15 Oct 2026 - 14 Nov 2026 (31 days)

Hakeem Jeffries

Candidate Sentiment Analysis Report

Alex Ayvazian
Alex.Ayvazian@outlook.com



Collected Data

15 Oct 2026 - 14 Nov 2026 (31 days)

Overview

Total mentions 30K +8665.5%	Total reach 346M +22036.6%	Positive mentions 1 154 +19133.3%
Negative mentions 8 976 +11710.5%	Average Presence Score 50/100 +4900.0%	AVE $30M +14546.4%
Social media reach 251M +48688.3%	Non-Social media reach 94M +8906.5%	User generated content 14K +12028.4%
Social media mentions 14K +11903.5%	Non-Social media mentions 16K +7046.5%	Social media reactions (e.g. likes) 4.9M +568876.1%
Social media comments 485K +1939388.0%	Social media shares 274K +215274.0%	Total social media interactions 5.6M +558315.9%

15 Oct 2026 - 14 Nov 2026 (31 days)

Executive Summary

Overview

Total mentions **26K** ↗ 625%	Total reach **322M** ↗ 949%	Positive mentions **1 058** ↗ 1002%
Negative mentions **8 024** ↗ 741%	Average Presence Score **63/100** ↗ 80%	AVE **$28M** ↗ 794%
Social media reach **239M** ↗ 1171%	Non-Social media reach **82M** ↗ 596%	User generated content **12K** ↗ 662%
Social media mentions **12K** ↗ 660%	Non-Social media mentions **14K** ↗ 598%	Social media reactions (e.g. likes) **5.7M** ↗ 2192%
Social media comments **498K** ↗ 1529%	Social media shares **320K** ↗ 2812%	Total social media interactions **6.5M** ↗ 2145%

Mentions by categories



Sentiment by categories



Sentiment breakdown





15 Oct 2026 - 14 Nov 2026 (31 days)

Mentions & Reach



Sentiment



15 Oct 2026 - 14 Nov 2026 (31 days)

Sentiment by Categories



Mentions by Categories



15 Oct 2026 - 14 Nov 2026 (31 days)

Most Active Sites

Site	Mentions
youtube.com	6.6 K
bsky.app	2.7 K
x.com	1.9 K
facebook.com	1.3 K
tiktok.com	652

Most influential sites

Site	Mentions	Reach	Influence score
youtube.com	6.6 K	67 M	10
facebook.com	1.3 K	163 M	10
x.com	1.9 K	3.9 M	10
reddit.com	1	15 K	10
tiktok.com	652	15 M	10

Hours of Activity



Analysis

15 Oct 2026 - 14 Nov 2026 (31 days)

Analysis Summary

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

30K
MENTIONS
+8,665% vs prior period

30.21%
NEGATIVE SHARE
9.0K negative mentions

3.88%
POSITIVE SHARE
1.2K positive mentions

7.8x
NEG. / POS. RATIO
negative vs positive mentions

1. Visibility surged, while negative sentiment increased

The current period recorded about 30K mentions versus 339 previously. Negative sentiment rose from 22.42% to 30.21% (+8 percentage points), while positive sentiment increased from 1.77% to 3.88% (+2 points). Neutral content still made up the majority, but the expanded attention included a substantially larger negative component.

2. Conversation mix

News + video accounted for about 68% of mentions.



News 46% | **Videos 22%** | **Other Socials 10%** | **X 6%**

Web 6% | Facebook 5% | TikTok 2% | Blogs 1%

3. Platform dynamics

YouTube	6.6K mentions / 67M reach
Facebook	1.3K mentions / 163M reach
X	1.9K mentions / 3.9M reach
TikTok	652 mentions / 15M reach

4. The surge was concentrated around early November

Daily mentions averaged 959 in the current period and reached a maximum of 4,485; the previous period averaged 11 and peaked at 219. Daily reach averaged about 11M and peaked at 58M, compared with a 50K average and 1.1M maximum previously. The charts show the sharpest escalation around the beginning of November.

Bottom line

Jeffries became dramatically more visible during this 31-day window, and the additional attention was not simply more exposure: the negative share of the conversation also increased. News and video generated most of the mention volume, while Facebook produced the largest reach among the listed social platforms. 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.

