

Secondary Publication



Mayer, Sabrina Jasmin; Dollmann, Jörg; Lietz, Almuth; Siegel, Madeleine [...]

DeZIM.panel : Data for Germany's Post-Migrant Society

Date of secondary publication: 02.06.2023

Version of Record (Published Version), Article

Persistent identifier: urn:nbn:de:bvb:473-irb-596506

Primary publication

Mayer, Sabrina Jasmin; Dollmann, Jörg; Lietz, Almuth; Siegel, Madeleine [...]: DeZIM.panel : Data for Germany's Post-Migrant Society. In: Jahrbücher für Nationalökonomie und Statistik = Journal of economics and statistics. 243 (2023), 1, pp. 93-108. DOI: 10.1515/jbnst-2022-0025

Legal Notice

This work is protected by copyright and/or the indication of a licence. You are free to use this work in any way permitted by the copyright and/or the licence that applies to your usage. For other uses, you must obtain permission from the rights-holder(s).

This document is made available under a Creative Commons license.



The license information is available online:

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/legalcode>

Data Observer

Jörg Dollmann*, Sabrina Jasmin Mayer, Almuth Lietz,
Madeleine Siegel and Jonas Köhler

DeZIM.panel – Data for Germany’s Post-Migrant Society

<https://doi.org/10.1515/jbnst-2022-0025>

Received April 27, 2022; accepted April 28, 2022

Abstract: The German DeZIM.panel is an online access panel that provides data specifically for topics regarding migration and integration. It includes an over-sampling for several migrant groups in Germany, and thus allows specific subgroup analyses. Due to its longitudinal structure, its long-term development and the effects of sudden external events can be traced and analyzed.

Keywords: panel, Germany, immigrants

JEL Classification: C8 (Data Collection and Data Estimation Methodology; Computer Programs)

1 Introduction

In recent years, most Western European societies have become increasingly diverse due to the ongoing immigration and naturalisation processes. Even though politics and society now mostly acknowledge the reality of post-migrant states in which immigration is an inevitable feature (Foroutan 2019), data collection infrastructures still have to catch up. Multi-wave access panels that allow researchers to analyse current trends in society, while still allowing for specific subgroup analyses, are still scarce.

***Corresponding author: Jörg Dollmann**, Forschungsdatenzentrum, DeZIM Institute, Mauerstr. 76, 10117 Berlin, Germany; and University of Mannheim, MZES, Mannheim, Germany, E-mail: dollmann@dezim-institut.de. <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6152-3361>

Sabrina Jasmin Mayer, Forschungsdatenzentrum, DeZIM Institute, Mauerstr. 76, 10117 Berlin, Germany; and Chair of Political Sociology, University of Bamberg, Bamberg, Germany. <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6267-4391>

Almuth Lietz, Madeleine Siegel and Jonas Köhler, Forschungsdatenzentrum, DeZIM Institute, Mauerstr. 76, 10117 Berlin, Germany

The DeZIM.panel has been set up as such a data collection infrastructure that explicitly takes today's post-migrant society into account. It started at the end of 2021, building on a large-scale offline-recruited first wave earlier in 2021 with more than 9000 participants, oversampling specific immigrant-origin groups: people from Turkey and from other majority Muslim countries, from states with guest worker agreements and re-settlers from the East.

The DeZIM.panel is a multi-thematic survey that includes topics relevant to sociology, political science, psychology, educational sciences, economics and other disciplines. It runs four regular waves per year, with additional flash surveys after current events such as the war in Ukraine (Mayer et al. 2022). The DeZIM.panel was initiated by the German Center for Integration and Migration Research (DeZIM), which is funded by the German Federal Ministry.

2 Aim of the DeZIM.panel

The general aim of the DeZIM.panel is to function as a multi-thematic, multi-wave access panel that allows researchers to track the impact of external events, as well as to track short- and long-term changes in public opinion of different societal groups with a specific regard to minorities, immigrants and their descendants. This allows us to capture both new developments and current trends. It also provides data of both the majority population and immigrant-origin groups, which is of specific interest to those studying minorities and immigrants. Such data include integration indicators, discrimination experiences, xenophobic and racist attitudes, and national and ethnic identities.

