Bridges and barriers –

Religion and immigrant occupational attainment across integration contexts*

Phillip Connor (Pew Research Center)

Matthias Koenig (University of Göttingen)

Abstract:

This paper advances knowledge about context-dependent impacts of religion on immigrants' structural integration. Drawing on theories of inter-generational immigrant integration, it identifies and spells out two context-dependent mechanisms through which religion impinges upon structural integration – as ethnic marker prompting exclusion and discrimination, or as social organization providing access to tangible resources. The propositions are empirically tested with nationally representative data on occupational attainment in three different integration contexts which vary in religious boundary configurations and religious field characteristics – the US, Canada and Western Europe. Using data from the US General Social Survey, the Canadian Ethnic Diversity Survey, and the European Social Survey, the paper analyzes indirect and direct effects of religious affiliation and participation on occupational attainment among first and second generation immigrants. The analyses find only limited evidence for the assumption that in contexts with "bright" religious boundaries (such as Western Europe and, to a lesser extent, Canada) immigrants face religious penalties in structural integration. By contrast, the analyses supports the assumption that in contexts with Tocquevillian religious field characteristics (such as the US and, to a lesser extent, Canada), religious participation tends to be positively related to occupational attainment, especially for the second generation. For the first time, the paper empirically tests arguments about transatlantic differences in the role of religion for immigrants' structural integration and suggests ways of better integrating micro-oriented survey research with macro-oriented institutional analysis.

Keywords: boundaries; integration; migration; occupational attainment; religion

Word Count: 9.671

* Both authors have contributed equally to this article. Please address correspondence to: Phillip Connor, pconnor@pewforum.org or Matthias Koenig, mkoenig@uni-goettingen.de.
We are grateful to Nancy Foner, Jeff Reitz, Andreas Wimmer, and workshop participants at the Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan (Ann Arbor), for critical comments and constructive advice on previous drafts of this paper.

1. Introduction

After years of neglect, sociologists have rediscovered religion as an important factor in the integration of immigrants in Western societies (for review see Cadge/Ecklund 2007). Critically engaging with the discipline's secularist assumptions, they increasingly acknowledge the continuous relevance of religious beliefs and practices for the encounter between immigrants and receiving society. At the micro-level, an abundance of ethnographic case studies has documented immigrants' individual religiosity, its various organizational forms, and the emerging contours of religious diversity (see e.g. Hirschman 2004; Alba et al. 2009). At the macro-level, comparative studies have charted how historical church-state relations and religious underpinnings of nationalism continue to affect policy responses to migration-related religious diversity (see e.g. Fetzer/Soper 2004, Koenig 2005, Kuru 2009). However, as these literatures rarely speak to each other, it is still unclear whether and how macro-contextual conditions impinge upon the micro-dynamics through which religion facilitates or hinders immigrants' integration (see Alba et al. 2009: 24). In this paper, we try to advance knowledge about context-dependent effects of religious affiliation and participation on structural immigrant outcomes, both theoretically and empirically.

Existing theories of immigrant integration, if they address religious factors at all, either accentuate the boundaries constituted by differences in religious affiliation (Alba 2005) or emphasize the various resources accessible through participation in religious organizations (Portes/Rumbaut 2006: 299-342; Warner 2007). Rarely, however, are both religious factors explicitly combined within one theoretical model. Foner and Alba (2008) have prominently argued that they are foregrounded in diverging scholarly approaches that prevail on both sides of the Atlantic. Whereas the US literature, revitalizing a long and respected tradition (Handlin 1951, Herberg 1956, Gordon 1965), tended to see religion as "bridge" to mainstream

assimilation and upward mobility of post-1965 immigrants, European authors focused on the "barrier" that religion constitutes for immigrants, notably for those from Islamic countries and their offspring (see also Casanova 2007; Zolberg/Long 1999).

We argue that this "bridge vs. barrier" metaphor can be theoretically reformulated by disentangling two context-dependent causal mechanisms. The first mechanism is assumed to be triggered in contexts where religion is a "bright" religious boundary; here religious minority affiliation may block immigrants' structural integration. By contrast, the second mechanism would be triggered in contexts with what may be called a Tocquevillian religious field; here religious participation provides access to various resources and thus facilitates structural integration. As we shall show, both causal mechanisms may, in principle, operate independently from each other given the respective contextual conditions.

Existing empirical research on religion and immigrant integration also faces a number of limitations. Only recently have quantitatively minded sociologists begun to systematically investigate how religious affiliation and practice influence such core structural integration outcomes as educational achievement, employment, earnings, or occupational achievement (Alksynska/Algan 2010; Berthoud 2000; Bisin et al. 2011; Beyer 2005; Connor 2011; Khattab 2009; Lindley 2002; Model/Lin 2002; Portes/Rumbaut 2006; Wuthnow/Hacket 2003). Their results are far from conclusive. First, religious "penalities" are sometimes identified without controlling for other variables known to affect socio-economic status (e.g. Beyer 2005). Second, many studies draw on immigrant surveys (e.g. CILS or NIS) and thus cannot assess the extent to which religious differences contribute to immigrant-native-gaps in socio-economic success (Connor 2011; Portes/Rumbaut 2006). And third, except for Model and Lin's (2002) analysis of ethno-religious minorities' labour force participation and employment in Britain and Canada, none of the survey-based studies has explicitly pursued a

broader transatlantic comparison. As a consequence, a number of questions remain unanswered: What precisely are the effects of religious affiliation and participation, respectively, on immigrant integration outcomes, net of other relevant factors? Do they indirectly mediate socio-structural gaps between natives and first or second generation immigrants or do they directly impinge upon the two generations' structural integration? And, above all, how do these effects differ across contexts?

We take up these empirical questions by analyzing survey data on first and second generation immigrants' occupational attainment across three macro-contexts: the US, Canada, and Europe. Occupational attainment is a tangible structural integration outcome that has attracted wide attention among migration scholars (see Heath/Cheung 2007), but that has rarely been analyzed with an explicit focus on religious penalties (an exception is Model/Lin 2003). Using data from the US General Social Survey, the Canadian Ethnic Diversity, and the European Social Survey, we study whether religious affiliation or participation explain native-immigrant-gaps in occupational attainment. Moreover, we scrutinize direct effects of religious affiliation and participation on first and second generation immigrants' occupational attainment. The comparative analysis of survey-data in three contexts that vary in both religious boundary configurations and religious field characteristics allows us to test the theoretical arguments implicit in the "bridge versus barrier" metaphor. We find that while in none of the three contexts religious affiliation or participation mediate native-immigrant gaps, they do have direct effects on occupational attainment, albeit in different ways for first and second generation immigrants. Furthermore, while we find only limited evidence for the existence of strong religious boundary effects, it seems that contextual variations in religious field characteristics do affect the role that religion plays for immigrants' structural integration.

Our article is organized as follows. We start with theoretical background for analyzing the role of religion in immigrant integration (2.). We then present our analytical strategy and provide relevant macro-characteristics of the three contextual cases of the US, Canada, and Europe (3.). After describing our data and laying out the variables and modelling approach (4.), we present major findings for the three contexts on indirect and direct effects of religion on occupational attainment (5.). By way of conclusion, we discuss limitations and theoretical implications of the findings (6.).

2. The "bridge vs. barrier" metaphor – a theoretical reformulation

To reformulate the "bridge vs. barrier" metaphor, we build on recent attempts to synthesize the empirical generalizations formulated by classical, segmented, and new assimilation theory within a coherent explanatory model of (intergenerational) immigrant integration (see notably Esser 2006). "Integration" is here understood as an open-ended process comprising cognitive, structural, social, and identificational dimensions, "assimilation" being one among several possible integration outcomes defined by the absence of inequalities between natives and immigrants. In this paper, we focus on structural integration outcomes, more specifically on immigrants' occupational attainment. Occupational attainment is of particular interest in assessing the degree of structural assimilation of the second generation for whom language, education and citizenship are typically more accessible than for the first generation (see Portes/Rumbaut 2006; Rumbaut 1994).

In general, the model of intergenerational integration attempts to explain structural integration outcomes as (often unintended) consequences of immigrants' individual actions which, in turn, are selected under given situational resources, opportunities and constraints (Esser 2006). Migration scholars have amply documented that the most important predictor of

structural integration outcomes in general is immigrants' socio-economic background (see Heath et al. 2008). Parental socio-economic status largely determines availability of economic, social, and cultural capital which immigrants and their children can transfer into upward mobility. Immigrants' educational achievement, in itself not unrelated to class origins, mitigates the relation between class origin and economic success since it provides competences as well as certificates valued on the labour market. Much of the literature therefore focuses on the crucial empirical question whether being an immigrant or ethnic minority member *as such*, i.e. net of class origin and education, constitutes a "penalty" for socio-economic status achievement including occupational attainment (see Akresh 2006; Chiswick/Miller 2010; De Jong/Steinmetz 2004; Gorodzeisky 2011; Reyneri/Fuller 2010).

