

CSES Working Paper Series

**Assimilation and the second generation in Europe and America:
Blending and segregating social dynamics
between immigrants and natives**

Lucas Drouhot and Victor Nee

Center for the Study of Economy & Society
Cornell University

Revised 10/13/18

Lucas Drouhot and Victor Nee¹
Cornell University

June 10, 2018 (revised 10/13/18)

**Assimilation and the second generation in Europe and America:
Blending and segregating social dynamics
between immigrants and natives**

FORTHCOMING: *Annual Review of Sociology*, 2018

Abstract: The diversity induced by migration flows to Western societies has continued to generate scholarly attention, and a sizable new body of work on immigrant incorporation has been produced in the last ten years. We review recent work in the United States, the United Kingdom, France, Germany, Sweden, Norway, Belgium, the Netherlands and Spain. Despite differences between the United States as a settler society and Western Europe as a composite of classic nation states, we find an overall pattern of intergenerational assimilation in terms of socioeconomic attainment, social relations and identity. We then qualify this perspective by considering sources of disadvantage for immigrants on both sides of the Atlantic. In the United States, the lack of legal status is particularly problematic; in Europe, by contrast, religious difference is the most prominent social factor complicating assimilation. We proffer several general propositions summarizing mechanisms embedded in purposive action, social networks, cultural difference and institutional structures that drive the interplay of blending and segregating dynamics in the incorporation of immigrants and their children.

Keywords: Immigration, Second Generation, Assimilation, Mechanisms, Blending and Segregating Dynamics, Institutions.

¹ *Corresponding author, Victor Nee, Department of Sociology, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY 14853; email: victor.nee@cornell.edu. Lucas Drouhot, Max Planck Institute for the Study of Religious and Ethnic Diversity, Göttingen, Germany; email: drouhot@mmg.mpg.de. We wish to thank Richard Alba, Douglas Massey and Filiz Garip for their thoughtful comments on earlier versions of this manuscript.

Over the last decades, international migration has led to unprecedented ethnic, racial and religious diversity within Western liberal societies. Comparative figures from national census bureaus and the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) suggest that, as of the early 2010s, the proportion of foreign-born hovers between 10%, in France and Spain, and 20%, in Belgium (Alba and Foner 2015, OECD/European Union 2015). Including native-born children with at least one immigrant parent, immigrant groups constitute 16% of the population in Spain, 19% in the UK, 20% in the Netherlands, 20% in Germany, 21% in Norway, 24% in the United States, 26% in France, 28% in Sweden, and 30% in Belgium (OECD/European Union 2015, 17).

Whether or not these new immigrants and their children are achieving full membership in their country of settlement, however, remains an open empirical question. Is there or is not there an attenuation of differences based on ethnic origin over time and generations, leading to the erosion of social boundaries distinguishing immigrants from natives? In this article, we review recent empirical work on immigrant incorporation on both sides of the Atlantic—specifically the United States, United Kingdom, France, Germany, the Netherlands, Sweden, Norway, Spain and Belgium. Our aim is to synthesize research findings published within the last decade on the incorporation of immigrants across these national contexts. Our neo-assimilationist approach assumes that assimilation is a contingent evolutionary outcome, which depends on the mix and balance between opposing social forces driving blending and segregating dynamics. Hence, we explore these dynamics, first in the United States and then Western Europe.

In both contexts, a credible commitment to the rule of law provides a common institutional framework for the incorporation of immigrants and their children. The United States' origin as an immigrant nation is reflected in its Constitution, empowering Congress “to establish an uniform rule of naturalization” for citizenship. In Western Europe, by contrast, conceptions of the national community have historically been more cultural in character, and their populations more homogenous. But there too, large-scale immigration has led to accommodative efforts to extend citizenship rights to immigrants and their children. Our review of the literature shows that the overall observed pattern in both the United States and Western Europe is one of assimilation—the gradual erosion of ethnic, racial, religious and other differences as determinants of life chances for immigrants and their children.

Comparing and contrasting immigrant trajectories in Western Europe and North America, however, we find that assimilation as a social process is contingent upon path-dependent mechanisms motivated and guided by cultural beliefs, formal rules, informal norms and networks governing the incorporation of immigrants (Nee and Alba 2013). Regarding the United States, numerous studies point to legal status as a key institutional rule channeling immigrants and their children in specific incorporation pathways. For Western Europe, a new literature has emerged identifying religion—and specifically the Muslim/non-Muslim distinction—as a potent symbolic divide affecting assimilation.

Assimilation is a complex and multidimensional convergence process occurring at socioeconomic (resource distributions and socioeconomic attainment), relational (preference in marriage and friendship, extent of intergroup contact and trust) and cultural (subjective feeling of belonging, being considered “one of us” by the majority group, engaging in cultural practices identified with immigrant community at little or

no social costs at all) levels.² These dimensions are, of course, causally linked. Nevertheless, each dimension can be examined separately as a distinct *signal* of the incorporation process, involving a varying degree of blending or segregating dynamics.

Our definition of assimilation considers the agency of both immigrants and natives in the maintenance or the erosion of the distinctions between them. It designates a *mutual* process of convergence: immigrants come to resemble natives over time and vice versa. Cumulatively, the intermixing of people and cultures contributes to a self-reinforcing, evolutionary broadening of social groups included in the imagined communities of the nation state (Anderson 1983). Assimilation does not imply homogenization of immigrant identity and culture towards a specific core as a necessary endpoint, although such homogenization may occur. We rather conceive of assimilation as the declining significance of context-specific markers of difference—like race, ethnicity or religion—in the lives of immigrants and their children. We view assimilation as a possible outcome of the generic process of incorporation and prefer this term to the more one-sided and race-related (at least in the U.S.) concept of integration. The extent of intergenerational change in specific empirical measures between the first and the second generation remains a crucial yardstick to evaluate assimilation, and the one we focus on in our review.

Wave-like sways in the balance between blending and segregating dynamics are recurrent in settler societies where anti-immigrant sentiments of nativism and nationalism routinely follow in the wake of sustained high volume immigration. Yet, historically, unwelcomed immigrant groups have incrementally assimilated into

² For more detailed discussion of this multidimensional process, see Alba and Nee (2003) and Wimmer (2013)

mainstream institutional and organizational life in the United States (Alba and Nee 2003) and Europe (e.g. Noiriel 1996). In a period of revival of nativism, credible commitment to formal rules and laws governing immigration and naturalization enable institutionalized safeguards limiting the effects of racial intolerance and dislike of foreigners. Whether or not the current nativist moment will work to stall the overall assimilation pattern we document here depends on the stability of these safeguards - a point we revisit in the conclusion of our review.

Diverse assimilation trajectories in America

The Hart-Cellar Immigration Act of 1965 has, in a fifty-year period, cumulatively reshaped the American demographic landscape with high volume immigration flows from Asia, Central and Latin America, and to a lesser extent Africa and the West Indies.

General and large-scale studies relying on survey data, such as White and Glick (2009) and Waters and Pineau (2015), describe an overall trend of assimilation in socioeconomic outcomes like educational attainment, earnings and occupations among contemporary immigrants in the US.³ Echoing findings from an earlier study (Kasinitz et al. 2008) of the second generation in New York City, Waters and Pineau (2015) and Duncan and Trejo (2015) find that second generation members of most immigrant groups reach or exceed the educational attainment of third plus generation White natives. Feliciano and Lanuza (2017) show that the “second generation advantage” of children of immigrants typically reflects the class background of their parents, who transmit aspirations for high relative status in the country of destination

³ For a review of earlier research on post-1965 immigration, see Alba and Nee 2003 chapter 6 and Waters and Jiménez 2005.

based on their social position—measured in terms of relative educational attainment—in the country of origin. The most recent representative data from Census-sponsored surveys unambiguously confirms this overall trend of substantial intergenerational progress in educational attainment across all immigrant groups (Duncan and Trejo 2018, Tran 2018).

Beyond this general picture portraying the overall trend, there is of course a heterogeneous social reality. Hsin and Xie (2014) use nationally representative longitudinal survey data to document a persistent academic advantage of Asian Americans over Whites, which they and others attribute to high stocks of human-cultural capital (Nee and Sanders 2001) and norms of academic achievement prevalent among selective immigrant groups from East and South Asia (Lee and Zhou 2015). Importantly, even the children of less well-educated working-class parents appear to benefit from spill-over effects of high academic achievement of middle-class Chinese immigrant and second-generation children (Kasinitz et al. 2008). By contrast, immigrants from Central America and Mexico tend to have much lower educational attainment levels and appear to lack organizational resources enabling information sharing and strategies for getting ahead in the public school system.⁴ Notwithstanding this, the second generation makes notable progress, completing on average three to four more years of education than their parents (Waters and Pineau 2015: 249-55, Bean et al. 2015 chapter 4, Duncan and Trejo 2018) and massively enrolling in American colleges (Pew Hispanic Center 2013).

⁴ Nee and Hilbrow (2013) suggest that the high academic achievement of immigrant and second-generation groups from Asia can be attributed not only to selectivity, but also to lower relative numbers of undocumented immigrants in these immigrant streams. The higher relative numbers of undocumented Mexican and Central American immigrants is not surprising given the greater distance between East and South Asia and the United States.