There are certainly panels that are already established in Germany that offer high-quality data based on random samples, which also often include at least subsamples with an oversample for certain groups such as refugees (e.g. IAB-BAMF-SOEP refugee sample, Brücker et al. 2016). However, as we intend to capture the impact of external events as well as short-term changes, we need a multi-wave panel that is not limited, as is the Socio-Economic Panel (SOEP), to running only once per year. As the DeZIM.panel should specifically add to the study of immigrant integration and societal conflicts, we also need indicators that capture concepts such as discrimination experiences or identities in a multi-faceted way that go beyond the scope of other multi-wave panels, such as the GESIS Panel (Bosnjak et al. 2018) or the German Internet Panel (GIP; Blom et al. 2015), neither of which focuses on these topics specifically.

Of course, commercial online access panels are available in Germany, which sometimes have at least 1000 persons with migration history in their databases and which may be used for specific subgroup analyses. However, these commercial

panels do not rely on random samples and thus cannot be used for generalized statements. Although quotas might be applied for the general population to refer to the data as national samples, none of the larger online access panels offers this for the group of immigrants, as their numbers are too low to apply quotas.

Our chosen research design – the offline generation of an online panel – has been used before by the GESIS Panel (which provides ongoing possibilities for offline participation) as well as by the GIP (which also provides options for offline participants). So far, relying on offline recruitment for online panels offers the least amount of bias, as individuals' addresses can be randomly drawn. However, the next step, going online, might still add bias because not every household might participate online, and the unit non-response is systematically distributed.¹ To account for these biases, different approaches exist – such as providing an internet equipment or an alternative access form – with evidence that points in the direction that offering alternative access is the most fruitful (Cornesse and Schaurer 2021). In addition, we thus intend to survey by post those initial participants who never provided an email address. This will allow us to gauge the differences between online and offline participants regarding key indicators (e.g. socioeconomic status, migration background, age, education, gender).

3 Research Design and Oversampled Groups

The target population of the DeZIM.panel includes all persons with and without an immigrant background living in Germany within the age group 18–67. This age range was chosen because it matches the working-age population and reduces the need to account for many offline participants. Given the aim of the DeZIM.panel to oversample respondents from minority or immigrant background groups, we decided to employ a two-stage stratified sampling approach that uses name-based pre-classifications to oversample certain subgroups.

We focused on four specific groups. First, respondents from Turkey because Turkish migrants make up the biggest group of immigrant-origin people in Germany. Second, we included people from other majority Muslim countries, enabling us to draw a broad picture of Muslim experiences in Germany. These countries were Afghanistan, Algeria, Bahrain, Egypt, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Kosovo, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Morocco, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, and Yemen. Next, we oversampled people from states with former guest worker agreements (besides Turkey) because this group has a distinct

¹ For example, those with lower resources, lower education and especially of older age are less likely to participate (Blom et al. 2015).

migration history as working migrants and is a large part of the German community of people with migrant backgrounds. These states include Greece, Italy, Portugal, and Spain, as well as three of the successor countries of the former Yugoslavia: Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, and Serbia. Last, we included another major group with a distinct history: re-settlers from Eastern Europe whose ancestors migrated in the 18th century to the then-Tsarist Russia and to other territories, and whose descendants mostly returned to Germany in the early 1990s. These respondents emigrated from the successor states of the former USSR as well as from Romania. All other people of immigrant-origin were not oversampled but were simply included as a fifth group of people with migrant backgrounds. For the setup of the panel and the pre-classification, we classified people from Poland as belonging to this fifth group even though re-settlers might have migrated back from Poland. Nowadays, the group of people of Polish origin in Germany consists mainly of non-ethnic Germans. It is important to keep in mind that these groupings are only preliminary, and we are of course able to group respondents later based on their actual answers to questions regarding their country of origin, ethnicity and religiosity.

