

How to Analyze Political Attention with Minimal Assumptions and Costs

Author(s): Kevin M. Quinn, Burt L. Monroe, Michael Colaresi, Michael H. Crespin and Dragomir R. Radev

Source: *American Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 54, No. 1 (Jan., 2010), pp. 209-228

Published by: Midwest Political Science Association

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20647980>

Accessed: 03-04-2018 19:16 UTC

---

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://about.jstor.org/terms>



JSTOR

*Midwest Political Science Association* is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *American Journal of Political Science*

# How to Analyze Political Attention with Minimal Assumptions and Costs

**Kevin M. Quinn** University of California, Berkeley  
**Burt L. Monroe** The Pennsylvania State University  
**Michael Colaresi** Michigan State University  
**Michael H. Crespin** University of Georgia  
**Dragomir R. Radev** University of Michigan

*Previous methods of analyzing the substance of political attention have had to make several restrictive assumptions or been prohibitively costly when applied to large-scale political texts. Here, we describe a topic model for legislative speech, a statistical learning model that uses word choices to infer topical categories covered in a set of speeches and to identify the topic of specific speeches. Our method estimates, rather than assumes, the substance of topics, the keywords that identify topics, and the hierarchical nesting of topics. We use the topic model to examine the agenda in the U.S. Senate from 1997 to 2004. Using a new database of over 118,000 speeches (70,000,000 words) from the Congressional Record, our model reveals speech topic categories that are both distinctive and meaningfully interrelated and a richer view of democratic agenda dynamics than had previously been possible.*

What are the subjects of political conflict and attention? How does the mix of topic attention change over time? How do we know? These questions are fundamental to much of political science, including studies of legislative representation (Lowi 1964; Mayhew 1974; Riker 1986), policy agenda change (Baumgartner, Green-Pedersen, and Jones 2006; Baumgartner and Jones 1993; Kingdon 1995), and issue evo-

lution (Carmines and Stimson 1989; Wolbrecht 2000). Conventional approaches to the problem of identifying and coding topic attention have used trained human coders to read documents. The careful and systematic use of human-coder techniques has helped to produce impressive data collections such as the Policy Agendas and Congressional Bills projects in American Politics (Adler and Wilkerson 2006; Jones, Wilkerson, and Baumgartner

---

Kevin M. Quinn is Professor of Law, University of California, Berkeley, 490 Simon #7200, Berkeley, CA 94720-7200 (kquinn@law.berkeley.edu). Burt L. Monroe is Associate Professor of Political Science and Director of the Quantitative Social Science Initiative, The Pennsylvania State University, 230 Pond Lab, University Park, PA 16802-6200 (burtmonroe@psu.edu). Michael Colaresi is Associate Professor of Political Science, Michigan State University, 303 South Kedzie Hall, East Lansing, MI 48824 (colaresi@msu.edu). Michael H. Crespin is Assistant Professor of Political Science, University of Georgia, 407 Baldwin Hall, Athens, GA 30602 (crespin@uga.edu). Dragomir R. Radev is Associate Professor, School of Information and Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, University of Michigan, 3310 EECS Building, 1301 Beal Avenue, Ann Arbor, MI 48109-2122 (radev@umich.edu).

An earlier version of this article was presented to the Midwest Political Science Association and was awarded the 2006 Harold Gosnell Prize for Excellence in Political Methodology. We would like to thank Steven Abney, Scott Adler, Scott Ainsworth, Frank Baumgartner, Ken Bickers, David Blei, Jake Bowers, Janet Box-Steffensmeier, Patrick Brandt, Barry Burden, Suzie Linn, John Freeman, Ed Hovy, Will Howell, Simon Jackman, Brad Jones, Bryan Jones, Kris Kanthak, Gary King, Glen Krutz, Frances Lee, Bob Luskin, Chris Manning, Andrew Martin, Andrew McCallum, Iain McLean, Nate Monroe, Becky Morton, Stephen Purpura, Phil Schrodt, Gisela Sin, Betsy Sinclair, Michael Ward, John Wilkerson, Dan Wood, Chris Zorn, and seminar participants at UC Davis, Harvard University, the University of Michigan, the University of Pittsburgh, the University of Rochester, Stanford University, the University of Washington, and Washington University in St. Louis for their comments on earlier versions of the article. We would like to give special thanks to Cheryl Monroe for her contributions toward development of the Congressional corpus in specific and our data collection procedures in general. We would also like to thank Jacob Balazer (Michigan) and Tony Fader (Michigan) for research assistance. In addition, Quinn thanks the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences for its hospitality and support. This article is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation under grants BCS 05-27513 and BCS 07-14688. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this article are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation. Supplementary materials, including web appendices and a replication archive with data and R package, can be found at <http://www.legislativespeech.org>.

*American Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 54, No. 1, January 2010, Pp. 209–228

©2010, Midwest Political Science Association

ISSN 0092-5853

n.d.) and the Comparative Manifesto Project in comparative politics (Budge et al. 2001; Klingemann et al. 2006). The impact and usefulness of these data sources to political science is difficult to overstate.<sup>1</sup> The great benefit of human-coder techniques is that the mapping of words in a text to a topic category is allowed to be highly complicated and contingent. The downside of human-coder techniques is that reliability can be a challenge, per-document costs are generally high, and it assumes that both the substance of topics and rules that govern tagging documents with a specific topic are known a priori.

Related tasks in political science have also been addressed using computer-checked dictionaries or, more recently, hybrid human/computer ("supervised learning") techniques. For example, event data coding in international relations has benefited enormously from the automated coding of news wire feeds using dictionaries created by the Kansas Event Data system (Gerner et al. 1994), and the Policy Agendas and Congressional Bills Projects have moved toward the use of supervised learning techniques to supplement human coding (Hillard, Purpura, and Wilkerson 2007, 2008). When automated approaches substitute computers for humans, the costs of coding are reduced and the reliability is increased (King and Lowe 2003). As with human coding, dictionary methods, and hybrid human/computer classification approaches, both assume that the substance of topics and the features that identify a particular topic are known a priori.

Here, we describe a statistical method to topic-code political texts over time that provides a reliable and replicable mapping of words into topics. However, unlike most extant approaches, our method estimates both the keywords that identify particular topics, as well as the division of topics from observed data, rather than assuming these features are known with certainty. Previously, if a researcher was interested in tracking topic attention over time within a set of documents, that researcher needed to bring a great deal of information into the analysis. The researcher first needed to define the substance, number, and subdivisions of each topic. Second, the researcher was required to codify a set of rules or keywords that would allow human coders or a computer to place documents into the researcher-created taxonomy of topics. In contrast, our statistical method of topic-coding text does not require a researcher to know the underlying taxonomy of categories with certainty. In-

stead, the division of topics and keywords that identify each topic are estimated from the text. Our statistical topic-coding method opens up the exciting possibility of tracking attention within lengthy political corpora that would be prohibitively expensive for human coders. The only additional input required from the investigator is the total number of categories into which texts should be grouped.

To illustrate the usefulness of our approach, we use our statistical model to topic-code the Congressional record for the 105th to the 108th U.S. Senate. The estimates provide (1) an ontology of topic categories and language choice and (2) a daily data series of attention to different topics in the U.S. Senate from 1997 to 2004. We believe this is the most extensive, temporally detailed map of legislative issue attention that has ever been systematically constructed. We evaluate the validity of our approach by examining (a) the extent to which there is common substantive meaning underlying the keywords *within* a topic, (b) the semantic relationships *across* topics, (c) the extent to which our daily measures of topic attention covary with roll calls and hearings on the topic of interest, (d) the relationships between exogenous events (such as 9/11 or the Iraq War) that are widely perceived to have shifted the focus of attention in particular ways, and (e) the usefulness of the produced data for testing hypotheses of substantive and theoretical interest.

## Categorizing Texts: Methods, Assumptions, and Costs

Each method for analyzing textual content imposes its own particular set of assumptions and, as a result, has particular advantages and weaknesses for any given question or set of texts. We focus our attention here on the basic problem of categorizing texts—placing texts into discrete target categories or bins.<sup>2</sup> Methods of text categorization vary along at least five dimensions: (1) whether they take the target categories as known or unknown, (2) whether the target categories have any known or unknown relationships with one another, (3) whether the relevant textual features (e.g., words, nouns, phrases, etc.) are known or unknown, (4) whether the mapping from features to categories is known or unknown, and (5) whether

<sup>1</sup>As outlined in the cited books and websites, each of these has inspired expansive research programs with books and papers too numerous to cite here.

<sup>2</sup>An equally interesting problem is placing texts, or their authors, in a continuous space, the problem addressed by such techniques as WORDSCORES (Laver, Benoit, and Garry 2003; Lowe 2008), WordFish (Slapin and Proksch 2008), and rhetorical ideal point estimation (Monroe and Maeda 2004; Monroe et al. 2007).

**TABLE 1 A Summary of Common Assumptions and Relative Costs Across Different Methods of Discrete Text Categorization**

	Method				
	<i>Reading</i>	<i>Human Coding</i>	<i>Dictionaries</i>	<i>Supervised Learning</i>	<i>Topic Model</i>
<b>A. Assumptions</b>					
<i>Categories are known</i>	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
<i>Category nesting, if any, is known</i>	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
<i>Relevant text features are known</i>	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
<i>Mapping is known</i>	No	No	Yes	No	No
<i>Coding can be automated</i>	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
<b>B. Costs</b>					
Preanalysis Costs					
<i>Person-hours spent conceptualizing</i>	Low	High	High	High	Low
<i>Level of substantive knowledge</i>	Moderate/High	High	High	High	Low
Analysis Costs					
<i>Person hours spent per text</i>	High	High	Low	Low	Low
<i>Level of substantive knowledge</i>	Moderate/High	Moderate	Low	Low	Low
Postanalysis Costs					
<i>Person-hours spent interpreting</i>	High	Low	Low	Low	Moderate
<i>Level of substantive knowledge</i>	High	High	High	High	High

the categorization process can be performed algorithmically by a machine. We are at pains, in particular, to describe how five ways of categorizing texts—reading, human coding, automated dictionaries, supervised learning, and the topic model we describe here—fill distinctive niches as tools for political science.

