Minoritized citizens' perspectives on political representation

de Jong, J.C.

Publication date
2025

REFERENCES

Abou-Chadi, T., & Wagner, M. (2020). Electoral fortunes of social democratic parties: Do second dimension positions matter? *Journal of European Public Policy, 27*(2), 246–272.

Ackerly, B. A., & True, J. (2010). *Doing feminist research in political and social science*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Acolin, A., Bostic, R., & Painter, G. (2016). A field study of rental market discrimination across origins in France. *Journal of Urban Economics*, *95*, 49-63.

Aikins, M. A., Bremberger, T., Aikins, J. K., et al. (2021). *Afrozensus* (Report). German Center for Integration and Migration Research (Dezim) & Alice Salomon University of Applied Sciences.

Akachar, S. (2018). *Representation in the eye of the beholder: Flemish Muslim youth on (not) feeling politically represented* (Doctoral dissertation). Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Belgium.

Alba, R., & Foner, N. (2015). *Strangers no more: Immigration and the challenge of integration in North America and Western Europe*. Princeton University Press.

Amara-Hammou, K. (2023). *Theorizing representation from the perspective of the represented: How people in socio-economically difficult situations in Brussels understand representation* (Doctoral dissertation). Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Belgium.

Amer, A. (2020). Between recognition and mis/nonrecognition: Strategies of negotiating and performing identities among White Muslims in the United Kingdom. Political Psychology, 41(3), 533–548.

André, A., & Depauw, S. (2017). The quality of representation and satisfaction with democracy: The consequences of citizen-elite policy and process congruence. Political Behavior, 39(2), 377–397.

Arendt, H. (1978). *The life of the mind*. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Arnold, C., & Franklin, M. N. (2012). Introduction: Issue congruence and political responsiveness. West European Politics, 35(6), 1217–1225.

Aydemir, N., & Vliegenthart, R. (2016). Minority representatives in the Netherlands: Supporting, silencing or suppressing? Parliamentary Affairs, 69(1), 73–92.

Azabar, S., Thijssen, P., & van Erkel, P. (2020). Is there such a thing as a Muslim vote? Electoral Studies, 66, 102164.

Bajpai, R. (2019). What do descriptive representatives describe? Minority representative claims and the limits of shape-shifting. *Ethnicities, 19*(5), 740–762.

Barbour, R. (2007). *Doing focus groups*. SAGE Publications.

Barbour, R., & Kitzinger, J. (1999). Developing focus group research: An introduction. In R. Barbour & J. Kitzinger (Eds.), *Developing focus group research: Politics, theory, and practice* (pp. 1–14). SAGE Publications.

Bassel, L., & Emejulu, A. (2010). Struggles for institutional space in France and the United Kingdom: Intersectionality and the politics of policy. *Politics and Gender, 6*(4), 517–544.

Bastedo, H. (2015). Not 'one of us': Understanding how non-engaged youth feel about politics and political leadership. *Journal of Youth Studies, 18*(5), 649–665.

Beaman, J. (2017). *Citizen Outsider: Children of North African Immigrants in France* (p. 168). University of California Press.

Begum, N. (2023). "The European family? Wouldn't that be the white people?": Brexit and British ethnic minority attitudes towards Europe. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, *46*(5), 1–23.

Bejarano, C., Brown, N. E., Gershon, S. A., & Montoya, C. (2021). Shared identities: Intersectionality, linked fate, and perceptions of political candidates. *Political Research Quarterly, 74*(4), 970–985.

hooks, bell. (1991). Essentialism and experience. *American Literary History, 3*, 172–183.

hooks, bell. (1981). Ain't I a woman? South End Press.

Bergh, J., & Bjørklund, T. (2011). The revival of group voting: Explaining the voting preferences of immigrants in Norway. *Political Studies, 59*(2), 308–327.

Bertossi, C., & Duyvendak, J. W. (2012). National models of immigrant integration: The costs for comparative research. *Comparative European Politics*, *10*(3), 237-247.

Bird, K. (2015). We are not an ethnic vote! Representational perspectives of minorities in the Greater Toronto Area. *Canadian Journal of Political Science, 48*(2), 249–279.

Bird, K. (2005). The political representation of visible minorities in electoral democracies: A comparison of France, Denmark, and Canada. *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics, 11*(4), 425–465.

Bird, K., Saalfeld, T., & Wüst, A. M. (2011). *The political representation of immigrants and minorities: Voters, parties and parliaments in liberal democracies*. Routledge/ECPR Series in European Political Science.

Bird, K., Saalfeld, T., & Wüst, A. M. (2010). Ethnic diversity, political participation, and representation: A theoretical framework. In *The political representation of immigrants and minorities: Voters, parties, and parliaments in liberal democracies* (pp. 1–21).

Bloemraad, I. (2013a). The promise and pitfalls of comparative research design in the study of migration. *Migration Studies, 1*(1), 27–46.

Bloemraad, I. (2013b). Accessing the corridors of power: Puzzles and pathways to understanding minority representation. *West European Politics, 36*(3), 652–670.

Bloemraad, I., & Schönwälder, K. (2013). Immigrant and ethnic minority representation in Europe: Conceptual challenges and theoretical approaches. *West European Politics, 36*(3), 564–579.

Bonilla-Silva, E. (1997). Rethinking racism: Toward a structural interpretation. *American Sociological Review, 62*(3), 465–480.

Bonjour, S., & Duyvendak, J. W. (2018). The "migrant with poor prospects": Racialized intersections of class and culture in Dutch civic integration debates. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 41*(5), 882–900.

Bonjour, S., & Lettinga, D. (2012). Political debates on Islamic headscarves and civic integration abroad in France and the Netherlands: What can models explain?. *Journal of Immigrant & Refugee Studies*, *10*(3), 260-278.

Bouras, N. (2012). *Het land van herkomst: Perspectieven op verbondenheid met Marokko*, 1960-2010 (Doctoral dissertation). Leiden University.

Bratton, K. A., & Ray, L. P. (2002). Descriptive representation, policy outcomes, and municipal day-care coverage in Norway. *American Journal of Political Science*, 46(2), 428–437.

Brear, M. (2018). Swazi co-researcher participants' dynamic preferences and motivations for, representation with real names and (English-language) pseudonyms – an ethnography. *Qualitative Research*, 18(6), 722–740.

Brito Vieira, M. (2020). Representing silence in politics. *American Political Science Review*, 114(4), 976–988.

Brown, N. E. (2014). Political participation of women of color: An intersectional analysis. *Journal of Women, Politics & Policy*, 35(4), 315–348.

Brown, N. E. (2014). *Sisters in the statehouse: Black women and legislative decision making*. Oxford University Press.

Brown, N. E., & Gershon, S. A. (2016). Intersectional presentations: An exploratory study of minority congresswomen's websites' biographies. *Du Bois Review*, 13(1), 85–108.

Brubaker, R. (2013). Categories of analysis and categories of practice: A note on the study of Muslims in European countries of immigration. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 36*(1), 1–18.

Butler, J. (2020). Performative acts and gender constitution: An essay in phenomenology and feminist theory. In *Feminist theory reader* (pp. 353-361). Routledge.

Butler, J. (2004). *Undoing gender*. Routledge.

Carbado, D. W., & Gulati, M. (2013). The intersectional fifth black woman. *Harvard Law Review, 127*(2), 527–540.

Cassese, E. C., Barnes, T. D., & Branton, R. P. (2015). Racializing gender: Public opinion at the intersection. *Politics & Gender, 11*(1), 1–26.

Celis, K. (2008). Substantive representation of women: The representation of women's interests and the impact of descriptive representation in the Belgian Parliament (1900–1979). *Social Politics*, 15(4), 4788.

Celis, K., & Childs, S. (2020). *Feminist democratic representation*. Oxford University Press.

Celis, K., & Childs, S. (2018). Conservatism and women's political representation. *Politics and Gender*, 14(1), 5–26.

Celis, K., & Childs, S. (2012). The substantive representation of women: What to do with conservative claims? *Political Studies*, 60(1), 213–225.

Celis, K., & Erzeel, S. (2015a). The complementarity advantage: Parties, representativeness and newcomers' access to power. *Parliamentary Affairs*, 70, 43–61.

Celis, K., & Erzeel, S. (2015b). Beyond the usual suspects: Non-left, male, and non-feminist MPs and the substantive representation of women. *Government and Opposition*, 50(1), 45–64.

Celis, K., Erzeel, S., Mügge, L., & Damstra, A. (2014). Quotas and intersectionality: Ethnicity and gender in candidate selection. *International Political Science Review, 35*(1), 41–54.

Celis, K., Erzeel, S., & Mügge, L. M. (2015). Intersectional puzzles: Understanding inclusion and equality in political recruitment. *Politics & Gender*, 11(4), 765–770.

Celis, K., & Mügge, L. M. (2018). Whose equality? Measuring group representation. *Politics*, 38(2), 197–213.

Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis*. SAGE.

Childs, S., & Krook, M. L. (2009). Analysing women's substantive representation: From critical mass to critical actors. *Government and Opposition*, 44(2), 125–145.

Childs, S., Webb, P., & Marthaler, S. (2010). Constituting and substantively representing women: Applying new approaches to a UK case study. *Politics & Gender*, 6(2), 199–223.

Chiu, L. F., & Knight, D. (1999). How useful are focus groups for obtaining the views of minority groups? In R. S. Barbour & J. Kitzinger (Eds.), *Developing focus group research: Politics, theory, and practice* (pp. 99–112). SAGE Publications.

Christoffersen, A., & Siow, O. (2024). There is no such thing as 'women's representation': Intersectionality and second-generation gender and politics scholarship. *European Journal of Politics and Gender, 1*(1), 1–22.

Collins, P. H. (1993). Black feminist thought in the matrix of domination. In C. Lemert (Ed.), *Social theory: The multicultural and classic readings* (pp. 615–625). Westview Press.

Collins, P. H. (1990). *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment*. Routledge.

Combahee River Collective. (1983). A Black feminist statement. In C. Moraga & G. Anzaldúa (Eds.), *This bridge called my back: Writings by radical women of color* (pp. 210–218). Kitchen Table: Women of Color Press.

Cowell-Meyers, K. (2017). The contagion effects of the feminist initiative in Sweden: Agenda-setting, niche parties, and mainstream parties. *Scandinavian Political Studies, 40*(4), 481–493.

Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory, and antiracist politics. *University of Chicago Legal Forum, 43*(6), 139–167.

Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Review, 43*(6), 1241–1299.

Dahl, R. A. (2006). *On political equality*. Yale University Press.

Dancygier, R. M. (2017). *Dilemmas of inclusion: Muslims in European politics*. Princeton University Press.

Danilova, N., & Kolpinskaya, E. (2020). The politics of heroes through the prism of popular heroism. *British Politics, 15*(2), 178–200.

Da Silva, C. (2021). *Le déni de reconnaissance de l'identité nationale des Français et Françaises d'origine maghrébine : double perspective socio-représentationnelle et socio-identitaire* [Doctoral dissertation, Université Paris Nanterre]. HAL.

Dawson, M. C. (1994). *Behind the mule*. Princeton University Press.

Degerman, D., & Bellazzi, F. (2024). Epistemic arguments for a democratic right to silence. *The Philosophical Quarterly, 0*(0), 1–22.

De Jong, J. C., & Mügge, L. M. (2023). Super politicians? Perspectives of minoritized citizens on representation. *Political Studies Review, 21*(3), 506–514.

De Jong, J. C., & Mügge, L. M. (2024). Political representation and intersectionality: Perspectives of ethnically/racially minoritized citizens. *Social Politics, 31*(1), 151–177.

Della Porta, D. (2005). Deliberation in movement: Why and how to study deliberative democracy and social movements. *Acta Politica, 40*(3), 336–350.

Den Ridder, J., Miltenburg, E., Steenvoorden, E., Van der Meer, T., & Dekker, P. (2020). *Burgerperspectieven 2020|2*. Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau.

De Mulder, A. (2023). Making sense of citizens' sense of being represented: A novel conceptualisation and measure of feeling represented. *Representation, 59*(4), 633–657.

Deterding, N. M., & Waters, M. C. (2021). Flexible coding of in-depth interviews: A twenty-first-century approach. *Sociological Methods and Research, 50*(2), 708–739.

De Vroome, T., Hooghe, M., & Marien, S. (2013). The origins of generalized and political trust among immigrant minorities and the majority population in the Netherlands. *European Sociological Review, 29*(6), 1336–1350.

Duchesne, S. (2017). Using focus groups to study the process of (de)politicization. In S. A. Barbour & A. Kitzinger (Eds.), A new era in focus group research: Challenges, innovation, and practice (pp. 365–387). Routledge.

