have any idea?

[Laughter]
Kathleen: Not anymore!

William: They're talking a billion here, a billion there.

Christy: What is a billion? A hundred million?

Joanne: Now they're talking a thousand million. And a trillion is a thousand billion.

Gerry: I mean they're taking about the amount it took to buy off votes for this health care. It's 130 million, isn't it?

Kathleen: For who?

Gerry: 130 billion dollars in pay-backs. Because you are the guys that are going to give it. Not us. Our children and our grandchildren.

William: this is the ultimate taxation without representation. A trillion dollar debt can never be paid off by us or our children or our grandchildren who aren't even born yet. That's the ultimate taxation without representation.

Christy: Ultimate child abuse.

Gerry: If you saw [a billion dollars] on this table, it wouldn't even fit.

Kathleen: They don't get how wealth is created. If they knew how wealth is created... the government doesn't know how wealth is created because they don't produce anything. It's created by work.

Ben: Yeah. I was wondering what you guys thought about certain situations – you talked about being pragmatic over being Constitutional has some very dire consequences. Do you see any situations where the opposite is true? Where maybe sticking to the Constitution could end up destroying the country as opposed to...

David: No!

William: No!

Kathleen: No!

Joanne: No!

Gerry: No!

David: If I have a credit card and I don't pay my bill, what do they do? They stop that credit card from being used. And you're stuck with the penalties of paying them back. They know what
happens. They know how your credit rating goes. The government knows very well how these financial problems arise. I don’t like the double standards. That’s what upsets me. This double talk is nonsense.

[Joanne grunts]

Christy: Well if you look at the history of the Constitution, the founders and how they came across the basic principles of the Constitution, of the Declaration of Independence, they looked back over centuries of moral thought and they came to the conclusions they did and those are basically guiding principles for civilization. And I think if you adhere to those basic principles, you can’t really go astray.

David: Absolutely.

William: Yes.

Ben: Well, one of the examples that is brought up by a lot of liberals is you have the situation of the recession that could’ve become a depression...

Gerry: It is!

Christy: It is! Woah, let him ask...

Ben: Well, the only organization that would be able to intervene in something like that when lenders aren’t lending and consumers aren’t spending is the federal government. What are your thoughts on that?

Kathleen: I think if they let things work, things would naturally work themselves out. People learn their lessons.

Pete: Taking over corporations and bailing out Fanny Mae and Freddy Mac with taxpayer money only to keep them afloat and they’re still bankrupt.

Kathleen: They didn’t change anything that happened! There’s no disclosure to the investors and all this crap is going on.

William: Law is like medicine. There’s no medicine that doesn’t have a good effect, but there’s no medicine that doesn’t have a side effect. And laws are the same way. When the government steps in to try to prop up one section of society, it just has unintended consequences somewhere else. Always.

Kathleen: It’s gonna break down somewhere else.

Ben: On that point, would you also agree – a lot of economists say that this recession was caused by the housing bubble...
William: Yes it was.

Joanne: Yes.

William: But what caused the housing crisis?

Ben: Well, let me just finish the point. The idea again is that the housing bubble caused the recession because, while there were some people who were just being... uh doing illegal practices, right, where they were...

William: No!

Joanne: No!

Ben: Some people were doing illegal practices where their work where they were borrowing too much on their mortgages.

William: No! That was mandated!

Joanne: Absolutely not!

Ben: But, my point is, though, is that by and large people just saw their houses as another bank, and they were just withdrawing from this bank. The issue is –do we let them learn their lesson or do we let their mistakes cause widespread problems in the economy? Consequences to people who managed their money very well. If you have a situation like that, do you see the government playing absolutely no role? The federal government as playing no role? And just let people stuck in this situation?

Kathleen: What do you mean by that? I have a home whose price is artificially inflated. Would it be so bad if the price came down to the value it should be at? It wasn’t just the homeowners who caused this. It was the transactions after... just trading the same stuff over and over and over to make more money. That created a bubble. None of that stuff has been cleaned up.

Christy: So that goes back to his question of regulation.

Kathleen: If that’s the regulation that needs happen, it needs to be disclosed to the people investing in it.

Ben: But the federal government does have a role in regulating it.

William: Regulating, not controlling.

Kathleen: Yes! Through the SCC! They weren’t doing their job!

William: They have a role in regulating and keeping a level playing field. They do not have a role in playing on the field. They’re umpires, not players.
Gerry: I like that!

William: And they keep getting into the playing side.

Ben: So what would you mean by umpire? What would be a policy choice that would be umpiring the situation?

David: The umpire enforces the rules.

William: The umpire’s the one that makes the rules. Here’s the rulebook. You play by the rules.

Kathleen: No. It doesn’t make the rules. It enforces the rules.

Joanne: What they did was they...

Kathleen: They make the rules. They’re picking winners and losers.

William: That’s right! They’re picking winners and losers.

Ben: OK, but you made a distinction between making the rules and enforcing the rules. You said that the government should make rules? Or...

William: Well, all laws are the rules that we live by.

Gerry: The legislature. Congress.

David: But who makes them? It’s the legislature that makes the rules.

William: But the problem is the law doesn’t mean it’s Constitutional. The law that’s passed can give the federal government a role in playing. That’s wrong.

Gerry: Let me give you an example.

Ben: Could we stick to the issue of...

Gerry: But it’s law.

Ben: OK

Gerry: Congress passed a law that they would not stand if they wouldn’t offset that spending with income, so to speak.

David: Pay as you go?
Gerry: Pay as you go! They did that – I don’t know what – six months ago? Three months ago? About two months ago or a month ago they decided to extend unemployment for people that are... Originally unemployment [benefits] were to get you over the hump. Now we were talking extending it a hundred more weeks or something like that. Something like that. They did not cover that spending. They had just passed the law. It was – who was it Pete?

Pete: Jim Bunning.

David: Jim Bunning.

William: Jim Bunning.

Gerry: He was a Congressman. He’s a Senator. He stood up and he said I’m not gonna vote for this. People are out of work. They’re unemployed. But I can’t vote for this because you said you passed this law! You and Mr. Obama and all the people that make the law. And he said I’m not gonna vote for it. They vilified him. They went against what they passed. This is what they do.

Ben: That’s actually a very good point. I guess on the issue of unemployment – I know there are a lot of issues that are packed in that issue – but...

Gerry: I want to send you my web, because there are a lot of issues here. There are a lot of issues – not just the housing. Financial markets. All kinds of things.

Ben: Right. Exactly. All these things are packed in. I guess, another point is what are your views on the federal government providing unemployment benefits for people? Again to level the playing field.

David: If it’s Constitutional!

Gerry: If it’s paid for. If you’re paying into it.

Joanne: But again you’re paying for it! You paid into it. IT’s like an insurance policy. Just like Social Security, they paid into it. They’re entitled to it. If they lose their job, they’re entitled to it.

Kathleen: I think for some people, for a lot of people, it will kill the will to look for a job. It’s not letting your human spirit take over.

Pete: Unemployment compensation was originally like an insurance policy. And it had prescribed limits, both in terms of the monthly payments and the number of months. When that runs out it runs out. But the government has been extending it – not with premium dollars or any other thing but with taxpayer dollars. It’s another way of buying votes.

Christy: So what if instead you let an increase charitable deduction for corporations or individuals to donate money to help those who are unemployed? That’s an alternative. But they never go to the private citizen. Their answer is always government will do it.
Gerry: Because then they control.

Kathleen: I think they just did here with the jobs bill that they just passed to get a temporary tax credit.

William: To buy their votes. They tax everybody and then they give them money too to create a dependency class.

Kathleen: They’re only hiring unemployed people. That’s picking a winner and a loser too. Nobody would fire somebody for a $1,000 tax credit. Or hire anyone. I mean, it’s idiotic. But I mean it’s another example of unleveling the playing field.

Ben: So this has all been very helpful. I guess my last question would be – all of you guys come from very diverse backgrounds and it looks like you guys come from very diverse backgrounds. Do you feel like… How do you feel like your views are different on social issues? How do you feel like that brings anything to the table when discussing these issues of the budget or the Constitutionality of laws? Or do you feel like it’s absolutely completely separate?

Joanne: I’m not following.

William: Yeah, what do you mean by social issues?

Christy: Our background? Our differing backgrounds?

Ben: Yeah, your differing backgrounds.

[Pause]

Christy: Yeah, I mean look at everyone. Look at the different… We have blue collar workers. We have professionals. We have middle management. We have every kind of venue comes here. And each person brings their own experience and own ideas. So that helps.

Gerry: It boils down to a core of responsibility and a moral authority which is self.

Joanne: We’re not homogeneous.

Kathleen: We’re Americans.

William: That’s right.

Kathleen: And we realize it.

William: If freedom is a coin, the reverse of that coin is responsibility.

Gerry: Yeah. It’s not freedom licence.
William: We have the power. And the federal government is trying to relieve us of our responsibilities. And you cannot relieve us of our responsibilities without relieving us of our liberties.

Gerry: Yes. Amen.

Christy: That's a good place to end.

Joanne: I think you should quote him! That's really good!

Kathleen: You should add that to the newsletter!
Appendix B: We Surround Them Discussion Group

Participants

1. Deborah Catron
2. Philip Catron
   a. I have been a conservative my entire life. That does not mean I have been a Republican that long as I started out affiliated with the Democratic party and now find myself aligned with neither party as both have let me and the nation down in so many ways. I do not trust the Federal government to deal honestly or openly with the American people and thus my coming to the We Surround Them and Tea Party advocates. I believe that all of us have a responsibility to care for our fellow man. I believe this care should come from one's heart and desire to do what is right and not because any government insists it be done or mandates that it takes from any group to disperse to others in an attempt to try to even the playing field. I have been to Honduras on 16 Mission trips and will soon be going again. I know poverty first hand and for the most part, it is government induced, not only in third world countries but here as well.
3. Debby Catron
   a. Born NJ in 1950
   b. One semester college, then switched to a one-year secretarial school
   c. Have been a secretary (these days it's called an administrative assistant) for 40 years
   d. Parents Republicans
   e. I consider myself an Independent; I am a conservative
   f. I believe in smaller government
   g. I believe that small businesses are the backbone of this country
   h. I love my country
   i. I am a Christian
   j. Was at one time pro-choice; changed to pro-life in 1986
   k. I believe it is up the individuals to help others
   l. I believe in putting others before myself
   m. I do not trust our government because of its abuse of power; they have far overreached their powers as outlined in the Constitution
   n. I believe in the Constitution & our Founding Fathers
4. Jay Jones
5. John Chucoski
   a. Grew up in Pennsylvania, 4th child to a family with alcoholic father, but hard worker and very caring (unless he was drunk). Their family struggled almost always for enough food and basic needs. John broke out of the mold of being non-functioning as the family moved to Northern Virginia when he was 12 and continued to not have much material wise and pretty much took care of himself. He started working in high school and was a good athlete but was unable to participate much because he had to be at work right after school. Joined the army in 1968 went to VietNam. Served a year there and when home finished 2 yrs
college in computers and with training from army in computers then started working in the computer field. Started his own business in 1975 and has continued to expand and diversify his business up till present.

6. Lynn Chucoski
   a. Grew up in New Jersey, 2nd child with one older brother. Traditional family growing up with Mother at home and dad working. One car, enough money to live on but nothing too much extra. Grew up with knowing if you wanted something you didn't think to ask for it but to find a way to make the money to earn it yourself. It was just the way things were and was a very normal way of life. I started working at varying stores and nursing homes when I was 14 and continued through college in various jobs. I did well in school, and went to nursing school right out of high school and earned my R.N.. Started working right away and continued until after married and had first child at age 26. Values were instilled in me early and throughout my childhood of faith, honesty, trustworthiness, and dependability, etc. Also, pride in our country was a common thread.

7. Annette Royster
   a. I am 58 years old. I came from a working class blue collar family. My father was a union sheet metal worker. My mother was a cook at a boys Catholic high school in Wheaton, MD. Both of my parents were conservative democrats. My mother was a strict Catholic. My father a lax Baptist. Once I became old enough, I walked away from the Catholic Church and all religions. I listened to my parents conversations at the dinner table, and I decided that I would register and vote a straight democrat ticket the first time I was eligible to vote in 1968. I continued to vote a straight democrat ticket through Clinton 2.

Transcript

Ben: Do you wanna go around so that not only do I have your name on paper. But also your voice so that I know who’s who. Do you wanna go around and introduce yourselves.

Jay: I am Jay Jones.

Ben: And maybe a little bit about how you got involved.

Debby: Kicking and screaming.

[Laughter]

Jay: Annette basically got me involved. Annette Royster. She’s been involved since the Tea Party. We talked about it last year. Because it was raining and I had other work to do, I let that get in my way of heading down to Winchester Hall in Frederick, to the first Tea Party movement. She told me about these meetings and I came to my first one probably in September or October. They were meeting at the Hampton Inn down in Frederick.