Each of these five methods comes with unique costs and benefits. We find it useful to think of these costs along two main dimensions: (1) the extent to which the method requires detailed substantive knowledge and (2) the length of time it would take a single person to complete the analysis for a fixed body of text. Each of these two types of costs can be incurred at three stages of the analysis: the preanalysis phase where issues of conceptualization and operationalization are dealt with (perhaps in one or more pilot studies), the analysis phase where the texts of interest are categorized, and the postanalysis phase where the results from the analysis phase are interpreted and assessed for reliability and validity. Tables 1A and 1B depict how five major methods of text categorization compare in terms of their underlying assumptions and costs, respectively. The cell entries in Table 1A represent the minimal assumptions required by each method.

In the most general sense, the fundamental “method” for inferring meaning from text is *reading*. For exam-

ple, one reader of a specific journal article might attempt to place that article into one of a set of substantive categories (e.g., legislative studies / agenda setting / methodology / text analysis), while another reader might categorize the text in terms of its relevance (cite / request more information / ignore). Not only might the relevant categories change by reader, but a given reader will create new categories as more information about the text becomes apparent.

For some target sets of categories, we could delineate specific features of the text that make particular categories more likely. We can imagine that words like *Congress* or *legislature* make it more likely that we place an article under “legislative studies,” that typesetting in L<sup>A</sup>T<sub>E</sub>X or multiple equations makes it more likely that we place it under “methodology,” and so on. For other target concepts, the relevant features are more abstract. To place it in the “cite” bin, we might require that the text display features like importance and relevance. Different readers may disagree on the salient features and their presence or absence in any particular text. This is important for the promise of automation via algorithm. We all use search engines that are useful at helping us find articles that are topically relevant (Google Scholar, JSTOR) or influential (Social Science Citation Index), but we would be

more skeptical of an algorithm that attempted to tell us whether a given article should be cited in our own work or not.

As one might expect—since all automated methods require at least some human reading—the act of reading a text rests on fewer assumptions than other methods of text categorization. The number of topics is not necessarily fixed in advance, the relationships between categories are not assumed *a priori*, texts can be viewed holistically and placed in categories on a case-by-case basis, and there is no attempt to algorithmically specify the categorization process. This allows maximum flexibility. However, the flexibility comes with nontrivial costs, especially when one attempts to read large, politically relevant texts such as the British *Hansard* or the U.S. *Congressional Record*. More specifically, human reading of text requires moderate-to-high levels of substantive knowledge (the language of the text and some contextual knowledge are minimal but nontrivial requirements) and a great deal of time in person-hours per text.<sup>3</sup> Finally, condensing the information in a large text requires a great deal of thought, expertise, and good sense. Even in the best of situations, purely qualitative summaries of a text are often open to debate and highly contested.

*Human coding* (see, for instance, Ansolabehere, Snowberg, and Snyder 2003; Budge et al. 2001; Ho and Quinn 2008; Jones, Wilkerson, and Baumgartner n.d.; and Klingemann et al. 2006) is the standard methodology for content analysis, and for coding in general, in social science. For such manual coding, the target categories of interest are assumed to be known and fixed. Coders read units of text and attempt to assign one of a finite set of codes to each unit. If the target categories have any relationship to each other (e.g., nesting), it is assumed to be known. There is typically no requirement that the readers use any particular feature in identifying the target category and the exact mapping from texts to categories is assumed unknown and never made explicit. One can tell, through reliability checking, whether two independent coders reach the same conclusion, but one cannot tell how they reached it. Manual coding is most useful when there are abundant human resources available, the target concepts are clearly defined *a priori*, but the mapping from texts to categories is highly complex and unknown (“I know it when I see it”).

By using clearly defined, mutually exclusive, and exhaustive categories to structure the coding phase, human coding methods require less substantive knowledge than would be necessary in a deep reading of the texts. Nev-

ertheless, the texts do still need to be read by a human (typically a research assistant) who is a competent reader of the language used in the texts. Further, some moderate contextual knowledge is required during this phase so that texts are interpreted in the proper context. While human coding is less costly than deep reading during the analysis phase, it has higher initial costs. In particular, arriving at a workable categorization scheme typically requires expert subject-matter knowledge and substantial human time.

The first steps toward automation can be found in *dictionary-based coding*, which easily carries the most assumptions of all methods here. Examples include Gerner et al. (1994), Cary (1977), and Holsti, Brody, and North (1964). In dictionary-based coding, the analyst develops a list (a dictionary) of words and phrases that are likely to indicate membership in a particular category. A computer is used to tally up use of these dictionary entries in texts and determine the most likely category.<sup>4</sup> So, as with manual coding, target categories are known and fixed. Moreover, the relevant features—generally the words or phrases that comprise the dictionary lists—are known and fixed, as is the mapping from those features into the target categories. When these assumption are met, dictionary-based coding can be fast and efficient.

As with human coding, dictionary methods have very high startup costs. Building an appropriate dictionary is typically an application-specific task that requires a great deal of deep application-specific knowledge and (often-times) a fair amount of trial and error. That said, once a good dictionary is built, the analysis costs are as low or lower than any competing method. A large number of texts can be processed quickly and descriptive numerical summaries can be easily generated that make interpretation and validity assessment relatively straightforward.

A more recent approach to automation in this type of problem is *supervised learning* (Hillard, Purpura, and Wilkerson 2007, 2008; Kwon, Hovy, and Shulman 2007; Purpura and Hillard 2006). Hand coding is done to a subset of texts that will serve as training data and to another subset of texts that serve as evaluation data (sometimes called “test data”). Machine-learning algorithms are then used to attempt to infer the mapping from text features to hand-coded categories in the training set. Success is evaluated by applying the inferred mapping to the test data and calculating summaries of out-of-sample predictive accuracy. Gains of automation are then realized by application to the remaining texts that have not been hand coded. There are a wide variety of possible algorithms and the field is growing. Again, note that target categories are assumed to be known and fixed. Some set

<sup>3</sup>The *Congressional Record* currently contains over four billion words and produces another half million—about the length of *War and Peace*—a day.

<sup>4</sup>One of the important early dictionary systems is the General Enquirer (Stone et al. 1966).

of possibly relevant features must be identified, but the algorithm determines which of those are relevant and how they map into the target categories. Some algorithms restrict the mapping from text features to categories to take a parametric form while others are nonparametric.<sup>5</sup>

Since supervised learning methods require some human coding of documents to construct training and test sets, these methods have high startup costs that are roughly the same as human-coding methods. Where they fare much better than human-coding methods is in the processing of the bulk of the texts. Here, because the process is completely automated, a very large number of texts can be assigned to categories quite quickly.

In the same way that supervised learning attempts to use statistical techniques to automate the process of hand coding, our topic model attempts to automate the topic-categorization process of reading. The key assumption shared with reading, and not shared with hand coding, dictionary-based coding, or supervised learning, is that the target categories and their relationships with each other are unknown. The target categories—here, the topics that might be the subject of a particular legislative speech—are an object of inference. We assume that words are a relevant feature for revealing the topical content of a speech, and we assume that the mapping from words to topics takes a particular parametric form, described below. The topic model seeks to identify, rather than assume, the topical categories, the parameters that describe the mapping from words to topic, and the topical category for any given speech.

The topic-modeling approach used in this article has a very different cost structure than all methods mentioned so far. Whereas other methods typically require a large investment in the initial preanalysis stage (human coding, dictionary methods, supervised learning) and/or analysis stage (reading, human coding), our topic model requires very little time or substantive knowledge in these stages of the analysis. Where things are reversed is in the postanalysis phase where methods other than deep reading are *relatively* costless but where our topic model requires more time and effort (but no more substantive knowledge) than other methods. The nature of the costs incurred by the topic model become more apparent below.

## A Model for Dynamic Multitopic Speech

The data-generating process that motivates our model is the following. On each day that Congress is in session a

legislator can make speeches. These speeches will be on one of a finite number  $K$  of topics. The probability that a randomly chosen speech from a particular day will be on a particular topic is assumed to vary smoothly over time. At a very coarse level, a speech can be thought of as a vector containing the frequencies of words in some vocabulary. These vectors of word frequencies can be stacked together in a matrix whose number of rows is equal to the number of words in the vocabulary and whose number of columns is equal to the number of speeches. This matrix is our outcome variable. Our goal is to use the information in this matrix to make inferences about the topic membership of individual speeches.<sup>6</sup>

We begin by laying out the necessary notation. Let  $t = 1, \dots, T$  index time (in days);  $d = 1, \dots, D$  index speech documents;  $k = 1, \dots, K$  index possible topics that a document can be on; and  $w = 1, \dots, W$  index words in the vocabulary. For reasons that will be clearer later, we also introduce the function  $s : \{1, \dots, D\} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, T\}$ .  $s(d)$  tells us the time period in which document  $d$  was put into the *Congressional Record*. In addition, let  $\Delta^N$  denote the  $N$ -dimensional simplex.

