Bridge and barrier –

Contextualizing religion and immigrant occupational attainment *

Phillip Connor (Pew Research Center)

Matthias Koenig (University of Göttingen)

Abstract:

How religion impacts upon immigrant integration is often assumed to differ widely across the Atlantic; while in the United States religion is portrayed as a 'bridge', it is described as a 'barrier' for immigrants in Europe. This paper formulates more fine-grained theoretical propositions on the context-dependent relations between religious affiliation or participation and structural integration, arguing that it is crucial to disentangle religious boundary dynamics from religious field characteristics. The propositions are empirically tested with nationally representative data on occupational attainment among first and second generation immigrants in the US (GSS), Western Europe (ESS) and Canada (EDS). In a first step, the US-Europe comparison confirms that while minority immigrant religious groups (notably Muslims) are less likely to be in higher occupations in Europe, occupational penalties by religious affiliation for immigrants in the US are hardly present. Likewise, religious participation is negatively associated with occupational attainment in Europe, but rather positively in the US. In a second step, a more detailed comparison within Canada indicates that religious minorities are not at an occupational disadvantage in English Canada, while Muslims are less likely to be in managerial/professional occupations in Quebec. However, second generation immigrants in both contexts seem to profit from religious participation for higher occupational attainment. Going beyond the 'bridge' v. 'barrier' metaphor, these findings suggest that religious boundary dynamics and religious field characteristics operate independently from each other.

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

Word Count 9.479

* Both authors have contributed equally to this article. Please address correspondence to:

Phillip Connor, pconnor@pewforum.org or Matthias Koenig, mkoenig@uni-goettingen.de.

1. Introduction

Religion is recognized to be an important factor in the integration of immigrants in Western societies. Much of the macro-comparative literature on immigration and integration policy, citizenship regimes, and church-state-relations has discussed the origins and consequences of different political responses to religious diversity (see e.g. Zolberg/Long 1999, Koenig 2005). A growing body of micro-oriented research has also documented immigrants' individual religiosity, its various organizational forms and the emerging contours of religious diversity (for review see Cadge/Ecklund 2007, Hirschman 2004, Stolz 2010). Yet whether and how precisely religion affects the outcomes of immigrant integration across contexts continues to be debated. In their widely cited review of the field, Foner and Alba (2008) have argued that diverging scholarly approaches 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 has constituted, most notably for immigrants from Islamic countries and their offspring. Indeed, or so they argue, religion plays different roles for immigrant integration across these contexts (Foner/Alba 2008: 361; see also Casanova 2007 and Zolberg/Long 1999).

However, empirical evidence for the impact of integration contexts upon the link between religion and immigrant integration is still rather limited. In fact, only recently have sociologists begun to systematically investigate how religious affiliation and practice influence such core integration outcomes as educational achievement, employment, earnings, or occupational achievement. Their results are far from conclusive. In the US, data from the

Social Capital Benchmarking survey show members of non-Western religions (both immigrants and natives) to have higher levels of education than Christians, although Muslims suffer from lower income returns on their educational advantages (Wuthnow/Hacket 2003). Data from the New Immigrant Survey indicate that religious participation has no significant impact upon employment, skilled occupation or earnings; for religious minority members, however, greater participation is linked with employment and higher wages (Connor 2011). And data from the Children of Immigrants Longitudinal Survey suggest that, for the second generation, religious affiliation and participation are positively related to education and occupational status (Portes and Rumbaut 2006: 324). In Western Europe, national survey data typically highlight ethno-religious penalties for religious minority members, notably for Muslims (Khattab 2009; Lindley 2002) and mostly find negative relations between religious practice and social as well as structural integration outcomes (Bisin et al. 2011; Alksynska/Algan 2010). Finally, to further complicate the picture, Canadian census data show that Jews, Muslims and Hindus have education above the national average, but these differences disappear in the second generation (Beyer 2005); and Canadian Muslims seem even to participate less in the labour market than their British counterpart (Model/Lin 2002). In sum, 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' upward mobility? And, above all, how do these effects differ across contexts?

Not only is empirical evidence on context-dependent relations between religion and immigrant integration lacking, there is also need for theoretical elaboration. Existing theories of immigrant integration, if they incorporate religious factors at all, either emphasize the

various resources embedded within religious organizations (Portes/Rumbaut 2006: 299-342; Warner 2007) or accentuate the boundaries constituted by religious differences (Alba 2003). Rarely, however, are both aspects of religion combined within one theoretical model. Tellingly, the most comprehensive analysis on the topic to date concludes that "the study of the interaction of contemporary immigration and religion is not far enough along that we should allow ourselves the conceit of presenting firm conclusions" (Alba et al. 2009: 24).

In this article, we aim to contribute to the debate over religion's impact on immigrant integration in both theoretical and empirical respects. Theoretically, we argue that the "bridge vs. barrier" metaphor can be refined by better disentangling two factors, the ethnic marker of religious affiliation and the social capital provided by religious participation. These factors affect integration outcomes depending on contextual boundary configurations and religious field characteristics that may operate independently from each other. Empirically, we test our argument with a comparative analysis of data from three large-scale surveys with sufficient subsamples of first and second generation immigrants, the US General Social Survey (GSS), the European Social Survey (ESS), and the Canadian Ethnic Diversity Survey (EDS). Addressing some of the above-mentioned research lacunae, we find that while neither religious affiliation nor religious participation mediate occupational attainment gaps between natives, first and second generation immigrants, they do have direct effects depending on contextual characteristics, but in more complex ways than the "bridge vs. barrier" metaphor suggests.

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, describe our data and lay out the variables and modelling approach we adopt (3.). After presenting

major findings for the comparison between the US and Western Europe (4.), we turn to Canada where larger sample size allows for more fine-grained analysis but also for regional comparison of English Canada and Quebec through which contextual conditions for religious effects on immigrant integration can be disentangled (5.).

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

In our theoretical reformulation of 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.

Explaining structural integration outcomes

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). Among the resources which, through various social mechanisms affect the socio-economic status of immigrants, class origin is of course crucial (see Heath/Rothon/Kilpi 2008). It largely determines availability of economic, social, and cultural capital which immigrants and their children can transfer into upward mobility. 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. The crucial empirical question, hence, becomes whether being an immigrant or ethnic minority member as such, i.e. net of class origin and education, blocks upward mobility.

The literature highlights different factors that potentially block immigrants' upward mobility and structural integration, and it is emphasized that these factors operate in context-dependent ways (Crul/Schneider 2010; Reyneri/Fullin 2010). A first set of factors relates to the resources available to immigrants, resources which, beyond parental class origin and educational background, are closely linked to 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. Maintenance of ethnic networks may 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). 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).

