

The Politicization of Immigration in Parliaments: Evidence From German State Legislative Sessions

Marius D. May
University of Siegen

This article makes two new contributions to the literature on the politicization of immigration. First, it examines whether politicians politicize immigration in parliaments. Second, the two dimensions of politicization, salience and political polarization, are measured qualitatively. Topic modeling is used to analyze speeches held by each right-wing AfD legislators and Green legislators in three state parliaments during the peak of the so-called “refugee crisis” in Germany. The topic models show that, in contrast to Green legislators, AfD legislators address various other issues in speeches dealing with immigration. This is evidence that only AfD legislators attempt to increase the salience of immigration. Moreover, AfD legislators frame immigrants as a threat, while Green legislators frame immigrants as victims. This is evidence of political polarization. Thus, qualitative measures for salience and polarization suggest that the AfD politicized the issue immigration in state parliaments.

Keywords: politicization, immigration, natural language processing, salience, polarization

INTRODUCTION

Immigration turned out to be one of the most debated public issues in Europe in the last decade. This issue polarized not only the society, but also the political landscape in these countries (Gattinara and Morales, 2017, and Maxwell, 2019 and van der Brug and Hartevelde, 2021). Immigration and the subsequent polarization caused both significant variations in the agendas of political parties and changes in electoral results. Literature on the latter issue has shown that many incumbent parties lost large voter shares in Western European countries while especially right-wing populist parties gained support due to the polarization (Akkerman, 2018, de Vries, 2018, Halikiopoulou, 2018, Jesse, 2018, Niedermayer, 2018).

An important question behind these results is how immigration could become such an important issue to trigger these changes. According to Van der Brug, et al. (2015), politicized issues play such an important role that they can shape party competition and public opinion. They also provide a definition for politicized issues. Following their framework, an issue has to be (i) salient and (ii) polarized in terms of conflicting opinions between parties in order to be considered politicized (Van der Brug, et al., 2015).

This article examines whether immigration was politicized in German state parliaments using qualitative criteria for salience and political polarization. As a first step, I analyze what issues right-wing AfD legislators and Green legislators address in speeches that deal with immigration. All speeches from three state parliaments during the peak of the German refugee crisis¹ between August 2015 and March 2016 are covered. In a second step, I only consider those sentences of the prementioned speeches that contain words of the issue immigration. Latent Semantic Index (“LSI”) models, which belong to Natural language

processing (“NLP”) are applied in both steps. The first step shows that, across the different parliaments, AfD legislators attempt to increase the salience of immigration in their speeches. They relate immigration to various other issues, such as international relations and law, democratic processes and politics from other German states. On the contrary, Greens focus on issues much closer to immigration, e.g., accommodation and integration. The second step provides evidence that while AfD legislators frame immigration as a threat, Green legislators frame immigrants as victims as defined by Benson (2013) and Hovden and Mjelde (2019). These differences hint at political polarization and, taking into account the results from the first step, at the politicization of the issue immigration.

Moreover, the AfD drives the politicization. Since the Greens can be regarded as an established party with a fixed agenda on immigration and the AfD was a political entrepreneur at that time, the results also suggest that the AfD strategically politicized immigration. This finding thus supports several contemporary theories from political competition, such as the (neo-)cleavage theory and the issue entrepreneurship theory. Notably, if salience was measured by the share of sentences dealing with immigration, results would suggest that both parties raised the salience of immigration equally. Thus, the results differ between the standard quantitative approach and the newly introduced qualitative approach in this study. This underscores the important role qualitative measures can play for studying salience, political polarization and politicization.

This study contributes to a young and fast-growing strand of literature on the politicization of immigration in Europe during the last decade. Politicization is attributed to different channels and causes by several sub-strands of literature. Some work examines whether migration-related socio-economic variables, such as the migration population, can explain the politicization in a sense that political attention increases (Hainmueller and Hopkins, 2014, Van der Brug, et al., 2015 and Green-Pedersen and Otjes, 2019). For example, Green-Pedersen and Otjes (2019) show that there is a positive correlation between political attention devoted to immigration and increasing numbers of migration born people in Western Europe. Other work yields evidence that socio-economic factors do not explain increases in the politicization. Instead, these studies find that parties increase the politicization of immigration. There is disagreement on what parties elicit politicization, though. While some literature shows that government parties, especially from the center-right, politicize immigration (e.g. Green-Pedersen and Krogstrup, 2008, Meyer and Rosenberger, 2015 and Van der Brug, et al., 2015), newer studies imply that radical-right or right-wing parties are the driving forces of the politicization of immigration (e.g. Grande, et al., 2019, Lauwers, et al., 2021, Gessler and Hunger, 2022 and Hutter and Kriesi, 2022). The latter findings support theories that right-wing parties play an important role to explain why immigration has become an essential issue in the last decade. These include the (neo-)cleavage theory (e.g., Kriesi, et al., 2012 and Hooghe and Marks, 2018) and the issue entrepreneurship theory (e.g., Hobolt and de Vries, 2015 and Buisseret and van Weelden, 2020).

Following the recent findings that right-wing parties induce the politicization of immigration, this paper investigates whether state legislators from the German right-wing AfD elicited politicization. Contrary to related work (e.g., Hutter and Grande, 2014, Meyer and Rosenberger, 2015, Grande, et al., 2019, Mendelsohn, et al., 2021 and Gessler and Hunger, 2022), this study does not examine data from social media, party manifestos or press releases, but from speeches in the parliament during the peak of the refugee crisis in Germany. Additionally, qualitative instead of quantitative measures (as e.g., Hutter and Grande, 2014, Grande, et al., 2019, Lauwers, et al., 2021, and Hutter and Kriesi, 2022 employ) are used to detect politicization. The results support the abovementioned finding that right-wing parties politicize immigration with evidence from the daily political arena during charged times. The rest of the article is organized as follows: In section 2, the data and methods are explained. I derive the hypotheses in section 3. The results are presented in section 4 and discussed in section 5. Section 6 concludes. Supplementary material can be found in the appendix.

DATA AND METHODS

In this study, I consider speeches of AfD and Green state legislators in the parliaments of the states Saxony, Thuringia and Brandenburg from August 10, 2015 to March 31, 2016. This type of data set is

different to most related work on the politicization of immigration (e.g., Hutter and Grande, 2014, Meyer and Rosenberger, 2015, Grande, et al., 2019, Mendelsohn, et al., 2021 and Gessler and Hunger, 2022). The nature of the data set in this study allows to check for whether right-wing parties also increase politicization during legislative processes. The analysis is thus a supplement to the prementioned literature.

The choice concerning the parliaments stems from the status of the rightwing AfD. The national parliament would be a natural source for this study, yet the AfD had not been being part of the national parliament until 2017. On the contrary, the AfD had parliamentary status in the state parliaments of Saxony, Thuringia and Brandenburg in the considered time span. Additionally, it was in the opposition in all three parliaments, which ensures good comparability. As a contrast to the right-wing AfD, the speeches of Green state legislators from these states are considered. Importantly, the Greens also enjoyed parliamentary status in the three state parliaments in concern. While the AfD is considered a party that increased its visibility with migration-skeptical views (Berning, 2017, Art, 2018 and Arzheimer and Berning, 2019), the Greens are regarded as their cosmopolitan antagonist (Bayram, 2017, Franz, et al., 2019 and Hartmann, 2020). The distinction between these two parties provides a good basis to examine polarization on the issue immigration. This is especially valid for the selected states, which are all part of Eastern Germany. The AfD is considered to be stronger right-wing in Eastern Germany than in Western Germany (Kopke, 2017 and Linhart, 2017).

The time span from August 10, 2015 to March 31, 2016 accounts for a very charged time during the refugee crisis (see, e.g., Franzmann, 2019). While there is, to the best of my knowledge, no absolute definition for the peak of the crisis in Germany, this period contains important events within the crisis. August 10, 2015 marks an important date in the early stages of the crisis as a huge wave of refugees arrived in the time following that day. Moreover, on March 18, 2016, the European Union and Turkey signed the meaningful EU-Turkey readmission agreement, mitigating larger migration into Europe from that point on (Haller, 2017). In order to capture short-term reactions on this deal, I prolong the period considered until the end of the month the treaty was sealed.

I examine politicization of the issue immigration in two steps. This procedure is inspired by the framework to study politicization by Van der Brug, et al. (2015). According to their definition, political issues can be classified within a 2*2-dimensional matrix. The first dimension depicts how salient the issue is. The second dimension shows how polarized stances of parties on an arbitrary issue are. If and only if the issue is both salient and politically polarized, it is considered a politicized issue (Van der Brug, et al., 2015). Several studies on the politicization of immigration have employed this approach (e.g., Grande, et al., 2019, Lauwers, et al., 2021, and Hutter and Kriesi, 2022), yet with different sources of data compared to this article.

In contrast to related work (e.g., Hutter and Grande, 2014, Grande, et al., 2019, Lauwers, et al., 2021, and Hutter and Kriesi, 2022), I do not utilize the share of sentences dealing with immigration to measure salience. Instead, I examine what issues politicians of the AfD and the Greens, respectively, address during their speeches in which immigration is covered. The criterion for an arbitrary speech to be part of the analysis is that at least one word directly related to immigration is used in this speech. This allows to measure salience in a sense that politicians relate the issue immigration to other issues. According to this approach, a higher salience of immigration implies that it interacts with or affects more other issues. This hints at an increased importance of immigration. Politicians can employ this mechanism in state legislative sessions, the source of the data in this study, easily. Debating on different issues highlighted by the agenda, they can include statements about immigration to link it with the issue and thus to increase its salience. Consequently, this study treats salience as a qualitative measure.

The second dimension of politicization in line with the framework by Van der Brug, et al. (2015) is polarization between parties. Similarly to salience, this article employs a qualitative approach to examine the prevalence of polarization. This approach is different to a strand of work focusing on quantitative methods based on the ideological distance between parties (e.g., Hutter and Grande, 2014, Grande, et al., 2019, Lauwers, et al., 2021, and Hutter and Kriesi, 2022). While the analysis of salience requires to filter all speeches containing at least one word of the issue immigration, only sentences comprising at least one word of the issue immigration are covered by this step. This procedure enables to study what framing

legislators use debating on immigration. A large body of literature has shown the important role framing plays in electoral competition (e.g., Slothuus and De Vreese, 2010, Elias, et al., 2015 and Vliegenhart, et al., 2016). In this study, I examine whether politicians of the AfD and Greens, respectively, employ different frames on the same issue, immigration, during state legislative sessions. This would hint at polarization. Several studies on the framing of immigration utilize “issue-specific” framing categories with different subcategories to distinguish different frames (e.g., Benson, 2013, Hovden and Mjelde, 2019 and Mendelsohn, et al., 2021). According to the definition of framing by Benson (2013), a frame contains certain aspects that account for a specific definition of an issue (see also Entman, 1993). The frames used by Benson (2013) let immigrants appear as “victims”, “heroes” or “threats” (Benson, 2013, Hovden and Mjelde, 2019 and Mendelsohn, et al., 2021). An overview of the categories and subcategories can be found in the appendix. If the topics depicted in the analysis imply that framing differs on party level, this will be a clear indicator for polarization within the legislative debate.

If these two steps reveal that the issue immigration is both salient and polarized, there will be evidence that it was a politicized issue in the state legislative process during the peak of the refugee crisis in Germany. As outlined above, all speeches in the state parliaments of Saxony, Thuringia and Brandenburg held by legislators of the Greens and of the AfD between August 10, 2015 and March 31, 2016 are in concern. The state parliament sessions are minuted on a word-by-word basis. The minutes are available on the webpage of the respective state parliament. Thus, the sample accounts for a full-testing of the state legislative process in the three states in the regarded time span. The speeches and sentences containing at least one word of the issue immigration are then filtered automatically as described in the description of steps to analyze salience and polarization.