### The Sampling Density

The  $d$ th document  $\mathbf{y}_d$  is a  $W$ -vector of nonnegative integers. The  $w$ th element of  $\mathbf{y}_d$ , denoted  $y_{dw}$ , gives the number of times word  $w$  was used in document  $d$ . We condition on the total number  $n_d$  of words in document  $d$  and assume that if  $\mathbf{y}_d$  is from topic  $k$

$$\mathbf{y}_d \sim \text{Multinomial}(n_d, \boldsymbol{\theta}_k).$$

Here  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_k \in \Delta^{W-1}$  is the vector of multinomial probabilities with typical element  $\theta_{kw}$ . One can think of  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_k$  as serving as a “prototype speech” on topic  $k$  in the sense that it is the most likely word-usage profile within a speech on this topic. This model will thus allow one to think about all the speeches in a dataset as being a mixture of  $K$  prototypes plus random error. We note in passing that a Poisson data-generating process also gives rise to the same multinomial model conditional on  $n_d$ . For purposes of interpretation, we will at some points below make use of

<sup>6</sup>The model we describe below differs from the most similar topic models in the computational linguistics literature (Blei and Lafferty 2006; Blei, Ng, and Jordan 2003; Wang and McCallum 2006) in several particulars. Among these are the dynamic model, the estimation procedure, and, most notably, the nature of the mixture model. In other models, documents have a mixture of topical content. This is perhaps appropriate for complex documents, like scientific articles. In ours, documents have a single topic, but we are uncertain which topic. This is appropriate for political speeches. Ultimately, our assumption allows us to distinguish between, for example, a speech on defense policy that invokes oil, and a speech on energy policy that invokes Iraq.

<sup>5</sup>In Table 1A, we code the assumptions for the least stringent supervised learning techniques.

the transformation

$$\beta_k = \left( \left[ \log \left( \frac{\theta_{k1}}{\theta_{k1}} \right) - c \right], \left[ \log \left( \frac{\theta_{k2}}{\theta_{k1}} \right) - c \right], \dots, \left[ \log \left( \frac{\theta_{kW}}{\theta_{k1}} \right) - c \right] \right)'$$

where  $c = W^{-1} \sum_{w=1}^W \log(\frac{\theta_{kw}}{\theta_{k1}})$ .

If we let  $\pi_{tk}$  denote the marginal probabilities that a randomly chosen document is generated from topic  $k$  in time period  $t$ , we can write the sampling density for all of the observed documents as

$$p(\mathbf{Y} | \boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \propto \prod_{d=1}^D \sum_{k=1}^K \pi_{s(d)k} \prod_{w=1}^W \theta_{kw}^{y_{dw}}.$$

As will become apparent later, it will be useful to write this sampling density in terms of latent data  $\mathbf{z}_1, \dots, \mathbf{z}_D$ . Here  $\mathbf{z}_d$  is a  $K$ -vector with element  $z_{dk}$  equal to 1 if document  $d$  was generated from topic  $k$  and 0 otherwise. If we could observe  $\mathbf{z}_1, \dots, \mathbf{z}_D$  we could write the sampling density above as

$$p(\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z} | \boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \propto \prod_{d=1}^D \prod_{k=1}^K \left( \pi_{s(d)k} \prod_{w=1}^W \theta_{kw}^{y_{dw}} \right)^{z_{dk}}.$$

## The Prior Specification

To complete a Bayesian specification of this model we need to determine prior distributions for  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$  and  $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ . We assume a semiconjugate Dirichlet prior for  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ . More specifically, we assume

$$\boldsymbol{\theta}_k \sim \text{Dirichlet}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_k) \quad k = 1, \dots, K.$$

For the data analysis below we assume that  $\lambda_{kw} = 1.01$  for all  $k$  and  $w$ . This corresponds to a nearly flat prior over  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_k$ . This prior was chosen before looking at the data.

The prior for  $\boldsymbol{\pi}$  is more complicated. Let  $\boldsymbol{\pi}_t \in \Delta^{K-1}$  denote the vector of topic probabilities at time  $t$ . The model assumes that a priori

$$\mathbf{z}_d \sim \text{Multinomial}(1, \boldsymbol{\pi}_{s(d)}).$$

We reparameterize to work with the unconstrained

$$\boldsymbol{\omega}_t = \left( \log \left[ \frac{\pi_{t1}}{\pi_{tK}} \right], \dots, \log \left[ \frac{\pi_{t(K-1)}}{\pi_{tK}} \right] \right)'.$$

In order to capture dynamics in  $\boldsymbol{\pi}_t$  and to borrow strength from neighboring time periods, we assume that  $\boldsymbol{\omega}_t$  follows a Dynamic Linear Model (DLM; Cargnoni, Müller, and West 1997; West and Harrison 1997). Specifically,

$$\boldsymbol{\omega}_t = \mathbf{F}_t' \boldsymbol{\eta}_t + \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t \quad \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{V}_t) \quad t = 1, \dots, T \quad (1)$$

$$\boldsymbol{\eta}_t = \mathbf{G}_t \boldsymbol{\eta}_{t-1} + \boldsymbol{\delta}_t \quad \boldsymbol{\delta}_t \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{W}_t) \quad t = 1, \dots, T \quad (2)$$

Here equation (1) acts as the observation equation and equation (2) acts as the evolution equation. We finish this prior off by assuming prior distributions for  $\mathbf{V}_t$ ,  $\mathbf{W}_t$ , and  $\boldsymbol{\eta}_0$ . Specifically, we assume  $\mathbf{W}_t = \mathbf{W}$  for all  $t$  and  $\mathbf{V}_t = \mathbf{V}$  for all  $t$  in which Congress was in session with  $\mathbf{V}$  and  $\mathbf{W}$  both diagonal and

$$V_{ii} \sim \text{InvGamma}(a_0/2, b_0/2) \quad \forall i$$

$$W_{ii} \sim \text{InvGamma}(c_0/2, d_0/2) \quad \forall i$$

We assume

$$\boldsymbol{\eta}_0 \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{m}_0, \mathbf{C}_0).$$

In what follows, we assume  $a_0 = 5$ ,  $b_0 = 5$ ,  $c_0 = 1$ ,  $d_0 = 1$ ,  $\mathbf{m}_0 = \mathbf{0}$ , and  $\mathbf{C}_0 = 25\mathbf{I}$ . For days in which Congress was not in session we assume that  $V_t = 10\mathbf{I}$ . We have found that this helps prevent oversmoothing. We note that our substantive results are not terribly sensitive to other, more diffuse, priors for  $V_{ii}$  and  $W_{ii}$ . In a web appendix we detail how models fit with  $a_0 = b_0 = c_0 = d_0 = 1$  and  $a_0 = c_0 = 1$ ,  $b_0 = d_0 = 10$  produce extremely similar results.

In what follows we specify  $\mathbf{F}_t$  and  $\mathbf{G}_t$  as a local linear trend for  $\boldsymbol{\omega}_t$ :

$$\mathbf{F}_t = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I}_{K-1} \\ \mathbf{0}_{K-1} \end{pmatrix} \quad t = 1, \dots, T$$

$$\mathbf{G}_t = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I}_{K-1} & \mathbf{I}_{K-1} \\ \mathbf{0}_{K-1} & \mathbf{I}_{K-1} \end{pmatrix} \quad t = 1, \dots, T.$$

While we adopt a fairly simple model for the dynamics in the Senate data, the DLM framework that we make use of is extremely general. Details of the Expectation Conditional Maximization (ECM) algorithm used to fit this model are provided in the web appendix. Model fitting takes between 20 minutes and three hours depending on the quality of the starting values and the speed of the computer. No specialized hardware is required.

Viewed as a clustering/classification procedure, the model above is designed for “unsupervised” clustering. At no point does the user pretag documents as belonging to certain topics. As we will demonstrate below in the context of Senate speech data, our model, despite not using user-supplied information about the nature of the topics, produces topic labelings that adhere closely to generally recognized issue areas. While perhaps the greatest strength of our method is the fact that it can be used without any manual coding of documents, it can also be easily adapted for use in semisupervised fashion by constraining some elements of  $\mathbf{Z}$  to be 0 and 1. It is also possible to use the model to classify documents that were not in the original dataset used to fit the model.

## Applying the Topic Model to U.S. Senate Speech, 1995–2004

We present here an analysis of speech in the U.S. Senate, as recorded in the *Congressional Record*, from 1995 to 2004 (the 105th to the 108th Congresses). In this section, we briefly describe how we process the textual data to serve as input for the topic model and then discuss the specification of the model for this analysis.

### Senate Speech Data

The textual data are drawn from the United States Congressional Speech Corpus<sup>7</sup> (Monroe et al. 2006) developed under the Dynamics of Political Rhetoric and Political Representation Project (<http://www.legislativespeech.org>). The original source of the data is the html files that comprise the electronic version of the (public domain) *United States Congressional Record*, served by the Library of Congress on its THOMAS system (Library of Congress n.d.) and generated by the Government Printing Office (United States Government Printing Office n.d.).

These html files correspond (nearly) to separately headed sections of the *Record*. We identify all utterances by an individual within any one of these sections, even if interrupted by other speakers, as a “speech” and it is these speeches that constitute the document set we model. For the eight-year period under study, there are 118,065 speeches ( $D$ ) so defined.

The speeches are processed to remove (most) punctuation and capitalization and then all words are *stemmed*.<sup>8</sup> There are over 150,000 unique stems in the vocabulary of the Senate over this eight-year period, most of which are unique or infrequent enough to contain little information. For the analysis we present here, we filter out all stems that appear in less than one-half of 1% of speeches, leaving a vocabulary of 3,807 ( $W$ ) stems for this analysis.

This produces a  $118,065 \times 3,807$  input matrix of stem counts, which serves as the input to the topic model. This matrix contains observations of just under 73 million words.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>7</sup>*Corpus* (plural *corpora*) is a linguistic term meaning a textual database.

<sup>8</sup>A word’s *stem* is its root, to which affixes can be added for inflection (*vote* to *voted*) or derivation (*vote* to *voter*). Stemming provides considerable efficiency gains, allowing us to leverage the shared topical meaning of words like *abort*, *aborts*, *aborted*, *aborting*, *abortion*, *abortions*, *abortionist*, and *abortionists* instead of treating the words as unrelated. An algorithm that attempts to reduce words to stems is a *stemmer*. We use the Porter Snowball II stemmer (for English), widely used in many natural language processing applications (Porter 1980, n.d.).

<sup>9</sup>Details of the process are provided in the web appendix.

## Model Output

The model contains millions of parameters and latent variables. We can focus on two subsets of these as defining the quantities of substantive interest, the  $\beta$ ’s and the  $z$ ’s.