Hakeem Jeffries gained 625% more mentions in the last 2 weeks

TOTAL MENTIONS
26K ↑ 625%

TOTAL REACH
315M ↑ 935%

SENTIMENT



4% Positive
65% Neutral
31% Negative

TOP INFLUENCERS

- BBC News facebook.com
- CNN facebook.com
- Fox News facebook.com
- NTD Television facebook.com
- VT facebook.com

MOST ACTIVE SITES



PRESENCE SCORE



Higher than 82% of brands

MOST POPULAR MENTIONS



Emotions share



Context of a discussion

Hide sentiment



Period Comparison

15 Oct 2026 - 14 Nov 2026 (31 days)

Overview

	Hakeem Jeffries 2026-10-15 - 2026-11-14	Previous period 2026-09-14 - 2026-10-14
Total mentions	30 K +8665%	339
Social media mentions	14 K +11904%	113
Non-Social media mentions	16 K +7046%	226
Positive mentions	3.88% (1.2 K) +2 p.p.	1.77% (6)
Negative mentions	30.21% (9.0 K) +8 p.p.	22.42% (76)
Social media reach	251 M +48688%	515 K
Non-Social media reach	94 M +8906%	1.0 M
Average Presence Score	50/100 +4900%	1/100
AVE	$ 30 M +14546%	$ 206 K
User generated content	14 K +12028%	116

15 Oct 2026 - 14 Nov 2026 (31 days)

Mentions



Reach



15 Oct 2026 - 14 Nov 2026 (31 days)

Positive sentiment



Negative sentiment



Hakeem Jeffries

15 Oct 2026 - 14 Nov 2026 (31 days)

Sentiment breakdown



Categories share



15 Oct 2026 - 14 Nov 2026 (31 days)

Top 10 Sources

Site	Mentions	Reach	Visits	Influence score
youtube.com	6.6 K	67 M	28 B	10
facebook.com	1.3 K	163 M	11 B	10
x.com	1.9 K	3.9 M	4.2 B	10
reddit.com	1	15 K	4.0 B	10
tiktok.com	652	15 M	3.0 B	10
yahoo.com	24	360 K	2.7 B	10
linkedin.com	2	0	1.9 B	10
twitch.tv	20	7.3 K	983 M	10
t.me	42	630 K	768 M	10
nytimes.com	9	1.3 M	640 M	10

4 Nov 2026 - 13 Nov 2026 (10 days)

Threads

Instagram Threads Posts

Posts and Comment Sentiment Analysis

Hakeem Jeffries

Alex Ayvazian

Alex.Ayvazian@outlook.com



Hakeem Jeffries Threads Sentiment Analysis

November 4-13, 2026 | Leadership preferences, target-specific feelings and recurring language

The captured discussion is predominantly critical of Jeffries. Replacement preferences are associated with responsiveness, Israel/AIPAC/Gaza, alternative leadership, establishment/change concerns, donor influence and use of institutional power. Feelings directed at other figures are kept separate.

ELIGIBLE CAPTURE

1,844 distinct text records

3 source exports

ANALYTICAL SAMPLE

450 sampled records

402 visible handles

STATED LEADERSHIP CHOICES

178 established preferences

272 without an established choice

Leadership preference

14/450 records (3.1%) support or retain Jeffries; 161/450 (35.8%) oppose or replace him. Among established choices, 90.4% favor replacement.

Personal evaluation

13/450 records (2.9%) express a positive evaluation; 256/450 (56.9%) express a negative evaluation. Among evaluative texts, 4.8% are positive and 94.1% are negative.

Scope

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

Stated preferences for the leadership role

Pie base: 178 records expressing support, opposition or conditional acceptance. Table base: all 450 sampled records.



- Support / retain — **14/178 | 7.9%**
- Oppose / replace — **161/178 | 90.4%**
- Conditional / either acceptable — **3/178 | 1.7%**

PREFERENCE	RECORDS	ALL SAMPLE	STATED CHOICES
Support / retain	14	3.1%	7.9%
Oppose / replace	161	35.8%	90.4%
Conditional / either acceptable	3	0.7%	1.7%
Not established	272	60.4%	Outside pie

Preference is separate from personal evaluation

A person can express a leadership choice without offering personal praise or criticism. Conversely, a critical or appreciative comment may leave the preferred officeholder unstated. News reporting, quoted endorsements and predictions are not automatically author preferences.

