14 Oct 2026 - 13 Nov 2026 (31 days)

Ayanna Pressley

Candidate Sentiment Analysis Report

Alex Ayvazian
Alex.Ayvazian@outlook.com



Collected Data

14 Oct 2026 - 13 Nov 2026 (31 days)

Overview

Total mentions 2 880 +31900.0%	Total reach 26M +7630.7%	Positive mentions 798 +0.0%
Negative mentions 462 +46100.0%	Average Presence Score 32/100 +3100.0%	AVE $3.0M +7937.2%
Social media reach 22M +6756.5%	Non-Social media reach 4.2M +22617.6%	User generated content 2 081 +69266.7%
Social media mentions 1 944 +97100.0%	Non-Social media mentions 936 +13271.4%	Social media reactions (e.g. likes) 451K +15016.2%
Social media comments 23K +2343200.0%	Social media shares 26K +11944.3%	Total social media interactions 501K +15533.2%

14 Oct 2026 - 13 Nov 2026 (31 days)

Executive Summary

Overview

Total mentions **2 048** ↗ 155%	Total reach **20M** ↗ 231%	Positive mentions **770** ↗ 2752%
Negative mentions **376** ↗ 353%	Average Presence Score **41/100** ↗ 71%	AVE **$2.3M** ↗ 214%
Social media reach **18M** ↗ 323%	Non-Social media reach **2.3M** ↗ 25%	User generated content **1 724** ↗ 401%
Social media mentions **1 635** ↗ 441%	Non-Social media mentions **413** ↘ -18%	Social media reactions (e.g. likes) **409K** ↗ 917%
Social media comments **22K** ↗ 1492%	Social media shares **24K** ↗ 1188%	Total social media interactions **455K** ↗ 947%

Sentiment by categories



Mentions by categories



Sentiment breakdown





14 Oct 2026 - 13 Nov 2026 (31 days)

Mentions & Reach



Sentiment



14 Oct 2026 - 13 Nov 2026 (31 days)

Sentiment by Categories



Mentions by Categories



14 Oct 2026 - 13 Nov 2026 (31 days)

Most Active Sites

Site	Mentions
youtube.com	685
x.com	551
bsky.app	355
facebook.com	131
threads.com	128

Most influential sites

Site	Mentions	Reach	Influence score
youtube.com	685	2.6 M	10
facebook.com	131	17 M	10
x.com	551	951 K	10
tiktok.com	84	1.2 M	10
yahoo.com	2	30 K	10

Hours of Activity



Analysis

14 Oct 2026 - 13 Nov 2026 (31 days)

Analysis Summary

What changed, where the attention came from, and how the tone shifted

2.9K
MENTIONS
+31,900% vs prior period

27.71%
POSITIVE SHARE
798 positive mentions

16.04%
NEGATIVE SHARE
462 negative mentions

1.73x
POS. / NEG. RATIO
positive vs negative mentions

1. Visibility surged and positive sentiment became a larger share

The current period recorded about 2.9K mentions versus 9 previously. Positive sentiment rose from 0.00% to 27.71% (+28 percentage points), while negative sentiment increased from 11.11% to 16.04% (+5 points). Positive mentions outnumbered negative mentions during the current period.

2. Conversation mix

News + video accounted for about 48% of mentions.



News 24% | Videos 24% | X 19% | Other Socials 17%

Blogs 5% | Facebook 5% | Web 4% | TikTok 3%

3. Platform dynamics

YouTube	685 mentions / 2.6M reach
Facebook	131 mentions / 17M reach
X	551 mentions / 951K reach
TikTok	84 mentions / 1.2M reach

4. Attention accelerated sharply during the period

Daily mentions averaged 93 in the current period and reached a maximum of 541; the previous period peaked at only 9. Daily reach averaged about 843K and peaked at 5.0M, compared with an 11K average and 338K maximum previously. The source report identifies major spikes on October 26, November 4, and November 12.

Bottom line

Pressley became dramatically more visible during this 31-day window. Positive mentions represented a larger share than negative mentions, while the conversation was distributed across news, video, X, and other social platforms. Facebook generated the largest reach among the listed social sources. These are media-monitoring sentiment metrics, not polling or a measure of voter approval.

Method note: the report contains different overview snapshots on earlier pages. For consistency, this analysis anchors percentage and period-change figures to the explicit Period Comparison table, and uses the category/source tables for channel figures.