The migration literature highlights two sets of factors that potentially block immigrants' upward mobility and structural integration, and it emphasizes that these factors operate in context-dependent ways (on the concept of "integration contexts" see Crul/Schneider 2010). We draw on this literature to identify and further elaborate two distinctive causal mechanisms through which religion may become relevant to structural integration outcomes.

Religious boundary configurations, minority affiliation, and structural integration

The first set of factors is related to opportunities and constraints existing in the receiving context. Evidently, structural integration outcomes, including occupational mobility, depend on general labour market characteristics that affect immigrants and natives alike and that are known to vary across national contexts (see Reitz et al. 2007; Crul/Schneider 2010). But they also depend on social closure through which newcomers are excluded from access to tangible resources in the receiving society, whether by formal governmental policy or by informal public stereotypes and discrimination (Gordon 1964). In such mechanisms of social closure, which some authors find to occur typically in situations of economic scarcity (see Dancygier

2010), symbolic boundaries are activated and become barriers of upward mobility and structural assimilation (Wimmer 2009). The "bridge" versus "barrier" metaphor could thus be reformulated as a causal mechanism of social closure in which religion forms part of salient boundary configurations.

Before formulating a general hypothesis, we underline that religious affiliation is in this argument treated as an ethnic marker or categorical attribute, regardless of actual religious practices. Thus, discriminatory behaviour may be prompted not only by visible signs of belonging (e.g. headscarves, kirpas) or other voluntary expressions of religious habitus, but also by ascriptive indicators of one's religious affiliation, such as names. Indeed, qualitative and experimental studies have documented this mechanism of social closure, e.g. among French employers who respond less favourably to Muslim than to Christian Senegalese job applicants (Adida/Laitin/Volfort 2011). Evidently, it is only members of (specific) minority religions, not immigrants belonging to a nationally dominant religion, who are subject to such ethno-religious exclusion.

We underline that according to this argument the causal mechanism linking religious minority status with structural integration outcomes is context-dependent. It is triggered only if codes of collective identity include religious markers and if these markers are institutionally salient, for instance by excluding religious minorities from legal or material privileges granted by the state. Where institutionalized boundary configurations highlight other markers, (e.g. racial or linguistic), religious affiliation should have a null relation with structural integration outcomes such as occupational attainment.

The argument so far presented can be formulated as an empirically testable hypothesis. In most general terms, it implies that macro-contextual characteristics impinge upon the degree

of correlation between religious minority affiliation and socio-economic status. More specifically, it implies that, depending on context, religious minority affiliation is a relevant variable, although certainly not the most relevant one, when explaining native-immigrants gaps in socio-economic status. The disappearance of such gaps, i.e. structural assimilation, would consequently require the "blurring" of religious boundaries in the receiving society (see Zolberg/Long 1999; Alba 2003). Since this process operates rather slowly, one would expect that both generations are affected by religious minority affiliation in similar ways. Hence: *Where "bright" religious boundaries exist within a receiving society, religious minority (majority) status has a negative (positive) impact on structural integration (such as occupational attainment) for both first and second generation, net of other relevant factors (H1).*

Religious field characteristics, participation, and structural integration

There is another set of factors explaining structural integration outcomes that the literature highlights: the resources available to immigrants. These resources evidently include (parental) class origin and educational background, but also other dimensions of integration. Thus, cognitive integration as indicated by dominant language acquisition may lead to higher educational achievement and better performance on the labour market, while its absence may channel immigrants into ethnic niche economies. Social integration, i.e. the establishment of social relations with the receiving context (residential desegregation, intermarriage etc.), may also influence structural integration outcomes.[1] Cultural integration, finally, may in certain contexts foster structural integration, but so may ethnically specific cultural values such as those among Chinese and Russian Jews in the US (see Kasinitz et al. 2008). In light of such argument, the "bridge" versus "barrier" metaphor could be reformulated in a way that does

[1] Maintenance of ethnic networks may actually have a differential impact; under the scenario of "selective acculturation" its embedded social capital may facilitate upward mobility of the second generation (Portes/Zhou 1993), but, depending on receiving context characteristics, "ethnic mobility traps" may also occur (Esser 2006).

not so much focus on religious boundaries but puts centre stage the ways in which religion does or does not provide access to tangible resources.

By way of conceptual clarification, it needs to be stressed that religiosity is in this argument not treated as marker of ethnicity but as individuals' active participation in religious organizations. While agnostic on whether and how religiously embedded cultural values affect structural integration outcomes, the argument thus stresses the resources that religious organizations may provide for immigrants. For instance, immigrants' involvement in the activities of churches, mosques or temples may provide them with access to complementary educational programs, to organized assistance on the job market, or to more general status-bridging social capital, as qualitative and ethnographic studies among groups such as Vietnamese Buddhists in New Orleans (Bankston/Zhou 1996) or among Haitians in Miami (Mooney 2009) have amply documented (see also Foley/ Hoge 2007; Wuthnow 2002).

Parallel to the previous argument, we underline that the argument about the impact of religious participation on structural integration outcomes is context-dependent. The relevant causal mechanism is triggered only if the overall religious field displays, as it were, Tocquevillian characteristics such as voluntary participation and congregationalism. True, religious organizations may also provide health services or social welfare in highly bureaucratic and state-regulated religious fields. But their role in providing socio-economically relevant social ties is more pronounced in religious fields which put a premium on individuals' active involvement. Under these contextual conditions, participation in either majority or minority organizations can thus promote up-ward mobility, albeit through slightly different channels; while religious majority organizations, notably in a multi-ethnic congregation, provide bridging social capital, religious minority organizations additionally

foster bonding social capital that may reduce inter-generational stress among immigrants and thus facilitate upward mobility.

Again, the argument can be a formulated as a testable hypothesis. In most general terms, it assumes macro-characteristics of religious fields to impinge on the degree of correlations between religious participation and socio-economic status. While the argument has no clear implications for immigrant-native-gaps, it does make a statement on direct effects on the first and second generation, respectively. As proponents of segmented assimilation theory argue, “ethnic churches” provide spaces of inter-generational communication and solidarity that enhance “selective acculturation” and, thus, upward mobility among the second generation (see Portes/Rumbaut 2006: 305; Warner 2007). Benefits of religious participation should therefore be more pronounced among the second generation, under respective contextual conditions. Hence: *Where a congregational religious field exists within a receiving society, religious participation has positive impacts on structural integration (such as occupational attainment), especially for the second generation, net of other relevant factors (H2).*

3. Religious boundaries and fields in three integration contexts

Having disentangled two possible causal mechanisms underlying the “bridge versus barrier” metaphor, the empirical question arises whether indirect and direct impacts of religious affiliation and religious participation upon occupational attainment of immigrants are in fact conditional on contextual boundary configurations or religious field characteristics, or both. We address this question by comparing findings from multivariate analyses of general surveys conducted in the US, Canada, and Western Europe where large-scale immigration since the post-war period has considerably altered religious demographics. In this section we lay out

the rationale of our comparative strategy and describe the three integration contexts in more detail.

Transatlantic comparison – the US and Western Europe

The obvious starting point in the study of integration contexts, and of religious contextual differences in particular, is the transatlantic contrast between the US and Western Europe (see Foner/Alba 2008; Casanova 2007; Thomas/Crul 2007). Both macro-contexts have differed markedly, not only in their general labor market and welfare regime characteristics, but also in their immigration and integration policies and in the selectivity of immigrants. As highlighted by Portes and Rumbaut (2006), the US mode of incorporation is rather passive, with government providing only weak assistance; some affirmative action programs notwithstanding, immigrants, from high-skill to undocumented low-skill, are rather left to themselves to integrate into mainstream society. By contrast, European governments have shown a more pro-active approach to integrate the mostly low-skilled labor migrants and, subsequently, their families. Needless to say, European policy approaches to integration have varied considerably, from ethnic exclusion (as in Germany before the reform of citizenship), to republic assimilation and liberal forms of multiculturalism (as in the UK) (Koopmans et al. 2005), although several observers have noted a common trend to robust forms of civic integration policies as expressed in obligatory language course, citizenship tests and the like (Brubaker 2001; Joppke 2007). But regardless of such internal differences, in terms of both state policies and financial support, immigrants are exposed to more interventionist integration policies in Western Europe than in the United States. [2]

---

[2] Our broad stroke transatlantic comparison is therefore defensible; it is the only feasible option for our analytical strategy given the data limitations of European survey data; multi-level analyses analyzing within-Europe differences (e.g. Fleischmann/Dronkers 2010) typically suffer from small subsample sizes once the immigrant population is broken down into generations and religious groupings.

