Applied Scaling & Classification Techniques in Political Science

Lecture 2

Unsupervised scaling algorithms: Wordfish
But before that... a summary

You pass to R the texts you want to analyze via `readtext`

You tell to R that those bunch of texts belong to the *same collection of texts* you want to analyze via `corpus`

You extract from the corpus the relative document term (or feature) matrix via `dfm`. By doing that you apply the bag of words approach to that corpus of texts
But before that...a summary

All the statistical models that we will see, work on this

NOT on this

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>docs</th>
<th>voto</th>
<th>programma</th>
<th>priorità</th>
<th>punti</th>
<th>piano</th>
<th>sostegno</th>
<th>famigli</th>
<th>natalità</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FDI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEGA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEU</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M5S</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Our Course Map

First Step

Define the corpus, acquire & convert documents, choose the unit of analysis

Preprocess → Statistical summaries

Scaling/Scoring

Supervised (wordscores)

Unsupervised (wordfish & co.)

Second Step

Goal

Classification

Known categories (supervised)

Automatic tagging (ontological dictionaries)

individual classification → Classifiers (SVM, Random Forest, Naïve Bayes, etc)

Human tagging

aggregated estimation → ReadMe - iSA

Unknown categories (unsupervised)

Single Membership Models

Mixed Membership Models (LDA, Structural Topic Model)
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Latent models

Textual data might focus on manifest characteristics whose significance lies primarily in how they were communicated in the text.

To take an example, if we were interested in whether a political speaker used racist language, this language would be manifest directly in the text itself in the form of racist terms or references, and what would matter is whether they were used, not so much what they might represent.
Latent models

However, sometimes the target of concern is not so much what the text contains, but what its contents reveal as data about the latent characteristics for which the text provides observable implications.

Is this important? YES!
Latent models

In the study of politics, some of our important theories about political and social actors concern qualities that are unobservable through direct means.

Ideology, in particular, is fundamental to the study of political competition and political preferences, but we have no direct measurement instrument for recording an individual or party’s relative preference for (for example) socially and morally liberal policies versus conservative ones.

That is, ideology is not something that the researcher can directly observe…rather it must be indirectly estimated based upon observable actions taken by actors.
Latent models

Observable actions…such as?
Roll-calls, for example! Still, voting in a legislature is subject to party discipline and may be highly strategic….and so?
Let’s rely on something else then…like…what?!?
Texts, of course!
Scaling methods

The goal of methods for scaling positions is to use some observed set of outcomes to draw inferences about an actor’s (in the widest sense of the word) unobservable position on a latent dimension relative to other actors.

Position is here to be understood as the preference on some dimension. To get at such a position, the observed outcomes must reveal some kind of preference on the part of the actor.
Scaling methods

When scaling the political positions of a corpus of texts, we can view the **choice of words as the observed outcome**

Whenever **certain statements are associated with particular political positions**, we can use them to discriminate between positions in a certain political space

In other words, the use of a particular (set of) word(s) provides us with a revealed preference for a specific (kind of) policy
Scaling methods

Whenever we can think of the data generating process in these terms, scaling intended as a way “to isolate a specific dimension on which texts are to be compared and provide a point estimate of this quantity, on some continuous scale”, might be feasible.

Moreover…estimating locations using existing data is often difficult and sometimes impossible…but nearly all political actors speak (or write)!
Scaling methods

(*text*) *Scaling methods* are designed to isolate a specific dimension on which texts are to be compared and provide a point estimate of this quantity, on some continuous scale.