NLP is a method of rapidly increasing popularity to analyze the content of texts in various fields, including politics (e.g., Chatsiou and Mikhaylov, 2020 and Terechshenko, et al., 2020). NLP approaches have been applied to examine political communication (e.g., Takikawa and Nagayoshi, 2017 and Cabot, et al., 2020) and also to structure party manifestos in different dimensions (e.g., Olbrich and Banisch, 2021). Studying salience and polarization qualitatively, NLP delivers adequate tools for the analysis. The filtered speeches and sentences are analyzed on party and state level. Given that three states and two parties are in scope, there are six subsets of data containing speeches as well as six subsets comprising sentences. These subsets are each then cleansed (e.g., erasing common stop words from standard lists).

NLP contains different approaches to conduct topic modeling. The steps of analysis require topic modeling to detect issues and frames as outlined above. LSI (Deerwester, et al., 1990) and Latent Dirichlet Allocation (“LDA”, Blei, et al., 2003) are two frequently used approaches across research subjects. Both methods aim at solving the problem of vocabulary mismatch employing latent space models (Gupta and Varma, 2017). There are important differences between the two methods, though. LSI works on the basis of a spectral analysis of the corresponding term-document matrix and is an information retrieval technique (Deerwester, et al., 1990, Zheng, et al., 2016 and Potha and Stamatatos, 2017). On the contrary, LDA is trained with representations for documents as distributions over word topics and is considered a celebrated generative model (Blei, et al., 2003, Zheng, et al., 2016 and Potha and Stamatatos, 2017). Both techniques feature specific advantages over each other. On the one hand, LDA generally provides a higher accuracy (The, et al., 2006 and Bertalan and Ruiz, 2019). On the other hand, LSI has two advantages. LSI models are trained faster, which means, it requires fewer data to yield precise results. In addition, LSI performs better than LDA if the documents are similar (Teh, et al., 2006, Anaya, 2011 and Bertalan and Ruiz, 2019). These different strengths make LSI the better method for this study for two reasons. First, the data set is relatively small compared to studies dealing with, e.g., data sets from larger time spans. Second, the documents in the data set are similar. The documents are all from legislative sessions and comprise speeches on the issue immigration by candidates of one specific party. The argument is even stronger for the data set which contains sentences on the issue immigration.

The number of topics and words within each topic to run LSI differ a lot across sizes of data sets and research questions (e.g., Deerwester, et al., 1990, Gupta and Varma, 2017, Potha and Stamatatos, 2017 and Bertalan and Ruiz, 2019). There is no standard or rule to find out how many topics and words within each topic are optimal for LSI. I conduct the analysis of each subset with five topics and ten words per topic.

This number of topics is relatively low compared to other work. Yet, it is sufficient for each step conducted and especially suitable for the size of the subsets. The first step aims at finding other issues than immigration in speeches with immigration. This requires fewer topics than, e.g., detecting all topics of a specific data set (e.g., Bertalan and Ruiz, 2019). Similarly, the second step covers the analysis of different frames. This can also be achieved with a relatively low number of topics.

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND AND HYPOTHESES

A large strand of literature has convincingly shown that right-wing parties increased the politicization of the issue immigration (e.g., Grande, et al., 2019, Lauwers, et al., 2021, Gessler and Hunger, 2022 and Hutter and Kriesi, 2022). The approach by Van der Brug, et al. (2015), which is the basis of the framework in this study, has been employed by several studies in this area. In this study, I attempt to confirm the finding that immigration was politicized during the time span in the three state parliaments considered with qualitative measures of salience and polarization and a scarcely considered source of data.

I expect that this effect is rather driven by the AfD as suggested by related literature. As defined above, the first ingredient to increase politicization is to render an issue salient. There are several reasons why the AfD had an incentive to increase the salience of immigration during the refugee crisis. Theoretical literature suggests that immigration may be brought to the political arena by right-wing parties. According to the issue entrepreneurship theory (Hobolt and de Vries, 2015), right-wing parties have an incentive to introduce new issues to electoral competition in order to gain voters' support. This process involves the increase of salience to maximize the aspired effects. Other theoretical literature also supports that new parties challenge mainstream parties with new issues (e.g., Aragonès, et al., 2015 and Buisseret and van Weelden, 2020). Notably, the time span covers the peak of the refugee crisis in Germany. Thus, incentives to introduce the issue immigration to the state legislative process can be expected to be stronger than in less charged times. Moreover, the AfD was not part of the national parliament at that time. The AfD had been a party with a focus on euroscepticism before 2015. The refugee crisis opened up new dimensions for political agendas. As a result, the time span covered in this study can be considered a turning point for the AfD, shifting from only euro-scepticism to a party introducing immigration to the political arena with a very critical position (Jesse, 2018).

An increasing number of theoretical studies from economics on electoral competition also includes the salience of issues in the model. Salience is then an important aspect to determine what issues parties focus on (e.g., Krasa and Polborn, 2010, Krasa and Polborn, 2014 and Matakos and Xefteris, 2017). If the AfD considers immigration to be an advantageous issue for electoral competition, which is implied by the issue entrepreneurship theory, this strand of work also suggests that the AfD will have an incentive to increase salience. Similar arguments hinting at strategic behavior by the AfD to increase salience of immigration are also implied by the (neo-)cleavage theory (e.g., Kriesi, et al., 2012 and Hooghe and Marks, 2018). In order to polarize the electorate effectively with a new issue, raising its salience is key.

The next argument supporting the hypothesis that the AfD increased the salience of immigration stems from the concept of issue ownership. This concept suggests that a specific party or candidate emphasizes a certain issue because the party or candidate is better at handling the issue than the competitors (see, e.g., Petrocik, 1996). Several studies show that right-wing parties owned the issue migration in the mid of the 2010s (e.g., Dennison and Goodwin, 2015). Importantly, the AfD took ownership of this issue in the considered time span in this study (Arzheimer and Berning, 2019 and Franzmann, 2019). This insight strengthens the expectation that the AfD candidates increased the salience of immigration. If the AfD was considered more competent at the issue immigration there would be a clear incentive to make this issue more visible in the debate.

Finally, there is some empirical support that right-wing parties link immigration with other issues, which is the indicator for salience in this study. Gessler and Hunger (2022) reveal that these parties connected immigration with European integration in Austria, Switzerland and Germany based on press releases.

While several arguments suggest that the AfD aims at reaching higher levels of salience for the issue immigration, the cosmopolitan Greens are not expected to twin the issue immigration with other issues. Consequently, speeches of these party should not hint at an intended increase in salience. The Greens were already established in the German political landscape in 2015, contrary to the AfD. As a result, the Greens were not in need to introduce new issues to the political arena. Another difference to the AfD is that supporting immigration had already been part of the agenda of the Greens before the refugee crisis. As outlined above, the AfD was a relatively new party with a high emphasis on euro-scepticism at that time. Intuitively, introducing a new issue with a polarizing position yields a higher incentive to raise salience than explaining the stance on an issue that has already been part of the own agenda before.

Given the abovementioned arguments, the expectations on the issues addressed by state legislators of the AfD and of the Greens in speeches including the immigration are as follows:

Hypothesis 1 (Salience of immigration) *AfD legislators' speeches in all states comprising the issue immigration also deal with issues not directly related to immigration. Green legislators' respective speeches in all states only deal with immigration-related issues.*

The second dimension of politicization in this framework is polarization, in line with the work by Van der Brug, et al. (2015). An issue is considered polarized if stances on it differ between parties. This study tests whether polarization is prevalent in a sense that frames of the issue immigration employed by AfD legislators differ from those utilized by Green legislators. The analysis is based on the distinction between different frames of immigration used by Benson (2013) and Mendelsohn, et al. (2021). This study employs the same definition of a frame as Benson (2013). The main categories consider immigrants “victims”, “heroes” or “threats”. While the first two categories hint at a supportive and positive framing of immigration, the latter accounts for a skeptical and negative framing.

The ideological positions the AfD and the Greens each represent suggest that their politicians employ different frames in speeches during state legislative sessions. As described above, the AfD is widely considered a party skeptical on immigration (Berning, 2017, Art, 2018 and Arzheimer and Berning, 2019), whereas the Green are regarded as their ideological counterpart in support of immigration (Bayram, 2017, Fran, et al., 2019 and Hartmann, 2020). Applying the aforementioned scheme by Benson (2013) then suggests that AfD politicians frame the issue immigration as a threat. On the contrary, the frames in the respective topics by Green politicians can be attributed to the categories victims and heroes. The different categories of frames represented in topics result in a clear indicator for polarization. In addition to the distinct differences in the political agendas, the arguments implying that the AfD has an incentive to increase the salience of the issue immigration also indicate that the AfD has an incentive to elicit polarization. Following the issue entrepreneurship theory, the AfD should aim at polarization to emphasize the opposite stance on immigration compared to established parties, such as the Greens. The argument from the cleavage theory is similar. The effect of a cleavage introduced to the political arena increases in the distance between the positions covered by the competing parties. Finally, there is empirical evidence that the AfD employs a rougher tone addressing immigration (Kopke, 2017).

In line with the prementioned arguments, the expectations on topics addressed by state legislators of the AfD and of the Greens in sentences containing the issue immigration are as follows:

Hypothesis 2 (Polarization between parties) *AfD legislators' sentences dealing with immigration reveal a framing of threats within the topics in all states. The respective sentences by Green legislators show frames of victims and heroes in all states.*

If framing of immigration differs on party level as outlined in Hypothesis 2, this will be evidence for political polarization related to the issue immigration between the two considered parties in the state legislative process. As defined in the framework by Van der Brug, et al. (2015), polarization prevails if positions by parties are very different, which is met if Hypothesis 2 can be confirmed. Notice that, if the results affirm both hypotheses, there will be evidence that the issue immigration is politicized in the context

of this study. Because the AfD strengthens salience in this case, politicization is driven mainly by the AfD. In order to detect politicization, the second hypothesis has to be confirmed, which means that polarization given by different frames is a necessary condition. This does not apply to the first hypothesis. Politicization can be reached if any of the two parties or both parties increase salience by addressing issues not related to immigration in the respective speeches. Parties that engage in strengthening salience elicit politicization in case polarization pertains as depicted in Hypothesis 2. The hypotheses in line with several strands of literature yet suggest that AfD legislators politicize the issue immigration. They achieve this by increasing its salience and employing a negative framing contrary to the positive framing by Green legislators.

RESULTS

Before presenting the analyses of the hypotheses, I provide some descriptive statistics on the data set. Note that “SN” stands for Saxony, “TH” for Thuringia and “BB” for Brandenburg. Speeches and sentences dealing with the issue immigration are defined such that they contain at least one of the following words or compounds: *asyl*, *immigrant*, *refugee*, *immigration*, *fled*².

TABLE 1
SUMMARY STATISTICS

Number of / State: Party	Legislative sessions	Total speeches	Speeches immigration immigration	Share: Speeches	Sentences immigration
SN: AfD	14	443	77	17.4 %	382
SN: Greens	14	298	49	16.4 %	166
TH: AfD	23	409	104	25.4 %	555
TH: Greens	23	79	22	27.8 %	161
BB: AfD	10	220	64	29.1 %	248
BB: Greens	10	194	48	24.7 %	285

Table 1 reveals that the share of speeches held from August 10, 2015 to March 31, 2016 related to immigration do not differ much between AfD legislators and Green legislators in SN and TH. The biggest difference prevails in BB, where the share of speeches containing the issue immigration is by 4.4 percentage points higher for AfD legislators compared to Green legislators. There are notable differences between state parliaments, though. Across parties, the share of speeches comprising the issue immigration as defined is higher in TH and BB compared to SN. If this study were to use a standard quantitative approach to measure salience of an arbitrary issue this would be evidence to conclude that the issue immigration was more salient in the peak of refugee crisis in TH and BB than in SN. This is due to both parties’ more frequent focus on the issue.