High average rates of educational attainment translate into white-collar occupations for a sizable proportion of the second generation. This is obviously the case among the children of Asian immigrants, whose widespread progress into benchmark occupations of socioeconomic success such as engineering, science, medicine and law has been well documented (Lee and Zhou 2015, Sakamoto et al. 2009). Importantly, it can also be observed among the children of immigrant parents who arrived in the United States with relatively low educational and occupational attainments. At 28% and 32.5% respectively, second generation Mexicans and Central Americans—the descendants of the most socially disadvantaged groups—are approximately three times more likely to be in managerial and professional positions compared to their foreign-born peers (Waters and Pineau, chapter 6). More generally, there is little evidence for Mexican or Latino stagnation or decline across generations. Although later generation Mexicans are typically thought to be at a high risk of downward mobility, Luthra and Waldinger (2010) instead report that they are actually much less likely than their parents to cluster in low-paying and unstable jobs. Tran and Valdez (2017) report important progress in occupational attainment from the immigrant to the second generation for all Latino groups.⁵

This general pattern of socioeconomic mobility is reflected in declining rates of spatial segregation across generations for most immigrant groups (Iceland 2009) and also in the emergence of middle-class residential neighborhoods inhabited by high-achieving immigrant minorities—the so-called ethnoburbs (Li 2009, Logan and Zheng 2010). This dynamic of spatial attainment is not limited to Asian immigrants.

⁵ Duncan and Trejo (2018) show a strong pattern of assimilation in earnings between the first and second generation across all major immigrant groups compared to third plus generation, non-Hispanic Whites. Likewise, Tran (2018) shows that second generation members of all immigrant groups are more likely to be in professional occupations than their native peers, with the exception of the Mexicans and the Vietnamese.

Using data from Los Angeles, Bean et al. (2015, chapter 6) show that the Mexican second generation's typical neighborhoods have higher levels of education and a lower percentage of co-ethnics and of poverty, and that this trend continues in the third generation. Recent work on the wealth accumulation of Mexican Americans and other Latinos similarly points to a cumulative pattern of upward mobility over the life course despite significant economic hurdles among the first generation (Keister, Vallejo and Borelli 2015).

Continuous large-scale migration may complicate the second generation's attempts to craft symbolic or optional forms of ethnic identity, as it may give rise to issues of cultural authenticity within the immigrant community (Jiménez 2010). And there may be negative externalities of public perception of high volume illegal migration that spill over to legal immigrants and natives of the same ethnicity. Nonetheless, socially successful Mexican Americans commonly integrate middle-class and Mexican identities, experiencing upward mobility while also maintaining ethnic solidarity with less fortunate members of the community (Vallejo 2012). This produces a type of social capital based on ethnic organizations and middle-class role models reminiscent of the collective culture of achievement and mobility found in many Asian American communities (Lee and Zhou 2015). Although social mobility leads some to identify as White (Emeka and Vallejo 2011), middle-class members of immigrant groups often maintain hyphenated identities in which ethnic belonging and socioeconomic success are not mutually exclusive (Vallejo 2012, Jiménez and Horowitz 2013). The ethnic culture of Korean and Indian professionals, in particular, portends a broader pattern of assimilation wherein ethnic identity becomes largely unproblematic (Dhingra 2007).

Research on intermarriage similarly points to a blurring of ethnic and racial boundaries. Despite replenishment of the pool of marriageable co-ethnics through continued migration (Lichter, Carmalt and Qian 2011), intermarriage rates have been rising steadily since the 1980s (Alba and Foner 2015 chapter 9). A majority of native-born Asian Americans now intermarry, most often with Whites—a pattern reflecting their high socioeconomic attainment, which leads to opportunities to marry with the native majority group (Min and Kim 2010). Meanwhile, research on dating preferences among Latinos suggests inclusive attitudes rather than strong tastes for same-race partners, despite persistent exclusionary attitudes among Whites (Feliciano, Lee and Robnett 2011). Consequentially, there is an increasing number of children from mixed unions and individuals identifying as biracial (Alba et al. 2018).

To a significant extent, human-cultural capital and family economic resources explain differences in socioeconomic mobility of the second generation across immigrant groups. In the present era, class has more explanatory power than does race and ethnicity. Taking such relative socioeconomic position into account, the contemporary, post-Civil Rights American immigrant story thus appears to be, overall, one of assimilation moderated by the selective power of formal immigration law and general dynamics of social reproduction. Most Asian immigrant groups, whose demographic composition has been drastically shaped by 1965 Hart-Celler Act, are thus assimilating into the American mainstream (Nee and Holbrow 2013, Lee and Zhou 2015; see Sakamoto et al. 2009 for a review), while the trajectories of Hispanic immigrants shows slow if significant progress (Morgan and Gelbgiser 2014, Luthra and Waldinger 2010, Tran and Valdez 2015, Bean et al. 2015, Tran 2018).

We find very little evidence in the recent literature for the pattern of “downward assimilation” that Portes and Zhou’s (1993) segmented assimilation theory predicted

for immigrant minorities in America's central cities. Of special importance here is the incorporation of West Indian and African immigrants. Rather than a dominant trend of downward assimilation towards a racialized underclass, empirical research describes an overall pattern of schooling success among the US born children of black immigrant families, especially compared to their native counterparts (Thomas 2009). This pattern is driven by class selectivity among Black (especially African) migrant families, resulting in high status aspirations and achievement norms in the United States (Imoagene 2017). More generally, we observe heterogeneous incorporation trajectories shaped by family economic resources and family structure (Elo et al. 2015, Thomas 2009, Kasinitz et al. 2008, Sakamoto et al. 2009).

This is not to say, of course, that race does not affect immigrant incorporation in America. For the first generation, there is strong evidence of racial disparities in earnings growth over time (Villarreal and Tamborini 2018) as well as a high rates of residential segregation of Black immigrants (Iceland and Scopilliti 2008) despite overall trends of earnings and spatial assimilation. Although race undoubtedly impacts the subjective experience of belonging among second generation Latinos (e.g. Frank et al. 2010, Vallejo 2012) and Blacks (e.g. Clerge 2014, Imoagene 2017), there exists no recent study systematically demonstrating that the life chances and incorporation trajectories of non-White members of the second generation are structurally shaped by race.⁶ Rather, within-group differences in such trajectories (see

⁶ Three prominent studies published in the last ten years warrant closer discussion. In their impressive longitudinal study of Mexican Americans in Los Angeles and San Antonio, Telles and Ortiz (2008) argue that slow educational progress of Mexican immigrants beyond the second generation reflects a dynamic of racialization. Yet, their own analysis shows that skin tone has no effect. More importantly, variation in their respondents' occupational attainment reflects their endowment in human capital, while one would expect racialization to nullify the effect of human capital on occupational attainment. The second study, by Haller, Portes and Lynch (2011) uses survey data from Florida and California and argues that the Mexican and Black Caribbean second generations are experiencing downward assimilation due to their race. Yet their analysis shows that ethnic and racial penalties for educational and occupational attainments largely vanish once school-level factors and educational aspirations are

Elo et al. 2015, Alba, Jiménez and Marrow 2014, Waters and Pineau 2015: 264-72 for substantial differences across national origins, geographic location and gender) suggest that racialization and its associated socioeconomic straits are neither inevitable nor uniform for non-White immigrant groups. As further data on the second generation becomes available, and as the third generation comes of age, more research on the relative impact of race and racial difference on assimilation will be necessary. Such research will need, in particular, to disentangle race from other confounding factors, as well as effects of ethnic attrition in samples based on self-identification among children of immigrants as they undergo assimilation (Emeka and Vallejo 2011, Emeka forthcoming).

The coming of age of the second generation in Western Europe

The contemporary *de facto* multiculturalism in Western Europe is, in great part, the legacy of yesteryear's guest worker programs launched during the economic boom of the postwar period, particularly the 1960s. France, the United Kingdom and the Netherlands relied on their ties to their ex-colonies, while Germany, Belgium, Sweden and Norway relied on bilateral treaties for supplies of labor. A system of temporary contracts thus brought large numbers of workers from Southern Europe, North Africa, Turkey, Pakistan, and to a lesser extent Southeast Asia and the Caribbean to Europe. After the 1973 oil shock crisis, this recruitment of guest workers abruptly stopped. However, many of these migrants stayed on in the destination

controlled for. Both studies provide relatively weak empirical evidence for a strong effect of ethnic or racial background on incorporation outcomes net of class and other characteristics. Finally, Pager et al. (2009), using experimental evidence, convincingly show that discrimination in hiring and job channeling affects Latinos as much as Blacks in the low-wage market. However, that study is not focused on immigrant groups. More evidence of this type focusing explicitly on the incorporation of immigrants—rather than racial groups—in labor markets and other institutional domains is needed to ascertain the effect of systematic ethn racial discrimination on progress towards assimilation.

countries, and migration flows shifted, at once, to family reunification. Migrant workers and their families thus became permanent immigrants. Asylum seekers from Chile, Vietnam, Yugoslavia and the Middle East also fed migration flows in the late 20th century. The historical narrative for Spain is somewhat different: The immigrant population in Spain, while substantial, primarily dates back to the early 21st century; it has been fueled by immigrants from other European member states and from South America.