Elrick, J., & Schwartzman, L. F. (2015). From statistical category to social category: Organized politics and official categorizations of 'persons with a migration background' in Germany. Ethnic and Racial Studies, 38(9), 1539–1556.

Emejulu, A. (2022). Ambivalence as misfeeling, ambivalence as refusal. *Post 45*.

Ersanilli, E., & Koopmans, R. (2010). Rewarding integration? Citizenship regulations and the socio-cultural integration of immigrants in the Netherlands, France and Germany. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, 36*(5), 773–791.

Ersanilli, E., & Koopmans, R. (2011). Do immigrant integration policies matter? A three-country comparison among Turkish immigrants. *West European Politics, 34*(2), 208–234.

European Commission. (2023). *Special Eurobarometer 535: Discrimination in the European Union*.

Evans, E., & Reher, S. (2023). Gender, disability and political representation: understanding the experiences of disabled women. *European Journal of Politics and Gender*, *1*(aop), 1-18.

Fraga, L. R., Martinez-Ebers, V., Lopez, L., Ramírez, R., & Reingold, B. (2008). Representing gender and ethnicity: Strategic intersectionality. In B. Reingold (Ed.), *Legislative women: Getting elected, getting ahead* (pp. 157–174). Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Geurts, N., Glas, S., Sipma, T., & Spierings, N. (2025). How do minoritized migrant-background citizens perceive their political representation? An intracategorical perspective. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 48*(2), 244–269.

Geurts, N., Davids, T., & Spierings, N. (2021). The lived experience of an integration paradox: Why high-skilled migrants from Turkey experience little national belonging in the Netherlands. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 47(1), 69–87.

Gilens, M. (2005). Inequality and democratic responsiveness. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, *69*(5), 778-796.

Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Aldine Publishing.

Goldberg, D. T. (2006). Racial Europeanization. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 29*(2), 331–364.

Golder, S. N., Stephenson, L. B., Van Der Straeten, K., Blais, A., Bol, D., Harfst, P., & Laslier, J. F. (2017). Votes for women: Electoral systems and support for female candidates. *Politics and Gender, 13*(1), 107–131.

Gray, S. W. D. (2023). Towards a democratic theory of silence. *Political Studies, 71*(3), 815–834.

Guasti, P., & Geissel, B. (2019). Saward's concept of the representative claim revisited: An empirical perspective. *Politics and Governance, 7*(3), 98–111.

Hall, S. (1989). Cultural identity and diaspora. In J. Rutherford (Ed.), *Identity: Community, culture, difference* (pp. 222–237). Lawrence & Wishart.

Hancock, A. M. (2007a). Intersectionality as a normative and empirical paradigm. *Politics & Gender, 3*(2), 248–254.

Hancock, A. M. (2007b). When multiplication doesn't equal quick addition: Examining intersectionality as a research paradigm. *Perspectives on Politics, 5*(1), 63–79.

Haraway, D. (2013). Situated knowledges: The science question in feminism and the privilege of partial perspective 1. In *Women, science, and technology* (pp. 455-472). Routledge.

Haraway, D. J. (1991). *A cyborg manifesto: Science, technology, and socialist-feminism in the late twentieth century.* In D. J. Haraway, *Simians, cyborgs, and women: The reinvention of nature* (pp. 149–181). Routledge.

Hardy-Fanta, C. (2011). *Intersectionality and politics: Recent research on gender, race, and political representation in the United States.* Routledge.

Hawkesworth, M. (2013). Sex, gender, and sexuality: From naturalized presumption to analytical categories. In G. Waylen, K. Celis, J. Kantola, & S. L. Weldon (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of gender and politics* (pp. 31–56). Oxford University Press.

Hennink, M. M. (2017). Cross-cultural focus group discussions. In A. M. R. Barbour & J. Kitzinger (Eds.), *A new era in focus group research* (pp. 59–82). Palgrave Macmillan.

Hochschild, A. (2016). *Strangers in their own land: Anger and mourning on the American right.* The New Press.

Hollander, J. A. (2004). The social contexts of focus groups. *Journal of contemporary ethnography*, *33*(5), 602-637.

Honneth, A. (1996). *The struggle for recognition: The moral grammar of social conflicts* (J. Anderson, Trans.). MIT Press.

Hopkins, N. (2011). Dual identities and their recognition: Minority group members' perspectives. *Political Psychology, 32*(2), 251–270.

Htun, M., & Weldon, S. (2018). *The logics of gender justice: State action on women's rights around the world.* Cambridge University Press.

Hughes, M. M. (2011). Intersectionality, quotas, and minority women's political representation worldwide. *American Political Science Review, 105*(3), 604–620.

Huijnk, W., & Andriessen, I. (2016). *Integratie in zicht? De integratie van migranten in Nederland op acht terreinen nader bekeken.* Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau.

Jackson, S. (2006). Heterosexuality, sexuality and gender: Re-thinking the intersections. In D. Richardson (Ed.), *Intersections between feminist and queer theory* (pp. 38–58). Palgrave Macmillan UK.

Janssen, C. (2021). Ethnicity, gender, and intersectionality: How context factors shape the intersectional (dis) advantage under proportional representation rules. *Politics, 48*(1), 67–80.

Joppke, C. (2007a). Beyond national models: Civic integration policies for immigrants in Western Europe. *West European Politics, 30*(1), 1–22.

Joppke, C. (2007b). Transformation of immigrant integration: Civic integration and antidiscrimination in the Netherlands, France, and Germany. *World Politics, 59*(2), 243–273.

Jordan-Zachery, J. (2013). Now you see me, now you don't: My political fight against the invisibility/erasure of Black women in intersectionality research. *Politics, Groups, and Identities, 1*(1), 101–109.

Kešić, J., & Duyvendak, J. W. (2019). The nation under threat: Secularist, racial and populist nativism in the Netherlands. *Patterns of Prejudice, 53*(5), 441–463.

Kitzinger, J. (1994). The methodology of focus groups: The importance of interaction between research participants. *Sociology of Health & Illness, 16*(1), 103–121.

Kitzinger, J., & Farquhar, C. (2011). The analytical potential of 'sensitive moments' in focus group discussions. In R. Barbour & J. Kitzinger (Eds.), *Developing Focus Group Research* (pp. 156–172). SAGE Publications.

Klarenbeek, L. M. (2021). Reconceptualising 'integration as a two-way process'. *Migration studies*, *9*(3), 902-921.

Koopmans, R., & Statham, P. (1999). Ethnic and civic conceptions of nationhood and the differential success of the extreme right in Germany and Italy. In M. G. Giugni, D. McAdam, & C. Tilly (Eds.), *How social movements matter* (pp. 225–251). University of Minnesota Press.

Korteweg, A. C., & Yurdakul, G. (2021). Liberal feminism and postcolonial difference: Debating headscarves in France, the Netherlands, and Germany. *Social Compass, 68*(3), 410–429.

Kranendonk, M. (2019). *I identify, therefore I participate: How social identification relates to political participation among Muslim immigrant-origin individuals in Western Europe* (Doctoral dissertation). University of Amsterdam.

Kranendonk, M., Vermeulen, F., & van Heelsum, A. (2018). "Unpacking" the identity-to-politics link: The effects of social identification on voting among Muslim immigrants in Western Europe. *Political Psychology, 39*(1), 43–67.

Kroeber, C. (2017). Growing numbers, growing influence? A comparative study of policy congruence between parliaments and citizens of immigrant origin. *European Journal of Political Research.*

Krook, M. L. (2009). *Quotas for women in politics: Gender and candidate selection reform worldwide.* Oxford University Press.

Krueger, R. A., & Casey, M. A. (2015). *Focus groups: A practical guide for applied research* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Lahman, M. K. E., Thomas, R., & Teman, E. D. (2023). A good name: Pseudonyms in research. *Qualitative Inquiry, 29*(6), 678–685.

Lee, T. (2008). Race, immigration, and the identity-to-politics link. *Annual Review of Political Science, 11*(1), 457–478.

Lobe, B. (2017). Best practices for synchronous online focus groups. In D. Barbour & R. Morgan (Eds.), *A new era in focus group research* (pp. 227–250). Palgrave Macmillan.

Lobe, B., Morgan, D., & Hoffman, K. A. (2020). Qualitative data collection in an era of social distancing. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 19*(July).

Lombardo, E., & Meier, P. (2014). *The symbolic representation of gender: A discursive approach*. Ashgate Publishing.

Lorde, A. (1984). *Sister outsider*. Crossing Press.

Loukili, S. (2020). Fighting fire with fire? "Muslim" political parties in the Netherlands countering right-wing populism in the city of Rotterdam. *Journal of Muslims in Europe, 9*(1), 21–42.

Lubbers, M., Otjes, S., & Spierings, N. (2023). What drives the propensity to vote for ethnic-minority-interest parties? *Acta Politica*, 59(3), 557–588.

Mansbridge, J. (1999a). Should Blacks represent Blacks and women represent women? A contingent "yes." *The Journal of Politics, 61*(3), 628–657.

Mansbridge, J., Professor, A., & Kennedy, J. E. (2003). Rethinking representation. *American Political Science Review, 97*(4).

Martin, N. S. (2021). How does the strength of the far right affect ethnic minority political behaviour? *Parliamentary Affairs*, 1–21.

Massey, D. S. (2007). *Categorically unequal: The American stratification system*. Russell Sage Foundation.

McCall, L. (2005c). The complexity of intersectionality. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 30(3), 771–800.

Mepschen, P., Duyvendak, J. W., & Tonkens, E. H. (2010). Sexual politics, orientalism, and multicultural citizenship in the Netherlands. *Sociology*, 44(6), 1041–1057.

Michon, L., & Tillie, J. (2010). Party choice among immigrants and visible minorities in comparative perspective: The Netherlands. In A. Bird, K. Saalfeld, T. Wüst (Eds.), T*he political representation of immigrants and minorities: Voters, parties and parliaments in liberal democracies* (pp. 33–36). Routledge.

Michon, L., & Vermeulen, F. (2013a). Explaining different trajectories in immigrant political integration: Moroccans and Turks in Amsterdam. *West European Politics*, 36(5), 773–796.

Monforte, P., & Morales, L. (2018). The participation, mobilization, and political representation of migrants in Europe. In A. W. Agnieszka, S. Bonjour, & Z. Lyubov (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of the Politics of Migration in Europe* (pp. 126–136). Routledge.

Monk, E. P. (2022). Inequality without groups: Contemporary theories of categories, intersectional typicality, and the disaggregation of difference. *Sociological Theory*, 40(1), 3–27.

Montoya, C. M., Bejarano, C., Brown, N. E., & Gershon, S. A. (2021). The intersectional dynamics of descriptive representation. *Politics & Gender*, 18(2), 483–512.

Morales, L., & Giugni, M. (2016). *Social capital, political participation and migration in Europe: Making multicultural democracy work?* Springer.

Morgan, D. L. (1996a). *Focus groups as qualitative research* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Morgan, D. L. (1996b). Focus groups. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 22(1), 129-152.

Morgan, D. L., & Lobe, B. (2015). Online focus groups. In D. L. Morgan & B. Lobe (Eds.), *The handbook of emergent technologies in social research* (pp. 199–230). Oxford University Press.

Mueller, J. E. (1970). Presidential popularity from Truman to Johnson. *American Political Science Review*, 64(1), 18–34.

Mügge, L. (2016). Intersectionality, recruitment, and selection: Ethnic minority candidates in Dutch parties. *Parliamentary Affairs*, 69(3), 512–530.

Mügge, L. M. (2013). In the mud puddle: The research diary as a method. In A. Van Heelsum & B. Garcés-Mascareñas (Eds.), *Migration and integration research: Filling in Penninx's heuristic model* (pp. 193–202). Amsterdam University Press.

Mügge, L. M., & Erzeel, S. (2016). Double jeopardy or multiple advantage? Intersectionality and political representation. *Parliamentary Affairs*, 69(3), 499–511.

Mügge, L., & van der Haar, M. (2016). Who is an immigrant and who requires integration? Categorizing in European policies. In B. Garcés-Mascareñas & R. Penninx (Eds.), Integration processes and policies in Europe: Contexts, levels and actors (pp. 77–90). Springer.

Mügge, L., Özvatan, Ö., & Jong, J. de. (2021). Vielfalt und Repräsentation. Die Rolle der ethnischen Herkunft in der Politik. *WZB Mitteilungen*, 173, 6–8.

Mügge, L., Runderkamp, Z., & Spierings, N. (2024). Descriptive representation of marginalized groups in Dutch politics. In S. de Lange, T. Louwerse, P. 't Hart, & C. van Ham (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Dutch Politics* (pp. 495–512). Oxford University Press.

Mügge, L. M., Van der Pas, D. J., & van de Wardt, M. (2019). Representing their own? Ethnic minority women in the Dutch Parliament. *West European Politics*, 42(4), 705–727.

