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Amilcar

Research Question:

* *how levels of media consumption impacted voter intention and potential political engagement*
* the media, a main contributing factor to negative views of the Latino community, can not only also help create a higher perception of linked fate as well as increasing political engagement amongst Latino immigrants.
* how the media has also been able to drive up voter intention.
* what can spur political participation in the Latino immigrant community

Puzzle:

* what can spur political participation in the Latino immigrant community?
* the impact of media on the Latino immigrant community and how it can be used to help and no longer harm and cause negative impacts. (p12)

Lit Review:   
- highly contentious political environment that was created against Latino immigrants, on top of the slow growth of Latino-advocacy organizations, helped pave the path for a new heightened level of political participation amongst Californian Latino immigrants (p4)

* citizenship status and nativity to the United States are two major factors that tend to have a significant impact on Latino Immigrant political participation (p6)
* linked fate and group consciousness as ways of studying political participation (p9)

Argument / Hypothesis:

* H1: Latino Immigrants, who have a large consumption of television news programs will tend to have a higher likelihood in being interested in voting and other campaign activities.

Methods:

* *Latino Immigrant National Election Study data for the 2012 national election*
* Only responses from citizens who have the right to vote were taken into consideration for the analysis.
* DV: “How likely is it that you will vote in the general election this November?” Results:
* *results showed that there was no level of significance when studying the factors of levels of media consumption and voter intention during that election*
* *IDV:* attention to news about national politics on television, “a great deal” and the “a lot” response categories were considered as large consumers of television news programs
* *Controls:* NATURALIZE, EDUCATION, GENDER

Areas for Improvement:

1. **Hypothesis / Argument:** What is the mechanism or logic at hand here? Why will the larger consumption of television news programs be correlated with a higher likelihood of political participation? There seems to be some related argument in the literature review about how the media is a main contributing factor to negative views (through group shame and negative media coverage), or create a perception of linked fate (communal feelings and a shared experience), but this isn’t directly linked to political participation.
   1. So are you arguing that media consumption 🡪 greater affiliation with American identity 🡪 (Increased) political participation?
   2. Or are you arguing media consumption 🡪 Transnational (Latino) linked fate 🡪 (Increased) Political Participation
   3. Does identity affect participation in the same direction (aka both greater American identity and Latino Identity = More political participation), or do they move in different directions (one causes more, one causes less)?
   4. On further reading on page 17 you point to how naturalization can instill a greater sense of American ideals and greater engagement, yet the coefficient on naturalization is negative (-0.557)… more on that on point 3, but some kind of commentary on whether this follows your logic or expectations would have been nice. But it also proves how it was (and is) important to distinguish between the effects of American identity versus latino identity as the reason for causing more or less political participation.
2. Data and Variables:
   1. Often we tend to include a quick description of how big the dataset / how many observations there are, especially if we are using a subset of the data, as you are. Since you are only looking at citizens with the right to vote in the dataset, you need to specify as well what the N of the sample is. It definitely needs to be in your model results on page 16, if not as well as in your section where you talk about the LINES dataset.
   2. Also, the question you use for your independent variable actually is specific to national politics on television, so it might be a little bit of a red herring to say that your independent variable measures media consumption generally, unless you are comparing attention to politics with the effect of lets say watching a lot of Spanish reality tv, or other types of media (that could also promote the “group identity” or “American identity” logic of your argument)
3. Results and Interpretation:
   1. Your primary dependent variable (PRMEDIA-ATTVNEWS) is a likert of 1 – 5, where increasing values of PRMEDIA-ATTVNEWS actually corresponds to LESS political participation. It isn’t clear if you recode this into a more intuitive interpretation (aka 1 is less, 5 is highest), that is important especially when you talk about your results because your reader will assume it is 1 less – 5 more, unless you explicitly point this out over and over again.
   2. Assuming you did not recode it, then your results make more sense. I.e. more attention to news, and naturalization, are both correlated with more political participation (lower values on your dependent variable), even if only one of them is significant. You should always explicitly comment on both the direction of your results, and the significance – aka you could have said inline (my independent variable, as predicted, is negatively correlated with the dependent variable, though this result is not significant). And I would have liked a commentary on the effect of naturalization on political participation, and whether you expected that or not.
   3. Also just a small point, a significance of 0.013 is not the lowest level (p16), it’s actually the higher / middling level. 0.10 is the lowest, followed by 0.05, then 0.01.
   4. Why do you think your results didn’t pan out? Any kind of reasoning would have been nice, perhaps your measure of media consumption is too crude? Or political participation? How would you have improved it?

