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Abstract

This paper explains the operationalization of my original culture inquiry that is designed to observe whether or not republicanism explains sporadic opposition to the Patriot Act. Opposition to the Act is heretofore not understood because it is unexplained by the liberal spectrum. Based on the observations of Alexis de Tocqueville, I provide a multiple traditions research inquiry that is operationalized to parse out republican, liberal, and authoritarian core values from a dataset and to send those values back to the political spectrum from which each value originates. Then, I code the same sentences as for repeal of the Act or not. I provide my dissertation’s preliminary evidence after the conclusion of this paper as evidence to support my theory of multiple core values as positive elements of the American political culture. The evidence suggests that a commitment to republicanism on behalf of the people does explain opposition to the Patriot Act at the national level.
3.1 Introduction: Observing Multiple Core Values

Political culture models have been developing on and off since the 1940s.\(^1\) Unfortunately, researchers still struggle with defining the singular elements of the entire political culture because culture “belongs with those ‘catch-words’ that serve as ‘deliberate vague conditioning concepts.’”\(^2\) Of particular concern, “Mainstream approaches to political culture in political science often display a similar shortfall in comprehending \textit{power}.”\(^3\)

The purpose of my original research inquiry is to capture and explain the \textit{power} and \textit{agency} of republicanism, liberalism, and authoritarianism. I claim that the former political languages are mutually exclusive as expressions of core values by which any \textit{core political value} is only attributable to a singular political value system. For instance, people may be vehemently committed to republican values and they expect their formal expressions of self-governments to be reinforced at the national level as representatives \textit{confirm or deny the instruction} from the local or state governments. This is the basis of an extended Republic. An extended Republic is different than a liberal democracy, and both are different than an authoritarian regime.

At MPSA last year and at the Center for the Study of Citizenship Conference recently, I demonstrated that republicanism in the hands of the Federalists imbued strictly


\(^3\) Ibid, The Concept of Political Culture; page 425. Italics mine.
republican institutions as a major power source of political agency because the people and American politics were intimately tied to expressions of republican values from the American people as a major determinant of American politics. In this paper, I explain an original theory and hypotheses to capture multiple core values in recent times and political space in order to assess how each core value is observed as an independent element of the American political culture. I sample the news on the Patriot Act from 2001-2013 and code sentences according to political values in order to observe a sample of the cultural expressions that happened.

I believe that republicanism is stronger in the early 21st century than during the Founding, perhaps even stronger than liberalism for millions of Americans as a political value system to answer political questions and problems; unrelatedly of the liberal society thesis. I explore if this political thought holds explanatory power by capturing a sample of liberalism, republicanism, and authoritarianism according to an original dataset on the Patriot Act. The former Act has long been criticized as an affront to civil liberties and Americans have long implemented republicanism to control anti-republican legislation at the national level, most prominently going back to James Madison’s Virginia Resolves to oppose the Alien and Sedition Acts which indeed helped to foster John Adams fall from power after his first term. I argue that Americans still use republicanism to communicate political signals

---

5 The epic race was between Aaron Burr and Thomas Jefferson, and John Adams wasn’t even a possibility for most voters, regardless of the authoritarianism affecting most eligible voters by today’s standards (with the exception of felony disenfranchisement).
for the representatives to act on as well for everyone in the political society be able to reference as empirical political discourse.⁶

My research question is: Who opposes the Patriot Act? And, with what power and agency, based on the political culture, do people express support for or opposition to the Patriot Act? My prime hypothesis is that opposition to the Patriot Act is expressed on republican grounds nationwide. I suspect that an examination of the political culture will illuminate how the values (or signals) of each core political value system (or political language) are observed according to multiple political spectrums (i.e., multiple traditions) in regards to a narrowly tailored topic (i.e., the Patriot Act). I suspect that only republican values will significantly express opposition to the Patriot Act.

In the following section (3.2), I give my hypotheses regarding multiple core values as distinct elements of the American political culture in regards to support for or opposition to the Patriot Act. I claim that a significant republican expression would be observed if and when the American people mimicked James Madison and the republican expression of the Virginia Resolves. If Americans passed hundreds of these resolutions, this would be a clear indication of active republican agency and power within empirical American political discourse.

In section 3.3, I provide the signals, or core values, of each political language to be applied to the dataset. These signals are based on the literature review and five years of researching political languages for the purposes of this dissertation.

In section 3.4, I provide the structure and methods to be operationalized in order to complete a multiple core values hypotheses. I conclude with a brief summary of conclusions and implications regarding my original culture inquiry (section 3.5).

⁶ Opposition to the Patriot Act is already predicted to be important to the 2016 election (see Chapter 1).
3.2 Hypotheses

In this section, I provide my hypotheses for multiple core values in regards to opposition of the Patriot Act. I claim that Americans subscribe to multiple core values, regardless of the fact that some Americans express high levels of partisanship towards one end a singular political spectrum.\(^7\) No singular political faction has a legitimate claim on all empirical political discourse.

