

Topic 4 · Part II: Policy Documents

From Documents to Analysis

Tone, change over time, and evidence-based synthesis — with citations.

Tone

Score

Track

Synthesize

Roumen Vesselinov, PhD **Roumen@jhu.edu**

Measure the tone · track the change · cite every claim · check it yourself

WHAT THIS TOPIC COVERS

Going deeper than summary

Topic 3 found the facts. Topic 4 measures and interprets them.

- **Tone & sentiment** — positive/negative, and hawkish vs. dovish for policy text.
- **A transparent score** — a word-count tone proxy you can audit by hand.
- **Change over time** — how stance and language shift across dated documents.
- **Synthesis with citations** — a one-page evidence-based picture, every fact sourced.
- **A claim checklist** — the artifact that lets every statement be traced.

KEEP IT ON THE WHOLE SESSION

The citation rule

“Every claim must cite the document and include a short exact quote”

— If the documents do not support a claim, say so instead of guessing.

Read the tone of a single document

Two scales

- **Overall tone:** very negative → negative → neutral → positive → very positive.
- **Policy tone** (central-bank text): **hawkish** (toward higher rates) vs. **dovish** (toward support).
- Use '**not applicable**' when a scale does not fit the document.

Evidence, not vibes

- Justify **both labels** with three short exact quotes.
- The quotes are the signal words: 'elevated', 'attentive to risks', 'solid pace', 'uncertainty'.
- A tone label with no quotes is an opinion — reject it.

The vocabulary of hawkish vs. dovish

Hawkish / tightening	Dovish / easing
inflation, elevated, price pressures	slowdown, weak, soft
overheating, tighten	downside risks, headwinds
attentive to risks, vigilant	support, accommodation
restrictive, firm	cut, ease, stimulus

Small wording choices carry the signal — that is what the score below counts.

A transparent tone score

- Count **hawkish / negative-for-easing** words (inflation, elevated, tighten, attentive to risks).
- Count **dovish / supportive-of-easing** words (slowdown, weak, downside risks, support, ease).
- Report **both counts, the word lists, and a net score** (hawkish minus dovish).
- State plainly: this is a **simple word-count proxy**, not a sophisticated model — and show the lists so it can be audited.
- Then test sensitivity: add or remove words and re-run to see how much the score moves.

Order the documents, then read the trend

Document	Date / source	Tone	Policy stance	Key quote
Doc1	...	...	...	" ... "
Doc2	...	...	...	" ... "
Doc3	...	...	...	" ... "

Use the dates inside the documents. Then: is tone getting more hawkish or more dovish?

How did the wording change?

- Compare the **earliest and latest** document in your set.
- Central banks and the IMF signal shifts by **changing a few words**.
- Present each change as: **[earlier phrase] → [later phrase] → what it signals**.
- Use **exact quotes** from each document; note important phrases that stayed the same.
- Do not speculate beyond what the wording supports.

A one-page, fully-cited picture

Structure it

- (1) Growth — (2) Inflation / prices
- (3) Policy direction — (4) Risks
- Where documents disagree, **present both sides with their quotes.**

Cite every fact

- Every factual sentence ends with a citation: (Doc2: “short quote”).
- Finish with '**Confidence & gaps**': what is well supported, what is thin, what is missing.
- No citation → not a finding yet.

The artifact a careful analyst keeps

Claim	Supporting quote(s)	Confidence
Claim 1	Doc?: “...”	high / med / low
Claim 2	Doc?: “...”	high / med / low
Claim 3	Doc?: “...”	high / med / low
Claim 4	Doc?: “...”	high / med / low
Claim 5	Doc?: “...”	high / med / low

Five most important claims — each with its quote, confidence, and one line of reasoning.

Pressure-test your own analysis

- **A tone label with no quotes is an opinion** — always demand the words that justify it.
- **Audit the word lists** for the score: are they fair? Add/remove words and re-run.
- **Check dates:** 'change over time' must use the dates inside the documents, not assumptions.
- **Trace two citations yourself.** If a quote is not in the document, discard the claim and re-prompt.

Teaching the model by example

Zero / one / few-shot

- **Zero-shot:** ask for a judgment with no examples.
- **One-shot:** give one past document + its actual outcome first.
- **Few-shot:** give several worked examples, then the new case.

Try it with the Fed set

- Use the **FOMC statements** on the Shot Learning page.
- Predict a rate decision, then **reveal the real outcome** to check.
- See how examples change the answer — and whether they help.

TAKE HOME

Interpretation is a claim — and claims need evidence

“If you can't quote it, you can't conclude it”

— Tone, trend, and synthesis are only as good as the quotes that back them.

Your workflow for Topic 4

1

Use the **same team** documents you used in Topic 3 (Doc1, Doc2, Doc3).

2

Open **Claude** in a new tab and upload them.

3

Work through **tone** → a **word-count score** → **change over time** → **synthesis**.

4

Enforce the **citation rule**: every claim cites a document and a quote.

5

Trace at least two citations back to the source yourself.