Final Project Rubric

PPOL6801

Fall 2025

Students: Zhiyang Cheng

Project Name: How Do U.S. Politicians Use Emotional Intensity?‘ **Total Score**: 91 / 100

Overall Comment: This is a nice project, and the results are promising. The key problem is with the BWS measure. It is really hard to understand your measure, and you do not sufficiently explain what your concepts are. Why did you reduce the sample to 3k text? what is best? what is worst? did you validate the scores in any way? there are so many open questions here that is hard to follow your main measurement choice. Also, I am not convinced by your findings related to the topic models – I did not take you points because of this, but, your explanation seemed rushed. I beleive here some validation fo the BWS score would help us understand what seems a counter-intuitive finding for the topics.

How to read this rubric?

In this rubric, I list the items I am considering when grading your assignment. For each section, you will get your score. I will note in the each item when you lose points. I will note in the each item when you lose points. **I will note in the each item when you lose points.** All my comments will start with **TV**

Project Materials

(9/10 points)

- Report was posted to a github repository
- Contains a well-detailed ReadME
- Student included the data used in a `Data/` folder.
- ReadME is well-organized and follow best practices

TV: almost perfect organization. the only area you could have improved was to also have a subfolder for the code

Project Code

(10/10 points)

- Code is well-documented throughout.
- file names follow best practices in terms of function names

- Code runs with no errors
- Figures are exported correctly
- If not violating any terms of service, is the data available in the repo.

Document Presentation

28/30 points

- **Student used professional looking visualizations in the report:**
  - Figures were easy to understand?
  - Figures made sense within the context of the report?
  - Student described the purpose and the insight drawn from the figure in the text?
  - Figures referenced in the text are labeled, i.e. references to "figure 1" correspond to the figure title (e.g. "Figure 1: Title")?
  - Figures include titles?
  - Figures labels/axes/text are readable?
    TV: several of your titles run over the page limits, particularly fig8 (-2pts). Also, the topic models figure could be split only on divisive and not devise topics. That would help understanding the findings
  - Color scheme made sense; easy to differentiate between colored items
  - Figures were appropriately proportioned to the document?
- **Student generated a professional looking report:**
  - Report was rendered without errors or warnings.
  - No code was visible in the report.
  - No raw output was visible in the report.
  - Report includes a title, author byline and abstract
  - Report contained no (or few) grammatical/spelling errors.
  - Report reads as a single cohesive document.
  - Student cited academic, data, and package sources.

Content

Points /50

The student's project sufficiently addressed these general areas.

TV: Writing suggestion. You don't need to use the royal we. Use first person, or "this project" instead of we

- **Introduction**
  - Student clearly established the aim of the project.
  - Student offered a clear roadmap of the report (i.e what is covered in the report).
- **Problem Statement and Background**
  - Student offered a clear and complete statement of the problem and/or aim of their analysis.
  - Student included a brief summary of any related work (i.e. a *light* literature review)

TV: I would like to see a discussion about the BWS methods. Has it been used in the literature before? Any related work that inspired this measure? (-1pt)

- **Data**
  - Student outlined where their data came from.
  - Student clearly specified:
    * the unit of observation;
    * the outcome of interest and how it is measured;
    * predictor variables of interest (and why they were selected);
    * potential issues in the data (e.g. missingness, coverage, etc.)
  - Student articulate the steps they took to wrangle the data.
- **Analysis**
  - Student described the methods/tools they explored in their project.
    * Justified the tools/methods that they used.
    * Adequately described what the tools/methods are doing.

TV: I feel you BWS measure is interesting, but definitely underexplained in the report. What exactly best and worst mean? is it most intense and least intense? Also, what is j? The unitof analysis is never defined in the report, so I am really not sure what I should be considering as your measurement? also, did you validate this in any way? It seems you did, but you do not provide any validation of the labels and the BWS scale. (-5pts)

- **Results**
  - Student gave a detailed summary of their results.
  - Student presented their results clearly and concisely.

TV: Figure 5 is VERY confusing. If the baseline are democrats, why are you plotting the democrats? it gives the reader the intuiton that effects are zero for the democrats (-1pts)

  - Student used visualizations (and tables) whenever possible/appropriate.

TV: You should have confidence intervals in your predicted probability graphs (-2pts)

  - Student highlighted some clear takeaways ("things learned") and theoretical implications ("potential hypotheses") from their analysis.
- **Discussion**
  - Student spoke on the "success" of their project (as defined in their proposal).
    * "Did you achieve what you set out to do? If not why?"
  - Student articulate how they would expand the analysis if given more time.