As in the United States, review of the recent literature regarding the status of immigrants in Western Europe points to socioeconomic assimilation across generations as the overall pattern.⁷ A crucial part of this story is intergenerational progress in educational attainment: recent comparative studies report that the second generation is much more educated than their immigrant parents, who often came from countries with little compulsory schooling (Crul et al. 2012). In spite of this noteworthy progress, however, the children of immigrants in Europe typically lag behind their native peers in predictable ways. Turks and North Africans are surpassed by European-origin migrants, with Asian-origin students outperforming both and sometimes natives as well (Alba and Foner 2015, chapter 9). Does this indicate an immigrant-specific penalty representing systematic ethnic inequality? It does not seem so, as scholars have established that the gap in educational attainment is best accounted for as a gap in parental socioeconomic resources—especially parents’ education—rather than an “ethnic” gap per se (Heath and Brinbaum 2014). A large array of new studies in Germany (Luthra 2010, Song 2011), France (Brinbaum and Kieffer 2009, Ichou 2013) Sweden (Jonsson and Rudolphi 2011), Norway (Støren and Helland 2010), Spain (Portes et al. 2016, Schnell and Azzolini 2015), and the United

⁷ See Heath et al. 2008 for a review of older work.

Kingdom (Wilson, Burgess and Briggs 2011, Ichou 2015) report that much of the gap stems from class rather than ethnic inequality. Some residual differences do remain for some groups, like African youths from the Sahel region and Turks in France, possibly stemming from their low parental educational attainment within their country of origin (Ichou 2014). Nevertheless, few studies report large differences once social background is controlled for (but see Borgna and Contini 2014). Some studies report an immigrant advantage compared to similar natives in terms of aspirations and achievement (Wilson, Burgess and Briggs 2011, Jackson et al. 2012, Salikutluk 2016, Fernández-Reino 2016), as well as an attenuated effect of parental social background (Luthra 2010, Brinbaum and Kieffer 2009, Tucci et al. 2013). There exists variation in educational outcomes within groups: Turks, for example, do better in some educational systems (such as in France and Sweden) than others (such as in Germany), despite their general disadvantage (Crul et al. 2012). Immigrant children appear to benefit from comprehensive systems with early schooling encouraging language acquisition and with a range of options kept open in later stages of secondary education (no early tracking), thus allowing their higher aspirations to blossom (Alba and Foner 2015 chapter 8, Jackson et al. 2012, Crul et al. 2012, Tucci et al. 2013, Crul 2013, Borgna and Contini 2014).

The overall trends in the second generation's labor market outcomes are social reproduction in existing structures of inequality and relative social mobility *given* prior family socioeconomic status, which is generally low due to the social origins of many immigrant families who first came through the guest worker programs. In France, the descendants of immigrants are overrepresented in the working class but show rates of upward mobility comparable to that of natives; thus occupying labor market positions, on average, more desirable than their parents' but less so than

natives' (Meurs et al. 2009). In Norway, using registry data, Hermansen (2016) documents an overall convergence in socioeconomic status among the children of immigrants and natives. In Spain, Aparicio (2007) documents large increases in occupational attainments—away from non-qualified labor—among second-generation Moroccan and South American youths compared to their parents. In Britain, using longitudinal household surveys, Li and Heath (2016) find that the substantial disadvantage of the first generation in terms of occupational attainment vanishes in the second generation. Crucially, they find that the patterns of social reproduction in occupational attainment across generations among natives are mirrored among immigrants. Class origins, in other words, trump ethnic origins for the life chances of the second generation in Europe. This important point is echoed in comparative work. Lessard-Phillips, Fibbi and Wanner (2012) show that the Turkish second generation experience relatively high social mobility in European cities, and that the bulk of the gap in labor market outcomes with natives can be accounted for by human capital differentials. Pichler (2011) shows that the second generation as a whole reaches high occupational levels at roughly the same rate as the native majority in European countries, with similar or slightly better returns to education in the case of men. Other recent work (Crul et al. 2017) has studied the emergence of a new, highly educated elite among the children of immigrants, as would be predicted by this general dynamic of upward mobility.

Qualifying this picture, however, several studies report gaps in employment rates between natives and immigrants. In Norway, Hermansen (2013) finds that ethnic minorities do not suffer a penalty in terms of promotion once employed, but does find an unexplained residual in terms of *access* to employment. Echoing earlier work (Heath et al. 2008), an ethnic penalty in access to employment for some immigrant

groups has been documented in other contexts (see Kalter 2011, Luthra 2013 for Turks in Germany, Tucci et al. 2013 for North Africans in France, Algan 2009 for comparative evidence of a gap in the UK, Germany and France). This gap can be the effect of several processes, including labor market institutions, lack of information about jobs among immigrant families, or discrimination. We shall revisit this point later on.

In addition to socioeconomic outcomes, European scholars have been at the forefront of the study of network structures as they relate to immigrant incorporation, producing a dynamic new literature on immigrant social capital and relational integration with native populations. Representing a shift from the focus on intermarriage and residential segregation of American scholars of incorporation, this research suggests that contacts with natives like friendship and acquaintanceship are associated with better economic outcomes such as higher income and chances of employment (Lancee 2010, Kanas et al. 2012), higher levels of acculturation in terms of identification with the host society and host language use among immigrants (de Vroome et al. 2011, Schulz and Leszczensky 2015, Ali and Fokkema 2016) and increased tolerance among natives (Savelkoul et al. 2011, Janmaat 2014).

Much recent research has logically sought to understand the predictors of such contact. Studies done in Germany, England and the Netherlands suggest that the main predictors of contacts with the native majority among immigrants are generational status (second, third, etc.) and educational attainment (Martinovic et al. 2009, Martinovic 2013, Platt 2014, Van Tubergen 2015, Damstra and Tillie 2015). While Turks appear to exhibit both lower levels of contact and weaker advantages from contact with natives (Martinovic et al. 2009, Kalter 2011, Schulz and Leszczensky 2015), a blending dynamic of increasing social amalgamation across generations

nevertheless appears to be at work. Research on preference in friendship among immigrant adolescents in Sweden, Germany, England and the Netherlands shows that while sharing a similar ethnic identity is an important factor for some subgroups, it is trumped in magnitude by general principles of tie formation such as gender homophily and network effects like reciprocity (Smith et al. 2014a). Meanwhile, research on generalized trust—the feeling that most people can be trusted, which signals social cohesion—shows that second-generation immigrants are adopting the trust patterns of native populations (Dinesen and Hooghe 2010) and that generalized trust does not vary by ethnic group as much as it does by education and material circumstances (de Vroome et al. 2013). The general picture emerging from this new work is thus one of incremental amalgamation between natives and immigrants. The probability of such intergroup contacts does not appear to be determined by ethnic differences as much as class differences.

The final dimension of assimilation that European scholars have heavily scrutinized in the last decade relates to culture, conceived in terms of identity, cultural practices such as language and religion, and values. The trend here is broadly similar to the socioeconomic and relational aspects of incorporation. There is, on one hand, an important shift in the feeling of belonging to the national community between first- and second-generation individuals. In the United Kingdom, Platt (2014) finds that the overwhelming majority express a feeling of belonging in Britain. Portes et al. (2011) obtain substantively similar results when studying the second generation in Spain. In France, Maxwell and Bleich (2014) focus on Muslim immigrants and document lower levels of identification compared to other groups, but find that most of this difference vanishes among those who were born in France and speak French. In terms of language more generally, the relative absence of studies concerning the lack of

fluency of the second generation in the destination country language suggests it to be a nonexistent problem. Meanwhile, studies in retention of the home language suggest rapid rates of decay unless parents explicitly emphasize it in the household context (see Soehl 2016a for France; Van Tubergen and Mentjox 2014 for Germany, England, Sweden and the Netherlands). Isolated studies on specific aspects of acculturation, such as name-giving (Gerhards and Hans 2009) and attitudes towards homosexuality (Soehl 2016b), suggest similar strides towards native reference points relative to the initial cultural distance between the destination and home country.

The overall picture emerging from a comparative review of the literature in the United States and Western Europe is one of assimilation as a path-dependent process of social reproduction and relative upward mobility, which is, in turn, closely related to dynamics of acculturation and social amalgamation. Despite differences within and between immigrant groups as well as variations in institutional and cultural contexts of reception, the fate of the second generation in Western liberal societies appears to be determined, first and foremost, by their initial stock in various forms of capital at the family level. As proposed by Nee and Alba (2013), *“If perceived opportunities are more extensive and plentiful in the mainstream than in ethnic enclaves, the purposive action of immigrants and their children will be aimed at optimizing returns to investment in human and cultural capital in the mainstream society, even in the face of opposition to their assimilation by individual members of the majority and minority groups”* (p.363). This proposition builds on Merton’s (1968) theory of unintended consequences of purposive action in its assumption that people striving for success often do not see themselves as assimilating per se. “Yet unintended consequences of practical strategies and actions undertaken in pursuit of the familiar goals—a good

education, a good job, a nice place to live, interesting friends and acquaintances, economic security—often result in specific forms of assimilation” (Nee and Alba 2013, p. 362). Reviewing the recent literature, we see sizable intergenerational progress toward majority group levels on most outcomes and generally do not find the life chances of the children of immigrants to be considerably impacted by ethnic differences or immigrant status *per se*.