Ayanna Pressley gained 168% more mentions in the last 2 weeks

TOTAL MENTIONS
2171 ↑ 168%

TOTAL REACH
22M ↑ 213%

SENTIMENT



38% Positive 44% Neutral 18% Negative

TOP INFLUENCERS

MS NOW
youtube.com

grok
x.com

McGill Media
facebook.com

MOST ACTIVE SITES



PRESENCE SCORE



Higher than 82% of brands



Emotions share



- Anticipation: 32%
- Joy: 13%
- Disgust: 5%
- Fear: 2%
- Sadness: 0%
- Trust: 29%
- Anger: 13%
- Distrust: 4%
- Surprise: 1%
- Irony: 0%

Context of a discussion

Hide sentiment



Period Comparison

14 Oct 2026 - 13 Nov 2026 (31 days)

Overview

	Ayanna Pressley 2026-10-14 - 2026-11-13	Previous period 2026-09-13 - 2026-10-13
Total mentions	2.9 K +31900%	9
Social media mentions	1.9 K +97100%	2
Non-Social media mentions	936 +13271%	7
Positive mentions	27.71% (798) +28 p.p.	0.00% (0)
Negative mentions	16.04% (462) +5 p.p.	11.11% (1)
Social media reach	22 M +6756%	320 K
Non-Social media reach	4.2 M +22618%	19 K
Average Presence Score	32/100 +3100%	1/100
AVE	$ 3.0 M +7937%	$ 37 K
User generated content	2.1 K +69267%	3

14 Oct 2026 - 13 Nov 2026 (31 days)

Mentions



Reach



14 Oct 2026 - 13 Nov 2026 (31 days)

Positive sentiment



Negative sentiment



14 Oct 2026 - 13 Nov 2026 (31 days)

Sentiment breakdown



Categories share



14 Oct 2026 - 13 Nov 2026 (31 days)

Top 10 Sources

Site	Mentions	Reach	Visits	Influence score
youtube.com	685	2.6 M	28 B	10
facebook.com	131	17 M	11 B	10
x.com	551	951 K	4.2 B	10
tiktok.com	84	1.2 M	3.0 B	10
yahoo.com	2	30 K	2.7 B	10
nytimes.com	1	128 K	640 M	10
cnn.com	2	349 K	436 M	10
timesofindia.indiatimes.com	1	103 K	258 M	10
threads.com	128	14 K	250 M	10
foxnews.com	5	496 K	248 M	10

4 Nov 2026 - 16 Nov 2026 (13 days)

Threads

Instagram Threads Posts

Posts and Comment Sentiment Analysis

Ayanna Pressley

Alex Ayvazian

Alex.Ayvazian@outlook.com



Ayanna Pressley Threads Sentiment Analysis

November 4-16, 2026 | Leadership preferences, expressed feelings and recurring language

Stated leadership preferences in the captured discussion strongly favor Pressley. Her supporters cite renewal, responsiveness, courage, representation, policy priorities and experience. Personal evaluations are predominantly positive. Discussion of her willingness to run is distinct from judgments about her qualities or agenda.

ELIGIBLE CAPTURE	ANALYTICAL SAMPLE	STATED LEADERSHIP CHOICES
2,665 distinct text records	900 sampled records	493 established preferences
4 source exports	592 visible handles	407 without an established choice

Leadership preference

485/900 records (53.9%) support Pressley for Speaker or House leadership. 8/900 (0.9%) oppose her selection or prefer another leader or role. Among established choices, 98.4% favor her.

Personal evaluation

161/900 records (17.9%) express a positive evaluation of Pressley; 10/900 (1.1%) express a negative evaluation. Generic nominations and reporting without an author evaluation remain outside the sentiment pie.

Scope

The main analysis attributes evaluations, feelings and reasons to Pressley herself. Separate sections examine mentions of three other politicians. Findings describe these exports, rather than a representative survey of Threads users, constituents or voters.

Stated preferences for Pressley

Pie base: 493 established leadership choices. Table base: all 900 sampled records.



- Support Pressley — 485/493 | 98.4%
- Oppose / another role — 8/493 | 1.6%

PREFERENCE	RECORDS	ALL SAMPLE	STATED CHOICES
Support Pressley	485	53.9%	98.4%
Oppose / prefer another role	8	0.9%	1.6%
Not established	407	45.2%	Outside pie

What support establishes

These entries favor Pressley for the leadership role, including direct nominations and explicit requests for representatives to support her. A brief nomination can establish a choice without establishing admiration, a policy rationale or a specific emotion.