Munday, J. (2006). Identity in focus: The use of focus groups to study the construction of collective identity. *Sociology*, 40(1), 89–105.

Murray, R. (2016). The political representation of ethnic minority women in France. *Parliamentary Affairs*, 69(3), 1–17.

National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. (2022). *Measuring sex, gender identity, and sexual orientation*. The National Academies Press.

Newman, P. A., Tepjan, S., & Rubincam, C. (2017). Exploring sex, HIV, and 'sensitive' space(s) among sexual and gender minority young adults in Thailand. In D. R. Barbour & M. Barbour (Eds.), *A new era in focus group research* (pp. 83–108). Palgrave Macmillan.

Noordzij, K., de Koster, W., & van der Waal, J. (2021). "They don't know what it's like to be at the bottom": Exploring the role of perceived cultural distance in less-educated citizens' discontent with politicians. *British Journal of Sociology*, 72(3), 566–579.

Norris, P., & Inglehart, R. (2001). Cultural obstacles to equal representation. *Journal of Democracy*, 12(3), 126–138.

Norris, P., & Lovenduski, J. (1995). *Political recruitment: Gender, race, and class in the British Parliament*. Cambridge University Press.

Norris, P., & Lovenduski, J. (1993). "If only more candidates came forward": Supply-side explanations of candidate selection in Britain. *British Journal of Political Science*, 23(3), 373–408.

Omi, M., & Winant, H. (2014). *Racial formation in the United States* (2nd ed.). Routledge.

Parent, M. C., DeBlaere, C., & Moradi, B. (2013). Approaches to research on intersectionality: Perspectives on gender, LGBT, and racial/ethnic identities. *Sex Roles*, 68(11–12), 639–645.

Peyton, K., Huber, G. A., & Coppock, A. (2022). The generalizability of online experiments conducted during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Journal of Experimental Political Science*, 9(3), 379–394.

Phillips, A. (2012). Representation and inclusion. *Politics & Gender*, 8(4), 512–518.

Phillips, A. (1995). *The politics of presence*. Oxford University Press.

Pitkin, H. F. (1967). *The concept of representation*. University of California Press.

Polletta, F., & Jasper, J. M. (2001). Collective identity and social movements. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 27, 283–305.

Powell, G. B. (2004). Political representation in comparative politics. *Annual Review of Political Science, 7*(1), 273–296.

Prins, J., van Stekelenburg, J., Polletta, F., & Klandermans, B. (2013). Telling the collective story? Moroccan-Dutch young adults' negotiation of a collective identity through storytelling. *Qualitative Sociology, 36*(1), 81–99.

Purdie-Vaughns, V., & Eibach, R. P. (2008). Intersectional invisibility: The distinctive advantages and disadvantages of multiple subordinate-group identities. *Sex Roles, 59*, 377–391.

Puwar, N. (2004). *Space invaders: Race, gender and bodies out of place*. Berg.

Quillian, L., Lee, J. J., & Oliver, M. (2020). Evidence from field experiments in hiring shows substantial additional racial discrimination after the callback. *Social Forces*, *99*(2), 732-759.

Ramos, M., Thijssen, L., & Coenders, M. (2021). Labour market discrimination against Moroccan minorities in the Netherlands and Spain: a cross-national and cross-regional comparison. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, *47*(6), 1261-1284.

Rehfeld, A. (2009). Representation rethought: On trustees, delegates, and gyroscopes in the study of political representation and democracy. *American Political Science Review, 103*(2), 214–230.

Rehfeld, A. (2011). The concepts of representation. *American Political Science Review, 105*(3), 631–641.

Reingold, B., Haynie, K. L., & Widner, K. (2020). *Race, gender, and political representation: Toward a more intersectional approach*. Oxford University Press.

Reingold, B., & Swers, M. (2011). An endogenous approach to women's interests: When interests are interesting in and of themselves. *Politics and Gender, 7*(3), 429–435.

Reisner, S. L., Randazzo, R. K., White Hughto, J. M., Peitzmeier, S., DuBois, L. Z., Pardee, D. J., Marrow, E., McLean, S., & Potter, J. (2018). Sensitive health topics with underserved patient populations: Methodological considerations for online focus group discussions. *Qualitative Health Research, 28*(10), 1658–1673.

Reynolds, A. (2013). Representation and rights: The impact of LGBT legislators in comparative perspective. *American Political Science Review, 107*(2).

Reynolds, A. (2019). *The children of Harvey Milk: How LGBTQ politicians changed the world*. Oxford University Press.

Richardson, D. (2015). Conceptualising gender. In V. Robinson & D. Richardson (Eds.), *Introducing gender and women's studies* (4th ed., pp. 3–22). Palgrave Macmillan.

Rivenbark, J. G., & Ichou, M. (2020). Discrimination in healthcare as a barrier to care: experiences of socially disadvantaged populations in France from a nationally representative survey. *BMC public health*, *20*(1), 31.

Ruedin, D. (2013). *Why aren't they there? The political representation of women, ethnic groups, and issue positions in legislatures*. ECPR Press.

Runciman, D. (2007). The paradox of political representation. *The Journal of Political Philosophy, 15*(1), 93–114.

Runderkamp, Z., Mügge, L., & Ihuoma, M. (2025). *Hyperzichtbaar in de schaduw van de macht: Politici met een migratieachtergrond in Nederland* (REPCHANCE Report). Universiteit van Amsterdam.

Runderkamp, Z., Van Der Pas, D., Schotel, A. L., & Mügge, L. (2022). Space invaders and norm-politicians: How the media represent the intersectional identities of members of parliament. *European Political Science Review, 14*(4), 566–582.

Ryan, C., Hopkins, N., Ahluwalia-McMeddes, A., Dobai, A., Pehrson, S., & Reicher, S. (2023a). On the misrecognition of identity: Muslims' everyday experiences in Scotland. *Political Psychology, 0*(0).

Sartre, J.-P. (1960). *Critique of dialectical reason*. Verso.

Saward, M. (2020). *Making representations: Claim, counterclaim and the politics of acting for others*. ECPR Press.

Saward, M. (2010). *The representative claim*. Oxford University Press.

Saward, M. (2006). The representative claim. *Contemporary Political Theory, 5*, 297–318.

Schildkraut, D. J. (2015). Latino attitudes about spheres of political representation. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 37*(3), 398–419.

Schildkraut, D. J. (2013a). The complicated constituency: A study of immigrant opinions about political representation. *Politics, Groups and Identities, 1*(1), 26–47.

Schildkraut, D. J. (2013b). Which birds of a feather flock together? Assessing attitudes about descriptive representation among Latinos and Asian Americans. *American Politics Research, 41*(4), 699–729.

Schinkel, W. (2018). Against 'immigrant integration': For an end to neocolonial knowledge production. *Comparative Migration Studies, 6*(1), 31.

Schmidtke, O. (2016). The 'party for immigrants'? Social democrats' struggle with an inconvenient electoral issue. *German Politics, 25*(3), 398–413.

Schönwälder, K. (2013). Immigrant representation in Germany's regional states: The puzzle of uneven dynamics. *West European Politics, 36*(3), 634–651.

Schotel, A. L. (2022). A rainbow Bundestag? An intersectional analysis of LGBTI representation in Angela Merkel's Germany. *German Politics, 31*(1), 101–118.

Schotel, A. L. (2023). Visible and vulnerable: The political representation of lesbian, gay, bisexual, trans and intersex (LGBTI) people in the Netherlands and Germany. PhD thesis, University of Amsterdam, the Netherlands.

Schouteden, A., & Wauters, B. (2016). Constituting 'the poor': A critical frame analysis of substantive claims. *Representation, 52*(2–3), 135–148.

Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau. (2024). *Is de politiek er voor iedereen?* Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau.

Severs, E., Celis, K., & Erzeel, S. (2016). Power, privilege and disadvantage: Intersectionality theory and political representation. *Politics, 36*(4), 346–354.

Severs, E., Celis, K., & Meier, P. (2013). Representative claims and beyond: A study of Muslim women's inclusion in the Flemish headscarf debate. *Politics, Groups and Identities, 1*(3), 433–450.

Severs, E. (2012). Substantive representation through a claims-making lens: A strategy for the identification and analysis of substantive claims. *Representation, 48*(2), 169–181.

Severs, E. (2010). Representation as claims-making: Quid responsiveness? *Representation, 46*(4), 412–423.

Simonsen, K. B. (2016). How the host nation's boundary drawing affects immigrants' belonging. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, 42*(7), 1153–1176.

Simonsen, K. B. (2021a). Politics feeds back: The minority/majority turnout gap and citizenship in anti-immigrant times. *Perspectives on Politics, 19*(2), 406–421.

Simonsen, K. B. (2021b). The democratic consequences of anti-immigrant political rhetoric: A mixed methods study of immigrants' political belonging. *Political Behavior, 43*(1), 189-209.

Siow, O. (2023a). Needles in a haystack: An intersectional analysis of the descriptive, constitutive and substantive representation of minoritised women. *European Journal of Politics and Gender, 6*(3), 328–358.

Siow, O. (2023b). What constitutes substantive representation, and where should we evaluate it? *Political Studies Review*, 1–9.

Slaughter, C. M., & Brown, N. E. (2022). Intersectionality and political participation. In M. Giugni & M. Grasso (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of political participation* (pp. 725–743). Oxford University Press.

Smooth, W. (2011). Standing for women? Which women? The substantive representation of women's interests and the research imperative of intersectionality. *Politics and Gender, 7*(3), 436–441.

Snel, E., de Boom, J., & Engbersen, G. (2003). Migration and migration policies in the Netherlands: Dutch SOPEMI-Report 2003. Rotterdam Institute of Social Policy Research (RISBO), Erasmus University Rotterdam.

Sobolewska, M. (2013). Party strategies and the descriptive representation of ethnic minorities: The 2010 British General Election. *West European Politics, 36*(3), 615–633.

Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau. (2016). *Integratie in zicht?* Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau.

Soedirgo, J., & Glas, A. (2020). Toward active reflexivity: Positionality and practice in the production of knowledge. *PS - Political Science and Politics, 53*(3), 527–531.

Spierings, N., & Vermeulen, F. (2023). Minding the political engagement gap: How discrimination and religion impact Dutch voters with an immigrant background. *Acta Politica*. 59, 619–642.

Spies, D. C., Mayer, S. J., Elis, J., & Goerres, A. (2022). Why do immigrants support an anti-immigrant party? Russian-Germans and the Alternative for Germany. *West European Politics, 46*(2), 275–299.

Spies, D. C., Mayer, S. J., & Goerres, A. (2020). What are we missing? Explaining immigrant-origin voter turnout with standard and immigrant-specific theories. *Electoral Studies, 65*, 102103.

Spivak, G. C. (1988). Can the subaltern speak? In C. Nelson & L. Grossberg (Eds.), *Marxism and the interpretation of culture* (pp. 271–313). University of Illinois Press.

Squires, J. (2008). The constitutive representation of gender: Extra-parliamentary representations of gender relations. *Representation, 44*(2), 187–204.

Stæhr Harder, M. M. (2020). Pitkin's second way: Freeing representation theory from identity. *Representation*, 56(1), 1–12.

Stoler, A. L. (2011). Colonial aphasia: Race and disabled histories in France. *Public Culture, 23*(1), 121–156.

Street, A., & Schönwälder, K. (2021). Understanding support for immigrant political representation: Evidence from German cities. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, 47*(11), 2650–2667.

Strolovitch, D. Z. (2007). *Affirmative advocacy: Race, class, and gender in interest group politics*. University of Chicago Press.

Strolovitch, D. Z. (2006). Do interest groups represent the disadvantaged? Advocacy at the intersections of race, class, and gender. *Journal of Politics, 68*(4), 894–910.

Tates, K., Zwaanswijk, M., Otten, R., Van Dulmen, S., Hoogerbrugge, P. M., Kamps, W. A., & Bensing, J. M. (2009). Online focus groups as a tool to collect data in hard-to-include populations: examples from paediatric oncology. *BMC medical research methodology*, *9*, 1-8.

Thijssen, L., Lancee, B., Veit, S., & Yemane, R. (2021). Discrimination against Turkish minorities in Germany and the Netherlands: field experimental evidence on the effect of diagnostic information on labour market outcomes. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, *47*(6), 1222-1239.

Timmermans, S., & Tavory, I. (2012). Theory construction in qualitative research: From grounded theory to abductive analysis. *Sociological Theory, 30*(3), 167–186.

Tilly, C. (1998). *Durable inequality*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Uitermark, J. (2010). *Dynamics of power in Dutch integration politics* (Doctoral dissertation). University of Amsterdam.