A second set of factors is related to opportunities and constraints existing in the receiving context. Evidently, structural integration outcomes (notably employment, occupational mobility, wages) depend on general labour market characteristics that affect immigrants and natives alike (see Reitz et al. 2007; Crul/Schneider 2010). But they also depend on

mechanisms of 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 (Wimmer 2009) are activated and become barriers of upward mobility and structural assimilation.

Boundary configurations, religious affiliation, and structural integration

How does religion enter into this model? We start with the mechanism of social closure in which religious boundaries become barriers for structural assimilation. Before a general hypothesis can be formulated, two points merit clarification. First, our focus here is on religious affiliation 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. Second, the causal mechanism linking religious minority status with structural integration outcomes is context-dependent. It is only triggered if codes of national identity include religious markers and if these markers are institutionally salient. Where institutionalized boundary configurations highlight other markers, (e.g. linguistic or racial, ethnic), religious minority status, or religious affiliation in general, should have a null relation with structural integration outcomes. Religious minorities' structural integration thus

depends on the "blurring" of religious boundaries in the receiving society (Zolberg/Long 1999; Alba 2003). In general, we therefore hypothesize that *if religion constitutes a "bright" institutionalized boundary within the receiving society, immigrants belonging to a religious minority are disadvantaged as compared to those belonging to a dominant religion, net of other relevant factors*.

Religious field characteristics, participation, and structural integration

We move to the second mechanism that operates through the resources which religion provides to immigrants for acquiring socio-economic status. Again, we provide some conceptual clarification before formulating a general hypothesis. First, while it is often speculated that religiously embedded cultural values are consequential for structural integration outcomes (whether positively or negatively), we argue that the crucial causal mechanism operates through participation in religious organizations. Indeed, immigrants' involvement in the activities of churches, mosques or temples may provide 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/ Hodge 2007; Wuthnow 2002). Second, religious participation may foster structural integration for both religious majorities and minorities, albeit in slightly different ways. Evidently, being active in religious majority organization, notably in a multi-ethnic congregation, provides bridging social capital that is relevant for structural integration. But being active in a religious minority organization, while fostering bonding social capital, may nonetheless contribute to structural integration; as proponents of segmented assimilation theory argue, "ethnic churches", particularly for the second generation, provide spaces of inter-generational communication and solidarity that

enhance "selective acculturation" and, thus, upward mobility (see Portes/Rumbaut 2006: 305; Warner 2007).[1] Third, and most crucially, we argue that the impact of religious participation on structural integration outcomes is also context-dependent. The relevant causal mechanism is triggered only if the religious field displays, as it were, Tocquevillian characteristics: voluntary participation, congregationalism, and a relatively high overall religious vitality – characteristics which typically coincide with relatively weakly developed welfare state. In general, we thus hypothesize that *if religious organizations are vital components of civil society in the receiving context, immigrants with higher rates of religious participation achieve higher socio-economic status, net of other relevant factors.*

Finally, one may ask whether, the bridging effect of religious participation requires the absence of religious boundaries. This is precisely what Foner and Alba (2008) seem to suggest in their contrasting portrayal of the US and the Western European context. We argue, however, that this is not necessarily the case. In contexts of "bright" religious boundaries, immigrants may in fact compensate for their religious "penalties" through religious participation if, and only if, the religious field has Tocquevillian characteristics. Where bright boundaries are absent, by contrast, religious participation may exacerbate penalties for immigrants.

3. Analytical strategy, data and methods

To empirically test the hypotheses just outlined, it is necessary to investigate relations between religious affiliation and religious participation with structural integration outcomes of similar groups across different contexts, net of class origin, otherwise existing ethnic

[1] However, as Allen (2010: 1064) found in his interviews with Somali and Sudanese refugees in Portland, it may be the case that for extremely marginalized groups, such as poor refugees in non-gateway contexts, bridging social capital is only embedded in religious majority organizations.

penalties, and relevant immigrant-specific resources such as language competence, length of stay or citizenship status. Our focus is on occupational attainment as a tangible structural integration outcome that has attracted wide attention among migration scholars (see Akresh 2006; Chiswick/Miller 2010; De Jong and Steinmetz 2004; Gorodzeisky 2011; Heath/Cheung 2007; Model/Lin 2002; Reyneri/Fullin 2010). Different results may of course be expected for outcomes such as labor force participation or employment; however, ethnic and religious differences in occupational attainment are of particular interest in assessing the upward mobility of immigrants and, in particular, 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 2000; Rumbaut 1994). Our guiding analytical question is whether the impact of religious affiliation and religious participation upon occupational attainment is indeed conditional on contextual features such as boundary configurations and religious field characteristics. To answer this question we compare findings from multivariate analyses that test the impact of religious affiliation and religious participation, respectively, on the occupational attainment of immigrants in the US, Europe and Canada.

Cross-survey design and data

Given the current literature it is obvious to start with a transatlantic comparison between the US and Western Europe. Technically speaking (George/Bennett 2004), these are two dissimilar cases that allow us to establish the relevance of integration contexts on the mechanisms specified above. Both contexts, on which we shall provide more detail background information in a later section, indeed vary on two relevant dimensions simultaneously: religious boundary configurations as well as religious field characteristics. For the US, we draw on data from the General Social Survey (GGS, pooled waves 2000, 2002, 2004) (Smith et al. 2002), while for Western Europe, here defined as EU-15 plus

Norway and Switzerland, we use the European Social Survey (ESS, pooled waves 2002, 2004) (Jowell and Team 2003 and 2005).[2] Both the GSS (pooled N = 4,816) and the ESS (pooled N = 27,459) are highly respected, nationally representative surveys with high response rates (over 70% for most years and most countries). Although they were not intended for immigrant analysis and thus face a number of limitations, they provide the best available data for a transatlantic comparison.[3]

Indeed, using the GSS and the ESS comparatively has a number of advantages. The two datasets not only allow us to measure native-immigrant gaps in socio-structural position, 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. 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, there are also disadvantages 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 (see Connor forthcoming). 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).[4] Both surveys contain only few immigrant-specific measures, they jointly lack comparable indicators for some key covariates known to be related to occupational attainment (detailed

[2] "Internal" migrants within the EU-15 plus Norway and Switzerland are not considered immigrants for the purpose of our analysis.
[3] The listed sample sizes for the GSS and ESS (and eventually, EDS) are limited to employed respondents between ages 25 and 64 who responded to all variables included in regression models. Listwise deletion is used for missing cases among control and key variables of interest. This results in the removal of 327 cases (6%) in the GSS, 1,437 cases (5%) in the ESS, and 831 cases (7%) in the EDS. Missing cases are assumed to be missing at random. To keep years consistent, the ESS and GSS data centers around 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, as contextual characteristics change more slowly, we would expect similar contextual effects for more recent immigrant cohorts.
[4] Connor (forthcoming) 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.

ethnicity/origin variable, time in country for first generation, citizenship, language ability), and they do not allow us to tease apart religious participation from other dimensions of religiosity.