Such dimension could be related to ideology, or to some other policy (or non-policy) space.
Scaling methods

Scaling methods can be differentiated between **Supervised & Unsupervised Methods**

**Supervised models** use human input, typically in the form of a set of reference texts that have been already validated (i.e., already classified as left, right, extreme right texts for example)

These estimates can then be used to predict (i.e., scale) the positions of texts the model has not encountered previously (i.e., virgin texts)

The reference texts also serve to **define the policy space** that the researcher seeks to estimate (if you use a set of reference-texts validated over a left-right economic scale, you will scale the virgin texts along such scale. More on this later on)
Scaling methods

Unsupervised Methods simultaneously learn about the latent space and estimate document positions in it, without input from the researcher, i.e., they “discover” words that distinguish locations on some dimensional spectrum (not defined a-priori as it happens in the case of the supervised scaling methods)

How is possible? Give me a moment…
Scaling methods

Which Assumptions are needed to Scale a Text?

First, even though it is called text scaling, what we most commonly want to draw inferences about is not the political position articulated in the text, but the preference held by the author.

But if the cost to articulating a position is low, authors’ might engage in cheap talk. Conversely, if costs are high, they might choose not to articulate the position for strategic reasons.

All the scaling techniques we focus on, assume that authors do not censor their statements for political reasons. This assumption, in some given circumstances, could however cause significant measurement error.
Scaling methods

Second, we need to make assumptions about how any given author translates her position into text, and how that relates to the other authors in the corpus. Specifically, the language used in the texts must discriminate between the intended messages of different authors. In other words, the authors should receive varying levels of utility from their choice of words, and this variation should be related to the political space, we want to measure.

If authors of different preferences receive the same utility from similar choices of words, we cannot use the texts to discriminate between their positions.
Scaling methods

Accordingly, the documents should be informative about the political differences we seek to estimate.

Particularly in contexts where there are strong common norms about how to phrase a document (as with highly technical legislative or legal documents) or the texts do not communicate any preference at all, it can be difficult to scale documents.

An interesting special case of incomparability is when authors simply use different languages.
Scaling methods

Third, and regarding the relation between documents, a set of texts is only be scalable, if they can be placed in the same Euclidian space

A possible violation in this respect would be if the language used in the documents is incomparable in the way meaning is ascribed to words

Analyzing text that is produced under very different conditions or in varying contexts; that are from different time periods or actors; or have very different audiences in mind would make it difficult to place them relative to each other, let alone in the same space

A similar problem can apply if texts refer to different dimensionality of the space
Wordfish

Unsupervised methods for scaling texts produce estimates using only the information available in the textual data itself.

How to do that?
Let’s introduce Wordfish!
Wordfish

Wordfish assumes that the **language** used by political actors expresses political ideology, that is…

…**Ideology** manifests itself in the **word choice** of politicians when writing party documents or saying something for example
More specifically, Wordfish assumes that parties’ relative word usage within party documents conveys information about their positions in a policy space.

To give an example, the technique assumes that if one party uses the word ‘freedom’ more frequently than the word ‘equality’ in a document on economic policy while another party uses ‘equality’ more often than ‘freedom’ in a similar document, these two words – ‘equality’ and ‘freedom’ – provide information about party ideology with regard to an underlying policy dimension, and discriminate between the parties.
Wordfish

The interpretation of the estimated dimension in Wordfish is then completely left to the researcher.

In the previous example, Wordfish does not tell the researcher whether ‘equality’ is a ‘left-wing word’ while ‘freedom’ is a ‘right-wing word’.

The algorithm will simply use the relative frequencies of these words as data to locate the documents on a scale, and it is up to the researcher to make an assessment about what constitutes ‘left’ and ‘right’ based upon her knowledge of politics (a-posteriori method!)
Wordfish Estimation Process

We already told that Wordfish, as all unsupervised scaling methods, “discovers” words that distinguish locations on a political spectrum.

This is made possible by adopting some statistical assumptions on the distribution of words employed in texts.
Wordfish Estimation Process

But which is the **statistical distribution** which most accurately approximate word usage?