Debby: He only has a few minutes, Jack.
Ben: No that's great.

Jay: Alright, I'm done. Your turn.

Debby: Debby Catron. Annette Royster and I are very good friends. So she told me about this.

John: Oh, I'm sorry. John Chucoski. I got involved because I started reading Barack Obama's books, and the more I read the more I realized there was something there that I couldn't understand. And then I started making phone calls to his constituents and reading more and more articles about him and finding out what he really stood for. And it sounded pretty dangerous to me when I found out the truth.

Lynn: Hi. And I'm Lynn Chucoski. As soon as I heard about that we were able to meet with the group to be able to come down to D.C. First of all, I guess it started in Frederick when we were able to meet there to just be a part of a movement that wants to see changes in America to get back to what America should be. I wanted to be a part of it and here I am.

Phillip: I am Philip Catron and I've been politically active for probably 30 years and I was looking for this kind of movement when Bill Clinton was elected. And I remember years ago, I told my wife I was very concerned for this country, that I thought that we would probably in our lifetime see a revolution. And still not sure that won't come to fruition.

Ben: Now, would you all agree that a lot of the values in the Tea Party Movement are conservative values, that it's a conservative movement or would anybody disagree with that?

John: No. I take it we're all conservative.

Ben: Now one of the things that I'm interested in...

Phillip: I would go beyond conservative, but I mean, certainly "conservative" is a good generic, general term.

Ben: That's my point. It's a generic term. How do you see "conservatism?" How would you define "conservatism?"

Phillip: Moral, ethical, honest.

Debby: And fiscal.

Ben: And what does that look like? For example, "fiscal conservatism"? What does that look like?

Debby: Fiscal conservatism against big government spending.

Phillip: You don't buy on credit.
Jay: You’re responsible in your own life and you expect your governmental leaders to be that way...[interrupted]

Debby: To be the same.

Jay: with the money that you’re allowing to be used in the general fund of the federal government; that money be used in a fiscally responsible manner.

Phillip: I take it down to a more one-on-one base. When my parents grew up, there was no such thing as credit cards. You saved so that there was a value to what you purchased and you bought it for cash. When my wife and I grew up, we tried to convince my parents that credit cards are OK. But we taught our kids the same thing: you carry credit cards because you don’t want to carry a lot of cash because it’s not safe. But you don’t buy more in a month than what you can’t pay off that month. Period.

Debby: You pay it off every month. We pay them off every month.

Jay: So do we.

Ben: So to take an issue... Now this is something that...

John: I have one thing. Responsibility. I think this is something that’s really been lost. That people just go around, go ahead and do anything they want right now. And they don’t realize what’s gonna happen later and someone has to pay the bills the bills for them.

Phillip: No accountability.

John: And they’re not accountable.

Lynn: That’s what conservatism means really to me. This self-accountability.

Debby: Self discipline too.

Ben: Now to get into some of the issues. One of the things that’s often brought up in criticisms of the two-party movement is that you have a ton of people who are, like all you said, being fiscally conservative and they want cuts and entitlements. But then when it comes to the issues like social security, they don’t necessarily want their social security cut. What do you guys feel about that?

Debby: I say take it.

Jay: I won’t depend on social security anyway. I never believed it was gonna be there. I never believed that it was a proper thing to do. It’s a situation like John said. John, right? You’re depending on somebody else. You’re not taking responsibility for yourself. And so I believe in taking responsibility for yourself, and therefore you shouldn’t need or have to have that.
Debby: I think that’s one of the reasons why we’ve gotten away from community. Where community always took care and we don’t have that anymore.

Phillip: Anybody that thinks or is silly enough to believe that you’re gonna be able to live off of social security, we can sell you some land.

[Laughter]

John: Yeah, there’s just not enough money there in social security and Medicare to take care...You need something more than that to stay through.

Debby: I don’t believe it’s the government’s responsibility.

Lynn: But as for myself, when I first started hearing about social security and that kind of idea as a young person, I just thought “Oh well, that’s a nice thing.” I had no idea really what, where the money was coming from, what was going on and you know...Okay. Sure, you get old and you get social security and go “Oh, that’s nice.” But it isn’t nice. And it isn’t right...

John: It’s an FDR brainwash plan that they started.

Ben: So in that respect, what role, if any, do you guys see the government playing in helping the least advantaged?

John: They shouldn’t. The state should do it and community.

Ben: Well, when I say government I mean anybody. State government, federal government...

John: State government.

Ben: Let’s say state government.

Debby: I disagree.

John: Well you’re always gonna have some... Somebody’s gotta be down in the drain.

Debby: I think it’s up to the churches, it’s up to the communities again. We can do it a lot better, a lot more effectively. The government can’t run anything. I don’t think it’s the government’s responsibility to do that, but it’s definitely the individual’s responsibility. Definitely.

Ben: So, you still think that the state government...

John: The state should have some say on it, but it’s always been the community and the church. The federal government should never, ever be involved. It got involved in this interstate commerce and now it’s been blown out of proportion. It was supposed to just protect what one state was doing to another state, not what the people are doing to people.
Ben: Now, in that regard, to bring up another criticism of some of the recent Tea Party people, where people who hold conservative views on certain things...One of the issues that often comes up is: you can respect the Constitution, but there are times where the government could provide stability, at least in the economy. The way the economy works, if you have a depression, for example, lenders aren’t lending, consumers aren’t spending, and you can go on this downward cycle where equilibrium in the markets is set at a very low point, so everybody is in the drain. In those situations, do you think that the government has a role in stimulating the economy?

Everyone: No.

Ben: I mean economists argue that the government is the only one in the position to stimulate the economy in that kind of a position.

John: Well, I think if you go back and look at the press, it was started because of the federal banks...were the ones that initially started the recession.

Ben: But again, in that situation, what got out of the recession was active government involvement in stimulating when nobody else would spend and nobody else would lend.

Phillip: Are you talking about the 1930’s depression?

Ben: Right.

Phillip: No, they absolutely did not pull us out of the depression.

Lynn: No, they extended it.

John: They extended it.

Debby: No, they extended it.

Lynn: For ten years.

Ben: What do you mean by “extending it”?

Phillip: All those programs extended and slowed the recovery down. If you had let the pendulums just swing back and forth the way it would normally in a capitalist society, and let the people who saw the opportunities take place, we would have come out of that recession probably in about three years.

Jay: Have you heard about the 1920 depression?

Ben: Yeah.
Jay: Okay. Do you know that depression was greater? The unemployment was greater than in the 30's. Inflation was greater than it was in the 30's. But the way they got out of that was the government did not spend money. The government cut 50% of its budget. They didn't cut 50% of the growth like they do now. Oh, it's grown 10%; let's just cut 2% out! No. Where they were in 1920, 1921, the budget was now 50% lower than it was then. They also cut tax rates by huge amounts, and within a couple years, BOOM, they were out of it. That's what brought on the Roaring Twenties.

Debby: That's what the stimulus was: the cutting.

Jay: Right. And so, when you put the funds and the ability to spend and earn and invest money back in the individual's hands, that's what grows commerce, that's what grows invention, that's what grows business and jobs. It is not the government.

Phillip: And that doesn't mean there's not gonna be a small percentage of people who get very, very wealthy because of that. But, [interrupted]

Debby: Somehow that became a bad thing.

Phillip: Those people have created jobs that have put food on the table and created more future jobs for people. So you have to look at it and...we've always considered ourselves extremely conservative, but very capitalistic. And this is gonna sound a little contradictory. How much money does somebody need? Well, at some point, you owe personally, not the government, you owe society. You have to give back to society; you should give back to society. I think that's just the foundational belief. And I think people that make a lot of money do give back a lot of money.

Lynn: But there are some that don't.

Phillip: But that's okay.

Debby: But the government is not dictating that.

Lynn: No, you cannot be dictated to do it.

John: The government actually helped start with Prohibition, helped start the precedent 20's that rolled over to the 30's because it took so many people and put them out of business and took an industry and pushed it down where it was a real thriving industry.

Phillip: What do you think is the biggest hurdle for Tea Party people together?

Ben: Wait, am I being interviewed here?

Lynn: It's going back.

[Laughter]
Lynn: Here, put your name on there.

[Laughter]

Phillip: You've interviewed a lot of people and been to a lot of parties. There's obviously a mental image that people not involved in this have of Tea Party members. What is our biggest hurdle? What's our challenge?

Ben: Well, can I tell you that after the interview? I'm supposed to get your views, and then afterwards I can tell you what I've found from other people. Is that fair?

Debby: Fair enough, fair enough.

[Laughter]

Lynn: What do we get now?

Ben: What you brought up, I think, is very interesting. Okay, I'll cheat a little bit. I've talked to a lot of other people in the Tea Party Movement, who do say the 10th Amendment is very important. There should be a division between the federal government's role, which is national defense, and the states' role. Now, when they say that, a lot of them believe that states, if the public decides is a public good, can have social safety net programs. They can set up these kinds of programs. Now, do you guys think that that's [interrupted]

Phillip: States or federal?

Debby: States. No, he said states. Individual.

Ben: States, I'm talking about states only. So, do you see a problem with that? Do you see a problem with state government providing these kinds of social securities?

Phillip: Personally, I don't simply because the way our government is run, federal law preempts state law. State law can be more harsh or more stringent than federal law, but it's easier to change state law than it is federal law.

Lynn: But state law is not supposed to be preempted by federal law.

Phillip: No, no. Federal preempts state. Let me give you example. Pesticide regulation is a federal regulation. States cannot regulate pesticides, even if they wanted to. They can have certain portions that restrict it more stringently, but never less.

John: That's because of the interstate...

Phillip: Exactly.

Jay: Interstate commerce.
Phillip: Kathy, nice to...

Kathy: Can you e-mail me?

Phillip: Yes, I will. And I wish you were writing again. My goodness. Did you meet my wife, Debby?

Debby: Yes. We’re interviewing. I’m sorry. Poor Ben.

[Laughter]

Lynn: Oh, the tape is running.

Ben: Now that we’ve pretty much established your guys’ views on states, did anybody else have anything to say on the role of state governments? The role state governments have in these kinds of issues? In social issues? You’re shaking your...like no, you don’t think they have a role or no...?

Lynn: No, I just really don’t have enough understanding of it to speak on it.

Ben: Okay. I mean, but in general, it’s the concept that government has [interrupted]

Phillip: Now I didn’t say they had a role. I said that they have a right.

Ben: Right.

Phillip: Okay.

Ben: Well, I’m not saying that obviously...

Lynn: Well you’re talking about like if you’re just starting out and you just have this country starting and which should be doing it. ‘Cause right now, we’re in a disaster that you could never even kind of figure out how to even do it from a state level. As far as taking care of people that are in need of assistance. You’ve got so many that how do you even back up from that?

Phillip: You look at the Massachusetts health care benefits. The guy who was the treasurer for the state of Massachusetts, who’s now running for office up there, was in charge of that whole thing. And he says it’s a disaster.

Lynn: It doesn’t work and it’s taking so much money.

Debby: And it’s cost what? Twenty times as much as they thought.

Phillip: Well they claimed it was gonna cost 880 million dollars. It’s now cost over four billion.
Lynn: But Mitt Romney says it’s like wonderful.

John: Well, you know what? My real serious reading (Obama’s?) books and everything and knowing about his mentor, his father’s friend, that he really wants to destroy the country. Now the scariest part was: why did he take a private plane to the Arab countries, Germany, Russia, and all that stuff. And from what I heard was every place he brought back briefcases full of something that was locked up. Now what was in here?

Jay: Comic books.

[Laughter]

John: And all at once, his treasure chest went from what? 20 million to almost a billion dollars? I believe this was just payoff money for him to socialize and destroy the United States. Because Russia’s never been near it. No one’s been able to do it externally. It has to be done internally. And I think he is the person they’re looking for. He’s like the Adolf Hitler, unfortunately.

Ben: Who?

John: Obama. They’re looking for someone to destroy us from inside our country ’cause they can’t do it and they’ve never been able to do it from outside the country.

Ben: And so why do you say he’s like Adolf Hitler?

John: Why? Socialism. Okay? Everything he says...If you look at all the comments that come out of the White House, it says the buck stops here at the White House, right? Nothing goes out of the White House, right? But every time there’s a bad something that happens bad, it’s not the White House. It’s so-and-so. He’s God. It’s him. It’s he who’s doing the controlling, okay? And if it doesn’t go right, someone else has to take the blame. So, I don’t know if you’re familiar. Do you know anything about the SA and the SS and how they took over Germany?

Ben: Yeah, I have studied German history.

John: It’s the same thing that’s happened now. You have two big groups. And then they got the SS to destroy the SA and then they took over. That was Night of the Long Knife that they killed all the SA people and took them over. One month later, they went and they started destroying all the Jewish businesses from the SS. What I think, he’s trying to destroy the conservative movements just like Adolf Hitler destroyed the Jewish movement because they had a lot of money and a lot of power. And he’s looking for all the people, all the minorities, to come up and take over. But he’s not gonna let [interrupted]

Lynn: Is this something that is getting away from what you need?