Given these shortcomings, we use the 2002 Canadian Ethnic Diversity Survey (EDS, Canada 2002) to provide a more complete analysis of our hypotheses.[5] 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. The survey thus provides a rich data source for exploring native-immigrant and first-second generation gaps without the problems that the GSS and ESS face. Furthermore, the EDS was conducted in English, French, and Canada's seven largest non-official languages: Mandarin, Cantonese, Italian, Punjabi, Portuguese, Vietnamese, and Spanish, removing potential acculturation bias. Also, the EDS permits analysis of occupational attainment using a greater number of control variables unavailable in comparative analysis of GGS and ESS. The EDS, by nature of its emphasis on ethnic minorities, has a detailed visible minority variable that allows for a more accurate picture of religious boundary effects net of ethnicity. Additionally, linguistic competence, as indicator of cognitive assimilation, can be operationalized by whether the interview was conducted in English or French; and, citizenship and time in country can be included for first generation analyses. And finally, religious participation can be disentangled from other, more private forms of religious activity (prayer, self-rated religiosity) so that the sub-hypothesis can be tested that religiously embedded social capital is more relevant for structural integration outcomes than religiosity itself.

[5] Another frequently used data alternative is to compare European countries (ex. UK with France or Germany), but the ESS does not provide sufficient sized immigrant subsamples to perform such an analysis (but see Fleischmann/Dronkers 2010). Additionally, the literature identifies the transatlantic contrast more frequently than inter-European differences.

But large sample size and greater potential for nuanced analysis are not our only reasons for using the EDS. In fact, Canada itself can be decomposed into two structurally similar contexts that however crucially differ in terms of symbolic boundary configurations. While English Canada represents a context where (today) religious boundaries are rather irrelevant, religion continues to be prominent part of boundary configurations in French-speaking Quebec. At the same time, although religious field characteristics differ slightly, with English Canada being more pluralistic than Catholic dominated Quebec, religious organizations in both contexts are more strongly embedded in civil society than their European counterparts.[6]

In sum, our analytical strategy is to first model the relationship of religious affiliation and religious participation with immigrant occupational attainment across the largely dissimilar contexts of the United States and Western Europe. We thereby scrutinize the often made, yet rarely tested assumptions about the differences of a context with blurred religious boundaries and religiously vital civil society, as compared to a context with bright religious boundaries and highly secularized society. In a second step, the same models, with additional variables specific to the EDS, are applied to two relatively similar contexts which however vary in crucial aspects: English Canada and Quebec respectively. This second comparison permits a further test of our hypotheses by contrasting a context with few religious boundaries yet a relatively strong role of religion within civil society (English Canada) to a context where religious boundaries are bright but still the religious field bears at least some Tocquevillian characteristics (Quebec).

Modeling approach and variables

[6] The public version of the EDS does not have a province variable, but the separation between English Canada and Quebec can be determined by the city and language of interview. Quebec is coded as representing interviews in Montreal as well as all other French language interviews not conducted in Toronto or Vancouver.

Our modeling approach follows our aforementioned theoretical arguments. The dependent variable is skilled occupational attainment as a recoded binary variable denoting professional/managerial occupations (otherwise known as the salariat). This variable is available across all three datasets.[7] 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. The sample population is limited to ages 25 through 64 and only respondents who are employed are included in the analysis.[8]

Religious affiliation is measured slightly differently in the the three surveys. In order to have a comparable set of variables, we use the following categorization of religious affiliation for GSS and ESS: religiously unaffiliated (reference group), Catholic, Christian Orthodox, Protestant, Muslim, Jewish, Eastern religion, and Other Religion. In Canada, a more detailed subdivision of Eastern religions (Buddhist, Hindu, and Sikh) is available.[9] The primary competing variable that could confound the impact of religious affiliation on occupational attainment is ethnicity or immigrant origin. In the GSS and ESS, we therefore include a binary variable denoting whether the respondent is an ethnic minority (GSS – non-white; ESS – self-described as an ethnic minority) as a control variable. In the EDS, we use the detailed visible minority variable with non-visible minority status as the reference category.

---

[7] There are no comparable measures for labor market participation, employment, or wages. In the EDS, most of the results for the full sample are similar to separate analyses for males and females. The only minor difference is that males in both English Canada and Quebec are more likely to be in a higher occupation if they are regularly attending a religious institution, whereas this relationship is weaker and sometimes not present for females.

[8] It would be ideal to present results by gender; however, the small N for some religious groups in some contexts makes this impractical.

[9] Although it may seem logical to use a Christian group (Catholic and/or Protestant) as the reference group, the hypotheses compare differences between all religious groups; therefore, the most straight forward presentation of results across datasets is the unaffiliated.

Following standard practice, we measure religious participation by self-rated worship attendance. 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, the testing of religious institutional involvement on occupational attainment is limited to respondents indicating a religious affiliation. In these later models, Catholic becomes the reference group for the religious affiliation variable. To better isolate the role of religious institutional participation, private religious activity (prayer, meditation, home worship activity) and self-rated religiosity (not important to very important on a five point scale) are used as additional covariates in the EDS.[10]

Standard socio-demographic control variables (female, age, marital status, respondent completion of some post secondary education) as available across all three datasets are employed in all models. Since no comparable variable across all three datasets noting parental occupational attainment as an indicator for class origins was available, parents' completion of some post secondary education is used as a proxy. For the Canadian analysis, additional controls (interview language not English or French, in Canada for more than 10 years, Canadian citizenship) are used for first generation models.

Since immigrant integration is best assessed in comparing first and second generation outcomes with the native-born population, the US and Western European findings begin with descriptive statistics of all variables by native-born and immigrant generation (first and

[10] These three religion variables (attendance, private religious activity, and religiosity) are correlated, but VIF tests do not indicate problems of multi-collinearity within regression models.

second separately). Similarly, occupational attainment is modeled for the complete GSS and ESS samples with a variable indicating first and second immigrant generation relative to the native-born. In inserting religion variables after the null model, it can be determined whether religion mediates any immigrant occupational disadvantage relative to the native-born population. Secondly, direct religion effects are modeled separately for each immigrant generation. To account for internal context-differences, all models for the US and Western Europe include regional or cross-national fixed effects.

The EDS analysis follows a similar modeling strategy beginning with descriptive statistics of each immigrant generation compared to the native-born population, separating English Canada from Quebec. Further analyses focus on direct effects by immigrant generation (first and second) across the two Canadian contexts. Religious affiliation effects are tested first, net of the detailed visible minority variable and additional controls for first generation immigrants. Secondly, religious organizational participation is tested net of all previous controls and other potentially competing religion variables (private religious activity and religiosity).