4 Initial Recruitment Process

4.1 Sampling Approach

The DeZIM.panel sample was the result of a two-stage stratified approach. The first stage or primary sampling units were municipalities, which were selected with “probability proportional to size”. In total, 57 municipalities were selected, resulting in 60 sampling points. Some large municipalities, like Berlin, comprised more than one sampling point. In order to ensure face validity of the sample, we included two implicit stratifiers, i.e. the federal state and the administrative district size of the municipalities (*BIK Gemeindegrößenklasse*). In Summer 2020, after the selection of the relevant primary sampling points, we asked the respective registration offices of the municipalities to provide names and addresses of about 2000 randomly drawn addresses of persons with and without an immigrant background within our age group.

Given the aim of the DeZIM.panel to oversample respondents from four minority and immigrant background groups – people from Turkey, other majority Muslim countries, states with guest worker agreements, and re-settlers from Eastern Europe – the selection of the secondary sampling units, i.e. the actual target population, was guided by the ideas of a disproportionate stratified sampling approach. However, besides the country of birth, registration offices do not

provide information on the ethno-religious or immigrant backgrounds of the municipalities’ inhabitants. Therefore, we decided to apply a name-based (onomastic) approach to classify the background of possible respondents a priori (Humpert and Schneiderheinze 2000). This approach has been widely used and works considerably well for most origin groups (Mateos 2007). Respondents who (most likely²) originated from one of the countries of interest were pre-classified as having an immigrant background from those countries. The remaining names that were not classified in one of these four groups were grouped together in the stratum “no or another immigrant background”. After the survey, we further divided this group into “no immigrant background” and “another immigrant background”.

Table 1 provides information about the distribution of five different groups – using all the names obtained from the registration offices – as well as the distribution of these groups in the gross sample that was contacted by *infas Institut für angewandte Sozialwissenschaft GmbH*, which conducted the fieldwork for us. Comparing the distribution of the complete sample obtained by the registration offices with the gross sample demonstrates the disproportionate sampling approach. Although almost 83% of the population within the registration sample was classified as having no or another migration background, this share was only about 52% in the gross sample (see Table 1). Instead, the proportion of ethno-religious minorities and immigrants within the gross sample was approximately three times as large as in the complete registration sample.

Table 1: Distribution of pre-classified groups between the total registration sample and the gross sample; column percentages in parentheses.

Pre-classified groups	Total registration sample “Ziehungsstichprobe”	Gross sample “Einsatzstichprobe”
Turkish origin	5779 (5.6%)	5779 (15.4%)
Origin from other majority Muslim countries	5200 (5.0%)	5200 (13.8%)
Origin from the former Soviet Union and Romania	1740 (1.7%)	1740 (4.6%)
Origin from countries with guest worker agreements	5263 (5.1%)	5263 (14.0%)
All other groups	85,944 (82.7%)	19,601 (52.2%)
Total number of addresses	103,926	37,583

² The onomastic procedure by Humpert and Schneiderheinze (2000) is not deterministic. Rather, their procedure results in some kind of probability that a certain name corresponds to a certain country of origin.

4.2 Recruitment Procedure and Response Rates

Initially, the recruitment wave was to be conducted as personal interviews in mid-2020. However, due to the ongoing Covid-19 pandemic and the many challenges arising from it, the collection process was delayed to see if the situation would improve. Finally, we decided to switch the mode to pencil and paper and computer-assisted web interviews (CAWI). We, thus, sent out a postal invitation which included both the printed questionnaire as well as a link to an online version of the questionnaire. To include minorities and recent immigrants with lower German language skills, all fieldwork documents, including the invitation letter and the online questionnaires, were translated into the four most commonly spoken languages within our oversampled groups: English, Russian, Turkish and Arabic.