Ben: Well no, unless anybody...Does anybody else have anything to say about that?

Phillip: I don’t necessarily...Well, it doesn’t matter.
Ben: No, I mean I’m interested in hearing what you have to say.

Phillip: It’s more flippant than anything. I don’t necessarily think that Barack Obama is comparable to Adolf Hitler.

Ben: And why do you think he’s not comparable?

Phillip: He’s not as smart as Adolf Hitler was.

[Laughter]

Ben: The difference is he’s not smart?

John: You don’t have to be smart. You have to be devious. That’s the word. Devious.

Phillip: I actually don’t believe Mr. Obama is intelligent enough to pull that off. I think he’s got some people.

Debby: He’s got hand boys.

Lynn: I’m sure he’s got people.

John: I’m sure he does. Hitler had people too.

Phillip: I don’t subscribe to those types of conspiracy theories.

John: Here’s the question I wanted to know. Why did Barack Obama…? His mother died at forty-seven; his father died at fifty-one. Why did he go and have both his mother and father exhumed from the grave and cremated? Why would you do that? He went to Africa and did it, and he went to Hawaii. That’s really kind of crazy. Why would you do something as nutty as that?

Annette: Can I weigh in on something?

Ben: Well first, do you want to introduce your names so that I have your name?

Annette: My name is Annette Royster. I do no think that Barack Obama is where we should focus. Period. The problem that we have is with our Congress. That is the problem. They are little kings and queens down there who [interrupted]

Jay: You got a problem with queens?

Annette: I do have a problem with queens.

[Laughter]
Annette: That completely have usurped power that rightfully belongs to the people in the states. And they have encroached upon the states’ rights so badly. And the states have rolled over just like lap dogs. They have rolled over, and said “yes, give us your money, give us your federal money so that we can have all these projects and everything and we’ll do whatever you tell us to do.” Our states have sold us down the road. Our federal representation has sold us down the road. And we are fighting a battle that we can’t win. I mean we honestly can’t win. I don’t see how we can [interrupted]

John: Who’s giving these congressmen the money? The Executive Branch is giving it.

Annette: It’s not Obama.

Debby: Okay, wait. Hold on.

Phillip: I think the states have been blackmailed more than they rolled over.

Annette: Huh?

Phillip: I think the states have been blackmailed by the federal government more so than they’ve rolled over. And that’s just a minor term.

Lynn: But this has also been coming on before this administration. This has been coming on for a long time.

Debby: This has been going on for a long time.

Phillip: They’re kicking us out, I think... Wait a minute. You haven’t answered my question.

Ben: I’ll go on record for this. What was your...? Can you repeat your [interrupted]

John: Twenty-five years ago, they started all the professors from England, from France, from Great Britain...have all come over here, all socialists, and they’ve gotten jobs in the colleges and they’ve been pushing this socialized program in this country for a flat twenty, thirty years. So that’s part of the drift there. I know many Arabs that teach at black institutions and the reason they do it is because they’re getting top-quality educators at a very low price. And they’re pushing the socialist agenda.
Appendix C: Surveys and T-Tests

Surveys were randomly distributed at the beginning of meetings and collected at the end. 72/100 responded in the Delco Patriots and 64/100 responded in We Surround Them. T-tests were performed using Stata, a statistical analysis program. Members were divided between new and veteran using a binominal dummy variable, in which new members were set equal to 1 and veteran members were set equal to 0. New membership is coded by response to question five; if the member were new, he/she would not be able to say that the chapter improved their understanding of the U.S. because they haven’t been a part of the chapter. T-tests were performed using the new variable compared with respondents’ answers to what issues they found most pressing in the U.S. Results are statistically significant if the t value \( \Pr(|T| > |t|) \) is less than .05. In other words, in these situations, one can say with 95% accuracy that the results were statistically significant.
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We Surround Them (64 individuals surveyed)

Total (136 individuals surveyed)
log: E:\sweettables.log
log type: text
opened on: 20 Apr 2010, 15:53:06

do "C:\Users\student\AppData\Local\Temp\STD00000000.tmp"

ttest fiscal if delco==1, by(new)

Two-sample t test with equal variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>.5217391</td>
<td>.0744651</td>
<td>.505047</td>
<td>[.3717587 .6717196]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>.4230769</td>
<td>.0988095</td>
<td>.5038315</td>
<td>[.219575   .6265789]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combined</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>.4861111</td>
<td>.0593162</td>
<td>.5033145</td>
<td>[.367838   .6043842]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diff</td>
<td>.0986622</td>
<td>.123811</td>
<td>-.1482711</td>
<td>.6717196</td>
<td>.6265789</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

diff = mean(0) - mean(1)  t = 0.7969
Ho: diff = 0  degrees of freedom = 70

Ha: diff < 0  Pr(T < t) = 0.7859
Ha: diff != 0  Pr(|T| > |t|) = 0.4282
Ha: diff > 0  Pr(T > t) = 0.2141

.ttest fiscal if delco==0, by(new)

Two-sample t test with equal variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.0666667</td>
<td>.4944132</td>
<td>[.2663414 .5336586]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.3333333</td>
<td>.166667</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>-.0510007    .7176674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combined</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>.390625</td>
<td>.0614684</td>
<td>.4917474</td>
<td>.2677902    .5134598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diff</td>
<td>.0666667</td>
<td>.1780383</td>
<td>-.2892267</td>
<td>.4225601</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

diff = mean(0) - mean(1)  t = 0.3745
Ho: diff = 0  degrees of freedom = 62

Ha: diff < 0  Pr(T < t) = 0.6453
Ha: diff != 0  Pr(|T| > |t|) = 0.7093
Ha: diff > 0  Pr(T > t) = 0.3547

.ttest fiscal, by(new)

Two-sample t test with equal variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>101</td>
<td>.4554455</td>
<td>.0498011</td>
<td>.5004948</td>
<td>[.3566416 .5542495]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.0840168</td>
<td>.4970501</td>
<td>[.2292573 .5707427]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combined</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>.4411765</td>
<td>.0427343</td>
<td>.4983633</td>
<td>.3566612 .5256918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diff</td>
<td>.0554455</td>
<td>.097998</td>
<td>-.1383774</td>
<td>.2492685</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

diff = mean(0) - mean(1)  t = 0.5658
Ho: diff = 0  degrees of freedom = 134

Ha: diff < 0  Pr(T < t) = 0.2927
Ha: diff != 0  Pr(|T| > |t|) = 0.4854
Ha: diff > 0  Pr(T > t) = 0.1211
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Pr}(T < t) &= 0.7138 \\
\text{Pr}(|T| > |t|) &= 0.5725 \\
\text{Pr}(T > t) &= 0.2862
\end{align*}
\]

:: 

test defense if delco==1, by(new)

Two-sample t test with equal variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0.0652174</td>
<td>0.036807</td>
<td>0.2496374</td>
<td>-.0089158 .1393506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.0384615</td>
<td>0.0384615</td>
<td>.1961161</td>
<td>-.0407515 .1176746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combined</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0.0555556</td>
<td>0.0271846</td>
<td>.2306689</td>
<td>.001351 .1097601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diff</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0267556</td>
<td>0.0569096</td>
<td>-.0867467</td>
<td>.1402584</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
diff = \text{mean}(0) - \text{mean}(1)
\]

Ho: diff = 0
t = 0.4701
degrees of freedom = 70

Ha: diff < 0
Pr(T < t) = 0.6801
Ha: diff != 0
Pr(|T| > |t|) = 0.6397
Ha: diff > 0
Pr(T > t) = 0.3199

.: test defense if delco==1, by(new)

Two-sample t test with equal variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combined</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diff</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
diff = \text{mean}(0) - \text{mean}(1)
\]

Ho: diff = 0
t = .
degrees of freedom = 62

Ha: diff < 0
Pr(T < t) =
Ha: diff != 0
Pr(|T| > |t|) =
Ha: diff > 0
Pr(T > t) =

.: test defense, by(new)

Two-sample t test with equal variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>0.029703</td>
<td>0.0169767</td>
<td>0.1706133</td>
<td>-.0039782 .0633842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.0285714</td>
<td>0.0285714</td>
<td>.1690309</td>
<td>-.0294927 .0866356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combined</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>0.0294118</td>
<td>0.0145416</td>
<td>.1695823</td>
<td>.000653 .0581705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diff</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0011315</td>
<td>0.0333863</td>
<td>-.0649007</td>
<td>.0671638</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
diff = \text{mean}(0) - \text{mean}(1)
\]

Ho: diff = 0
t = 0.0339
degrees of freedom = 134

Ha: diff < 0
Pr(T < t) = 0.5135
Ha: diff != 0
Pr(|T| > |t|) = 0.9730
Ha: diff > 0
Pr(T > t) = 0.4865

.: test biggov if delco==1, by(new)
Two-sample t test with equal variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0.4130435</td>
<td>0.0733998</td>
<td>0.4978213</td>
<td>0.2652088 - 0.5608782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.509902</td>
<td>0.2940461 - 0.7059539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combined</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0.4444444</td>
<td>0.0589717</td>
<td>0.5003911</td>
<td>0.3268583 - 0.5620306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diff</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.0869565</td>
<td>0.1232114</td>
<td>0.3326938</td>
<td>0.1587808</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ho: diff = 0

Ha: diff < 0
Pr(T < t) = 0.2502
Pr(|T| > |t|) = 0.5004
Pr(T > t) = 0.7498
diff = mean(0) - mean(1)

T test socialism if delco==1, by(new)

Two-sample t test with equal variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0.0869565</td>
<td>0.042004</td>
<td>0.2848849</td>
<td>0.0023561 - 0.1715569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.509902</td>
<td>0.2940461 - 0.7059539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combined</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0.4444444</td>
<td>0.0589717</td>
<td>0.5003911</td>
<td>0.3268583 - 0.5620306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diff</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.0869565</td>
<td>0.1232114</td>
<td>0.3326938</td>
<td>0.1587808</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ho: diff = 0

Ha: diff < 0
Pr(T < t) = 0.2413
Pr(|T| > |t|) = 0.4827
Pr(T > t) = 0.7587
diff = mean(0) - mean(1)

T test biggov, by(new)

Two-sample t test with equal variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0.3272727</td>
<td>0.0638524</td>
<td>0.4735424</td>
<td>0.1992563 - 0.5552892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.4444444</td>
<td>0.1756821</td>
<td>0.5270463</td>
<td>0.0393208 - 0.8495681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combined</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>0.34375</td>
<td>0.0598392</td>
<td>0.4787136</td>
<td>0.2241709 - 0.4633291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diff</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.1171717</td>
<td>0.1728759</td>
<td>-0.4627458</td>
<td>-0.2284023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ho: diff = 0

Ha: diff < 0
Pr(T < t) = 0.2502
Pr(|T| > |t|) = 0.5004
Pr(T > t) = 0.7498
diff = mean(0) - mean(1)

T test biggov if delco==0, by(new)

Two-sample t test with equal variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>0.3663366</td>
<td>0.0481803</td>
<td>0.484206</td>
<td>0.2707483 - 0.461925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.4857143</td>
<td>0.0857143</td>
<td>0.5270463</td>
<td>0.315219 - 0.6599021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combined</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>0.4444444</td>
<td>0.0589717</td>
<td>0.4910972</td>
<td>0.3197758 - 0.5620306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diff</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.1193777</td>
<td>0.0961329</td>
<td>-0.3095118</td>
<td>-0.1715569</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ho: diff = 0

Ha: diff < 0
Pr(T < t) = 0.1082
Pr(|T| > |t|) = 0.2165
Pr(T > t) = 0.8918
diff = mean(0) - mean(1)

T test biggov if delco==0, by(new)

Two-sample t test with equal variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0.0869565</td>
<td>0.042004</td>
<td>0.2848849</td>
<td>0.0023561 - 0.1715569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.509902</td>
<td>0.2940461 - 0.7059539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combined</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0.4444444</td>
<td>0.0589717</td>
<td>0.5003911</td>
<td>0.3268583 - 0.5620306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diff</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.0869565</td>
<td>0.1232114</td>
<td>-0.3326938</td>
<td>0.1587808</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ho: diff = 0

Ha: diff < 0
Pr(T < t) = 0.2502
Pr(|T| > |t|) = 0.5004
Pr(T > t) = 0.7498
diff = mean(0) - mean(1)

T test socialism if delco==1, by(new)

Two-sample t test with equal variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0.3272727</td>
<td>0.0638524</td>
<td>0.4735424</td>
<td>0.1992563 - 0.5552892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.4444444</td>
<td>0.1756821</td>
<td>0.5270463</td>
<td>0.0393208 - 0.8495681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combined</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>0.34375</td>
<td>0.0598392</td>
<td>0.4787136</td>
<td>0.2241709 - 0.4633291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diff</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.1171717</td>
<td>0.1728759</td>
<td>-0.4627458</td>
<td>-0.2284023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ho: diff = 0