4. Religion and occupational attainment in the United States and Western Europe

Immigration and religion in the US and Europe – contextual characteristics

To establish that the impact of religion on occupational attainment is context-dependent, we start with two extremely different contexts of reception, the United States and Western Europe. Both macro-contexts have experienced large-scale immigration in the post-war period but have differed markedly, not only in their general labor market and welfare regime characteristics, but also more specifically 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, it is rather left to immigrants, from high-skill to undocumented low-skill, 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, 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). In any event, 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.

More specifically, the two contexts differ markedly in their boundary configurations and religious field characteristics. As Zolberg and Loon have noted, "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; see also Casanova 2007). It has to be conceded that at the level of public attitudes religion is not among the most prominent markers of national identity and boundaries against immigrants in core Western European countries (see Bail 2008). But most European states, even presumably secularist France, have in various forms continued practices of selective governmental cooperation with, if not support for, majority religions (see e.g. Fox

2008 and Koenig 2005 for national varieties). It also has to be conceded that religious components abound within discursive repertoires of US national identity. But unlike in Europe where they are institutionally embedded, often serving to designate a (Judeo-) Christian cultural heritage (Davie 2000), they are far less rigid in the US. Not only has the Supreme Court adopted a rather strict "wall of separation" doctrine, public references to religion do 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 high religious mobility facilitates regular boundary crossing (Putnam/ Campbell 2010: 4) thus resulting in overall "blurred" religious boundaries.

Since Tocqueville, pluralism has been regarded as key feature of the US American religious field, going hand in hand with a congregational model of religious organization (Finke/Stark 2005) and high rates of voluntary religious membership and attendance (Norris/Inglehart 2004). By contrast, the religious field in Europe with its parochial model of (bureaucratic) religious organization has more tightly been regulated by the state, while rates of membership and attendance have declined dramatically over the past decades (Norris/Inglehart 2004). Taking into account transatlantic differences of welfare regimes (Pontusson 2005), it is fair to say that religious organizations in the US are more important providers of social capital than their European counterparts.

In light of our theoretical reformulation of the "bridge vs. barrier" hypothesis we expect that religious minority status has a negative impact on occupational attainment in Western Europe but not in the US and that religious participation has a positive impact on occupational attainment in the US but not in Western Europe.

- TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE -

Context-dependent effects of religion on occupational attainment

Descriptive statistics comparing differences across immigrant generations relative to the native-born population present some interesting differences across the two contexts, many of which are expected (see Table 1). For both the United States and Europe, a smaller proportion of the first generation is employed in professional/managerial occupations compared to the natives whereas the second generation performs at or better than their native counterparts. Therefore, the occupational disadvantage of the first generation seems, at first glance, to disappear as the second generation comes of age.[11] However, since there is a similar rise in the proportion of the second generation having at least some post-secondary education, relative to the native population, it has to be asked whether educational success is actually translated into occupational attainment.

Religiously, a greater proportion of first generation immigrants are Christian in the U.S. than compared to Western Europe.[12] There is also a higher proportion of Christians among the second generation than in the first generation, relative to the native-born. In Western Europe, our finddings 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. Apparently there is an underlying process of religious adaptation across generation, with

[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 a multivariate model.

second generation attendance rates more or less mirroring the levels of natives, and the first generation having higher religious participation rates in both contexts.

- TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE -

Multivariate models in Table 2 predict skilled occupational attainment by context for the complete survey sample, testing generational differences relative to the native population in the first model and introducing religious affiliation and worship attendance in the second model. Both in the US and in Western Europe, first generation immigrants are significantly less likely to be in a professional/managerial job, net of socio-demographic controls; in contrast, there is no significant difference in occupational attainment between the second generation and natives which, contrary to standard perceptions, suggests considerable upward mobility in both the US and Europe. For both contexts, this occupational disadvantage for the first generation persists at more or less the same level when religion variables are added, indicating that religious factors (as expressed in these models) do not mediate the structural integration of immigrants in either context. In other words, neither religious affiliation nor active involvement in religious organizations narrows or expands the economic gap between first generation immigrants and natives, net of other factors.

- TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE -

Religious effects on occupational attainment, however, can be directly experienced for particular immigrant generations. Table 3 examines these more direct religion effects by immigrant generation, holding other factors constant. In the United States, first generation Catholics (b= -0.703) are less likely to hold a professional/managerial job than first generation

immigrants with no religious affiliation. Although Catholics represent nearly a quarter of the US society, it is still a minority religious group compared to the combined Protestant category. However, it would be premature to argue that this effect is indicative of a religious boundary. Not only does the Catholic penalty not exist in the second generation; the majority of Catholic immigrants are in fact Hispanics for which other, e.g. linguistic, mechanisms of exclusion are known to operate (Zolberg/Long 1999; Alba et al. 2008). In Western Europe, by contrast, the Muslim penalty occurs in both the first (b= -0.489) and, with even higher magnitude, in the second generation (b= -0.830) which confirms that European boundary configurations can lead to a negative relationship between immigrant Muslims and occupational attainment.

Religious participation as measured by worship attendance is not significantly related to occupational attainment in either context or for either generation. We should note, however, that most sample sizes for these generational breakdowns by context are very small (about 500 or less), highly influencing standard errors. Of the four religious attendance coefficients in Table 3, the US second generation coefficient (b= 0.406) and the European first generation (b= -0.306) have the lowest p-values (0.14). These findings confirm our expectations concerning the positive relation of religious participation with immigrants' upward mobility within the American context (see Portes and Rumbaut 2006:324), and respective negative relations for the European context.

To summarize the US-Western Europe comparison, it seems that while religion generally does not mediate native-immigrant gaps, religious affiliation and participation do have direct effects in ways that grosso modo correspond to our theoretical assumptions, although the effects are not as obvious as the "bridge vs. barrier" metaphor would suggest. In the Western

European context with its "bright" religious boundary against Islam, we find a Muslim penalty for both generations, net of other relevant factors such as class origin, education, and ethnic minority status. In the US, by contrast, we only find first generation Catholics to be occupationally disadvantaged, whereas religious participation may have a positive association with skilled attainment for the second generation, but a negative association for the first generation in Europe.

However, given the limited number of comparable variables across the GSS and ESS, these findings are far from providing a rigid test of our hypotheses. The Catholic effect in the American first generation could simply represent Hispanic disadvantage and might be absent if a variable for linguistic competence and detailed ethnicity were available for both data sources. Indeed, the same set of issues (language, ethnic origin) could be underlying the Muslim penalty found in Western Europe. And in both contexts, we cannot disentangle religious participation from more private forms of religiosity. Most of these data challenges can be overcome in contrasting English Canada with Quebec.