I hypothesize that the Patriot Act will draw out the peoples’ republican core values. This happens because the American people have always subscribed to republicanism as a core value system from the beginning of American history.\(^8\) Americans become concerned that the Patriot Act provides the federal government with the legal authority to violate their republican values. This causes the people to commit themselves to republicanism as an ends to a means for increasing republicanism in political discourse in order to save The Republic. Given a widespread belief that the Patriot Act is responsible for civil liberties violations since 2001, I argue that Americans will come together to openly reinforce their core republican values by creating “resolutions of instruction” to express legitimate opposition to the Patriot Act with the intended consequence of coercing legislators to recognize self-government based on republican grounds. As a political consequence, the people cause a “call to recognize” America as an extended Republic instead of a liberal democracy based on the issue of the Patriot Act. Therefore, do republican core values influence our understanding of American political discourse?

\(^7\) For example, many political scientists would agree that some Americans vehemently subscribe to progressive or traditional liberal values.

\(^8\) For example, see Malloy, 2011, in Bib.
I hypothesize that the Patriot Act will draw out core liberal values. This occurs because the legislation advances liberal values by securitizing public and private sector *markets* and is a reinforcement expansion of markets themselves. The regulations from the Patriot Act should also allow the national government to maintain the agency and power necessary to gather information from all information gathering markets in order to locate terrorists. Therefore, Americans who by and large subscribe to core liberal values in society will be likely to *support the Patriot Act on liberal grounds*. Americans should oppose the Act on liberal grounds when it intrudes on the proliferation of markets or causes too much cost and too few benefits to public and private sector markets, or individuals.

I hypothesize that the Patriot Act will draw out authoritarian core values. This happens because Americans have, on the whole, never escaped their history of slavery, segregation, discrimination, and in the early 21st century, *ethnocentrism*. The terrorist attacks on 9/11 should cause Americans who subscribe to authoritarian core values to argue that terrorists should be tortured and imprisoned without civil liberties. Authoritarian values in government should show that the Patriot Act was created in secrecy and demanded obedience by the people regardless of injury by the governmental authority upon the people deemed suspect as a terrorist. Finally, authoritarian values should promote a total surveillance system for the government to watch for, capture, and detain terrorists in America and across the globe (i.e., a *panopticon*).

**Assumptions**

My hypotheses are based on four assumptions. First, the three core value systems of republicanism, liberalism, and authoritarianism *are independent of each other*. This is

---

9 Further, most political scientists would agree that the Patriot Act was passed by two liberal parties in 2001.
required so that the people have an opportunity to subscribe to multiple core values. There is much contestation in the field regarding the idea of multiple traditions, let alone the expected dominance of liberalism through a multiplicity of constant liberal reactions to new liberal public policy. Thus, in order to create signals for independent political languages, I use the past 70 years of culture research as well primary sources\textsuperscript{10} to formulate them in this chapter. The signals of republicanism, liberalism, and authoritarianism are independent variables, even if imperfectly delineated.

Second, my hypotheses do assume that I will observe multiple core values. This assumption is dependent on the qualitative element.\textsuperscript{11} I do not assume that a paucity of data in the dataset on any given political language, such as republicanism, is equivalent to a paucity of the political core values ubiquitous in American politics because the dataset is inherently biased as a description of the event / public policy with focal points organized on dominant core values regarding the narrowly defined topic. Therefore, a paucity of a political languages in any given dataset does not mean that the language is absent from empirical political discourse—only that I didn’t find it. I assume that there is not an “actual” level of republicanism, liberalism, or authoritarianism; hence, my sample of data only “predicts” what we should see Americans doing or thinking in regards to the topic of inquiry (e.g., Patriot Act).

Third, my hypotheses do assume that one or maybe two of the core value systems will be much more powerful than the other multiple core value systems. This is because only one of the political languages is best suited to resolve the political issue in the first instance, and then my hypotheses should capture all the additional independent reactions as they are

\textsuperscript{10} Such as the Convention Debates in Chapter 1.
\textsuperscript{11} Meaning, there is no algorithm of the culture because each independently builds upon itself. This research process must be completed manually.
accounted for in the dataset. For instance, the Patriot Act is dominantly a liberal political reaction to 9/11; however, I believe that republican values are also important to understanding opposition to the Patriot Act based on an empirical account of the American political discourse. The content is more important than the count.

Fourth, as all the languages are utilized by different people for different ends, I assume each political language has its own strength as an observance as a reflection from within. For instance, people use republicanism to fortify res publica because they are committed to republican values, just as traditional liberals employ their liberal values to defend classic liberalism in elections and to impress the need of representatives to promote traditional liberal values within American politics. I do not assert that my inquiry will demonstrate the strength of power and agency between political languages.