Next, I present the results on the topics legislators of the AfD and of the Greens address in their speeches containing the issue immigration across the different states. This analysis aims to test Hypothesis 1 for each state.

The following two tables show the topics from the speeches held by each AfD and Green legislators in SN³. In the right column, each topic is summarized by a key word.

TABLE 2A
TOPICS IN SPEECHES: AFD IN SN

No.	Words	Description
1	request, citizens, euro, million, germany, applicant for asylum, refugee, human, saxony, already	request costs
2	euro, million, rural district, independent, local authority, local, amount, city, separate estate, space	costs constitution
3	pallas ⁴ , Albrecht, asylum law, immigration, consider, agreed, use, voice, bartl ⁵ , opinion	state politicians asylum law
4	property, square meter, million, euro, housing space, vacancy, property, vacant, administrative order, request	housing costs
5	leipzig, begin, state minister, council for refugees, equality, translator, mandatory, conduct, convey, anyway	Integration via language education

TABLE 2B
TOPICS IN SPEECHES: GREENS IN SN

No.	Words	Description
1	request, saxony, human, integration, commune, afd, political, city, faction, tillich ⁶	AfD request on integration
2	state of law, commune, tillich, municipality, integration, heidenau, city, monopoly on the use of force, force, worth	federal structure
3	commune, city, municipality, jewish, organization for immigrants, state minister, hungary, afd, european, organization for immigrants of the state	organizations for immigrants
4	School, youths, child, state of law, resource, politics, integration, hungary, immigration background, students	education resources
5	Interview, hungary, commune, safety, draft bill, state of law, coalition, playing soccer, afd, jewish	safety state of law

Tables 2a and 2b yield evidence that both legislators of the AfD and legislators of the Greens in SN address issues related to immigration in speeches which contain at least one word of the issue immigration. Moreover, AfD politicians include another issue, which is the federal structure. Thus, Hypothesis 1 cannot be rejected for SN. In addition, AfD legislators mention costs in three of the five topics. This is not met in the respective speeches by Green legislators.

Next, speeches held by AfD legislators and Green legislators in TH are analyzed analogously:

TABLE 3A
TOPICS IN SPEECHES: AFD IN TH

No.	Words	Description
1	euro, local authority, applicant for asylum, draft bill, state government, democracy, million, Thuringian, school, certainly	costs lawmaking
2	media information, organizer, consumer protection, justice, immigration, launiger ⁷ minister, petty bourgeois, xenophobic, demonstration	immigration law demonstration
3	democracy, referendum, polling, citizens' initiative, people, direct, euro, constitution, media information, citizen	pure democracy
4	local authority, student, euro, sport club, school, teacher, million, gymnasium, local, local government reorganization	local educational infrastructure costs
5	sport club, school, europe, gymnasium, local authority, EU, student, democracy, sport, acceptance rate	european democracy local educational infrastructure

TABLE 3B
TOPICS IN SPEECHES: GREENS IN TH

No.	Words	Description
1	euro, refugee, million, human, day, disposal, school, cdu, request, subsequent	costs request
2	interview, draft bill, oral, sport, youth, additional question, document, legislator, committee, session	legislative session
3	education for adults, fit, euro, million, day, munich, strengthen, refugee, maybe, sponsor	optimization of refugee education
4	document, additional question, legislator, insulation, oral, accommodation for refugees, request, state secretary, götz ⁸ , assault	request refugee protection
5	municipality, integration of refugees, social workers at schools (female), school related, education of adults, day, social workers at schools (male), municipality, social work for the youth, organizer	education and social work for integration

Tables 3a and 3b reveal that AfD candidates include topics addressing democracy in speeches containing the issue immigration in SN. These are topic three and topic five. This result shows that those speeches also cover wider issues with which the issue immigration is linked. This pattern cannot be found within the respective speeches delivered by the Greens. The second topic is not directly related to immigration, but an administrative one. Combining the findings on side of the AfD and on side of the Greens, there is evidence that AfD legislators attempt to increase the salience of the issue immigration as outlined in Hypothesis 1. This does not apply to Green legislators in TH. As a result, Hypothesis 1 is confirmed for TH.

As a last step to examine Hypothesis 1, speeches of AfD legislators and Green legislators in BB are analyzed:

TABLE 4A
TOPICS IN SPEECHES: AFD IN BB

No.	Words	Description
1	Political, human, say, sanction, brandenburg, state government, politics, euro, state, cdu	state politics
2	Sanction, Russia, economy, Russian, political, german, partner, medium-sized, reach, relationship	economic partnership between Russia and Germany
3	kretschmann ⁹ , teacher, facility, east, baden-württemberg, greens, school, municipality, prime minister, winfried	Winfried Kretschmann schools
4	School, facility, teacher, accommodate, gymnasium, tent, use, child, space, financial	accommodation at schools
5	kretschmann, force, east, baden-württemberg, brandenburgian, winfried, available, distribution, green, plumber	Winfried Kretschmann violence in Brandenburg

TABLE 4B
TOPICS IN SPEECHES: GREENS IN BB

No.	Words	Description
1	integration, shared accommodation, state, euro, good, fled, million, human, request, Brandenburg	integration costs
2	shared accommodation, afd, fled, draft, bill, flat, Germany, private, supply, social politics, threat	accommodation
3	shared accommodation, border check, reception centre, university, removal, fled, violence, commission of inquiry, country of origin, asylum applications	Arrival of refugees
4	shared accommodation, euro, million, supplemental budget, draft bill, force, flat, fled, federal state, budget	costs for accommodation
5	private, minister, problem, unaccompanied, housing space, motion for a resolution, underage, feel happy for, ending, general agreement	agreement on accommodation for underaged without parents

As depicted in Table 4a, only topic four addressed by AfD legislators in BB is related to immigration. The other topics on their side deal with state politics, international relations and the prime minister of the state Baden-Württemberg, Winfried Kretschmann, who represents the Greens. Consequently, there is evidence to conclude that AfD legislators in BB aim to increase the salience of the issue immigration as defined above. On the contrary, all topics addressed by the Greens in BB deal with immigration. Due to the evidence found, Hypothesis 1 is confirmed for BB.

In the following, I examine Hypothesis 2 for each state, similar to the previous analysis. Therefore, the topics addressed in sentences containing the issue immigration are considered. The description contains a frame as outlined by Benson (2013) and Mendelsohn, et al. (2021) or, if those frames are not applicable, a summary of the topic as in the prior step.

For SN, the topics addressed by AfD legislators and Green legislators, respectively, in sentences comprising the issue immigration are as follows:

TABLE 5A
TOPICS IN SENTENCES: AFD IN SN

No.	Words	Description
1	applicant for asylum, must, refugee, saxony, more, year, germany, million, asylum, euro	Threat: Fiscal
2	european, agenda for migration, applicant for asylum, already, together, politics on asylum, enumerate, system of asylum, new, policy for immigration	Threat: Public Order
3	asylum, applicant for asylum, euro, million, european, must, refugee, county, already, agenda for immigration	Threat: Fiscal
4	asylum law, million, euro, applicant for asylum, go, germany, county, european, know, AfD	Threat: Fiscal
5	asylum law, go, know, requesting asylum, AfD, asylum, stand, time, therefore, abandon	Threat: Public Order

TABLE 5B
TOPICS IN SENTENCES: GREENS IN SN

No.	Words	Description
1	Refugee, go, topic, integration, request, asylum, seeking for asylum, saxony, assault, fled	Victim: Discrimination
2	Motivated, political, accommodation for asylees, crime, right-wing mentioned, case, capture, arson, refugee	Victim: Discrimination
3	Refugee, topic, accommodation for refugees, assault, asylum, integration, at, fled, go, debate	Victim: Discrimination
4	Accommodation for refugees, refugee, assault, all around Germany, go, request, society, accommodate, reject, demand	Victim: Discrimination
5	Request, organization for immigrants, placement, topic, fled, stand, assault, child, youths, immigration background	Victim: Discrimination

Table 5a indicates that AfD legislators in SN focus on topics framing immigrants as a threat in line with the framework employed by Benson (2013) and Mendelsohn, et al. (2021) within sentences dealing with immigration in their speeches. Topics one, three and four are about costs immigration entails. Moreover, topics two and five imply that asylum law has altered due to the waves of immigrants at that time. On the contrary, topics addressed by Green legislators in SN suggest that they consider immigrants as victims of crime. This pattern prevails in all five topics. Consequently, Hypothesis 2 can be confirmed for SN, implying that there is polarization based on the different frames of immigration.

Next, sentences by each AfD and Green legislators in TH are analyzed:

TABLE 6A
TOPICS IN SENTENCES: AFD IN TH

No.	Words	Description
1	immigration, consumer protection, justice, minister, launiger, applicant for asylum, year, committee, million, euro	Threat: Fiscal
2	year, applicant for asylum, consumer protection, justice, immigration, minister, million, euro, launiger, more	Threat: Fiscal
3	euro, year, million, refugee, per, politics on asylum, must, certainly, say, asylum	Threat: Fiscal
4	applicants for asylum, euro, million, placement, year, accommodate, state, child, fair, field of asylum	Threat: Fiscal
5	year, applicant for asylum, euro, placement, Germany, last, number, per cent, refugee, accommodate	Numbers on refugees

TABLE 6B
TOPICS IN SENTENCES: GREENS IN TH

No.	Words	Description
1	seeking for asylum, refugee, must, Thuringia, human, accommodation for refugees, fled, state, secure, attack	Victim: Discrimination
2	seeking for asylum, accommodation for refugees, refugee, attack, must, act of violence, human, state, right-wing, racist	Victim: Discrimination
3	cdu, committee, justice, consumer protection, immigration, draft bill, transfer, fiedler ¹⁰ , request, must	legislative process
4	thuringia, seeking for asylum, attack, accommodation for refugees, act of violence, secure, local authority, year, so-called, country of origin	Victim: Discrimination
5	protection, task, Thuringia, come, fled, human, always, grant, put, clear	protection for refugees

According to Table 6a, AfD legislators talk about the costs of immigration in several contexts, e.g., consumer protection and accommodation. This hints at a framing of immigration as a threat. Only the last topic does not convey a frame in a sense that immigration can be considered a threat. Green legislators in TH frame immigrants as victims of discrimination in a sense that there is crime and violence against. This prevails in topics one, three and four. The last topic suggests that the state has to protect refugees, which strengthens this framing. Thus, the evidence suggests that Hypothesis 2 can be confirmed in TH.

Finally, sentences by each AfD and Green legislators in BB are examined:

TABLE 7A
TOPICS IN SENTENCES: AFD IN BB

No.	Words	Description
1	refugee, come, applicant for asylum, state, Brandenburg, must, know, year, let, say	Refugees in Brandenburg
2	come, applicant for asylum, refugee, refugee crisis, let, fled, costs, Brandenburg, year, always	Threat: Public Order Fiscal
3	refugee crisis, costs, overcoming, immigration crisis, applicant for asylum, enormous, challenge, come, know, asylum	Threat: Public Order Fiscal
4	seeking for asylum, fled, applicant for asylum, request, put in, human, come, legal status, asylum, let	Process of integration
5	politics on asylum, applicant for asylum, already, Brandenburg, must, asylum application, reject, immigration, year, know	Administration of immigration

TABLE 7B
TOPICS IN SENTENCES: GREENS IN BB

No.	Words	Description
1	refugee, human, fled, brandenburg, state, integration, must, more, provide, good	Hero: Integration
2	Integration, fled, human, immigrant, supply, more, request, refugee, always, state	More opportunities for integration
3	accommodation for refugees, integration, especially, attack, violence, political, supply, human, act of crime, fled	Victim: Discrimination
4	more, integration, immigrant, germany, state government, flat, federal state, moment, possible, say	More opportunities for integration
5	integration, state, under aged, unaccompanied, secure, must, more, fled, immigrant, really	Immigration of under aged

Topics two and three within Table 7a show that AfD legislators in BB consider the situation at that time as a crisis, which hints at a framing of a threat for the public order, in line with Benson (2013) and Mendelsohn, et al. (2021). Besides, costs are also part of these two topics, suggesting a frame of a fiscal threat. This is in line with the findings for AfD legislators in the other two states. The other topics do not convey such a frame, though. Topics addressed by Green legislators in BB do not only suggest that the Greens consider immigrants as victims of violence as in the two prior cases, but also that immigrants integrate into society and that this process has to be enhanced. As a result, Hypothesis 2 can be confirmed for BB.