The survey ran from March 12 to September 5, 2021. A major reason for this rather long fieldwork period was that there were several incentive experiments for which we divided our sample into three different tranches. We contacted each tranche separately, one after the other. We tested the value of the incentive (€5 vs. €10) as well as the payment type (unconditional pre-paid vs. conditional post-paid) to see which incentive would drive participation as well as to optimize the later tranches.

The invitation for the first tranche of addresses was sent out in March 2021 ($n = 7139$, two conditions: €5 prepaid plus €5 for panel sign up vs. €10 postpaid plus €5 for panel sign up). About 50% of the addresses were pre-classified as of immigrant origin. There were no significant differences between the two incentive conditions for any of the five groups. To see whether external conditions drove the success of certain incentive strategies, we divided our sampling points into four groups, based on their economic conditions, i.e. low or high unemployment rate, and their likelihood of having contact with foreigners, i.e. high or low proportion of foreigners. However, we did not find any meaningful differences: participation rates within the four contextual categories were similar for the two incentive strategies.

With the second tranche of addresses in May 2021 ($n = 3567$, one condition: €10 prepaid plus €5 for panel sign up; only addresses pre-classified as of immigrant origin), we tested an additional variation which did not substantially outperform the unconditional prepaid scenario with €5. Thus, the third tranche ($n = 26,877$) comprised the remaining pre-classified cases for our four groups of interest and randomly drawn addresses from the group of “no migration” background and “other migration” background. To this third tranche, we implemented the best overall performing incentive mode, i.e. €5 unconditional prepaid incentive with €5 for the panel sign up.

Data collection ended on September 5, 2021. In total, 37,583 addresses were contacted: of those, 393 did a partial interview; 122 were non-eligible; 1038 refused to participate, and 26,817 addresses were of unknown eligibility. Finally, 9168 respondents participated in the survey, which corresponds to a response rate of 24%. Among those classified as German without (or with another) migration background, participation was much higher (31%) than among those classified as belonging to one of the predefined migration background groups. Participation was lowest among those classified as being from Turkey (14%) or other Muslim countries (19%), and slightly higher for those from other countries (18–22%).

Online and offline participation was quite evenly distributed, with 47% taking part online and 53% taking part offline. On an average, the online participants took 19 minutes to fill out the survey. Online participation rates were the highest among people from majority Muslim regions and were the lowest among those with a migration background from any other country (see Table 2).

Only the CAWI participants were offered the chance to switch languages. About 357 respondents (8% of all CAWI participants) used at least a part of one of the foreign-language versions. Here, Arabic was the most prominent language, accounting for more than half of all foreign-language interviews.

Of the 9168 respondents, 6719 provided their consent to be contacted again (panel consent rate: 73%). Among those who participated online, panel consent was considerably higher (84%) compared with those who participated offline (64%). This might be caused partly by the nature of the panel itself, as it was only offered online. Panel consent was the lowest among respondents from Turkey, and the highest among those from other countries and among those without a migration background (see Table 3).

Table 2: Participation modes in the recruitment wave by immigrant-origin groups; row percentages.

Real group belonging ^a	Online participation	Offline participation
Immigrants and their children from:		
Turkey (n = 723)	50.1	49.9
Other majority Muslim countries (n = 892)	53.7	46.3
Former Soviet Union and Romania (n = 579)	48.4	51.6
Countries with guest worker agreements (n = 706)	45.9	54.1
All other immigrant-origin groups (n = 916)	43.9	56.1
Germans without a migration background (n = 5104)	49.0	51.0
Total (n = 9168)	47.4	52.6

Participants with missing information on the country of origin (n = 317) were excluded from the sub-analysis but not from the total. ^aBased on the question about where the respondent and their parents were born.

Table 3: Proportion of panel consent by immigrant-origin groups; cell percentages.