Segregating dynamics for the second generation

Nonetheless, there remain significant barriers to assimilation. In the United States, undocumented status is a source of multiple forms of disadvantage for Mexican and Central American immigrant families. In Europe, meanwhile, religious difference affects the assimilation trajectories of Muslim immigrants and their children. Additionally, class inequality interacts with parental immigrant culture in maintaining or recreating ethnic and religious identities among the second generation, thus preserving the symbolic boundaries separating them from natives.

The challenges of undocumented status in the United States

Undocumented status—not having legal rights that benefit legal immigrants-- has a deleterious effect on socioeconomic outcomes (Massey and Bartley 2006).⁸ Studies comparing documented and undocumented immigrants from Mexico and Central America suggests a seven and four percent net wage penalty for undocumented men and women, respectively, as well as lower returns to education

⁸ In general, undocumented immigrants come with the lowest level of formal education, while legal immigrants include a high representation of the college-educated, especially from Asia, who change their immigration status after completing their formal education in the United States.

(Hall et al. 2010, Bean et al. 2015 chapter 4); a higher probability of working physically demanding and repetitive jobs and generally worse work conditions (Massey and Sánchez 2010, Hall and Greenman 2015); a lower likelihood of owning a home and higher probability of living in a low-quality neighborhood (Cort 2011, Greenman and Hall 2013). These empirical studies underscore and help to explain a broader pattern of declining wages and resilient poverty rates among Mexican migrants, over half of whom are undocumented in the US, largely unable to return to Mexico due to border enforcement and thus at the risk of descent into a new underclass (Massey and Gelatt 2010, Massey and Pren 2012, Massey et al. 2016, Pew Hispanic Center 2011).⁹

Undocumented status is consequential as regards other aspects of incorporation. There is evidence linking the share of undocumented Mexican migrants to higher rates of segregation from native Whites (Hall and Stringfield 2014). Menjívar and Abrego (2012)'s ethnographic study reveals the perpetual fear of deportation among undocumented Central American migrants in California and Arizona—fear that translates into an avoidance of mainstream institutions like social services or even schools (see also Asad and Rosen forthcoming). These qualitative approaches are particularly well suited to studying the cultural impact of the absence of legal status on identity and self-understanding. Massey and Sánchez (2010), for example, document the emergence of a panethnic Latina identity and a rejection of American culture among undocumented immigrants enduring the struggles associated with lacking papers and being barred from the American dream. In another ethnographic study, Menjívar and Lakhani (2016) vividly describe the “personal metamorphosis”

⁹ An earlier study, however, shows labor market earnings of undocumented immigrants improving as they acquire specific skills through work experience in the United States (Tienda and Singer 1995).

and personal struggles associated with their legal status, or lack thereof. For these individuals, being undocumented dictates work, marriage and childbearing decisions, civic engagement, and, ultimately, their self-understanding as deserving individuals striving to become 'legal'. Meanwhile, recent experimental evidence from Schachter (2016) convincingly shows that White natives consider undocumented status to be an unacceptable trait of potential neighbors or friends, while Florès and Schachter (2018) use similar methods to study perceptions of illegality and demonstrate that many White Americans hold a lack of legal status in close cognitive association with a propensity for sexual assault and murder. In other words, members of the White majority think of being undocumented as a profound breach of the social contract, one that may be associated with possible tendencies to commit other criminal offenses. These findings, which point to a culturalization of legal status as a vector of meaning and individual worth, are particularly important: as members of the White majority infer legal status based on outwardly visible characteristics, such as race and national origins, it is plausible for the stigma of being “illegal” to diffuse to entire immigrant groups regardless of actual legal status.

At a socioeconomic, relational and cultural levels, the absence of legal status thus operates to channel immigrants away from assimilation. What does this imply for young children who immigrated with their parents—the so-called 1.5 generation—and the native-born second generation? Undocumented students are less likely to finish high school and go to college (Hall and Greenman (2013), and those in community colleges are more likely to drop out due to their ineligibility for financial aid (Terriquez 2015). More generally, Gonzales (2011) describes the process of “learning to be illegal” after high school for those who immigrated as children with

their parents and were protected from deportation while in school thanks to the 1982 *Plyler v. Doe* Supreme Court ruling. The lives of the high school dropouts and those who managed to go to college converge towards precariousness and work in the low-wage sector due to the lack of a Social Security number. For those born in the US to undocumented families, there is a pattern of intergenerational transmission of social disadvantage. At age three, these infants tend to exhibit a lower cognitive development, as their parents' working conditions leave little time and energy to stimulate their children and scant resources to pay for child care (Yoshikawa 2011). Survey data from Los Angeles show that children growing up in families with *both* undocumented parents have, all else equal, a one to 1.7 year deficit in terms of years of school completed compared to similar children in families with one or no undocumented parent (Bean et al. 2015, chapter 4). Crucially, children—especially females—whose parents entered without papers and later regularized their status appear to catch up completely with those growing up in legally stable families (Bean et al. 2015, 87). This implies a causal effect of legalization on the second generation's educational attainment.

The challenges of religion and cultural difference in Western Europe

A large literature on the incorporation of Muslim groups has emerged within the sociology of immigration in the last ten years. This literature broadly documents the crystallization of social differences between immigrants and natives around religion, and the Muslim vs. non-Muslim divide in particular. A secondary, related literature sheds light on the endogenous role of social inequality in reinforcing pre-existing symbolic differences between immigrants and natives.

The persistence of a strong religious culture among Muslim immigrants long after having migrated and among the second generation is remarkable given the normative pressure towards secularism and lower religiosity levels in the European context. In Britain, Muslims' religious identity is demonstrably as salient among individuals who migrated fifty years ago as among those who were born in the UK (Bisin et al. 2008, Lewis and Kashyap 2013). In the Netherlands, Maliepaard et al. (2012) describe a religious resurgence among the Muslim second generation. In France, Drouhot (2017) shows that Muslims are, regardless of generation and demographic heterogeneity, substantially more religious than socially comparable natives. Substantively similar findings have been reported in comparative research across Europe (Fleischmann and Phalet 2012, Torrekens and Jacob 2016, de Hoon and Tubergen 2014). A recurrent finding in this literature is that parental socialization and control among Muslim families play a key role in the transmission of religiosity to the second generation (Drouhot 2017, Soehl 2016c, de Hoon and Tubergen 2014, Maliepaard and Lubbers 2013, Fleischmann and Phalet 2012). This is also true of societal attitudes correlated with religiosity, such as attitudes towards homosexuality (Soehl 2016b) and gender equality (Diehl et al. 2009, Kretschmer 2018), which tend to be considerably more conservative among Muslim immigrants and their children due to their higher religiosity.

Meanwhile, native populations react to the vitality of Muslims' religious culture with increasing suspicion if not hostility, as reflected in the evolution of public opinion in Britain and France (Bleich 2009). Experimental studies isolating religious affiliation from other confounding factors (e.g. race or national origins) convincingly confirm anti-Muslim bias. A survey experiment with 18,000 European voters in 15 countries explore perceived desirable and undesirable traits of asylum seekers

(Bansak et al. 2016). The study finds that Muslim asylum seekers are 11% less likely to be accepted than Christians—a penalty comparable in size to being unable to speak the national language, net of everything else. Their analyses show that such a penalty can be offset only if the applicant is a highly trained professional, such as a medical doctor, or a victim of torture. Similarly, Adida et al. (2016) use a series of audit studies and experimental games in France to precisely measure the potential bias in hiring, association and allocation preferences of natives, and show that a unique religious discrimination exists against Muslims, net of their regional, ethnic or racial origins. The authors argue that part of this bias can be attributed to statistical discrimination, and to the belief among natives that Muslims have gender and religious norms that are incompatible with theirs. These studies are especially important insofar as a host of prior experimental studies¹⁰ that did not properly control for religion reported an ethnic bias against groups (e.g., Pakistanis or Turks) that are overwhelmingly Muslim. Using survey data, Heath and Martin (2013) similarly find that ethnic penalties on British labor markets are largely religious in nature.

The recent literature on Muslim incorporation thus broadly depicts the social reproduction of religious culture in immigrant families, on one hand, and the stigmatization of this culture by natives, on the other. The literature points to multiple consequences from this dual dynamic of cultural polarization. First, there is a significant employment gap between Muslims and non-Muslims, the exact origins of which are debated. Some point to the role of discrimination in hiring (Lessard-Phillips et al. 2012, Connor and Koenig 2015) while others emphasize the role of high religiosity in moderating labor force participation, particularly among women

¹⁰ E.g., Van der Bracht et al's (2015) study of the housing market in Belgium, Kaas and Manger's (2012) study of the labor market in Germany and Midtbøen's (2014) study of the labor market in Norway.