3.3 A Multiple Traditions Culture Inquiry Based on Tocqueville

I create an original culture inquiry that is designed to parse out political languages within a given dataset. To accomplish this inquiry, I create four signals to capture authoritarianism, five signals to capture liberalism, and six signals to capture republicanism. These signals are based on the literature review and contain many subcategories. Each broad signal should capture broad swaths of political discourse, if and when available in the dataset. Each signal is mutually exclusive to all other signals. Hence, each signal is categorized as republicanism, authoritarianism, or liberalism. In this way, my dataset accounts for a sample of political discourse regarding the Patriot Act in order to return the observations back to the political spectrum from which they did originate. Thus, capturing sentences in the dataset that are descriptive of republicanism are returned to the republican spectrum and should
verify my prime hypothesis: The Patriot Act is opposed on republican grounds through observable expressions of self-government.

In order to parse out the political languages from the political discourse, I take insights from Alexis de Tocqueville to showcase how multiple political spectrums are working in concert to cause and effect the American political culture (Chart 3.1). At the center of the picture, there is a “box” of all observable American political discourse. In my dissertation, I query “Patriot Act” in the news in order to “open the box” and observe the data about the Patriot Act. As I read each article, each sentence should describe one political language “signal” that belongs to one of the four political spectrums, though I exclude the Biblical Spectrum from this paper because I am unable to generate the appropriate “signals”

---

**Picture 3.1  Tocqueville’s Account of Multiple Core Values in American Political Culture**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liberal Spectrum</th>
<th>Authoritarian Spectrum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Progressive Redistribution</td>
<td>Total Control of Distribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Market Exchange</td>
<td>Dictated / Directed Market Exchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communist Spectrum</td>
<td>Republican Spectrum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associational, Local Distribution</td>
<td>Kingdom Exchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Market Exchange</td>
<td>Dogmatic Distribution</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

12 I expand and explain these insights in the previous chapter in my dissertation.
Culture research is the broad strokes. I will not place the evidence precisely on any of the political spectrums or attempt to account for spectrum equilibrium and disequilibrium. I only intend to send the sentences back to each spectrum as a verification of the spectrum “in use” as an element of the culture. The box of empirical political discourse holds political reality. The arrows go both ways because empirical political discourse is an ongoing conversation and each political spectrum is constantly sending signals back and forth based in order to affect political reality.

Parsing out political discourse has long been a long journey. To overcome the obstacle of Americans promoting authoritarianism or republicanism through liberal institutions, and vice-versa; I delineate the core values of each political language as “signals” of each political language so that I only “capture the values” in my dataset which belong to a singular value system (i.e., political language). For instance, a sentence defending segregation (i.e., ascriptive hierarchy) would automatically be coded as authoritarianism. The review of all authoritarian sentences should illuminate how authoritarianism permeates American politics as a singular system. Therefore, matching the available signals to the dialogue in my dataset will enable me to transform ordinary sentences about the Patriot Act into a numerical display of core value system counts in regards to empirical political discourse.

Parsing out republicanism at the national level from liberalism has long been a goal of political science. To overcome the obstacle, I code all discourse related directly to representative government as liberalism. This is not a weakness of my inquiry; rather, a great

\[13\] I exclude biblical thought, even though I expect Biblical Thought to be important in some manner that is beyond the scope of this paper.

\[14\] Political languages are explained in the previous chapter of my dissertation.
strength because all signals for liberalism that should be coded as republicanism based on core republican value observances will be secondarily coded as republicanism. This qualitative secondary column allows the researcher to account for times when republicanism or authoritarianism are observed in representative government, which allows for the opportunity to capture between interactions of political languages at the national level, even though this explanation is not expected considering the liberal society / multiplicity theses.\textsuperscript{15} Evidence from the secondary column represents times of contestation between liberalism and the other political language.

Considering the liberal society thesis, which suggests that all national legislation is based on liberalism (and liberal reactions) from within the liberal spectrum; I should not assume that many republican or authoritarian anomalies will be present in the results regarding a description of representative government. The Republicans on the right and the Democrats on the left should not feel the need to rely on republican values in order to protect and serve America’s liberal society. I believe that this is an oversimplification of America’s political culture, and that we can only overcome this over-simplification by beginning to explore new ways to simultaneously assess multiple political traditions. I offer the “Dranar Inquiry” below.

The problem for representatives, according to my theory and unquestionably to American history, is that representatives simultaneously must serve a republican society in

\textsuperscript{15} For example, a sentence may explain that a representative is opposing the Patriot Act because she is influenced by a resolution of instruction from her constituents—to formally oppose the Patriot Act—in Congress. This would clearly be an example of the representative and American people practicing republicanism in an extended Republic because the people are utilizing republican core values to relay a signal to the representative and the representative acts on the people’s signal. Indeed, these are the types of sentences my hypotheses hopes to capture because I propose that Americans share multiple core values and that, at times and often, Americans live in an extended Republic. Sentences coded as liberalism and secondarily as republicanism or authoritarianism potentially hold immense explanatory power to explain how and why multiple core values act cohesively as elements on one political culture.
addition to the liberal society. This happens because Americans *are demonstrating*
commitments to republican values through their own creation of republican discourse in
regards to the Patriot Act at the local and state levels. Is it there!