Summarizing the results of the two conducted steps to check for the hypotheses in each state, there is evidence that immigration is a polarized issue in all three considered states. Moreover, especially in TH and BB, AfD legislators address issues not directly related to immigration in speeches that contain the issue immigration. This hints at an attempt to increase the salience of the issue immigration as defined. Thus, AfD legislators politicize the issue immigration notably in TH and BB and to some extent in SN. This is in line with previous literature on politicization of immigration and on how right-wing parties.

DISCUSSION

An increasing number of studies shows that right-wing parties have strengthened the politicization of the issue immigration in various countries (Grande, et al., 2019, Lauwers, et al., 2021, Gessler and Hunger, 2022 and Hutter and Kriesi, 2022). These articles employ a quantitative measure, i.e., the share of text dealing with immigration, to examine the salience of the issue immigration. Using speeches in three German state parliaments during the peak of the refugee crisis in Germany and this quantitative measure, I cannot confirm an increase of the salience of the issue immigration stemming from the speeches by the right-wing AfD. The shares of speeches comprising at least one word from the issue immigration do not differ much between AfD and Green legislators on state level. In case of TH, the share is even higher on the Green side.

There are two reasons why the quantitative criterion does not imply a stronger emphasis on the issue immigration on the AfD side compared to the Green side of each parliament. First, legislative sessions feature an agenda which provides a clear structure on issues to a large extent. Thus, there is few space for legislators to place issues arbitrarily in case those do not fit the agenda item. In contrast, parties are able to design manifestos, social media posts and press releases. These constitute the basis of most related studies, with very few restrictions regarding content. Second, this study analyzes legislative speeches only within the peek of the refugee crisis, while other literature focuses on long periods of time and identifies peeks of salience. In the latter strand of literature, peeks with high salience of the issue immigration are characterized by high shares of content related to immigration compared to times with low salience. Within the peeks, differences are not detected, as in this study. This study also suggests that in peek times, not only right-wing parties, but also cosmopolitan parties such as the Greens in Germany deal with the issue immigration with high intensity.

Quantitative measures do not suggest that AfD legislators politicized the issue immigration because of a lack of an increase in salience. This does not indicate that the data on legislative sessions does not provide evidence that the AfD politicized immigration. Instead of quantitative criteria, qualitative criteria newly introduced to the literature show that the AfD politicizes the issue immigration in the case of the legislative process.

AfD legislators address several issues which are not directly related to immigration in speeches comprising the issue immigration. These include state politics in general, democratic processes, international politics and relations and politics in other German states. This is evidence that AfD legislators attempt to connect immigration with other issues to increase its importance. Intuitively, AfD politicians suggest that immigration influences the other issues, the other way around or that both directions are valid. An exact analysis of the direction of the influence is not possible with NLP methods. The existence can be shown, though. On the contrary, Green legislators focus on immigration in their respective speeches. Some topics deal with integration, education and accommodation. These are important aspects of politics on immigration. This is a key difference to the topics found for AfD legislators. Intuitively, Green politicians focus on immigration and all its facets itself to optimize the work on this issue. As a contrast, AfD legislators put immigration and its effects in a much wider context. These findings provide abundant evidence to conclude that AfD legislators, contrarily to Green legislators, intentionally increase the salience of the issue immigration.

There is an alternative approach to explain the prevalence of issues not related to immigration in speeches held by AfD politicians. While the agenda of state legislative session is structured, there are also some general agenda items at which representatives discuss general or major issues. Following the results, this could imply that the AfD places the issue immigration into the set of important issues they address in this agenda item. This does not require any direct connection between these issues. This explanation does not hurt the conclusion that AfD legislators increase salience while Greens do not do so, though. The explanation from the previous paragraph assumes that the increased salience of immigration stems from the interaction between immigration and various other issues. The approach in this paragraph suggests that an increase in salience of immigration is depicted by addressing this issue in agenda items dedicated to major issues. In other words, the first explanation is based on an indirect increase of salience while the latter explanation rests on a direct increase of salience. Importantly, neither approach suggests an intended

increase of salience by Green legislators. Distinguishing between the two approaches is not possible with the method used in this article but is an interesting avenue for future literature on this matter.

The outcomes on salience are in line with the expectations depicted in Hypothesis 1. Literature on the (neo-)cleavage theory (e.g., Kriesi, et al., 2012 and Hooghe and Marks, 2018) and on the issue entrepreneurship theory (e.g., Hobolt and de Vries, 2015 and Buisseret and van Weelden, 2020) suggests that the AfD, a relatively new party at that time, had an interest in increasing the salience of immigration. This study adds evidence of these theories from the legislative process with a qualitative measure for salience. Moreover, the concept of issue ownership provides another explanation why the AfD had an incentive to increase the salience of the issue immigration. Several studies find that the AfD took the ownership of this issue during the time span considered in this article (Arzheimer and Berning, 2019 and Franzmann, 2019). The finding that the AfD linked the issue immigration with other issues may be interpreted as evidence of the process of taking the ownership. If the links between the issue immigration and other issues seem sensible for the electorate, this will be an indicator for the competence of the AfD regarding immigration.

Recent literature on the relation between the salience of an arbitrary issue within an electorate and political elites suggests that an increase of salience of an arbitrary issue within the electorate causes changes in politicians' communication (Helbling and Tresch, 2011, Wagner and Meyer, 2014, Klüver and Sagarzazu, 2016, Stier, et al., 2018 and Dennison and Geddes, 2019). The results from this study can be interpreted as an example for this pattern. As outlined in section 2, the refugee crisis reached its peak during the time span considered with a large share of the electorate shaping opinions on this issue (Jesse, 2018 and Niedermayer, 2018). Combining with the (neo-)cleavage theory and the issue entrepreneurship theory, the AfD could have been incentivized to change the communication in legislative sessions to increase the salience of immigration. The incentive also applies to the political arena.

Additionally, the results support the increasing role salience plays in theoretical models of electoral competition from political economy (e.g., Krasa and Polborn, 2010, Krasa and Polborn, 2014 and Matakos and Xefteris, 2017). In such models, salience or the weight of the issue is treated as an exogenous parameter. It determines, e.g., how much an issue is focused in strategies. The evidence suggests that certain parties increase salience of issues by themselves, though. Thus, this article suggests that modeling salience as an endogenous parameter is a more realistic assumption. This insight may enhance theoretical models from political economy.

The examination of sentences in which each AfD and Green legislators mention the issue immigration suggests that they frame immigration differently as expected in Hypothesis 2. This applies to each of the three states considered. Moreover, the framing used by AfD politicians suggests that immigration is a threat while the Greens frame immigrants as victims. The frame of a threat can be considered negative, whereas the victim framing is supportive towards immigrants. This is evidence that there is ideological polarization between the parties considered. The framework by Benson (2013) and Hovden and Mjelde (2019) provides several subcategories of the general frames victim, hero and threat. The framing hero only prevails for the Greens in BB in one topic. Most topics found are evidence of the subcategory "fiscal" in case of the AfD while most topics can be attributed to the subcategory "discrimination" on the Green side. Some other topics addressed by AfD legislators in SN and BB can be related to the subcategory "public order".

While the major categories of frames in the results are as expected, the low number of subcategories featured in the sentences requires some intuition. One reason behind the limited scope of subcategories may be the source of data. In state legislative sessions, daily and current political issues are discussed. Thus, the focus is on events and major concerns which matter at that time. In addition, the time each legislator possesses for each speech is limited. Both factors contribute to speeches that aim at conveying as much important content as possible. Contrary to e.g., manifestos or press releases, there is not enough time to address developments or reasons behind events. Stating costs of immigration or violence against immigrants is much easier and more valuable in this regard than, e.g., explaining long-term effects of immigration or reasons behind immigration. Examples for subcategories depicting long-term effects in the framework by Van der Brug, et al. (2015) and Hovden and Mjelde (2019) are "jobs" or "worker", an

example for a reason for integration is “global economy”. Such subcategories should not be expected in speeches from state legislative sessions.

The time frame of the collected speeches and sentences accounts for another reason. As outlined in section two, it is the peak of the refugee crisis in Germany. At that time, large numbers of immigrants arrived. Consequently, long-term effects of immigration on, e.g., society, culture and economy could not be detected at that time. There should thus be a strong focus on the arrival and short-term accommodation of immigrants with all its effects. The topics of the first analysis support this expectation.

The results from this analysis are evidence that framing an arbitrary issue in different manners can engender polarization. Notably, the data consists of speeches and not of manifesto data. The latter contains much more information about policies. Consequently, the nature of polarization found in various other studies that focus on manifestos (e.g., Hutter and Grande, 2014 and Meyer and Rosenberger, 2015) is different to the nature of polarization in this article. Importantly, there are more opportunities to polarize by employing framing, e.g., in social media and in speeches, than by utilizing policies. Therefore, the study therefore reinforces the growing body of contemporary literature that researches the role of framing in politics (e.g., Slothuus and De Vreese, 2010, Elias, et al., 2015 and Vliegenhar, et al., 2016).

The results show that legislative sessions as a data source as well as qualitative measures of salience and polarization are worthwhile alternatives to approaches in related literature. Similar research questions could be examined with focus on centre-right parties (inspired by earlier findings by e.g., Green-Pedersen and Krogstrup, 2008, Meyer and Rosenberger, 2015 and Van der Bru, et al., 2015) or on changes over time, e.g., before and after a tipping point in the course of a crisis. Notice that, data sets from state legislative sessions are not very large compared to long-term manifesto data. Yet, they are relatively easy to collect completely and can show short-term effects well because parliamentary sessions are frequent and deal with current issues.

Using a quantitative measure for salience did not reveal the results expected in Hypothesis 1. On the contrary, a newly introduced qualitative measure uncovered that the salience of the issue immigration was rather increased by AfD legislators than by Green legislators. This is evidence that salience should not only be considered a quantitative characteristic, but also a qualitative one.

Finally, the results show that AfD legislators in SN did not politicize immigration as much as their colleagues in TH and BB due to lower increases in salience. The purely quantitative measure also suggests that salience was higher in TH and BB compared to SN. This is depicted by a lower share of speeches dealing with immigration from both parties in SN. This implies that the context matters for the investigation of politicization. Importantly, certain local events may have a strong effect. The topics provide several clues that local events are addressed. Examples include demonstrations and crime against accommodations for refugees.

CONCLUSION

This study presents how the right-wing AfD politicized the issue immigration during the peak of the refugee crisis in Germany. Using state legislative speeches from three state parliaments as a basis, it employs a new type of data source within the corresponding literature. Moreover, it builds on the definition of a politicized political issue by Van der Brug, et al. (2015), who assume that an issue is politicized if and only if it is both salient and polarized. Salience and polarization are measured qualitatively and using NLP, contrary to related literature. Immigration is salient if speeches covering immigration also contain other political issues. Employing frame categories as introduced by Benson (2013) and Hovden and Mjelde (2019), topic modeling applied on the sentences containing the issue immigration can detect different frames across parties and thus polarization. The results show that the AfD politicized the issue immigration as expected in all states considered, especially in Thuringia and Brandenburg. AfD legislators, contrarily to Green legislators, raised the salience of immigration connecting it with various other political issues. Moreover, AfD politicians frame immigrants as a threat while Greens employ a victim frame, suggesting strong polarization.