(Khoudja and Fleischmann 2015, Koopmans 2016, Cheung 2014). It is likely that the employment gap is a product of both sides of the divide between Muslims and non-Muslims.

Second, recent work on intermarriage and friendship structures suggests that religion has also become a key relational divide in Western Europe, contributing to segregating dynamics. Using data from Belgium, Great Britain, and Germany, Carol (2016) describes low rates of religious intermarriage among second-generation Muslims, whose behavior does not significantly depart from their foreign-born counterparts. Through an emphasis on cultural maintenance, Muslim parents exert strong influence on intermarriage rates (Carol 2016) as well as friendship and romantic involvement with non-Muslim peers (Munniksma et al. 2012, Smith et al. 2014b) among their native-born children. Meanwhile, using data on friendship patterns in German schools, Leszczensky and Pink (2017) show that Christian students discriminate against Muslims as potential friends. Previous studies reporting a strong influence of ethnic background on homophily patterns in friendship among immigrant adolescents and natives (Smith et al. 2014a, Smith et al. 2016) did not properly control for religion and religiosity. In light of Leszczensky and Pink (2017)'s study, it is likely that religious homophily explains at least some portion of ethnic homophily in friendship networks involving Muslim-origin youths. Notably, social dynamics of religious segregation are reflected in residential segregation of Muslim-majority groups such as Bangladeshis and Pakistanis in Great Britain, and North African in Belgium and the Netherlands (Iceland 2014).

In the case of Muslim immigrants in Europe, the causal arrow follows a Weberian trajectory from culture and religious affiliation to relational and socioeconomic outcomes. Parental influences aiming at cultural maintenance and

discrimination from natives are the two sides of the predicament faced by the second-generation Muslim youths.¹¹

Besides religion as an exogenous source of cultural difference imported from the country of origin, there is evidence for cultural decoupling from natives produced by high levels of inequality experienced by the second generation. Wimmer and Soehl (2014) use large-scale survey data across Europe to demonstrate that social and legal disadvantage leads to the maintenance of parental culture (measured as values) from the country of origin. Thus, inequality blocks acculturation—and does so with a substantial magnitude, as experiencing disadvantage has the same effect on acculturation as having 8.5 fewer years of schooling. Ethnographic research in Belgium by Van Kerckem et al. (2013) shows that low socioeconomic resources and limited opportunities for social mobility result in stronger involvement in the local immigrant communities among Belgian-born Turks. In turn, the preservation of parental cultural traits, such as traditional gender norms, is enforced through gossip and social control in dense and homogeneous networks making up the ethnoreligious community. Other ethnographic accounts show that socioeconomic marginality encourages cultural decoupling from parental as well as mainstream culture in response to relative deprivation. In Germany, Bucerius (2014) describes the lives of second-generation male migrants from Turkey who are legal and symbolic foreigners due to their lack of German citizenship. Perceiving their treatment as unfair, they reject what they perceive to be mainstream German culture in favor of the drug trade,

¹¹ These patterns appear widespread in Western Europe with the exception of Spain, whose migration streams are more recent and whose conception of the mainstream is politically and culturally contested. As such, it has not had a clear policy blueprint for immigrant incorporation, even though such absence seems to have resulted in successful incorporation overall (Portes et al. 2016). Isolated, attitudinal evidence on the Spanish case suggests that immigrant marginalization revolves around race rather than religion (Florès 2015).

which allows them to attain material signs of success. A critical aspect of the social trajectories of poor, second-generation Turkish men is the influence of early tracking in school towards vocational careers with lower prospect for social mobility—an outcome largely explained by parental background (Luthra 2010) but often thought by Bucerius’s subjects to reflect anti-immigrant bias. Ethnographic research in France has documented analogous perception of unequal treatment by public institutions like schools and the police (Marlière 2008) and analogous cultural responses to perceived exclusion in the form of petty criminal enterprises regulated by autonomous and localized economies of honor (Sauvadet 2006).

Ethnographic accounts of the marginalized second generation in Germany and France describe a sharp symbolic divide between an emergent ‘us’—oppressed, poor, isolated, powerless, non-White, Muslim—and ‘them’: the powerful, well-off, well-connected, non-Muslim natives. In turn, the subjective experience of economic, spatial and cultural marginalization provides fertile ground for oppositional worldviews and for illicit, alternative economic options such as the drug trade (Sauvadet 2006, Lapeyronnie 2008, Bucerius 2014). While affecting a very minor share of the second generation, these dysfunctional scenarios are widely publicized and tend to contribute to a nativist sentiment in the host populations by depicting certain immigrant groups as problematic—e.g., being more prone to crime and harboring norms and values that are incompatible with the mainstream. This is, in turn, a social condition for further stigmatization and for more segregating dynamics of social closure affecting the children of immigrants as a whole.

Conclusion: Blending & Segregating Dynamics in Europe and America

Overall, recent research on immigrant incorporation in the United States and in Western Europe tends to support the proposition of neo-assimilation theory cited earlier:

Proposition 1: Purposive Action

“If perceived opportunities are more extensive and plentiful in the mainstream than in ethnic enclaves, the purposive action of immigrants and their children will be aimed at optimizing returns to investment in human and cultural capital in the mainstream society, even in the face of opposition to their assimilation by individual members of the majority and minority groups” (Nee and Alba 2013: 367).

As the recent and rapidly increasing literature on the deleterious effect of undocumented legal status in the US makes clear, however, constitutional rules extending formal equality of rights to legal citizens are a crucial and enabling scope condition. Thus:

Proposition 2: Institutions and the Law

“If society’s constitutional rules and their enforcement by the state extend formal equality of rights to all citizens and if political actors signal credible commitment to reinforcing cultural beliefs and formal rules of equality of rights, then immigrants and their children entitled to full citizenship are likely to choose a course of social action that increases their likelihood of assimilation” (Nee and Alba 2013: 367).

The institutional apparatus of modern polities such as the United States can outlaw racial discrimination and increase its social and economic costs in non-trivial ways (Alba and Nee 2003: 54-56). In reviewing the recent literature, we do not find the incorporation trajectories of immigrant groups to be structurally shaped by their racial difference from the native majority in the contemporary, post-Civil Rights era. We do find, however, a profound influence of their legal status and mode of entry into the U.S. Both the central role of legal status, on one hand, and the relatively marginal place of race, on the other, constitute a testimony to the influence of the law—the

formal rules of the game shaping incentives and defining legitimate social action among natives and immigrants—in the incorporation process.

While the most emphatic sources of segregating dynamics in the United States involve immigration law, in Western Europe the primary sources of segregating dynamics involve cultural – specifically religious – differences. Put differently, hurdles to assimilation involve the *state* and belonging in a *political* community, in one case; in the other, they involve the *nation* and belonging in a *cultural* community. Our comparative review of recent European research prompts us to consider the analytic link between perceived cultural difference among immigrants and their life chances, and the role of initial cultural difference in triggering segregating social dynamics between immigrants and natives. We therefore propose:

Proposition 3: Cultural Difference

If certain cultural beliefs and associated symbols are integral to community cohesion among immigrants but generally stigmatized among natives, cultural difference and social closure between immigrants and natives are likely to co-evolve.

When immigrants face strong institutional or cultural barriers, how does assimilation occur? Reliance on collective action among immigrant groups is a standard response to societal hostility, but commonly works to reinforce segregating dynamics of the majority group, as Bonacich and Model (1980) discuss in their study of the Japanese enclave economy in California of the early 20th century. However, ethnic collective action can also be linked to blending dynamics, as in the Chinese community effort to gain entry of the second generation in white public schools in the same period in Mississippi (Loewen 1988). Neo-assimilation theory maintains the following:

Proposition 4: Immigrant Collective Action

“In general, when discriminatory barriers block an individualistic pattern of social mobility, assimilation when it occurs, depends on ethnic collective action mobilized” (Nee and Alba 2013: 364).

In the United States, the mobilization of ethnic collective action has become more common following Civil Rights era legislation that outlawed racial discrimination and extended equal legal rights to immigrant minorities.¹² In Western Europe, meanwhile, progress towards assimilation will remain limited in the absence of a better political organization among Muslim minorities in their respective national fields. The institutional integration of Islam, however, and the establishment of religious organizational bodies to further dialogue between state and religious institutions, seems to be well on its way (Laurence 2013). This represents an encouraging step towards further assimilation for Muslim minorities in Western Europe.

Our review of the burgeoning literature on incorporation of immigrants in the United States and Europe points to promising directions for future research. As already mentioned, there is presently a relative scarcity of systematic studies on ethnoracial discrimination and its effect on immigrant incorporation among the second generation. Yet experimental evidence convincingly shows that discrimination in hiring and job channeling affects Latinos as much as Blacks in the low-wage market (Pager et al. 2009). More evidence of this type focusing explicitly on the incorporation of immigrants—rather than racial groups—in labor markets and other

¹² For example, immigrant entrepreneurs from Taiwan, South Asia and China gained a secure footing in the mainstream technology economy in Silicon Valley by reliance on immigrant professional associations for social capital to secure advice, training, resources and entry as founders of start-up firms in Silicon Valley (2006).

institutional domains is needed to ascertain the effect of systematic discrimination on progress towards assimilation.