5. Religion and occupational attainment in English Canada and Quebec

Immigration and religion in Canada - contextual characteristics

While Canada is sometimes regarded as lying somewhere between United States and Western Europe in both religious and political terms (see e.g. Lyon/van Die 2000), we suggest that contrasting English Canada and Quebec provides for a more nuanced analytical strategy. Both contexts share similar labor market characteristics, welfare regimes, and immigration policy. Indeed, post-war Canada has pursued a national immigration policy, although modes of incorporation within its borders reflect different codes of national identity (see Breton 1988).

In reversal of previous expectations of Anglo-conformity, English Canada has since the 1970s adopted a policy of "multiculturalism" that in rather liberal fashion allows immigrants to retain or not retain their particular cultural identities (Kymlicka 1996; Li 2003). Quebec defending her own national identity within a hegemonic English-speaking polity has, by contrast, pursued a more pro-active strategy of integrating immigrants through active French language programs and the like (Milot 2009: 118). As recent controversies over "reasonable accommodation" attest (Bouchard / Taylor 2008), religion is of crucial importance in the Quebecois policy debate over integration.

Indeed, Quebec differs substantively from English Canada in terms of religious boundary configurations. Until the Quiet Revolution, Catholicism was the main pillar of Quebec's imagined identity as a peripheral nation. Although a rapid process of secularization has moved other, linguistic and cultural markers, to the core of Quebecois national imaginations, new religious minorities do face "bright" boundaries (Milot 2009, O'Toole 1996). By contrast, religious diversity has more easily been embraced in English Canada. By the time of Confederation (1867), the Anglican Church was formally disestablished and put on equal terms with the other four major denominations in the country (Catholic, Presbyterian, Methodist, Baptist). While denominational diversity initially went hand in hand with imaginations of a "Christian nation", it provided fertile ground for religious diversification that came with new waves of immigration (Bramadat/Seljak 2008 and 2009).

Prima facie, the diverging historical background seems also to translate into different religious field characteristics, with religious organizations in English Canada having adopted a congregational model since the 19th century, while in Quebec a church model continued to be operative into the 20th century. Worship attendance has also declined less sharply in English

Canada than in Quebec, albeit still at faster pace than in the US (Clark 2003). However, seen in comparison with Western Europe, the religious field in contemporary Quebec can be regarded as considerably less regulated, more pluralistic, and to some degree Tocquevillian. To start with, 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, in both English Canada and Quebec (Bramadat/Seljak 2008; Christie/Gauvreau 2010). Furthermore, Quebec is subject to the rights-based jurisprudence that since the adoption of the Charter (1982) has enhanced the position of religious minorities throughout Canada. In sum, contrasting English Canada and Quebec allows disentangling boundary configurations and religious field characteristics as contextual conditions for the impact of religious affiliation and participation on immigrants' structural integration.

- TABLE 4 ABOUT HERE -

Context-dependent effects of religion on occupational attainment

Descriptive statistics for first and second generation immigrants relative to the Canadian native population mirror the same relative differences between generations as in the US and Western Europe (see Table 4). Although not the case in Quebec, first generation immigrants are at a slight occupational disadvantage relative to the natives. This may seem surprising given that educational attainment of the first generation in Canada is higher than that of the natives, but it is well known that foreign credentials like education and job experience are not easily transferable to the Canadian labor market (Reitz 2007). The second generation is more highly represented in the salariat, thus underlining the overall upward mobility among many (but not all) immigrant groups which previous studies documented (e.g. Boyd/Grieco 1998).

Although a potential effect of cohort differences, less first generation immigrants in English Canada belong to Christian denominations or have no religious affiliation at all compared to natives; the second generation shows a similar religious breakdown as the native population, albeit slightly more diverse. In Quebec, the share of Catholics is greater among the second generation than among the first generation, but there are few differences between immigrant generations in the proportion of religiously unaffiliated.[13] In terms of religious participation, the first generation in both contexts attends more frequently than either the natives or the second generation, and a similar pattern emerges for other variables like religiosity and private religious activity (for similar findings using EDS and census data see Clark/Schellenberg 2006).

- TABLE 5 ABOUT HERE -

Since few differences occurred in previous models examining the relative differences between immigrant generations and the native population, we do not present them for the Canadian analyses.[14] Rather we turn immediately to logistic regression coefficients predicting professional/managerial occupational attainment by generation and context (see table 5). Since the Canadian data only asks questions about religious participation and activity for religiously affiliated respondents, table 5 only examines the impact of religious affiliation on occupational attainment.

The first model for each immigrant generation in table 5 is a replication of the same variables used to test religious boundary effects in the US and Western Europe plus Statistics Canada's

[13] The first generation estimates of religious affiliation and native-born for English Canada and Quebec are in line with the 2001 Census (authors' calculations).
[14] We did test mediating effects using the Canadian data, finding that native-immigrant gaps do not change considerably if religion variables are included in the models.

detailed visible minority variable (unshown). In English Canada, Sikh (b=-1.065) first generation immigrants are the only religious group with significant occupational disadvantage relative to unaffiliated first generation immigrants, and net of other factors such as education, and parental educational background. The religious boundary effects become even less significant and smaller in magnitude once additional control variables unique to the first generation population are added, such as citizenship status and length of stay. The negative Sikh effect, however, remains, which could be due to the refugee entry class represented by many of these immigrants; unfortunately, immigrant entry class does not exist in the data to test this assumption. For the second generation in English Canada, there are barely any differences across religious boundaries in occupational attainment, thus confirming our assumption that in the absence of "bright" symbolic boundaries religious affiliation has a null effect on structural integration outcome.

Given boundary configurations in Quebec we would expect religious minority status to have a negative effect on structural integration outcome. The religious minority experiencing the greatest occupational penalty compared to religiously unaffiliated first generation immigrants are Muslims (b= -0.882). Yet surprisingly, when additional first generation controls are added in the following model, the negative Muslim effect disappears. Further analysis indicates that time in country is the variable which most influences the removal of the religious boundary effect for Muslim immigrants in Quebec. Unlike in Western Europe, there are no significant religious boundary effects for the second generation in Quebec. Indeed, the second generation in Quebec more resembles the second generation in English Canada in terms of occupational attainment than the second generation in Western Europe, although it should be noted that the European data could be suffering from omitted variable bias and/or a small number of cases.

- TABLE 6 ABOUT HERE -

Table 6 examines the role of religious participation on occupational attainment for immigrants indicating religious affiliation, again by generation and English Canadian versus Quebecois contexts. The first model for both generations includes religious affiliation (this time Catholic as the reference group), the detailed ethnicity variable (unshown), and religious activity variables (including religious attendance). In English Canada, there is no significant effect for religious attendance for the first generation; instead, religiosity is negative (b= -0.145) This finding persists when additional first generation controls are added in the second model. However, there is a relationship between attendance and occupational attainment for the second generation (b=0.239) even when competing religiosity variables are added in the second model. In this way, participation in religious congregations does seem to provide relevant resources for economic success in English Canada, somewhat similar to the marginally positive effect for the second generation in the US.