What opposition establishes

The eight opposing or alternative-role entries include suitability objections, a different preferred leader, requests to move to a willing candidate, and one positively worded preference for a presidential run. These are not eight expressions of personal dislike.

Support records involve 326 visible handles; opposition records involve 8. Handles are not verified individuals.

Evaluation of Ayanna Pressley

Author evaluation of Pressley only. All-sample base: 900; evaluative-record base: 171.



Positive **161/171 | 94.2%**

Negative **10/171 | 5.8%**

EVALUATION	RECORDS	ALL SAMPLE	EVALUATIVE TEXTS
Positive	161	17.9%	94.2%
Negative	10	1.1%	5.8%
Mixed	0	0.0%	0.0%
Not established	729	81.0%	Outside pie

Positive and negative evaluation

Positive entries praise her qualities, record, policy alignment or suitability. The ten negative entries criticize her priorities, qualifications, recognition, suitability or readiness to step forward. A repeated immigration-related criticism appears under three distinct post IDs.

Unestablished evaluation

Generic nominations, reports, quotations and missing-context records do not automatically establish the author's personal evaluation. This category is separate from the pie and does not imply acceptance, approval or an absence of political preference.

Feelings expressed about Pressley

Base: all 900 sampled records. Only feelings directed toward Pressley or her conduct, agenda, suitability or anticipated candidacy are counted. Categories overlap.



Hope and appreciation

Hope or enthusiasm appears in 151/900 records (16.8%); admiration or trust appears in 114/900 (12.7%). These include anticipation of her leadership, direct appreciation and confidence in her qualities.

Concern and disappointment

Candidate-related worry includes uncertainty about a run or the risks involved. Sadness includes disappointment about the prospect that she may not run. Those feelings do not automatically constitute criticism of her. Direct anger, distrust and ridicule are counted only when the expressed feeling concerns her or her agenda.

260/900 records carry at least one attributable feeling; the remainder do not establish one under this coding rule. Determined calls to act are not classified as feelings.

Reasons cited for supporting her

Base: 485 support records. Counts describe stated qualities or expectations of Pressley. Reasons overlap.



Substantive foundations

Renewal concerns a desired change in leadership. Responsiveness concerns listening and representing public needs. Courage, representation, policy and experience add specific standards for what supporters expect her to do.

324/485 support records (66.8%) contain no separate Pressley-specific reason under this rule. Generic nominations and criticism solely of somebody else do not supply a quality or policy position for her.

Feelings accompanying her stated strengths

Each row uses support records carrying that Pressley-specific reason as its base. Only Pressley-directed feelings enter the columns.

REASON-SPECIFIC BASE	Hope / enthusiasm	Admiration / trust	Fear / anxiety
Renewal / change / n=50	17/50 I 34.0%	9/50 I 18.0%	0/50 I 0.0%
Responsiveness / community / n=49	14/49 I 28.6%	27/49 I 55.1%	0/49 I 0.0%
Courage / action / n=37	11/37 I 29.7%	25/37 I 67.6%	0/37 I 0.0%
Black women / representation / n=33	5/33 I 15.2%	11/33 I 33.3%	0/33 I 0.0%
Experience / competence / record / n=27	7/27 I 25.9%	26/27 I 96.3%	0/27 I 0.0%
Domestic policy / affordability / n=27	5/27 I 18.5%	14/27 I 51.9%	0/27 I 0.0%

Different kinds of support

A demand for renewal can be stated without praise. A claim about experience can carry admiration, while anticipation of a candidacy can carry hope or worry. The table records these combinations without treating one dimension as a substitute for another.

Interpretation

Co-occurrence describes what appears together in the text. It does not establish that a particular feeling caused support, that every supporter shares it, or that an attributed quality has been independently verified.

Pressley qualities discussed together

PAIRED PRESSLEY REASONS	RECORDS	SUPPORT RECORDS
Responsiveness / community + Courage / action	20	4.1%
Responsiveness / community + Independence from donors (perceived)	14	2.9%
Responsiveness / community + Experience / competence / record	13	2.7%
Courage / action + Experience / competence / record	12	2.5%
Courage / action + Independence from donors (perceived)	11	2.3%

How the arguments fit together

Support can combine personal qualities with a desired policy direction. Responsiveness describes whose needs leadership should serve; independence describes perceived freedom from donor constraints; courage and experience describe the ability to act. Representation can be valued alongside all of these.