Monica

Research Question:

* how well do immigrants from different countries assimilate to their state’s majority political party identification

Puzzle:

* how does political assimilation for immigrants vary by country of origin

Argument / Hypothesis:

* Immigrants coming from countries with governments considered “partly free” or “not free” will be more likely to conform with his or her state’s majority political affiliation.

Methods:

Results:

Areas for Improvement:

1. **Hypothesis / Argument:** What is the mechanism or logic at hand here? What about originating from an authoritarian regime makes an immigrant more likely to assimilate, compared to their more democratic-originating counterparts? There isn’t much logic presented here in the hypothesis section. You mention assimilation theory briefly, but not why the presence of an authoritarian past makes them more likely to assimilate
   1. I think the logic here is not unintuitive, that those with semi-democratic ideals might find that holding onto their own histories still allows them to feel comfortable and part of American culture, but you should make that directly and not expect your reader to infer for you.
2. Data and variables:
   1. I had a pretty difficult time following your explanation of how the variables were calculated, despite being there for most of the process. This is in part because in your methods section you jump from ideology/ assimilation, to country of origin and authoritativeness, and then back to assimilation.
   2. Secondly, you tend to reference things without making sure the reader knows what you are talking about. For example on page 11 you mention the democratic advantage score, but you don’t actually use that in the earlier section when you are describing the Gallup Poll. So while I know what you are talking about, the reader does not. And the reader does not know how you are matching democratic advantage and the respondent’s party affiliation. I would have gone with an anecdotal example at least, of what “assimilation” and “not assimilation” would both look like.
3. Analysis and Interpretation:
   1. Aside from your technical difficulties with RStudio, I actually think you might have interpreted your results wrongly. Your primary independent variable is the political rights estimate (PR) from Freedom house, where higher levels of PR indicates authoritarian origins. Your results on page 13-14 indicate that the coefficient estimate for PR is -0.0058, with a p-value of 0.502. So your hypothesis cannot be rejected. Your only significant variables are YRSINUS (p value 0.031), and maybe SOUTH (p-value 0.0017). The results themselves are fine, I just think you mistook standard error for p value. Since you seemingly misread it for a confirmation of the hypothesis, it’s difficult to expect you to come up for alternate explanations for why you didn’t get the results you wanted.
   2. The plot itself is pretty interesting but difficult to read, since your y-axis is actually a count, not a proportion. So we don’t know the active proportion of assimilated to not-assimilated immigrants, at each level of Freedom House scores. But judging from the ratios, it would seem like immigrants from both extremely democratic countries (PR = 1) and extremely authoritarian countries (PR = 7), are most likely to assimilate, and the middle less so. I think that would have been a fair conclusion to make.

Yami

indigenous peoples will be more likely to support democracy or have a preference for democracy. I identify two factors of interest: experiences with cultural racism and efforts for self-determination. I also control for variables such as voting behavior and years of education.

one would expect that indigenous peoples would seek self-determination rights through democratic avenues that allow for indigenous activism and civic engagement.

Hypothesis:

(1) indigenous peoples will be more likely to prefer democracy,

(2) those who have voted will be more likely to prefer democracy and

(3) lastly more years of education will generate greater satisfaction with democracy.

Areas of Improvement:

Yami, this is really an excellent project. Not even considering the difficulties and obstacles you encountered. You did yourself proud and I think this is a coherent, clear, well written paper.