Ha: diff < 0
Pr(T < t) = 0.2413
Pr(|T| > |t|) = 0.4827
Pr(T > t) = 0.7587
diff = mean(0) - mean(1)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>.2363636</td>
<td>.0578145</td>
<td>.4287638</td>
<td>.1204525 , .3522747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.1111111</td>
<td>.1111111</td>
<td>.3333333</td>
<td>-.1451116 , .3673338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combined</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>.21875</td>
<td>.0520833</td>
<td>.4166667</td>
<td>.1146698 , .3228302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diff</td>
<td></td>
<td>.1252525</td>
<td>.1501855</td>
<td>.1749641</td>
<td>.4254691</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ho: diff = 0
degrees of freedom = 70

Ha: diff < 0
Pr(T < t) = 0.5578
Pr(|T| > |t|) = 0.8844
Pr(T > t) = 0.4422

Ha: diff > 0
Pr(T < t) = 0.7963
Pr(|T| > |t|) = 0.4075
Pr(T > t) = 0.2037

Two-sample t test with equal variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>.1683168</td>
<td>.0374147</td>
<td>.3760135</td>
<td>.0940871 , .2425466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>.0857143</td>
<td>.0480096</td>
<td>.2840286</td>
<td>-.011853 , .1832815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combined</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>.1470588</td>
<td>.0304816</td>
<td>.3554738</td>
<td>.0867755 , .2073421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diff</td>
<td></td>
<td>.0826025</td>
<td>.0696197</td>
<td>.0550916</td>
<td>.2202967</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ho: diff = 0
degrees of freedom = 134

Ha: diff < 0
Pr(T < t) = 0.8812
Pr(|T| > |t|) = 0.2375
Pr(T > t) = 0.1188

Ha: diff > 0
Pr(T < t) = 0.7963
Pr(|T| > |t|) = 0.4075
Pr(T > t) = 0.2037

Two-sample t test with equal variances
# Two-sample t test with equal variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.0544331</td>
<td>.4036867</td>
<td>.0908682 -.3091318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.2222222</td>
<td>1469862</td>
<td>.4409586</td>
<td>-.1167285 .561173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combined</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>.203125</td>
<td>0506882</td>
<td>.4055053</td>
<td>.1018328 .3044172</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**diff** = mean(0) - mean(1)  
**t** = 0.9199  
Ho: **diff** = 0  
degrees of freedom = 70

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>.1782178</td>
<td>.0382696</td>
<td>.3846047</td>
<td>.102292 .2541436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>.1142857</td>
<td>.0545636</td>
<td>.3228029</td>
<td>.0033991 .2251724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combined</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>.1617647</td>
<td>.0316926</td>
<td>.3695961</td>
<td>.0900865 .2244429</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**diff** = mean(0) - mean(1)  
**t** = -0.1512  
Ho: **diff** = 0  
degrees of freedom = 62

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>.0434783</td>
<td>.0304003</td>
<td>.2061846</td>
<td>-.017751 .1047075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combined</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>.0277778</td>
<td>.019503</td>
<td>.1654888</td>
<td>-.011102 .0666657</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**diff** = mean(0) - mean(1)  
**t** = 0.8812  
Ho: **diff** = 0  
degrees of freedom = 134

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>.0434783</td>
<td>.0304003</td>
<td>.2061846</td>
<td>-.017751 .1047075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combined</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>.0277778</td>
<td>.019503</td>
<td>.1654888</td>
<td>-.011102 .0666657</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**diff** = mean(0) - mean(1)  
**t** = 1.0719  
Ho: **diff** = 0  
degrees of freedom = 70

---

**sweettables**

**t** = 0.9199  
Ho: **diff** = 0  
degrees of freedom = 70

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.0544331</td>
<td>.4036867</td>
<td>.0908682 -.3091318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.2222222</td>
<td>1469862</td>
<td>.4409586</td>
<td>-.1167285 .561173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combined</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>.203125</td>
<td>0506882</td>
<td>.4055053</td>
<td>.1018328 .3044172</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**diff** = mean(0) - mean(1)  
**t** = 0.9199  
Ho: **diff** = 0  
degrees of freedom = 70

**t** = -0.1512  
Ho: **diff** = 0  
degrees of freedom = 62

**t** = 0.8812  
Ho: **diff** = 0  
degrees of freedom = 134

---

**t** = 1.0719  
Ho: **diff** = 0  
degrees of freedom = 70
Two-sample t test with equal variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0.0545455</td>
<td>0.0309031</td>
<td>0.2291839</td>
<td>-.0074116 to 0.1165025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.1111111</td>
<td>0.1111111</td>
<td>0.3333333</td>
<td>-.1451116 to 0.3673338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combined</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>0.0625</td>
<td>0.0304969</td>
<td>0.243975</td>
<td>0.0015569 to 0.1234431</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

diff = mean(0) - mean(1)
Ho: diff = 0
t = -0.6418
degrees of freedom = 62

Pr(T < t) = 0.2874
Pr(T > t) = 0.7383
Pr(|T| > |t|) = 0.5234

Two-sample t test with equal variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>0.049505</td>
<td>0.021692</td>
<td>0.2180017</td>
<td>0.0064687 to 0.0925412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.0285714</td>
<td>0.0285714</td>
<td>0.1690309</td>
<td>-.0294927 to 0.0866356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combined</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>0.0441176</td>
<td>0.0176743</td>
<td>0.2061156</td>
<td>0.0091634 to 0.0790719</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

diff = mean(0) - mean(1)
Ho: diff = 0
t = 0.5164
degrees of freedom = 134

Pr(T < t) = 0.3032
Pr(T > t) = 0.6968
Pr(|T| > |t|) = 0.6064

Two-sample t test with equal variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0.4130435</td>
<td>0.0733998</td>
<td>0.4978213</td>
<td>0.2652088 to 0.5608782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.2307692</td>
<td>0.084265</td>
<td>0.4296689</td>
<td>0.0572222 to 0.4043163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combined</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0.3472222</td>
<td>0.0565011</td>
<td>0.4794281</td>
<td>0.2345621 to 0.4598823</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

diff = mean(0) - mean(1)
Ho: diff = 0
t = 1.5653
degrees of freedom = 70

Pr(T < t) = 0.0610
Pr(T > t) = 0.9390
Pr(|T| > |t|) = 0.1220

Two-sample t test with equal variances
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>.3818182</td>
<td>.0661134</td>
<td>.4903101</td>
<td>.2492688 .5143676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.3333333</td>
<td>.1111111</td>
<td>.3333333</td>
<td>-.1451116 .3673338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combined</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>.34375</td>
<td>.0598392</td>
<td>.4787136</td>
<td>.2241709 .4633291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diff</td>
<td>.2707071</td>
<td>.1700751</td>
<td>-.0692683</td>
<td>.6106824</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| diff = mean(0) - mean(1) | t = 1.5917 | degrees of freedom = 62 |

Ho: diff = 0

Ha: diff < 0
Pr(T < t) = 0.9417
Ha: diff != 0
Pr(|T| > |t|) = 0.1165
Ha: diff > 0
Pr(T > t) = 0.0583

.ttest constitutional, by(new)

Two-sample t test with equal variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>.3960396</td>
<td>.0489073</td>
<td>.4915121</td>
<td>.2990089 .4930703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.0685994</td>
<td>.4058397</td>
<td>.0605892 .4265345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combined</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>.3455882</td>
<td>.0409297</td>
<td>.4773178</td>
<td>.264642 .4265345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diff</td>
<td>.1960396</td>
<td>.092433</td>
<td>.0132232</td>
<td>.3788561</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| diff = mean(0) - mean(1) | t = 2.1209 | degrees of freedom = 134 |

Ho: diff = 0

Ha: diff < 0
Pr(T < t) = 0.9821
Ha: diff != 0
Pr(|T| > |t|) = 0.0358
Ha: diff > 0
Pr(T > t) = 0.0179

.ttest corruption if delco==1, by(new)

Two-sample t test with equal variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>.3478261</td>
<td>.0709997</td>
<td>.4815434</td>
<td>.2048253 .4908268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>.3461538</td>
<td>.0951486</td>
<td>.4851645</td>
<td>.1501917 .542116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combined</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>.3472222</td>
<td>.0565011</td>
<td>.4794281</td>
<td>.2345621 .4598823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diff</td>
<td>.0016722</td>
<td>.1184687</td>
<td>-.2346062</td>
<td>.2379507</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| diff = mean(0) - mean(1) | t = 0.0141 | degrees of freedom = 70 |

Ho: diff = 0

Ha: diff < 0
Pr(T < t) = 0.5056
Ha: diff != 0
Pr(|T| > |t|) = 0.9888
Ha: diff > 0
Pr(T > t) = 0.4944

.ttest corruption if delco==0, by(new)

Two-sample t test with equal variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>.0545455</td>
<td>.0309031</td>
<td>.2291839</td>
<td>-.0074116 .1165025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Obs</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std. Err.</td>
<td>Std. Dev.</td>
<td>[95% Conf. Interval]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>.1881188</td>
<td>.0390807</td>
<td>.3927562</td>
<td>.1105838 .2656538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>.2571429</td>
<td>.074955</td>
<td>.4434396</td>
<td>.104816 .4094697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combined</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>.2058824</td>
<td>.0348005</td>
<td>.4058397</td>
<td>.1370577 .274707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diff</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.069024</td>
<td>.0796766</td>
<td>-.2266106</td>
<td>.0885625</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( \text{diff} = \text{mean}(0) - \text{mean}(1) \)

**Ho:** \( \text{diff} = 0 \)

**t = 0.7092**

**degrees of freedom = 62**

Ha: diff < 0

Pr(\(T < t\)) = 0.7596

Ha: diff \neq 0

Pr(|\(T| > |t|\)) = 0.4808

Ha: diff > 0

Pr(\(T > t\)) = 0.2404

---

**t test immigration if delco==1, by(new)**

Two-sample t test with equal variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>std. Err.</th>
<th>std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>.0434783</td>
<td>.0304003</td>
<td>.2061846</td>
<td>-.017751 .1047075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>.0769231</td>
<td>.0532939</td>
<td>.2717465</td>
<td>-.0328377 .186639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combined</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>.0555556</td>
<td>.0271846</td>
<td>.2306689</td>
<td>.001351 1097601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diff</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.0334448</td>
<td>.056859</td>
<td>-.1468465</td>
<td>.0799569</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( \text{diff} = \text{mean}(0) - \text{mean}(1) \)

**Ho:** \( \text{diff} = 0 \)

**t = -0.5882**

**degrees of freedom = 70**

Ha: diff < 0

Pr(\(T < t\)) = 0.2791

Ha: diff \neq 0

Pr(|\(T| > |t|\)) = 0.5583

Ha: diff > 0

Pr(\(T > t\)) = 0.7209

---

**t test immigration if delco==0, by(new)**

Two-sample t test with equal variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>std. Err.</th>
<th>std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.015625</td>
<td>.015625</td>
<td>-.0155991 .0468491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.1111111</td>
<td>.333333</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>-.4155916 .3673338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combined</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>.0430542</td>
<td>.0430542</td>
<td>-.1971752</td>
<td>-.025047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diff</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.1111111</td>
<td>.0430542</td>
<td>.3673338</td>
<td>.0468491</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( \text{diff} = \text{mean}(0) - \text{mean}(1) \)

**Ho:** \( \text{diff} = 0 \)

**t = -0.8663**

**degrees of freedom = 134**

Ha: diff < 0

Pr(\(T < t\)) = 0.1939

Ha: diff \neq 0

Pr(|\(T| > |t|\)) = 0.3879

Ha: diff > 0

Pr(\(T > t\)) = 0.8061
The table below shows the results of two-sample t-tests with equal variances for different groups:

### ttest immigration, by(new)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.019802</td>
<td>0.0139319</td>
<td>0.1400141</td>
<td>-0.0078386 - 0.0474425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.0857143</td>
<td>0.0480096</td>
<td>0.2840286</td>
<td>-0.011853 - 0.1832815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combined</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>0.0367647</td>
<td>0.0161963</td>
<td>0.1888793</td>
<td>0.0047335 - 0.0687959</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**t = -2.5807**

**Pr(T < t) = 0.0061**

**Pr(|T| > |t|) = 0.0122**

**Pr(T > t) = 0.9939**

**Ho: diff = 0**

**Ha: diff < 0**

**Ha: diff != 0**

**Ha: diff > 0**

### ttest complacency if delco==1, by(new)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0.0869565</td>
<td>0.042004</td>
<td>0.2848849</td>
<td>0.0023561 - 0.1715569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.1153846</td>
<td>0.0638971</td>
<td>0.3258126</td>
<td>-0.0162139 - 0.2469832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combined</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0.0972222</td>
<td>0.0351596</td>
<td>0.2983392</td>
<td>0.027116 - 0.1673285</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**t = -1.7937**