Depth of the preference

These combinations show that support is not limited to a name or a single slogan. They also distinguish a general wish for change from an affirmative account of the conduct people expect from Pressley. Counts refer to records, and several records can come from the same handle.

Responsiveness and constituent connection

49/485 support records (10.1%) cite this Pressley-specific reason. Reasons overlap.

"Ayanna has town halls and meet and greet opportunities all the time to connect with her constituents. On the few times I've met her she's always been a wonderful listener."

AP0364 | @kristen.havlik | Nov 11, 2026 05:32 PM PST | TF4 row 299 | Open Threads record

Listening as a leadership standard

Self-described constituent testimony supplies an account of accessibility and attention. Other supporters treat her perceived connection to ordinary people as a qualification for a wider leadership role. They want public priorities to remain visible once a leader acquires institutional power.

"This is why I support Ayanna Pressley for House Speaker. She listens, she's courageous, & not bought by special interests."

AP1119 | @acrotrekker | Nov 13, 2026 10:21 AM PST | TF4 row 720 | Open Threads record

What the evidence shows

These comments connect listening with action and independence. The export establishes that the author expressed that judgment; it does not verify constituent status, the frequency of public events or the experience of all residents.

Perceived independence and integrity

22/485 support records (4.5%) cite this Pressley-specific reason. Reasons overlap.

"She has the courage, competence, and integrity to lead. Ayanna Pressley is FOR THE PEOPLE!"

AP1441 | @kiwispillow | Nov 13, 2026 01:02 PM PST | TF1 row 513 | Open Threads record

Independence as an expected relationship

Supporters who explicitly describe Pressley as independent from donors connect that belief with confidence that she would prioritize public needs. The substantive argument concerns how influence would operate: whose interests she would listen to, and which proposals she would advance.

"She supports Medicare for All. She is not owned by AIPAC."

AP1681 | @sjsice | Nov 13, 2026 04:49 PM PST | TF1 row 263 | Open Threads record

Separate perception from financial proof

Assertions about money, independence or integrity are recorded as reasons expressed by supporters. They are not a complete financial history, proof of a donation-to-decision relationship or an independently verified statement about future conduct.

Healthcare, reparations and policy delivery

27/485 support records (5.6%) cite this Pressley-specific reason. Reasons overlap.

"I think prioritizing what fight comes first is vital. There are things that help everyone like Medicare for all, affordable housing, stopping the war ect."

AP2769 | @amberskyesofficial | Nov 16, 2026 11:30 AM PST | TF2 row 477 | Open Threads record

The requested outcome

Policy-based support names healthcare, housing, reproductive rights, reparations, immigration enforcement and other public priorities. The desired change concerns the agenda a Speaker could advance, rather than the title alone. Some supporters emphasize an ability to order competing priorities.

"They don't get it- that's the very reason why we admire her so much- she stands firmly with moral and humanitarian principles! What's not to love about that? REPARATIONS MUST HAPPEN! IT'S A MORAL IMPERATIVE. Rep. Pressley for MSOH!"

AP2171 | @kristisundberg | Nov 15, 2026 06:40 PM PST | TF4 row 18 | Open Threads record

Agreement and disagreement

Reparations is explicitly a reason for some support and a point of policy disagreement elsewhere in the capture. Neither a slogan nor an asserted platform verifies a bill's contents, prospects, costs or effects. Policy criticism remains a judgment about her agenda, separate from opposition to her holding a role.

Courage, qualifications and effectiveness

37/485 support records (7.6%) cite this Pressley-specific reason. Reasons overlap.

"Ayanna Pressley is the best person to be the Speaker of the House. First woman of color on Boston's City Council in its 100-year history Unseated a 10-term incumbent in 2018 Fought for Medicare for All, ending qualified immunity, and protecting ACA subsidies The Speaker decides what is voted on, setting that agenda. Please [...]"

AP1563 | @stephen_m_snyder | Nov 13, 2026 02:49 PM PST | TF4 row 725 | Open Threads record

From qualities to institutional action

Supporters describe Pressley as willing to confront powerful interests and capable of turning priorities into action. They cite public-office experience and asserted legislative accomplishments. Those claims supply an argument about expected performance, without independently establishing the record asserted.