More importantly for our analysis, the US and Western Europe also vary in both religious boundary configurations as well as religious field characteristics. Introducing the concept of cultural boundary dynamics to the migration literature, Zolberg and Loon prominently argued that "European identity, despite national variations, remains deeply embedded in Christian tradition, in relation to which 'Muslim' immigrants constitute the visible 'other'", while Americans' identity "as a result of the resolution of earlier immigration confrontations, […] is no longer anchored in Christianity narrowly defined, but rather in a more diffuse deistic civil religion that easily embraces other faiths" (Zolberg/Long 1999: 7). One has to concede that public attitudes in Western Europe do not seem to emphasize religion as the most prominent marker of national identity and distinction from immigrants (see Bail 2008). But most Western European states, including even presumably "secularist" France, have in various forms continued practices of selective governmental cooperation with, if not support for, majority churches (see e.g. Fox 2008; see also Koenig 2005 for national varieties) and of drawing "bright" boundaries around the (Judeo-)Christian cultural heritage (see Davie 2000). This situation contrasts starkly with the US where, to be sure, religious components abound within discursive repertoires of national identity but are institutionally less rigid than in Western Europe. Not only has the Supreme Court, at least until recently, adopted a rather strict "wall of separation" doctrine; public references to religion also tend to be more pluralistic, at least since the mid-20th century when Catholicism and Judaism became part of the multiple melting pot (Herberg 1951). Boundary drawing does occur between religious communities (Warner 1997), but exceptionally high religious mobility facilitates regular boundary crossing (Putnam/Campbell 2010: 4) thus producing overall "blurred" religious boundaries.

The US and Western Europe are also generally known to vary in religious field characteristics. Since Alexis de Tocqueville, pluralism has been regarded as key feature of the

US American landscape, going hand in hand with a congregational model of religious organization that emphasizes voluntary religious membership and attendance. Whether the presumed "religious market" in the US explains the exceptionally high rates of religious participation, is open to debate (see Finke/Stark 2005 and Norris/Inglehart 2004). It is clear though that immigrants find themselves confronted with a highly active and volatile religious field where participation gives access to various embedded resources. This contrasts starkly with Western Europe where the religious field has for centuries been characterized by a parochial bureaucratic model of religious organization that is more tightly regulated by the state and has experienced dramatically declining rates of membership and attendance over the past decades (Norris/Inglehart 2004).

Between the US and Western Europe – the Canadian case

While the focus on two extreme cases such as the US and Western Europe allows establishing that individual-level correlations of immigrants' religious affiliation and participation with structural integration outcomes vary at all across integration contexts, more cases are needed if we are to disentangle which aspects of integration contexts actually matter. More specifically, the contrast between the US and Western Europe does not permit disentangling the relative relevance of boundary configurations and religious field characteristics. It cannot settle whether the bridging mechanism of religious participation requires the absence of religious boundaries, as Foner and Alba (2008) seem to suggest; after all, it could also be true that, in contexts of "bright" religious boundaries, immigrants can compensate for their religious "penalties" through participation in religious organizations, as long as the religious field has Tocquevillian characteristics.

In addition to the conventional transatlantic comparison we therefore include Canada in our analysis. That Canada differs from both the US and Western Europe in terms of its

immigration and integration policies has often been noted in the comparative literature (e.g. Bloemrad 2006). In reversal of previous expectations of Anglo-conformity, Canada has since the 1970s adopted a policy of "multiculturalism" which, while premised on liberal principles, supports immigrants in retaining their particular cultural identities (Kymlicka 1995; Li 2003).[3] Apart from these characteristics, Canada also departs from the US and Western Europe in both its religious boundary configuration and its religious field characteristics (see e.g. Lyon/van Die 2000).

Despite its multicultural policies, religious boundaries are more salient in the Canadian integration context than in the US. Not only has Christianity figured prominently in imaginations of the Canadian nation, even in the early twentieth century (see Christie/Gauvreau 2010), the state has also developed stronger institutional relations with the churches. Evidently this has been the case in Quebec where Catholicism was, until the Quiet Revolution, the main pillar of the imagined identity as a peripheral nation; but even English Canada where the Anglican Church was formally disestablished and put on equal terms with the other four denominations (Catholic, Presbyterian, Methodist, Baptist) by the time of Confederation (1867), has still remnants of institutional privilege for religious majorities. As recent controversies over religious education and religious family law in Ontario or over "reasonable accommodation" in Quebec attest (see Bouchard/Taylor 2008), religious difference is an issue in policy debates of immigrant integration. At the same time, religious boundaries are evidently less "bright" than in Western Europe; the turn to multiculturalism provided fertile ground for accepting religious diversification that came with the post-war waves of immigration (Bramadat/Seljak 2008 and 2009), and since the adoption of the

[3] While Quebec as a peripheral nation within Canada has hesitated in embracing cultural diversity (see Breton 1988) and has pursued a more pro-active strategy of integration immigrants through active French language programs, its shares in the main thrust of Canadian immigration and integration policy; in fact, there seem to be few differences between Quebec and English Canada in the social integration of immigrants; see Reitz et al. 2009.

Charter of Fundamental Rights (1982) Canada's religious freedom jurisprudence has strongly emphasized principles of equality and non-discrimination.

Canada also lies between the US and Western Europe in terms of its religious field characteristics. Although the aforementioned patterns of informal establishment have for long prevented the development of a full-fledged religious "market" as in the US, religious organizations in English Canada and even in Quebec have departed rather strongly from the European-style parochial model. In the absence of a strong central state, religious organizations have historically been the most prominent institutions of civil society, including even the working classes (Bramadat/Seljak 2008; Christie/Gauvreau 2010). Even mainline denominations have adopted a rather congregational model of voluntary and activist religious organizations. Perhaps not accidentally, Canadian rates of religious participation today lie between the US and Western Europe (O'Toole 1996; Clark 2003).

In sum, comparing the three cases of the US, Canada, and Western Europe allows for a nuanced analysis of the impact that religious boundaries and religious field characteristics have, respectively, on the relations between of immigrants' religiosity and their structural integration. The theoretical reformulation of the "bridge vs. barrier" metaphor would lead us to expect that religious minority/majority status has the strongest negative/positive effect on immigrants' occupational attainment in Western Europe, similar but less pronounced effect in Canada, and none in the US (H1). It would furthermore lead us to expect religious participation to have positive effects for immigrants' structural integration in the US and, although to a lesser degree, in Canada, while this relation should be absent or (for minorities) even negative in Western Europe (H2).

4. Survey data and methods

Testing the hypotheses derived from our theoretical reformulation of the "bridge versus barrier" metaphor poses a number of challenges. First, it requires individual-level data that include not only variables for socio-economic status, religious affiliation and participation, and various controls but also allows us to distinguish first and second generation immigrants from the native population. Second, it requires that these variables be strictly comparable across surveys. To address these challenges, we draw on the US General Social Survey (GSS), the European Social Survey (ESS) and the Canadian Ethnic Diversity Survey (EDS), to analyze effects of religious affiliation and participation on occupational attainment, net of other relevant factors. In this section, we briefly discuss the three datasets which all provide data for the early 2000s and explain our modeling approach.

Datasets

For the US, we use pooled data from the General Social Survey (GSS, waves 2000, 2002, and 2004), while for Western Europe, here defined as EU-15 plus Norway and Switzerland, we use pooled data from the European Social Survey (ESS, waves 2002, 2004).[4] Given our outcome variable (occupational attainment), the listed sample sizes for the GSS (pooled N = 4,816) and ESS (pooled N = 27,459) are limited to employed respondents between ages 25 and 64 who responded to all variables that are included in regression models.[5]

Both the GSS and the ESS are highly respected, nationally representative surveys with high response rates, typically lying over 70% for most years and most countries (see Smith et al. 2002; Jowell and Team 2003 and 2005). Although they were not explicitly intended for

[4] To keep years consistent, we only pooled GSS and ESS waves close to 2002 – the survey year of the EDS. With data being a decade old, it is possible that the rates of occupational disadvantage and the relationship with religion have changed. However, we assume contextual characteristics to change rather slowly.
[5] After setting the population universe, listwise deletion is used for missing cases among control and key variables of interest. This results in the removal of 58 cases (2%) in the GSS, 537 cases (2%) in the ESS, and 1,298 cases (7%) in the EDS. Missing cases are assumed to be missing at random.