The  $\beta$  matrix contains  $K \times W$  ( $\approx 160,000$ ) parameters. Each element  $\beta_{kw}$  of this matrix describes the log-odds of word  $w$  being used to speak about topic  $k$ . If  $\beta_{kw} > \beta_{kw'}$  it is the case that word  $w$  is used more often on topic  $k$  than word  $w'$ . This is the source of the semantic content, the meaning, in our model. That is, we use this to learn what each topic is *about* and how topics are related to one another.  $\beta$  describes the intratopic data-generating process, so it can be used to generate new “speeches” (with words in random order) on any topic. It can also be used, in conjunction with the other model parameters, to classify other documents. This is useful either for sensitivity analysis, as noted below, or for connecting the documents from some other setting (newspaper articles, open-ended survey responses) to the topical frame defined by this model.

$Z$  is a  $D \times K$  matrix with typical element  $z_{dk}$ . Each of the approximately 5,000,000  $z_{dk}$  values is a 0/1 indicator of whether document  $d$  was generated from topic  $k$ . The model-fitting algorithm used in this article returns the expected value of  $Z$  which we label  $\hat{Z}$ . Because of the 0/1 nature of each  $z_{dk}$ , we can interpret  $\hat{z}_{dk}$  (the expected value of  $z_{dk}$ ) as the probability that document  $d$  was generated from topic  $k$ .

We find that approximately 94% of documents are more than 95% likely to be from a single topic. Thus, we lose very little information by treating the maximum  $z_{dk}$  in each row as an indicator of “the topic” into which speech  $d$  should be classified, reducing this to  $D$  (118,000) parameters of direct interest. Since we know when and by whom each speech was delivered, we can generate from this measures of attention (word count, speech count) to each topic at time scales as small as by day, and for aggregations of the speakers (parties, state delegations, etc.). It is also possible to treat  $\hat{z}_d$  as a vector of topic probabilities for document  $d$  and to then probabilistically assign documents to topics.

## Model Specification and Sensitivity Analysis

We fit numerous specifications of the model outlined in the third section to the 105th–108th Senate data. In particular, we allowed the number of topics  $K$  to vary from 3 to 60. For each specification of  $K$  we fit several models using different starting values. Mixture models, such as that used here, typically exhibit a likelihood surface that is multimodal. Since the ECM algorithm used to fit the



model is only guaranteed to converge to a local mode, it is typically a good idea to use several starting values in order to increase one's chances of finding the global optimum.

We applied several criteria to the selection of  $K$ , which must be large enough to generate interpretable categories that have not been overaggregated and small enough to be usable at all. Our primary criteria were substantive and conceptual. We set a goal of identifying topical categories that correspond roughly to the areas of governmental competence typically used to define distinct government departments/ministries or legislative committees, such as "Education," "Health," and "Defense." This is roughly comparable to the level of abstraction in the 19 major topic codes of the Policy Agendas Project, while being a bit more fine-grained than the 10 major categories in Rohde's roll-call dataset (Rohde 2004) and more coarse than the 56 categories in the Comparative Manifestos Project. Conceptually, for us, a genuine topic sustains discussion over time (otherwise it is something else, like a proposal, an issue, or an event) and across parties (otherwise it is something else, like a frame). With  $K$  very small, we find amorphous categories along the lines of "Domestic Politics," rather than "Education"; as  $K$  increases, we tend to get divisions into overly fine subcategories ("Elementary Education"), particular features ("Education Spending"), or specific time-bound debates ("No Child Left Behind"). Results matching our criteria, and similar to each other, occur at  $K$  in the neighborhood of 40–45. We present here results for the  $K = 42$  model with the highest maximized log posterior. A series of sensitivity analyses are available in the web appendix.

## Reliability, Validity, Interpretation, and Application

This is a measurement model. The evaluation of any measurement is generally based on its reliability (can it be repeated?) and validity (is it right?). Embedded within the complex notion of validity are interpretation (what does it mean?) and application (does it "work"?).

Complicating matters, we are here developing multiple measures simultaneously: the assignment of speeches to topics, the topic categories themselves, and derived measures of substantive concepts, like attention. Our model has one immediate reliability advantage relative to human and human-assisted supervised learning methods. The primary feature of such methods that can be assessed is the human-human or computer-human intercoder reliability in the assignment of documents to the given topic frame, and generally 70–90% (depending on index and application) is taken as a standard. Our

approach is 100% reliable, completely replicable, in this regard.

More important are notions of validity. There are several concepts of measurement validity that can be considered in any content analysis.<sup>10</sup> We focus here on the five basic types of *external* or *criterion-based* concepts of validity. First, the measures of the topics themselves and their relationships can be evaluated for *semantic validity* (the extent to which each category or document has a coherent meaning and the extent to which the categories are related to one another in a meaningful way). This speaks directly to how the  $\beta$  matrix can be *interpreted*. Then, the derived measures of attention can be evaluated for *convergent construct validity* (the extent to which the measure matches existing measures that it should match), *discriminant construct validity* (the extent to which the measure departs from existing measures where it should depart), *predictive validity* (the extent to which the measure corresponds correctly to external events), and *hypothesis validity* (the extent to which the measure can be used effectively to test substantive hypotheses). The last of these speaks directly to the issue of how the  $z$  matrix can be *applied*.

## Topic Interpretation and Intratopic Semantic Validity

Table 2 provides our substantive labels for each of the 42 clusters, as well as descriptive statistics on relative frequency in the entire dataset. We decided on these labels after examining  $\hat{\beta}_k$  and also reading a modest number of randomly chosen documents that were assigned a high probability of being on topic  $k$  for  $k = 1, \dots, K$ . This process also informs the semantic validity of each cluster. Krippendorff (2004) considers this the most relevant form of validity for evaluating a content analysis measure. We discuss these procedures in turn.

In order to get a sense of what words tended to distinguish documents on a given topic  $k$  from documents on other topics we examined both the magnitude of  $\hat{\beta}_{kw}$  for each word  $w$  as well as the weighted distance of  $\hat{\beta}_{kw}$  from the center of the  $\hat{\beta}$  vectors other than  $\hat{\beta}_{kw}$  (denoted  $\hat{\beta}_{-kw}$ ). The former provides a measure of how often word  $w$  was used in topic  $k$  documents relative to other words in topic  $k$  documents. A large positive value of  $\hat{\beta}_{kw}$  means that word  $w$  appeared quite often in topic  $k$  documents. The weighted distance of  $\hat{\beta}_{kw}$  from the center of the  $\hat{\beta}_{-kw}$ ,

<sup>10</sup>The most common is, of course, face validity. Face validity is inherently subjective, generally viewed as self-evident by authors and with practiced skepticism by readers. We believe the results from the model as applied to the *Congressional Record* (see below) demonstrate significant face validity. But, by definition, there are no external criteria one can bring to bear on the issue of face validity and thus we focus on several other types of validity.

**TABLE 2 Topic Labels and Descriptive Statistics for 42-Topic Model**

Topic Labels	% <sup>a</sup>	Clarifying Notes
1. Judicial Nominations	1.0/2.4	
2. Supreme Court / Constitutional	1.1/3.0	incl. impeachment, DOJ, marriage, flag-burning
3. Campaign Finance	0.9/2.4	
4. Abortion	0.5/1.1	
5. Law & Crime 1 [Violence/Drugs]	1.3/1.8	violence, drug trafficking, police, prison
6. Child Protection	0.9/2.6	tobacco, alcohol, drug abuse, school violence, abuse
7. Health 1 [Medical]	1.5/2.4	emph. disease, prevention, research, regulation
8. Social Welfare	2.0/2.8	
9. Education	1.8/4.6	
10. Armed Forces 1 [Manpower]	1.0/1.5	incl. veterans' issues
11. Armed Forces 2 [Infrastructure]	2.3/3.0	incl. bases and civil defense
12. Intelligence	1.4/3.9	incl. terrorism and homeland security
13. Law & Crime 2 [Federal]	1.8/2.7	incl. the FBI, immigration, white-collar crime
14. Environment 1 [Public Lands]	2.2/2.5	incl. water management, resources, Native Americans
15. Commercial Infrastructure	2.0/2.9	incl. transportation and telecom
16. Banking and Finance	1.1/3.1	incl. corporations, small business, torts, bankruptcy
17. Labor 1 [Workers, esp. Retirement]	1.0/1.5	emph. conditions and benefits, esp. pensions
18. Debt / Deficit / Social Security	1.7/4.6	
19. Labor 2 [Employment]	1.4/4.5	incl. jobs, wages, general state of the economy
20. Taxes	1.1/2.7	emph. individual taxation, incl. income and estate
21. Energy	1.4/3.3	incl. energy supply and prices, environmental effects
22. Environment 2 [Regulation]	1.1/2.8	incl. pollution, wildlife protection
23. Agriculture	1.2/2.5	
24. Foreign Trade	1.1/2.4	
25. Procedural 3 [Legislation 1]	2.0/2.8	
26. Procedural 4 [Legislation 2]	3.0/3.5	
27. Health 2 [Economics—Seniors]	1.0/2.6	incl. Medicare and prescription drug coverage
28. Health 3 [Economics—General]	0.8/2.3	incl. provision, access, costs
29. Defense [Use of Force]	1.4/3.7	incl. wars/interventions, Iraq, Bosnia, etc.
30. International Affairs [Diplomacy]	1.9/3.0	incl. human rights, organizations, China, Israel, etc.
31. International Affairs [Arms Control]	0.9/2.3	incl. treaties, nonproliferation, WMDs
32. Symbolic [Tribute—Living]	1.9/1.3	
33. Symbolic [Tribute—Constituent]	3.2/1.9	
34. Symbolic [Remembrance—Military]	2.3/1.9	incl. tributes to other public servants, WWII Memorial
35. Symbolic [Remembrance—Nonmilitary]	2.4/2.3	
36. Symbolic [Congratulatory—Sports]	0.6/0.4	
37. Jesse Helms re: Debt	0.5/0.1	almost daily deficit/debt 'boxscore' speeches
38. Gordon Smith re: Hate Crime	0.4/0.1	almost daily speeches on hate crime
39. Procedural 1 [Housekeeping 1]	20.4/1.5	
40. Procedural 5 [Housekeeping 3]	15.5/1.0	
41. Procedural 6 [Housekeeping 4]	6.5/1.6	
42. Procedural 2 [Housekeeping 2]	2.4/0.8	