**Pr(T < t) = 0.0376**

**Pr(|T| > |t|) = 0.0751**

**Pr(T > t) = 0.9624**

**Ho: diff = 0**

**Ha: diff < 0**

**Ha: diff != 0**

**Ha: diff > 0**

### ttest complacency if delco==0, by(new)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0.1636364</td>
<td>0.0503432</td>
<td>0.373355</td>
<td>0.0627044 - 0.2645684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.1111111</td>
<td>0.1111111</td>
<td>0.3333333</td>
<td>-0.1451116 - 0.3673338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combined</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>0.15625</td>
<td>0.0457453</td>
<td>0.3659625</td>
<td>0.0648353 - 0.2476647</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**t = 0.3965**

**Pr(T < t) = 0.6534**

**Pr(|T| > |t|) = 0.6931**

**Pr(T > t) = 0.3466**

**Ho: diff = 0**

**Ha: diff < 0**

**Ha: diff != 0**

**Ha: diff > 0**
### Two-sample t test with equal variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>0.1287</td>
<td>0.033478</td>
<td>0.336552</td>
<td>0.0622733  ( .1951525 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.1143</td>
<td>0.054564</td>
<td>0.328029</td>
<td>0.0033991  ( .2251724 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combined</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>0.028464</td>
<td>0.331941</td>
<td>0.0687075  ( .1812925 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**diff** | 0.0144272 | 0.0653389 | \( -0.1148018 \) \( .1436561 \) |

\( \text{diff} = \text{mean}(0) - \text{mean}(1) \)

\( t = 0.2208 \)

\( \text{degrees of freedom} = 134 \)

**Ho:** diff = 0

- Ha: diff < 0 \( \text{Pr}(T < t) = 0.5872 \)
- Ha: diff \( \neq \) 0 \( \text{Pr}(|T| > |t|) = 0.8256 \)
- Ha: diff > 0 \( \text{Pr}(T > t) = 0.4128 \)

### Two-sample t test with equal variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.038462</td>
<td>0.196116</td>
<td>0.0040751  ( .1176746 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.0138</td>
<td>0.038462</td>
<td>0.196116</td>
<td>0.0040751  ( .1176746 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combined</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0.0138</td>
<td>0.028757</td>
<td>0.117851</td>
<td>0.0041582  ( .0415825 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**diff** | -0.0384621 | 0.028757 | \( -0.0958144 \) \( .0188914 \) |

\( \text{diff} = \text{mean}(0) - \text{mean}(1) \)

\( t = -1.3375 \)

\( \text{degrees of freedom} = 70 \)

**Ho:** diff = 0

- Ha: diff < 0 \( \text{Pr}(T < t) = 0.0927 \)
- Ha: diff \( \neq \) 0 \( \text{Pr}(|T| > |t|) = 0.1854 \)
- Ha: diff > 0 \( \text{Pr}(T > t) = 0.9073 \)

### Two-sample t test with equal variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0.0182</td>
<td>0.018182</td>
<td>0.13484</td>
<td>0.0182705  ( 0.0546342 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.018182</td>
<td>0.13484</td>
<td>0.0182705  ( 0.0546342 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combined</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>0.0156</td>
<td>0.015625</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>0.0155991  ( 0.0468491 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**diff** | 0.018182 | 0.045249 | \( -0.0722692 \) \( .1086329 \) |

\( \text{diff} = \text{mean}(0) - \text{mean}(1) \)

\( t = 0.4018 \)

\( \text{degrees of freedom} = 62 \)

**Ho:** diff = 0

- Ha: diff < 0 \( \text{Pr}(T < t) = 0.6554 \)
- Ha: diff \( \neq \) 0 \( \text{Pr}(|T| > |t|) = 0.6892 \)
- Ha: diff > 0 \( \text{Pr}(T > t) = 0.3446 \)

### Two-sample t test with equal variances

**Ho:** diff = 0
sweettables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>.009901</td>
<td>.009901</td>
<td>.0995037</td>
<td>-.0097423 -.0295443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>.0285714</td>
<td>.0285714</td>
<td>.1690309</td>
<td>-.0294927 .0866356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combined</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>.0147059</td>
<td>.01036</td>
<td>.1208178</td>
<td>-.0057831 .0351949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diff</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.0186704</td>
<td>.0237312</td>
<td>-.0656066</td>
<td>.0282657</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \text{diff} = \text{mean}(0) - \text{mean}(1) \]

Ho: diff = 0
degrees of freedom = 134

Ha: diff < 0
Pr(\(T < t\)) = 0.2164

Ha: diff \(!=\) 0
Pr(|\(T| > |t|\)) = 0.4328

Ha: diff > 0
Pr(\(T > t\)) = 0.7836

.ttest education if delco==1, by(new)

Two-sample t test with equal variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>.0217391</td>
<td>.0217391</td>
<td>.147442</td>
<td>-.0220457 .065524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combined</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>.0138889</td>
<td>.0138889</td>
<td>.1178511</td>
<td>-.0138048 .0415825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diff</td>
<td></td>
<td>.0217391</td>
<td>.0290054</td>
<td>.065524</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \text{diff} = \text{mean}(0) - \text{mean}(1) \]

Ho: diff = 0
degrees of freedom = 70

Ha: diff < 0
Pr(\(T < t\)) = 0.7720

Ha: diff \(!=\) 0
Pr(|\(T| > |t|\)) = 0.4561

Ha: diff > 0
Pr(\(T > t\)) = 0.2280

.ttest education if delco==0, by(new)

Two-sample t test with equal variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>.1272727</td>
<td>.0453534</td>
<td>.33635</td>
<td>.0363446 .2182009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combined</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>.109375</td>
<td>.0393221</td>
<td>.3145764</td>
<td>.0307961 .1879939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diff</td>
<td></td>
<td>.1272727</td>
<td>.1128703</td>
<td>.3528973</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \text{diff} = \text{mean}(0) - \text{mean}(1) \]

Ho: diff = 0
degrees of freedom = 62

Ha: diff < 0
Pr(\(T < t\)) = 0.8681

Ha: diff \(!=\) 0
Pr(|\(T| > |t|\)) = 0.2638

Ha: diff > 0
Pr(\(T > t\)) = 0.1319

.ttest education, by(new)

Two-sample t test with equal variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>.0792079</td>
<td>.0270063</td>
<td>.27141</td>
<td>.0256282 .1327877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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combined | 136 | .0588235 | .0202509 | .236164 | .0187735 | .0988736
---|---|---|---|---|---|---
diff | .0792079 | .0459884 | -.0117491 | .1701649

diff = mean(0) - mean(1) | t = 1.7223 | degrees of freedom = 134
Ho: diff = 0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ha: diff &lt; 0</th>
<th>Ha: diff != 0</th>
<th>Ha: diff &gt; 0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pr(T &lt; t) = 0.9563</td>
<td>Pr(</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

.ttest conspiracy if delco==1, by(new)

Two-sample t test with equal variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combined</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diff</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

diff = mean(0) - mean(1) | t = | degrees of freedom = 70
Ho: diff = 0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ha: diff &lt; 0</th>
<th>Ha: diff != 0</th>
<th>Ha: diff &gt; 0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pr(T &lt; t) =</td>
<td>Pr(</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

.ttest conspiracy if delco==0, by(new)

Two-sample t test with equal variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>.0909091</td>
<td>.039121</td>
<td>.2901294</td>
<td>.0124761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.2222222</td>
<td>.1469862</td>
<td>.4409586</td>
<td>-.1167285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combined</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>.109375</td>
<td>.0393221</td>
<td>.1469862</td>
<td>.4409586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diff</td>
<td>-.1313131</td>
<td>.1127957</td>
<td>-.3567885</td>
<td>.0941622</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

diff = mean(0) - mean(1) | t = -1.1642 | degrees of freedom = 62
Ho: diff = 0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ha: diff &lt; 0</th>
<th>Ha: diff != 0</th>
<th>Ha: diff &gt; 0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pr(T &lt; t) = 0.1244</td>
<td>Pr(</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

.ttest conspiracy, by(new)

Two-sample t test with equal variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>.049505</td>
<td>.021692</td>
<td>.2180017</td>
<td>.0064687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>.0571429</td>
<td>.0398075</td>
<td>.2355041</td>
<td>-.0237556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combined</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>.0514706</td>
<td>.0436563</td>
<td>.0988736</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diff</td>
<td>-.0076379</td>
<td>.0436563</td>
<td>-.0939825</td>
<td>.0787067</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

diff = mean(0) - mean(1) | t = -0.1750 |
Ho: diff = 0
degrees of freedom = 134

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>.9782609</td>
<td>.0217391</td>
<td>.147442</td>
<td>.934476 to 1.022046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>.9818182</td>
<td>.0181818</td>
<td>.13484</td>
<td>.9453658 to 1.018271</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

combined | 72  | .9861111 | .0138889 | .1178511  | .9584175 to 1.013805|

diff | -.0217391 | .0290054 | -.0795886 | .0361103 |

diff = mean(0) - mean(1)
t = -0.7495
degrees of freedom = 70

Ho: diff < 0
Pr(T < t) = 0.2280
Pr(|T| > |t|) = 0.4561
Pr(T > t) = 0.7720

Ho: diff = 0
Pr(T < t) = 0.2027
Pr(|T| > |t|) = 0.4054
Pr(T > t) = 0.7973

Ho: diff > 0
Pr(T < t) = 0.4307
Pr(|T| > |t|) = 0.8614
Pr(T > t) = 0.5693

Ha: diff < 0
Pr(T < t) = 0.4307
Pr(|T| > |t|) = 0.8614
Pr(T > t) = 0.5693

Ha: diff != 0
Pr(T < t) = 0.2280
Pr(|T| > |t|) = 0.4561
Pr(T > t) = 0.7720

Ha: diff > 0
Pr(T < t) = 0.2027
Pr(|T| > |t|) = 0.4054
Pr(T > t) = 0.7973

.ttest talk if delco==1, by(new)

Two-sample t test with equal variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>.9818182</td>
<td>.0181818</td>
<td>.13484</td>
<td>.9453658 to 1.018271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>.980198</td>
<td>.0139319</td>
<td>.1400141</td>
<td>.9525575 to 1.007839</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

combined | 136 | .9852941 | .01036 | .1208178  | .9648051 to 1.005783|

diff | -.019802 | .0237243 | -.0667246 | .0271206 |

diff = mean(0) - mean(1)
t = -0.4018
degrees of freedom = 62

Ho: diff < 0
Pr(T < t) = 0.3446
Pr(|T| > |t|) = 0.6892
Pr(T > t) = 0.6554

Ho: diff = 0
Pr(T < t) = 0.2280
Pr(|T| > |t|) = 0.4561
Pr(T > t) = 0.7720

Ho: diff > 0
Pr(T < t) = 0.2027
Pr(|T| > |t|) = 0.4054
Pr(T > t) = 0.7973

.ttest talk if delco==0, by(new)

Two-sample t test with equal variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9818182</td>
<td>.005625</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>.9531509 to 1.015599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

combined | 136 | .9852941 | .01036 | .1208178  | .9648051 to 1.005783|

diff | -.019802 | .0237243 | -.0667246 | .0271206 |

diff = mean(0) - mean(1)
t = -0.8347
degrees of freedom = 134

Ho: diff < 0
Pr(T < t) = 0.2027
Pr(|T| > |t|) = 0.4054
Pr(T > t) = 0.7973

Ho: diff = 0
Pr(T < t) = 0.2280
Pr(|T| > |t|) = 0.4561
Pr(T > t) = 0.7720

Ho: diff > 0
Pr(T < t) = 0.2027
Pr(|T| > |t|) = 0.4054
Pr(T > t) = 0.7973
sweettables

: ttest everyone if delco==1, by(new)

Two-sample t test with equal variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>.3695652</td>
<td>.0719547</td>
<td>.4880207</td>
<td>.2246409 - .5144895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>.5384615</td>
<td>.0997037</td>
<td>.5083911</td>
<td>.3331179 - .7438052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combined</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>.4305556</td>
<td>.058764</td>
<td>.4986288</td>
<td>.3133835 - .5477276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diff</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.1688963</td>
<td>.1215485</td>
<td>-.4113172</td>
<td>.0735246</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

diff = mean(0) - mean(1)

Ho: diff = 0
t = -1.3895
degrees of freedom = 70

Ha: diff < 0  Pr(T < t) = 0.0845
Ha: diff != 0  Pr(|T| > |t|) = 0.1691
Ha: diff > 0  Pr(T > t) = 0.9155

: ttest everyone if delco==0, by(new)