In Quebec, no significant effect for religious participation among the religiously affiliated exists for first generation immigrants in Quebec. Neither is any other religion variable (religiosity, private religious activity) significant, even when additional first generational controls are added. However, like in English Canada, worship attendance for the second generation (b=0.751) does have positive effects that even remain when additional religion variables are added. In spite of greater boundaries confronted by religious minorities in Quebec, notably by Muslims, it seems that religious field characteristics may still allow minority religious congregations to foster immigrant structural integration.

The within-Canada comparison thus provides a more nuanced perspective on the relationship between religion and immigrant structural integration. The expected differences between English Canada and Quebec including notably disadvantages of first generation Muslims disappeared as soon as immigrant-specific factors such as length of stay and citizenship were included in the models. This indicates that the religious boundary effect may be more due to the timing of immigration of Muslims to Quebec than to actual religious boundaries. At the same time, we could show that different religious boundary configurations notwithstanding, English Canada and Quebec with their quasi-congregational religious fields provide contexts in which religious participation has positive effects on structural integration outcomes 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 immigrant outcomes, by analyzing data from the US American General Social Survey, the European Social Survey, and the Canadian Ethnic Diversity Survey. We tested for indirect as well as for direct effects of religious affiliation and participation, respectively, on occupational attainment among first and generation immigrants in comparative perspective. Our analyses confirm that in contexts with "bright" religious boundaries (such as Western Europe or Quebec) religious minority affiliation tends to be negatively related to occupational attainment, especially for Muslims. In contexts with Tocquevillian religious field characteristics, religious participation tends to be positively related to occupational attainment, especially for the second generation, and this effect seems to hold independently of religious boundary characteristics.

Of course, our analysis faces a number of limitations. First of all, the datasets for the US and Western Europe, for which the "bridge vs. barrier" metaphor has been most prominently used (Foner/Alba 2008), do not allow disentangling religious from ethno-racial effects in a satisfactory manner and they also lack immigrant-related measures that would need be to controlled. To address these limitations, however, we turned to the Canadian dataset which due to its larger sample size has permitted a more nuanced analysis; the Quebec case in fact suggests that Muslim penalties among the first generation may be confounded by other factors, notably time in country. Second, we had to treat Western Europe as macro-context thus side-lining well-known national specificities, as in fact much transatlantic comparative scholarship on immigration does (Foner/Alba 2008; Zolberg/Long 1999). However, we did try to account for contextual differences within Western Europe in our models through fixed effects by country. But ultimately, testing our theoretical hypothesis about the context-dependence of religious effects on structural integration would require datasets with much greater subsamples of immigrants that would allow for cross-national analysis. Third, the causal mechanisms we identified in our theoretical account can obviously not be accurately observed with the cross-sectional data we used in this paper. The regression analyses leave open the question whether religious affiliation and religious participation (context-dependently) affect structural integration outcomes or whether the causal arrow points in the other direction. This problem is almost insurmountable when the outcome is employment, where both time constraints and existential insecurity would provide for plausible causal mechanisms in the other direction. However, this is not the case for occupational attainment; it is indeed 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 (Skribekk et al. 2010). Lastly, the data do not permit us to interact religious affiliation with 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 factors of structural integration. Empirically, we present 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). 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.

Allen, Ryan. 2010. "The bonding and bridging roles of religious institutions for refugees in a non-gateway context." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 33:1049-1068.

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.

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 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.

Clark, Warren and Grant Schellenberg. 2006. "“Who’s religious?”." *Canadian Social Trends*, 2-9.

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.

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.

Foner, Nancy, and Richard Alba. 2008. "Immigrant religion in the U.S. 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.

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.

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.

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.

Pontusson, Jonas. 2005. *Inequality and Prosperity. Social Europe vs. Liberal America*. Ithaca: Cornell 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.

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

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			EUROPE		
Variable	Native-born	First Gen Imm	Sec Gen Imm	Native-born	First Gen Imm	Sec Gen Imm
Outcome Variable						
Professional/Managerial Occupation	0.51	0.47	0.58 *	0.48	0.37 *	0.52
Religious Affiliation						
Unaffiliated	0.15	0.14	0.17	0.40	0.31 *	0.48 *
Catholic	0.21	0.39 *	0.37 *	0.30	0.24 *	0.20 *
Christian Orthodox	0.00	0.04 *	0.01	0.05	0.11 *	0.07
Protestant	0.60	0.30 *	0.35 *	0.23	0.11 *	0.15 *
Muslim	0.00	0.04 *	0.00 *	0.00	0.17	0.08 *
Jewish	0.02	0.02	0.07 *	0.00	0.01 *	0.00
Eastern Religion	0.01	0.06 *	0.02 *	0.00	0.05 *	0.02 *
Other Religion	0.02	0.01 *	0.02	0.00	0.01	0.00
Religious Attendance						
Monthly or more frequent	0.45	0.50 *	0.42	0.19	0.30 *	0.18
Socio-demographic variables						
Ethnic Minority	0.17	0.47 *	0.25 *	0.02	0.36 *	0.16 *
Female	0.51	0.50	0.57 *	0.45	0.43	0.47
Age	42	41 *	42	43	40 *	41 *
Married	0.53	0.59 *	0.50	0.61	0.65 *	0.54 *
Respondent Post Secondary Education	0.64	0.70 *	0.74 *	0.37	0.37	0.41
Parent Post Secondary Education	0.29	0.31	0.28	0.18	0.23 *	0.26 *
N	3,961	519	336	25,858	1,024	577