immigrant analysis, they provide the best available data for a transatlantic comparison of immigrants' occupational attainment. The two datasets not only allow us to measure native-immigrant gaps in occupational attainment, but also to distinguish between first generation (foreign-born in the GSS, born outside of selected European countries in the ESS) and second generation (having at least one foreign-born parent) immigrant subgroups.[6] Moreover, both datasets contain a common set of variables sufficient for testing the role of religious affiliation as well as religious participation upon occupational attainment. However, we also note some limitations to these datasets. Above all, they suffer from small immigrant subsamples, particularly among the second generation; this is most problematic in the ESS since it essentially precludes otherwise desirable cross-national comparisons. Furthermore, it is questionable whether they adequately represent first generation immigrants, especially since the GSS was only conducted in English and ESS interviews were done in the country's official language(s).[7]

For the Canadian case, we use the Ethnic Diversity Survey (EDS). The EDS (N=20,232) was conducted in 2002 by Statistics Canada, representing the national population but oversampling for ethnic minorities, which consequently creates sizeable samples of first and second generation immigrants. Furthermore, the survey was conducted in English, French, and Canada's seven largest non-official languages (Mandarin, Cantonese, Italian, Punjabi, Portuguese, Vietnamese, and Spanish), thus removing potential acculturation bias. Given these features, the EDS provides a more powerful data source for exploring native-immigrant and first-second generation gaps than the GSS and the ESS. This has to be taken into account when comparing the results of multiple regression analysis across surveys; therefore, significant findings for GSS and ESS data should depend on an alpha level of $p<0.10$ whereas

---

[6] "Internal" migrants within the EU-15 plus Norway and Switzerland are not considered immigrants for the purpose of our analysis.
[7] Connor (unpublished working paper) has conducted an analysis of using immigrant subsamples within the ESS and potential acculturation bias. He finds that descriptive statistics are not always reliable for immigrant subsamples, but effects are in the expected direction within multivariate regression models.

this should be lowered to $p<0.05$ for the EDS. This is particularly relevant when models are specified for a particular immigrant generation.

Modeling approach and variables

Our modeling approach directly follows our theoretical discussion. The *dependent variable* is skilled occupational attainment as a key structural integration variable which is available across all three datasets.[8] Occupational attainment is measured as a recoded binary variable denoting professional/managerial occupations (otherwise known as the salariat). In the GSS and the ESS, the ISCO88 categorical listing of occupations is used whereby occupations at the 4000 level and lower are considered the salariat (Iversen/Soskice 2001). In the EDS, Statistics Canada uses the 1991 Standard Occupational Classification (SOC) of which the first five categories (Management, Business, Finance, Administrative, Natural and Applied Sciences, Health, Social Science, Education, Government Service, and Religious Occupations) are considered the salariat.[9]

The key *independent variables* that allow testing of the two hypotheses derived from our theoretical discussion of the bridge versus barrier metaphor are religious affiliation and religious participation. Religious affiliation is measured slightly differently in the three surveys. In order to have a comparable set of variables, we use the following categorization of religious affiliation: religiously unaffiliated (reference group), Catholic, Christian Orthodox, Protestant, Muslim, Jewish, Eastern religion, and Other Religion. We use unaffiliated as the reference group since this allows to test religious minority penalties and Christian majority advantages simultaneously. In measuring religious participation we follow standard practice

[8] There are no comparable measures for labor market participation, employment, or wages across all three surveys which would allow for more comprehensive analysis of structural integration outcomes.

[9] It would be ideal to present results by gender; however, the small N for some religious groups makes this impractical, especially for the GSS and the ESS. Since the larger sample size of the Canadian data does enable a gender breakdown, we ran separate analyses for males and females respectively; the results are very similar to those presented for the full sample.

and use self-rated worship attendance as variable. To have a comparable measure across all three datasets that takes into account the variety of religious groups' expectations for attendance, we employ a binary variable indicating monthly or more frequent attendance. In the EDS, this measure is only available for those indicating a religious affiliation. To account for this skip pattern, we impute zero attendance for the unaffiliated in the EDS; correspondingly, the very few cases among the religiously unaffiliated within the GSS and ESS indicating monthly or more frequent religious attendance were also recoded as zero.

We include a number of *control variables*. First, since occupational attainment is known to be largely determined by education and by parents' socio-economic status (SES) and education, we include measures for both constructs in our models. In the GSS and ESS, parental SES is measured by parents' professional or managerial occupation. Since this variable is unavailable in the EDS, we use parents' completion of a post secondary degree as a proxy. Education is measured as respondents' completion of post-secondary degree. Additional socio-demographic controls include gender, age, and marital status which are available across all three datasets. Second, as it could be argued that potential effects of religious affiliation are confounded by non-religious dimensions of ethnic boundaries, above all race, we include an ethnicity variable as a control in all our models. To achieve maximum comparability across surveys, we constructed this variable as follows. In the EDS, we use the detailed "visible minority" variable, with "non-visible" (i.e. white) as reference category. In the GSS and ESS, a comparable measure can be constructed by aggregating country of origin variables (GSS – country of origin; ESS – country of birth or parent's country of birth) which pit North-Americans or Europeans (i.e. white) against others.[10] Third, to account for internal differences

[10] More specifically, the origin variable used in the GSS and ESS is collapsed into 6 categories: 1) North American/European, 2) Central/South American/Caribbean, 3) Middle Eastern/North African, 4) Sub-Saharan African, 5) East Asian, and 6) South Asian. The GSS also contains a simple self-classified race variable (with categories white/black/others). Not surprisingly, few respondents indicating "black" selected African origins; for the purposes of our analysis, we recoded these cases as having Sub-Saharan African origins. In the ESS, native-born respondents were assumed to be in the North American/European category.

of integration contexts, our models include country-fixed effects in the European analysis, and we control for geographic region in the US and for Census Metropolitan Area in the Canadian models.

To assess immigrant integration it is crucial to compare both first and second generation immigrants with the native-born population. We therefore start with descriptive statistics of all variables by native-born and (first and second) immigrant generation. We then move to multivariate regression analysis, in which occupational attainment is modeled for the complete samples. The null model includes a variable indicating first and second immigrant generation (native born as reference group) as well as all controls. By inserting religious affiliation and participation into the model, we can determine whether religion mediates any immigrant occupational disadvantage relative to the native-born population, net of other factors. Finally, we model direct effects of both religious affiliation and participation separately for the two immigrant generations.

We present descriptive statistics and the regression models in parallel analysis for all three integration contexts (US, Canada, Western Europe). Having harmonized variables across these contexts, we use t-test differences of significant coefficients between the three data analyses. This allows us to test hypotheses concerning the impact of macro-context characteristics upon direction and magnitude of the effect of religious affiliation and participation, respectively.

4. Findings – religion and occupational attainment in the United States, Canada, and Western Europe

Descriptive statistics

Descriptive statistics comparing differences across immigrant generations relative to the native-born population present some interesting differences across the three contexts, many of which are not surprising (see Table 1). In all three contexts, a smaller proportion of the first generation is employed in professional/managerial occupations compared to the native-born, albeit this is only statistically significant for Canada. In contrast, the second generation performs at the same level or even better than their native counterparts, particularly in the US and Canada (see also Boyd/Grieco 1998). The occupational disadvantage of the first generation seems, at first glance, to disappear as the second generation comes of age.[11]

- TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE -

In line with our above characterization of the three religious fields, the percent religiously unaffiliated among the native-born population is highest in Europe (40%), lowest in the US (15%), and somewhat in between in Canada (19%). Similarly, there is a higher proportion of Christians of various types in the US than in Europe, with Canada again in the middle. Among both first and second generation immigrants, Christians constitute a larger group in the US than in Europe.[12] In Western Europe, our findings confirm previous studies using ESS data (Aleksyska/Algan 2010) in displaying a higher proportion of second generation immigrants who are religiously unaffiliated compared to first generation immigrants – even higher than in the native population. The inter-generational decline in religious affiliation also seems to occur in Canada.

[11] These analyses cannot of course disentangle period and cohort effects from generational differences, which could also be plausible explanations for generational differences relative to the native population.
[12] Although the GSS, conducted in English, inflates the number of Protestants, these results are largely similar to estimates of previous demographic work on the religious affiliation of immigrants (Connor 2011). The ESS does seem to undersample the first generation Muslim population in Europe; however, this sample bias in the ESS should be equalized in multivariate models.

Religious attendance rates among the native-born are highest in the US (44% attend monthly or more) and lowest in Europe (19% attend monthly or more), with Canada in between (29% attend monthly or more). Among the immigrant population, the data indicate an underlying process of religious adaptation, with the first generation having considerably higher religious participation rates than the native-born and the second generation more or less approaching the levels of natives in all three contexts.

Against this background, we assess context-dependent effects of religious affiliation and religious participation upon occupational attainment, net of parental class status, ethnic minority status, education, and other socio-demographic controls. We first analyze whether religion indirectly mediates native-immigrant gaps, and second we focus on direct effects of religion on first and second generation immigrants' occupational attainment.