Two-sample t test with equal variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>.3818182</td>
<td>.0661134</td>
<td>.4903101</td>
<td>.2492688 - .5143676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.2222222</td>
<td>.1469862</td>
<td>.4409586</td>
<td>-.1167285 -.561173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combined</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>.359375</td>
<td>.0604513</td>
<td>.4836103</td>
<td>.2385727 - .4801773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diff</td>
<td></td>
<td>.159596</td>
<td>.1741143</td>
<td>-.1884536</td>
<td>.5076455</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

diff = mean(0) - mean(1)

Ho: diff = 0
t = 0.9166
degrees of freedom = 62

Ha: diff < 0  Pr(T < t) = 0.8186
Ha: diff != 0  Pr(|T| > |t|) = 0.3629
Ha: diff > 0  Pr(T > t) = 0.1814

: ttest everyone, by(new)

Two-sample t test with equal variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>.3762376</td>
<td>.0484441</td>
<td>.486857</td>
<td>.280126 - .4723493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>.4571429</td>
<td>.0854337</td>
<td>.5054327</td>
<td>.2835207 - .6307651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combined</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>.3970588</td>
<td>.0421112</td>
<td>.4910972</td>
<td>.3137758 - .4803419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diff</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.0809052</td>
<td>.0964315</td>
<td>-.27163</td>
<td>.1098195</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

diff = mean(0) - mean(1)

Ho: diff = 0
t = -0.8390
degrees of freedom = 134

Ha: diff < 0  Pr(T < t) = 0.2015
Ha: diff != 0  Pr(|T| > |t|) = 0.4030
Ha: diff > 0  Pr(T > t) = 0.7985

: ttest friends if delco==1, by(new)

Two-sample t test with equal variances
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>.7608696</td>
<td>.0635867</td>
<td>.431266</td>
<td>.6327994 .8889398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>.6153846</td>
<td>.0973009</td>
<td>.4961389</td>
<td>.4149898 .8157795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combined</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>.7083333</td>
<td>.0539427</td>
<td>.4577194</td>
<td>.6007745 .8158921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diff</td>
<td></td>
<td>.1454849</td>
<td>.1117599</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.0774131 .368383</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### diff = mean(0) - mean(1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ho: diff = 0</th>
<th>degrees of freedom = 70</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ha: diff &lt; 0</td>
<td>Pr(T &lt; t) = 0.9014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ha: diff = 0</td>
<td>Pr(</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ha: diff &gt; 0</td>
<td>Pr(T &gt; t) = 0.0986</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Two-sample t test with equal variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>.4909091</td>
<td>.0680301</td>
<td>.504525</td>
<td>.3545169 .6273013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.6666667</td>
<td>.1666667</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.2823326 1.051001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combined</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>.515625</td>
<td>.0629633</td>
<td>.5037065</td>
<td>.3898029 .6414471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diff</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.1757576</td>
<td>.1812046</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.5379803 .1864652</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### diff = mean(0) - mean(1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ho: diff = 0</th>
<th>degrees of freedom = 62</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ha: diff &lt; 0</td>
<td>Pr(T &lt; t) = 0.1679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ha: diff = 0</td>
<td>Pr(</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ha: diff &gt; 0</td>
<td>Pr(T &gt; t) = 0.8321</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Two-sample t test with equal variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>.6138614</td>
<td>.0486863</td>
<td>.4892913</td>
<td>.5172692 .7104536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>.6285714</td>
<td>.0828658</td>
<td>.4902409</td>
<td>.4601678 .7969751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combined</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>.6176471</td>
<td>.041825</td>
<td>.4877586</td>
<td>.5349302 .700364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diff</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.01471</td>
<td>.0960188</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.2046185 .1751984</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### diff = mean(0) - mean(1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ho: diff = 0</th>
<th>degrees of freedom = 134</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ha: diff &lt; 0</td>
<td>Pr(T &lt; t) = 0.4392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ha: diff = 0</td>
<td>Pr(</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ha: diff &gt; 0</td>
<td>Pr(T &gt; t) = 0.5608</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Two-sample t test with equal variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>.1956522</td>
<td>.0591368</td>
<td>.4010855</td>
<td>.0765445 .3147599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>.2692308</td>
<td>.088712</td>
<td>.4523443</td>
<td>.0865249 .4519366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Obs</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std. Err.</td>
<td>Std. Dev.</td>
<td>[95% Conf. Interval]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>.222222</td>
<td>.0493392</td>
<td>.1238426</td>
<td>.3206018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.1030776</td>
<td>-.2791605</td>
<td>.1320033</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combined</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>- .1230771</td>
<td>-.370875</td>
<td>.1200514</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ho: diff = 0**

**degrees of freedom = 70**

| diff = mean(0) - mean(1) | t  | Pr(T < t) | Pr(|T| > |t|) | Pr(T > t) |
|---------------------------|----|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| .2727273                 | -.7138 | 0.2389 | 0.4777 | 0.7611 |
| .2222222                 | -.1167285 | 0.2389 | 0.4777 | 0.7611 |
| .265625                  | .1544281 | 0.2389 | 0.4777 | 0.7611 |
| .0505051                 | -.2717785 | 0.2389 | 0.4777 | 0.7611 |

**ttest work if delco==0, by(new)**

### Two-sample t test with equal variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>.2727273</td>
<td>.0606061</td>
<td>.1512194</td>
<td>.3942351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.2222222</td>
<td>.1469862</td>
<td>.1167285</td>
<td>.561173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combined</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>.265625</td>
<td>.0556446</td>
<td>.3768219</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ho: diff = 0**

**degrees of freedom = 62**

| diff = mean(0) - mean(1) | t  | Pr(T < t) | Pr(|T| > |t|) | Pr(T > t) |
|---------------------------|----|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| .0425627                 | .3133 | 0.6224 | 0.7551 | 0.3776 |
| .0368952                 | .16087 | 0.6224 | 0.7551 | 0.3776 |
| .084692                 | .104816 | 0.6224 | 0.7551 | 0.3776 |

**ttest work, by(new)**

### Two-sample t test with equal variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>.2376238</td>
<td>.0425627</td>
<td>.1531805</td>
<td>.322067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>.2571429</td>
<td>.074955</td>
<td>.104816</td>
<td>.4094697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combined</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>.2426471</td>
<td>.0306952</td>
<td>.1696797</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ho: diff = 0**

**degrees of freedom = 134**

| diff = mean(0) - mean(1) | t  | Pr(T < t) | Pr(|T| > |t|) | Pr(T > t) |
|---------------------------|----|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| .0733998                 | -.2305 | 0.4777 | 0.8181 | 0.5910 |
| .0997037                 | .3133 | 0.6224 | 0.7551 | 0.3776 |
| .0591327                 | .1696797 | 0.6224 | 0.7551 | 0.3776 |

**ttest home if delco==1, by(new)**

### Two-sample t test with equal variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>.4130435</td>
<td>.0733998</td>
<td>.4978213</td>
<td>.652088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>.5381625</td>
<td>.097037</td>
<td>.5083913</td>
<td>.743852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combined</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>.4583333</td>
<td>.0521757</td>
<td>.3404261</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ho: diff = 0**

**degrees of freedom = 70**

| diff = mean(0) - mean(1) | t  | Pr(T < t) | Pr(|T| > |t|) | Pr(T > t) |
|---------------------------|----|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| .1254181                 | -1.0190 | 0.2389 | 0.4777 | 0.7611 |
sweettables

Ho: \( \text{diff} = 0 \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ha: ( \text{diff} &lt; 0 )</th>
<th>Ha: ( \text{diff} != 0 )</th>
<th>Ha: ( \text{diff} &gt; 0 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \Pr(T &lt; t) = 0.1559 )</td>
<td>( \Pr(</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

. `ttest` home if delco==0, by(new)

Two-sample t test with equal variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>.3454545</td>
<td>.0647096</td>
<td>.479899</td>
<td>.2157197 .4751894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.4444444</td>
<td>.1756821</td>
<td>.5270463</td>
<td>.0393208 .8495681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combined</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>.359375</td>
<td>.0604513</td>
<td>.4836103</td>
<td>.2385727 .4801773</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| diff | - .0989899 | .1748387 | -.4484875 | .2505077 |

Ho: \( \text{diff} = 0 \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ha: ( \text{diff} &lt; 0 )</th>
<th>Ha: ( \text{diff} != 0 )</th>
<th>Ha: ( \text{diff} &gt; 0 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \Pr(T &lt; t) = 0.2867 )</td>
<td>( \Pr(</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

. `ttest` home, by(new)

Two-sample t test with equal variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>.3762376</td>
<td>.0484441</td>
<td>.486857</td>
<td>.280126 .4723493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>.5142857</td>
<td>.0857143</td>
<td>.5070926</td>
<td>.3400933 .6884781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combined</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>.4117647</td>
<td>.0423578</td>
<td>.4939724</td>
<td>.327994 .4955354</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| diff | -.1380481 | .0965165 | -.328941 | .0528448 |

Ho: \( \text{diff} = 0 \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ha: ( \text{diff} &lt; 0 )</th>
<th>Ha: ( \text{diff} != 0 )</th>
<th>Ha: ( \text{diff} &gt; 0 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \Pr(T &lt; t) = 0.0775 )</td>
<td>( \Pr(</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

. `ttest` tpevents if delco==1, by(new)

Two-sample t test with equal variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>.173913</td>
<td>.0565032</td>
<td>.383223</td>
<td>.0601098 .2877162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combined</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>.1111111</td>
<td>.0372969</td>
<td>.3164751</td>
<td>.0367431 .1854791</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| diff | .173913 | .0753893 | .0235539 | .3242722 |

Ho: \( \text{diff} = 0 \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ha: ( \text{diff} &lt; 0 )</th>
<th>Ha: ( \text{diff} != 0 )</th>
<th>Ha: ( \text{diff} &gt; 0 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \Pr(T &lt; t) = 0.9880 )</td>
<td>( \Pr(</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```plaintext
// ttest tpevents if delco==0, by(new)

Two-sample t test with equal variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0.01818</td>
<td>0.01818</td>
<td>0.13484</td>
<td>-0.0182705 - 0.0546342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combined</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>0.015625</td>
<td>0.015625</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>-0.0155991 - 0.0468491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diff</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.01818</td>
<td>0.0452488</td>
<td>.0722692</td>
<td>0.1086329</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ho: diff = 0

t = 0.4018

Group I +

diff = mean(0) - mean(1)

Ha: diff < 0
Pr(T < t) = 0.6554

Ha: diff > 0
Pr(T > t) = 0.3446

. ttest tpevents, by(new)

Two-sample t test with equal variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>0.089109</td>
<td>0.0284901</td>
<td>0.2863218</td>
<td>0.0325854 - 0.1456324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.0661765</td>
<td>0.0213952</td>
<td>0.2495093</td>
<td>0.0238633 - 0.1084897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combined</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>0.0891089</td>
<td>0.0485151</td>
<td>-0.0068455</td>
<td>0.1850633</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ho: diff = 0

t = 1.8367

Group I +

diff = mean(0) - mean(1)

Ha: diff < 0
Pr(T < t) = 0.9658

Ha: diff > 0
Pr(T > t) = 0.0342

: ttest online if delco==1, by(new)

Two-sample t test with equal variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0.0434783</td>
<td>0.0304003</td>
<td>0.2061846</td>
<td>-0.017751 - 0.1047075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combined</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0.0277778</td>
<td>0.0195032</td>
<td>0.1654888</td>
<td>-0.111102 - 0.0666657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diff</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0434783</td>
<td>0.0405615</td>
<td>-0.0374191</td>
<td>0.1243756</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ho: diff = 0
t = 1.0719

Group I +

diff = mean(0) - mean(1)

Ha: diff < 0
Pr(T < t) = 0.8563

Ha: diff > 0
Pr(T > t) = 0.1437

: ttest online if delco==0, by(new)

Two-sample t test with equal variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combined</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diff</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