Support entries involve 14 visible handles; opposition entries involve 142. Handles are not verified individual people.

Evaluation of Hakeem Jeffries

Author evaluation of the named politician. All-sample base: 450; evaluative-record base: 272.



- Positive — 13/272 | 4.8%
- Negative — 256/272 | 94.1%
- Mixed — 3/272 | 1.1%

EVALUATION	RECORDS	ALL SAMPLE	EVALUATIVE RECORDS
Positive	13	2.9%	4.8%
Negative	256	56.9%	94.1%
Mixed	3	0.7%	1.1%
Not established	178	39.6%	Outside pie

What the distribution captures

An evaluative statement concerns the author's view of the politician. A short nomination can establish a leadership preference while supplying no personal assessment. Criticism of another politician, support for a policy, and a report of someone else's endorsement are not interchangeable with evaluation of this target.

Unestablished evaluation

This group includes factual reporting, generic nominations, quoted statements, missing context and posts without a clear author judgment. It is kept outside the evaluative pie and does not imply approval or acceptance.

Feelings expressed about Jeffries

Base: all 450 sampled records. Only feelings directed toward Jeffries, his conduct, agenda, suitability or leadership candidacy are counted. Categories overlap.



Attribution matters

The most frequent target-directed feelings are distrust / betrayal (115/450), anger / frustration (113/450) and contempt / ridicule (52/450). Feelings about supporters, opponents, alternative candidates or the broader party are excluded unless the text also directs that feeling toward Jeffries.

Mixed-target records

Records previously coded as involving multiple emotional targets were re-read. Only the portion attributable to the central politician enters these counts. Determined calls to act are kept separate from feelings.

Reasons cited for replacement

Base: 161 records expressing the dominant leadership preference. Counts require a reason attributable to Jeffries, his record, conduct, policy position or expected leadership. Reasons overlap.



Target-specific rule

Reasons describe an argument about Jeffries or his continued leadership. Praise or criticism directed only at a different politician is not imported into this chart. Mentioning an alternative can establish a leadership preference without supplying a reason about Jeffries.

Target-directed feelings accompanying recurring reasons

Each row uses records carrying that target-specific reason as its base. Only feelings directed toward Jeffries enter the columns. Emotions overlap.

REASON-SPECIFIC BASE	Distrust / betrayal	Anger / frustration	Contempt / ridicule
Voice, coercion and responsiveness / n=50	21/50 I 42.0%	23/50 I 46.0%	3/50 I 6.0%
Israel / AIPAC / Gaza / n=36	24/36 I 66.7%	18/36 I 50.0%	3/36 I 8.3%
Better alternative / job fit / n=33	9/33 I 27.3%	7/33 I 21.2%	6/33 I 18.2%
Establishment / change mandate / n=32	14/32 I 43.8%	13/32 I 40.6%	2/32 I 6.2%
Corporate and donor influence / n=30	28/30 I 93.3%	18/30 I 60.0%	2/30 I 6.7%
Weakness / accommodation / n=24	12/24 I 50.0%	19/24 I 79.2%	4/24 I 16.7%

Different dimensions

A reason can appear without a strong feeling, and a feeling can appear without a detailed reason. The co-occurrence table records what appears together in the text; it does not establish causation or imply that every person expressing that reason shares the same emotion.

No cross-target transfer

Anger, hope, distrust or admiration directed at another politician is not assigned to Jeffries. This corrects the broader discussion-wide emotion model used in the earlier version of this report.

07 / COMBINED REASONS

Jeffries reasons discussed together

PAIRED TARGET-SPECIFIC REASONS	RECORDS	SHARE
Establishment / change mandate + Voice, coercion and responsiveness	18	11.2%
Corporate and donor influence + Israel / AIPAC / Gaza	10	6.2%
Israel / AIPAC / Gaza + Voice, coercion and responsiveness	10	6.2%
Establishment / change mandate + Israel / AIPAC / Gaza	10	6.2%
Corporate and donor influence + Weakness / accommodation	9	5.6%

How the arguments fit together

These combinations show which standards are articulated together in the same record. They can connect responsiveness, policy, independence, competence, change or the use of institutional power without treating several themes in one post as several independent participants.

Interpretation

Co-occurrence describes the structure of the expressed argument. It does not establish that one concern caused another, that the claims are independently verified, or that every supporter or critic shares the same combination.