With its results and approach, the study contributes to the strand of literature finding that right-wing populist drive the politicization of immigration. This is accomplished with novel criteria to measure salience and polarization, though. The is key to detect an increase of salience induced by the AfD qualitatively since the shares of speeches dealing with polarization do not differ much between the Greens and the AfD.

Besides its new features to the literature on politicization of immigration, the study contributes to and reinforces other related work as well. The results are in support of both the (neo-)cleavage theory (e.g., Kriesi, et al., 2012 and Hooghe and Marks, 2018) and the issue entrepreneurship theory (e.g., Hobolt and de Vries, 2015 and Buisseret and van Weelden, 2020). Moreover, it shows how parties can influence the salience of issues. This is a key finding for recent theoretical work on electoral competition comprising the salience of issues (e.g., Krasa and Polborn, 2010, Krasa and Polborn, 2014 and Matakos and Xefteris, 2017).

Finally, the approach employed in this article opens up plenty of room for further studies on the politicization of issues. Future research may e.g., focus on short-term effects, which are by the nature of parliamentary sessions a good field. Moreover, differences in the degree of politicization between an arbitrary party across states can be examined. Additionally, it can be a valuable to consider what issues parties associate with a given arbitrary issue.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am thankful to the participants of the 2023 Meeting of the European Public Choice Society.

ENDNOTES

Data availability statement and Data deposition: Only minutes of state legislative sessions in the German states Saxony, Thuringia and Brandenburg from August 10, 2015 to March 31, 2016 are used. These can be found on the webpages of the state parliaments or under the DOI: 10.17605/OSF.IO/7APW6.

1. This term is mainly employed by media and refers to the time period between 2014 and 2016. The number of asylum applications reached several heights in Germany during this time span. The term is used in this article for clarity reasons. The assessment leading to this term is not supported.
2. The German words are: Asyl, Migrant, Flüchtling, Migration, Geflüchtet, geflüchtet, Zuwander, zugewandert. Notice that immigrant, immigration and refugees have more than one valid translation in German and that some German words are shortened to gather compounds.
3. Words are translated from German into English. Note that German compounds cannot be translated with an English compound in many cases, which results in more than one word in the translation. Topics in German can be found in the appendix.
4. Albrecht Pallas: state legislator, Social Democrat (SPD)
5. Klaus Bartl: state legislator for the left party
6. Stanislaw Tillich: prime minister of Saxony, Christ Democrat (CDU)
7. Dieter Launiger: Minister of migration, justice and consumer protection in Thuringia, Green
8. Probably a reference to Götz Kubitschek, a right-wing activist
9. Winfried Kretschmann: prime minister of Baden-Württemberg, Green
10. Wolfgang Fiedler: state legislator in Thuringia, Christ Democrat (CDU)

REFERENCES

- Akkerman, T. (2018). *The impact of populist radical-right parties on immigration policy agendas: A look at the Netherlands*. Washington D.C.: Migration Policy Institute.
- Anaya, L.H. (2011). *Comparing Latent Dirichlet Allocation and Latent Semantic Analysis as Classifiers*. ERIC.
- Aragónes, E., Castanheira, M., & Giani, M. (2015). Electoral competition through issue selection. *American Journal of Political Science*, 59(1), 71–90.
- Art, D. (2018). The AfD and the End of Containment in Germany? *German Politics and Society*, 36(2), 76–86.
- Arzheimer, K., & Berning, C.C. (2019). How the Alternative for Germany (AfD) and their voters veered to the radical right, 2013–2017. *Electoral Studies*, 60(1), 10–40.
- Bayram, A.B. (2017). Due Deference: Cosmopolitan Social Identity and the Psychology of Legal Obligation in International Politics. *International Organization*, 71(1), 137–163.
- Benson, R. (2013). *Shaping Immigration News: A French-American Comparison*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Berning, C.C. (2017). Alternative für Deutschland (AfD) – Germany’s New Radical Right-wing Populist Party. *ifo DICE Report*, 17(4), 16–19.
- Bertalan, V.G., & Ruiz, E.E.S. (2019). Using Topic Modeling to Find Main Discussion Topics in Brazilian Political Websites. *Proceedings of the 25th Brazilian Symposium on Multimedia and the Web*, pp. 245–249.
- Blei, D.M., Ng, A.Y., & Jordan, M.I. (2003). Latent Dirichlet Allocation. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 3(1), 993–1022.
- Buisseret, P., & van Weelden, R. (2020). Crashing the party? Elites, outsiders, and elections. *American Journal of Political Science*, 64(2), 356–370.
- Cabot, P.-L.H., Dankers, V., Abadi, D., Fischer, A., & Shutova, E. (2020). The pragmatics behind politics: Modelling metaphor, framing and emotion in political discourse. *Findings of the association for computational linguistics: EMNLP 2020*, pp. 4479–4488.
- Chatsiou, K., & Mikhaylov, S.J. (2020). Deep Learning for Political Science. *CoRR*.
- de Vries, C.E. (2018). The cosmopolitan-parochial divide: Changing patterns of party and electoral competition in the Netherlands and beyond. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 25(12), 1541–1565.
- Deerwester, S., Dumais, S.T., Furnas, G.W., Landauer, T.K., & Harshman, R. (1990). Indexing by latent semantic analysis. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science*, 41(6), 391–407.
- Dennison, J., & Geddes, A. (2019). A Rising Tide? The Salience of Immigration and the Rise of Anti-Immigration Political Parties in Western Europe. *The Political Quarterly*, 90(1), 107–116.
- Dennison, J., & Goodwin, M. (2015). Immigration, Issue Ownership and the Rise of UKIP. *Parliamentary Affairs*, 68(1), 168–187.
- Elias, A., Szöcsik, E., & Zuber, C.I. (2015). Position, selective emphasis and framing: How parties deal with a second dimension in competition. *Party Politics*, 21(6), 839–850.
- Entman, R.M. (1993). Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. *Journal of Communication*, 43(4), 51–58.
- Franz, C., Fratzscher, M., & Kritikos, A. (2019). Grüne und AfD als neue Gegenpole der gesellschaftlichen Spaltung in Deutschland. *DIW Wochenbericht*, 86(34), 591–602.
- Franzmann, S.T. (2019). Extra-Parliamentary Opposition within a Transforming Political Space: The AfD and FDP under Merkel III between 2013 and 2017. *German Politics*, 28(3), 332–349.
- Gattinara, P.C., & Morales, L. (2017). *The politicization and securitization of migration in Western Europe: public opinion, political parties and the immigration issue*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Gessler, T., & Hunger, S. (2022). How the refugee crisis and radical right parties shape party competition on immigration. *Political Science Research and Methods*, 10(3), 524–544.

- Grande, E., Schwarzbözl, T., & Fatke, M. (2019). Politicizing immigration in Western Europe. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 26(10), 1444–1463.
- Green-Pedersen, C., & Krogstrup, J. (2008). Immigration as a political issue in Denmark and Sweden. *European Journal of Political Research*, 47(5), 610–634.
- Green-Pedersen, C., & Otjes, S. (2019). A hot topic? Immigration on the agenda in Western Europe. *Party Politics*, 25(3), 424–434.
- Gupta, S., & Varma, V. (2017). Scientific Article Recommendation by Using Distributed Representations of Text and Graph. *Proceedings of the 26th International Conference on World Wide Web Companion*.
- Hainmueller, J., & Hopkins, D. J. (2014). Public attitudes toward immigration. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 17(1), 225–249.
- Halikiopoulou, D. (2018). A Right-wing Populist Momentum? A Review of 2017 Elections Across Europe. *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 12(1), 133–154.
- Haller, M. (2017). *Die Flüchtlingskrise in den Medien. Tagesaktueller Journalismus zwischen Meinung und Information*. Frankfurt am Main: Otto Brenner Stiftung.
- Hartmann, M. (2020). Die Kosmopoliten als Profiteure des Nationalstaats und seiner Institutionen. *Leviathan*, 48(1), 90–111.
- Helbling, M., & Tresch, A. (2011). Measuring party positions and issue salience from media coverage: Discussing and cross-validating new indicators. *Electoral Studies*, 30(1), 174–183.
- Hobolt, S.B., & de Vries, C.E. (2015). Issue Entrepreneurship and Multiparty Competition. *Comparative Political Studies*, 48(9), 1159–1185.
- Hooghe, L., & Marks, G. (2018). Cleavage theory meets Europe’s crises: Lipset, Rokkan, and the transnational cleavage. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 25(1), 109–135.
- Hovden, J.F., & Mjelde, H. (2019). Increasingly Controversial, Cultural, and Political: The Immigration Debate in Scandinavian Newspapers 1970–2016. *Javnost*, 26(2), 138–157.
- Hutter, S., & Grande, E. (2014). Politicizing Europe in the National Electoral Arena: A Comparative Analysis of Five West European Countries, 1970–2010. *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 52(5), 1002–1018.
- Hutter, S., & Kriesi, H. (2022). Politicising immigration in times of crisis. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 48(2), 341–365.
- Jesse, E. (2018). Die Bundestagswahl 2017 und die Regierungsbildung. *Zeitschrift für Politik*, 65(2), 168–194.
- Kluüver, H., & Sagarzazu, I. (2016). Setting the Agenda or Responding to Voters? Political Parties, Voters and Issue Attention. *West European Politics*, 39(2), 380–398.
- Kopke, C. (2017). Verschwörungsmymen und Feindbilder in der AfD und in der neuen Protestbewegung von rechts. *Neue Kriminalpolitik*, 29(1), 49–61.
- Krasa, S., & Polborn, M. (2010). The binary policy model. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 145(2), 661–688.
- Krasa, S., & Polborn, M. (2014). Social ideology and taxes in a differentiated candidates framework. *American Economic Review*, 104(1), 308–322.
- Kriesi, H., Grande, E., Lachat, R., Dolezal, M., Bornschie, S., & Frey, T. (2012). *West European Politics in the Age of Globalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lauwers, N., Orbie, J., & Delputte, S. (2021). The Politicization of the Migration–Development Nexus: Parliamentary Discourse on the European Union Trust Fund on Migration. *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 59(1), 72–90.
- Linhart, E. (2017). Politische Positionen der AfD auf Landesebene: Eine Analyse auf Basis von Wahl-O-Mat-Daten. *Zeitschrift für Parlamentsfragen*, 48(1), 102–123.
- Matakos, K., & Xefteris, D. (2017). Divide and rule: Redistribution in a model with differentiated candidates. *Economic Theory*, 63, 867–902.
- Maxwell, R. (2019). Cosmopolitan Immigration Attitudes in Large European Cities: Contextual or Compositional Effects? *American Political Science Review*, 113(2), 456–474.