Wordfish assumes that word frequencies (the number of times an actor $i$ mentions word $j$) are generated by/drawn from a **Poisson process**, a distribution that is heavily skewed, as is the case of **word usage**.
Wordfish Estimation Process

The **systematic component** of this process contains 4 parameters: 1) *word fixed effects*; 2) *document fixed effects*; 3) *document positions*; 4) *word weights* (discriminating parameters)

**Word fixed effects** are included to capture the fact that some words need to be used **much more often** in a language.

Such words may serve a grammatical purpose but they have no substantive or ideological meaning, such as conjunctions or definite and indefinite articles.
Wordfish Estimation Process

The **document fixed effect** parameters control for the possibility that some documents in the analysis may be **significantly longer** than others.

When using manifestos to estimate party positions, for example, this can happen when some parties in some years write much longer manifestos.
Wordfish Estimation Process

The **document positions parameters** tells us the positions of each document relative to the other documents in the recovered latent space.
Wordfish Estimation Process

The **word discrimination parameters** allow the researcher to analyze **which words differentiate documents (party) positions**

In previous example, ‘*equality*’ would have a high absolute value for its discrimination value and its usage would most likely be associated with left-wing documents (and parties). The word ‘*freedom*’ would also have a high absolute value **but with the opposite sign** because its usage would be associated with right-wing parties.

This allows the researcher to estimate party positions and uncover the variations in political language that are responsible for placing parties on this dimension.
More formally

Formally the functional form of the model is as follows:

\[ y_{ijt} \approx POISSON(\lambda_{ijt}) \]

where \( y_{ijt} \) is the count of word \( j \) in document \( i \)'s (i.e., party manifesto; speech; etc.) at time \( t \)

The lambda parameter has the following systematic component:

\[ \lambda_{ijt} = \exp(\alpha_{it} + \psi_j + \beta_j \cdot \theta_{it}) \]

with \( \alpha \) as a set of **document fixed effects at time** \( t \), \( \Psi \) (psi) as a set of **word fixed effects**, \( \beta \) as estimates of **word specific weights** capturing the importance of word \( j \) in discriminating between documents (manifestoes or speeches), and \( \theta \) (theta) as the estimate of document (i.e., party if we are talking about parties’ documents) \( i \)'s **position** at time \( t \) (therefore it is indexing one specific document)
More formally

WORDFISH uses an **expectation maximization (EM) algorithm** to retrieve maximum likelihood estimates for all parameters.

The implementation of this algorithm entails an **iterative process**:

**first** document parameters are held fixed at a certain value while word parameters are estimated, **then** word parameters are held fixed at their new values while the document parameters are estimated.

This process is **repeated until the parameter estimates reach an acceptable level of convergence**.
Some challenges

1. Document processing
2. Interpretation
3. Dynamic pattern
4. Problems with confidence intervals
Document Processing

Document processing is essential and possibly the most tricky task in the estimation process in Wordfish (and not only for this method…)

Researchers should predefine the sets of texts to be analyzed.

The model specification used by Wordfish works best as more data is available, meaning as more documents are used in the analysis and as those documents contain more unique words.

If the documents do not contain a sufficient number of unique words, there will not be adequate information to estimate document parameters.
Moreover, Wordfish will recognize differences in word use between two texts as indicative of their different political positions, but in reality these differences could be also due to the topics addressed by the authors.

A special case of this, is in situations where texts use completely incomparable language or do not address similar topics at all.

In these situations they cannot be scaled together, and if they are, it will often result in the main policy dimension being miss-specified.
The selection of texts will depend on what kind of policy dimension should be analyzed.

Wordfish estimates a single policy dimension, and the information contained in this dimension depends upon the texts that the researcher chooses to analyze.

Therefore, the selection of texts should depend on the particular policy dimension the researcher wishes to examine.
Document Processing

For instance, if a researcher is interested in comparing foreign policy statements of parties in country X, then only such texts should be included in the analysis.