Van Bezouw, M. J., Závecz, G., Penna, C., Rijken, A. J., Klandermans, P. G., & Uluğ, M. (2019). Social psychological explanations of political inaction: Citizens' perspectives in Brazil, Hungary, and the Netherlands. *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy, 19*(1), 381–406.

Van der Meer, T., Steenvoorden, E., & Ouattara, E. (2023). Fear and the COVID-19 rally round the flag: A panel study on political trust. *West European Politics, 46*(6), 1089–1105.

Van der Zwan, R., Tolsma, J., & Lubbers, M. (2020). Under what conditions do ethnic minority candidates attract the ethnic minority vote? How neighbourhood and candidate characteristics affected ethnic affinity voting in the Dutch 2017 parliamentary elections. *Political Geography, 77*, 102098.

Van Deth, J. W. (2014). A conceptual map of political participation. *Acta Politica, 49*(3), 349–367.

Van Heelsum, A. (2002). The relationship between political participation and civic community of migrants in the Netherlands. *Journal of International Migration and Integration/Revue de l'intégration et de la Migration Internationale, 3*(2), 179–200.

Van Oosten, S., Mügge, L., & van der Pas, D. (2023). Race/ethnicity in candidate experiments: A meta-analysis and the case for shared identification. *Acta Politica*, 58(3), 345–367.

Vermeulen, F. (2014). Suspect communities—Targeting violent extremism at the local level: Policies of engagement in Amsterdam, Berlin, and London. *Terrorism and Political Violence, 26*(2), 286–306.

Vermeulen, F. (2006). *The immigrant organising process: Turkish organisations in Amsterdam and Berlin and Surinamese organisations in Amsterdam, 1960–2000*. Amsterdam University Press.

Vila-Henninger, L., Dupuy, C., Van Ingelgom, V., Caprioli, M., Teuber, F., Pennetreau, D., Bussi, M., & Le Gall, C. (2022). Abductive coding: Theory building and qualitative (re) analysis. *Sociological Methods and Research, January 2023*, 1–34.

Wallem, G. (2020). *Doing 'Russian-Germanness': Performativity and co-ethnic belongings in the context of post-Soviet migration to Germany* (Doctoral dissertation, Sciences Po). HAL.

Walter, S., & Glas, S. (2024). The political representation of minoritized groups in times of crisis: COVID-19 and beyond. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 48*(2), 229–243.

Wängnerud, L. (2009). Women in parliaments: Descriptive and substantive representation. *Annual Review of Political Science, 12*, 51–69.

Ward, O. (2016). Intersectionality and press coverage of political campaigns: Representations of Black, Asian, and minority ethnic female candidates at the U.K. 2010 General Election. *The International Journal of Press/Politics, 22*(2), 221–243.

Waterton, C., & Wynne, B. (2011). Can focus groups access community views? In R. Barbour & J. Kitzinger (Eds.), *Developing focus group research* (pp. 127–143). SAGE Publications.

Wekker, G. (2016). *White innocence: Paradoxes of colonialism and race*. Duke University Press.

Weldon, S. L. (2011). *When protest makes policy: How social movements represent disadvantaged groups*. University of Michigan Press.

Weldon, L. (2011). Perspectives against interests: Sketch of a feminist political theory of "women." *Politics & Gender, 7*(3), 441–446.

Weldon, S. L. (2008). Intersectionality. In G. Goertz & A. G. Mazur (Eds.), *Politics, gender and concepts: Theory and methodology* (pp. 193–218). Cambridge University Press.

Weldon, L. (2002). Beyond bodies: Institutional sources of representation for women in democratic policymaking. *The Journal of Politics, 64*(4), 1153–1174.

Will, A. K. (2019). The German statistical category "migration background": Historical roots, revisions, and shortcomings. *Ethnicities, 19*(3), 535–557.

Williams, M. (1998a). *Voice, trust, and memory: Marginalized groups and the failings of liberal democracy*. Princeton University Press.

Wilkinson, S. (2011). How useful are focus groups in feminist research? In R. Barbour & J. Kitzinger (Eds.), *Developing focus group research* (pp. 64–78). SAGE Publications.

Wust, A. M. (2000). New citizens—new voters? Political preferences and voting intentions of naturalized Germans: A case study in progress. *International Migration Review, 34*(2), 560–567.

Yanow, D. (2014). Interpretive analysis and comparative research. In I. Engeli & C. Rothmayr Allison (Eds.), *Comparative policy studies: Conceptual and methodological challenges* (pp. 131–159). Palgrave Macmillan.

Yanow, D., & Schwartz-Shea, P. (2014). Wherefore "interpretive?": An introduction. In D. Yanow & P. Schwartz-Shea (Eds.), *Interpretation and method: Empirical research methods and the interpretive turn* (2nd ed., pp. xiii–xxvii). Routledge.

Yanow, D., & Van Der Haar, M. (2013). People out of place: Allochthony and autochthony in the Netherlands' identity discourse-metaphors and categories in action. *Journal of International Relations and Development, 16*, 227–261.

Young, I. M. (2011). *Justice and the politics of difference*. Princeton University Press.

Young, I. M. (2000). *Inclusion and democracy.* Oxford University Press.

Yurdakul, G. (2009). *From guest workers into Muslims: The transformation of Turkish immigrant associations in Germany.* Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Yuval-Davis, N. (2006). Belonging and the politics of belonging. *Patterns of Prejudice, 40*(3), 197–214.

Zoch, G., & Wamsler, S. (2024). From rally to reality: Unveiling long-term dynamics in political trust over two years of COVID-19 in Germany. *Political Research Exchange, 6*(1), 2403438.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Topic list

FOCUS GROUP TOPIC LIST

Prior
- Double check if informed consent is complete
- Talk through participant profiles who signed up today

1. Start (10min)

A. Intro: address these bullet points
- Purpose of the conversation: Gain insight into your own ideas and opinions about political representation.
- Important: the main purpose is for participants to engage in conversation together. They can also ask each other questions and bring in new topics. Moderator asks questions, note-taker occasionally.
- Respect each other's opinion, give each other speaking time & let each other finish. Your involvement in politics does not matter, everyone's opinion is valuable (regardless of political affiliation).
- Ask one more time: permission to record. The purpose of the recording is to be able to transcribe the focus group conversation afterwards. Participants will be anonymized. If everyone is okay with this, start recorder.

Recorder on
- Introduction round (Moderator starts, then invites participants one by one). Each participant can select the next person to introduce themselves.

2. Political representation: What does it mean? (20min)

1. The conversation is about "political representation" what does it mean for you to feel represented in politics?
2. IImagine you are talking to some friends/acquaintances about politics. If you wanted to tell a story about a situation where you felt represented in politics, what would you tell? What about a story in which you did not feel well represented in politics?

Important!
- Moderators ask many follow-up questions in this part, it could last longer than 20 minutes.
- What exactly do participants mean by the terminology they use?
- Attention to both feeling represented and not feeling represented.

3) Substantive representation (35 min)

1. Who advocates for your interests in politics? Why? Ask for specific examples. Who stands up for your ideals in politics?

[In case participants did not bring up electoral politics]
- Who, if so, advocates for your interests in parliament? Who does not? Why? How does this happen? How do you feel heard in politics? When you do/do not? If not, who do you think is heard?

[In case participants did not bring up extra-parliamentary representation]
- Who, if so, advocates for you outside of parliament? Why?
- Besides politicians and political parties, who else advocate for your interests? Examples?

2. How should politicians keep track of the interests of their constituents? How should they be in touch with voters? Is that sufficiently happening now?

4) Break (10 min)
Thank you so much for your contribution and attention so far! We will now take a 10-minute break until [...], let's meet back here at [...].

5) Descriptive representation (40 min)
So far, we've talked about what it means to (not) feel represented, and who (not) represents your interests.

1. Is it important to you that a political representative resembles you? What does "resembling" mean according to you?
2. Why is it (not) important to you? When? Examples?
3. HHow do you feel represented by political representatives who resemble you? And those who don't resemble you? Why is that? Why is that (not) important to you? When? Examples? Difference between representatives who "resemble" and those who represent you?

3. How important is it to you that politics reflects society?

We heard several reasons why you might feel represented by these individuals. Moderator asks follow-up questions on descriptive representation and concrete examples. Important questions, if they were not already discussed:

1. How do you think a political representative who resembles you in matters to their political views/policies? Suppose we lived in a world where politics reflected society, what would happen?
2. W2. What about political representatives who resemble you but have different views? What is more important, that a representative resembles you or has the same political views as you?
3. What do you think makes a good or bad political representative? Examples? What are the qualities a political representative should have? What makes you trust a political representative or not? Moderator asks as much as possible for concrete examples. And invites participants to engage in conversation with each other.

6) Representative claims (10min)

1. Are there any political representatives who say that they advocate for you? How do you feel about that? Do you have any examples?

7) Final question and closing (10 min)

- Listening to this conversation, what did you think was most important?
- Thank you so much for participating in this conversation! Do you have any questions? We are happy to answer them.
- Do you know of any people who might want to participate in future groups?
- Participants will receive a voucher via email.

Moderator and note taker answer questions and say goodbye.

After the meeting
Moderator and note taker write a summary and reflection of the meeting and first discuss it separately, then together.

Appendix 2: Pre-focus group survey and informed consent form

This informed consent form and survey was presented to all participants prior to taking part in the focus groups. Participants filled out the form in their native language: Dutch, German, or French. The survey was programed into Qualtrics so that it could be accessed from participants' phones, computers, or other devices. The form below was used in the Netherlands, relevant country-specific changes made in the German and French versions are specified in footnotes.

Welcome to the group interviews!

Start of Block: Default Question Block

Dear Participant, thank you for participating in the study and have your voice heard! If you agree to participate in this project, you will be invited to participate in a focus group discussion with max 5 other people via videoconferencing platform Zoom. The conversation will be recorded and transcribed, so we do not have to take notes during the conversation. You have the right to refrain from (further) participation in this study or follow-up research, without giving reasons, at this time, during the study or after the study. This means that your personal data will be deleted, including contact details, with the exception of personal data that has already been processed (for example, research data that has already been anonymized). The decision to stop will not affect you in any way.

What happens with the information you share?

All personal information and everything you say during the interview will be treated confidentially. We will make an anonymised transcript of the interview. Your personal information (about who you are) will be kept separate from the written documentation and any information that could be used to identify you will be removed from the transcript. Statements quoted in written work are anonymised and therefore cannot be traced back to you. All digital recordings can be kept at the University of Amsterdam for 10 years and will then be destroyed.[34]

34 To the German and French versions of the informed consent form, the following sentences were added here: "The recordings of the interview are transcribed by an outside/external company. It is contractually agreed that your personal data will be kept confidential and will not be used for any other purpose."

Please be aware that full confidentiality cannot be guaranteed from our side due to the group situation. Please respect each other's privacy and do not talk about who attended the meeting. Please do not repeat anything that was said and do not make private recordings. We also recommend sitting in a neutral environment as your immediate surroundings will be visible on camera to other participants.

What happens to the results of the project?

The results of this study will be used in academic papers and other written pieces for publication and in presentations. I will be happy to send you a summary of the results if you wish.

What are the possible benefits of participating?

By participating in this study, you can help us better understand how people feel represented in politics. In addition, you will receive a voucher of 25 euros.

Contact details

Judith de Jong is the main contact for the study. If you have any questions about the project, please do not hesitate to ask. My contact details are: j.c.dejong2@uva.nl. If you would like to contact a senior member of the university about the research or make a complaint, please contact: Dr. Liza M. Mügge, E-mail: L.M.Mugge@uva.nl. For questions or complaints about the processing of your personal data, please contact the data protection officer of the University of Amsterdam [e-mail of data protection officer at the time of the study]. Thank you for participating in this study and for reading this information! If you are willing to participate in a focus group for this research project under the conditions described in this letter, please select the 'agree' option to this question.

- o Agree (1)
- o Not agree (2)

Skip To: End of Survey If Dear participant… = Not agree

Q28 What is your name?

……

Q1 How did you learn about this study?

- o Via a member of the research team (1)
- o Via internet/social media (2)
- o Via a poster (3)
- o Different, namely... (4) ……

Q2 What is your year of birth?

……

Q3 Do you identify as…

- o Man (1)
- o Woman (2)
- o Different, namely…. (3)
- o Prefer not to say (4)

Q4 How would you describe your living situation?

- o Single (1)
- o I live together with friends/flatmates (2)
- o I live together with family (3)
- o Married/living together with partner (4)
- o Living together with children and/or partner (5)
- o Divorced/separated (6)
- o Widow(er) (7)
- o Different, namely... (8) ……

Q We would also like to ask you about your employment. What best describes your situation?