How are immigrants remaking the mainstream in their host society?

Assimilation involves decreasing social costs to the expression of cultural difference. Through assimilation, immigrants may transform the norms and meaning surrounding core aspects of the mainstream. In the US, for instance, the meaning of educational success is being redefined by high achievement norms found among Asian families (Jiménez and Horowitz 2013). In Germany, Schönwälder et al. (2016) describes a variety of response from natives to the new cultural diversity they witness in their everyday life, ranging from appreciation to distancing. As our review has made clear, perceived cultural difference can be a ground for rejection from natives, who act as gatekeepers (Schachter 2016). Describing changes in the mainstream that result from immigration, as well as the scope conditions for such changes to take place, represents an important area for future work. This likely will involve research on the third generation: on socioeconomic outcomes, relational integration and patterns of acculturation for these individuals as their social experiences induce a reworking of the imagined communities in their respective nation-state contexts.

What triggers blending or segregating social dynamics in intergroup relations?

Exploring this question in greater depth is a key challenge for future research. A blurring of ethnic boundaries facilitates gradual assimilation by larger numbers of second generation immigrant minorities, contingent on periods of “non-zero-sum mobility” of sustained economic growth (Alba and Nee 2003). Inter-group competition for resources, on the other hand, triggers segregating dynamics (Olzak 2006). In the present decade, ongoing international migration and new inflows of refugees have activated a latent nativism manifest in populist politics in both the

United States and Europe. In the former, nativist social movements of the early 20th century culminated in the passing of the Immigration Act of 1924. The effect of this anti-immigration law was to end mass immigration, which ironically opened the way for the gradual assimilation of the children of immigrants from Southern and Eastern Europe, and Asia. In both the United States and Europe, populist politicians once again are mobilizing anti-immigrant sentiment, possibly ushering in a new era of restricted immigration. The rise of reactionary racial politics in the United States (Abrajano and Hajnal 2015) is mirrored by the backlash against multiculturalism in European political discourses (Vertovec and Wessendorf 2010), although the latter has had limited policy effects so far. Whether or not the current nativist moment will work to durably shift the balance towards segregating dynamics primarily revolves around changes in immigration law. This, in turn, is predicated on voting behavior among native and immigrant voters, demographic shifts shaping the electoral balance between them, and the capacity of civil society and immigrant organizations to produce credible alternative narratives and policies. It is likely that this nativist moment will come to pass in favor of another period of gradual assimilation, as has been the overall pattern in the past among Western countries of immigration.

Literature cited :

1. Abrajano M, Zoltan HL. 2015. *White Backlash: Immigration, Race and American Politics*. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press
2. Adida CL, Laitin D, Valfort MA. 2016. *Why Muslim Integration Fails in Christian Heritage Societies*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press
3. Alba R, Nee V. 2003. *Remaking the American Mainstream. Assimilation and Contemporary Immigration*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press
4. Alba R, Beck B, Sahin DB. 2018. The U.S. mainstream expands – again. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 44(1): 99-117
5. Alba R, Jiménez TR, Marrow HB. 2014. Mexican Americans as a paradigm for contemporary intra-group heterogeneity. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 37(3): 446-66
6. Alba R, N Foner. 2015. *Strangers No More. Immigration and the Challenges of Integration in North America and Western Europe*. Princeton: Princeton University Press
7. Algan Y, Dustmann C, Glitz A, Manning A. 2010. The economic situation of first- and second-generation immigrants in France, Germany and the United Kingdom. *Economic Journal* 120 F4-F30

8. Ali S, Fokkema T. 2016. The Importance of Peers: Assimilation Patterns among Second-Generation Turkish Immigrants in Western Europe. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 41(2): 260-83
9. Anderson B. 1983. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso
10. Aparicio R. 2007. The integration of the second and 1.5 generations of Moroccan, Dominican and Peruvian origin in Madrid and Barcelona. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 33(7): 1169–93
11. Asad AL, Rosen E. Forthcoming. Hiding within racial hierarchies: how undocumented immigrants make residential decisions in an American city. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*
12. Bansak K, Hainmueller J, Hangartner D. 2016. How economic, humanitarian and religious concerns shape European attitudes towards asylum seekers. *Science* 354(6309): 217-23
13. Bean FD, Brown SK, Bachmeier JD. 2015. *Parents Without Papers. The Progress and Pitfalls of Mexican American Integration*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation
14. Bisin A, Patacchini E, Verdier T, Zenou Y. 2008. Are Muslim Immigrants Different in Terms of Cultural Integration?. *Journal of the European Economic Association* 6(2–3): 445–56
15. Bleich E. 2009. Where do Muslims stand on ethno-racial hierarchies in Britain and France? Evidence from public opinion surveys, 1988-2008. *Patterns of Prejudice* 43: 379-400

16. Bonacich E, Modell John. 1980. *The Economic Basis of Ethnic Solidarity: Small Business in the Japanese American Community*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press
17. Borgna C, Contini D. 2014. Migrant Achievement Penalties in Western Europe: Do Educational Systems Matter?. *European Sociological Review* 30(5): 670-83
18. Brinbaum Y, Kieffer A. 2009. Les scolarités des enfants d’immigrés de la sixième au baccalauréat : différenciation et polarisation des parcours. *Population* 64(3): 561-610
19. Bucerius SM. 2014. *Unwanted: Muslim Immigrants, Dignity and Drug Dealing*. New York: Oxford University Press
20. Carol, Sarah. 2013. “Intermarriage attitudes among minority and majority groups in Western Europe: The role of attachment to the religious in-group” *International Migration* 51(3): 67-83
21. Carol S. 2016. Like Will to Like? Partner Choice among Muslim Migrants and Natives in Western Europe. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 42(2): 261-76
22. Cheung SY. 2014. Ethno-religious minorities and labour market integration: Generational advancement or decline?. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 37(1): 140-60
23. Clerge O. 2012. Balancing stigma and status: racial and class identities among middle-class Haitian youth. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 37(6) 958-77.
24. Connor P, Koenig M. 2015. Explaining the Muslim employment gap in Western Europe. *Social Science Research* 49:191-201

25. Cort DA. 2011. Reexamining the ethnic hierarchy of locational attainment: evidence from Los Angeles. *Social Science Research* 40 (6): 1521–33
26. Crul M, Keskiner E, Lelie F. 2017. The upcoming new elite among children of immigrants: a cross-country and cross-sector comparison. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 40(2): 202-29
27. Crul M, Schnell P, Herzog-Punzenberger B, Wilmes M, Slooman M, Aparicio Gómez, R. 2012. School careers of second-generation youth in Europe. Which education systems provide the best chances for success?. In *The European Second Generation Compared. Does the Integration Context Matter?*, ed M Crul, J Schneider, F Lelie, pp. 101-64. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press
28. Crul M. 2013. Snakes and Ladders in Educational Systems: Access to Higher Education for Second Generation Turks in Europe. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 39(9): 1-19
29. Damstra A, Tillie J. 2016. How crosscutting weak ties are established—the case of Muslims in Europe. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 42(2): 237-60
30. De Hoon S, Van Tubergen F. 2014. The religiosity of children of immigrants and natives in England, Germany, and the Netherlands: The role of parents and peers in class. *European Sociological Review* 30(2): 194-206
31. De Vroome T, Hooghe M, Marien S. 2013. The Origins of Generalized and Political Trust among Immigrant Minorities and the Majority Population in the Netherlands. *European Sociological Review* 29(6): 1336-50

32. Dhingra P. 2007. *Managing Multicultural Lives: Asian American Professionals and the Challenges of Multiple Identities*. Stanford: Stanford University Press
33. Diehl C, Koenig M, Ruckdesche Kl. 2009. Religiosity and Gender Equality: Comparing Natives and Muslim Migrants in Germany. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 32: 278–301
34. Dinesen PT, Hooghe M. 2010. When in Rome, Do as the Romans Do: The Acculturation of Generalized Trust among Immigrants in Western Europe. *International Migration Review* 44(3): 697-727
35. Drouhot LG. 2017. Cracks in the Melting Pot? Religiosity & Assimilation Among the Diverse Muslim Population in France. Unpublished dissertation manuscript. Department of Sociology, Cornell University
36. Duncan B, Trejo SJ. 2015. “Assessing the Socio-Economic Mobility and Integration of U.S. Immigrants and their Descendants” *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 657(1): 108-35
37. Duncan B, Trejo. 2018. “Socioeconomic Integration of US Immigrants Over The Long Term: The Second Generation And Beyond” NBER Working Paper 24394, National Bureau of Economic Research, Cambridge, MA.
38. Elo IT, Frankenberg E, Gansey R, Thomas D. 2015. Africans in the American Labor Market. *Demography* 52(5): 1513-42
39. Emeka A. Forthcoming. “Just black” or not “just black?” Ethnic attrition in the Nigerian-American second generation. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*
40. Emeka A, Vallejo JA. 2011. Non-Hispanics with Latin American ancestry: assimilation, race, and identity among Latin American descendants in the US. *Social Science Research* 40(6): 1547–63