"@repayannapressley came down to Big Memphis to help campaign and personally check out the Elon Musk monstrosities harming our communities with @justinjpearson"

AP2160 | @_boydshotimages | Nov 15, 2026 05:19 PM PST | TF2 row 228 | Open Threads record

A concrete account of showing up

The Memphis account is used as evidence of attention beyond a home district. Its meaning in the discussion is that leadership should involve visible participation in communities facing harm. The event, its circumstances and the author's status are not independently verified by the export.

Representation and a wider leadership standard

33/485 support records (6.8%) cite this Pressley-specific reason. Reasons overlap.

"We need Ayanna Pressley, who would be our first Black woman Speaker, and who leads without special interests influencing her."

AP0495 | @seestineinsta | Nov 12, 2026 08:18 AM PST | TF4 row 796 | Open Threads record

Representation as a reason

Some supporters explicitly value the prospect of a Black woman leading the House. They link the choice to recognition of political labor, inclusion and a possibility of different priorities. In these entries, representation can be part of an argument about both who leads and what leadership would do.

"The new house Speaker needs to ABSOLUTELY be my fellow Alopecia BLACK QUEEN Ayanna Pressley!"

AP0317 | @saadiyarose | Nov 11, 2026 02:16 PM PST | TF4 row 820 | Open Threads record

Avoiding a single explanation

The support reasons overlap. Representation does not displace comments about competence, courage, care or policy. Separately, objections to imposing expectations on her concern her agency and treatment; those are not automatically negative feelings toward her.

Calls, petitions and support for Pressley

"I was successfully able to leave a msg for @repayannapressley letting her know she'd make a great SOH. I'm ready to chip in with time and a few dollars to keep her in congress, and to fight for everyday working ppl."

AP0106 | @myrealtor_marcus | Nov 10, 2026 12:57 PM PST | TF3 row 656 | Open Threads record

Forms of participation

Pressley-specific appeals ask readers to contact House representatives, sign petitions, share her name, support her agenda or provide financial backing. The explicit objective is to communicate support for her candidacy or leadership. Some records report completed actions; others urge an action that may or may not occur.

"WE GOT YOUR BACK!!! WE SENT THE FRESHMAN CLASS TO DO WORK!! WE WANT YOU TO LEAD THE CHARGE!! @repayannapressley FOR SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE!!!!!"

AP0553 | @deonistruth | Nov 12, 2026 11:45 AM PST | TF3 row 835 | Open Threads record

What participation can establish

The posts demonstrate visible organizing language and expressed willingness to act. They do not verify completed calls, signature totals, donations, residence or the number of people persuaded. A call to act is not itself an emotion or a separate personal evaluation of Pressley.

Willingness, announcement and consent

Candidacy, willingness, consent or feasibility discussion appears in 152/900 sampled records (16.9%). This is independent of personal sentiment.

"She said she is "very humbled to even be in conversation" but is "making no declarations or announcements here.""

AP3010 | @andrew_solender | Nov 16, 2026 05:07 PM PST | TF2 row 236 | Open Threads record

Different readings of a statement

Captured accounts of the November 16 town hall distinguish an announcement, willingness to run and the ability to serve. Some authors read the absence of a declaration as a reason to move on; others treat it as leaving the possibility open. Those are reported interpretations, not verified evidence of a candidacy decision.

"I trust her implicitly. I value her judgment."

AP3087 | @ateliercraftypaws | Nov 16, 2026 06:10 PM PST | TF4 row 98 | Open Threads record

Agency and evaluation

A person can respect her discretion while wanting her to run. Objections to pressuring her do not establish dislike of her. Similarly, disappointment that a run might not happen can coexist with admiration. These distinctions are retained in the preference, sentiment and emotion measures.

Criticism and alternative-role preferences

Personal negative evaluation: 10/900 (1.1%). Opposition or another-role preference: 8/900 (0.9%). These are separate measures.

"No Ayanna Pressley. Need better keader."

AP2856 | @lovergolf2010 | Nov 16, 2026 02:25 PM PST | TF2 row 389 | Open Threads record

Substantive criticism

The negative entries question qualifications, legislative results, public recognition, policy priorities or readiness to step forward. Immigration and reparations generate policy objections. Such claims describe the authors' judgments; the analysis does not verify their factual premises or endorse identity-based claims.

"The more I learn about Ayanna Pressley, the less I want her running for Speaker and the more I want her running for president. She's a real gem."