- I am a student (1)
- I work parttime (up to 24 hours) (2)
- I work fulltime (3)
- I am unemployed/looking for a job (4)
- I am unable to work (5)
- I am retired (6)
- I do domestic work (7)
- Different? (8) ……

Q6 (when applicable) What is your profession?

……

Q7 What is the highest level of education that you have completed?[35]

- o Primary school (1)
- o Vocational training (MBO) (2)
- o University for Applied Sciences (HBO) (3)
- o University (WO) (4)
- o Different, namely… (5) ……

Q8 What transportation do you use most?

- o Car (1)
- o Train (2)
- o Bus/tram/metro (3)
- o Bike/scooter (4)
- o Walking (5)
- o Different? (6) ……

35 In the German version, the following options were given: Kein Schulabschluss (1) Grundschule (2) Hauptschulabschluss (3) Realschulabschluss (4) Abitur / Hochschulreife (5) Berufsausbildung (6) Universitärer Abschluss (Magister / Diplom / Bachelor / Master / Promotion) (7). The following options were given in the French version: Pas d'éducation (1) Niveau école primaire ou moins (2) Niveau brevet des collèges (3) CAP-BEP (4) Niveau Baccalauréat (5) Bac+2 (6) Bac+3 ou Bac+4 (7) Bac+5 ou plus (8) D'autres, à savoir… (9).

Q9 In politics, people often talk about "left" and "right". Where would you place yourself on a scale where 1 is the most left and 10 is the most right?

Left (1) to right (10) (1)	☆	☆	☆	☆	☆	☆	☆	☆	☆	☆

Q10 In a national election, do you vote…

- Always (1)
- In most cases (2)
- Hardly ever (3)
- Don't know/prefer not to say (4)
- I am politically active in other ways (e.g., signing petitions, joining demonstrations, other...) (5)……

Q11 Suppose there were a national election soon and you were to vote, which party would you be likely to vote for?[36]

- VVD (1)
- PVV (2)
- CDA (3)
- D66 (4)
- GroenLinks (5)
- SP (6)
- PvdA (7)
- ChristenUnie (8)
- Partij voor de Dieren (9)

36 In the German version, the following options were provided: Christlich Demokratische Union Deutschlands / Christlich-Soziale Union in Bayern (CDU / CSU) (1) Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschlands (SPD) (2) Freie Demokratische Partei (FDP) (3) Bündnis 90/Die Grünen (4) Die Linke (5) Alternative für Deutschland (AfD) (6) Andere Partei, nämlich… (7) __ Ich gehe nicht wählen (8) Ich weiß es nicht (9) Ich mache meine Stimme ungültig (10) Ich bevorzuge nichts anzukreuzen (11). In the French version: (1) La République en marche (LREM) (2) Les Républicains (LR) (3) Rassemblement national (RN) (4) La France insoumise (LFI) (5) Parti socialiste (PS) (6) Mouvement démocrate (MoDem) (7) Europe Écologie Les Verts (EÉLV) (8) Union des démocrates et indépendants (UDI) (9) Parti communiste français (PCF) (10) Debout la France (DLF) (11) Parti radical de gauche (PRG) (12) Reconquête (REC) (13)

Autre parti, à savoir... (14) Je ne vote pas (15) Je ne sais pas (16) J'invalide mon vote (17) Je préfère ne rien cocher.

- 50PLUS (10)
- SGP (11)
- DENK (12)
- Forum voor Democratie (13)
- Artikel1/Bij1 (14)
- Different party, namely… (15)
- I don't intend to vote (16)
- I don't know (17)
- I would vote blank (18)
- Prefer not to say (19)

Q26 Could you name someone by whom you feel represented in politics? You can choose anyone.

……

Q12 If you are together with friends, how often do you talk about politics?

o Never (1)
o Sporadically (2)
o Recurring topic (3)
o (Very) often (4)

Q13 If you have a strong opinion, do you ever try to convince friends, colleagues or family?

o Never (1)
o Sporadically (2)
o Recurring topic (3)
o (Very) often (4)

Q14 How do you stay informed about what's going on in the community?

- Newspaper, if so which one?: ……. (1)
  ……
- Television/radio, if so which program?: …… (2)
  ……
- Social media, if so which platforms/groups: ….. (3)
  ……
- Friends/acquaintances/family (4)
- I don't keep up with the news (5)
- Prefer not to say (6)

Q15 In which country were you born?[37]

- o The Netherlands (1)
- o Turkey (2)
- o Morocco (3)
- o Surinam (4)
- o Different, namely… (5) ……

Q16 In which country was your mother born?

- o The Netherlands (1)
- o Turkey (2)
- o Morocco (3)
- o Surinam (4)
- o Different, namely… (5) ……

37 In the German and French surveys, Q15, Q16 and Q17 were replaced by the open question: "Where were you/your mother/your father born?"

Q17 In which country was your father born?

- o The Netherlands (1)
- o Turkey (2)
- o Morocco (3)
- o Surinam (4)
- o Different, namely… (5) ……

Q18 Which group(s) do you most identify with? You can also indicate multiple options[38]

- Antillian (1)
- Arabic (2)
- Aruban (3)
- Berber (4)
- Bonairean (5)
- Curaçaoan (6)
- Creole (7)
- Dutch (8)
- Hindustani (9)
- Turkish (10)
- Kurdish (11)
- Moroccan (12)
- Surinamese (13)
- Different, namely… (14)……

38 The options presented to German participants were: Deutsch (1) Türkisch (2) Kurdisch (3) Armenisch (4) Russland-Deutsche (5) (Spät-)Aussiedler (6) Russisch (7) Schwarz (8) Schwarze Deutsche (9) Afro-Deutsche (10) Afrikanisch (11) Afropäisch (12) Gibt es ein bestimmtes Land/ bestimmte Länder? Wenn ja, welche?... (13) ___Anders, nämlich... (14). In France, the options were: Français (1), Turc (2), Kurde (3), Arménien (4)

Marocain (5), Berbère (6), Arabe (7), Maghrébin (8), Sénégalais (9), Wolof (10), Fula (11), Serer (12), Jola (13), Y a-t-il un ou des pays spécifiques? Si oui, lesquels? (14), _Différent, à savoir (15).

Q19 Do you consider yourself to belong to a particular religion or denomination?

- o Yes (1)
- o No (2)
- o Prefer not to say (3)

Skip To: Q27 If Do you consider yourself to belong to a particular religion or denomination? = No
Skip To: Q27 If Do you consider yourself to belong to a particular religion or denomination? = Prefer not to say

Q20 Which religion

- o Christian (1)
- o Muslim (2)
- o Hindu (3)
- o Buddhist (4)
- o Jewish (5)
- o Different, namely… (6) ……

Skip To: Q24 If Which religion? = Muslim
Skip To: Q27 If Which religion? = Hindu
Skip To: Q27 If Which religion? = Buddhist
Skip To: Q27 If Which religion? = Jewish
Skip To: Q27 If Which religion? = Different, namely…

Q23 What movement within Christianity do you most identify with?[39]

- o Catholic (1)
- o Protestant (2)
- o Different, namely... (3 ……

39 The German survey provided the following options here: Der römisch-katholischen Kirche (1) Der evangelischen Kirche (ohne Freikirchen) (2) Einer evangelischen Freikirche (3) Der christlich-orthodoxen Religionsgemeinschaft (4) Andere, nämlich (5). In the French version: Chrétien (1), L'Islam (2), Judaïsme (3)

D'autres, à savoir (4).

Skip To: Q27 If What movement within Christianity do you most identify with? = Catholic
Skip To: Q27 If What movement within Christianity do you most identify with? = Protestant
Skip To: Q27 If What movement within Christianity do you most identify with? = Different, namely...

Q24 What movement within Islam do you most identify with?[40]

- Sunni (1)
- Shia (2)
- Alevi (3)
- Different, namely... (4) ……

Q27 We would like to ask your e-mail address, so that we can send you a link to the group discussion.

……

End of Block: Default Question Block

40 In addition, the German and French surveys included the options Sufi and Ahmadiyya.

Appendix 3: Participants' descriptive information by focus group

Pseudo-nym	Migration back-ground	Gender	Age range	Education	Religion	Left-right[41]	Vote[42]	Politically Engaged[43]
FG1-Turkish Dutch 1-Mixed gender								
Senna	Turkish	Woman	20-30	University	Muslim Sunni	2	GL	High
Mehmet	Turkish	Man	30-40	University	No	-	Don't know	High
Günay	Turkish	Man	30-40	University	Muslim Sunni	3	BIJ1/ NIDA	High
Sana	Turkish	Woman	20-30	University	Muslim Sunni	3	GL	Medium
Aysun	Turkish	Woman	50-60	Applied Sciences	Muslim Sunni	3	Don't know	Medium
FG2-Turkish Dutch 2-Mixed gender								
Berat	Turkish	Man	40-50	No	Muslim Sunni	4	DENK	High
Deniz	Turkish	Woman	30-40	Applied sciences	Muslim Sunni	1	SP	Medium
Tuana	Turkish	Woman	20-30	University	Muslim Sunni	3	DENK/ Don't know	Low
Yaman	Turkish	Man	40-50	University	Muslim	5	Don't know	Medium
Naslı	Turkish	Woman	20-30	University	No	1	BIJ1	Medium
Erve	Turkish	Man	20-30	Applied sciences	Muslim Sunni	5	Don't know	High
FG3-Turkish Dutch 3-Mixed gender								
Mert	Turkish	Man	18-20	University	Muslim Sunni	2	DENK	Low
Derviş	Turkish	Man	50-60	Vocational Training	Muslim Sunni	3	PvdA	High
Ayhan	Turkish	Man	20-30	University	Muslim Sunni	3	Don't know	Medium

41 Based on the question: In politics, people often talk about "left" and "right". Where would you place yourself on a scale where 1 is the most left and 10 is the most right?

42 Party choice if participant would vote in an election.

43 Based on the questions: In a national election, do you vote… Always (1) In most cases (2) Hardly ever (3) Don't know/prefer not to say (4) I am politically active in other ways (e.g., signing petitions, joining demonstrations, other...) If you are together with friends, how often do you talk about politics? If you have a strong opinion, do you ever try to convince friends, colleagues, or family?

Naslıhan	Turkish	Woman	20-30	Vocational training	Muslim Sunni	2	DENK	Low
Ayşe	Turkish	Woman	20-30	University	Muslim Sunni	3	GL	Medium
FG4-Turkish Dutch 4-Women only								
Arzu	Turkish	Woman	18-20	Applied Sciences	Muslim Sunni	3	Don't Know	Medium
Cemre	Turkish	Woman	20-30	Applied Sciences	Muslim Sunni	5	Don't Vote	Low
Sarah	Turkish	Woman	20-30	University	Muslim Sunni	3	DENK	Medium
Hatice	Turkish	Woman	40-50	University	No	4	Don't Know	Medium
Pınar	Turkish	Woman	30-40	University	Muslim Sunni	7	VVD	High
FG5-Moroccan Dutch 1-Mixed gender								
Farida	Moroccan	Woman	50-60	No	Prefer not to say	6	Prefer Not to Say	Medium
Mo	Moroccan	Man	40-50	University	Muslim	10	Don't Know	High
Ayoub	Moroccan	Man	20-30	University	No	3	FvD	Medium
Layla	Moroccan	Woman	20-30	University	Muslim Sunni	5	GL/DENK /NIDA	High
Sara	Moroccan	Woman	20-30	University	Muslim Sunni	3	GL/ NIDA	High
FG6-Moroccan Dutch 2-Mixed gender								
Jamila	Moroccan	Woman	20-30	Applied Sciences	Muslim Sunni	5	D66/ Don't Know	Medium
Rayan	Moroccan	Man	18-20	Applied Sciences	Muslim Sunni	6	Don't Know	Low
Noor	Moroccan	Woman	30-40	Applied Sciences	Muslim Sunni	3	Don't Know	Medium
Maysem	Moroccan	Woman	20-30	Vocational Training	Muslim Sunni	3	DENK	Medium
Emir	Moroccan	Man	20-30	University	Muslim Sunni	8	Don't Know	Medium
Omar	Moroccan	Man	20-30	Applied Sciences	Muslim Sunni	4	DENK	Medium

FG7-Moroccan Dutch 3-Women only								
Karima	Moroccan	Woman	40-50	Applied Sciences	Muslim Sunni	5	Don't Know	Medium
Fatima	Moroccan	Woman	20-30	University	Muslim Sunni	5	DENK	Medium
Najar	Moroccan	Woman	20-30	Applied Sciences	Prefer Not to Say	5	D66/GL /Don't Know	Medium
Amin	Moroccan	Woman	50-60	Vocational Training	Muslim Sunni	1	DENK	High
Imane	Moroccan	Woman	20-30	Applied Sciences	Muslim Sunni	-	GL/ PvdD	Medium
FG8-Moroccan Dutch 4-Women only-50+ years old[44]								
Bahrya	Moroccan	Woman	50-60	Vocational Training	Muslim	Left-wing	Don't Vote	Low
Chourouk	Moroccan	Woman	50-60	Vocational Training	Muslim	Left-wing	Don't Vote	Low
Hassna	Moroccan	Woman	50-60	Vocational Training	Muslim	Left-wing	Don't Vote	Low
Lobaba	Moroccan	Woman	50-60	Vocational Training	Muslim	Left-wing	Don't Vote	Low
Moena	Moroccan	Woman	50-60	Vocational Training	Muslim	Left-wing	Don't Vote	Low
Nadira	Egyptian	Woman	50-60	Vocational Training	Muslim	Left-wing	NIDA	Medium
FG9-Surinamese Dutch 1-Mixed gender								
Benny	Surinamese	Man	60-70	Vocational Training	No	5	D66	Medium
Brigitte	Surinamese	Woman	50-60	Applied Sciences	No	5	D66	High
Naomi	Surinamese	Woman	20-30	University	No	2	Don't know	Medium
Sandra	Surinamese	Woman	20-30	University	No	Don't know	GL	High
FG10-Surinamese Dutch 2-Mixed gender								
Sam	Surinamese	Man	60-70	Applied Sciences	Christian Catholic	5	PvdA	High
Nancy	Surinamese	Woman	50-60	Applied Sciences	No	3	GL	High

44 As we organized this group in-person, and since not all participants read Dutch well, we presented participants with informed consent forms that we discussed with them and did not go through the entire survey. Therefore, some background information is missing. Due to a Covid-19-related last-minute replacement, one participant with an Egyptian background participated in this group.