<sup>a</sup>Percentage of documents (left of slash) and percentage of word stems (right of slash).

which we operationalize as

$$r_{kw} = \frac{\hat{\beta}_{kw} - \text{median}_{j \neq k}(\hat{\beta}_{jw})}{\text{MAD}_{\ell \neq k}(\hat{\beta}_{\ell w})},$$

where MAD represents the median absolute deviation, provides a measure of how distinctive the usage of word  $w$  is on topic  $k$  documents compared to other documents. To take an example, the word *the* always has a very high

$\beta$  value, as it is very frequently used. However, it is used roughly similarly across all of the topics, so its value of  $r$  is generally quite close to 0. We combine these measures by ranking the elements of  $\hat{\beta}_k$  and  $\mathbf{r}_k$  and adding the ranks for each word  $w$ . This combined index gives us one measure of how distinctive word  $w$  is for identifying documents on topic  $k$ . Table 3 provides the top keys for each topic.<sup>11</sup>

Inspection of these tables produced rough descriptive labels for all of the clusters. After arriving at these rough labels we went on to read a number of randomly chosen speech documents that were assigned to each cluster. In general we found that, with the exception of the procedural categories, the information in the keywords (Table 3, extended) did an excellent job describing the documents assigned to each (substantive) topic. However, by reading the documents we were able to discover some nuances that may not have been apparent in the tables of  $\beta$  values, and those are reflected in the topic labels and clarifying notes of Table 2.

In general, the clusters appear to be homogeneous and well defined. Our approach is particularly good at extracting the primary meaning of a speech, without being overwhelmed by secondary mentions of extraneous topics. For example, since 9/11, the term *terrorism* can appear in speeches on virtually any topic from education to environmental protection, a fact that undermines information retrieval through keyword search.<sup>12</sup> It is worth noting that this technique will extract information about the centroid of a cluster's meaning and lexical use. There will be speeches that do not fall comfortably into any category, but which are rare enough not to demand their own cluster.<sup>13</sup>

Reading some of the raw documents also revealed some additional meaning behind the clusters. For instance, two of the clusters with superficially uninformative keywords turn out to be composed exclusively of pro forma "hobby horse" statements by Senator Jesse Helms about the current level of national debt and by Senator Gordon Smith about the need for hate crime legislation.

The  $\beta$  parameters identify words that, if present, most distinguish a document of this topic from all others, for the

time period under study and for the Senate as a whole. Our approach does *not* demand that all legislators talk about all topics in the same way. To the contrary, there is typically both a common set of terms that identifies a topic at hand (as shown in Table 3) *and* a set of terms that identifies particular political (perhaps partisan) positions, points of view, frames, and so on, within that topic.

For example, Table 3 lists the top 10 keys for Judicial Nominations (*nomine, confirm, nomin, circuit, hear, court, judg, judici, case, vacanc*), all of which are politically neutral references to the topic that would be used by speakers of both parties. Within these topically defined speeches, we can define keys that are at any given time (here the 108th) the most Democratic (which include *republican, white, hous, presid, bush, administr, lifetim, appoint, pack, controversi, divis*) or the most Republican (which include *filibust, unfair, up-or-down, demand, vote, qualifi, experi, distinguish*), clearly reflecting the partisan split over Bush appointees and Democratic use of the filibuster to block them.<sup>14</sup>

## Relationships between Topics and Metatopic Semantic Validity

An important feature of the topic model, another sharp contrast with other approaches, is that the  $\beta$  matrix is an estimate of the relationship between *each* word in the vocabulary and *each* topical cluster. As a result, we can examine the semantic relationships within and across groups of topics. Given the more than 150,000 parameters in the  $\beta$  matrix, there are many such relationships one might investigate. Here we focus on how the topics relate to each other as subtopics of larger metatopics, how they aggregate. The coherent meaning of the metatopics we find is further evidence of the semantic validity of the topic model as applied to the *Congressional Record*. This type of validation has not been possible with other approaches to issue coding.

One approach to discovering relationships among the 42 topics is agglomerative clustering of the  $\beta$  vectors,  $\hat{\beta}_1, \dots, \hat{\beta}_{42}$ , by topic. Agglomerative clustering begins by assigning each of the 42 vectors to its own unique cluster. The two vectors that are closest to each other (by Euclidean distance) are then merged to form a new cluster. This process is repeated until all vectors are merged into

<sup>11</sup> Longer lists of keywords and index values are provided in the web appendix.

<sup>12</sup> The reader can confirm this by searching on the word *terrorism* in THOMAS.

<sup>13</sup> As noted above, about 94% of all documents have a better than 95% chance of being generated from a single topic, over 97% of documents have a better than 75% chance of being generated from a single topic, and over 99% have a better than 50% chance of being generated from a single topic. The bulk of the documents that were not clearly on a single topic have high probabilities of being from two or more "procedural" categories and are thus clearly on some procedural topic.


<sup>14</sup> These words all appear among the top keys using any of the variance-respecting feature selection techniques described in Monroe, Colaresi, and Quinn (2008). This includes the simplest method, roughly equivalent to ranking words by z-scores in a multinomial model of word choice with party as the only covariate, and a more computationally complex method based on regularization (a technique designed to reduce noise in such feature selection problems).

TABLE 3 Topic Keywords for 42-Topic Model

Topic (Short Label)	Keys
1. Judicial Nominations	<i>nomine, confirm, nomin, circuit, hear, court, judg, judici, case, vacanc</i>
2. Constitutional	<i>case, court, attorney, supreme, justic, nomin, judg, m, decis, constitut</i>
3. Campaign Finance	<i>campaign, candid, elect, monei, contribut, polit, soft, ad, parti, limit</i>
4. Abortion	<i>procedur, abort, babi, thi, life, doctor, human, ban, decis, or</i>
5. Crime 1 [Violent]	<i>enforc, act, crime, gun, law, victim, violenc, abus, prevent, juvenil</i>
6. Child Protection	<i>gun, tobacco, smoke, kid, show, firearm, crime, kill, law, school</i>
7. Health 1 [Medical]	<i>diseas, cancer, research, health, prevent, patient, treatment, devic, food</i>
8. Social Welfare	<i>care, health, act, home, hospit, support, children, educ, student, nurs</i>
9. Education	<i>school, teacher, educ, student, children, test, local, learn, district, class</i>
10. Military 1 [Manpower]	<i>veteran, va, forc, militari, care, reserv, serv, men, guard, member</i>
11. Military 2 [Infrastructure]	<i>appropri, defens, forc, report, request, confer, guard, depart, fund, project</i>
12. Intelligence	<i>intellig, homeland, commiss, depart, agenc, director, secur, base, defens</i>
13. Crime 2 [Federal]	<i>act, inform, enforc, record, law, court, section, crimin, internet, investig</i>
14. Environment 1 [Public Lands]	<i>land, water, park, act, river, natur, wildlif, area, conserv, forest</i>
15. Commercial Infrastructure	<i>small, busi, act, highwai, transport, internet, loan, credit, local, capit</i>
16. Banking / Finance	<i>bankruptci, bank, credit, case, ir, compani, file, card, financi, lawyer</i>
17. Labor 1 [Workers]	<i>worker, social, retir, benefit, plan, act, employ, pension, small, employe</i>
18. Debt / Social Security	<i>social, year, cut, budget, debt, spend, balanc, deficit, over, trust</i>
19. Labor 2 [Employment]	<i>job, worker, pai, wage, economi, hour, compani, minimum, overtim</i>
20. Taxes	<i>tax, cut, incom, pai, estat, over, relief, marriag, than, penalti</i>
21. Energy	<i>energi, fuel, ga, oil, price, produce, electr, renew, natur, suppli</i>
22. Environment 2 [Regulation]	<i>wast, land, water, site, forest, nuclear, fire, mine, environment, road</i>
23. Agriculture	<i>farmer, price, produc, farm, crop, agricultur, disast, compact, food, market</i>
24. Trade	<i>trade, agreement, china, negoti, import, countri, worker, unit, world, free</i>
25. Procedural 3	<i>mr, consent, unanim, order, move, senat, ask, amend, presid, quorum</i>
26. Procedural 4	<i>leader, major, am, senat, move, issu, hope, week, done, to</i>
27. Health 2 [Seniors]	<i>senior, drug, prescript, medicar, coverag, benefit, plan, price, beneficiari</i>
28. Health 3 [Economics]	<i>patient, care, doctor, health, insur, medic, plan, coverag, decis, right</i>
29. Defense [Use of Force]	<i>iraq, forc, resolut, unit, saddam, troop, war, world, threat, hussein</i>
30. International [Diplomacy]	<i>unit, human, peac, nato, china, forc, intern, democraci, resolut, europ</i>
31. International [Arms]	<i>test, treati, weapon, russia, nuclear, defens, unit, missil, chemic</i>
32. Symbolic [Living]	<i>serv, hi, career, dedic, john, posit, honor, nomin, dure, miss</i>
33. Symbolic [Constituent]	<i>recogn, dedic, honor, serv, insert, contribut, celebr, congratul, career</i>
34. Symbolic [Military]	<i>honor, men, sacrific, memori, dedic, freedom, di, kill, serve, soldier</i>
35. Symbolic [Nonmilitary]	<i>great, hi, paul, john, alwai, reagan, him, serv, love</i>
36. Symbolic [Sports]	<i>team, game, plai, player, win, fan, basebal, congratul, record, victori</i>
37. J. Helms re: Debt	<i>hundr, at, four, three, ago, of, year, five, two, the</i>
38. G. Smith re: Hate Crime	<i>of, and, in, chang, by, to, a, act, with, the, hate</i>
39. Procedural 1	<i>order, without, the, from, object, recogn, so, second, call, clerk</i>
40. Procedural 5	<i>consent, unanim, the, of, mr, to, order, further, and, consider</i>
41. Procedural 6	<i>mr, consent, unanim, of, to, at, order, the, consider, follow</i>
42. Procedural 2	<i>of, mr, consent, unanim, and, at, meet, on, the, am</i>

Notes: For each topic, the top 10 (or so) key stems that best distinguish the topic from all others. Keywords have been sorted here by  $\text{rank}(\beta_{kw}) + \text{rank}(r_{kw})$ , as defined in the text. Lists of the top 40 keywords for each topic and related information are provided in the web appendix. Note the order of the topics is the same as in Table 2 but the topic names have been shortened.