Real group belonging	Panel consent
Immigrants and their children from:	
Turkey	62.7
Other majority Muslim countries	73.4
Former Soviet Union and Romania	69.4
Countries with guest worker agreements	73.4
All other immigrant-origin groups	75.4
Germans without a migration background	75.4
Total	73.3

4.3 Specificity and Sensitivity: Onomastic Classification Compared to Real Group Belonging

As outlined above, the name-based pre-qualification approach using onomastic procedures, as described by Humpert and Schneiderheinze (2000), is not deterministic but provides a probability of a respondent’s name being associated with a specific country of origin.

These estimates work better for some countries of origin than for others. In the German context, the population of Russian Germans, i.e. ethnic Germans, poses a particular challenge to the process, as names are more similar to those of native Germans although being born in Kazakhstan (Liebau et al. 2018). In addition, more assimilated immigrants who, for example, might have married a German native or started to use German first names are also harder to identify with this method (Schnell et al. 2014). Thus, we can assume that these procedures add bias to our sample. However, as we included all addresses in our study, regardless of their pre-classification (only the selection probabilities vary between groups), this is not important for our panel per se. However, it is interesting to see the differences between the onomastic pre-classification results and the real group belonging in our study, which are similar to Liebau et al.’s (2018) study using data from the SOEP. Similarly, we discuss false positives, the specificity of the approach (meaning the proportion of those pre-classified as being part of a certain group when they are not part of that group), as well as false negatives, the sensitivity of the approach (meaning those pre-classified as not being part of a certain group when they are part of that group). For the real group belonging, we rely on respondents’ answers to the questions about the country of their birth and the country of their parents’ birth. Based on these answers, we provide an overview in Table 4 of the discrepancies between the onomastic classification and the real

countries of origin. Our results show high effectiveness of the onomastic procedure not only for those respondents from Turkey and other majority Muslim countries (almost 90%) but also for those classified as being from the former Soviet Union and Romania, and to a lesser extent for those from countries with guest worker agreements. The effectiveness of the onomastic procedure is the highest for those classified as having no migration background or from another origin. However, when we look at the selectivity (see Table 5), we see that immigrants and their children, as well as natives, are identified well by onomastic procedures (with rates ranging from 87 to 96%). The exception is the group of people from the former Soviet Union and Romania, which encompasses mostly ethnic Germans. Here, only half of the group is actually identified by onomastic procedures. Nevertheless, as we surveyed all groups, we were able to capture the false negatives in this group within the group classified as “all other groups”.

As we know about assimilation bias (Kruse and Dollmann 2017; Schnell et al. 2014), we can assume that the onomastic approach works better for first-generation immigrants, but less well for immigrant-origin respondents who were born in Germany. In Table 6, we see that the correct onomastic classification rates even increase for children of Turkish immigrants (from 95 to 97%), whereas they decrease substantially for the other groups. The greatest reduction between the generations is for the group of those from the former Soviet Union, whose naming customs have largely adapted to the German majority.

Table 4: Specificity of onomastic procedure (false positives); row percentages.

Pre-classified groups (onomastic):	Real group belonging				
	Turkey	Other majority Muslim countries	Former Soviet Union and Romania	Countries with guest worker agreements	All other groups
Turkish origin	87.3	2.6	0.8	1.5	7.8
Origin from other ma- jority Muslim countries	1.9	87.8	0.5	0.2	9.6
Origin from the former Soviet Union and Romania	0.0	0.3	85.3	1.3	13.1
Origin from countries with guest worker agreements	0.6	0.4	2.2	68.5	28.2
All other groups	0.1	0.5	3.9	0.8	93.7

The onomastic results for “other immigrant” background and “no immigrant” background were not available separately and are thus grouped for Tables 4 and 5.

Table 5: Sensitivity of onomastic procedure (false negatives); row percentages.

Real group belonging	Pre-classified groups (onomastic)				
	Turkish origin	Origin from other majority Muslim countries	Origin from the former Soviet Union and Romania	Origin from countries with guest worker agreements	All other groups
Immigrants and their descendants from:					
Turkey	95.9	2.5	0.0	0.8	0.8
Other majority Muslim countries	2.4	93.7	0.1	0.5	3.4
Former Soviet Union and Romania	1.0	0.9	55.1	3.6	39.4
Countries with guest worker agreements	1.7	0.3	0.7	90.9	6.4
All other groups	1.0	1.5	0.8	4.4	92.2

Table 6: Specificity of onomastic procedure by immigrant generation (false negatives); cell percentages.