On the other hand, if the research question is to determine a general ideological position using all aspects of policy (e.g. left-right), then the analysis should potentially be conducted using all parts of an election manifesto, for example, assuming that such documents are encyclopedic statements of policy positions.
Document Processing

The estimated single dimension will thus be a function of the selection of the text corpus.

This also implies that when the generative model specifies a unidimensional policy space, when it really is multidimensional, we risk miss-specifying the policy dimension.
WORDFISH does not estimate multiple dimensions, only a single dimension, but it does allow the estimation of different dimensions if you use different text sources.

For instance, if your interest is in estimating positions of presidential candidates on foreign policy and economic policy, then you could estimate separate positions using foreign policy speeches only on the one hand and economic policy speeches on the other hand and from this creating a 2-dimensional space.
Interpretation

Position estimates derived using Wordfish are based only on the information in the texts.

This lack of an ex ante defined dimensionality is a double-edged sword: while Wordfish scales texts independently of prior information, it renders uncertain the exact nature of the dimension being estimated (as it happens in all unsupervised approaches!)

One important drawback of unsupervised algorithms is thus that the nature of the dimensions produced requires intensive validation before they can be applied across different sets of texts and contexts.
Interpretation

Improving the validation of scales will help improve current models, which quite often rely on the strong assumption of ideological dominance in speech (i.e., that actors’ ideological leanings determine what is discussed in texts)…sometimes this makes sense, other times no!

This is not a shortcoming of Wordfish!

In fact, next week we will see how also (non)ideological locations that Wordfish eventually identifies can be quite useful!

This simply suggests that one should not blindly assume that Wordfish output measures an ideological location of political actors without careful validation.
Dynamic Estimation

Using text to estimate party positions over time creates an additional challenge. On the one hand, we would like to use as much information in the texts as possible. On the other hand, we would like to estimate position change over time. This is a trade-off.

For example, if the political debate changes and new vocabulary enters the political lexicon in election \( t \), then this will differentiate the texts at point \( t \) from those at point \( t-1 \).

In fact, in this instance, we are likely to pick up a policy agenda shift in texts, whereas we are interested in party position change.
Dynamic Estimation

Potential route to addressing this issue: carefully select the **words** that enter the analysis!!!

Thus, if there is movement of parties, it can only be due to **different word usage**

This requires that the **word data over time** must be comparable at a minimum level
Dynamic Estimation

Take as an example the set of parties’ manifestos in Germany since 1970 to 2005. Assume that you want to analyze such documents with Wordfish.

Now assume that the political lexicon in the manifestos at election time $t$ contains an issue that is no longer relevant at time $t+1$, e.g. official relations with the GDR (East Germany).

If all parties make a statement with regard to the GDR at point $t$ but not at $t+1$, then the words will not only distinguish parties at point $t$, but also distinguish the elections.

As a result, if all words are counted, even the rare ones, the parties are more likely to be clustered by election.
Dynamic Estimation

The same is true if we have some changes in the actual meaning of some political words. Which word inclusion criteria then? Two (main) options
Dynamic Estimation

First alternative (non-informative priors): in the term-document matrix includes words that are mentioned in a minimum number of documents (say, in at least 20%), thus essentially keeping words that are deemed important enough to be mentioned either over time by one party or by several parties.
Dynamic Estimation

Second alternative (informative priors): in the term-document matrix includes only those words that appear both pre- and post-1990, i.e., reunification added words to the German political lexicon that were not in it previously. Likewise, some words that were previously important likely fell out of use.

If we do not control for this fact, we would see a large jump in all parties around 1990 as they all shift their word usage to account for new political realities.
Dynamic Estimation

As suspected, **agenda effects over time** dominate the results when all words are used.

Excluding **words that are specific to a given time-period** induces stability and the results are corroborated by their good face validity.
Confidence intervals

Wordfish in the Quanteda package implements asymptotic standard errors. These SEs rely however heavily on the model being correctly specified. As a result such SEs should really be treated with care cause quite often they will be too small.