1. Hypothesis / Argument
   1. Good job separating the future and potential applications of your project, from what is actually within the scope of the project and what you can explain. Often people forget and mix the two up, but this is very clear and well written.
   2. It is worth noting that for your second hypothesis, it could be argued that the relationship is reverse as well, i.e. those who prefer democracy more are more likely to vote. Untangling which way the relationship goes is not easy, so we don’t expect you to do it in this paper, it’s just a point to note and to be careful of, for future work.
2. Data and Variables
   1. Yami, you do an excellent job describing your research design and what your survey includes, as well as it’s limitations. It’s very thoughtful.
3. Analysis and Interpretation
   1. Just a small point, I think you mislabeled your model 3 as model 2, but I could follow easily because it’s a clear argument (education and its effects on democracy.
   2. Good job presenting your results in different forms, especially with the table, plot, and the discussion of the R squared. The one thing I would be careful of in the future, is making sure your plots are also labelled in English, you could do both Spanish and English labels together, though it is uncommon.
   3. You are right that even though the second hypothesis is not significant, the coefficient is still interesting and informative. Though for future reference, I would separate model 2 from model 3, having when you include both variables in the same model, they are both having an effect on the dependent variable, so we can’t judge their independent effect. So when you have three hypotheses, you would often have at least three models, maybe even more if you want to first show the main model, and then include the controls.
   4. You did a great job with your analysis and interpretation! I’m not sure if you recall what Dr. Siegel said about interactions in the last two classes, but as a way to continuously improve your project and skills, the way I would personally approach hypothesis 2 is to interact voting with indigenous. You do this in R by using indigenous \* voting as the independent variable. What it basically means is that you are looking at the change in the effect of indigenous, depending if the respondent has voted or not. According to your hypothesis, you are saying that though indigenous peoples are more likely to prefer democracy, those who vote are even more likely to prefer democracy, so we would expect the interaction to have a positive and significant effect as well. The interaction is a slightly better, though more complicated way as well to present this. But since your prediction was that the effect would still be positive, you don’t necessarily need an interaction, but it would be more advanced.

Christian

ideology can be seen through dramaturgical analysis, as theorized by Erving Goffman, introducing a dimension of ideology based on how individuals want their ideology to be outwardly perceived through “impression management.”

Argument:

I argue that people signal how they want to be ideologically perceived uniquely by the follower networks they choose to maintain. Thus, measures of ideology based on online networks operationalize contextual signaling heuristics which reveal pro-social-facing (or “with emphasis on how actions will be outwardly perceived”) ideal point estimates.

H1: I argue that Twitter network-based ideology and Co-sponsor based ideology are both pro-social facing measures which emphasize how actions will be outwardly perceived. There will be a higher correlation between Twitter Ideal Point Estimations and Co-Sponsorship-based ideology than Twitter Ideal Point Estimations and DW-NOMINATE scores for the aggregate of MOC.

H2: There will be a stronger correlation between Twitter Ideal Point Estimations and Co-Sponsorship-based ideology than Twitter Ideal Point Estimations and DW-NOMINATE for inter-party as compared to the aggregate measures of H1.

H3: MOC of the Republican party will have higher outward party unity, shown through a higher correlation between Twitter ideal point estimates and co-sponsor ideology estimates when compared Democrats.

What does using twitter to do a social network analysis of Congress contribute on top of DW-NOMINATE (roll call votes), co-sponsoring bills, and campaign finance?

Youssef

I argue that despite the brief radicalization of the digital space, Sisi’s censorship strategies have been able to regain control of the internet and shift public opinion towards his favor

**H1: As Egyptian citizens are exposed to more censorship online, they are more likely to have a favorable view of the government.**

According to my hypothesis, as censorship encounters increase (Q 403 has more 2’s), the public opinion of the government becomes more favorable (increase along Q 201-1 ordinal trust scales).

Areas for improvement

1. Hypothesis and Argument
   1. Argument and hypothesis NEEDS to come in the introduction. The first mention of the word “argue” is on page 11, the reader cannot and should not go through 10 pages of history to understand what they expect from the paper.
2. Data and Variables
   1. Good job describing both the way you recoded the variables, and the potential misinterpretations for certain kinds of coding choices
   2. For the specific reequirements of RBSI, describing your methods for cleaning data and recoding variables is helpful for us to understand your thought process. Just a note for future work, you wouldn’t have to describe these processes in as much detail in an actual academic paper; or at best it would be in the appendix.
3. Analysis and Interpretation
   1. Excellent intrepretatin of your results, you did a good job explaining the substantial effect of your coefficient (what does an increase of 0.23 mean, relative to the full trust scale), and the intercept. Good job including the r-square and explaining it’s significance here.
   2. Also, aren’t models 1 and 2 the same model? I don’t see a difference in what goes in the model, or the results at all. Likewise with models 3 and 4. So technically you only have two models, not four.
   3. Combining the table and predicted value is good as well, though I wish you actually explained the predicted results as well, though I see you reference it when talking about the baseline results.
   4. It is a little disappointing you couldn’t include more controls, even a simplified version of the controls would have been helpful or interesting here. Since we don’t get any sense of comparison for whether the effect of censorship is significant compared to other predictors of public opinion (i.e. if the effect of education or internet usage frequency is 10 or 100 times greater than censorship, then it would put things in perspective, or vice versa.) You do this in model 3, which is good for your results because the effect of censorship is almost double that of political interest.