Responsiveness and constituent voice

This reason appears in 50/161 records (31.1%) within the dominant replacement preference.

"I don't understand Letitia James' comments about potential primary challengers to Hakeem Jeffries. You're free to support him. But calling people "drunk with power" simply for considering a challenge? Why not tell us why Jeffries deserves to stay? Make the case for his leadership, his record, his accomplishments. Instead, we get a warning about having to go through Tish James. Since when is asking voters to [...]"

T0346 | @thecounterpointhq | Nov 08, 2026 07:32 PM PST | TF3 row 123 | Open Threads record

Responsiveness

A recurring objection concerns the relationship between representatives and the people who elect them. Authors describe leadership as a position that should remain contestable, with committee assignments and policy decisions justified by public needs rather than personal loyalty.

"That Hakeem Jeffries doesn't feel duty bound to stack committees with the most qualified individuals is, all by itself, disqualifying. There should be absolutely no other criteria, especially not a fucking loyalty pledge"

T0470 | @stevenfoxbury | Nov 10, 2026 07:09 PM PST | TF3 row 9 | Open Threads record

Interpretation

Criticism of alleged pressure on challengers is connected with a wider demand for accountability. In this strand, the leadership choice is a test of whether dissent can influence party decisions. The posts do not independently establish that specific threats or disciplinary actions occurred.

Donor influence and independence

This reason appears in 30/161 records (18.6%) within the dominant replacement preference.

"@housedemocrats Ending ICE must be a top priority day 1. If Hakeem Jeffries has been compromised by his donors that are part of this machinery (like Palantir) then Hakeem Jeffries is not fit for Speaker. It's simple. Find someone that is willing to work for the people and not corporate interests."

T0796 | @apaintjournal | Nov 13, 2026 07:53 AM PST | TF3 row 282 | Open Threads record

Donor influence

The financial argument links perceived donor influence with expectations about policy and oversight. Healthcare companies, AIPAC and alleged private contacts appear as examples of relationships authors believe require scrutiny.

"I have not trusted Hakeem Jeffries for a lot of reasons since he took over, mostly because he's so ineffectual, but the Kushner meeting is disqualifying to me. I can't trust that. He should not be Speaker."

T0108 | @marigoldsky22 | Nov 04, 2026 07:44 AM PST | TF3 row 184 | Open Threads record

Interpretation

Two claims recur: that leadership priorities do not match the public interests authors describe, and that financial or private relationships help explain the mismatch. The capture establishes that these concerns are expressed; it does not establish a donation-to-decision causal chain or wrongdoing.

Healthcare and the legislative agenda

This reason appears in 16/161 records (9.9%) within the dominant replacement preference.

""We're gonna work to extend the affordable health care tax credits" is just fancy language for saying "we're gonna give your tax dollars to big insurance companies instead of working towards a universal healthcare system" Hakeem Jeffries is the wrong person for the job of Speaker, he doesn't work for the people. He works for his corporate donors."

T1632 | @saschabarros | Nov 13, 2026 04:58 PM PST | TF1 row 302 | Open Threads record

Healthcare

Healthcare criticism is often specific. Authors compare Medicare for All with subsidies or incremental insurance reform and connect the leadership choice with which proposals receive a vote. Some discuss insurance costs as an immediate household burden.

"Another major concern I have with Hakeem Jeffries is that he doesn't support Medicare for All. People across SC-06 are struggling to afford healthcare, medications, and basic necessities. I know that struggle firsthand. I nearly lost my life because I couldn't afford care. Medicare for All could be life-changing for families across this district, and I want leadership that recognizes the urgency of [...]"

T1673 | @kylehaiglerforcongress | Nov 13, 2026 05:22 PM PST | TF1 row 267 | Open Threads record

Interpretation

The objection is therefore about agenda-setting as well as policy preference. A leader who declines to advance a proposal can be seen as an obstacle even by authors who otherwise support the party. Statements about future scheduling, commitments or bill passage remain claims and expectations within the capture.

Confrontation and accountability

This reason appears in 24/161 records (14.9%) within the dominant replacement preference.

"WHO TF told Hakeem Jeffries "The American people don't want to get even"? ACCOUNTABILITY AND AFFORDABILITY we want BOTH!"