41. Feliciano C, Lanuza YR. 2017. "An Immigrant Paradox? Contextual Attainment and Intergenerational Educational Mobility" *American Sociological Review* 82(1): 211-41
42. Feliciano C, Lee R, Robnett B. 2011. Racial Boundaries Among Latinos: Evidence from Internet Daters' Racial Preferences. *Social Problems* 58(2): 189-12
43. Fernández-Reino M. 2016. Immigrant optimism or anticipated discrimination? Explaining the first educational transition of ethnic minorities in England. *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility* 46: 151-56
44. Fleischmann F, Phalet K. 2012 Integration and Religiosity Among the Turkish Second Generation in Europe: A Comparative Analysis Across Four Capital Cities. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 35(2): 320-41
45. Florès RD. 2015. The Resurgence of Race in Spain: Perceptions of Discrimination Among Immigrants. *Social Forces* 94(1): 237-69
46. Florès RD, Schachter A. 2018. Who are the « Ilegals » ? The Social Construction of Illegality in the United States. *American Sociological Review* 83(5) : 839-68
47. Frank R, Akresh IR, Lu B. 2010. Latino Immigrants and the U.S. Racial Order: How and Where Do They Fit In? *American Sociological Review* 75(3): 378-401
48. Gerhards J, Hans S. 2009. From Hasan to Herbert: Name-giving patterns of immigrant parents between acculturation and ethnic maintenance. *American Journal of Sociology* 114 (4): 1102-28

49. Gonzales RG. 2011. Learning to be Illegal: Undocumented Youths and Shifting Legal Contexts in the Transition to Adulthood. *American Sociological Review* 76(4): 602-19
50. Greenman E, Hall M. 2013. Legal Status & Educational Transitions for Mexican & Central American Immigrant Youth. *Social Forces* 91(4): 1475–98
51. Hall M, Greenman E. 2013. Housing and neighborhood quality among undocumented Mexican and Central American immigrants. *Social Science Research* 42(6): 1712-25
52. Hall M, Greenman E. 2015. The Occupational Cost of Being Illegal in the United States: Legal Status, Job Hazards, and Compensating Differentials. *International Migration Review* 49(2): 406-42
53. Hall M, Stringfield J. 2014. Undocumented migration and the residential segregation of Mexicans in new destinations. *Social Science Research* 47: 61-78
54. Hall M, Greenman E, Farkas G. 2010. Legal Status and Wage Disparities for Mexican Immigrants. *Social Forces* 89(2) 491-513
55. Haller W, Portes A, Lynch SM. 2011. Dreams Fulfilled, Dreams Shattered: Determinants of Segmented Assimilation in the Second Generation. *Social Forces* 89(3): 733–62
56. Heath AF, Rothon C, Kilpi E. 2008. The Second Generation in Western Europe: Education, Unemployment, and Occupational Attainment. *Annual Review of Sociology* 34: 211–35
57. Heath A, Martin J. 2013. Can religious affiliation explain ‘ethnic’ inequalities in the labour market?. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 36(6): 1005-27

58. Heath A, Brinbaum Y (Eds.). 2014. *Unequal Attainments: Ethnic Educational Inequalities in Ten European Countries*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press
59. Hermansen, AS. 2013. Occupational Attainment Among Children of Immigrants in Norway: Bottlenecks into Employment – Equal Access to Advantaged Positions?. *European Sociological Review* 29(3): 517-34
60. Hermansen, AS. 2016. Moving Up or Falling Behind? Intergenerational socioeconomic Transmission among Children of Immigrants in Norway. *European Sociological Review* 32(5): 675-89
61. Hsin A, Xie Y. 2014. “Explaining Asian Americans’ academic advantage over whites” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 111(23): 8416-21
62. Iceland J. 2009. *Where We Live Now: Immigration and Race in the United States*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press
63. Iceland J. 2014. *Residential Segregation: a Transnational Perspective*. Washington: Migration Policy Institute
64. Iceland J, Scopilliti M. 2008. Immigrant Residential Segregation in U.S. Metropolitan Areas, 1990-2000. *Demography* 45(1): 79-94
65. Ichou, M. 2013. Différences d’origine et origine des différences : les résultats scolaires des enfants d’émigrés/immigrés en France du début de l’école primaire à la fin du collège. *Revue Française de Sociologie* 54(1): 5-52
66. Ichou, M. 2014. Who They Were There: Immigrants’ Educational Selectivity and Their Children’s Educational Attainment. *European Sociological Review* 30(6): 750-65

67. Ichou, M. 2015. Origine migratoire et inégalités scolaires : étude longitudinale des résultats scolaires des descendants d'immigrés en France et en Angleterre. *Revue Française de Pédagogie* 191: 29-46
68. Imoagene O. 2017. *Beyond Expectations: Second-Generation Nigerians in the United States and Britain*. Berkeley and Los Angeles : University of California Press
69. Jackson M, Jonsson JO, Rudolphi F. 2012. Ethnic Inequality in Choice-driven Education Systems: Longitudinal Study of Performance and Choice in England and Sweden. *Sociology of Education* 85(2) : 158-78
70. Janmaat JG. 2014. Do Ethnically Mixed Classrooms Promote Inclusive Attitudes Towards immigrants Everywhere? A Study Among Native Adolescents in 14 Countries. *European Sociological Review* 30(6): 810-22
71. Jiménez TR, Horowitz AL. 2013. “When White is Just Alright: How Immigrants Redefine Achievement and Reconfigure the Ethnoracial Hierarchy” *American Sociological Review* 78(5): 849-71
72. Jiménez TR. 2010. *Replenished Ethnicity. Mexican Americans, Immigration and Identity*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press
73. Jonsson JO, Rudolphi F. 2011. Weak Performance – Strong Determination: School Achievement and Educational Choice among Children of Immigrants in Sweden. *European Sociological Review* 27(4): 487-508
74. Kaas L, Manger C. 2012. Ethnic Discrimination in Germany’s Labour Market: A Field Experiment. *German Economic Review* 13 (1): 1–20
75. Kalter, F. 2011. “The Second Generation in the German Labor Market: Explaining the Turkish Exception” in *The Next Generation: Immigration*

- Youth in a Comparative Perspective*, Ed. R Alba and M Waters, pp. 166-84.
New York and London: New York University Press
76. Kanas A, Chiswick BR, Lippe TVD, Van Tubergen F. 2012. Social Contacts and the Economic Performance of Immigrants: A Panel Study of Immigrants in Germany *International Migration Review* 46(3): 680-709
77. Kasinitz P, Mollenkopf JH, Waters MC, Holdaway J. 2008. *Inheriting the City. The Children of Immigrants Come of Age*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation
78. Keister LA, Vallejo JA, Borelli EP. 2014. Mexican American Mobility: Early Life Processes and Adult Wealth Ownership. *Social Forces* 93(3): 1015-46
79. Khoudja Y, Fleischmann F. 2015. Ethnic Differences in Female Labour Force Participation in the Netherlands: Adding Gender Role Attitudes and Religiosity to the Explanation. *European Sociological Review* 31(1): 91-102
80. Koopmans R. 2016. Does assimilation work? Sociocultural determinants of labour market participation of European Muslims. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 42(2): 197-216
81. Kretschmer D. 2018. Explaining differences in gender role attitudes among migrant and native adolescents in Germany: intergenerational transmission, religiosity, and integration. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 44(13): 2197-2218
82. Lancee, B. 2010. The Economic Returns of Immigrants' Bonding and Bridging Social Capital: The Case of the Netherlands. *International Migration Review* 44(1): 202-26
83. Lapeyronnie D. 2008. *Ghetto urbain. Ségrégation, violence, pauvreté en France aujourd'hui*. Paris: Robert Laffont

84. Laurence J. *The Emancipation of Europe's Muslims: The State's Role in Minority Integration*. Princeton: Princeton University Press
85. Lee J, Zhou M. 2015. *The Asian American Achievement Paradox*. New York: Russel Sage Foundation
86. Lessard-Phillips L, Fibbi R, Wanner P. 2012. "Assessing the labour market position and its determinants for the second generation" in *The European Second Generation Compared. Does the Integration Context Matter?*, Ed. M Crul, J Schneider, F Lelie, pp. 165-224. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press
87. Leszczensky L, Pink S. 2017. Intra- and Inter-group Friendship Choices of Christian, Muslim, and Non-religious Youth in Germany. *European Sociological Review* 33(1): 72-83
88. Lewis VA, Kashyap R. 2013. Are Muslims a distinctive minority? An empirical analysis of religiosity, social attitudes, and Islam. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 52(3): 617-26
89. Li, W. 2009. *Ethnoburb: The New Ethnic Community in America*. Honolulu: University of Hawai Press
90. Li YL, Heath A. 2016. Class Matters: A study of Minority and Majority Social Mobility in Britain, 1982-2011. *American Journal of Sociology* 122(1): 162-200
91. Lichter D, Carmalt J, Qian Z. 2011. Immigration and Intermarriage among Hispanics: Crossing Racial and Generational Boundaries. *Sociological Forum* 26 241-64
92. Loewen JW. 1988. *The Mississippi Chinese: Between Black and White*. Long Grove: Waveland Press

