

# Contents

<b>List of Tables</b>	<b>ix</b>
<b>List of Figures</b>	<b>xiii</b>
<b>Acknowledgments</b>	<b>xvi</b>
<b>Contributors and Funding Sources</b>	<b>xviii</b>
<b>1 Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Political representation and responsiveness . . . . .	4
1.2 Civil society and political protest . . . . .	7
1.3 Overview of the dissertation . . . . .	11
1.3.1 Geographic representation and responsiveness to geographic constituents (Chapters 1 and 2) . . . . .	12
1.3.2 Inclusion of protesters' issues into the policy-making process (Chapter 4) . . . . .	14
1.3.3 Repression of protest and civil society's response (Chapter 5)	15
<b>2 Who represents the constituency? Online political communica- tion by members of parliament in the German mixed-member electoral system</b>	<b>17</b>
2.1 Introduction . . . . .	18
2.2 Theory . . . . .	19

2.2.1	MPs in mixed-member electoral systems and their differing representational focus . . . . .	19
2.2.2	Social media as a means for regional representation . . . . .	21
2.3	Research design . . . . .	24
2.3.1	Country selection and timeframe . . . . .	24
2.3.2	Social media data . . . . .	24
2.3.3	Analysis strategy . . . . .	26
2.4	Results . . . . .	27
2.5	Discussion and conclusion . . . . .	31
<b>3</b>	<b>Do competitive districts get more political attention? Strategic use of geographic representation during campaign and non-campaign periods</b>	<b>33</b>
3.1	Introduction . . . . .	34
3.2	Geographic representation during campaign and non-campaign periods . . . . .	36
3.3	Research design . . . . .	39
3.3.1	Case: The German mixed-member electoral system . . . . .	39
3.3.2	Dependent variable: Share of geographic representation on Twitter . . . . .	41
3.3.3	Independent variables and model . . . . .	44
3.4	Results . . . . .	45
3.4.1	Robustness tests . . . . .	51
3.5	Conclusion and implications . . . . .	53
<b>4</b>	<b>The impact of local protests on political elite communication: Evidence from <i>Fridays for Future</i> in Germany</b>	<b>56</b>
4.1	Introduction . . . . .	57
4.2	Theory . . . . .	60

4.2.1	Rhetorical responsiveness and dyadic representation . . . . .	60
4.2.2	Street protest as public opinion signal . . . . .	61
4.2.3	How politicians learn about protests in their districts . . . . .	61
4.2.4	The unique ‘Think Global, Act Local’ protest approach of the Climate Strike Movement . . . . .	63
4.2.5	Social media as a means to individualize political commu- nication . . . . .	64
4.3	Research design . . . . .	65
4.3.1	Case selection: Germany . . . . .	65
4.3.2	Data: Political communication on Facebook and in parlia- mentary speeches . . . . .	66
4.3.3	Method: Dictionary-based quantitative text analysis . . . . .	68
4.4	Results . . . . .	71
4.4.1	Rhetorical responsiveness to local protests events . . . . .	71
4.4.2	Validity tests . . . . .	78
4.4.3	Additional analyses . . . . .	79
4.5	Discussion and conclusion . . . . .	80
<b>5</b>	<b>Does repression provoke protest participation in liberal democ- racies? Evidence from the Spanish <i>Law on Citizen Security</i></b>	<b>83</b>
5.1	Introduction . . . . .	84
5.2	Legal Restrictions of civil liberties and protest activities . . . . .	86
5.2.1	Repression leads to less dissident behavior in non- democratic countries . . . . .	89
5.2.2	Backlash dynamics lead to rising numbers of protest partic- ipants in liberal democracies . . . . .	91
5.3	Research design . . . . .	93
5.3.1	Case selection and historical background: The Spanish <i>Law on Citizen Security</i> . . . . .	93