T0171 | @xlcomedyshow | Nov 05, 2026 03:56 AM PST | TF3 row 635 | Open Threads record

Confrontation

Requests for a fighter or a stronger response to Republicans concern the use of power. Authors frequently combine affordability with investigations, enforcement and accountability rather than treating them as competing priorities.

"Hakeem Jeffries went on MSNOW's Morning Joe. In response to the host's leading (and stupid) question, Jeffries said that the House will focus on affordability and not retribution or revenge. He is pretending that holding people accountable for corruption and law-breaking is revenge. It is not. Jeffries cannot become Speaker. Contact your rep and tell them not to choose Jeffries as House Speaker."

T0119 | @jodhansen | Nov 04, 2026 10:00 AM PST | TF3 row 691 | Open Threads record

Interpretation

The criticism interprets restraint as accommodation or inadequate urgency. Other entries raise the constraints of congressional leadership and the need to hold a broad coalition together. These arguments concern strategy and judgment; forceful language alone does not demonstrate future effectiveness.

Representation and leadership standards

This reason appears in 6/161 records (3.7%) within the dominant replacement preference.

"There are people legit trying to make wanting Jeffries and Schumer out about Jeffries being Black and Schumer being Jewish. Well I'm BOTH, and I want them OUT."

T0168 | @angryblacklady | Nov 04, 2026 10:49 PM PST | TF3 row 508 | Open Threads record

Representation

Representation is important to participants on more than one side of the debate. Some value the prospect of a Black Speaker; others name Pressley while disputing the claim that opposition to Jeffries must be opposition to Black leadership.

"The Democrats in Congress who were just elected come from all points along the Democratic side of the political spectrum. And Hakeem Jeffries helped get many of them get elected. Jeffries has never served as Speaker. Now is the time we give him a chance to fulfill that role."

T1580 | @dan_kalb | Nov 13, 2026 04:15 PM PST | TF1 row 350 | Open Threads record

Interpretation

These arguments also invoke competence, trust, ideology and the ability to represent a diverse caucus. A candidate name or an identity-based rebuttal cannot establish the motives of every participant. The observed discussion includes both recognition of representation and disagreement over what else the role requires.

Contact, petitions and continued political pressure

Base: 248 leadership-focused records. Counts cover author advocacy or self-reported activity; categories overlap.



Forms of participation

Authors describe phone calls, emails, office visits, petitions, sharing and electoral consequences. Some invoke earlier votes, donations or campaigning as reasons they expect an explanation of a representative's leadership choice. Others offer scripts or encouragement to reduce the practical burden of taking part.

From preference to action

The participation language connects an expressed view with a proposed route for influencing officials. Reports of completed calls, office responses, signatures and donations are not independently confirmed. Repeated messages measure visible activity, not verified turnout or the number of people persuaded.

Other judgments in the capture

Explicit support/retention preference: 14/450 sampled records (3.1%). The discussion also includes views without an established preference.

"Found myself in the extremely odd position of defending Hakeem Jeffries today. I'm not really a fan, but Hakeem Jeffries is not the speaker of the house yet and is not responsible for how the vote on the impeachment of Pete Hegseth was handled. Some of y'all really need to read up on how the transition between parties is handled after elections. Hakeem Jeffries will not be the speaker, if he is [...]"

T0505 | @witchsgardencrafts | Nov 11, 2026 02:07 PM PST | TF3 row 626 | Open Threads record

Competing considerations

Supportive and defensive entries emphasize institutional experience, coalition management, representation and the practical constraints of a narrow majority. Some challenge the fairness or accuracy of particular attacks without endorsing Jeffries for Speaker. Those defenses are distinct from explicit support/retention preferences.

"The Democrats in Congress who were just elected come from all points along the Democratic side of the political spectrum. And Hakeem Jeffries helped get many of them get elected. Jeffries has never served as Speaker. Now is the time we give him a chance to fulfill that role."

T1580 | @dan_kalb | Nov 13, 2026 04:15 PM PST | TF1 row 350 | Open Threads record

Personal evaluation and officeholding

A record may appreciate a politician while preferring another role or leader. A defense of fairness can also stop short of an endorsement. These positions remain distinct in the sentiment and preference tables.