FIGURE 1 Agglomerative Clustering of 42-Topic Model



Notes: Hierarchical agglomerative clustering of  $\hat{\beta}_1, \dots, \hat{\beta}_K$ . Clustering based on minimizing the maximum euclidean distance between cluster members. Each cluster is labeled with a topic name, followed by the percentage of documents and words, respectively, in that cluster.

a single cluster. The results of this process are displayed in the dendrogram of Figure 1.<sup>15</sup> Roughly speaking, the lower the height at which any two topics, or groupings of topics, are connected, the more similar are their word use patterns in Senate debate.<sup>16</sup>

Reading Figure 1 from the bottom up provides information about which clusters were merged first (those

merged at the lowest height). We see that topics that share a penultimate node share a substantive or stylistic link. Some of these are obvious topical connections, such as between the two health economics clusters or between energy and environmental regulation. Some are more subtle. For example, the “Environment 1 [Public Lands]” category, which is dominated by issues related to management and conservation of public lands and water, and the “Commercial Infrastructure” category are related through the common reference to distributive public works spending. Both contain the words *project* and *area* in their top 25 keys, for example. The “Banking / Finance” category and the “Labor 1 [Workers]” category discuss different aspects of economic regulation and intervention,

<sup>15</sup>The order of topics given in Tables 2 and 3 is as determined here; the labels were determined prior to the agglomerative clustering.

<sup>16</sup>Further specifics, with code to reproduce this analysis and figure, are provided in the replication archive. Please note that the agglomerative clustering is not part of the model, but rather a tool (analogous to a regression table) for compactly displaying several important features of the estimates.

the former with corporations and consumers, the latter with labor markets. Other connections are stylistic, rather than necessarily substantive. The symbolic categories, for example, all have *great*, *proud*, and *his* as keywords.

We can also read Figure 1 from the top down to get a sense of whether there are recognizable rhetorical metacusters of topics. Reading from the top down, we see clear clusters separating the housekeeping procedural, hobby horse, and symbolic speech from the substantive policy areas. The more substantive branch then divides a cluster of conceptual and Constitutional issues from the more concrete policy areas that require Congress to appropriate funds, enact regulations, and so on. Within the concrete policy areas, we see further clear breakdowns into domestic and international policy. Domestic policy is further divided into clusters we can identify with social policy, public goods and infrastructure, economics, and “regional.” Note that what binds metacusters is language. The language of the Constitutional grouping is abstract, ideological, and partisan. The social policy grouping is tied together by reference to societal problems, suffering, and need. The public goods / infrastructure grouping is tied together both by the language of projects and budgets, as well as that of state versus state particularism. The most interesting metacuster is the substantively odd “regional” grouping of energy, environment, agriculture, and trade. Exploration of the language used here shows that these are topics that divide rural and/or western senators from the rest—distributive politics at a different level of aggregation.

This approach has the potential to inform ongoing debates about how to characterize the underlying political structure of public policy. Whether such characterization efforts are of interest in and of themselves—we would argue they are—is not of as much relevance as the fact that they are necessary for understanding dimensions of political conflict (Clausen 1973; Poole and Rosenthal 1997), the dynamics of the political agenda (Baumgartner and Jones 2002; Lee 2006), the nature of political representation (Jones and Baumgartner 2005), or policy outcomes (Heitschusen and Young 2006; Katznelson and Lapinski 2006; Lowi 1964). Katznelson and Lapinski (2006) provide an eloquent defense of the exercise and a review of alternative approaches.

### Speeches, Roll Calls, Hearings, and Construct Validity

The construct validity of a measure is established via its relationships with other measures. A measure shows evidence of *convergent construct validity* if it correlates with other measures of the same construct. A measure shows


*discriminant construct validity* when it is uncorrelated with measures of dissimilar constructs (Weber 1990).

Construct validity has a double edge to it. If a new measure differs from an established one, it is generally viewed with skepticism. If a new measure captures what the old one did, it is probably unnecessary. In our case, the model produces measures we expect to converge with others in particular ways and to diverge in others. Consider a specific policy-oriented topic, like abortion. We expect that, typically, a roll call on abortion policy should be surrounded by a debate on the topic of abortion. This convergent relationship should appear in our measure of attention to abortion in speech and in indicators of roll calls on abortion policy.

Figure 2 displays the number of words given in speeches categorized by our model as “Abortion” over time. We also display the roll-call votes in which the official description contains the word *abortion*. We see the basic convergence expected, with number of roll calls and number of words correlated at +0.70. But note also that we expect divergence in the indicators as well. Attention is often given to abortion outside the context of an abortion policy vote, the abortion policy nature of a vote might be unclear from its description, and a particular roll call might receive very little debate attention.

Consider first, the spikes of debate attention that do not have accompanying roll-call votes. The first such spike is in February of 1998, when no vote was nominally on abortion. The occasion was the Senate confirmation of Clinton’s nominee for Surgeon General, David Satcher, and debate centered around Satcher’s positions on abortion. “Abortion” appears nowhere in the description of the vote. Hand-coding exercises would also not code the vote as abortion. For example, Rohde’s roll-call data (Rohde 2004) cover the House, but if extended to the Senate would clearly characterize the accompanying vote on February 10 as a confirmation vote, within a larger procedural category. None of Clausen (1973), Peltzman (1985), or Poole and Rosenthal (1997) extends forward to 1998, but all code previous Surgeon General confirmations at similar high levels of aggregation. For example, the C. Everett Koop confirmation vote, in 1981, is coded under the Clausen system as “Government Management,” under Peltzman as “Government Organization” (primarily) and “Domestic Social Policy” (secondarily), and under Poole and Rosenthal as “Public Health.”<sup>17</sup> Satcher would have been coded identically in each case. But it

<sup>17</sup>These codes are all listed in the D-NOMINATE dataset used for Poole and Rosenthal (1997) and archived on Poole’s website, <http://www.voteview.com>.

**FIGURE 2** The Number of Words Spoken on the 'Abortion' Topic Per Day

is clear from reading the transcript that the debate was about, and that attention was being paid to, abortion.

Another such spike is in March of 2004, when the Unborn Victims of Violence Act establishing penalties for violence against pregnant women was debated. The House vote on this identical bill is coded in the Rohde data under "Crime / Criminal Procedure" (Rohde 2004). Much of the debate attention, however, centered around the implications of the bill and possible amendments for abortion rights. In both cases, the spike in attention to abortion is real—captured by the speech measure and uncaptured by roll-call measures.

Similarly, the speech measure captures subtleties that the roll-call count does not. For example, on or around July 1 in every year from 1997 to 2003, Senator Murray offered an amendment to the Department of Defense Appropriations bill, attempting to restore access to abortions for overseas military personnel. The roll-call measure captures these through 2000, but misses them later. This is because the word *abortion* was removed from the description, replaced by a more opaque phrase: "to restore a previous policy regarding restrictions on use of Department of Defense medical facilities." But with speech, these minor spikes in attention can be seen. Moreover, the speech measure captures when the amendment receives only cursory attention (a few hundred words in 1998) and when it is central to the discussion (2000, 2002).

Note also the relationship between speech and hearings data. The hearings data are sparse and generally examined at an annual level. At this level of aggregation, the two measures converge as expected—both show more


attention to abortion by the Senate during the Clinton presidency (1997–2000) than during the Bush presidency (2001–4). But at a daily level, the measures are clearly capturing different conceptual aspects of political attention. Higher cost hearings are more likely to capture attention that is well along toward being formulated as policy-relevant legislation. Speech is lower cost, so more dynamic and responsive at the daily level, more reflective of minority interests that may not work into policy, and potentially more ephemeral.

### Exogenous Events and Predictive Validity


*Predictive validity* refers to an expected correspondence between a measure and exogenous events uninvolved in the measurement process. The term is perhaps a confusing misnomer, as the direction of the relationship is not relevant. This means that the correspondence need not be a pure forecast of events from measures, but can be concurrent or postdictive, and causality can run from events to measures (Weber 1990). Of the limitless possibilities, it suffices to examine two of the most impactful political events in this time period: 9/11 and the Iraq War.

Figure 3a plots the number of words on the topic that corresponds to symbolic speech in support of the military and other public servants. Here we see a large increase in such symbolic speech immediately after 9/11 (the largest spike on the plot is exactly on September 12). There is another large spike on the first anniversary of 9/11 and then a number of consecutive days in March 2003 that feature moderate-to-large amounts of this type

**FIGURE 3** The Attention to ‘Symbolic [Remembrance—Military]’ and ‘Defense [Use of Force]’ Topics over Time



(a) The Number of Words on the ‘Symbolic [Remembrance-Military]’ (‘Fallen Heroes’) Topic Per Day



(b) The Number of Words on the ‘Defense [Use of Force]’ Topic Per Day

of symbolic speech. This corresponds to the beginning of the Iraq War.