If the dataset reveals broad swaths of republican discourse, my multiple core values
hypotheses should clarify how Americans, elected officials, and American politics is
observed as an *expression* of multiple core values in regards to the Patriot Act. This culture
inquiry is an empirical snapshot and does not account for other events or public policy
debates. In this way, a strong republican reaction to the Patriot Act does *not* mean that
Americans use republicanism to oppose other public policies or that Americans prefer
republicanism to liberalism on other issues.

The problem for liberalism has always been the constant observance of
authoritarianism. I try to maximize my potential for capturing authoritarianism by defining it,
especially, as *public domination* by the public or private sector, or by a citizen. However,
authoritarianism may be the most practical public policy given complex and imminently
harmful situations, such as a need to enforce a public evacuation policy before a category
five hurricane is projected to hit shore, or for the military to be operated under authoritarian
structures when actively pursuing the enemy in war.

I offer an imperfect empirical culture inquiry\(^\text{16}\) regarding American politics that is
designed to capture raw liberal, republican, and authoritarian data given a narrowly tailored
topic.

\(^\text{16}\) My empirical inquiry is extremely limited in scope considering the prevalence of culture research. My
explanation speaks only to the Patriot Act, which is an important issue (Spectrum 1.1 from Chapter 1). My data
results based on my culture inquiry are only expected to point the researcher in the direction of more evidence
and the sample is not expected to be entirely reflective of the culture, *per se*. This differs from behavioral
research, for instance, because I am not trying to assess the attitudes of the population; rather, I seek to simply
parse out the multiple core values embedded in the ideas and evidence in regards to a narrowly tailored topic or
event in order to reflect political culture.
3.4 Common Signals for Republicanism, Liberalism, and Authoritarianism

This section accounts for wide-ranging signals or values that republicanism, authoritarianism, and liberalism produce. I do not claim to account for all possible values; however, the signals below are exclusively relatable to only one political language and will therefore be useful in parsing out political values from my dataset in order to complete a multiple traditions inquiry into American political culture.

**Signals of Authoritarianism**

The signals to find expressions of authoritarianism are:

1. **The panopticon effect (degrees on domination)**
   A. State surveillance without people’s rights
   B. State is secretive about security
   C. State has power over the people, not people over state
   D. Nationalism to leader over patriotism to ideals
   E. Power / agency formations top-down creating ascriptive hierarchies

2. **Violations of civil liberties (abandoning protection from government)**
   A. Authoritarians dictate rights and take them away, at will
   B. Widespread governmental *corruption* of polity / society
      a. denial of habeas corpus
      b. denial of right to remain silent
      c. denial of a lawyer with defense rights
      d. denial to a speedy and fair trial
      e. government engages search and seizure without probable cause
      f. people arrested for publicly peacefully protesting
      g. freedom of religion denied to people

3. **Violations of civil rights (abandoning protection for all to participate equally in the polity and society)**
   A. ascriptive hierarchy present
   B. weighted voting for winners
   C. exclusion of voters from politics
   D. one party rule
   E. non-party members excluded from political / social life
   F. eliminate liberal neutrality
   G. eliminate republican “worthwhile opportunity” (Geise 1984)
4. Stationary Ruler (degrees on authoritarian rule)
   A. Non-democracy
   B. Prefers exploitation / cabal in economic / political systems
   C. Society exhibits high levels of fear
      a. of government
      b. of other people in society
   D. congruence between authoritarian people and authoritarian Government
   E. Authoritarians fight against exogenous political languages

An authoritarian government enforces a panopticon, violates civil rights and liberties, and is a stationary ruler (from benevolent to totalitarian). Freedom is based on obedience to the rules set in place by the elite. Now, let me note the signals of liberalism.

**Signals of Liberalism**

The signals to find expressions of liberalism are:

5. Advancement of liberal values (e.g., Brettschneider, 2012)
   A. Liberal neutrality (all types of speech activity protected)
   B. Value society (promote core democratic values)
   C. Imposing Liberalism (coercion for capitalism and democracy)

6. Admonishment of illiberal values (e.g., Brettschneider, 2012)
   A. Admonish hateful society
   B. Admonish invasive state

7. Advancement of democracy
   A. Towards full protections of civil rights.
   B. Towards full protections of civil liberties.
   C. National public opinion is part of politics
   D. Towards government transparency for the people
   E. Linkage and leverage (linking capitalism / democracy to more people)
   F. “Free and Fair” elections” Procedural democracy
      a. inter-party relations
      b. intra-party relations
      c. elections open to all citizens
      d. admonish voter suppression
      e. open campaigns
   G. Independent Courts
8. Advancement of capitalism.
   A. Bell curve distribution is ideal, but not necessary
   B. Efficient and robust middle class, but not necessary
   C. Conservatives understand inequality natural
   D. Progressives use capitalism to assist median voter
   E. Protections of capitalistic markets and workers / owners