Does religion mediate native-immigrant differences in occupational attainment?

Since the debate over "bridges" and "barriers" implicitly compares immigrants' economic success to that of the native-born population, it is important to analyze whether immigrant-native gaps in occupational attainment are mediated by religious factors. Multivariate models in Table 2 therefore predict skilled occupational attainment by context for the full survey samples, testing generational differences relative to the native population in the first model and introducing religious affiliation and worship attendance in the second model. In all three contexts, first generation immigrants are significantly less likely to be in a professional/managerial job, net of socio-demographic controls, albeit this effect is significantly stronger in Europe than in the US and Canada. By contrast, there are no significant differences in occupational attainment between the second generation and natives which, contrary to standard perceptions, suggests a considerable degree of structural assimilation in all three contexts. The occupational disadvantage of the first generation

persists at more or less the same level when religion variables are added. Neither religious affiliation nor religious participation substantially narrows or expands the economic gap between first generation immigrants and natives, net of other factors.

- TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE -

Although religion variables do not mediate differences in economic success among immigrants as compared to the native-born, Table 2 does confirm our assumption that macro-contexts impinge upon the way in which religion is linked to occupational achievement among the general population. In the US, religious affiliation coefficients are largely insignificant, while monthly or more frequent religious attendance is associated with a greater likelihood of having a professional or managerial job. In Western Europe, by contrast, Muslims are significantly less likely to have high occupational attainment compared to the religiously unaffiliated, while religious participation is not statistically significant. In Canada, we also find negative effects of affiliation on occupational attainment for Christian Orthodox, Muslim, Eastern religions, and other religions (mainly Sikhs) relative to the religiously unaffiliated; being Protestant is actually associated with a greater likelihood of holding a professional or managerial job. It should be noted, however, that the negative Muslim effect is less pronounced in Canada than in Europe. The coefficient of religious attendance while standing between the US and Europe as expected, is not statistically significant. In sum, the findings for the general population largely correspond to the view according to which religion fosters economic success in the US, but constitutes a barrier in Western Europe (particularly for Muslims) and, to a lesser extent, in Canada.

Does religion contribute to immigrants' occupational attainment?

Even if religious characteristics do no mediate native-immigrant gaps, they may have direct effects on occupational attainment for particular immigrant generations. By breaking out immigrant populations separately we can examine whether different religious groups within the first or second generation experience upward mobility differently from the religiously unaffiliated, and whether religious attendance levels are associated with differing levels of occupational attainment. Table 3 examines these direct effects of religion by immigrant generation, holding other factors constant.

- TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE -

In the US, there are no differences between religious groups on occupational attainment in either immigrant generation. Among the second generation, however, attending religious service monthly or more increases the probability to be in a professional or managerial job (b= 0.511); note that the religious participation effect is as marginally significant and about the same magnitude as parental SES (b=0.470). Although religion does not mediate occupational differences between immigrant generations and the native-born, it does seem to have direct effects, at least for the second generation, on occupational attainment in the US.

In Western Europe, our analysis of the ESS immigrant subsample suggests that there is a Muslim penalty for occupational attainment. However, we find that this penalty only occurs for the first generation (b= -0.600) and does not persist through the second generation. It should also be noted that being member of the religious majority does not seem to constitute any advantages for economic success. Put differently, the assumption about “bright” religious boundaries blocking immigrants’ structural integration receives only partial support in our analysis. Interestingly, we also find a negative effect of religious attendance on the first generation’s occupational attainment in Europe (b= -0.513).

In Canada, like in Western Europe, several minority religious groups (Christian Orthodox, Muslim, Eastern religion, and other religion) in the first generation are less likely to have a professional job than religiously unaffiliated immigrants. The relative size of the Muslim effect in the Canadian first generation (b= -0.509) appears to be lower than in Europe, but t-tests of the two coefficients indicate the difference is not statistically significant. Where Canada does seem to differ from Europe is in occupational advantage for Protestant first generation immigrants (b= 0.391) compared to the religiously unaffiliated. For the second generation, however, neither religious minority disadvantages nor majority advantages seem to persist.

Turning to religious participation, correlations with occupational attainment confirm the assumptions about the Canadian case standing between the US and European in terms of its religious field characteristics. For the first generation, there is a negative relationship between religious attendance and occupational attainment (b= -0.219), but it is significantly lower than in Europe. For the second generation, by contrast, religious attendance is positively associated with higher occupational attainment (b= 0.237) although this effect is significantly lower than in the US (b= 0.511).

In sum, it seems that while religion generally does not mediate native-immigrant gaps, religious affiliation and participation do have direct effects upon occupational attainment, net of other relevant factors such as class origin, ethnic minority status, and education. However, the effects are much more ambiguous than the “bridge vs. barrier” metaphor would suggest. Hypothesis 1 according to which religious penalties are to be expected in contexts with “bright” religious boundaries received only limited support. While religious penalties are largely absent in the US, they do exist for the first generation in Canada and, even more

strongly for Muslims in Western Europe. However, the fact that these penalties do not persist through the second generation, raises serious doubts about the relevance of mechanisms associated with the argument about religious boundaries. In fact, it could be that the negative effects among the first generation are due to unobserved heterogeneity such as different migration histories of various religious groups. We therefore conducted separate analyses for the first generation in which we include time in country, foreign language use, and citizenship as variables in the statistical model (see Appendix).[13] These analyses show that the Muslim penalty in Europe and most religious minority penalties in Canada diminish or entirely disappear once we account for these factors.

By contrast, Hypothesis 2 according to which religious participation fosters structural integration in contexts with Tocquevillian religious field characteristics received stronger support. In the US, we find a positive association with skilled attainment for the second generation. Such religious advantages also exist for the second generation in Canada, but in that context religious participation has an opposite effect the first generation. In Western Europe, disadvantages for religiously active first generation immigrants are even stronger, and moreover religious participation creates no advantages for the second generation.

6. Discussion and conclusions

In this paper, we have tried to advance knowledge about context-dependent impacts of religion on structural integration. While it is often assumed that religion operates as a "bridge" in the US and as a "barrier" in Western Europe (Foner/Alba 2008), we attempted to formulate more nuanced theoretical arguments about the impact of religion on structural integration. Building on a general theory of inter-generational integration, we identified two potential

---

[13] Unfortunately, these variables are not available in the GSS.

mechanisms through which religion impinges upon structural integration – as ethnic marker prompting exclusion and discrimination, or as social organization providing access to tangible resources. We furthermore assumed that these potential mechanisms presume macro-characteristics such as "bright" religious boundaries and a Tocquevillian religious field that may vary independently from one another.

To empirically test these arguments, we analyzed data from the US General Social Survey, the European Social Survey, and the Canadian Ethnic Diversity Survey. In comparative perspective, we tested for indirect as well as for direct effects of religious affiliation and participation on occupational attainment among first and generation immigrants. In contexts with "bright" religious boundaries (such as Western Europe and, to a lesser extent, Canada), we did find some religious penalties, especially for Muslims. However, they only seem to exist for the first generation and, upon closer scrutiny, they turn out to be strongly confounded by the respective migration histories of various religious groups. Of course, this does not imply that "bright" religious boundaries are not relevant for other, e.g. cultural and political, dimensions of integration; but whether and how public hostilities toward religious minorities or lack of institutional recognition translate into occupational disadvantages requires further discussion. For the time being, we find stronger evidence for the argument on religiously embedded resources; in contexts with Tocquevillian religious field characteristics, religious participation tends to be positively related to occupational attainment, especially for the second generation. And as the Canadian findings illustrates, this effect seems to hold independently of religious boundary characteristics.

Our analysis evidently faces a number of limitations. First of all, in following much transatlantic comparative scholarship on immigrant integration (Foner/Alba 2008; Thomas/Crul 2007; Zolberg/Long 1999) we treat Western Europe as a single macro-context,

thus side-lining well-known national specificities. We tried to account for contextual differences within Western Europe in our models through fixed country-effects; moreover, in light of aggregate data on religious participation, of degrees of religious fractionalization (Alesina et al. 2003), and of standardized indexes of state regulation of religion (Fox 2008: 108) we are confident that almost all Western European countries differ in the assumed ways from both Canada and the US. Ultimately, however, testing our theoretical hypothesis about the context-dependence of religious effects on structural integration requires datasets with much greater subsamples of immigrants than available in the ESS that would allow for cross-national or even cross-regional analysis.