The number of words on the topic dealing with the use of military force is displayed in Figure 3b. The small intermittent upswings in 1998 track with discussions of Iraqi disarmament in the Senate. The bombing of Kosovo is represented as large spikes in spring 1999. Discussion within this topic increased again in May 2000 surrounding a vote to withdraw U.S. troops from the Kosovo peacekeeping operation. Post 9/11, the Afghanistan invasion brings a small wave of military discussion, while the largest spike in the graph (in October 2002) occurred during the debate to authorize military action in Iraq. This was followed, as one would expect,

by other rounds of discussion in fall 2003 concerning the emergency supplemental appropriations bill for Iraq and Afghanistan, and in the spring of 2004 surrounding events related to the increasing violence in Iraq, the Abu Ghraib scandal, and the John Negroponte confirmation.

### Hypothesis Validity and Application to the Study of Floor Participation

Hypothesis validity—the usefulness of a measure for the evaluation of theoretical and substantive hypotheses of interest—is ultimately the most important sort of validity. In this section we offer one example of the sort of



analysis to which attention measures can be applied directly. We return to a discussion of further applications in the concluding discussion.

One direct use of these data is to investigate floor participation itself to answer questions about Congressional institutions, the electoral connection, and policy representation. Prior empirical work has had severe data limitations, depending on low frequency events (e.g., floor amendments; Sinclair 1989; Smith 1989), very small samples (e.g., six bills; Hall 1996), or moderately sized, but expensive, samples (e.g., 2,204 speeches manually coded to three categories; Hill and Hurley 2002). Our data increase this leverage dramatically and cheaply.

Figure 4 summarizes the results from 50-count models (negative binomial) of the speech counts on all non-procedural topics and selected metatopical aggregations, for the 106th Senate, for all 98 senators who served the full session. Selected hypotheses, discussed below, are represented by shaded backgrounds.<sup>18</sup>

Congressional behavior is of core relevance to questions about the existence and possible decline of “norms” of committee deference, specialization, and apprenticeship (Hall 1996; Matthews 1960; Rohde, Ornstein, and Peabody 1985; Shepsle and Weingast 1987; Sinclair 1989; Smith 1989). As noted by Hall, this is a difficult empirical question as the primary leverage has come from floor amendment behavior, a relatively rare occurrence (1996, 180–81). Figure 4 shows that committee membership, but not necessarily service as chair or ranking member, continues to have a substantial impact on the tendency to participate in debate across policy topics. The apprenticeship norm, as indicated by a negative impact of freshman status, also seems to be present in more technical policy areas, but notably not in common electoral issues like abortion or the size of government. Examination of the data over time could further inform the question of decline (Rohde, Ornstein, and Peabody 1985; Sinclair 1989; Smith 1989) and, with the cross-topic variation provided here, the role of expertise costs (Hall 1996) versus norms (Matthews 1960) in both deference and apprenticeship.

Since at least Mayhew, Congressional scholars have also been interested in how career considerations affect the electoral connection (Fenno 1978, 1996; Hill and Hurley 2002; Maltzman and Sigelman 1996; Mayhew 1974). The sixth and seventh rows of Figure 4 identify two career cycle effects in the electoral connection and symbolic/empathy speech. A senator approaching election is more likely to give speeches in the symbolic (“I am proud

to be one of you”) and social (“I care about you”) categories than is one whose next election is further in the future. Conversely, senators who subsequently retired gave many fewer such speeches, adding further evidence to the literature on *participatory shirking* (Poole and Rosenthal 1997; Rothenberg and Sanders 2000).

The last two rows of Figure 4 provide evidence of two (arbitrary) examples of policy representation, unemployment and agriculture. This reflects the notion of representation as congruence between constituency and representation, a subject of considerable scholarly attention (Ansolahehere, Snyder, and Stewart 2001 is a prominent example, in a literature that traces at least to Miller and Stokes 1963). Previous studies of congruence have generally been limited, on the legislator side, to measures of position based on elite surveys or roll calls. Jones and Baumgartner (2005) examine the year-by-year congruence of relative attention to topic (via hearings) with aggregate (not constituency-level) demand measured by Gallup “most important problem” data.


The party and ideology results (rows four and five) also contain interesting insights for our broader interests in how speech can inform our understanding of the landscape of political competition. Democrats are more likely to speak on social issues and more likely to speak in general. Given that Democrats were in the minority in the 106th Senate, this does lend some support to the assertion that speech is better than more constrained legislative behaviors at revealing thwarted minority party preferences and strategies.

Extremity (absolute DW-NOMINATE score) is associated with more speeches on constitutional, international, and economics topics, but not generally on social issues or geographically driven topics. This could be taken as evidence that the former set of topics is of greater interest to ideological extremists. Or—our view—it could be taken as evidence that these are the topics that *define* the current content of the primary dimension captured by roll-call-based ideal point estimation procedures. The lack of association between “extremism” and attention to other topics is suggestive that those other topics define higher dimensions of the political space.

## Discussion

In this article we have presented a method for inferring the relative amount of legislative attention paid to various topics at a daily level of aggregation. Unlike other commonly used methods, our method has minimal startup costs, allows the user to infer category labels (as well as the mapping from text features to categories), and can be

<sup>18</sup>These are graphical tables (Gelman, Pasarica, and Dodhia 2002; Kestellec and Leoni 2007). Alternative specifications, for both standardized and unstandardized coefficients, and for equivalent models of word count, all show substantively similar results.

**FIGURE 4** Speech Count Models, 106th Senate

**Notes:** Each column represents a negative binomial model of speeches delivered on a given topic, or group of topics, in the 106th Senate, with one observation per senator who served the entire two years (98 in total). Each row of the table represents a covariate: “Committee” (binary indicating whether the senator is on a topic-relevant committee); “Chair/Ranking” (binary indicating the senator is the chair or ranking member of a topic-relevant committee); “Freshman” (binary); “Republican” (binary); “Extremity” (absolute value of Dimension 1 Poole-Rosenthal DW-NOMINATE scores); “Agriculture” (log of state agricultural income per capita, 1997); “Election” (dummy, up for election in next cycle); “Retiring” (dummy, retired before next election); “Unemployment” (state unemployment rate, 1999). Plotted are standardized betas and 95% confidence intervals, darker where this interval excludes zero. Shaded areas represent hypotheses discussed in the text.

applied to very large corpora in reasonable time. While other methods have one or more of these features, no other general method possesses all of these desirable properties.

While our method has several advantages over other common approaches to content analysis, it is not without its own unique costs. In particular, the topic model discussed in this article requires more user input *after* the initial quantitative analysis is completed. Since no substantive information is built directly into the model, the user must spend more time interpreting and validating the results *ex post*.

This article presents several ways that such interpretation and validation can be performed. Specifically, we demonstrate how (a) keywords can be constructed and their substantive content assessed, (b) agglomerative clustering can be used to investigate the semantic relationships *across* topics, (c) construct validity of our daily measures of topic attention can be evaluated by looking at their covariation with roll calls and hearings on the topic

of interest, and (d) predictive validity of our measures can be assessed by examining their relationships with exogenous events (such as 9/11 or the Iraq War) that are widely perceived to have shifted the focus of attention in particular ways. In each case, we find strong support for the validity of our measures.

While our method is useful, it will not (and should not) replace other methods. Instead, our data and method supplement and extend prior understandings of the political agenda in ways that have been to date prohibitively expensive or near impossible. Our method is particularly attractive when used as an exploratory tool applied to very large corpora. Here it quickly allows new insights to emerge about topic attention measured at very fine temporal intervals (in our example days). In some applications this will be enough; in others more detailed (and expensive) confirmatory analysis will be in order.

There are many potential applications beyond those we have given here for such measures of attention as

this. The dynamic richness of our data allows topic-specific examination of policy-agenda dynamics, and questions of incrementalism or punctuated equilibrium (Baumgartner and Jones 1993). The dynamic richness also allows us to move beyond static notions of congruence into dynamic notions of responsiveness, illuminating the topics and conditions under which legislators lead or follow public opinion (Jacobs and Shapiro 2000; Stimson, MacKuen, and Erikson 1995).

Moving another step, there are many possible indirect applications of the topic model. Once speeches are separated by topic, we can examine the substantive content—the values and frames—that underlie partisan and ideological competition. We can, for example, track in detail the dynamics by which issues and frames are adopted by parties, absorbed into existing ideologies, or disrupt the nature of party competition (Carmines and Stimson 1989; Monroe, Colaresi, and Quinn 2008; Poole and Rosenthal 1997; Riker 1986).

Further, once we know the content of party competition, we can evaluate the positioning of individual legislators. That is, as hinted above, the topic model is a valuable first step toward using speech to estimate ideal points from legislative speech. This allows dynamically rich, topic-by-topic ideal point estimation, and insights into the content and dimensionality of the underlying political landscape (Lowe 2007; Monroe and Maeda 2004; Monroe et al. 2007).

Perhaps most exciting, our method travels beyond English and beyond the Congressional setting, where conventional methods and measures can be prohibitively expensive or difficult to apply. We hope this might provide an important new window into the nature of democratic politics.