9. Hartz’s toolkit
   A. Alger Myth (work hard and you will make the middle-class)
   B. American democrat (a belief in individual development via capitalism)
   C. Liberal enlightenment (enable the next, wiser, liberal regime)
   D. Charm and terror (make money, work hard, and success follows; if you fail then you are the failure and not the system)
   E. Hysteria after critical event (turning eccentricity into sin)
   F. Transcended liberalism, no hysteria after critical event
   G. Messianism (America is the greatest country of all time—the example)
   H. Whiggery (deny faith in democracy)
   I. Liberal imperialism (violence initiated against exogenous languages)
   J. Liberal absolutism (no violence against fellow liberals only)

A liberal government enforces and advances equal opportunity to participate in governance and capitalism, because anyone can become President of the United States if they work hard and earn positions in society through equal opportunity. To do so, liberalism promotes protections for civil rights and civil liberties with respect to private property and extends these rights to public property according to the degree of progressive or traditional liberalism that is reflected in elections and within society.

_Signals of Republicanism_

The signals to find expressions of republicanism are:

10. Enforce non-domination
A. Advocate efficacy and worthwhile activity
B. Admonish vitiation, invigilation and intimidation
C. Admonish liberal neutrality

11. Local ideology [not localist]
   A. Local associations are powerful
   B. Local government salient domestically
   C. People express opposition to policy directly (resolutions, petitions)
   D. Local people expect national government promotes republicanism in foreign policy—making rules to enable / incentivize local people to participate globally

12. Equitable civil rights
   A. Not simply equal opportunity by law among citizens
   B. Promotes equal resources for all citizens

13. Grassroots civil liberties
   A. Protections not simply from government; but,
   B. Grassroots actively protects people from government and people.

14. Economy
   A. End rapacious capitalism
   B. Promote not-for-profits / fair trade
   C. Promote local government, education, small business partnerships
   D. Promote common pool resources when appropriate
   E. Promote benefit corporations

15. Deliberative Democracy
   A. Tracking citizen interests in voting
   B. Tracking citizen interests in tax returns
   C. Tracking public opinion is deliberative
      a. what you think knowing x,y,z information
      b. local government open to public opinion
      c. local government records and distributes public opinion
      d. public choice (move to preferred local government) salient
   D. Likely a multiparty system
   E. High levels of partisan debate / contention
   F. High levels of compromise for action
      a. low levels of single party dominance
   G. Measure of voter suppression based on equitable opportunity
   H. The right to instruct is alive (the people instruct government on laws)
Republican core values place an emphasis on deliberative democracy because political action is based on self-governance. Common trends in republican practice are grassroots movements to increase deliberative democracy, fair trade, and equitable relationships regarding resource availability.

3.5 Operationalization of the American Political Culture

In this section, I explain how I operationalize multiple core values as three within examinations that are brought together at the end of the data analysis as an empirical sample of the political culture. The results will demonstrate how opposition to the Patriot Act is explained distinctly within each political language, if any opposition exists at all. This is a qualitative and quantitative inquiry into American political culture [henceforth “Dranar Inquiry”]. I qualitatively establish multiple core values [henceforth MCV] as the independent variable, and then I quantitatively reorganize the dataset on the Patriot Act according to signal matches with special attention paid to the theoretical and empirical history of those languages in the field.\(^7\)

The “count” of MCVs in the dataset is important as a heuristic regarding which political core value system is dominating the debate and describes the data overall. However, the quantitative count is very limited in explanatory power because the qualitative process is more important as a predictor of MCV power and agency regarding the languages as elements of the culture. This happens because each political language holds unique hypotheses based on the mutually exclusive value processes that cause the proliferation of

\(^7\) For example, people committed to republicanism or authoritarianism would not promote the equal opportunity of citizens to succeed in the marketplace over the long term because their core values are based on other distinct notions of equality. Indeed, a partisan liberal does contend with multiple core values because the culture consists of multiple core values, regardless of whether or not a partisan liberal is staunchly opposed to exogenous political languages.
each political language as an observation of dialogue concerning American politics (e.g., Patriot Act).  

The Dranar Inquiry is designed to explain the strength of power and agency of each political language from within. To test for my hypotheses, I created a dataset in Excel by compiling a systematic random sample of news articles on the topic "Patriot Act." The source is Lexis Nexis Academic Universe. From the 1,000 most relevant articles returned on the "Patriot Act" under the category of "World News Publications" from 2001-2013, I sampled every 20th article (1, 20, 40... 1,000) which results in a sample size of 51 news articles. My unit of analysis is sentence. I input the data chronologically (n. 1,085 sentences on the Patriot Act) in my dataset.