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

Note: Descriptive statisitics are unweighted

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						WESTERN EUROPE					
Generation												
Native-born	ref.			ref.			ref.			ref.		
First Generation Immigrant	-0.223	(0.108)	*	-0.268	(0.113)	*	-0.642	(0.086)	***	-0.622	(0.089)	***
Second Generation Immigrant	0.155	(0.128)		0.108	(0.130)		0.069	(0.102)		-0.087	(0.103)	
Religious Affiliation												
Unaffiliated	ref.			ref.			ref.			ref.		
Catholic				-0.200	(0.113)	†				-0.067	(0.043)	
Christian Orthodox				-0.504	(0.407)					-0.143	(0.149)	
Protestant				-0.274	(0.103)	**				-0.066	(0.043)	
Muslim				-0.497	(0.471)					-0.550	(0.174)	**
Jewish				0.356	(0.271)					0.370	(0.478)	
Eastern Religion				0.722	(0.319)	*				0.651	(0.219)	**
Other Religion				0.194	(0.287)					-0.332	(0.248)	
Religious Attendance												
Monthly or more				0.281	(0.722)	***				0.027	(0.042)	
Socio-demographic variables												
Ethnic Minority	-0.305	(0.082)	***	-0.351	(0.085)	***	-0.230	(0.087)	**	-0.187	(0.090)	*
Female	0.363	(0.064)	***	0.357	(0.065)	***	-0.065	(0.029)	*	-0.067	(0.029)	*
Age	0.017	(0.003)	***	0.017	(0.003)	***	0.010	(0.001)	***	0.010	(0.002)	***
Married	0.193	(0.065)	**	0.175	(0.067)	***	0.076	(0.031)	*	0.085	(0.031)	**
Respondent Post Secondary Education	1.594	(0.072)	***	1.570	(0.072)	***	2.368	(0.033)	***	2.367	(0.033)	***
Parent Post Secondary Education	0.710	(0.075)	***	0.687	(0.076)	***	0.625	(0.042)	***	0.618	(0.042)	***
Constant	-1.757	(0.223)	***	-1.630	(0.234)	***	-1.273	(0.082)	***	-0.214	(0.087)	***
Pseudo R2	0.14			0.15			0.22			0.22		
N	4816			4816			27459			27459		

Note: Fixed effects for sub national region of analysis (US - Census region; Europe - country of residence)

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

Note: Estimates are unweighted

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						WESTERN EUROPE					
	first			second			first			second		
Religious Affiliation												
Unaffiliated	ref.			ref.			ref.			ref.		
Catholic	-0.703	(0.347)	*	-0.275	(0.413)		-0.076	(0.249)		-0.014	(0.296)	
Christian Orthodox	-0.736	(0.599)		-1.413	(1.305)		-0.193	(0.422)		0.244	(0.801)	
Protestant	-0.388	(0.360)		-0.283	(.424)		-0.012	(0.297)		-0.195	(0.330)	
Muslim	-0.977	(0.619)		n/a			-0.489	(0.278)	†	-0.830	(0.456)	†
Jewish	-0.330	(0.745)		0.451	(0.667)		1.590	(1.078)		n/a		
Eastern Religion	-0.231	(0.514)		1.130	(1.159)		0.199	(0.385)		0.788	(0.834)	
Other Religion	-1.593	(1.287)		1.831	(1.270)		0.081	(0.982)		n/a		
Religious Attendance												
Monthly or more	-0.094	(0.232)		0.406	(0.290)		-0.306	(0.208)		0.085	(0.317)	
Socio-demographic variables												
Ethnic Minority	0.141	(0.218)		-0.349	(0.311)		-0.265	(0.185)		0.188	(0.310)	
Female	0.136	(0.210)		0.229	(0.262)		-0.039	(0.167)		0.024	(0.208)	
Age	0.018	(0.011)	†	0.003	(0.319)		0.016	(0.009)	†	0.006	(0.012)	
Married	0.553	(0.214)	*	0.060	(0.263)		-0.016	(0.170)		-0.113	(0.218)	
Respondent Post Secondary Education	1.881	(0.257)	***	1.797	(0.319)	***	2.084	(0.170)	***	2.068	(0.224)	***
Parent Post Secondary Education	0.656	(0.233)	**	0.857	(0.330)	*	0.627	(0.199)	**	0.630	(0.267)	**
Constant	-2.168	(0.489)	**	-1.325	(0.855)		-1.995	(0.575)	**	-1.816	(0.616)	
Pseudo R2	0.19			0.18			0.27			0.24		
N	519			336			1024			571		

Note: Fixed effects for sub national region of analysis (US - Census region; Europe - country of residence)

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

Note: Estimates are unweighted

Table 4 Descriptive Statistics by Context
Sources: Canadian Ethnic Diversity Survey (EDS 2002)

	ENGLISH CANADA			QUEBEC		
Variable	Native-born	First Gen Imm	Sec Gen Imm	Native-born	First Gen Imm	Sec Gen Imm
Outcome Variable						
Professional/Managerial Occupation	0.54	0.52 *	0.57 *	0.53	0.57 *	0.65 *
Religious Affiliation						
Unaffiliated (ref.)	0.22	0.19 *	0.23	0.06	0.12 *	0.11 *
Catholic	0.27	0.34 *	0.30 *	0.88	0.55 *	0.69 *
Christian Orthodox	0.01	0.04 *	0.02 *	0.00	0.07 *	0.05 *
Protestant	0.49	0.24 *	0.42 *	0.05	0.10 *	0.09 *
Muslim	0.00	0.05 *	0.00	0.00	0.08 *	0.00
Jewish	0.01	0.02 *	0.02 *	0.01	0.03 *	0.05 *
Buddhist	0.00	0.03 *	0.00	0.00	0.03 *	0.00
Hindu	0.00	0.04 *	0.00	0.00	0.01 *	0.00
Sikh	0.00	0.04 *	0.01 *	0.00	0.00	0.00
Religious activity						
Religious Attendance (monthly or more frequent)[a]	0.44	0.56 *	0.42 *	0.25	0.38 *	0.21 *
Religiosity (1=not important; 5=very important)[a]	3.44	3.90 *	3.37 *	3.15	3.65 *	3.05
Private Religious Activity (weekly or more frequent)[a]	0.51	0.58 *	0.47 *	0.43	0.49 *	0.38 *
Socio-demographic variables						
Integration variables (first generation)						
Interview Language not English or French	0.00	0.08 *	0.00	0.00	0.02 *	0.00
In Canada more than 10 years	1.00	0.77 *	1.00	1.00	0.73 *	1.00
Canadian citizen	1.00	0.81 *	1.00	1.00	0.83 *	1.00
Socio-demographic variables						
Ethnic minority	0.03	0.46 *	0.13 *	0.00	0.41 *	0.11 *
Female	0.55	0.45 *	0.48 *	0.55	0.46 *	0.47 *
Age	42	44 *	41 *	43	43	39 *
Married	0.67	0.74 *	0.62 *	0.47	0.62 *	0.43
Respondent Post Secondary Education	0.62	0.66 *	0.71 *	0.58	0.73 *	0.77 *
Parent Post Secondary Education	0.37	0.37	0.42 *	0.28	0.42 *	0.42 *
N	7,596	4,225	5,345	1,852	567	647

* t-test difference of p<0.05 between from native born within each context
[a] Limited to respondents with a religious affiliation
Note: Descriptive statisitics are unweighted

Table 5 Logistic Regression Coefficients Predicting Professional/Managerial Occupational Attainment by Context and Generation (Religious Boundaries)
Sources: Canadian Ethnic Diversity Survey (EDS 2002)