AP0466 | @fooleryco | Nov 12, 2026 05:36 AM PST | TF3 row 446 | Open Threads record

Preference does not equal personal dislike

The second excerpt is personally positive while preferring a different role. Other entries ask to move to a willing alternative without negatively evaluating Pressley. Reporting that she has not announced, or defending her right to choose, does not by itself establish opposition.

Repeated text and active accounts

SAMPLE TREATMENT	BASE	SUPPORT	NEGATIVE EVALUATION
All sampled records	900	485	10
One per exact whole text	780	431	8
One per visible handle	592	312	7

What repetition changes

Repeated comments and organizing templates can increase visible volume without establishing an equal number of independent participants. The sample keeps distinct post IDs in its principal counts. The alternative views above expose how repeated whole text or repeated handles affect the distribution.

Limits of the alternatives

Exact-text removal can collapse independently written identical nominations. One-per-handle selection can discard genuine changes of view or several different arguments. Neither method identifies unique people or turns the capture into a representative poll.

When the captured Pressley records were posted



Collection pattern

The dates describe records present in these exports. They are not a complete daily count of posts about Pressley. Overlapping queries, collection timing, visibility and repeated messages can affect the apparent concentration.

Interpretation

The distribution helps locate the captured discussion in time. It does not establish platform-wide growth, a change in population sentiment, a causal effect of a particular event or a verified number of constituents taking part.

Interaction totals in the captured records

RECORD ID	LIKES	VISIBLE HANDLE
AP0660	18,936	@1teeweezy
AP0617	16,829	@marco.foster
AP2165	15,674	@kiandria
AP0176	10,369	@tank_top_ted
AP0485	10,195	@echoesofstreet
AP1937	9,308	@saschabarros
AP0804	7,708	@the_desk_judge

Interaction is a different measure

Stored likes, replies and reposts describe the collected snapshot. A highly liked item can be an endorsement, a question, commentary or reporting. Its total is not equivalent to the number of people who support Pressley for a particular office.

How these totals are used

Interaction counts do not weight the sentiment or preference percentages. Views are not used as an exposure denominator. The exports do not establish a verified electorate, the number of unique people reached or the effect of one post on another.

What the discussion says about Pressley

Strength and nature of the stated preference

485/900 sampled records favor her for leadership, and 98.4% of established choices favor her. Personal evaluations are positive in 161/171 evaluative texts (94.2%), while many nominations contain no separate personal judgment.

Substantive expectations

The most frequent Pressley-specific support reasons are renewal / change (50/485), responsiveness / community (49/485), courage / action (37/485), black women / representation (33/485), experience / competence / record (27/485). Supporters connect a desired leader with listening, courage, representation, public priorities and the ability to use institutional power.

Emotion and uncertainty

Hope/enthusiasm (151/900) and admiration/trust (114/900) are the dominant attributable feelings. Worry and disappointment often concern candidacy or its prospects. They are distinct from negative evaluations of her qualities or agenda.

Practical meaning

The capture documents expressed support, articulated expectations and visible efforts to communicate them. It also records questions about availability and minority criticism. These findings describe this discussion and do not establish an electorate-wide mandate or a verified leadership outcome.

Recurring words in Pressley-focused passages

Base: 1,475 eligible records with qualifying passages. A word counts once per record; one record can contain many words. Candidate names, common function words and profanity are excluded from the displayed words.



Language of nomination and participation

The most frequent words describe the desired office and actions around it. Support, calls, petitions and amplification sit alongside agenda, representation and candidacy language. These are word-presence counts, not additional sentiment or endorsement counts.

Effect of repeated language

"Focus" appears in 56 records but 7 distinct extracted passage texts. "Amplifying" appears in 54 records but 5 distinct passage texts. The repeated wording reflects templates or copied passages; it does not establish coordination between accounts.

Recurring phrases and their context

Qualifying-record base: 1,475; distinct extracted-passage base: 1,125. Counts are once per feature in each base. Rows overlap; nested phrases are not added together.

NORMALIZED PHRASE	RECORDS	DISTINCT PASSAGE TEXTS
speaker of the house	314	180
pressley for speaker	290	117
house speaker	102	69
support pressley	57	55
focus on amplifying the call	53	4
want pressley	45	32
run for speaker	43	43
town hall	37	33
doesn't want	30	30
pressley day	30	4
black woman	17	17
for the people	16	14

Recurring functions

Office and nomination phrases identify the desired role. Amplification phrases concern visibility and organizing. Town-hall and willingness phrases concern availability. Representation and public-service phrases supply a different kind of meaning from a simple nomination.