The initial output of the Dranar Inquiry configures political time and political language space. I organize the sentences chronologically by date (oldest to newest) to account for “time.” The fifty-one articles account for fifty-one time periods. I manually compile the count of values located in each article per sentence so that the row of fifteen indicators does reveal the count of each signal according to the qualitative assigning of signals to sentences. Therefore, the results are a display of political time and space regarding multiple core values and the narrow topic of the Patriot Act.

The quantitative output regarding my hypotheses is helpful in so far as I map the elements of the culture across time and MCV space. The count description of political signals

---

18 For instance, a singular sentence saying the Supreme Court ruled in favor of hundreds of resolutions of instruction indemnifying the people from the Patriot Act, causing the Patriot Act to be unconstitutional, would mean that republicanism is extremely strong in the early 21st century despite on comprising less than one percent of the sentences on the Act in the dataset.

19 The "outline" of the inquiry is located in Appendix D.

20 I explain this statistical approach more in the next chapter.

21 The bibliography is in the dissertation.

22 I am currently working on a second dataset, and my preliminary research shows a major increase in republican discourse.
(1-15) chronologically in time is observed because each article should produce a “highest count” regarding one of the fifteen signals. With 51 time events, the highest signal density will be displayed as a “black box with white letters” in contrast to all lower signal counts which are white boxes with black letters. However, what if one, ten, or twenty articles are grounded on republican terms? Could the data reveal “times of contestation” between political core value systems? If the data does demonstrate articles regarding republicanism, I argue, we will observe times of contestation and the field should continue to examine how multiple core values are occupying political space across time.

Next, I recode the signals so that I only count the political languages as distinct elements of the American political culture. If the sentence illuminates signals 1-4; the political language is authoritarianism which is recoded “1”. For signals 5-9, liberalism is recoded “2”. For signals 10-15, republicanism is recoded “3”. I use the signal “0” if the sentence does not meet any political language signal specification. “0”s are removed for both the narrative and the statistical analysis. This accounts for Variable 1 (i.e., political languages).

To test my hypotheses for opposition to the Patriot Act, I add a second variable. Is each core value system (Variable 1), statistically correlated with a preponderance of the data in each sentence as an expression of opposition to the Patriot Act (Variable 2). I label this latter variable “Repeal or not.” To accomplish this, I code the same sentences in the original dataset as either for repeal of the Patriot Act (coded 1) or not (coded 2) or not applicable (coded 0). I believe that almost all sentences coded as republicanism [if any] will be coded

---

23 For example, “The Patriot Act is bad legislation and this resolution of instruction seeks to indemnify the people in our community from the violation of our civil liberties because our official public policy is to not enforce the Patriot Act at the local level and to report abuse of the Patriot Act to local officials” would be coded as repeal. I made that sentence up, however, I coded the following sentence as “not repeal” in the dataset: “The
as “Repeal” of the Patriot Act and that liberal and authoritarian sentences will not favor repeal; hence, my culture inquiry may demonstrate large explanatory power regarding sporadic opposition to the Patriot Act in Congress since 2013. Congress may have finally caught up with the republican sentiments of the people.

Finally, I add a second dataset to help ascertain if we observe differences in the sample which may simultaneously suggest a cultural trajectory towards any particular political language given the narrowly tailored dataset. This happens because the first dataset searches the news from 2001-2013 and the second dataset is a result of the same search inquiry, however, I add two years (2001-2015). I believe that adding years to the search might sway the results towards a more accurate reflection of the values associated with the Patriot Act in 2015 because the debate shifted over time (Chapter 1). To accomplish this feat, I complete the processes from the former paragraphs, and then I compare the levels of liberalism, authoritarianism, and republicanism between the datasets. Considering the observation of salient opposition to the Patriot Act beyond the liberal spectrum beginning in 2013 (i.e., Chapter 1), I think it is reasonable to suggest that the second dataset will contain more republican sentences than the first dataset. If true, this observation would suggest that republicanism could be a very important cultural element in understanding the vote decision during the 2016 elections.

Limitations

There are limitations to the Dranar Inquiry. The signals listed above are based on 70 years of political science as primary resources and (1) may be naive with respect to the latent habits of the three political languages, and (2) does openly exclude other “major political

---

Patriot Act is ‘not the big change that everybody makes it out to be,’ Mr. Baker said, but rather like waving ‘the centerfielder over to the right a couple of yards.’"

24 This is the same paper presented at the Citizenship Conference as noted in the Introduction.
languages” in America, like biblical thought (Abbott 2009; Bellah 1985). Further, my signals may be biased towards describing the debate in terms of liberalism against other political languages because all conversations within the representative government are coded as liberalism, hence, the coder may overlook republican tones in liberal speak. Indeed, I cannot deemphasize the “count” enough because the observable strength or lack of presence of each core value system must be measured from within according to the hypotheses.

Despite these limitations, the Dranar Inquiry will substantiate whether or not opposition to the Patriot Act within multiple core values are observed. This is because republicanism in the national government is simply an affirmation that America is practicing as an extended Republic. This means little to liberals until, perhaps, legitimate republican expressions of opposition from self-government arrives as a ripe case before the Supreme Court. Indubitably, the dataset should capture the former event if it happens.