	ENGLISH CANADA				QUEBEC			
	First		Second		First		Second	
Religious Affiliation								
Unaffiliated	ref.		ref.		ref.		ref.	
Catholic	-0.005 (0.108)		-0.086 (0.110)		-0.025 (0.085)		-0.063 (0.337)	-0.260 (0.347)	-0.206 (0.311)
Christian Orthodox	-0.353 (0.186)	†	-0.342 (0.189)	†	0.149 (0.244)		-0.361 (0.481)	-0.271 (0.486)	-0.557 (0.482)
Protestant	0.199 (0.111)	†	0.098 (0.113)		0.006 (0.079)		-0.045 (0.447)	-0.117 (0.458)	-0.511 (0.417)
Muslim	-0.364 (0.200)	†	-0.369 (0.201)	†	0.260 (0.515)		-0.882 (0.525) †	-0.754 (0.533)	0.052 (1.400)
Jewish	0.574 (0.280)	*	0.522 (0.280)	†	0.454 (0.248)	†	0.266 (0.678)	0.159 (0.691)	-0.238 (0.502)
Buddhist	-0.275 (0.227)		-0.179 (0.238)		-0.259 (0.426)		0.036 (0.756)	-0.045 (0.789)	-1.078 (1.500)
Hindu	-0.287 (0.248)		-0.346 (0.249)		-0.423 (0.569)		0.436 (1.113)	0.327 (1.141)	n/a
Sikh	-1.345 (0.262)	***	-1.137 (0.268)	***	-0.098 (0.467)		n/a	n/a	n/a
Integration Variables								
Interview Language not English or French			-1.383 (0.174)	***				-0.982 (0.876)	
In Canada more than 10 years			0.237 (0.096)	*				0.475 (0.272) †	
Canadian citizen			0.197 (0.095)	*				0.634 (0.662) *	
Socio-demographic controls								
Female	0.809 (0.070)	***	0.841 (0.071)	***	0.892 (0.060)	***	0.658 (0.202) **	0.626 (0.205) **	0.518 (0.177) **
Age	0.012 (0.004)	**	0.010 (0.004)	*	0.010 (0.004)	**	0.009 (0.012)	-0.003 (0.013)	0.012 (0.011)
Married	0.080 (0.081)		0.140 (0.082)	†	0.265 (0.065)	***	-0.042 (0.207)	0.068 (0.213)	0.159 (0.183)
Respondent Post Secondary Education	1.351 (0.078)	***	1.254 (0.080)	***	1.280 (0.069)	***	2.062 (0.250) ***	2.068 (0.254) ***	1.064 (0.211) ***
Parent Post Secondary Education	0.469 (0.076)	***	0.447 (0.076)	***	0.128 (0.066)	†	0.262 (0.215)	0.245 (0.217)	0.632 (0.197) **
Constant	-2.042 (0.227)	***	-2.200 (0.237)	***	-1.703 (0.179)	***	-1.807 (0.663) **	-2.118 (0.688) **	-0.931 (0.578)
Pseudo R2	0.13		0.15		0.10		0.16	0.18	0.07
N	4,225		4,225		5,345		567	567	646

* t-test difference of p<0.05 between from native born within each context
Detailed visible minority (unshown) is used as a control in all models
[a] Limited to respondents with a religious affiliation
Note: Estimates are unweighted

Table 6 Logistic Regression Coefficients Predicting Professional/Managerial Occupational Attainment by Context and Generation (Religious Institutions)
Sources: Canadian Ethnic Diversity Survey (EDS 2002)

	ENGLISH CANADA			QUEBEC	
	First		Second	First	Second
Religious Activity					
Religious Attendance	0.020 (0.098)	0.045 (0.099)	0.268 (0.092) **	-0.306 (0.272)	-0.327 (0.277)	0.751 (0.280) **
Religiosity	-0.145 (0.040) ***	-0.134 (0.040) **	0.000 (0.035)	-0.060 (0.096)	-0.052 (0.098)	-0.004 (0.223)
Private Religious Activity	0.071 (0.092)	0.052 (0.093)	-0.062 (0.085)	0.185 (0.253)	0.239 (0.258)	-0.379 (0.870) †
Religious Affiliation						
Catholic	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.
Christian Orthodox	-0.291 (0.179)	-0.197 (0.182)	0.207 (0.245)	-0.321 (0.416)	0.089 (0.439)	-0.311 (0.407)
Protestant	0.164 (0.095) †	0.148 (0.094)	0.068 (0.075)	0.056 (0.355)	0.155 (0.365)	-0.366 (0.318)
Muslim	-0.353 (0.199) †	-0.267 (0.200)	0.127 (0.529)	-0.971 (0.464) *	-0.556 (0.486)	0.767 (1.402)
Jewish	0.677 (0.276) *	0.684 (0.276) *	0.423 (0.250) †	0.314 (0.635)	0.350 (0.645)	-0.162 (0.435)
Buddhist	-0.520 (0.256) *	-0.205 (0.271)	-0.328 (0.258)	0.944 (1.117)	1.283 (1.234)	-0.754 (1.627)
Hindu	-0.353 (0.249)	-0.323 (0.251)	-0.545 (0.612)	0.368 (1.063)	0.347 (1.093)	n/a
Sikh	-1.387 (0.263) ***	-1.082 (0.271) ***	-0.236 (0.525)	n/a	n/a	n/a
Integration Variables						
Interview Language not English or French		-1.446 (0.237) ***			-1.4546 (1.200)	
In Canada more than 10 years		0.298 (0.109) **			0.807 (0.310) *	
Canadian citizen		0.169 (0.107)			0.394 (0.315)	
Socio-demographic variables						
Female	0.857 (0.080) ***	0.884 (0.080) ***	0.959 (0.070) ***	0.712 (0.218) **	0.678 (0.223) **	0.615 (0.197) **
Age	0.009 (0.005) †	0.005 (0.005)	0.009 (0.004) *	0.017 (0.013)	0.001 (0.014)	0.019 (0.012)
Married	0.156 (0.093) †	0.207 (0.094) *	0.276 (0.077) ***	-0.053 (0.225)	0.068 (0.232)	-0.114 (0.200)
Respondent Post Secondary Education	1.305 (0.087) ***	1.247 (0.089) ***	1.374 (0.080) ***	1.827 (0.267)	1.848 (0.272)	1.055 (0.226) ***
Parent Post Secondary Education	0.480 (0.085) ***	0.452 (0.086) ***	0.081 (0.076)	0.347 (0.233) ***	0.308 (0.236) ***	0.672 (0.216) **
Constant	-1.483 (0.272) ***	-1.747 (0.283) ***	-1.877 (0.220) ***	-1.875 (0.729) *	-2.366 (0.766) **	-1.321 (0.611)
Pseudo R2	0.14	0.15	0.11	0.16	0.18	0.08
N	3,395	3,395	4,094	482	482	571

* t-test difference of p<0.05 between from native born within each context
Detailed visible minority (unshown) is used as a control in all models
[a] Limited to respondents with a religious affiliation
Note: Estimates are unweighted