Read polarity in context

A phrase such as "doesn't want" may report a claim, dispute a rumor or discuss consent; it is not automatically negative sentiment. Phrase counts do not establish the author's stance. Normalization replaces recognized Pressley names and handles with "pressley" and removes URLs. Profanity is excluded from the displayed phrases.

Hakeem Jeffries mentions

Source: Pressley's exports only. These are incidental mentions in that corpus, rather than an independent sample about this politician.

TEXT-MENTION MEASURE	RECORDS	SHARE OF RELEVANT BASE
Eligible captured texts	606	22.7% of 2665
Sampled texts	204	22.7% of 900

How his name is used

The captured examples use him as an incumbent comparator, an object of replacement demands, a subject of reported leadership developments, or a preferred leader in a smaller counterview. A mention alone does not establish which of these functions applies.

"Rep. Ayanna Presley is our choice for the Speaker of Congress, she has the spine and courage that Hakeem Jeffries lacks, she is not a corporate puppet and she's not beholden to AIPAC."

AP0207 | @kennethosita4 | Nov 11, 2026 12:44 AM PST | TF4 row 793 | Open Threads record

Attribution within a comparison

In this excerpt, courage and independence are affirmatively attributed to Pressley. The criticism of the comparator is separate. In other entries, a negative description of him supplies no affirmative Pressley quality and is excluded from her reason chart.

"NOPE! Hakeem Jeffries is a LIAR and a corporate goon. NEVER JEFFRIES Speaker Ayanna Pressley"

AP1244 | @gingercaddy | Nov 13, 2026 11:22 AM PST | TF1 row 702 | Open Threads record

Separate target, separate interpretation

The attack in this second excerpt concerns him; the final line states a leadership preference for Pressley. It does not transfer the distrust or anger to her. Accusations about money, honesty or conduct remain attributed claims, not independently verified findings.

Chuck Schumer mentions

Source: Pressley's exports only. These are incidental mentions in that corpus, rather than an independent sample about this politician.

TEXT-MENTION MEASURE	RECORDS	SHARE OF RELEVANT BASE
Eligible captured texts	232	8.7% of 2665
Sampled texts	76	8.4% of 900

How his name is used

Examples pair Senate and House leadership demands, discuss the broader party direction, or switch attention from a Senate campaign to Pressley. Senate-specific dissatisfaction does not by itself establish an assessment of her.

"I've been so focused on "GTFO Schumer" messaging. For the rest of the week I'm switching to the warmest and most positive support for Ayanna Pressley."

AP0190 | @emalinestirling | Nov 10, 2026 08:51 PM PST | TF4 row 141 | Open Threads record

A change in the object of feeling

The excerpt explicitly changes its focus. The negative language concerns Schumer, while the author describes positive support for Pressley. The two sentiments are attributed to their respective objects.

"Ayanna Pressley for Speaker of the House @repayannapressley Chris Van Hollen for Senate Majority Leader @chrisvanhollen Call your reps and tell them no to Jeffries/Schumer."

AP0079 | @thyme_is_honey | Nov 10, 2026 04:54 AM PST | TF4 row 157 | Open Threads record

Different offices and counting

A paired slogan keeps the House and Senate preferences distinct. The mention total counts recognized names and variants once per text, regardless of the sentiment expressed. It is not an opposition rate, a Senate leadership poll or an estimate from Schumer's separate dataset.

Chris Van Hollen mentions

Source: Pressley's exports only. These are incidental mentions in that corpus, rather than an independent sample about this politician.

TEXT-MENTION MEASURE	RECORDS	SHARE OF RELEVANT BASE
Eligible captured texts	1021	38.3% of 2665
Sampled texts	360	40.0% of 900

How his name is used

Examples pair a Senate leadership choice with Pressley's House candidacy, discuss one effort as a model for another, or evaluate reported endorsements. Praise or disappointment directed at him does not establish a feeling toward Pressley.

"I'm proud to support Chris Van Hollen for Senate Majority Leader and Ayanna Pressley for Speaker of the House!"