Reported developments and competing interpretations

"My issue with Jeffries over Pressley as Speaker is simple: Jeffries protects establishment power. Pressley challenges it. Democrats celebrate Black representation, but are they equally willing to elevate Black leaders who challenge corporate influence, militarism, and the status quo?"

T1129 | @hipstergenius412 | Nov 13, 2026 11:56 AM PST | TF3 row 890 | Open Threads record

State of the discussion

The alternative-leadership discussion includes Pressley and other names, but rejecting Jeffries does not identify a single agreed replacement. Some entries name a preferred successor; others ask for an open contest or describe general leadership standards. Predictions about caucus votes and claims about private commitments do not establish the authors' own preferences or a verified vote count.

"@thedemocrats We voted for change, not more of the same! We need new leadership, not another round of Chuck Schumer and Hakeem Jeffries. Our elected officials need to understand that they work for the people, not their donors or their own political interests. And let's be clear: If you vote to keep the same leadership despite your constituents demanding change, don't [...]"

T1394 | @justchantelibra | Nov 13, 2026 02:07 PM PST | TF1 row 540 | Open Threads record

Statements about private intentions, caucus commitments, procedures, vote counts or negotiations are attributed to the captured texts. The analysis does not establish a live candidacy decision or a verified whip count.

Sensitivity to repeated text and active accounts

SAMPLE TREATMENT	BASE	SUPPORT / RETAIN	OPPOSE / REPLACE
All sampled records	450	14 I 3.1%	161 I 35.8%
One per exact text	440	14 I 3.2%	153 I 34.8%
Earliest sampled per handle	402	14 I 3.5%	139 I 34.6%

CAPTURE MEASURE	OBSERVED
Visible handles	1,384 across 1,844 records
Extra identical-text records	44 I 2.4%
Most active visible handle	@americanopposition I 19 records

Direction and concentration

The reductions show how the distribution changes when repeated wording or multiple sampled entries from one handle are reduced. They are sensitivity checks rather than representative person-level estimates. Different accounts can belong to the same person; one account can express more than one view.

Visible amplification

Templates, repeated names and shared scripts are part of the captured activity. Their presence does not establish automation, deceptive coordination, account ownership or a causal effect on officials.

When the captured records were posted

Eligible records by America/Los_Angeles date. Capture window: November 4-13, 2026.



The two largest dates in the capture are November 13 (1,217 records), November 12 (190 records).

Collection pattern

The date distribution describes these exports. Unequal collection, overlapping queries and changes in visibility can affect the apparent concentration. Without complete and comparable daily capture, the pattern does not establish platform-wide growth or a change in population sentiment over time.

Interactions attached to the captured records

EXPORTED RECORD	LIKES	AUTHOR HANDLE
T0815	51,642	@kevonstage
T0257	40,067	@reprobertgarcia
T0752	37,879	@cristinstogram
T0827	36,771	@aubrey.mayne
T0672	36,456	@randomblueseyes
T0723	35,718	@qtilman

Different content attracts interaction

Highly liked records can be news, commentary, an endorsement, a policy claim or a prompt to share. Their interaction totals are not interchangeable with the number of people supporting a leadership candidate. They are not used as weights in the sentiment or preference percentages.

Snapshot limitations

Counts reflect the saved export, not verified live totals. Views are not usable as an exposure denominator in these files. Media accompany 301 eligible records, but their visual or audiovisual content was not inspected. The analysis uses the exported text.

What the discussion says about Jeffries

Strength and nature of the stated preference

161/450 sampled records express the dominant replacement preference, or 90.4% of records that establish a leadership choice. Unassigned choices are not treated as support for the status quo.

Substantive expectations and objections

The leading target-specific reasons are voice, coercion and responsiveness (50), israel / aipac / gaza (36), better alternative / job fit (33), establishment / change mandate (32), corporate and donor influence (30). These categories describe the reasons authors actually attach to Jeffries or his leadership, rather than importing criticism or praise aimed only at somebody else.

Target-directed emotion

The most frequent attributable feelings are distrust / betrayal (115/450), anger / frustration (113/450), contempt / ridicule (52/450). This is narrower than the earlier discussion-wide emotion measure because feelings aimed at other politicians, supporters, opponents or the party are separated.

Practical meaning

The capture documents expressed leadership preferences, target-specific judgments, recurring language and visible political participation. It does not establish a representative electorate-wide mandate, unique-person count, verified whip count or causal effect on officeholders.