## References

- Adler, E. Scott, and John Wilkerson. 2006. "Congressional Bills Project." Technical report, University of Washington, Seattle. NSF 00880066 and 00880061.
- Ansolabehere, Stephen, Erik C. Snowberg, and James M. Snyder. 2003. "Statistical Bias in Newspaper Reporting: The Case of Campaign Finance." MIT Department of Political Science Working Paper.
- Ansolabehere, Stephen, James M. Snyder, and Charles Stewart. 2001. "Candidate Positioning in U.S. House Elections." *American Journal of Political Science* 45(1): 136–59.
- Baumgartner, Frank R., Christoffer Green-Pedersen, and Bryan D. Jones. 2006. "Comparative Studies of Policy Agendas." *Journal of European Public Policy* 13(7): 959–74.
- Baumgartner, Frank R., and Bryan D. Jones. 1993. *Agendas and Instability in American Politics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Baumgartner, Frank R., and Bryan D. Jones, eds. 2002. *Policy Dynamics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Blei, David M., and John D. Lafferty. 2006. "Dynamic Topic Models." 23rd International Conference on Machine Learning, Pittsburgh, PA.
- Blei, David M., Andrew Y. Ng, and Michael I. Jordan. 2003. "Latent Dirichlet Allocation." *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 3: 993–1022.
- Budge, Ian, Hans-Dieter Klingemann, Andrea Volkens, Judith Bara, and Eric Tannenbaum. 2001. *Mapping Policy Preferences: Parties, Electors and Governments, 1945–1998*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cargnoni, Claudia, Peter Müller, and Mike West. 1997. "Bayesian Forecasting of Multinomial Time Series Through Conditional Gaussian Dynamic Models." *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 92(438): 640–47.
- Carmines, Edward G., and James A. Stimson. 1989. *Issue Evolution: Race and the Transformation of American Politics*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Cary, Charles D. 1977. "A Technique of Computer Content Analysis of Transliterated Russian Language Textual Materials: A Research Note." *American Political Science Review* 71(1): 245–51.
- Clausen, Aage R. 1973. *How Congressmen Decide: A Policy Focus*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Fenno, Richard F. 1978. *Home Style: House Members in Their Districts*. Boston: Little, Brown.
- Fenno, Richard F. 1996. *Senators on the Campaign Trail*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Gelman, Andrew, Cristian Pasarica, and Rahul Dodhia. 2002. "Let's Practice What We Preach: Turning Tables into Graphs." *The American Statistician* 56(2): 121–30.
- Gerner, Deborah J., Philip A. Schrodt, Ronald A. Francisco, and Judith L. Weddle. 1994. "Machine Coding of Event Data Using Regional and International Sources." *International Studies Quarterly* 38(1): 91–119.
- Hall, Richard L. 1996. *Participation in Congress*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Heitschusen, Valerie, and Garry Young. 2006. "Macropolitics and Changes in the U.S. Code: Testing Competing Theories of Policy Production, 1874–1946." In *The Macropolitics of Congress*, ed. E. Scott Adler and John S. Lapinski. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 129–50.
- Hill, Kim Quaile, and Patricia A. Hurley. 2002. "Symbolic Speeches in the U.S. Senate and Their Representational Implications." *Journal of Politics* 64(1): 219–31.
- Hillard, Dustin, Stephen Purpura, and John Wilkerson. 2007. "An Active Learning Framework for Classifying Political Text." Presented at the annual meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association.
- Hillard, Dustin, Stephen Purpura, and John Wilkerson. 2008. "Computer Assisted Topic Classification for Mixed Methods Social Science Research." *Journal of Information Technology and Politics* 4(4): 31–46.
- Ho, Daniel E., and Kevin M. Quinn. 2008. "Measuring Explicit Political Positions of Media." Harvard Department of Government Working Paper.
- Holsti, Ole R., Richard A. Brody, and Robert C. North. 1964. "Measuring Affect and Action in International Reaction

- Models: Empirical Materials from the 1962 Cuban Crisis." *Journal of Peace Research* 1(3/4): 170–90.
- Jacobs, Lawrence R., and Robert Y. Shapiro. 2000. *Politicians Don't Pander: Political Manipulation and the Loss of Democratic Responsiveness*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Jones, Bryan D., and Frank R. Baumgartner. 2005. *The Politics of Attention: How Government Prioritizes Problems*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Jones, Bryan D., John Wilkerson, and Frank R. Baumgartner. n.d. "The Policy Agendas Project." <http://www.policyagendas.org>.
- Kastellec, Jonathan P., and Eduardo L. Leoni. 2007. "Using Graphs Instead of Tables in Political Science." *Perspectives on Politics* 5(4): 755–71.
- Katznelson, Ira, and John S. Lapinski. 2006. "The Substance of Representation: Studying Policy Content and Legislative Behavior." In *The Macropolitics of Congress*, ed. E. Scott Adler and John S. Lapinski. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 96–126.
- King, Gary, and Will Lowe. 2003. "An Automated Information Extraction Tool for International Conflict with Performance as Good as Human Coders: A Rare Events Evaluation Design." *International Organization* 57(3): 617–42.
- Kingdon, John W. 1995. *Agendas, Alternatives, and Public Policies*. Boston: Little, Brown.
- Klingemann, Hans-Dieter, Andrea Volkens, Judith Bara, Ian Budge, and Michael McDonald. 2006. *Mapping Policy Preferences II: Estimates for Parties, Electors, and Governments in Eastern Europe, European Union and OECD 1990–2003*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Krippendorff, Klaus. 2004. *Content Analysis: An Introduction to Its Methodology*. 2nd ed. New York: Sage.
- Kwon, Namhee, Eduard Hovy, and Stuart Shulman. 2007. "Identifying and Classifying Subjective Claims." Eighth National Conference on Digital Government Research, Digital Government Research Center.
- Laver, Michael, Kenneth Benoit, and John Garry. 2003. "Extracting Policy Positions from Political Texts Using Words as Data." *American Political Science Review* 97: 311–31.
- Lee, Frances. 2006. "Agenda Content and Senate Party Polarization, 1981–2004." Presented at the annual meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association.
- Library of Congress. n.d. "THOMAS." <http://thomas.loc.gov>.
- Lowe, William. 2007. "Factors, Ideal Points, and Words: Connecting Legislators' Preferences to Legislative Speech." Measures of Legislators' Policy Preferences and the Dimensionality of Policy Spaces, Washington University, St. Louis.
- Lowe, William. 2008. "Understanding Wordscores." *Political Analysis* 16(4): 356–71.
- Lowi, Theodore J. 1964. "American Business, Public Policy, Case-Studies, and Political Theory." *World Politics* 16: 677–715.
- Maltzman, Forrest, and Lee Sigelman. 1996. "The Politics of Talk: Unconstrained Floor Time in the U.S. House of Representatives." *Journal of Politics* 58(3): 819–30.
- Matthews, Donald. 1960. *U.S. Senators and Their World*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Mayhew, David R. 1974. *Congress: The Electoral Connection*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Miller, Warren E., and Donald Stokes. 1963. "Constituency Influence in Congress." *American Political Science Review* 57: 45–56.
- Monroe, Burt L., Michael P. Colaresi, and Kevin M. Quinn. 2008. "Fightin' Words: Lexical Feature Selection and Evaluation for Identifying the Content of Partisan Conflict." *Political Analysis* 16(4): 372–403.
- Monroe, Burt L., and Ko Maeda. 2004. "Rhetorical Ideal Point Estimation: Mapping Legislative Speech." Society for Political Methodology, Stanford University.
- Monroe, Burt L., Cheryl L. Monroe, Kevin M. Quinn, Dragomir Radev, Michael H. Crespin, Michael P. Colaresi, Jacob Balazar, and Steven P. Abney. 2006. "United States Congressional Speech Corpus." <http://www.legislativespeech.org>.
- Monroe, Burt L., Kevin M. Quinn, Michael P. Colaresi, and Ko Maeda. 2007. "Estimating Legislator Positions from Speech." Measures of Legislators' Policy Preferences and the Dimensionality of Policy Spaces, Washington University, St. Louis.
- Peltzman, Sam. 1985. "An Economic Interpretation of the History of Congressional Voting in the Twentieth Century." *American Economic Review* 75: 656–75.
- Poole, Keith T., and Howard Rosenthal. 1997. *Congress: A Political-Economic History of Roll-Call Voting*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Porter, Martin F. 1980. "An Algorithm for Suffix Stripping." *Program* 14(3): 130–37.
- Porter, Martin F. n.d. <http://snowball.tartarus.org/algorithms/english/stemmer.html>.
- Purpura, Stephen, and Dustin Hillard. 2006. "Automated Classification of Congressional Legislation." Technical report, John F. Kennedy School of Government.
- Riker, William H. 1986. *The Art of Political Manipulation*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Rohde, David W. 2004. "Roll-Call Voting Data for the United States House of Representatives, 1953–2004." Technical report, Political Institutions and Public Choice Program, Michigan State University.
- Rohde, David, Norman Ornstein, and Robert Peabody. 1985. "Political Change and Legislative Norms in the U.S. Senate, 1957–74." In *Studies of Congress*, ed. Glenn Parker. Washington, DC: Congressional Quarterly Press, 147–88.
- Rothenberg, Lawrence S., and Mitchell S. Sanders. 2000. "Severing the Electoral Connection: Shirking in the Contemporary Congress." *American Journal of Political Science* 44: 316–25.
- Shepsle, Kenneth A., and Barry R. Weingast. 1987. "Why Are Committees Powerful?" *American Political Science Review* 81: 929–45.
- Sinclair, Barbara. 1989. *The Transformation of the U.S. Senate*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Slapin, Jonathan B., and Sven-Oliver Proksch. 2008. "A Scaling Model for Estimating Time-Series Positions from Texts." *American Journal of Political Science* 52(3): 705–22.

- Smith, Steven S. 1989. *Call to Order: Floor Politics in the House and Senate*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.
- Stimson, James A., Michael B. MacKuen, and Robert S. Erikson. 1995. "Dynamic Representation." *American Political Science Review* 89(3): 543–65.
- Stone, Philip J., Dexter C. Dunphy, Marshall S. Smith, and Daniel M. Ogilvie. 1966. *The General Enquirer: A Computer Approach to Content Analysis*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- United States Government Printing Office. n.d. "The Congressional Record, GPO Access." <http://www.gpoaccess.gov/crecord>.
- Wang, Xuerui, and Andrew McCallum. 2006. "Topics over Time: A Non-Markov Continuous-Time Model of Topical Trends." 12th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining, Philadelphia.
- Weber, Robert Phillip. 1990. *Basic Content Analysis*. New York: Sage.
- West, Mike, and Jeff Harrison. 1997. *Bayesian Forecasting and Dynamic Models*. New York: Springer.
- Wolbrecht, Christina. 2000. *The Politics of Women's Rights: Parties, Positions, and Change*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.