Second, by focusing on occupational attainment we only captured one aspect of structural integration. There are reasons to expect that results may differ for socio-economic outcomes such as labor force participation, employment, or wages. Analyses within Western Europe, for instance, often find high unemployment rates among second generation Muslims (e.g. Lindley 2002; Model/Lin 2003). As these outcome variables are not consistently available across the three contexts, it would require better datasets to analyze religious effects on structural integration more broadly across the three contexts.[14]

Third, the causal mechanisms we identified in our theoretical account can obviously not be directly observed with the cross-sectional data we used in this paper. Without panel data, multiple regression analyses cannot decide whether religious affiliation and religious participation (context-dependently) affect structural integration outcomes or whether the causal arrow points in the other direction. This problem would be almost insurmountable for employment as outcome variable, where both time constraints and existential insecurity

---

[14] We did run separate analyses with GSS and ESS data on employment as dependent variable, which yield similar results as our analysis of occupational attainment.

would provide for plausible causal mechanisms in the other direction (Stolz 2010; van Tubergen/Sindradottir 2011). However, this is not the case for occupational attainment; it is hard to imagine that immigrants with high occupational status become more religiously active in North America, or that they should identify less with a minority religion in Western Europe. Moreover, there is little evidence of religious affiliation switching among first generation immigrants (Connor 2010), except for those entering with no religious affiliation in the United States (Skirbekk et al. 2010).

Lastly, the data do not permit us to test interaction effects of religious affiliation and religious participation; therefore, our religious participation findings are not disaggregated by religious group. It would be interesting to know whether the apparent economic advantage for religiously participating second generation immigrants is similar or different across major religious groups.

Despite these limitations, our paper makes a number of contributions to the literature on religion and immigrant integration. Theoretically, it reformulates the “bridge vs. barrier” metaphor by including religion in a more general analytical framework of intergenerational integration of immigrants and by disentangling two crucial context-dependent mechanisms of structural integration. Empirically, it presents an original analytical strategy of cross-survey comparisons that provides nuance to an existing body of research on religion and structural integration and could fruitfully be applied in future research. Finally, our paper raises a number of important research questions. Thus, the context-dependence of causal mechanisms between religion and structural immigrant integration calls for more historical-sociological research on changes in religious boundary configurations (see Wimmer 2009) and religious field characteristics in immigrant societies (see Alba et al. 2009) beyond the typical transatlantic comparison of Europe and the US. Following these or similar lines of research

would allow better integration of micro-oriented survey research on immigrant integration with macro-oriented institutional analysis that this (and other) sociological research fields so desperately need.

References

Adida, Claire, David Laitin and Marie-Anne Valfort. 2010. “Integration into Europe: Identifying a Muslim Effect.” Paper presented at CERI (Science Po), Paris.

Akresh, Illana Redstone. 2006. "Occupational mobility among legal immigrants to the United States." *International Migration Review* 40:854-884.

Alba, Richard. 2005. "Bright vs. blurred boundaries: Second-generation assimilation and exclusion in France, Germany, and the United States." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 28:20-49.

Alba, Richard, Albert J. Raboteau, and Josh DeWind (Eds.). 2009. *Immigration and Religion in America. Comparative and Historical Perspectives*. New York: New York University Press.

Aleksynska, Mariya, and Yann Algan. 2010. "Economic and cultural assimilation and integration of immigrants in Europe." CEPII Working Paper 29.

Alesina, Alberto, Arnaud Devleeschauwer, William Easterly, Sergio Kurlat, and Romain Wacziarg. 2003. "Fractionalization." *Journal of Economic Growth* 8:155-194.

Bail, Christopher A. 2008. "The configuration of symbolic boundaries against immigrants in Europe." *American Sociological Review* 73:37-59.

Bankston, C.L. III, and Min Zhou. 1996. "The ethnic church, ethnic identification, and the social adjustment of Vietnamese adolescents." *Review of Religious Research* 38:18-37.

Berthoud, R. 2000. “Ethnic employment penalties in Britain.” *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 26(3):389–416.

Beyer, Peter. 2005. "Religious identity and educational attainment among recent immigrants to Canada: Gender, Age, and 2nd Generation." *Journal of International Migration and Integration* 6:177-199.

Bisin, Alberto, Eleonora Patacchini, Thierry Verdier, and Yves Zenou. 2011. "Ethnic identity and labour market outcomes of immigrants in Europe." *Economic Policy* 26:57-92.

Bloemraad, Irene. 2006. *Becoming a Citizen: Incorporating Immigrants and Refugees in the United States and Canada*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Bouchard, Gerard, and Charles Taylor. 2008. *Building the Future: A Time for Reconciliation*. Quebec City, Quebec: Gouvernement du Quebec.

Boyd, Monica, and Elizabeth M. Grieco. 1998. "Triumphant transitions: socio-economic achievements of the second generation in Canada." *International Migration Review* 32:853-876.

Bramadat, Paul, and David Seljiak. 2008. *Christianity and Ethnicity in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Bramadat, Paul, and David Seljak. 2009. *Religion and Ethnicity in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Breton, Raymond. 1988. "From ethnic to civic nationalism: English Canada and Quebec." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 1:85-201.

Brubaker, Rogers. 2001. "The return of assimilation? Changing perspectives on immigration and its sequels in France, Germany, and the United States." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 24:531-548.

Cadge, Wendy, and Elaine Howard Ecklund. 2007. "Immigration and religion." *Annual Review of Sociology* 33:359-379.

Casanova, José. 2007. "Immigration and the New Religious Pluralism: A European Union/United States Comparison." Pp. 59-83 in *Democracy and the New Religious Pluralism*, edited by Thomas Banchoff. New York: Oxford University Press.

Chiswick, Barry R., and Paul E. Miller. 2010. “Occupational language requirements and the value of English in the US labor market”. *Journal of Population Economics* 23: 353-372.

Christie, Nancy, and Michael Gauvreau. 2010. “Secularisation or resacralisation? The Canadian case, 1760-2000”. In: *Secularisation in the Christian World*, ed. by Callum G. Brown and Michael Snape. Aldershot: Ashgate, 93-117.

Clark, Warren 2003. "Pockets of belief: Religious attendance patterns in Canada." *Canadian Social Trends*, pp. 2-5.

Connor, Phillip. 2011. "Religion as resource: Religion and immigrant economic incorporation." *Social Science Research* 40: 1350-1361.

Connor, Phillip. “The European Social Survey as potential cross-national immigrant data source. A research note”. Unpublished working paper.

Connor, Phillip. 2011. “Religion and Migration around the Globe: Introducing the Global Religion and Migration Database”. in *NORFACE Conference on Migration*, London, UK.

Crul, Maurice, and Jens Schneider. 2010. "Comparative integration context theory: participation and belonging in different European cities." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 33(7):1249-1268.

Dancygier, Rafaela. 2010. *Immigration and Conflict in Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Davie, Grace. 2000. *Religion in Modern Europe. A Memory Mutates*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

De Jong, Gordon F., and Michele Steinmetz. 2004. “Receptivity attitudes and the occupational attainment of male and female immigrant workers”. *Population Research and Policy Review* 23: 91-116.

Esser, Hartmut. 2006. "Does the “new”immigration require a “new” theory of intergenerational integration?" *International Migration Review* 38:1126-1159.

Finke, Roger, and Rodney Stark. 2005. *The Churching of America: Winners and Losers*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

Fleischmann, Fenella/Dronkers, Jaap. 2010, "The Socioeconomic Integration of Immigrants in the EU. Effects of Origin and Destination Countries on the First and Second Generation". In: Paul Attewell/Katherine S. Newman (Eds.): Growing Gaps. Educational Inequality around the World. Oxford u.a.: Oxford University Press, S. 258-283.

Foley, Michael W., and Dean R. Hoge. 2007. *Religion and the New Immigrants: How Faith Communities Form Our Newest Citizens*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Foner, Nancy, and Richard Alba. 2008. "Immigrant religion in the US and Western Europe: Bridge or Barrier to Inclusion?" *International Migration Review* 42:360-392.

Fox, Jonathan. 2008. *A World Survey of Religion and the State*. Cambridge et al.: Cambridge University Press.George, Alexander L., and Andrew Bennett. 2004. *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences*. MIT Press.

Gordon, Milton. 1964. *Assimilation in American Life: The Role of Race, Religion, and National Origins*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Gorodzeisky, Anastasia. 2011. "Occupational Incorporation of Immigrants in Western European Countries." in *Population Association of America*. Washington, D.C. Handlin, O. 1951. *The Uprooted: The Epic Story of the Great Migrations that Made the American People*. Boston: Little Brown.

Handlin, O. 1951. *The Uprooted: The Epic Story of the Great Migrations that Made the American People*. Boston: Little Brown.

Heath, Anthony F., Catherine Rothon, and Elina Kilpi. 2008. "The second generation in Western Europe: Education, unemployment, and occupational attainment." *Annual Review of Sociology* 34:211-235.