Recurring words in Jeffries-focused passages

Base: 1,139 eligible records with qualifying passages. A word counts once per record; common function words, the target's own name and profanity are excluded from the displayed words.



What these words capture

The word counts describe recurring language in passages centered on the target without one of the three separately analyzed politicians. They are not additional sentiment counts: the same word can appear in praise, criticism, reporting, organizing or a question.

Repetition

Each word counts at most once per record. Repeated templates can therefore raise visible record frequency, but they do not prove coordination or the number of independent people using the language.

Recurring phrases and their context

Qualifying-record base: 1,139; distinct extracted-passage base: 1,078. Counts are once per feature in each record. Rows overlap; nested phrases are not added together.

NORMALIZED PHRASE	RECORDS	DISTINCT TEXTS
speaker of the house	90	89
support jeffries	48	45
jeffries for speaker	32	30
want jeffries	29	27
supporting jeffries	24	23
jeffries as speaker	19	19
house speaker	25	25
minority leader	14	13
next speaker	14	14
not support jeffries	11	10
vote for jeffries	11	11
do not want jeffries	10	8

Read polarity in context

A phrase such as 'support', 'want', 'not support' or 'needs to' can appear in several grammatical contexts. Phrase frequency does not itself establish stance. The target name is normalized, URLs and unrelated handles are removed, and profanity is excluded from displayed phrases.

Sensitivity to repeated wording

The distinct-text column collapses identical normalized target-focused passages, helping separate broad recurrence from repeated templates or copied language.

Chuck Schumer mentions

Source: Jeffries's exports only. These are incidental mentions in that corpus, rather than an independent sample about Chuck Schumer.

TEXT-MENTION MEASURE	RECORDS	SHARE OF BASE
Eligible captured texts	442	24.0% of 1,844
Sampled texts	112	24.9% of 450

Why the name appears

Schumer frequently appears beside Jeffries in joint leadership criticism, party-direction arguments and paired calls for replacement. Joint wording is interpreted by target; a statement can criticize both, one, or neither personally.

"Chuck Schumer and Hakeem Jeffries need to step aside."

T0826 | @terrypecora | 2026-11-13 | source row 29 Open Threads record

Separate target, separate interpretation

The excerpt is coded according to what it says about Jeffries. Language aimed at Chuck Schumer remains attached to Chuck Schumer; a paired name, contrast or slogan is not enough to transfer the feeling.

"I don’t trust anyone who supports Schumer or Jeffries at this point."

T0440 | @lazersly | 2026-11-10 | source row 374 Open Threads record

Ayanna Pressley mentions

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

TEXT-MENTION MEASURE	RECORDS	SHARE OF BASE
Eligible captured texts	185	10.0% of 1,844
Sampled texts	37	8.2% of 450

Why the name appears

Pressley appears in paired House/Senate leadership slogans, successor discussions and cross-chamber organizing. Her presence does not convert a House leadership preference into a judgment about Jeffries unless the record separately states one.

"■WE DO NOT WANT HAKEEM JEFFRIES ■■ WE WANT @repayannapressley AS HOUSE SPEAKER ■"

T1286 | @speakingmytruth1111 | 2026-11-13 | source row 649 Open Threads record

Separate target, separate interpretation

The excerpt is coded according to what it says about Jeffries. Language aimed at Ayanna Pressley remains attached to Ayanna Pressley; a paired name, contrast or slogan is not enough to transfer the feeling.

"To everyone saying “people are just against Jeffries as speaker because he’s Black”. No, darlings. No. Guess who people want instead? Ayanna Pressley."

T0479 | @angelwritessf | 2026-11-11 | source row 103 Open Threads record

Chris Van Hollen mentions

Source: Jeffries's exports only. These are incidental mentions in that corpus, rather than an independent sample about Chris Van Hollen.

TEXT-MENTION MEASURE	RECORDS	SHARE OF BASE
Eligible captured texts	93	5.0% of 1,844
Sampled texts	20	4.4% of 450

Why the name appears

Van Hollen appears in cross-chamber organizing and as a Senate leadership alternative. His candidacy, praise or criticism is kept analytically separate from the House leadership judgment about Jeffries.