- Mendelsohn, J., Budak, C., & Jurgens, D. (2021). Modeling Framing in Immigration Discourse on Social Media. *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*.
- Meyer, S., & Rosenberger, S. (2015). Just a shadow? The role of radical right parties in the politicization of immigration, 1995–2009. *Politics and Governance*, 3(2), 1–17.
- Niedermayer, O. (2018). Die Entwicklung des bundesdeutschen Parteiensystems. In *Handbuch der deutschen Parteien* (pp. 114–135). Wiesbaden: Springer VS.
- Olbrich, E., & Banisch, S. (2021). The Rise of Populism and the Reconfiguration of the German Political Space. *Front. Big Data*.
- Petrocik, J.R. (1996). Issue Ownership in Presidential Elections, with a 1980 Case Study. *American Journal of Political Science*, 40(3), 825–850.
- Potha, N., & Stamatatos, E. (2017). Intrinsic Author Verification Using Topic Modeling. *Proceedings of the 10th Hellenic Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pp. 1–7.
- Slothuus, R., & De Vreese, C.H. (2010). Political Parties, Motivated Reasoning, and Issue Framing Effects. *The Journal of Politics*, 72(3), 630–645.
- Stier, S., Bleier, A., Lietz, H., & Strohmaier, M. (2018). Election Campaigning on Social Media: Politicians, Audiences, and the Mediation of Political Communication on Facebook and Twitter. *Political Communication*, 35(1), 50–74.
- Takikawa, H., & Nagayoshi, K. (2017). Political polarization in social media: Analysis of the “Twitter political field” in Japan. *2017 IEEE International Conference on Big Data*, pp. 3143–3150.
- Teh, Y., Jordan, M.I., Beal, M.J., & Blei, D.M. (2006). Hierarchical Dirichlet Processes. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 101(476), 1566–1581.
- Terechshenko, Z., Linder, F., Padmakumar, V., Liu, F., Nagler, J., Tucker, J., & Bonneau, R. (2020). A Comparison of Methods in Political Science Text Classification: Transfer Learning Language Models for Politics. *SSRN Electronic Journal*.
- Van der Brug, W., & Hartevelde, E. (2021). The conditional effects of the refugee crisis on immigration attitudes and nationalism. *European Union Politics*, 22(2), 227–247.
- Van der Brug, W., D’Amato, G., Ruedin, D., & Berkhout, J. (2015). *The Politicisation of Migration*. London: Routledge.
- Vliegenhart, R., Schuck, A.R.T., & De Vreese, C.H. (2016). Who’s Afraid of Conflict? The Mobilizing Effect of Conflict Framing in Campaign News. *British Journal of Political Science*, 46(1), 177–194.
- Wagner, M., & Meyer, T.M. (2014). Which Issues do Parties Emphasise? Salience Strategies and Party Organisation in Multiparty Systems. *West European Politics*, 37(5), 1019–1045.
- Zheng, S., Bao, H., Xu, J., Hao, Y., Qi, Z., & Hao, H. (2016). A Bidirectional Hierarchical Skip-Gram model for text topic embedding. *2016 International Joint Conference on Neural Networks*, pp. 855–886.

APPENDIX

The following table depicts frames of immigration as identified by Benson (2013) and Hovden and Mjelde (2019) and presented by Mendelsohn, et al. (2021):

**TABLE 8
FRAMES OF IMMIGRATION**

Frame	Description
Victim: Global Economy	Immigrants are victims of global poverty, underdevelopment and inequality
Victim: Humanitarian	Immigrants experience economic, social, and political suffering and hardships
Victim: War	Focus on war and violent conflict as reason for immigration
Victim: Discrimination	Immigrants are victims of racism, xenophobia, and religion-based discrimination
Hero: Cultural Diversity	Highlights positive aspects of differences that immigrants bring to society
Hero: Integration	Immigrants successfully adapt and fit into their host society
Hero: Worker	Immigrants contribute to economic prosperity and are an important source of labor
Threat: Jobs	Immigrants take non immigrants' jobs or lower their wages
Threat: Public Order	Immigrants threaten public safety by being breaking the law or spreading disease
Threat: Fiscal	Immigrants abuse social service programs and are a burden on resources
Threat: National Cohesion	Immigrants' cultural differences are a threat to national unity and social harmony

The following pictures show the topics of speeches used for the examination of Hypothesis 1 in German. Notice that the first number stands for the number of all speeches, while the second number depicts the number of speeches containing at least one word of the issue immigration.

**FIGURE 1A
TOPICS IN SPEECHES IN GERMAN: AFD IN SN**

```
443
77
[(0, '0.127*"antrag" + 0.119*"bürger" + 0.104*"euro" + 0.103*"million" +
0.102*"deutschland" + 0.090*"asylbewerber" + 0.086*"flüchtling" + 0.078*"mensch"
+ 0.075*"sachsen" + 0.071*"schon"'), (1, '-0.417*"euro" + -0.371*"million" +
-0.205*"landkreis" + -0.169*"kreisfrei" + -0.151*"kommune" + -0.151*"kommunal" +
-0.137*"betrag" + -0.130*"stadt" + -0.118*"sondervermögen" + -0.110*"raum"'),
(2, '-0.541*"pallas" + -0.388*"albrecht" + -0.370*"asylrecht" +
-0.159*"einwanderung" + -0.141*"beachten" + -0.140*"überein" + -0.133*"nutzen" +
-0.107*"stimme" + -0.103*"bartl" + -0.097*"meinung"'), (3, '0.339*"objekt" +
0.316*"quadratmeter" + -0.182*"million" + -0.171*"euro" + 0.159*"wohnraum" +
0.157*"leerstand" + 0.144*"immobilie" + 0.138*"stehend" +
0.126*"verwaltungsvorschrift" + 0.120*"anfrage"'), (4, '-0.189*"leipzig" +
-0.186*"beginnen" + -0.182*"staatsministerin" + -0.155*"flüchtlingsrat" +
-0.151*"gleichstellung" + -0.147*"dolmetscher" + -0.129*"verbindlich" +
-0.123*"durchführen" + -0.122*"vermitteln" + -0.122*"übrigens"')]
```

Figure 1a Alt Text: This image shows that AfD legislators held in total 443 speeches in the state parliament of Saxony from August 10, 2015 to March 31, 2016. 77 of these speeches dealt with the issue immigration. The image depicts the five topics revealed by LSI models used to analyze the speeches dealing with immigration. The topics include the following words:

1. antrag, bürger, euro, million, deutschland, asylbewerber, flüchtling, mensch, sachsen, schon
2. euro, million, landkreis, kreisfrei, kommune, kommunal, betrag, stadt, sondervermögen, raum
3. pallas, albrecht, asylrecht, einwanderung, beachten, überein, nutzen, stimme, bartl, meinung
4. objekt, quadratmeter, million, euro, wohnraum, leerstand, immobilie, stehend, verwaltungsvorschrift, anfrage
5. leipzig, beginnen, staatsministerin, flüchtlingsrat, gleichstellung, dolmetscher, verbindlich, durchführen, vermitteln, übrigens

**FIGURE 1B
TOPICS IN SPEECHES IN GERMAN: GREENS IN SN**

```
298
49
[[('0.134*'antrag' + 0.094*'sachsen' + 0.091*'mensch' + 0.089*'integration' +
0.082*'gemeinde' + 0.080*'afd' + 0.076*'politisch' + 0.074*'stadt' +
0.073*'fraktion' + 0.072*'tillich'), (1, '-0.203*'rechtsstaat' +
0.187*'gemeinde' + -0.149*'tillich' + 0.125*'landkreis' + 0.124*'integration' +
-0.120*'heidenau' + 0.107*'stadt' + -0.105*'gewaltmonopol' + -0.104*'gewalt' +
-0.098*'wert'), (2, '0.365*'gemeinde' + 0.213*'stadt' + 0.206*'landkreis' +
0.175*'jüdisch' + 0.133*'migrantenorganisation' + 0.120*'staatsministerin' +
-0.117*'ungarn' + -0.114*'afd' + -0.109*'europäisch' + 0.089*'landes-
migrantenorganisation'), (3, '0.163*'schule' + 0.145*'jugendliche' +
0.133*'kind' + 0.132*'rechtsstaat' + 0.114*'ressource' + -0.106*'politik' +
0.105*'integration' + -0.100*'ungarn' + 0.097*'migrationshintergrund' +
0.097*'schüler'), (4, '-0.169*'anhörung' + 0.160*'ungarn' + 0.150*'gemeinde' +
-0.149*'sicherheit' + -0.139*'gesetzentwurf' + 0.128*'rechtsstaat' +
-0.128*'koalition' + -0.109*'fußballspielen' + 0.105*'afd' + 0.103*'jüdisch')]]
```

Figure 1b Alt Text: This image shows that Green legislators held in total 298 speeches in the state parliament of Saxony from August 10, 2015 to March 31, 2016. 49 of these speeches dealt with the issue immigration. The image depicts the five topics revealed by LSI models used to analyze the speeches dealing with immigration. The topics include the following words:

1. antrag, sachsen, mensch, integration, gemeinde, afd, politisch, stadt, fraktion, tillich
2. rechtsstaat, gemeinde, tillich, landkreis, integration, heidenau, stadt, gewaltmonopol, gewalt, wert
3. gemeinde, stadt, landkreis, jüdisch, migrantenorganisation, staatsministerin, ungarn, afd, europäisch, landesmigrantenorganisation
4. schule, jugendliche, kind, rechtsstaat, ressource, politik, integration, ungarn, migrationshintergrund, schüler
5. anhörung, ungarn, gemeinde, sicherheit, gesetzentwurf, rechtsstaat, koalition, fußballspielen, afd, jüdisch

FIGURE 2A
TOPICS IN SPEECHES IN GERMAN: AFD IN TH

```
409
104
[(0, '-0.131*"euro" + -0.097*"kommune" + -0.092*"asylbewerber" +
-0.086*"gesetzentwurf" + -0.084*"landesregierung" + -0.082*"demokratie" +
-0.081*"million" + -0.076*"thüringer" + -0.075*"schule" + -0.074*"natürlich'),
(1, '-0.346*"medieninformation" + -0.331*"organisator" +
-0.321*"verbraucherschutz" + -0.285*"justiz" + -0.257*"migration" +
-0.206*"lauinger" + -0.205*"minister" + -0.199*"biedermänner" +
-0.186*"fremdenfeindlich" + -0.145*"demonstration'), (2, '0.293*"demokratie" +
0.290*"volksentscheid" + 0.252*"abstimmung" + 0.190*"bürgerbegehren" +
0.159*"volk" + 0.149*"direkt" + -0.148*"euro" + 0.120*"grundgesetz" +
-0.112*"medieninformation" + 0.110*"bürger'), (3, '-0.308*"kommune" +
0.183*"schüler" + -0.179*"euro" + 0.168*"sportverein" + 0.155*"schule" +
0.145*"lehrer" + -0.116*"million" + 0.111*"turnhalle" + -0.095*"kommunal" +
-0.092*"gebietsreform'), (4, '0.217*"sportverein" + 0.174*"schule" +
-0.147*"europa" + 0.138*"turnhalle" + 0.123*"kommune" + -0.121*"eu" +
0.118*"schüler" + 0.118*"demokratie" + 0.116*"sport" +
-0.107*"aner kennungsquote')]
```

Figure 2a Alt Text: This image shows that AfD legislators held in total 409 speeches in the state parliament of Thuringia from August 10, 2015 to March 31, 2016. 104 of these speeches dealt with the issue immigration. The image depicts the five topics revealed by LSI models used to analyze the speeches dealing with immigration. The topics include the following words:

1. euro, kommune, asylbewerber, gesetzentwurf, landesregierung, demokratie, million, thüringer, schule natürlich
2. medieninformation, organisator, verbraucherschutz, justiz, migration, launiger, minister, biedermänner, fremdenfeindlich, demonstration
3. demokratie, volksentscheid, abstimmung, bürgerbegehren, volk, direkt, euro, grundgesetz, medieninformation, bürger
4. kommune, schüler, euro, sportverein, schule, lehrer, million, turnhalle, kommunal, gebietsreform
5. sportverein, schule, europa, turnhalle, kommune, eu, schüler, demokratie, sport, aner kennungsquote