---

```plaintext
// Two-sample t test with equal variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Two-sample t test with equal variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>.089109</td>
<td>.0284901</td>
<td>.2863218</td>
<td>.0325854 -.1456324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>.028571</td>
<td>.0285714</td>
<td>.1690309</td>
<td>-.0294927 .0866356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combined</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>.073529</td>
<td>.0224636</td>
<td>.2619684</td>
<td>.0291033 .1179555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diff</td>
<td>.0605375</td>
<td>.051309</td>
<td>-.0409429</td>
<td>.1620178</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

diff = mean(0) - mean(1)  
t = 1.1799  
Ho: diff = 0  
degrees of freedom = 134

Ha: diff < 0  
Pr(T < t) = 0.8799  
Pr(|T| > |t|) = 0.2401  
Pr(T > t) = 0.1201

Two-sample t test with equal variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>.0434783</td>
<td>.0304003</td>
<td>.2061846</td>
<td>-.017751 .1047075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>.0769231</td>
<td>.0532939</td>
<td>.2717465</td>
<td>-.0328377 .1866839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combined</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>.0555556</td>
<td>.0271848</td>
<td>.2306689</td>
<td>.001351 .1097601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diff</td>
<td>-.0334448</td>
<td>.056859</td>
<td>-.1468465</td>
<td>.0799569</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

diff = mean(0) - mean(1)  
t = -0.5882  
Ho: diff = 0  
degrees of freedom = 70

Ha: diff < 0  
Pr(T < t) = 0.2791  
Pr(|T| > |t|) = 0.5583  
Pr(T > t) = 0.7209

Two-sample t test with equal variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>.0727273</td>
<td>.0353391</td>
<td>.2620818</td>
<td>.0018766 .1435779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.1111111</td>
<td>.1111111</td>
<td>.3333333</td>
<td>-.1451116 .3673338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combined</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>.078125</td>
<td>.0338112</td>
<td>.2704897</td>
<td>.0105587 .1456913</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
sweettable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>diff</th>
<th>-0.0383838</th>
<th>0.0979208</th>
<th>-0.2341248</th>
<th>0.1573571</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>diff = mean(0) - mean(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ho: diff = 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t = -0.3920</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>degrees of freedom = 62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ha: diff < 0
Pr(T < t) = 0.3482
Pr(|T| > |t|) = 0.6964
Pr(T > t) = 0.6518

Ha: diff != 0

Ha: diff > 0

. ttest church, by(new)

Two-sample t test with equal variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>0.0594059</td>
<td>0.0236383</td>
<td>0.2375619</td>
<td>0.0125082 0.1063036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.0857143</td>
<td>0.0480096</td>
<td>0.2840286</td>
<td>-0.011853 0.1832815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combined</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>0.0661765</td>
<td>0.0213952</td>
<td>0.2495093</td>
<td>0.0238633 0.1084897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diff</td>
<td>-0.0263083</td>
<td>0.0490694</td>
<td>-0.1233591</td>
<td>0.0707424</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diff = mean(0) - mean(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ho: diff = 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t = -0.5361</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>degrees of freedom = 134</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ha: diff < 0
Pr(T < t) = 0.2964
Pr(|T| > |t|) = 0.5927
Pr(T > t) = 0.7036

Ha: diff != 0

Ha: diff > 0

. ttest often if delco==1, by(new)

Two-sample t test with equal variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0.173913</td>
<td>0.0565032</td>
<td>0.383223 0.1601098 0.2877162</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.0384615</td>
<td>0.0384615</td>
<td>0.1961161 -0.0407515 0.1176746</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combined</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>0.0392491</td>
<td>0.3330398</td>
<td>0.0467395 0.2032660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diff</td>
<td>-0.1354515</td>
<td>0.0806875</td>
<td>-0.0254747</td>
<td>0.2963777</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diff = mean(0) - mean(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ho: diff = 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t = 1.6787</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>degrees of freedom = 70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ha: diff < 0
Pr(T < t) = 0.9512
Pr(|T| > |t|) = 0.0977
Pr(T > t) = 0.0488

Ha: diff != 0

Ha: diff > 0

. ttest often if delco==0, by(new)

Two-sample t test with equal variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0.1636364</td>
<td>0.0503432</td>
<td>0.373355 0.0627044 0.2645684</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combined</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>0.140625</td>
<td>0.0437978</td>
<td>0.3503824</td>
<td>0.0531021 0.2281479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diff</td>
<td>0.1636364</td>
<td>0.1252883</td>
<td>0.0886113</td>
<td>0.414084</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diff = mean(0) - mean(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ho: diff = 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t = 1.3061</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>degrees of freedom = 62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Page 20
sweettables

Ha: diff < 0  Pr(T < t) = 0.9018  Ha: diff != 0  Pr(|T| > |t|) = 0.1964  Ha: diff > 0  Pr(T > t) = 0.0982

`.ttest often, by(new)

Two-sample t test with equal variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>.1683168</td>
<td>.0374147</td>
<td>.3760135</td>
<td>.0940871 to .2425466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>.0285714</td>
<td>.0285714</td>
<td>.1690309</td>
<td>-.0294927 to .0866336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combined</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>.1323529</td>
<td>.0291656</td>
<td>.3401269</td>
<td>.0746723 to .1900336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diff</td>
<td></td>
<td>.1397454</td>
<td>.0658651</td>
<td>.0094758</td>
<td>.270015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

diff = mean(0) - mean(1)  t = 2.1217  degrees of freedom = 134

Ho: diff = 0  Ha: diff < 0  Pr(T < t) = 0.9821  Ha: diff != 0  Pr(|T| > |t|) = 0.0357  Ha: diff > 0  Pr(T > t) = 0.0179

`.ttest sometimes if delco==1, by(new)

Two-sample t test with equal variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>.2173913</td>
<td>.0614875</td>
<td>.4170288</td>
<td>.093549 to .3412336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>.0769231</td>
<td>.0532939</td>
<td>.2717465</td>
<td>-.0328377 to .1866839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combined</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>.1666667</td>
<td>.0442287</td>
<td>.3752933</td>
<td>.0784771 to .2548563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diff</td>
<td></td>
<td>.1404682</td>
<td>.0912043</td>
<td>-.041433</td>
<td>.3223694</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

diff = mean(0) - mean(1)  t = 1.5401  degrees of freedom = 70

Ho: diff = 0  Ha: diff < 0  Pr(T < t) = 0.9360  Ha: diff != 0  Pr(|T| > |t|) = 0.1280  Ha: diff > 0  Pr(T > t) = 0.0640

`.ttest sometimes if delco==0, by(new)

Two-sample t test with equal variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>.2545455</td>
<td>.0592784</td>
<td>.4396203</td>
<td>.1356994 to .3733915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combined</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>.21875</td>
<td>.0520833</td>
<td>.4166667</td>
<td>.1146698 to .3228302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diff</td>
<td></td>
<td>.2545455</td>
<td>.1475252</td>
<td>-.0403532</td>
<td>.5494441</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

diff = mean(0) - mean(1)  t = 1.7254  degrees of freedom = 62

Ho: diff = 0  Ha: diff < 0  Pr(T < t) = 0.9553  Ha: diff != 0  Pr(|T| > |t|) = 0.0894  Ha: diff > 0  Pr(T > t) = 0.0447

`.ttest sometimes, by(new)
sweetables

Two-sample t test with equal variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>0.2376238</td>
<td>0.0425627</td>
<td>0.4277503</td>
<td>0.1531805 - 0.322067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.5571429</td>
<td>0.0398075</td>
<td>0.2355041</td>
<td>-0.0237556 - 1.380413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combined</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>0.1911765</td>
<td>0.0338437</td>
<td>0.3946814</td>
<td>0.1242441 - 0.2581088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diff</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.1804809</td>
<td>0.0761224</td>
<td>0.0299241</td>
<td>0.3310377</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \text{diff} = \text{mean}(0) - \text{mean}(1) \]

\[ t = \frac{0.1804809}{0.0761224} = 2.3709 \]

Ho: \( \text{diff} = 0 \)  
degrees of freedom = 134

Ha: \( \text{diff} < 0 \)  
Pr(\( T < t \)) = 0.0040

Ha: \( \text{diff} \neq 0 \)  
Pr(\( |T| > |t| \)) = 0.0192

Ha: \( \text{diff} > 0 \)  
Pr(\( T > t \)) = 0.9904

\[ t \text{test never if delco==1, by(new)} \]

Two-sample t test with equal variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0.5869565</td>
<td>0.0733998</td>
<td>0.4978213</td>
<td>0.4391218 - 0.7347912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.8846154</td>
<td>0.0638971</td>
<td>0.3258126</td>
<td>0.7530168 - 1.016214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combined</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0.6944444</td>
<td>0.0546682</td>
<td>0.4638749</td>
<td>0.5854392 - 0.8034497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diff</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.2976589</td>
<td>0.1089647</td>
<td>-0.5149821</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \text{diff} = \text{mean}(0) - \text{mean}(1) \]

\[ t = \frac{-0.2976589}{0.1089647} = -2.7317 \]

Ho: \( \text{diff} = 0 \)  
degrees of freedom = 70

Ha: \( \text{diff} < 0 \)  
Pr(\( T < t \)) = 0.0004

Ha: \( \text{diff} \neq 0 \)  
Pr(\( |T| > |t| \)) = 0.0080

Ha: \( \text{diff} > 0 \)  
Pr(\( T > t \)) = 0.9904

\[ t \text{test never if delco==0, by(new)} \]

Two-sample t test with equal variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0.5818182</td>
<td>0.0671242</td>
<td>0.4472422</td>
<td>0.4472422 - 0.7163942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.640625</td>
<td>0.0604513</td>
<td>0.4836103</td>
<td>0.5198227 - 0.7614273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combined</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>0.640625</td>
<td>0.0604513</td>
<td>0.5198227</td>
<td>0.7614273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diff</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.4181818</td>
<td>0.167051</td>
<td>-0.752112</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \text{diff} = \text{mean}(0) - \text{mean}(1) \]

\[ t = \frac{-0.4181818}{0.167051} = -2.5033 \]

Ho: \( \text{diff} = 0 \)  
degrees of freedom = 62

Ha: \( \text{diff} < 0 \)  
Pr(\( T < t \)) = 0.0075

Ha: \( \text{diff} \neq 0 \)  
Pr(\( |T| > |t| \)) = 0.0150

Ha: \( \text{diff} > 0 \)  
Pr(\( T > t \)) = 0.9925

\[ t \text{test never, by(new)} \]

Two-sample t test with equal variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>0.5841584</td>
<td>0.0492866</td>
<td>0.4953247</td>
<td>0.4863751-0.6819417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.9142857</td>
<td>0.0480096</td>
<td>0.2840286</td>
<td>0.8167185-1.011853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combined</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>0.6691176</td>
<td>0.0404968</td>
<td>0.4727203</td>
<td>0.5890274-0.7492079</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

diff = mean(0) - mean(1)  t = -3.7304  degrees of freedom = 134

Ho: diff = 0

Ha: diff < 0  Pr(T < t) = 0.0001
Ha: diff != 0  Pr(|T| > |t|) = 0.0003
Ha: diff > 0  Pr(T > t) = 0.9999

ttest radio if delco==1, by(new)

Two-sample t test with equal variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0.3695652</td>
<td>0.0719547</td>
<td>0.4880207</td>
<td>0.2246409-0.5144895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.3846154</td>
<td>0.0973009</td>
<td>0.4961389</td>
<td>0.1842205-0.5850102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combined</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>0.0574548</td>
<td>0.4875203</td>
<td>0.2604383-0.4895617</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

diff = mean(0) - mean(1)  t = -0.1249  degrees of freedom = 70

Ho: diff = 0

Ha: diff < 0  Pr(T < t) = 0.4505
Ha: diff != 0  Pr(|T| > |t|) = 0.9009
Ha: diff > 0  Pr(T > t) = 0.5495

ttest radio if delco==0, by(new)

Two-sample t test with equal variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>0.4257426</td>
<td>0.0494455</td>
<td>0.4969212</td>
<td>0.3276441-0.5238411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.4285714</td>
<td>0.0848698</td>
<td>0.5020964</td>
<td>0.2560953-0.6010476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combined</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>0.4264706</td>
<td>0.0425653</td>
<td>0.4963922</td>
<td>0.3422896-0.5106516</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ttest radio, by(new)

Two-sample t test with equal variances
diff | -.0028289 .0977266 -.1961151 .1904574
-----|------------------

diff = mean(0) - mean(1) t = -0.0289
Ho: diff = 0 degrees of freedom = 134

Ha: diff < 0
Pr(T < t) = 0.4885

Ha: diff != 0
Pr(|T| > |t|) = 0.9770

Ha: diff > 0
Pr(T > t) = 0.5115

:. ttest tv if delco==1, by(new)

Two-sample t test with equal variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>.7608696</td>
<td>.0635867</td>
<td>.431266</td>
<td>.6327994 .8889398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>.7307692</td>
<td>.088712</td>
<td>.4523443</td>
<td>.5480634 .9134751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combined</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.0513892</td>
<td>.4360514</td>
<td>.6475329 .8524671</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| diff | .0301003 | .1076902 | -.1846811 | .2448817 |

| diff = mean(0) - mean(1) t = 0.2795 |
| Ho: diff = 0 degrees of freedom = 70 |

Ha: diff < 0
Pr(T < t) = 0.6097

Ha: diff != 0
Pr(|T| > |t|) = 0.7807

Ha: diff > 0
Pr(T > t) = 0.3903

:. ttest tv if delco==0, by(new)

Two-sample t test with equal variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>.6181818</td>
<td>.0661134</td>
<td>.431266</td>
<td>.5443677 .6913157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>.7777778</td>
<td>.1469862</td>
<td>.4409586</td>
<td>.5480634 .9134751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combined</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.0513892</td>
<td>.4360514</td>
<td>.6475329 .8524671</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| diff | -.159596 | .1741143 | -.5076455 | .1884536 |