Real group belonging	Correctly classified by onomastic	
	Immigrants	Children of immigrants
Immigrants and their descendants from:		
Turkey	94.5	97.1
Other majority Muslim countries	95.0	85.3
Former Soviet Union and Romania	60.3	24.1
Countries with guest worker agreements	93.8	86.7

5 Panel Design and Survey Programme

In the future, we intend to field four panel waves per year with a median length of 25 minutes. In addition to these regular waves, we also have the survey format of the so-called short surveys (“OAP Kurzbefragungen”) with the median length of approximately 3–5 minutes and a field time of 7 days, with one reminder in between. This allows us to respond in a timely manner to important current societal and political issues.

The general idea of the DeZIM.panel was the offline recruitment of respondents with a switch to online-only for the subsequent waves, i.e. inviting respondents only via email and conducting the fieldwork via a web survey only. However, only about 52% of respondents with panel consent provided us with a valid email address at first. We, thus, contact the respondents for the regular waves via email or via post, with up to four online reminders and one postal reminder over the field time of the survey. We specifically ask respondents without an email address at the end of the survey to provide us their addresses. In the first wave, this procedure resulted in 1220 new email addresses after the survey.

Respondents who participate in one of the regular online access panel waves receive a €10 voucher for several online stores they can choose from.³ Furthermore, from wave 2 onwards, we will also offer the possibility of a bank transfer of the incentive. In order to increase the response rates at the end of the field time, we also implemented a lottery in the first panel wave in which, on each day over a 5-day period, all previous participants could win a €200 voucher. A similar lottery is organized for the short surveys: of all the participants, 20 could win a €100 voucher.

To date, two regular waves have already been conducted: the first panel wave from the end of November 2021 to the end of January 2022, and the second wave from the end of March to the beginning of May 2022. The next waves are planned for June to July 2022, for September to October 2022 and for December 2022 to January 2023.

The first short survey was launched on February 28, 2022, as a reaction to the escalation of the war in Ukraine that had started 5 days earlier. This survey included questions on affective reactions, preferred policies and engagement preferences, and attribution of responsibilities (Mayer et al., 2022). In total, 3682 respondents participated in wave 1 (completion rate = 55%)⁴ and 2663 respondents participated in the first short survey. In the short survey, respondents were invited to participate only by email (completion rate = 54%); the total number of participants are shown in Table 7.

In the future, we intend to field four panel waves per year. Each wave will include one of our four core modules. These remain largely the same every year: questions on current topics and scientific questions submitted by other researchers from the DeZIM Institute and Research Community. Prospectively, we also intend to open the submission process to other external researchers.

3 Participants could choose between Amazon, Zalando (fashion shop) and buecher.de (online bookstore).

4 The completion rate for those invited by email was 61% and for those invited by post was 48%.

Table 7: Number of participants by immigrant group.

Real group belonging	Recruitment wave	Panel consent in recruitment wave	Participation in wave 1
Immigrants and their descendants from:			
Turkey	723	453	234
Other majority Muslim countries	892	655	277
Former Soviet Union and Romania	579	402	218
Countries with guest worker agreements	706	518	261
All other immigrant-origin groups	916	691	352
Germans without a migration background	5104	3848	2282

The four core modules focus on political institutions, attitudes and behaviour in wave 1, on societal values and societal norms in wave 2, health and well-being in wave 3 and labour and education as well as discrimination experiences in wave 4. As we intend to have the same questions in the core modules, we are thus able to track trends over time. Questions about subjective well-being and the assessment of individual life situations are asked in each wave. Furthermore, we include scientific concepts submitted by other researchers such as affective polarization or racism. In addition, we ask questions about current topics, such as the Corona pandemic and the war in Ukraine. All questions should be taken either from other established surveys or should be pre-tested. They also need to be able to be given to the whole panel instead of only one or several subgroups, so that all answers are available for all respondents.