Heath, Anthony F., and Sin Yi Cheung (Eds.). 2007. *Unequal Chances: Ethnic Minorities in Western Labour Markets* (Proceedings of the British Academy, vo. 137). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Herberg, Will. 1956. *Protestant, Catholic, Jew. An Essay in American Religious Sociology*. New York: Doubleday & Company.

Hirschman, Charles. 2004. "The role of religion in the origins and adaptation of immigrant groups in the United States." *International Migration Review* 38:1206-1233.

Iversen, Torben, and David Soskice. 2001. "An asset theory of social policy preferences". *American Political Science Review* 95: 875-895.

Joppke, Christian. 2007. "Beyond national models: civic integration policies for immigrants in Western Europe." *West European Politics* 30:1-22.

Jowell, Roger and Central Co-ordinating Team. 2003. "European Social Survey 2002/2003: Technical Report." Center for Comparative Social Surveys, City University, London.

Jowell, Roger and Central Co-ordinating Team. 2005. "European Social Survey 2004/2005: Technical Report." Center for Comparative Social Surveys, City University, London.

Kasinitz, Philip, John H. Mollenkopf, Mary C. Waters, and Jennifer Holdaway (Eds.). 2008. *Inheriting the City: The Children of Immigrants Come of Age*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Khattab, Nabil. 2009. "Ethno-religious background as a determinant of educational and occupational attainment in Britain." *Sociology* 43:304-322.

Koenig, Matthias. 2005. "Incorporating Muslim immigrants in Western Nation States - A comparison of the United Kingdom, France, and Germany." *Journal for International Migration and Integration* 6:219-234.

Koopmans, Ruud, Paul Statham, Marco Guigni, and Florence Passy. 2005. *Contested Citizenship: Immigration and Cultural Diversity in Europe*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Kymlicka, Will. 1995. *Multicultural Citizenship. A Liberal Theory of Minority Rights*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Li, P.S. 2003. *Destination Canada*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lindley, Joanne. 2002. "Race or religion? The impact of religion on the employment and earnings of Britain's ethnic communities." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 28:409-442.

Lyon, David, and Marguerite Van Die (Eds.). 2000. *Rethinking Church, State, and Modernity: Canada Between Europe and the USA*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Milot, Micheline. 2009. "Modus Co-vivendi: Religious Diversity in Canada." in *International Migration and the Governance of Religious Diversity*, edited by P. Bramadat and M. Koenig. Montreal and Kingston: McGill- Queen's University Press.

Model, S., and L. Lin. 2003. "The cost of not being Christian: Hindus, Sikhs and Muslims in Britain and Canada." *International Migration Review* 36:1061-1092.

Mooney, Margarita A. 2009. *Faith Makes Us Live: Surviving and Thriving in the Haitian Diaspora*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Norris, Pippa, and Ronald Inglehart. 2004. *Sacred and Secular. Religion and Politics Worldwide*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Portes, Alejandro, and Min Zhou. 1993. "The New Second Generation: Segmented Assimilation and Its Variants." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social* 530:74-96

Portes, Alejandro, and Rubén G. Rumbaut. 2006. *Legacies: The Story of the Immigrant Second Generation*. 3rd edition. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Putnam, Robert, and David E. Campbell. 2010. *American Grace. How Religion Divides and Unites Us*. New York et al.: Simon & Schuster.

O'Toole, Roger. 1996. "Religion in Canada: Its Development and Contemporary Situation." *Social Compass* 43: 119-134.

Reitz, Jeffrey G. 2007. "Immigrant employment success in Canada, part I: individual and contextual causes." *Journal of International Migration and Integration* 8:11-36.

Reitz, Jeffrey G., Rupa Banerjee, Mai Phan, and Jordan Thompson. 2009. "Race, religion, and the social integration of new immigrant minorities in Canada." *International Migration Review* 43:695-726.

Reyneri, Emilio and Giovanna Fullin. 2010. “Labor Market Penalties of New Immigrants in New and Old Receiving West European Countries.” *International Migration* 49: 31-57.

Rumbaut, Ruben G. 1994. "The crucible within: Ethnic identity, self-esteem, and segmented assimilation among children of immigrants." *The International Migration Review* 28:748.

Smith, Tom W., Peter Marsden, MIchael Hout, and Jiburn Kim. 2002. "General Social Survey." Edited by NORC. Chicago: The Roper Center for Public Opinion Research.

Skirbekk, Vegard, Eric Kaufmann, and Anne Goujon. 2010. "Secularism, Fundamentalism, or Catholicism? The Religious Composition of the United States to 2043." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 49:293-310.

Stolz, Jörg. 2010. "The 'social integration' of religious groups in society: a social mechanisms approach." *Annual Review of the Sociology of Religion* 2.

Thomas, Mark, and Maurice Crul. 2007. "The second generation in Europe and the United States: how is the transatlantic debate relevant for further research on the European second generation?" *Journal for Ethnic and Migration Studies* 33(7):1025-41.

Van Tubergen, Frank, and Jorunn I. Sindradottir. 2011. "The religiosity of immigrants in Europe: a cross-national study." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 50:272-288.

Warner, Stephen R. 1997. "Religion, boundaries, and bridges." *Sociology of Religion* 58:217-239.

Warner, R. Stephen. 2007. "The role of religion in the process of segmented assimilation." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 612:102-115.

Wimmer, Andreas. 2009. "Herder's heritage and the boundary-making approach. Studying ethnicity in immigrant societies." *Sociological Theory* 27:244-270.

Wuthnow, Robert. 2002. "Religious involvement and status-bridging social capital." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 41:669-675.

Wuthnow, Robert, and C. Hackett. 2003. "The social integration of practitioners of non-Western religions in the United States." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 42:651-667.

Zolberg, Aristide R., and Litt Woon Long. 1999. "Why Islam is like Spanish: cultural incorporation in Europe and the United States." *Politics & Society* 27(1): 5-38.

Table 1 Descriptive Statistics by Context

Sources: General Social Survey 2000-2002-2004 (US); European Social Survey 2002, 2004 (Europe)

	UNITED STATES			CANADA			EUROPE		
Variable	Native-born	First Gen Imm	Sec Gen Imm	Native-born	First Gen Imm	Sec Gen Imm	Native-born	First Gen Imm	Sec Gen Imm
Outcome Variable									
Professional/Managerial Occupation	0.50	0.47	0.57 *	0.54	0.52	0.58 *	0.48	0.37 *	0.52
Religious Affiliation									
Unaffiliated	0.15	0.15	0.17	0.19	0.18	0.22 *	0.40	0.31 *	0.47 *
Catholic	0.21	0.40 *	0.38 *	0.42	0.37 *	0.34 *	0.30	0.25 *	0.21 *
Christian Orthodox	0.00	0.03 *	0.01	0.01	0.05 *	0.02 *	0.05	0.10 *	0.08
Protestant	0.60	0.30 *	0.34 *	0.37	0.22 *	0.38	0.23	0.11 *	0.15 *
Muslim	0.00	0.04 *	0.00 *	0.00	0.06 *	0.00	0.00	0.17	0.06 *
Jewish	0.02	0.02	0.07 *	0.01	0.02 *	0.02 *	0.00	0.01 *	0.01
Eastern Religion	0.01	0.06 *	0.02 *	0.00	0.11 *	0.02 *	0.00	0.05 *	0.02 *
Other Religion	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.01
Religious Attendance									
Monthly or more frequent	0.44	0.49 *	0.41	0.29	0.44 *	0.31	0.19	0.31 *	0.17
Socio-demographic variables									
Female	0.51	0.50	0.57 *	0.48	0.46 *	0.48	0.45	0.43	0.48
Age	42	41 *	42	42	44 *	40 *	43	40 *	41 *
Married	0.53	0.59 *	0.50	0.61	0.73 *	0.60	0.61	0.64	0.52 *
Completion of Post Secondary Education	0.31	0.39 *	0.41 *	0.27	0.36 *	0.33 *	0.33	0.35	0.37
Parental SES	0.41	0.43	0.39	0.30	0.32 *	0.34 *	0.22	0.27 *	0.32 *
N	4,158	548	352	7,547	4,826	6,009	26,744	1,058	557

* t-test difference of p<0.05 between native born within each context

Note: Descriptive statisitics are unweighted and limited to those who are employed aged 25-64

Table 2 Logistic Regression Coefficients Predicting Professional/Managerial Occupational Attainment by Context

Sources: General Social Survey 2000-2002-2004 (US); European Social Survey 2002, 2004 (Europe)