5.3.2	Synthetic Control Method, Data and Modelling Choices . . .	95
5.4	Results . . . . .	98
5.4.1	<i>Law on Citizen Security</i> had positive effects on the number of protest participants . . . . .	98
5.4.2	External validity . . . . .	101
5.5	Conclusion . . . . .	103
<b>6</b>	<b>Concluding remarks</b>	<b>105</b>
6.1	Contributions to the scientific community and policy-implications	106
6.2	Limitations and potential avenues for future research . . . . .	108
<b>A</b>	<b>Appendix to Chapter 2: Who represents the constituency?</b>	<b>111</b>
A.1	Time series of social media posts . . . . .	112
A.2	Operationalization of variables . . . . .	113
A.3	Descriptive statistics . . . . .	115
A.4	Candidacy and mandate mode effects . . . . .	116
A.5	Effect heterogeneity by gender . . . . .	118
A.6	Effect heterogeneity by party . . . . .	120
A.7	Additional regression models . . . . .	124
<b>B</b>	<b>Appendix to Chapter 3: Do competitive districts get more po- litical attention?</b>	<b>129</b>
B.1	Calculation example electoral marginality . . . . .	130
B.2	Descriptive statistics . . . . .	131
B.3	Robustness tests . . . . .	132
B.3.1	Longer campaign time . . . . .	132
B.3.2	Week until election as continuous variable . . . . .	134
B.3.3	Excluding outliers . . . . .	135
B.3.4	Triple interaction: Campaign period * Mandate mode * Electoral Marginality . . . . .	136

B.3.5	State-level elections on federal-level MPs . . . . .	138
-------	--	-----

<b>C</b>	<b>Appendix to Chapter 4: The impact of local protests on political elite communication</b>	<b>140</b>
C.1	Summary: The Climate Strike Movement in Germany . . . . .	141
C.2	Descriptive statistics . . . . .	143
C.3	Operationalization: Independent and control variables . . . . .	146
C.4	Main regression models . . . . .	152
C.5	Validity tests . . . . .	156
C.5.1	Models with party dummies instead of party ideology . . . . .	159
C.5.2	Models with clustered standard errors . . . . .	160
C.5.3	Models with excluding outlier MPs . . . . .	161
C.5.4	Models with logged dependent variable . . . . .	162
C.5.5	Models with protest events as binary variable . . . . .	163
C.5.6	Models with binary threshold: More than one protest event . . . . .	164
C.5.7	Models with protest events as factor variable . . . . .	165
C.5.8	Models excluding MPs without protest event in district . . . . .	166
C.5.9	Models with protest events as logged variable . . . . .	167
C.5.10	Models differentiating between short-term and mid-term effects . . . . .	168
C.5.11	Models with heterogeneous effects of protest and public opinion . . . . .	170
C.5.12	Models with heterogeneous effects of protest and issue ownership (environment) . . . . .	171
C.5.13	Models with protest and electoral (in)security interaction . . . . .	172
C.5.14	Models with partylist leader variable . . . . .	173
C.5.15	Models with poisson distribution . . . . .	174
C.5.16	Models with negative binomial distribution . . . . .	175
C.6	Additional analyses . . . . .	176

C.6.1	Twitter data . . . . .	178
C.6.2	Issue attention to the Climate Strike Movement and Environmental Policy (2017 – 2020) . . . . .	180
C.6.3	Sentiment analyses . . . . .	181
C.7	Dictionaries: Climate Strike Movement and Environmental Policy . . . . .	183
<b>D</b>	<b>Appendix to chapter 5: Does repression provoke protest participation in liberal democracies?</b>	<b>189</b>
D.1	Overview of covariates . . . . .	190
D.2	Weight tables protest participants . . . . .	193
D.3	MSPE plot . . . . .	195
D.4	Placebos-in-place test . . . . .	195
D.5	Results from unweighted values . . . . .	196
D.6	Results excluding regionalist protest . . . . .	197
D.7	Alternative specification with number of protest events as dependent variable . . . . .	198
D.7.1	Weight tables protest events . . . . .	199
D.7.2	MSPE plot protest events . . . . .	201
D.7.3	Placebo-in-place-test protest events . . . . .	201
D.7.4	Results from unweighted values protest events . . . . .	202
D.7.5	Results excluding regionalist protest . . . . .	203
D.8	General distribution of protest events and participants per month during 2000-2015 . . . . .	204
D.9	Further information on external validity . . . . .	205
	<b>Bibliography</b>	<b>209</b>