6 Composition and Data Quality of the DeZIM.panel

In order to assess possible biases during sample selection and fieldwork, we compare the distribution of our sample on specific central characteristics with the distribution of these characteristics in the German Microcensus, as displayed in Table 8.

The results show that from recruitment over panel consent to actual participation in wave 1, bias towards higher education and younger participants increases. With regard to gender, no conclusive patterns emerge. Conducting multivariate logistic regression on the likelihood of not participating in the panel

Table 8: Comparison of groups by gender, education and age range before weighting; cell percentages.

Real group belonging	Gender: male				Education: Abitur				Age range: 18–30			
	MZ	W0	W0 P	W1	MZ	W0	W0 P	W1	MZ	W0	W0 P	W1
Immigrants and their descendants from:												
Turkey	51.8	47.2	44.5	42.3	27.7	35.4	38.8	43.5	34.6	31.0	35.8	39.3
Other majority Muslim countries	60.0	57.9	59.1	58.8	47.2	45.1	47.5	51.1	44.1	33.3	35.1	35.7
Former Soviet Union and Romania	47.6	38.9	41.8	39.0	37.8	43.1	48.5	53.8	28.7	18.5	22.1	24.8
Countries with guest worker agreements	54.1	47.8	50.1	46.2	35.0	46.8	51.6	61.3	26.4	23.1	26.6	30.7
All other groups with a migration background	50.6	41.8	43.2	41.3	48.5	54.9	58.4	66.2	22.5	19.8	23.0	24.7
Germans without migration background	50.1	45.8	46.7	47.7	40.8	45.8	49.5	54.3	27.2	20.1	22.0	23.9

MZ: Microcensus 2017, W0 P: those taking part in the recruitment wave and giving panel consent. Abitur: excluding all with other/ongoing education. Gender: excluding all identifying as diverse.

or in wave 1 shows that besides age, education and gender, migrant status has a significant positive relationship. In the recruitment wave, the likelihood of not participating is 8% points significantly higher for immigrants than for natives (however, no substantial difference between natives and children of immigrants was found). In the first wave, it was about 14% points significantly higher for immigrants (compared with natives), and 5% points for children of immigrants (compared with natives, all $p < 0.05$). The results show the need to account for non-response characteristics with weights.

Data should be weighted for analyses, due to the differences in the selection probabilities and stratification of the groups. We, thus, offer a design weight that accounts for different selection probabilities [dweight], as well as a combined weight also accounting for unit-non-response in the recruitment sample (based on age groups, gender, federal state and size of municipalities [BIK]) [dweight_adj]. In future, we plan to provide specific panel weights to account for non-response between the waves.

7 Analytical Potential

Currently, the DeZIM.panel is the only access panel in Germany with an over-sampling of immigrants and their descendants that offers a specific focus on topics relevant to integration research.

The DeZIM.panel allows the analysis of changes and trends over time by comparing different groups of respondents. Due the longitudinal survey design, the DeZIM.panel enables researchers to capture short- and long-term changes for individuals and between groups. Furthermore, the impact of external events with relevance for immigrant-origin groups – such as the war in Ukraine – can be studied with the help of flash surveys. Our long-term monitoring also makes it possible to detect whether – and how – policy changes, such as bans on head scarves or changes to immigration policy, affect the German population, and whether these effects are the same for all groups, while still taking individual factors such as socio-economic status into account.

For more in-depth analyses, contextual data on NUTS-2 or NUTS-3 (“Nomenclature des Unités territoriales statistiques”), such as employment rates or the proportion of refugees in the population, can be merged with the survey data based on official municipality keys (“Amtlicher Gemeindeschlüssel”), and the consequences of social contexts can be analyzed with multi-level analysis.