Michelle	Surinamese	Woman	20-30	University	No	4	Don't know	Medium
Romana	Surinamese	Woman	20-30	University	Christian Pente-Costal	4	CDA	Low
Narain	Surinamese	Man	40-50	Vocational training	No	9	Don't know	High
Orlando	Surinamese	Man	30-40	Applied Sciences	Prefer Not to say	5	DENK/ BIJ1	Low
FG11-Surinamese Dutch 3-Women only								
Ishaan	Surinamese	Woman	30-40	University	Muslim/ Hindu	5-6	D66	Medium
Samantha	Surinamese	Woman	60-70	Applied Sciences	No	3	Don't know	Medium
Monique	Surinamese	Woman	30-40	Applied Sciences	Prefer Not to Say	-	Don't know	Low
Natasha	Surinamese	Woman	30-40	Vocational Training	No	4	Don't know	Low
Jennifer	Surinamese	Woman	40-50	University	No	2	Don't know	High
Rachelle	Surinamese	Woman	30-40	Applied Sciences	Christian Evangelical	6	Don't know	High
FG12-Surinamese Dutch 4-Mixed gender								
Meera	Surinamese	Woman	20-30	University	No	1	GL/ BIJ1	High
Olivia	Surinamese	Woman	50-60	Applied Sciences	Christian Evangelical	5	CU	Medium
Gregory	Surinamese	Man	20-30	Applied Sciences	No	3	PvdA	High
Amal	Surinamese	Man	30-40	Vocational Training	No	5	GL	High
Angela	Surinamese	Prefer Not to Say	40-50	Applied Sciences	No	7	D66	Medium
Selena	Surinamese	Woman	30-40	University	No	5	D66	High
FG13-Turkish German 1-Women only								
Özlem	Turkish	Woman	20-30	-	Muslim Sunni	7	Don't Know	Medium
Marla	Turkish	Woman	20-30	Abitur	No	3	Grünen	High
Ayla	Turkish	Woman	30-40	Abitur	Muslim Alevi	5	CDU	Low
Merve	Turkish	Woman	20-30	University	No	2	Volt	Low

FG14-Turkish German 2-Mixed gender								
Kaan	Turkish	Man	40-50	University	Muslim Sunni	6	SPD	High
Pelin	Turkish	Woman	20-30	University	No	1	Grünen Linke	High
Murat	Turkish	Man	20-30	Abitur	Muslim Alevi	1	SPD	High
Selma	Turkish	Woman	20-30	Middle school	Muslim Sunni	5	Don't Know	Medium
Melek	Turkish	Woman	40-50	Abitur	Muslim Alevi	2	SPD	Medium
FG15-Turkish German 3-Mixed gender								
Ece	Turkish	Woman	20-30	University	No	3	Grünen	High
Hasan	Turkish	Man	40-50	Middle school	No	-	SPD	Low
Nazlı	Turkish	Woman	30-40	University	No	2	Linke	High
Veli	Turkish	Man	20-30	Abitur	Prefer not to say	4	Prefer not to say	Low
Canan	Turkish	Woman	20-30	Abitur	Muslim Sunni	5	Don't know	Medium
Gülcan	Turkish	Woman	30-40	Vocational	Muslim Sunni	-	Don't know	Low
FG16-Resettler German 1[45]-Mixed gender								
Feodor	**Resettler**	**Man**	**60-70**	University	Christian evangelical	5	CDU	High
Tom	Resettler	Man	20-30	University	No	2	Grünen	High
Tatjana	Resettler	Woman	30-40	University	Prefer not to say	4	Grünen	High
Elena	Resettler	Woman	40-50	-	Prefer not to say	1	Urbane	High
Monja	Resettler	Woman	30-40	University	No	5	CDU	Medium
FG17-Resettler German 2-Women only								
Katharina	Resettler	Woman	20-30	University	Prefer not to say	5	Prefer not to say	Low
Larissa	Resettler	Woman	50-60	University	No	8	CDU	High
Marija	Resettler	Woman	20-30	University	No	2	Grünen	High
Jana	Resettler	Woman	30-40	University	Christian evangelical	5	Don't know	Low

45 Resettler German focus groups included participants with differing migration backgrounds, including (mixed) Ukrainian, Russian, Moldovan, Kazakhstani, Belarusian, and Kyrgyz descent.

FG18-Resettler German 3-Mixed gender								
Anna	Resettler	Woman	30-40	University	Christian Orthodox	6	SPD	Medium
Artur	Resettler	Man	20-30	Vocational	Christian Evangelical	5	Don't know	High
Maxim	Resettler	Man	30-40	University	No	2	Grünen	Medium
Alexander	Resettler	Man	60-70	No education	No	5	Don't know	Low
Olga	Resettler	Woman	40-50	Vocational	Jewish	5	FDP	Low
FG19-African German 1-Mixed gender								
Naimah	Sub-Saharan-Aftican	Woman	20-30	Abitur	No	3	SPD Grünen	Medium
Nelson	North-African	Man	40-50	University	Prefer not to say	5	Don't vote	Low
Faiza	Sub-Saharan-Aftican	Woman	20-30	University	Prefer not to say	1	Linke, don't know	High
Abdou	Sub-Saharan-Aftican	Man	20-30	University	No	3	Grünen, Linke, don't know	High
FG20-Turkish French-Mixed gender								
Ela	Turkey	Woman	30-40	CAP-BEP	Muslim, Sunni	3	Does not vote	Medium
Yusuf	Turkey	Man	30-40	BAC5+	Muslim, Sunni	5	Prefer not to say	Medium
Hüseyin	Turkey	Man	20-30	BAC	Muslim, Hanafi	8	Does not vote	Low
FG21-Turkish French-Mixed gender								
Melek	Turkey	Woman	40-50	BAC	Prefer not to say	7	RN	Medium
Yunus	Turkey	Man	20-30	BAC5+	No	7	Does not vote	Low
Kerem	Turkey	Man	30-40	BAC	No	4	Union des démocrates musulmans français	Medium
Özden	Turkey	Woman	20-30	BAC5+	Muslim, Sunni	3	LFI	High

Vedat	Turkey	Man	30-40	BAC+2	No	3	Don't know	High
FG22-Turkish French-Women only								
Duygu	Turkey	Woman	18-20	BAC	Prefer not to say	2	Parti Radical de Gauche, Parti Socialiste	Low
Buket	Turkey	Woman	-	BAC5+	No	3	LFI, does not vote	Medium
Esrin	Turkey	Woman	30-40	BAC5+	No	2	LFI	High
Nur	Turkey	Woman	40-50	BAC 3 ou 4	Muslim, Sunni	4	Parti Socialiste	Medium
FG23-Senegalese French-Mixed gender								
Ella	Senegalese	Woman	20-30	BAC5+	Muslim, Sunni	8	LFI, does not vote	Medium
Idrissa	Senegalese	Man	30-40	BAC 3 ou 4	Muslim, Sunni	6	REM	Medium
Modou	Senegalese	Man	20-30	BAC5+	Prefer not to say	7	Don't know	Low
Mariama	Senegalese	Woman	20-30	BAC5+	Muslim, Sunni	2	LFI	Medium
Aida	Senegalese	Woman	20-30	BAC2	Muslim, Sunni	2	LFI	Medium
FG24-Senegalese French-Mixed gender								
Moussa	Senegalese	Man	20-30	BAC5+	Muslim, Sunni	4	EELV	Low
Youssef	Senegalese	Man	40-50	BAC5+	Muslim, Ahmadiyya	-	Prefer not to say	Low
Malik	Senegalese	Other	20-30	BAC	Prefer not to say	4	-	Medium
Asmaa	Senegalese	Woman	40-50	BAC5+	Muslim, Sunni	2	LFI	High
FG25-Senegalese French-Women only								
Nola	Senegalese	Woman	20-30	BAC5+	No	4	EELV	Medium
Sira	Senegalese	Woman	20-30	BAC2	Prefer not to say	10	EELV, LFI, Parti Socialiste	Medium
Aly[46]	Senegalese	Woman	18-20	BAC3 ou 4	Muslim, Sunni	3	LFI	High

46 Aly and Mounia dropped out early on in the focus group due to connection issues.

Mounia	Senegalese	Woman	20-30	BAC3 ou 4	Muslim, Ahmadiyya	-	-	Medium
FG26-Moroccan French-Mixed gender								
Ilyas	Moroccan	Man	20-30	BAC3 ou 4	Prefer not to say	1	LFI	Low
Nassim	Moroccan	Man	20-30	BAC	Prefer not to say	1	LFI	Medium
Safa	Moroccan	Woman	40-50	No	Prefer not to say	-	Prefer not to say	Medium
Hasna	Moroccan	Woman	20-30	BAC5+	Muslim, Sunni	3	LFI	High
Azra	Moroccan	Woman	30-40	BAC5	Muslim, Sunni	3	LFI	Medium
Aisha	Moroccan	Woman	30-40	BAC2	Muslim, Sunni	5	LFI	Medium
FG27-Moroccan French-Mixed gender								
Taha	Moroccan	Man	20-30	BAC3	No	2	LFI	High
Kausar	Moroccan	Woman	20-30	BAC5+	Muslim, Sunni	3	PS, EELV	High
Mohammed	Moroccan	Man	30-40	BAC5+	Prefer not to say	5	UDI, EELV, MoDem, REM	Medium
Houda	Moroccan	Woman	30-40	BAC5+	Muslim, Sunni	2	PS	Medium
Hakim	Moroccan	Man	-	BAC5+	Muslim, Sunni	3	PS	Medium
FG-28-Moroccan French-Women only								
Nora	Moroccan	Woman	30-40	BAC5+	No	1	LFI	Medium
Chaima	Moroccan	Woman	30-40	BAC5+	Prefer not to say	4	LFI	Low
FG-29-Neighborhood center[47]								
Hassina	Algerian	Woman	30+	-	-	-	-	-
Mimouna	Algerian	Woman	30+	-	-	-	-	-
Sana	Moroccan	Woman	30+	-	-	-	-	-
Aleena	Guadeloupe	Woman	30+	-	-	-	-	-
Ouardia	Algerian	Woman	30+	-	-	-	-	-
Nadia	Algerian	Woman	30+	-	-	-	-	-
Aylin	Turkish	Woman	30+	-	-	-	-	-

47 This focus group with French citizens with differing immigrant backgrounds was organized in-person at a neighborhood center in France. We presented participants with informed consent forms that we discussed with them and did not go through the entire survey. Therefore, some background information is missing.

DISSERTATION SUMMARY

How are minoritized citizens with immigration backgrounds politically represented in Western European countries? This dissertation argues that answering this question requires asking citizens how they think and feel about their political representation. European citizens with immigration backgrounds who are othered based on color, religion, or roots face structural obstacles in politics. Most Western European house of representatives still do not reflect the increasing diversity among the represented. Yet, minoritized politicians slowly access political spaces. The visible presence of minoritized politicians in Western European parliaments coincides with pervasive political debates on integration, immigration, and Islam. This dual trend raises new questions. How do minoritized citizens experience their representation in politics, and how does minorization or immigrant history matter? How do they evaluate the political representatives who are supposed to speak or act on their behalf? And opportunities do they see to effect change in political representation processes?