As a way of obtaining uncertainty estimates with weaker assumptions, Lowe and Benoit (2013) also introduced a bootstrap procedure, that basically iterates across different (bootstrapped) samples of the original DfM and then average the results.

The Quanteda package supplies functionality for random sampling of Words \([\text{dfm\_sample}]\), which can be used to implement the above bootstrap procedure with relative ease.
Confidence intervals

What do we mean by bootstrapping?

In essence bootstrapping repeatedly draws independent samples from our data set to create bootstrap data sets. This sample is performed with replacement, which means that the same observation can be sampled more than once.

Each bootstrap data set contains $n$ observations, sampled with replacement from the original data set. Each bootstrap is the used to compute the estimated statistic we are interested in (i.e., a mean or anything else – as the thetas of a Wordfish model!)
Confidence intervals

An example with 3 resamples
Confidence intervals

Bootstrapping is an extremely powerful statistical tool that can be used to quantify the uncertainty associated with a given estimator or statistical learning method. We can in fact use all the bootstrapped data sets to compute the standard error of the desired statistics, or their 95% confidence intervals, etc.
An application of Wordfish to Japanese parliamentary debates, 1953–2013
The theoretical framework

Measuring how confrontational parties are within a legislature and in particular the ‘distance’ between cabinet and opposition parties (i.e. the extent to which a government and its opposition oppose each other) is a relevant political metric that explains several important facts (the ability of a cabinet to change the status quo, its survival, etc.)

Usually such distance is measured in terms of ideological/policy distance

But is that enough?
Beyond ideology?

After all, the line of conflict between government and opposition can underline not only the mere ideological distance between parties, but also several other factors, among them:

✓ mutual (dis)trust
✓ evolving parliamentary dynamics
✓ past behaviours
✓ forward expectations
Beyond ideology?

As a result, the cabinet-opposition divide in some given circumstances could be much (less) larger than what would appear based on ideological considerations.

How we estimate the level of confrontational among parties within a parliament (i.e. the actual content of parties’ relative positions) is in few words very important!

This point has substantial theoretical (and empirical) consequences.
Beyond ideology?

In this sense, **words matter!!!**

…by focusing on the **type of words** that different political actors employ to express their positions with respect to the cabinet during a parliamentary debate, **we could be in a better position** to assess their relative degree of distance (the by-product of the several factors mentioned above) in that precise moment.
Beyond ideology?

But be aware…

…as the language spoken on the floor is primarily directed at other delegates, cabinets, or opposition parties rather than to voters, it could be expected that the dimension of conflict (and cooperation) would be possibly different from the ideological one often found in different political texts primarily prepared for election campaigning!
Beyond ideology?

We demonstrate this by analysing the speeches made by prime ministers and party representatives in the parliamentary sessions of the Japanese Diet from 1953 to 2013 using the Wordfish algorithm

Why Japan?

1. The Japanese Diet is known for its adversarial nature
2. Japan shows a relatively high number of changes of cabinet
3. A quasi-experimental setting (pre- and post- 1993)
The Japanese case

We have selected all the speeches in which Prime Minister makes a general policy speech (*shoshin hyoumei enzetsu*) in the following situations:

i) after being nominated in the Special session

ii) after having succeeded a predecessor during a parliamentary session

iii) and in the beginning of the Extraordinary session
The Japanese case

Overall 439 speeches over 82 sessions, and almost 20,000 words/kanji

URL to get access to Japanese legislative speeches:
http://kokkai.ndl.go.jp/

Of course, we tokenized all the texts!!!
The temporal challenge

Using texts to estimate positions over time is quite tricky (remember!)