FIGURE 2B
TOPICS IN SPEECHES IN GERMAN: Greens IN TH

```
79
22
[(0, '0.151*"euro" + 0.148*"flüchtling" + 0.132*"million" + 0.099*"mensch" +
0.086*"tag" + 0.083*"verfügung" + 0.080*"schule" + 0.078*"cdu" + 0.077*"antrag" +
0.075*"kommend'), (1, '0.233*"anhörung" + 0.226*"gesetzentwurf" +
0.197*"mündlich" + 0.173*"sport" + 0.165*"jugend" + 0.156*"zusatzfrage" +
0.153*"drucksache" + 0.140*"abgeordnet" + 0.137*"ausschuß" + 0.133*"sitzung'),
(2, '-0.226*"erwachsenenbildung" + 0.203*"passen" + -0.192*"euro" +
-0.179*"million" + 0.163*"tag" + 0.141*"münchen" + -0.110*"stärken" +
0.107*"flüchtling" + 0.105*"vielleicht" + -0.102*"träger'), (3,
'-0.168*"drucksache" + -0.154*"zusatzfrage" + -0.145*"abgeordnet" +
0.138*"wärmedämmung" + -0.133*"mündlich" + -0.124*"flüchtlingsunterkunft" +
-0.120*"anfrage" + -0.114*"staatssekretär" + -0.108*"götz" +
-0.106*"übergriff'), (4, '0.247*"landkreis" + 0.191*"flüchtlingsintegration" +
0.191*"schulsozialarbeiterinnen" + 0.191*"schulbezogen" +
0.176*"erwachsenenbildung" + 0.150*"tag" + 0.143*"schulsozialarbeiter" +
0.143*"gebietskörperschaft" + 0.143*"jugendsozialarbeit" + 0.142*"träger')]
```

Figure 2b Alt Text: This image shows that Green legislators held in total 79 speeches in the state parliament of Thuringia from August 10, 2015 to March 31, 2016. 22 of these speeches dealt with the issue

immigration. The image depicts the five topics revealed by LSI models used to analyze the speeches dealing with immigration. The topics include the following words:

1. euro, flüchtling, million, mensch, tag, verfügung, schule, cdu, antrag, kommend
2. anhörung, gesetzentwurf, mündlich, sport, jugend, zusatzfrage, drucksache, abgeordnet, ausschluß, sitzung
3. erwachsenenbildung, passen, euro, million, tag, münchen, stärken, flüchtling, vielleicht, träger
4. drucksache, zusatzfrage, abgeordnet, wärmedämmung, mündlich, flüchtlingsunterkunft, anfrage, staatssekretär, götz, übergriff
5. landkreis, flüchtlingsintegration, schulsozialarbeiterinnen, schulbezogen, erwachsenenbildung, tag, schulsozialarbeiter, gebietskörperschaft, jugendsozialarbeit, träger

FIGURE 3A
TOPICS IN SPEECHES IN GERMAN: AFD IN BB

```

220
64
[(0, '0.090*"politisch" + 0.089*"mensch" + 0.089*"sagen" + 0.084*"sanktion" +
0.084*"brandenburg" + 0.082*"landesregierung" + 0.081*"politik" + 0.081*"euro" +
0.080*"land" + 0.080*"cdu"'), (1, '0.619*"sanktion" + 0.507*"russland" +
0.180*"wirtschaft" + 0.100*"russisch" + 0.092*"politisch" + 0.080*"deutsch" +
0.080*"partner" + 0.079*"mittelständisch" + 0.079*"verzeichnen" +
0.078*"verhältnis"'), (2, '-0.163*"kretschmann" + 0.127*"lehrer" +
0.123*"anlage" + -0.123*"osten" + -0.123*"baden-württemberg" + -0.119*"grüne" +
0.117*"schulisch" + 0.113*"landkreis" + -0.108*"ministerpräsident" +
-0.098*"winfried"'), (3, '0.328*"schulisch" + 0.262*"anlage" + 0.245*"lehrer" +
0.184*"unterbringen" + 0.128*"sporthalle" + 0.120*"zelt" + 0.119*"nutzen" +
0.115*"kind" + 0.106*"platz" + -0.104*"finanziell"'), (4, '-0.223*"kretschmann"
+ 0.195*"gewalt" + -0.159*"osten" + -0.155*"baden-württemberg" +
-0.144*"brandenburger" + -0.142*"winfried" + -0.113*"vorhanden" +
-0.110*"verteilung" + -0.105*"grün" + -0.105*"klempner"')]

```

Figure 3a Alt Text: This image shows that AfD legislators held in total 220 speeches in the state parliament of Brandenburg from August 10, 2015 to March 31, 2016. 64 of these speeches dealt with the issue immigration. The image depicts the five topics revealed by LSI models used to analyze the speeches dealing with immigration. The topics include the following words:

1. politisch, mensch, sagen, sanktion, brandenburg, landesregierung, politik, euro, land, cdu
2. sanktion, russland, wirtschaft, russisch, politisch, deutsch, partner, mittelständisch, verzeichnen, verhältnis
3. kretschmann, lerher, anlage, osten, baden-württemberg, grüne, schulisch, landkreis, ministerpräsident, winfried
4. schulisch, anlage, lehrer, unterbringen, sporthalle, zelt, nutzen, kind, platz, finanziell
5. kretschmann, gewalt, osten, baden-württemberg, brandenburger, winfried, vorhanden, verteilung, grün, klempner

FIGURE 3B
TOPICS IN SPEECHES IN GERMAN: GREENS IN BB

```
194
48
[(0, '-0.095*"integration" + -0.094*"gemeinschaftsunterkunft" + -0.091*"land" +
-0.084*"euro" + -0.084*"gut" + -0.084*"geflüchtet" + -0.082*"million" +
-0.079*"mensch" + -0.078*"antrag" + -0.076*"brandenburg"'), (1,
'-0.171*"gemeinschaftsunterkunft" + 0.169*"afd" + -0.136*"geflüchtet" +
-0.133*"gesetzentwurf" + -0.125*"wohnung" + 0.115*"deutschland" +
-0.109*"privat" + -0.102*"versorgung" + 0.100*"sozialpolitik" +
0.100*"bedrohung"'), (2, '0.134*"gemeinschaftsunterkunft" +
0.128*"grenzkontrolle" + 0.127*"erstaufnahmeeinrichtung" + -0.117*"hochschule" +
0.100*"abschiebung" + 0.097*"geflüchtet" + 0.094*"gewalt" +
-0.091*"enquetekommission" + 0.086*"herkunftsstaat" + 0.085*"asylverfahren"'),
(3, '-0.193*"gemeinschaftsunterkunft" + 0.168*"euro" + 0.138*"million" +
0.137*"nachtragshaushalt" + -0.133*"gesetzentwurf" + -0.129*"gewalt" +
-0.126*"wohnung" + -0.118*"geflüchtet" + 0.100*"bund" + 0.096*"haushalt"'), (4,
'-0.215*"privat" + -0.119*"ministerin" + -0.114*"problem" + 0.114*"unbegleitet"
+ -0.109*"wohnraum" + 0.101*"entschließungsantrag" + 0.099*"minderjährig" +
0.095*"freuen" + 0.091*"punkt" + -0.088*"rahmenvereinbarung"')]
```

Figure 3b Alt Text: This image shows that Green legislators held in total 194 speeches in the state parliament of Brandenburg from August 10, 2015 to March 31, 2016. 48 of these speeches dealt with the issue immigration. The image depicts the five topics revealed by LSI models used to analyze the speeches dealing with immigration. The topics include the following words:

1. integration, gemeinschaftsunterkunft, land, euro, gut, geflüchtet, million, mensch, antrag, brandenburg
2. gemeinschaftsunterkunft, afd, geflüchtet, gesetzentwurf, wohnung, deutschland, privat, versorgung, sozialpolitik, bedrohung
3. gemeinschaftsunterkunft, grenzkontrolle, erstaufnahmeeinrichtung, hochschule, abschiebung, geflüchtet, gewalt, enquetekommission, herkunftsstaat, asylverfahren
4. gemeinschaftsunterkunft, euro, million, nachtragshaushalt, gesetzentwurf,

FIGURE 4A
TOPICS IN SENTENCES IN GERMAN: AFD IN SN

```
443
77
382
[(0, '0.408*"asylbewerber" + 0.244*"müssen" + 0.209*"flüchtling" +
0.186*"sachsen" + 0.183*"mehr" + 0.170*"jahr" + 0.166*"deutschland" +
0.137*"million" + 0.132*"asyl" + 0.126*"euro"'), (1, '0.670*"europäisch" +
0.406*"migrationsagenda" + -0.230*"asylbewerber" + 0.210*"bereits" +
0.166*"gemeinsam" + 0.131*"asylpolitik" + 0.125*"benennen" + 0.123*"asylsystem"
+ 0.115*"neu" + 0.103*"migrationspolitik"'), (2, '0.352*"asyl" +
-0.323*"asylbewerber" + 0.311*"euro" + 0.302*"million" + -0.191*"europäisch" +
-0.167*"müssen" + 0.161*"flüchtling" + 0.136*"landkreis" + 0.133*"schon" +
-0.129*"migrationsagenda"'), (3, '0.312*"asylrecht" + -0.311*"million" +
-0.298*"euro" + -0.287*"asylbewerber" + 0.202*"gehen" + 0.200*"deutschland" +
-0.175*"landkreis" + -0.165*"europäisch" + 0.158*"wissen" + 0.143*"afd"'), (4,
'0.536*"asylrecht" + -0.394*"gehen" + 0.239*"wissen" + -0.236*"asylsuchend" +
0.177*"afd" + -0.160*"asyl" + 0.149*"stehen" + -0.129*"zeit" + 0.127*"deswegen"
+ 0.121*"abschaffung"')]
```

Figure 4a Alt Text: This image shows that AfD legislators held in total 443 speeches in the state parliament of Saxony from August 10, 2015 to March 31, 2016. 77 of these speeches dealt with the issue immigration. 382 sentences within these speeches include the issue immigration. The image depicts the five topics revealed by LSI models used to analyze the sentences dealing with immigration. The topics include the following words:

1. asylbewerber, müssen, flüchtling, sachsen, mehr, jahr, deutschland, million, asyl, euro
2. europäisch, migrationsagenda, asylbewerber, bereits, gemeinsam, asylpolitik, benennen, asylsystem, neu, migrationspolitik
3. asyl, asylbewerber, euro, million, europäisch, müssen, flüchtling, landkreis, schon, migrationsagenda
4. asylrecht, million, euro, asylbewerber, gehen, deutschland, landkreis, europäisch, wissen, afd
5. asylrecht, gehen, wissen, asylsuchend, afd, asyl, stehen, zeit, deswegen, abschaffung

FIGURE 4B
TOPICS IN SENTENCES IN GERMAN: GREENS IN SN

```

298
49
166
[(0, '0.343*"flüchtling" + 0.206*"gehen" + 0.194*"thema" + 0.173*"integration" +
0.169*"antrag" + 0.169*"asyl" + 0.165*"asylsuchend" + 0.158*"sachsen" +
0.156*"angriff" + 0.137*"geflüchtet'), (1, '0.433*"motiviert" +
0.429*"politisch" + 0.381*"asylunterkunft" + 0.377*"strafat" + 0.293*"rechts" +
0.177*"genannt" + 0.167*"fall" + 0.160*"erfassen" + 0.158*"brandstiftung" +
-0.122*"flüchtling'), (2, '0.423*"flüchtling" + -0.354*"thema" +
0.329*"flüchtlingsunterkunft" + 0.322*"angriff" + -0.199*"asyl" +
-0.181*"integration" + -0.152*"beim" + -0.142*"geflüchtet" + 0.132*"gehen" +
-0.126*"debatte'), (3, '0.504*"flüchtlingsunterkunft" + -0.420*"flüchtling" +
0.388*"angriff" + 0.166*"deutschlandweit" + -0.147*"gehen" + 0.138*"antrag" +
0.127*"gesellschaft" + -0.125*"aufnehmen" + 0.105*"ablehnen" +
-0.103*"fordern'), (4, '-0.401*"antrag" + -0.273*"migrantenorganisation" +
0.264*"unterbringung" + 0.198*"thema" + 0.177*"geflüchtet" + -0.174*"stehen" +
0.171*"angriff" + -0.163*"kind" + -0.163*"jugendliche" +
-0.159*"migrationshintergrund')]