Building on, and connecting political representation theories, intersectional scholarship, and literature on race/ethnicity and migration, this dissertation analyzes minoritized citizens' perspectives on political representation. It distinguishes three aspects of citizen perspectives: experiences, evaluations, and actions. *Experiences* refer to the range of emotions, intuitions, and situations citizens mention when thinking about political representation. *Evaluations* are the reflexive interpretations citizens express about political representation. They include interpretations of what groups citizens associate themselves with in politics, what their political interests are, what representation means, and what they believe causes this process to succeed or fail. *Actions* refer to the various political strategies citizens consider to influence their political representation. This distinction contributes by dissecting the different levels through which people relate to politics and allows for mapping variation at each level.

To gain insight into the full range of experiences, evaluations, and actions, this dissertation puts deliberation at its core; it relies on focus group conversations through which minoritized citizens exchange and contrast their views. In the design and analysis of the focus group material, I considered diversity between individuals; in the crosscutting political groups that citizens identify with, immigration history, and country-specific political contexts. The dataset consists of 29 focus groups with 143 minoritized citizens across France, Germany, and the Netherlands.

The distinction between experiences, evaluations, and actions informs the structure of the empirical chapters. Chapter 2 analyzes experiences of political

representation in France, Germany, and the Netherlands. I show that the initial intuitions and sentiments that most citizens associate with political representation are predominantly negative. Drawing on political psychology work on identity misrecognition (Ryan et al., 2023), I construct a typology of negative experiences of representation. I distinguish *non-representaton*, when citizens perceive that their political identities and concerns are *invisible*, *ignored* later in the representation process, or *uncomprehended* by representatives. These types align with classic literature that conceptualizes negative representation as the invisibility of identities and interests. However, I find that *misrepresentation* also drives negative experiences. Misrepresentation refers to situations in which political actors, speak about citizens in ways that are at odds with how they would like to be represented. Representatives *deny* and *misconstrue* citizens' political identities or *impose* group labels in contextually irrelevant situations.

Experiences of misrepresentation in themselves lead to negative sentiments toward politics, especially when they involve established, authority political figures who are influential in shaping societal norms. Moreover, citizens discern a negative, reinforcing dynamic between misrepresentation and nonrepresentation. Hyper-visibility of political discussions about Muslims and integration lead community members to hesitate to enter politics, and take away space from perceived real problems, such as socioeconomic inequality. The chapter maps who experiences what forms of non- and misrepresentation. I find that participants who identify with two or more disadvantaged groups, primarily Black, Muslim- and/or Women of Color, often felt non-represented. Muslims, who are subject to exclusionary political rhetoric felt most misrepresented. Citizens conversations fall on a spectrum between hope and pessimism, depending on the country-specific opportunities for change they see.

Chapters 3 and 4 explore citizens' evaluations of political representation. Chapter 3 focuses on citizens with Turkish, Moroccan and Surinamese migration backgrounds in the Netherlands, a country with a highly open multi-party landscape with no predetermined electoral threshold. It asks how citizens prefer to be represented (based on which political identities and interests), how they evaluate representation, and who represents them. The chapter zooms in on ambivalence: citizens hesitate considerably between different facets of representation – though interest representation is a common priority – and between political parties that only partially appeal to most citizens. Citizens see consciousness raising and contagion effects by anti-racist movements (notably Black Lives Matter) as an

important supplement to electoral politics. The chapter exposes the complexity in citizens' evaluations across the (extra)parliamentary landscape.

Chapter 4 focuses on how citizens evaluate individual political representatives in Germany and the Netherlands. I ask how, if so, it matters to minoritized citizens that politicians resemble them. Building on representation literature and Hannah Arendt's (1978) theory of judgement, I find that citizens see whether politicians (1) imagine their lived reality and related political concerns, (2) propose a course of action that matches citizens' preferences, and (3) achieve their aims. Although secondary to most, many also consider whether representatives (4) change negative meanings about their group, and (5) increase community political efficacy as role models. Most believe that the experiential knowledge of minoritized politicians enables them to better represent their interests, but there is much skepticism in practice. Citizens often see minoritized politicians as assimilated within established political parties. This limits interest representation, although they remain role models. Majority politicians are mainly seen as out of touch. In few cases, empathy and close contact with minoritized communities enable majority politicians to represent them.

Chapters 3 and 4 show that studying citizens' self-identification with crosscutting political groups, rather than group categories often used by researchers, provides more accurate insight in citizens' evaluations. For instance, citizens consider interrelationships of race/ethnicity, class, gender, age and religion, rather than migration background, to determine the extent to which a politician resembles them. Young Women of Color in particular value role models. Findings between countries are mostly consistent.

In Chapter 5, I investigate the last aspect of citizen perspectives: action. Across France, Germany, and the Netherlands, I analyze how minoritized citizens link (not) being represented and voting. Although research on electoral participation often conflates voting and representation, the findings suggest that this relationship is not self-evident. The chapter creates a typology of *satisfied voters*, *partly satisfied voters*, *dissatisfied voters*, and *dissatisfied non-voters*, investigates electoral choices citizens in each category make, and their relationship to perceived representation. Immigrant-history specific generational differences and electoral systems feature in these conversations. The chapter shows that future expectations play an important role in understanding the relationship between evaluations of representation and electoral participation.

Exploring citizen perspectives allows scholars to question, integrate and conceptually extend existing theoretical models. The research calls attention to the enduring barriers minorities experience in pathways to equal political influence and shows that increasing numbers of minoritized politicians in parliament does not automatically make citizens feel adequately represented. It highlights the importance of intersectional analysis in political representation scholarship to gain insights into within- and between-group differences in how citizens want to be represented, in what ways, and by whom.

SAMENVATTING

PROEFSCHRIFT

Hoe worden geminoriseerde burgers met een migratieachtergrond politiek vertegenwoordigd in West-Europese landen? Dit proefschrift stelt dat, om deze vraag te beantwoorden, we burgers zelf moeten vragen hoe zij denken over hun politieke vertegenwoordiging. Europese burgers met een migratieachtergrond die geminoriseerd worden op basis van huidskleur, religie of afkomst ondervinden structurele obstakels in de politiek. De meeste West-Europese parlementen zijn nog onvoldoende een afspiegeling van de toenemende diversiteit onder burgers. Geminoriseerde politici krijgen langzaam toegang tot politieke ruimtes. De zichtbare aanwezigheid van geminoriseerde politici in West-Europese parlementen valt samen met alomtegenwoordige politieke debatten over integratie, immigratie en islam. Deze tweeledige trend roept nieuwe vragen op. Hoe ervaren geminoriseerde burgers hun vertegenwoordiging in de politiek, en welke rol spelen minorisering of migratiegeschiedenis daarin? Hoe beoordelen burgers de politieke vertegenwoordigers die verondersteld worden namens hen te spreken of te handelen? En welke mogelijkheden zien ze om veranderingen te bewerkstelligen in politieke vertegenwoordigingsprocessen?

Dit proefschrift analyseert perspectieven van geminoriseerde burgers op politieke vertegenwoordiging door theorieën over politieke vertegenwoordiging te verbinden met het concept intersectionaliteit en literatuur over ras/etniciteit en migratie. Het onderscheidt drie aspecten van burgerperspectieven: ervaringen, beoordelingen, en acties. Ervaringen hebben betrekking op het scala aan emoties, intuïties en situaties die burgers noemen wanneer ze nadenken over politieke vertegenwoordiging. Beoordelingen zijn de reflexieve interpretaties die burgers uiten over politieke representatie. Ze omvatten interpretaties van met welke groepen burgers zich associëren in de politiek, wat hun politieke belangen zijn, wat vertegenwoordiging betekent, en wat volgens hen dit proces doet slagen of mislukken. Acties verwijzen naar de verschillende politieke strategieën die burgers overwegen om hun politieke vertegenwoordiging te beïnvloeden. Dit onderscheid ontleedt de verschillende niveaus waarop mensen zich tot politiek verhouden en maakt het mogelijk om variatie op elk niveau in kaart te brengen.

Om inzicht te krijgen in het volledige scala aan ervaringen, beoordelingen, en acties, stelt dit proefschrift deliberatie centraal; het gaat uit van focusgroepgesprekken waarin geminderde burgers hun standpunten bespreken en vergelijken. Het ontwerp en de analyse van het focusgroepmateriaal hield rekening met diversiteit tussen individuen: op basis van de politieke groepen waarmee burgers zich identificeren, immigratiegeschiedenis en landspecifieke politieke contexten. De

dataset bestaat uit 29 focusgroepen met 143 geminoriseerde burgers in Frankrijk, Duitsland en Nederland.

Het onderscheid tussen ervaringen, beoordelingen en acties vormt de basis voor de structuur van de empirische hoofdstukken. Hoofdstuk 2 analyseert ervaringen van politieke vertegenwoordiging in Frankrijk, Duitsland en Nederland. Het laat zien dat de eerste intuïties en gevoelens die de meeste burgers associëren met politieke vertegenwoordiging overwegend negatief zijn. Op basis van politiek psychologisch werk over identiteitsmiskenning (Ryan et al., 2023), construeer ik een typologie van negatieve ervaringen van vertegenwoordiging. Ik onderscheid *non-representatie*, wanneer burgers ervaren dat hun politieke identiteiten en belangen *onzichtbaar* zijn, later in het representatieproces worden *genegeerd*, of *onbegrepen* zijn door vertegenwoordigers. Deze types sluiten aan bij de klassieke literatuur die negatieve vertegenwoordiging conceptualiseert als de onzichtbaarheid van identiteiten en belangen. Echter, ik vind *misrepresentatie* als een tweede drijvende kracht achter negatieve ervaringen van vertegenwoordiging. Misrepresentatie verwijst naar situaties waarin politieke actoren over burgers spreken op een manier die haaks staat op hoe zij vertegenwoordigd willen worden. Vertegenwoordigers *ontkennen* en *misconstrueren* de politieke identiteit van burgers of *schrijven* groepslabels aan hen *toe* in irrelevante situaties.

Misrepresentatie leidt op zichzelf tot negatieve gevoelens tegenover de politiek, vooral wanneer het begaan wordt door gevestigde, gezaghebbende politieke figuren die een belangrijke rol spelen in het vormgeven van maatschappelijke normen. Bovendien zien burgers een negatieve, versterkende dynamiek tussen misrepresentatie en non-representatie. De hyperzichtbaarheid van politieke discussies over moslims en integratie leidt ertoe dat leden van de gemeenschap aarzelen om de politiek in te gaan. Ook onttrekt het politieke aandacht voor waargenomen echte problemen, zoals sociaaleconomische ongelijkheid. Het hoofdstuk brengt in kaart wie welke vormen van non- en misrepresentatie ervaart. Ik vind dat deelnemers die zich identificeren met twee of meer achtergestelde groepen, voornamelijk Zwarte vrouwen, vrouwen van kleur en moslima's, het vaakst non-representatie ervaren. Moslims, die het lijdend voorwerp zijn van uitsluitende politieke retoriek, voelden zich het meest gemisrepresenteerd. De gesprekken van burgers bevinden zich op een spectrum tussen hoop en pessimisme, afhankelijk van de landspecifieke mogelijkheden voor verandering die zij zien.

Hoofdstukken 3 en 4 onderzoeken hoe burgers politieke vertegenwoordiging beoordelen. Hoofdstuk 3 richt zich op burgers met een Turkse, Marokkaanse en Surinaamse migratieachtergrond in Nederland, een land met een zeer open meerpartijensysteem zonder vooraf bepaalde kiesdrempel. Het hoofdstuk onderzoekt hoe burgers het liefst vertegenwoordigd willen worden (op basis van welke politieke identiteiten en belangen), hoe ze vertegenwoordiging beoordelen en wie hen vertegenwoordigt. Het hoofdstuk spitst zich toe op ambivalentie: burgers twijfelen aanzienlijk tussen verschillende facetten van vertegenwoordiging – hoewel belangenvertegenwoordiging een algemene prioriteit is – en tussen politieke partijen die de meeste burgers slechts gedeeltelijk aanspreken. Burgers zien *consciousness raising* en *contagion effects* door antiracistische bewegingen (met name Black Lives Matter) als een belangrijke aanvulling op electorale politiek. Het hoofdstuk legt de complexiteit bloot in de beoordelingen van burgers in het (extra)parlementaire landschap.