| diff = mean(0) - mean(1) t = -0.9166 |
| Ho: diff = 0 degrees of freedom = 62 |

Ha: diff < 0
Pr(T < t) = 0.1814

Ha: diff != 0
Pr(|T| > |t|) = 0.3629

Ha: diff > 0
Pr(T > t) = 0.8186

:. ttest tv, by(new)

Two-sample t test with equal variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>.6831683</td>
<td>.0465241</td>
<td>.4675616</td>
<td>.5908658 .7754708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>.748571</td>
<td>.074955</td>
<td>.4434396</td>
<td>.5905303 .895184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combined</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>.6985294</td>
<td>.0394955</td>
<td>.4605931</td>
<td>.6204194 .7766394</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| diff | -.0596888 | .0905323 | -.2387459 | .1193682 |

| diff = mean(0) - mean(1) t = -0.6593 |
| Ho: diff = 0 degrees of freedom = 134 |
: ttest internet if delco==1, by(new)

Two-sample t test with equal variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>.5217391</td>
<td>.0744651</td>
<td>.505047</td>
<td>.3717587 - .6717196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>.4615385</td>
<td>.0997037</td>
<td>.5083911</td>
<td>.2561948 - .6668821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combined</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.0593391</td>
<td>.5035088</td>
<td>.3816812 - .6183188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diff</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>.0602007</td>
<td>.1242111</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.1875306 + .3079319</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

: ttest internet if delco==0, by(new)

Two-sample t test with equal variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>.4363636</td>
<td>.0674881</td>
<td>.5005048</td>
<td>.3010582 - .571669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.5555556</td>
<td>.1756821</td>
<td>.5270463</td>
<td>.1504319 - .9606792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combined</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>.453125</td>
<td>.0627166</td>
<td>.5017331</td>
<td>.3277958 - .5784542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diff</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>-.1191919</td>
<td>.1812278</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.4814612 + .2430773</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

: ttest internet, by(new)

Two-sample t test with equal variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>.4752475</td>
<td>.0499387</td>
<td>.5018777</td>
<td>.3761706 - .5743245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>.4857143</td>
<td>.0857143</td>
<td>.5070926</td>
<td>.3115219 - .6599067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combined</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>.4779412</td>
<td>.0429912</td>
<td>.5013598</td>
<td>.3929177 - .5629646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diff</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>-.0104668</td>
<td>.0987008</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.2056797 + .1847462</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

: ttest print if delco==1, by(new)
Two-sample t test with equal variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>.3478261</td>
<td>.0709997</td>
<td>.4815434</td>
<td>.2048253 .4908268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>.3461538</td>
<td>.0951486</td>
<td>.4851645</td>
<td>.1501917 .542116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combined</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>.3472222</td>
<td>.0565011</td>
<td>.4794281</td>
<td>.2345621 .4598823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diff</td>
<td></td>
<td>.0016722</td>
<td>.1184687</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.2346062 .2379507</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ha: diff < 0
Pr(T < t) = 0.8186

Ho: diff = 0
degress of freedom = 70

Ha: diff != 0
Pr(T > t) = 0.3629

Ha: diff > 0

.ttest print if delco==0, by(new)

Two-sample t test with equal variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>.3818182</td>
<td>.0661134</td>
<td>.4903101</td>
<td>.2492688 .5143676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.2222222</td>
<td>.1469862</td>
<td>.4409586</td>
<td>-.1167285 .561173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combined</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>.359375</td>
<td>.0604513</td>
<td>.4836103</td>
<td>.2385727 .4801773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diff</td>
<td></td>
<td>.159596</td>
<td>.1741143</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.1884536 .5076455</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ha: diff < 0
Pr(T < t) = 0.5056

Ho: diff = 0
degrees of freedom = 70

Ha: diff != 0
Pr(T > t) = 0.9888

Ha: diff > 0
Pr(T > t) = 0.4944

.ttest print if delco==0, by(new)

Two-sample t test with equal variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>.3663366</td>
<td>.0481803</td>
<td>.484206</td>
<td>.2707483 .461925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>.3142857</td>
<td>.0796149</td>
<td>.4710082</td>
<td>.1524887 .4760827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combined</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>.3529412</td>
<td>.0411298</td>
<td>.4796513</td>
<td>.2715992 .4342832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diff</td>
<td></td>
<td>.0520509</td>
<td>.0943239</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.1345054 .2386072</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ha: diff < 0
Pr(T < t) = 0.5518

Ho: diff = 0
degrees of freedom = 134

Ha: diff > 0
Pr(T > t) = 0.2910

.ttest people if delco==1, by(new)

Two-sample t test with equal variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>.3818182</td>
<td>.0661134</td>
<td>.4903101</td>
<td>.2492688 .5143676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.2222222</td>
<td>.1469862</td>
<td>.4409586</td>
<td>-.1167285 .561173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combined</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>.359375</td>
<td>.0604513</td>
<td>.4836103</td>
<td>.2385727 .4801773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diff</td>
<td></td>
<td>.159596</td>
<td>.1741143</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.1884536 .5076455</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ha: diff < 0
Pr(T < t) = 0.5056

Ho: diff = 0
degrees of freedom = 70

Ha: diff != 0
Pr(T > t) = 0.9888

Ha: diff > 0
Pr(T > t) = 0.4944

.ttest print if delco==0, by(new)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.0544331</td>
<td>.4036867</td>
<td>.0908682 .3091318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combined</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>.171875</td>
<td>.0475318</td>
<td>.3802542</td>
<td>.0768903 .2668597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diff</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>1354668</td>
<td>-0.0707943</td>
<td>.4707943</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ho: diff = 0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>.1386139</td>
<td>.0345543</td>
<td>.3472666</td>
<td>.0700591 .2071686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>.0571429</td>
<td>.0398075</td>
<td>.2355041</td>
<td>-.0237556 .1380413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combined</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>.1176471</td>
<td>.0277297</td>
<td>.3233808</td>
<td>.0628063 .1724878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diff</td>
<td>.081471</td>
<td>.0632752</td>
<td>-.0436763</td>
<td>.2066183</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ho: diff = 0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>.1304348</td>
<td>.0502044</td>
<td>.3405026</td>
<td>.029318 .2315516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>.1153846</td>
<td>.0638971</td>
<td>.3258126</td>
<td>-.0162139 .2469832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combined</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>.0392491</td>
<td>.3330398</td>
<td>.0467395 .2032605</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ho: diff = 0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.0544331</td>
<td>.4036867</td>
<td>.0908682 .3091318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combined</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>.171875</td>
<td>.0475318</td>
<td>.3802542</td>
<td>.0768903 .2668597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diff</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>1354668</td>
<td>-0.0707943</td>
<td>.4707943</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ho: diff = 0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>.1386139</td>
<td>.0345543</td>
<td>.3472666</td>
<td>.0700591 .2071686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>.0571429</td>
<td>.0398075</td>
<td>.2355041</td>
<td>-.0237556 .1380413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combined</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>.1176471</td>
<td>.0277297</td>
<td>.3233808</td>
<td>.0628063 .1724878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diff</td>
<td>.081471</td>
<td>.0632752</td>
<td>-.0436763</td>
<td>.2066183</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ho: diff = 0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>.1304348</td>
<td>.0502044</td>
<td>.3405026</td>
<td>.029318 .2315516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>.1153846</td>
<td>.0638971</td>
<td>.3258126</td>
<td>-.0162139 .2469832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combined</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>.0392491</td>
<td>.3330398</td>
<td>.0467395 .2032605</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Two-sample t test with equal variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>.2181818</td>
<td>.0562037</td>
<td>.4168182</td>
<td>[.1055001 .3308635]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combined</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>.1875</td>
<td>.0491747</td>
<td>.3933979</td>
<td>[.0892321 .2857679]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diff</td>
<td>.2181818</td>
<td>.1398734</td>
<td>-.0614211</td>
<td>.4977847</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Ho: diff = 0 | degrees of freedom = 70 |

- $\text{Ha: diff < 0}$
- $\text{Ha: diff != 0}$
- $\text{Ha: diff > 0}$

$\text{Pr}(T < t) = 0.5723$  \hspace{1cm} $\text{Pr}(|T| > |t|) = 0.8554$  \hspace{1cm} $\text{Pr}(T > t) = 0.4277$

### Two-sample t test with equal variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>.1782178</td>
<td>.0382696</td>
<td>.3846047</td>
<td>[.102292 .2541436]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>.0857143</td>
<td>.0480096</td>
<td>.2840286</td>
<td>-.011853 .1832815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combined</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>.1544118</td>
<td>.0310995</td>
<td>.3626788</td>
<td>.0929066 .2159169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diff</td>
<td>.0925035</td>
<td>.0709536</td>
<td>-.0478303</td>
<td>.2328374</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Ho: diff = 0 | degrees of freedom = 62 |

- $\text{Ha: diff < 0}$
- $\text{Ha: diff != 0}$
- $\text{Ha: diff > 0}$

$\text{Pr}(T < t) = 0.9381$  \hspace{1cm} $\text{Pr}(|T| > |t|) = 0.1239$  \hspace{1cm} $\text{Pr}(T > t) = 0.0619$

### Two-sample t test with equal variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>.5869565</td>
<td>.0733998</td>
<td>.4978213</td>
<td>.4391218 .7347912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>.6538462</td>
<td>.0951486</td>
<td>.4851645</td>
<td>.457884 .8498083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combined</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>.6111111</td>
<td>.0578554</td>
<td>.4699291</td>
<td>.4957508 .7264714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diff</td>
<td>-.0668896</td>
<td>.1210446</td>
<td>-.3083055</td>
<td>.1745263</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Ho: diff = 0 | degrees of freedom = 70 |

- $\text{Ha: diff < 0}$
- $\text{Ha: diff != 0}$
- $\text{Ha: diff > 0}$

$\text{Pr}(T < t) = 0.9027$  \hspace{1cm} $\text{Pr}(|T| > |t|) = 0.1946$  \hspace{1cm} $\text{Pr}(T > t) = 0.0973$

### Two-sample t test with equal variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>.5896551</td>
<td>.0767078</td>
<td>.4978213</td>
<td>.4391218 .7347912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>.6538462</td>
<td>.0951486</td>
<td>.4851645</td>
<td>.457884 .8498083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combined</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>.6111111</td>
<td>.0794398</td>
<td>.4699291</td>
<td>.4957508 .7264714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diff</td>
<td>-.0642951</td>
<td>.0951486</td>
<td>-.3083055</td>
<td>.1745263</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Ho: diff = 0 | degrees of freedom = 70 |

- $\text{Ha: diff < 0}$
- $\text{Ha: diff != 0}$
- $\text{Ha: diff > 0}$

$\text{Pr}(T < t) = 0.9027$  \hspace{1cm} $\text{Pr}(|T| > |t|) = 0.1946$  \hspace{1cm} $\text{Pr}(T > t) = 0.0973$
Two-sample t test with equal variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0.4727273</td>
<td>0.0679401</td>
<td>0.5038572</td>
<td>0.3365156 - 0.6089389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.6666667</td>
<td>0.1666667</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.2823326 - 1.051001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combined</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.0629941</td>
<td>0.5039526</td>
<td>0.3741164 - 0.6258836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diff</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.1939394</td>
<td>0.1809952</td>
<td>0.5557437</td>
<td>0.1678649</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
\text{diff} = \text{mean}(0) - \text{mean}(1) \quad t = -1.0715
\]

Ho: diff = 0 \quad \text{degrees of freedom} = 62

\[
\text{Ha: diff} < 0 \quad \text{Pr}(T < t) = 0.1440 \\
\text{Ho: diff} = 0 \quad \text{Pr}(|T| > |t|) = 0.2881 \\
\text{Ha: diff} > 0 \quad \text{Pr}(T > t) = 0.8560
\]

Two-sample t test with equal variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>0.5247525</td>
<td>0.0499387</td>
<td>0.5018777</td>
<td>0.4256755 - 0.6238294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.6571429</td>
<td>0.0814042</td>
<td>0.481594</td>
<td>0.4917095 - 0.8225762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combined</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>0.5588235</td>
<td>0.0427343</td>
<td>0.4983633</td>
<td>0.4743082 - 0.6433388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diff</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.1323904</td>
<td>0.0974461</td>
<td>0.3251219</td>
<td>0.0603411</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
\text{diff} = \text{mean}(0) - \text{mean}(1) \quad t = -1.3586
\]

Ho: diff = 0 \quad \text{degrees of freedom} = 134

\[
\text{Ha: diff} < 0 \quad \text{Pr}(T < t) = 0.0883 \\
\text{Ho: diff} = 0 \quad \text{Pr}(|T| > |t|) = 0.1766 \\
\text{Ha: diff} > 0 \quad \text{Pr}(T > t) = 0.9117
\]

end of do-file
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