A thick empirical description of multiple core values may provide significant explanatory power because the discourse data should illuminate the political reality given the time frame of the research topic (e.g., Patriot Act after 9/11).

3.6 Summary

The Dranar Inquiry is a systematic way to capture elements of the American political culture in order to confirm whether or not republicanism, liberalism, and authoritarianism are observed and significant from within given a narrowly tailored topic. For instance, Americans may support the Patriot Act in 2001 on liberal grounds and then begin to express opposition to the Patriot Act on republican grounds in 2002. The American culture is comprised of multiple elements, and Americans may begin to favor the republican element over time as a political response that is designed to reduce or remove liberalism and
authoritarianism as impediments on a republican society. I seek to account for how Americans juxtapose multiple political traditions as distinct political elements of the culture that impose specific political foundations within political society.

The general purpose of testing my hypotheses is to locate the central authoritarian, liberal, and republican signals observed in American politics considering the Patriot Act. The answers should reveal how expressions of opposition to the Patriot Act are described as elements of the political culture. The strength of the Dranar Inquiry is that it is based on Tocqueville and utilizes reputable discourse data in order to account for the cultural reflections that Tocqueville predicts. Further, sentences coded as liberalism due to the expression stemming from the national government and then secondarily coded as republicanism essentially reflects the smoking guns the Dranar Inquiry aims to capture! In fact, smoke is in the air!

Culture is not easily conceptualized using mathematics because defining political languages as mutually exclusive political elements of the culture often confounds or contorts our efforts to understand how each element influences the whole or, even more helpful, works in concert with other political elements in order to maintain effective governance. I argue that we must judge the strength of political languages from within, since one sentence describing hundreds of resolutions passed to indemnify the people from the Patriot Act by the rules of republican self-governance, like Madison’s Virginia Resolves, would reveal that republicanism is highly significant as an element of American political culture. I believe that Americans live in an extended Republic and a Liberal Democracy, and I also contend that a partial authoritarian regime exists to a more limited degree in American politics during the early 21st century that in times past.
A belief in multiple core values allows for all Americans to express themselves, and simultaneously, no singular political language has a monopoly on power and agency in American politics. It may be true that the Patriot Act is an example of liberal legislation and national representatives are, in general, unresponsive to the republican commitments expressed by Americans at the local and state level. However, what if Americans who favor republican values regarding the Patriot Act base their 2016 vote on republican grounds?
Table 5.1 is the data analysis from the first dataset covering the Patriot Act from 2001-2013.

Table 5.1: Political Languages and Repeal of the Patriot Act

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Political Language Responses</th>
<th>Fate of the Patriot Act</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>Predicted</td>
<td>Pearson Residual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarianism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Repeal</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97,000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeal</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberalism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Repeal</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>718,000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeal</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>116,000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republicanism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Repeal</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeal</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>69,000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The percentages are based on total observed frequencies in each subpopulation.

Republicanism Important as Opposition to Patriot Act!
Figure 5.1
Expression of Opposition to Patriot Act
Positive Model Results
## APPENDIX C

### Table 5.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>1.1.</th>
<th>1.2.</th>
<th>1.3.</th>
<th>1.4.</th>
<th>1.5.</th>
<th>1.6.</th>
<th>1.7.</th>
<th>1.8.</th>
<th>1.9.</th>
<th>1.10.</th>
<th>1.11.</th>
<th>1.12.</th>
<th>1.13.</th>
<th>1.14.</th>
<th>1.15.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/5/2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/1/2002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/17/2002</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/29/2002</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/8/2003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/21/2003</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/24/2003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/31/2003</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/10/2003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/29/2003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/1/2003</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/11/2003</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/20/2003</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/22/2003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/15/2003</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/29/2004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/9/2004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/21/2004</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/14/2004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/30/2004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/30/2004</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/17/2005</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/30/2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/29/2005</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/1/2005</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/23/2005</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/2/2005</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/14/2005</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/1/2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/11/2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/17/2005</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/28/2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/14/2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/17/2005</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/19/2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/21/2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/23/2005</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/2/2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/1/2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/8/2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/13/2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/23/2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/31/2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/9/2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/6/2009</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/9/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/9/2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/27/2011</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/1/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/12/2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/25/2013</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CATEGORY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authoritarianism</th>
<th>Liberalism</th>
<th>Republicanism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Black boxes with white numbers are "highest value" per article. n = 1,048
APPENDIX D

Replicate or Initiate DRENAR INQUIRY

The purpose of this appendix is to account for the steps regarding the model formation process utilized in this dissertation to gather and analyze evidence of multiple core values given a dataset. The narrowly tailored inquiry allows the researcher to capture a snapshot of the American political culture by observing a specific topic or event in order to distinguish the political languages as “observed” elements of the American political culture.