AP0657 | @katrina_deville | Nov 12, 2026 04:55 PM PST | TF4 row 78 | Open Threads record

Shared support can be explicit

Here the author expressly supports both people for different offices. Shared praise or a shared expected quality can apply to each when the text actually attributes it to both. A mention or appearance beside another name alone is insufficient.

"There is still time for Pressley to run, SHE IS WHO DESERVES THE ENDORSEMENT. i know it's not decided, im just praying that she does decide to actually run "

AP3113 | @itsmarciamay | Nov 16, 2026 06:39 PM PST | TF4 row 317 | Open Threads record

Context of disagreement

The full record criticizes a reported endorsement by Van Hollen while hoping that Pressley runs. The disappointment in that account concerns his reported action; the hope in the excerpt concerns her potential candidacy. The report does not independently verify the reported endorsement.

Preparation, selection and attribution

DATA PROCESSING	RECORDS
Raw rows across four exports	3,899
Distinct post IDs	3,227
Repeated-ID copies removed	672
Outside the stated date window	4
Empty in-window text	18
Eligible audience texts naming Pressley	2,665
Uniform random sample	900

Selection

The latest scraped copy is retained per post ID, preserving all export locations. The eligible population requires an identifiable Pressley reference and excludes her own tracked accounts. Distinct IDs with identical text remain separate. Sampling uses Python random.Random(2026111701) from the chronological population. Dates use America/Los_Angeles.

Attribution review

574 distinct previously tagged texts, covering 613 sampled records, were re-read to assign feelings and affirmative reasons specifically to Pressley. Identical whole texts share a decision. The remaining 287 records had no prior feeling or affirmative/critical reason flags and retain none. Sentiment and preference labels are retained independently.

Interpretive coding

Coding is contextual AI interpretation by one coder, without independent human validation or an inter-coder reliability estimate. The labels describe expressed language, not a verified internal mental state.

Interpreting the reported measures

Independent dimensions

Sentiment concerns the author's evaluation of Pressley. Leadership preference concerns her holding the relevant role. Emotion concerns an expressed feeling directed toward her, her agenda, conduct, suitability or anticipated candidacy. None of these measures automatically supplies the others.

Reasons and context

The support-reason base is 485 support records. Reasons must state a Pressley quality, record or expectation. Comparison alone and criticism solely of another politician are excluded. Expected qualities expressly attributed to a paired set of candidates can apply to her. Reasons overlap, and no primary reason is forced.

Recurring language

A qualifying sentence or line explicitly names Pressley and does not name any of the three politicians in the separate mention analysis. URLs and other handles are removed; Pressley variants become "pressley". Words and contiguous phrases count once per eligible record. The sensitivity column collapses identical extracted passage text. Selected substantive words and phrases are shown; profanity is excluded. The language subset is narrower than the full capture.

Evidence boundaries

Parent conversations, images and linked articles were not reconstructed. Assertions about money, laws, events, intentions, policy effects or biography were not independently verified. Handles do not establish residence, voter status or unique people. No representative public-opinion estimate, population margin of error or demographic inference is asserted.

Percentages round half up to one decimal. Different collection windows and selection rules prevent treating reports about different politicians as directly comparable approval ratings.

Exports and record-level evidence

TF1 / 1,011 exported rows

01-threads_Ayanna_Pressley_1794642191490.csv

TF2 / 1,002 exported rows

01-threads_ayanna_pressley_1794905149659.csv

TF3 / 885 exported rows

02-threads_Ayanna_Pressley_1794641899264.csv

TF4 / 1,001 exported rows

02-threads_ayanna_pressley_1794904847132.csv

EMBEDDED EVIDENCE FILE	CONTENTS
Record_Audit.csv	All distinct records, source locations and eligibility
Coding_Audit.csv	All 900 sample records, target-specific feelings and reasons
Methodology.json	Definitions, attribution, sampling and source hashes
Statistics.json	Computed report counts
Language_Audit.json	Word/phrase counts, sensitivity counts and phrase record IDs
Mentions_Audit.json	Per-politician mention counts and sample record IDs

Source references

Quotes are exact excerpts of the exported text. [...] marks shortening; complete text is preserved in the record audit. Quote labels identify record ID, handle, local timestamp, export and CSV row, with an original Threads link. CSV data begin at line 2 after the header. Quote selection does not add records to percentage bases.

Only these four Pressley Threads exports contribute. Analysis date: November 17, 2026. Embedded CSV/JSON evidence is accessible in PDF readers supporting attachments.