```

Figure 4b Alt Text: This image shows that Green legislators held in total 298 speeches in the state parliament of Saxony from August 10, 2015 to March 31, 2016. 49 of these speeches dealt with the issue immigration. 166 sentences within these speeches include the issue immigration. The image depicts the five topics revealed by LSI models used to analyze the sentences dealing with immigration. The topics include the following words:

1. flüchtling, gehen, thema, integration, antrag, asyl, asylsuchend, sachsen, angriff, geflüchtet
2. motiviert, politisch, asylunterkunft, strafat, rechts, genannt, fall, erfassen, brandstiftung, flüchtling
3. flüchtling, thema, flüchtlingsunterkunft, angriff, asyl, integration, beim, geflüchtet, gehen, debatte
4. flüchtlingsunterkunft, flüchtling, angriff, deutschlandweit, gehen, antrag, gesellschaft, aufnehmen, ablehnen, fordern
5. antrag, migrantenorganisation, unterbringung, thema, geflüchtet, stehen, angriff, kind, jugendliche, migrationshintergrund

FIGURE 5A
TOPICS IN SENTENCES IN GERMAN: AFD IN TH

```
409
104
509
[(0, '-0.381*"migration" + -0.378*"verbraucherschutz" + -0.374*"justiz" +
-0.320*"minister" + -0.296*"lauinger" + -0.183*"asylbewerber" + -0.182*"jahr" +
-0.157*"ausschuß" + -0.137*"million" + -0.131*"euro"'), (1, '0.302*"jahr" +
0.288*"asylbewerber" + -0.278*"verbraucherschutz" + -0.273*"justiz" +
-0.245*"migration" + -0.236*"minister" + 0.229*"million" + 0.223*"euro" +
-0.191*"lauinger" + 0.138*"mehr"'), (2, '-0.386*"euro" + -0.385*"jahr" +
-0.294*"million" + 0.194*"flüchtling" + -0.157*"pro" + 0.130*"asylpolitik" +
0.115*"müssen" + 0.115*"natürlich" + 0.109*"sagen" + 0.101*"asyl"'), (3,
'-0.446*"asylbewerber" + 0.332*"euro" + 0.285*"million" + -0.209*"unterbringung"
+ -0.205*"jahr" + -0.191*"unterbringen" + 0.165*"land" + -0.133*"kind" +
-0.126*"messe" + 0.122*"asylbereich"'), (4, '0.416*"jahr" +
-0.247*"asylbewerber" + -0.241*"euro" + -0.240*"unterbringung" +
0.227*"deutschland" + 0.197*"letzter" + 0.188*"zahl" + 0.182*"prozent" +
0.174*"flüchtling" + -0.166*"unterbringen"')]
```

Figure 5a Alt Text: This image shows that AfD legislators held in total 409 speeches in the state parliament of Thuringia from August 10, 2015 to March 31, 2016. 104 of these speeches dealt with the issue immigration. 509 sentences within these speeches include the issue immigration. The image depicts the five topics revealed by LSI models used to analyze the sentences dealing with immigration. The topics include the following words:

1. migration, verbraucherschutz, justiz, minister, launiger, asylbewerber, jahr, ausschuß, million, euro
2. jahr, asylbewerber, verbraucherschutz, justiz, migration, minister, million, euro, launiger, mehr
3. euro, jahr, million, flüchtling, pro, asylpolitik, müssen, natürlich, sagen, asyl
4. asylbewerber, euro, million, unterbringung, jahr, unterbringen, land, kind, messe, asylbereich
5. jahr, asylbewerber, euro, unterbringung, deutschland, letzter, zahl, prozent, flüchtling, unterbringen

FIGURE 5B
TOPICS IN SENTENCES IN GERMAN: GREENS IN TH

```
79
22
161
[(0, '0.456*"asylsuchend" + 0.208*"flüchtling" + 0.182*"müssen" +
0.178*"thüringen" + 0.166*"mensch" + 0.161*"flüchtlingsunterkunft" +
0.153*"geflüchtet" + 0.136*"land" + 0.132*"sicher" + 0.132*"übergriff"'), (1,
'0.559*"asylsuchend" + 0.244*"flüchtlingsunterkunft" + -0.239*"flüchtling" +
0.221*"übergriff" + -0.214*"müssen" + 0.197*"gewalttat" + -0.162*"mensch" +
-0.152*"land" + 0.122*"rechter" + 0.120*"rassistisch"'), (2, '0.395*"cdu" +
0.321*"ausschuß" + 0.277*"justiz" + 0.277*"verbraucherschutz" +
0.272*"migration" + 0.221*"gesetzentwurf" + 0.169*"überweisung" +
0.154*"fiedler" + 0.146*"beantragen" + -0.140*"müssen"'), (3, '0.296*"thüringen"
+ -0.280*"asylsuchend" + 0.220*"übergriff" + 0.209*"flüchtlingsunterkunft" +
0.199*"gewalttat" + -0.163*"sicher" + -0.156*"kommune" + 0.154*"jahr" +
-0.146*"sogenannter" + -0.139*"herkunftsstaat"'), (4, '-0.284*"schutz" +
-0.254*"aufgabe" + 0.233*"thüringen" + 0.232*"kommen" + 0.224*"geflüchtet" +
-0.203*"mensch" + -0.199*"immer" + -0.172*"gewähren" + -0.151*"stellen" +
-0.131*"klar"')]
```

Figure 5b Alt Text: This image shows that Green legislators held in total 79 speeches in the state parliament of Thuringia from August 10, 2015 to March 31, 2016. 22 of these speeches dealt with the issue immigration. 161 sentences within these speeches include the issue immigration. The image depicts the five topics revealed by LSI models used to analyze the sentences dealing with immigration. The topics include the following words:

1. asylsuchend, flüchtling, müssen, thüringen, mensch, flüchtlingsunterkunft, geflüchtet, land, sicher, übergriff
2. asylsuchend, flüchtlingsunterkunft, flüchtling, übergriff, müssen, gewalttat, mensch, land, rechter, rassistisch
3. cdu, ausschluß, justiz, verbraucherschutz, migration, gesetzentwurf, überweisung, fiedler, beantragen, müssen
4. thüringen, asylsuchend, übergriff, flüchtlingsunterkunft, gewalttat, sicher, kommune, jahr, sogenannter, herkunftsstaat
5. schutz, aufgabe, thüringen, kommen, geflüchtet, mensch, immer, gewähren, stellen, klar

FIGURE 6A
TOPICS IN SENTENCES IN GERMAN: AFD IN BB

```

220
64
248
[(0, '-0.322*"flüchtling" + -0.275*"kommen" + -0.265*"asylbewerber" +
-0.208*"land" + -0.181*"brandenburg" + -0.158*"müssen" + -0.148*"wissen" +
-0.142*"jahr" + -0.140*"lassen" + -0.137*"sagen"'), (1, '-0.583*"kommen" +
0.361*"asylbewerber" + -0.237*"flüchtling" + 0.194*"flüchtlingskrise" +
-0.171*"lassen" + -0.164*"geflüchtet" + 0.152*"kosten" + 0.116*"brandenburg" +
0.114*"jahr" + 0.113*"immer"'), (2, '0.656*"flüchtlingskrise" + 0.291*"kosten" +
0.233*"bewältigung" + 0.227*"migrationskrise" + -0.199*"asylbewerber" +
0.191*"immens" + 0.141*"herausforderung" + 0.134*"kommen" + -0.120*"wissen" +
0.117*"asyl"'), (3, '0.453*"asylsuchend" + 0.381*"geflüchtet" +
-0.226*"asylbewerber" + 0.208*"antrag" + 0.192*"stellen" + 0.187*"mensch" +
-0.180*"kommen" + 0.169*"aufenthaltstitel" + 0.167*"asyl" + -0.144*"lassen"'),
(4, '-0.271*"asylpolitik" + 0.271*"asylbewerber" + 0.270*"bereits" +
-0.223*"brandenburg" + -0.213*"müssen" + -0.208*"asylantrag" + -0.204*"ablehnen"
+ -0.196*"zuwanderung" + 0.178*"jahr" + -0.164*"wissen"')]

```

Figure 6a Alt Text: This image shows that Green legislators held in total 220 speeches in the state parliament of Brandenburg from August 10, 2015 to March 31, 2016. 64 of these speeches dealt with the issue immigration. 248 sentences within these speeches include the issue immigration. The image depicts the five topics revealed by LSI models used to analyze the sentences dealing with immigration. The topics include the following words:

1. flüchtling, kommen, asylbewerber, land, brandenburg, müssen, wissen, jahr, lassen, sagen
2. kommen, asylbewerber, flüchtling, flüchtlingskrise, lassen, geflüchtet, kosten, brandenburg, jahr, immer
3. flüchtlingskrise, kosten, bewältigung, migrationskrise, asylbewerber, immens, herausforderung, kommen, wissen, asyl
4. asylsuchend, geflüchtet, asylbewerber, antrag, stellen, mensch, kommen, aufenthaltstitel, asyl, lassen
5. asylpolitik, asylbewerber, bereits, brandenburg, müssen, asylantrag, ablehnen, zuwanderung, jahr, wissen

FIGURE 6B
TOPICS IN SENTENCES IN GERMAN: GREENS IN BB

```

194
48
285
[(0, '-0.246*"flüchtling" + -0.236*"mensch" + -0.228*"geflüchtet" +
-0.225*"brandenburg" + -0.205*"land" + -0.176*"integration" + -0.165*"müssen" +
-0.147*"mehr" + -0.133*"geben" + -0.124*"gut"'), (1, '0.373*"integration" +
-0.333*"geflüchtet" + -0.268*"mensch" + 0.257*"zuwanderer" + -0.185*"versorgung"
+ 0.175*"mehr" + -0.169*"antrag" + 0.160*"flüchtling" + 0.155*"immer" +
0.155*"land"'), (2, '0.407*"flüchtlingsunterkunft" + -0.206*"integration" +
0.166*"besonders" + 0.165*"übergriff" + 0.161*"gewalt" + 0.158*"politisch" +
-0.151*"versorgung" + -0.145*"mensch" + 0.142*"strafat" +
-0.140*"geflüchtet"'), (3, '0.505*"mehr" + -0.388*"integration" +
-0.298*"zuwanderer" + -0.156*"deutschland" + 0.143*"landesregierung" +
0.139*"wohnung" + 0.133*"bund" + 0.132*"moment" + 0.117*"möglich" +
0.117*"sagen"'), (4, '0.331*"integration" + -0.298*"land" +
-0.252*"minderjährig" + -0.244*"unbegleitet" + -0.186*"sicher" + 0.182*"müssen"
+ 0.170*"mehr" + 0.154*"geflüchtet" + 0.145*"zuwanderer" + -0.120*"wirklich"')]

```

Figure 6b Alt Text: This image shows that Green legislators held in total 194 speeches in the state parliament of Brandenburg from August 10, 2015 to March 31, 2016. 48 of these speeches dealt with the issue immigration. 285 sentences within these speeches include the issue immigration. The image depicts the five topics revealed by LSI models used to analyze the sentences dealing with immigration. The topics include the following words:

1. flüchtling, mensch, geflüchtet, brandenburg, land, integration, müssen, mehr, geben, gut
2. integration, geflüchtet, mensch, zuwanderer, versorgung, mehr, antrag, flüchtling, immer, land
3. flüchtlingsunterkunft, integration, besonders, übergriff, gewalt, politisch, versorgung, mensch, strafat, geflüchtet
4. mehr, integration, zuwanderer, deutschland, landesregierung, wohnung, bund, moment, möglich, sagen
5. integration, land, minderjährig, unbegleitet, sicher, müssen, mehr, geflüchtet, zuwanderer, wirklich