8 Data Security and Access

After a certain embargo time, the data from the DeZIM.panel will be made available to the scientific community within the DeZIM.fdz, the research data centre of the DeZIM institute (<https://fdz.dezim-institut.de/>). Because many questions touch sensitive topics such as health status, immigration history or political attitudes, the data need a high level of confidentiality and protection. In order to comply with strict national and international standards, a bundle of data security measures and a flexible data access plan have been established. We, thus, offer several different ways to access the data, with hierarchical levels of information sensitivity based on various levels of anonymization. Currently, Scientific Use Files (SUF) are available for secure download and secure on-site access. In future, we will also provide Campus Use Files with a subset of all cases and easier access specifically for academic teaching and for offering secure remote access. The SUF download version of the data has the highest level of anonymization, i.e. age groups and countries of origin are, for example, highly aggregated, and text answers are removed from the data set. The SUF are provided in Stata format with German and English labels and English documentation (questionnaire, codebook and method report). The SUF on-site version include more fine-grained details, and they also allow the addition of contextual data.

For any access to the DeZIM.panel data, the users have to first register for an account and then submit a signed user agreement (available in German and English). All users have to be affiliated with a scientific institution or a state organisation. Their applications need to include a brief description of the research project for which the data are intended to be used, the project time frame, and the other collaborators on the project. After the application has been approved, either the available SUF can be downloaded free of charge, or the data can be accessed on-site or from the secure platform.

References

- Blom, A.G., Gathmann, C., and Krieger, U. (2015). Setting up an online panel representative of the general population: the German internet panel. *Field Methods* 27: 391–408.
- Bosnjak, M., Dannwolf, T., Enderle, T., Schaurer, I., Struminskaya, B., Tanner, A., and Weyandt, K.W. (2018). Establishing an open probability-based mixed-mode panel of the general population in Germany: the GESIS panel. *Soc. Sci. Comput. Rev.* 36: 103–115.
- Brücker, H., Rother, N., and Schupp, J. (2016). *IAB-BAMF-SOEP-Befragung von Geflüchteten: Überblick und erste Ergebnisse*, 29. Bundesamt für Migration und Flüchtlinge, Nuremberg, p. 77.

- Cornesse, C. and Schaurer, I. (2021). The long-term impact of different offline population inclusion strategies in probability-based online panels: evidence from the German internet panel and the GESIS panel. *Soc. Sci. Comput. Rev.* 39: 687–704.
- Foroutan, N. (2019). *Die postmigrantisches Gesellschaft*. Transcript-Verlag, Bielefeld.
- Humpert, A. and Schneiderheinze, K. (2000). Stichprobenziehung für telefonische Zuwandererumfragen: Einsatzmöglichkeiten der Namenforschung. *ZUMA Nachr.* 24: 36–63.
- Kruse, H. and Dollmann, J. (2017). Name-based measures of neighborhood composition: how telling are neighbors' names? *Surv. Res. Methods* 11: 435–450.
- Liebau, E., Humpert, A., and Schneiderheinze, K. (2018). *Wie gut funktioniert das Onomastik-Verfahren? Ein Test am Beispiel des SOEP-Datensatzes (No. 976)*. *SOEP papers on multidisciplinary panel data research*. German Socio-Economic Panel (SOEP), DIW Berlin, Berlin.
- Mateos, P. (2007). A review of name-based ethnicity classification methods and their potential in population studies. *Popul. Space Place* 13: 243–263.
- Mayer, S.J., Lietz, A., Dollmann, J., Siegel, M., and Köhler, J. (2022). Reaktionen auf den Ukraine-Krieg. Eine Schnellbefragung des DeZIM.panels. *DeZIM.insights Working Paper 1*, <https://doi.org/10.31235/osf.io/j9df3>.
- Schnell, R., Trappmann, M., and Gramlich, T. (2014). A study of assimilation bias in name-based sampling of migrants. *J. Off. Stat.* 30: 231–249.