Hoofdstuk 4 richt zich op hoe burgers individuele politieke vertegenwoordigers in Duitsland en Nederland beoordelen. De centrale vraag is of het voor geminoriseerde burgers van belang is dat politici op hen lijken. Ik bouw voort op representatieliteratuur en Hannah Arendt's (1978) theorie over politieke beoordeling. Het hoofdstuk vindt dat burgers kijken of politici (1) zich kunnen inleven in hun geleefde werkelijkheid en gerelateerde politieke zorgen, (2) een politieke koers voorstellen die overeenkomt met de voorkeuren van burgers, en (3) hun doelen bereiken. Hoewel dit voor de meesten secundair is, overwegen veel burgers ook of vertegenwoordigers (4) negatieve betekenissen over hun groep veranderen en (5) als rolmodel de *political efficacy* van de gemeenschap vergroten. De meeste burgers denken dat de ervaringskennis van politici uit geminoriseerde groepen hen in staat stelt om hun belangen beter te vertegenwoordigen. Echter, in de praktijk is er veel scepsis. Burgers zien politici uit geminoriseerde groepen vaak als geassimileerd binnen gevestigde politieke partijen. Dit beperkt de belangenvertegenwoordiging, hoewel ze wel rolmodellen blijven. Politici die tot de dominante groep behoren worden vaak gezien als verafstaand van de dagelijkse realiteit van burgers. Een aantal politici die tot de dominante groep behoren slagen erin om goede vertegenwoordigers te zijn door middel van empathie en nauw contact met geminoriseerde burgers.

Hoofdstukken 3 en 4 tonen aan dat het bestuderen van de zelfidentificatie van burgers met intersectionele politieke groepen nauwkeuriger inzicht biedt in de beoordelingen van burgers, ten opzichte van groepscategorieën die vaak door onderzoekers worden gebruikt. Zo kijken burgers naar intersecties van ras/etniciteit, klasse, gender, leeftijd en religie, om te bepalen in hoeverre een politicus op hen lijkt, in plaats van de veelgebruikte categorie migratieachtergrond. Vooral jonge vrouwen van kleur hechten waarde aan rolmodellen. De bevindingen tussen de landen komen veelal overeen.

In hoofdstuk 5 onderzoek ik het laatste aspect van burgerperspectieven: acties. In Frankrijk, Duitsland en Nederland analyseer ik hoe geminoriseerde burgers verbanden bespreken tussen (niet) vertegenwoordigd zijn en stemmen. Hoewel onderzoek naar electorale participatie stemmen vaak gelijkstelt aan vertegenwoordiging, suggereren de bevindingen dat deze relatie niet vanzelfsprekend is. Het hoofdstuk creëert een typologie van tevreden stemmers, gedeeltelijk tevreden stemmers, ontevreden stemmers en ontevreden niet-stemmers. Ik onderzoek de electorale keuzes die burgers in elke categorie maken en hun relatie met waargenomen vertegenwoordiging. In deze gesprekken komt de rol van immigratiegeschiedenissen, generatieverschillen en kiesstelsels naar voren. Het hoofdstuk toont aan dat toekomstverwachtingen een belangrijke rol spelen in het begrijpen van de relatie tussen beoordelingen van vertegenwoordiging en electorale participatie.

Het onderzoeken van burgerperspectieven stelt wetenschappers in staat om bestaande theoretische modellen ter discussie te stellen, te integreren en conceptueel uit te breiden. Dit proefschrift vestigt de aandacht op de aanhoudende barrières die minderheden ondervinden op weg naar gelijke politieke invloed en laat zien dat een toenemend aantal geminoriseerde politici in het parlement er niet automatisch toe leidt dat burgers zich adequaat vertegenwoordigd voelen. Het onderstreept het belang van intersectionele analyse binnen onderzoek naar politieke vertegenwoordiging om inzicht te krijgen in verschillen binnen en tussen groepen in hoe burgers vertegenwoordigd willen worden, op welke manier, en door wie.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am very grateful to have had the opportunity to write this PhD dissertation. I could not have done so without the research participants, colleagues, friends, and family who inspired and supported me throughout this process. Thanks to you all, I was able to leap over this dissertation – as the image shows.

Firstly, I would like to express my gratitude to my supervisors, Liza Mügge, Evelyn Ersanilli, and Ton Nijhuis, for their support, dedication and constructive feedback throughout this trajectory. Liza, thank you for giving me the opportunity to take on this fascinating project and for giving me the confidence to truly make it my own. I deeply value your mentorship over the years, both professionally and personally ('don't think too much, just do it'). I have learned a great deal from your innovation, creativity, and craftsmanship. Now that I am teaching, I find myself passing on your insights to students. I am also inspired by your contributions to public debate and your motivation to make the world a better place. Evelyn, thank you for all your support, valuable feedback, and attention to detail. I especially appreciated your openness and accessibility. Your office, conveniently located next to the coffee machine, was always a welcoming space for a quick chat or a brainstorming session whenever I felt stuck. Ton, I am grateful to you for facilitating my PhD within the DIA. You helped me to always stay mindful of the value and relevance of my work.

Before, during, and after this PhD, I have been incredibly lucky to work with a group of inspiring scholars and wonderful people: Betty de Hart, Jan Willem Duyvendak, Bertjan Doosje, Allard Feddes, Caroline da Silva, Daphne van der Pas, Floris Vermeulen, Christopher Wratil, and Bartolomeo Cappellina. Their sharp insights, encouragement, and informal mentoring played a key role in shaping this dissertation.

Betty, thank you for being an important academic role model during my time as your research assistant, for stimulating my critical thinking, and for your generosity in consistently checking in on how I was doing. Jan Willem, I found your curiosity and ability to critically and playfully engage with ideas inspiring and contagious. Thank you for enabling me to participate in the Transatlantic Forum exchange, which broadened my academic horizons. Bertjan, thank you for sharing your extensive knowledge and insights in social psychology, for the autonomy you granted me in the MisMiE project, and for treating me as a full-fledged team member from the outset. I greatly admire your kindness, your genuine concern for junior colleagues' well-being, and your commitment to promoting a healthy work-life balance. Allard, thank you for boosting my confidence, always offering the right advice, and for the many 'rondjes Amstel' and conversations about books. Caroline, I am grateful for your perseverance in ensuring the project kept moving forward, and for the enjoyable meetings we had in Paris. Daphne, I have learned a great deal from your ability to critically analyze arguments and from your serious yet relaxed approach to teaching. Floris, thank you for all your valuable feedback and for consistently involving me in everything relevant to my work. Chris and Bart, I have greatly benefited from your insights into political representation and I am inspired by your ambition to tackle big questions.

I am indebted to all research participants for their contribution to this study. Thank you for sharing your knowledge, analyses, and experiences with me. Every conversation made a deep impression on me, and I hope that this is reflected in the dissertation.

Many thanks to the research assistants who supported me with the data collection: Hannah Abdullahi, Roman Akyüz, Mehmet Yaşar Altundağ, Çağla Babacan, Sati Cakar, Aya El-Yamany, Mélissa Hamdi, Mariam Hothout, Anas Maamar, Sina Rauch, Daniel Schneiß, and David Gamboa Solano. I am grateful for your perseverance, critical eye, and enthusiasm.

During my PhD trajectory, I had two home bases: the Amsterdam Institute for Social Science Research (AISSR) and the Duitsland Instituut Amsterdam (DIA). At both places, I am grateful to all colleagues in administration and cleaning.

Within the AISSR, I would like to thank my colleagues in the Challenges to Democratic Representation research group for providing a rich and intellectually stimulating environment. Thanks also to the migration scholars (now ARC-M) and researchers at the Amsterdam Research Centre for Gender and Sexuality (ARC-GS) for excellent feedback and seminars. Special thanks to my PhD colleagues on the tenth floor for all the lunches, drinks, and fun: Ellis Aizenberg, Uğur Aytaç, Sonja Evaldsson Mellstrom, Maaike Homan, Thomas Jocker, Haylee Kelsall, Sander Kunst, Maria Kranendonk, Yue Li, Rojika Maharjan, Laura Mulder, Ebe Ouattara, Christian Pipal, Isabella Rebasso, Mariana Riquito Pereira, Vera Vrijmoeth, and Hannah Werner. Outside of the Challenges PhDs, I would like to thank Mira Ducommun and Sophie Schriever for so many enjoyable conversations about research, PhD struggles, volleyball, and dinosaurs.

The DIA stands out as a workplace with a friendly atmosphere, great colleagues, and, of course, excellent Christmas cookies. I greatly benefited from the many informal conversations about Germany and from the opportunity to attend the DAAD conference in Porto Alegre. Many thanks to all my DIA colleagues for the enjoyable exchanges, to Ezra Engelsberg and Thomas von der Dunk for lively office chats, and to Charlotte Broersma for her dedication and organizational efforts.

During my PhD, I was fortunate to be affiliated as a guest researcher with the Berlin Institute for Migration and Integration Research (BIM) at Humboldt University, and the Institut national d'études démographiques (Ined) in Paris. I would like to express my sincere gratitude to Özgür Özvatan and Mathieu Ichou for facilitating my guest researcher position, connecting me with the right people, and providing valuable input during critical phases of the data collection. Once again, many thanks to Mathieu, as well as Rosa Weber and Mathieu Ferry, for welcoming me in Paris.

I would like to thank my colleagues in Interdisciplinary Social Sciences for the warm welcome and the positive start to this new phase of my career. Special thanks to Amrita, Floor, Hannah, Iti, Jet, Marloes, Maud, Max, Michaela, Sophie, and Suzan.

Dear "Team Liza": Natalie, Anne Louise, Zahra, and Sanne, thank you for welcoming me as the final team member, for all the in-depth theoretical discussions, and for always celebrating our successes together. I consider myself lucky to have found

myself in such a group of intelligent and inspiring women. Natalie, it is simply a pleasure to be around someone as brilliant as you. Anne Louise, I have always admired the clarity and precision with which you express your thoughts. Sanne, my project buddy, I have gained so much from our research exchanges over the years, and I am continually impressed by your perseverance and sense of community. Zahra, I have learned a great deal from your cheerful outlook and your courage to speak out publicly. Thank you for such an enjoyable collaboration experience, which began with a late-evening WhatsApp conversation and resulted in a report and article. Many thanks also for supporting me as a paranymph in this final phase.

Some colleagues have gradually become friends. Merve, my partner in crime! From the moment we first met, I felt that we did not need many words to understand each other. I loved sharing all the serious and hilarious moments with you, and I am grateful to have you by my side as paranymph. Eline, thank you for your wonderfully uninhibited sense of humor and for the many fun writing retreats. Eda, you are anything but een arme vrouw, thank you for your generous personality. Your lively and funny stories never fail to make me laugh. I am sure you will appreciate the image accompanying these acknowledgements, given our shared love for cats, although Merve is, of course, our biggest cat fan. Mira, our lunches and clothing swaps were real highlights. I am thankful we could share highs and lows, and I truly appreciated your hospitality in bringing people together as the cocktail master. Valerie and Anne, thank you for your activist energy, writing sprints, and book recommendations. Benjamin, admire your attentiveness to others and your dedication to your students. Thank you for all the great conversations in the DIA PhD room, which sometimes continued over dinners at your home. Rebekka and Michael, thank you for welcoming this PhD into the late-stage PhD/postdoc/ambiguous office, for your encouragement, and for all the conversations about politics, plants, favorite mugs, and more.

In addition to the wonderful people I met during my PhD at the university, I am thankful for the amazing friends who have stood by my side during these years: David, Dunya, Ely, Esther, Hasse, Jaël, Jetske, Kees, Peter, Sacha, Siebert, Sophie, and Volkan. Thank you all for listening to my ramblings about university, for your support, adventures, and many funny moments. I would like to thank two friends in particular: Aimée and Fiorella. Aimée, I will resist the temptation to write a story about red whales here. Instead, I want to thank you for being a truly amazing, loyal, and sweet friend over all these years. Fiorella, we live far apart and yet we are such close friends. Thank you for always understanding me and for the unruly chaos that manifests itself when we are together. I love you both very much.

I would like to thank my family, and in particular my grandparents Oma Lot, Opa Tijn, Oma Joop, and Opa Frans, whose lives and convictions continue to inspire me. Thanks to the Van Tetterodes for the Zandvoort cheerfulness. Many thanks to my father-in-law, Jan Roland, for his kindness and creativity. Thank you for always supplying fresh batches of beautiful and/or funny drawings, including the cover image and those featured in these acknowledgements.

I consider myself incredibly lucky to have two fantastic parents. Dear parents, thank you for your unconditional support and love. I am very grateful to have grown up in a home filled with conversation, joy, and genuine attention for one another. To my brother Jona, thank you for always being so caring towards your little sister, and for your inexhaustible arsenal of hilarious commentary. I truly cherish you and our relationship.

Dear Peer, you are my favorite person. I am grateful for all the beautiful walks and peaceful mornings, for all the times you cooked and did the dishes, and for teasing me when I took the PhD too seriously. Thank you for your love, support, humor, and originality. I love you.