We chose to include in the analysis only words that fulfill a minimum threshold criterion based on informative priors, i.e., we kept in the analysis only those words that appear both pre- and post-1990

Choosing different temporal breaking points (such as 1993 or the early 80s when a change in the meaning of ideology seems to have happened in the Japanese case: Jou and Endo 2016) does not affect any of our conclusions reported below

The same results are found if we use non-informative priors
The Japanese case

After this normalization, the average number of words for a typical legislative speech is 4119.7 (standard deviation: 1408.5)

The relative large number of words is reassuring, given that it has been shown that WORDISFH tends to estimate positions (more) accurately as the number of words increases
The discriminating words
The discriminating words

Positive betas: breakthrough, successfully, bills passed, steady, prompt, policy measure, policy making

Negative betas: decline, misgovernment, arrogance, decision to leave from a position, deterioration, by force, rejecting bills

The two opposite sides of the words spectrum seem to define different attitudes toward government very well: a positive one (words with a positive beta) and a negative one (words with a negative beta)
And the speech positions?

Overall average position of Japanese Parties on the latent WordFish scale

Source: Word Fish analysis on Legislative Speeches 1953-2013
However, if we break down the estimated positions from legislative speeches over time…
In 1993 JSP leapfrogs the LDP

From 1996 LDP back to power

In 2009 DPJ leapfrogs the LDP

From 2012 LDP back to power
Findings

The extracted scores appear clearly related to the confrontational nature of Parliamentary institutions, and therefore to a government-opposition divide. This is not an artifact of WORDFISH plus Japanese language (Hone + Tatemae)! In Proksch et al. (ES 2011), Japanese parties were clearly located according to their ideological position when analyzing party programs with WORDFISH.
Note that we have HUGE problems if we consider **all the words** over the entire period (as in the German case)!

---

**Diagram Description:**
- In 1993 JSP leapfrogs the LDP.
- Since 1996 LDP back to power.
- In 2009 DPJ leapfrogs the LDP.
- Since 2012 LDP back to power.

*Source: Word Fish analysis on Japanese Legislative Speeches*
Intensity of Government and Opposition (IGO)

We use the WORDISFH scores to estimate a measure of the intensity of the government-opposition divide over each session.

To this aim, we adapted the Dalton’s index (2004) of party system polarization, that, except for a constant, is mathematically the weighted population standard deviation of party positions in a given country.

Of course, in our case, such index of polarization is based on positions that go beyond ideology to include several other factors related to the government-opposition divide.
Intensity of Government and Opposition (IGO)

\[ IGO_k = \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^{V} VS_{jk} \times \left(\frac{P_{jk} - \bar{P}_k}{5}\right)^2} \]

where \( IGO_k \) is the value of IGO during the parliamentary session \( k \), \( VS_{jk} \) is the seat share of party \( j \) during session \( k \), \( P_{jk} \) is the position of party \( j \) during session \( k \) over the latent government-opposition scale, and \( \bar{P}_k \) is the average position of parties along the same scale during session \( k \).

In estimating IGO, we have rescaled \( P_{jk} \) on a 0 to 10 scale. In our sample the average value of IGO is 5.6 (standard deviation: 1.07).
IGO index over time
The determinants of the trend in the IGO index

Ideology? Not that much

Source: Japanese Legislative Speeches & CMP Data
The determinants of the trend in the IGO index

What seems to matter most: the change in cabinet format and...the electoral cycle!

Source: Model 1 - Table 1
And so? Much ado about nothing?

Does this new measure of distance help us solve the empirical puzzles that important legislative phenomena cannot be explained well by party competition merely based on ideological confrontations?

The answer is…YES!
Two applications

1. The **survival rate** of Japanese governments (1953-2013)

2. The **duration of cabinet bills** (i.e., time needed for governments to pass their proposed bills in the 1953-1996 period; source: Fukumoto 2000)

In both cases we contrast the results obtained by employing the **IGO index** with a different measure of the **level of complexity** in the bargaining environment in which a cabinet must operate based on a **pure ideological** polarization index using CMP data (1960-2005)

And in both case IGO turns out to be very significant in explaining our dependent variables!
Only in Japan?