"Hakeem Jeffries and Chuck Schumer have GOT TO GO! Chris Van Hollen has stepped up to challenge Schumer for Senate Majority Leader. Who will take on Jeffries? #ChuckSchumer #HakeemJeffries #ChrisVanHollen #BlueWave"

T1794 | @moedimanche | 2026-11-13 | source row 163 Open Threads record

Separate target, separate interpretation

The excerpt is coded according to what it says about Jeffries. Language aimed at Chris Van Hollen remains attached to Chris Van Hollen; a paired name, contrast or slogan is not enough to transfer the feeling.

"@repayannapressley @chrisvanhollen are our candidates, and we’re making it loud and clear. We don’t want neither one of you @senschumer @repjeffries. If you don’t want to end your political career, step aside now. We the American ppl have spoken and we want to be heard."

T0739 | @gilcela1 | 2026-11-13 | source row 900 Open Threads record

Preparation, selection and target attribution

DATA PROCESSING	RECORDS
Raw rows across source exports	2,611
Distinct post IDs	1,945
Repeated-ID copies removed	666
Outside the stated date window	86
Empty in-window text	15
Eligible text population	1,844
Analytical sample	450

Selection

One row is retained per post ID using the source report's deduplication rule. Distinct IDs with identical text remain separate in the principal counts. The analytical sample contains 450 records and retains the original sample selection (seed 2026111407). Dates use America/Los_Angeles.

Target attribution review

Sentiment remains target-specific. Emotion coding was revised so that only feelings about Jeffries, his conduct, agenda, suitability or leadership candidacy are counted. Mixed-target records were re-read; feelings aimed only at other politicians or the wider party are excluded.

Reasons and language

Reason charts require a target-specific reason. Recurring-language passages explicitly name the target and omit the three separately analyzed politicians; displayed words and phrases exclude profanity. All coding remains contextual AI interpretation by one coder without independent inter-coder validation.

Interpreting the reported measures

Independent dimensions

Author sentiment concerns the author's evaluation of Jeffries. Leadership preference concerns his holding the relevant role. Emotion concerns an expressed feeling directed toward him, his agenda, conduct, suitability or leadership candidacy. None automatically supplies the others.

Reasons and context

Reasons describe arguments about Jeffries or his expected leadership and can overlap. Comparison alone and criticism solely of another politician are excluded from the target-specific reason chart. A named alternative can establish a preference without establishing a separate evaluation.

Recurring language

A qualifying sentence or line explicitly names the target and does not name the three politicians in the separate mention analysis. URLs and unrelated handles are removed; target variants are normalized. Words and contiguous phrases count once per eligible record. Profanity is excluded from displayed language.

Separate mentions

Mention sections count recognized names and variants once per text. A mention does not establish endorsement, opposition or emotion. Examples are interpreted by grammatical target so that criticism or praise is not transferred across politicians.

Evidence boundaries

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

Percentages round to one decimal. Different collection windows and selection rules prevent treating cross-report percentages as directly comparable approval rati

Exports and record-level evidence

TF1 / 1,007 exported rows

01-threads_Hakeem_Jeffries_1794638931160.csv

TF2 / 604 exported rows

02-threads_Hakeem_Jeffries_1794638560256.csv

TF3 / 1,000 exported rows

03-threads_Hakeem_Jeffries_1794638062633.csv

EMBEDDED EVIDENCE FILE	CONTENTS
Hakeem_Jeffries_Threads_Record_Audit.csv	All distinct records, source locations and eligibility
Hakeem_Jeffries_Threads_Coding_Audit.csv	Sample records with revised target-specific emotion/reason fields
Hakeem_Jeffries_Threads_Methodology.json	Definitions, attribution rules, sampling and source hashes
Hakeem_Jeffries_Threads_Statistics.json	Computed revised report counts
Hakeem_Jeffries_Threads_Language_Audit.json	Word/phrase counts and qualifying passage records
Hakeem_Jeffries_Threads_Mentions_Audit.json	Per-politician mention counts and sample record IDs

Record references

Quotes reproduce the exported text with [...] marking shortening. Record labels identify the stable audit ID, visible handle, date and source row, with a link to the original Threads record where available. Illustrative quotations do not add records to percentage bases.

Revision scope

Only this target's listed Threads exports contribute to this report. The revision changes attribution and presentation logic; it does not pool YouTube, X or another politician's dataset into the target's sample. Analysis date: November 17, 2026.