	UNITED STATES						CANADA						WESTERN EUROPE					
Generation																		
Native-born	ref.			ref.			ref.			ref.			ref.			ref.		
First Generation Immigrant	-0.317	(0.127)	*	-0.324	(0.130)	*	-0.340	(0.049)	***	-0.300	(0.050)	***	-0.914	(0.127)	***	-0.897	(0.128)	***
Second Generation Immigrant	0.121	(0.137)		0.091	(0.139)		0.069	(0.039)	†	0.071	(0.039)	†	-0.113	(0.144)		-0.114	(0.145)	
Religious Affiliation																		
Unaffiliated	ref.			ref.			ref.			ref.			ref.			ref.		
Catholic				-0.136	(0.114)					0.061	(0.050)					-0.079	(0.042)	†
Christian Orthodox				-0.311	(0.413)					-0.267	(0.124)	*				-0.171	(0.150)	
Protestant				-0.196	(0.103)	†				0.158	(0.050)	**				-0.065	(0.042)	
Muslim				-0.922	(0.523)	†				-0.490	(0.154)	**				-0.694	(0.182)	***
Jewish				0.299	(0.293)					0.216	(0.148)					0.054	(0.440)	
Eastern Religion				0.766	(0.346)	*				-0.275	(0.137)	*				0.563	(0.220)	*
Other Religion				0.151	(0.292)					-0.926	(0.172)	***				-0.316	(0.244)	
Religious Attendance																		
Monthly or more				0.277	(0.073)	***				0.044	(0.038)					0.007	(0.042)	
Socio-demographic variables																		
Female	0.456	(0.065)	***	0.440	(0.066)	***	0.930	(0.033)	***	0.924	(0.033)	***	-0.076	(0.028)	**	-0.075	(0.029)	**
Age	0.010	(0.003)	**	0.010	(0.003)	**	0.010	(0.002)	***	0.009	(0.002)	***	0.009	(0.001)	***	0.009	(0.001)	***
Married	0.180	(0.066)	**	0.159	(0.067)	*	0.161	(0.035)	***	0.151	(0.036)	***	0.061	(0.030)	*	0.073	(0.030)	*
Completion of Post Secondary Education	2.106	(0.078)	***	2.081	(0.079)	***	1.478	(0.039)	***	1.488	(0.040)	***	2.477	(0.034)	***	2.477	(0.034)	***
Parental SES	0.563	(0.068)	***	0.553	(0.069)	***	0.258	(0.038)	***	0.248	(0.038)	***	0.567	(0.036)	***	0.561	(0.358)	***
Constant	-1.251	(0.223)	***	-1.172	(0.233)	***	-1.099	(0.096)	***	-1.139	-0.100	***	-1.178	(0.082)	***	-1.132	(0.085)	***
Pseudo R2	0.19			0.19			0.12			0.12			0.22			0.22		
N	5,058			5,058			18,382			18,382			28,359			28,359		

Note: Fixed effects for sub national region of analysis applied to all models (US - Census region; Canada - Census Metropolitan Area; Europe - country of residence)

Country origins (United States, Western Europe) and detailed visible minority status (Canada) controls applied to all models.

Standard errors in parantheses. Estimates are unweighted and limited to those who are employed aged 25-64.

† p<0.10, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001, two tailed.

Table 3 Logistic Regression Coefficients Predicting Professional/Managerial Occupational Attainment by Context and by Generation

Sources: General Social Survey 2000-2002-2004 (US); European Social Survey 2002, 2004 (Europe)

	UNITED STATES						CANADA						WESTERN EUROPE					
	first			second			first			second			first			second		
Religious Affiliation																		
Unaffiliated	ref.			ref.			ref.			ref.			ref.			ref.		
Catholic	-0.417	(0.339)		-0.418	(0.412)		0.157	(0.110)		-0.050	(0.085)		0.113	(0.246)		0.156	(0.306)	
Christian Orthodox	-0.498	(0.604)		-0.903	(1.094)		-0.409	(0.181)	*	-0.154	(0.219)		-0.441	(0.444)		0.862	(0.989)	
Protestant	-0.010	(0.357)		-0.251	(0.425)		0.391	(0.115)	**	-0.030	(0.082)		0.229	(0.299)		-0.113	(0.345)	
Muslim	-1.071	(0.659)		n/a			-0.509	(0.181)	**	-0.082	(0.483)		-0.600	(0.285)	***	-0.652	(0.527)	
Jewish	-0.007	(0.783)		0.454	(0.712)		0.522	(0.269)	†	0.019	(0.226)		1.954	(1.028)	†	-2.575	(1.389)	†
Eastern Religion	0.018	(0.545)		0.989	(1.182)		-0.269	(0.168)		-0.457	(0.347)		0.028	(0.385)		1.060	(0.823)	
Other Religion	-0.898	(1.282)		0.635	(1.292)		-1.239	(0.227)	***	-0.134	(0.354)		0.141	(1.009)		n/a		
Religious Attendance																		
Monthly or more	-0.249	(0.229)		0.511	(0.293)	†	-0.219	(0.074)	**	0.237	(0.067)	***	-0.513	(0.206)	*	-0.139	(0.329)	
Socio-demographic variables																		
Female	0.278	(0.207)		0.120	(0.266)		0.816	(0.066)	***	0.847	(0.057)	***	-0.004	(0.164)		0.095	(0.215)	
Age	0.008	(0.010)		-0.006	(0.013)		0.007	(0.004)	†	0.008	(0.003)	*	0.012	(0.009)		-0.002	(0.012)	
Married	0.475	(0.211)	*	-0.167	(0.270)		-0.008	(0.075)		0.230	(0.062)	***	-0.049	(0.167)		-0.023	(0.218)	
Completion of Post Secondary Education	1.704	(0.221)	***	2.072	(0.308)	***	1.436	(0.074)	***	1.384	(0.069)	***	2.165	(0.169)	***	2.163	(0.240)	***
Parental SES	0.522	(0.215)	*	0.470	(0.283)	†	0.455	(0.074)	***	0.156	(0.066)	*	0.378	(0.179)	*	0.629	(0.248)	*
Constant	-0.974	(0.706)		-0.266	(0.830)		-1.200	(0.210)	***	-0.994	(0.167)	***	-1.822	(0.552)	**	-1.388	(0.683)	*
Pseudo R2	0.19			0.22			0.14			0.11			0.27			0.24		
N	548			351			4,826			6,005			1,058			551		

Note: Fixed effects for sub national region of analysis applied to all models (US - Census region; Canada - Census Metropolitan Area; Europe - country of residence)

Country origins (United States, Western Europe) and detailed visible minority status (Canada) controls applied to all models.

Standard errors in parantheses. Estimates are unweighted and limited to those who are employed aged 25-64.

† p<0.10, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001, two tailed.

Table A Logistic Regression Coefficients Predicting Professional/Managerial Occupational Attainment by Context for first generation immigrants

Sources: European Social Survey 2002, 2004 (Europe); Ethnic Diversity Survey 2002 (Canada)

	CANADA			EUROPE		
Religious Affiliation						
Unaffiliated	ref.			ref.		
Catholic	0.159	(0.112)		0.095	(0.250)	
Christian Orthodox	-0.030	(0.186)		-0.397	(0.460)	
Protestant	0.294	(0.117)	*	0.266	(0.307)	
Muslim	-0.275	(0.186)		-0.376	(0.296)	
Jewish	0.501	(0.272)	†	1.936	(1.026)	
Eastern Religion	-0.212	(0.170)		-0.003	(0.393)	
Other Religion	-1.111	(0.233)	***	0.168	(1.047)	
Religious Attendance						
Monthly or more	-0.113	(0.076)		-0.411	(0.210)	†
Socio-demographic variables						
Female	0.835	(0.067)	***	-0.006	(0.167)	
Age	-0.001	(0.004)		0.001	(0.010)	
Married	0.084	(0.078)		-0.003	(0.172)	
Completion of Post Secondary Education	1.516	(0.076)	***	2.132	(0.172)	***
High Parental SES	0.392	(0.076)	***	0.377	(0.183)	*
Citizen	0.352	(0.090)	***	0.696	(0.205)	**
Foreign-language used in the home	-0.632	(0.082)	***	-0.402	(0.187)	*
More than 10 years in country	0.312	(0.094)	***	0.325	(0.224)	
Constant	-1.232	(0.223)	***	-1.984	(0.591)	**
Pseudo R2	0.15			0.29		
N	4,785			1,054		

Note: Fixed effects for sub national region of analysis applied to all models (US - Census region; Europe - country of residence; Canada - Census Metropolitan Area)

Country origins (United States, Western Europe) and detailed visible minority status (Canada) controls applied to all models.

Standard errors in parantheses. Estimates are unweighted and limited to those who are employed aged 25-64.

† p<0.10, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001, two tailed.