We replicated the analysis in the case of the Italian Second Republic (1996-2012)
Different language, different political setting…but same results!
Only in Japan?

[Diagram showing the correlation between IGO-Cabinet duration and some political events.]

- Centre-Left cabinets
- Centre-Right cabinets
- Centre-Left cabinet
- Centre-Right cabinet
- Monti cabinet

FI/PDL at the opposition
FI/PDL back to opposition

Investiture Debate year

DS/ULIVO/PD and left cabinet
FI/PDL
Conclusion: what did we learn?

Studying legislative speeches is very relevant and in some instances an irreplaceable opportunity, given that by analyzing them we can capture the position of parties and political actors and their change over time.

Still, a researcher should devote an extra care about the substantial content of the positions of political actors that she gets by analyzing such speeches, especially when she decides to employ any automated scale algorithm to texts.
Conclusion: what did we learn?

The recovered positions may contain not only ideological/policy considerations but also several other aspects that are however important to better define the intensity of the cabinet-opposition divide.

In a nutshell, do not apply Wordfish (or any algorithm…) blindly!!! Always validate your results!!!

Remember the fourth Principles that we have studied in our first lecture!!!
Before today’s Lab

1. `install.packages("cowplot", repos='http://cran.us.r-project.org')`
2. `install.packages("magicfor", repos='http://cran.us.r-project.org')`
3. `devtools::install_github("quanteda/quanteda.corpora")`
IMPORTANT!!! (part 1)
Before using rtweet

We will use in the next classes the rtweet package: so start to install it!

```r
install.packages("rtweet", repos='http://cran.us.r-project.org')
install.packages("httpuv", repos='http://cran.us.r-project.org')
install.packages("ggmap", repos='http://cran.us.r-project.org')
```
Before using rtweet

Then open an R session and type the following commands. Plz let me know if you are able (or not) to download the 10 tweets:

library(rtweet)
library(httputv)
rt <- search_tweets("#rstats", n = 10, include_rts = FALSE)
print(rt$text[1:10])
Optional

Before we can start geocoding data, we need to obtain an API key from Google. Go to the registration page, and follow the instructions (select all mapping options)

The geocoding API is a free service, but you nevertheless need to associate a credit card with the account.

Please note that the Google Maps API is not a free service. There is a free allowance of 40,000 calls to the geocoding API per month, and beyond that calls are $0.005 each

This implies that basically you have a monthly free limit of $200 (more than enough…)

To register you need to have: a) a gmail account; b) a credit card
Optional

After you finish the registration (if everything hopefully works fine!) Google gives you back an API number. Save it!

Then type:

```r
library(ggmap)
register_google(key = "NUMBER OF YOUR GOOGLE API!")
geocode(c("White House", "Uluru"))
```

You should get this result back:

```
# A tibble: 2 x 2
   lon  lat
  <dbl> <dbl>
1  -77.0 38.9
2  131. -25.3
```
Optional

If you are able to get the Google API, but GGMAP does not get any results back, enable the “geocoding app” in your console developer. Check how to enable GOOGLE API here.
IMPORTANT!!! (part 2)
CMP and R

We will use in the next classes also The ManifestoR package (https://manifesto-project.wzb.eu/information/documents/manifestoR): so start to install it!

For using such package, however, you also need to have a personal API KEY to get access to the CMP database

How to get it?

Sign up on the Manifesto Project Database webpage to get an account (https://manifesto-project.wzb.eu/signup)
CMP and R

Then login to your account, go to your profile page and generate an API key.
CMP and R

Then save such API key by writing down somewhere.
CMP and R

Now install the R package «manifestoR»

```
install.packages("manifestoR", repos='http://cran.us.r-project.org')
```

Then type:

```
library(manifestoR)

mp_setapikey(key.file = NULL, key = "THE API KEY YOU GOT")
```

If you get an error, please let me know!
Please check that everything is ok with both rtweet and ManifestoR before 23 of October!!!