The Big Steps:

1. Search “Lexis Nexis Academic Universe” for “topic” (i.e., “Patriot Act”).
   a. Sample size should be about 1,000 sentences (50 articles). Make sure the query is sorted in chronological order.
   b. “Select” a systematic random sample to attain sample size; like, if 1,000 articles are returned, then select every 20th article (1, 20, 40…).
   c. Export all relevant information as a document.
   d. Create Appendixes and gather all relevant statistical information from Lexis Nexis, as available, regarding your original dataset.

2. Input the following information into Excel as a COLUMN:
   a. Sentence NO. (1, 2, 3, 4… rest of dataset, create “Line Number”) (Column A)
   b. NEWS Organization Name in Chronological Order (e.g., Washington Post) (C, B)
   c. Publication Type / Section (Specific Category from Dataset) (Column C)
   d. Author (Column D)
   e. Date (Column E)
   f. In Column L, copy and paste the sentence from the Word Dataset, from Alpha to Omega.

3. In Excel, input:
   a. Variable 1 (Column F)
      • Repeal or not
      • Explanation if needed (Column G)
   b. Variable 2 (Column H, coded: 1 is Auth, 2 is Libe, 3 is Repu; 0 if null)
      • Indicators 1-15 for Republicanism, Liberalism, Authoritarianism (c. I)
      • Explanation if needed (Column J)
      • If could be labeled differently (Column K)***SIGNIFICANCE
         • Anomalies can be the significance we are looking for
         • Reps in D.C. arguing on the floor (coded liberalism in column I) on “republican” grounds (coded republicanism in column K).

25 “Dranar” is my middle name pronounced backwards, as my eight year old daughter likes to call me.
4. Complete the qualitative coding process according to the indicators in Chapter 3, Section 4.

5. Analyze the Data

a. Count variable levels (SPSS)
   • Bayes interpretative analysis; long-term research inquiry as *predictive*

**CONSIDER COMBINING I SIMILAR STORY BELOW TO DATA FOR EXPLANATORY POWER (I USE #3)**

• What are the implications of Patriot Act as new legislation over a decade after a test for political core values is complete?
• Apply a similar case study regarding an evolution of the issue
  • Research Edward Snowden, NDAA,\(^\text{26}\) Department of Homeland Security, etc.
• Consider the Alien and Sedition Acts as the prior, with the Patriot Act as the posterior, or, *new prior*.

**QUALITATIVE ELEMENT OF THE DATA ANALYSIS**

Actual dominance of one political language is *expected* [NORMATIVE] given the topic and is relatively helpful as a *prior* for what “everyone knows;” and data analysis provides the *actual sample* [POSITIVE]:

• Very helpful in establishing the actual “status quo” regarding MCVs and TOPIC
  • Helps to foster equilibria research lines with additional research inquiries because research provides a realistic “starting point.”

**QUANTITATIVE ELEMENT**

1. Count levels of Variable 1 per article as a TABLE of Time and Space
   • Bold the highest indicator count cell (Table in Excel)
   • this is “Mapping Core Values in Time and Political Space” task.

2. Correlation test of Variable 1 and Variable 2 (SPSS)
   • Explain correlation for repeal and each political language
   • Answer Hypotheses (i.e., only republicanism opposes Patriot Act)
   • Code article titles as for or against REPEAL of Patriot Act in dataset(s)

**OPTIONAL STEP—APPLY “GMODEL”**.

• Apply the “G Model” (GModel) Observe Multiple Core Values

---

• Account for Normative GModel according to literature review
• Account for Positive GModel according to Step 5.

• Findings of Sample on American political culture as a snapshot of the culture.
  a. Display the correlation tests as a G per MCV
     • Size of G depends on prime hypothesis.²⁷

STEP 2: [optional] ADD SECOND DATASET with longer time frame and analyze
  1. Repeat all steps from STEP 1
     • Dataset 1 as random sample (e.g., 2001-2013)
     • Dataset 2 as random sample (e.g., 2002-2014)
  2. Test for differences in Variables 1 and 2
     • Compare differences between COUNTS in datasets.
     • Compare differences between CONTENT in datasets.

²²Inter-coder reliability in next appendix, which is unnecessary for preliminary research because the inquiry’s qualitative element is “produced” for the reader in great detail—making all reads act as additional coders. Of particular salience, the statistics of count per political language is not as relevant as the correlation test with Variable 2.

²⁷For example, SEE: https://politicalpipeline.wordpress.com/2015/03/31/psi-the-people-breathe-cultural-expressions
APPENDIX E

*Note, republican power and agency stems from the people, yet the national representatives are active in “returning” power and agency to the people by affirming their direct political participation in American politics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key: Political Languages as Elements of American Political Culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>POLITICAL LANGUAGE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Values capitalism on traditional and progressive terms</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarianism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Values paternalism</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republicanism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Values efficacy, a common good, and non-domination</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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