93. Logan JR, Zhang C. 2010. Global Neighborhoods: New Pathways to Diversity and Separation. *American Journal of Sociology*, 115(4): 1069-1109
94. Luthra RR. 2010. Assimilation in a new context: Educational attainment of the immigrant second generation in Germany. ISER Working Paper Series 2010-21
95. Luthra, RR. 2013. Explaining Ethnic Inequality in the German Labor Market: Labor Market Institutions, Context of Reception and Boundaries. *European Sociological Review* 29(5): 1095-1107
96. Luthra RR, Waldinger R. 2010. Into the Mainstream? Labor Market Outcomes of Mexican-Origin Laborers. *International Migration Review* 44(4): 830-68
97. Maliepaard M, Lubbers M. 2013. Parental Religious Transmission after Migration: The Case of Dutch Muslims. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 39(3): 425-42
98. Marlière E. 2008. *La France nous a lâché! Le sentiment d'injustice chez les jeunes des cités*. Paris: Fayard
99. Martinovic B, Van Tubergen F, Maas I. 2009. Dynamics of Interethnic Contact: A Panel Study of Immigrants in the Netherlands. *European Sociological Review* 25(3): 303-18
100. Martinovic B. 2013. The Inter-Ethnic Contacts of Immigrants and Natives in the Netherlands: A Two-Sided Perspective. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 39(1): 69-85
101. Massey DS, Gelatt J. 2010. What happened to the wages of Mexican immigrants? Trends and interpretations. *Latino Studies* 8(3): 328-54
102. Massey DS, Pren KA. 2012. Origins of the New Latino Underclass. *Race and Social Problems* 4(1): 5-17

103. Massey DS, Bartley K. 2006. The Changing Legal Status Distribution of Immigrants: A Caution. *International Migration Review* 39(2): 469-84
104. Massey DS, Sánchez M. 2010. *Brokered Boundaries: Creating Immigrant Identity in Anti-Immigrant Times*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation
105. Massey DS, Durand J, Pren KA. 2016. Why Border Enforcement Backfired. *American Journal of Sociology* 121(5): 1557-1600
106. Maxwell R, Bleich E. 2014. What Makes Muslims Feel French?. *Social Forces* 83(1): 155-79
107. Menjívar C, Abrego L. 2013. Legal Violence: Immigration Law and the Lives of Central American Migrants. *American Journal of Sociology* 117(5): 1380-1421
108. Menjívar C, Lakhani SM. 2016. Transformative effects of immigration law: Immigrants' personal and social metamorphoses through regularization. *American Journal of Sociology* 121(6): 1818-55
109. Merton RK. 1936. The Unanticipated Consequences of Purposive Social Action. *American Sociological Review* 1(6): 894-904
110. Meurs D, Lhommeau B, Okba M. 2009. Document de travail 182: Emplois, salaires et mobilité intergénérationnelle. Paris: Institut National d'Etudes Démographiques
111. Midtbøen, AH. 2014. Discrimination of the Second Generation: Evidence from a Field Experiment in Norway. *Journal of International Migration and Integration* 17(1): 252-72

112. Min PG, Kim C. 2010. Patterns of intermarriages and cross-generational in-marriages among native-born Asian Americans. *International Migration Review* 43(3): 443–70
113. Morgan SL, Gelbgiser D. 2014. Mexican Ancestry, Immigrant Generation, and Educational Attainment in the United States. *Sociological Science* 1: 397-422
114. Munniksma A, Flache A, Verkuyten M, Veenstra R. 2012. Parental acceptance of children’s intimate ethnic outgroup relations: The role of culture, status, and family reputation *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 36(4): 575-85
115. Nee V, Sanders J. 2001. “Understanding the Diversity of Immigrant Incorporation: A Forms-of-Capital Model.” *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 24 (3): 386-411
116. Nee V, Holbrow H. 2013. “Why Asian Americans are Becoming Mainstream.” *Daedalus* 142(3): 65-75
117. Nee V, Alba R. 2013. “Assimilation as Rational Action in Contexts Defined by Institutions and Boundaries” In *Handbook of Rational Choice Social Research*, Ed. R Wittek, T Snijders, V Nee, pp. 355-380. Stanford: Stanford University Press
118. Noiriel G. 1996. *The French Melting Pot. Immigration, Citizenship and National Identity*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press
119. OECD/European Union. 2015. *Indicators of Immigrant Integration 2015: Settling In*. Paris: OECD Publishing
120. Olzak S. 2006. *The Global Dynamics of Race and Ethnic Mobilization*. Stanford: Stanford University Press

121. Pager D, Bonikowski B, Western B. 2009. Discrimination in a Low-Wage Labor Market: A Field Experiment. *American Sociological Review* 74(5): 777-99
122. Pew Hispanic Center. 2011. *Statistical portrait of Hispanics in the United States, 2009*. Washington, D.C.: Pew Hispanic Center. Retrieved from <http://pewhispanic.org/factsheets/factsheet.php?FactsheetID=70> (August 2017)
123. Pew Hispanic Center. 2013. "Hispanic high school graduates pass whites in rate of college enrollment". Retrieved from <http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2013/09/04/hispanic-college-enrollment-rate-surpasses-whites-for-the-first-time/> (August 2017)
124. Pichler F. 2011. Success on European labor markets: A cross-national comparison of attainment between immigrant and majority populations. *International Migration Review* 45(4): 938-78
125. Platt L. 2014. Is there assimilation in minority groups' national, ethnic and religious identity?. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 37(1): 46-70
126. Portes A, Zhou M. 1993. The New Second Generation: Segmented Assimilation and its Variants. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 530: 74-96
127. Portes A, Aparicio Gomez R, Haller W. 2016. *Spanish Legacies: The Coming of Age of the Second Generation*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press
128. Qian Z, Lichter DT. 2011. Changing patterns of interracial Marriage in a Multiracial Society. *Journal of Marriage and Family* 73(5): 1065-84

129. Sakamoto A, Goyette KA, Kim CH. 2009. "Socioeconomic Attainments of Asian Americans" *Annual Review of Sociology* 35 255-76
130. Salikutluk Z. 2016. Why do Immigrant Students Aim High? Explaining the Aspiration-Achievement Paradox of Immigrants in Germany. *European Sociological Review* 32(5): 581-92
131. Sauvadet T. 2006. *Le capital guerrier. Concurrence et solidarité entre jeunes de cité*. Paris: Armand Collin
132. Savelkoul M, Scheepers P, Tolsma J, Hagendoorn L. 2011. Anti-Muslim Attitudes in the Netherlands: Tests of Contradictory Hypotheses Derived from Ethnic Competition Theory and Intergroup Contact Theory. *European Sociological Review* 27(6): 741-58
133. Saxenian, AL. 2006. *The New Argonauts: Regional Advantage in a Global Economy*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press
134. Schachter A. 2016. From "Different" to "Similar": An Experimental Approach to Understanding Assimilation. *American Sociological Review* 81(5): 981-1013
135. Schnell P, Azzolini D. 2015. The academic achievements of immigrant youths in new destination countries: Evidence from Southern Europe *Migration Studies* 3(2) : 217-40
136. Schönwälder K, Petermann S, Hüttermann J, Vertovec S, Hewstone M, Stolle D, Schmid K, Schmitt T. 2016. *Diversity and Contact: Immigration and Social Interaction in German Cities*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan
137. Schulz B, Leszczensky L. 2015. Native friends and national identification among adolescent immigrants in Germany: the role of ethnic boundaries. *International Migration Review* 50(1): 163-96.

138. Smith S, Maas I, Van Tubergen F. 2014a. Ethnic ingroup friendships in schools: Testing the by-product hypothesis in England, Germany, the Netherlands and Sweden. *Social Networks* 39: 33-45
139. Smith S, Maas I, Van Tubergen F. 2014b. "Parental Influence on Friendships Between Native and Immigrant Adolescents" *Journal of Research on Adolescence* 25(3): 580-91
140. Soehl T. 2016a. But do they speak it? The intergenerational transmission of home-country language in migrant families in France. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 42(9): 1513-35
141. Soehl, T. 2016b. From origins to destinations: acculturation trajectories in migrants' attitudes towards homosexuality. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 43(11): 1831-53
142. Soehl T. 2016c. Social Reproduction of Religiosity in the Immigrant Context: The Role of Family Transmission and Family Formation – Evidence from France. *International Migration Review* 51(4): 999-1030
143. Song S. 2011. Second-Generation Turkish Youth in Europe: Explaining the Academic Disadvantage in Austria, Germany, and Switzerland. *Economics of Education Review* 30(5): 938–49
144. Støren LA, Helland H. 2010. Ethnicity differences in the completion rates of upper secondary education: How do the effects of gender and social background variables interplay? *European Sociological Review* 26(5): 585-601
145. Telles E, Ortiz V. 2008. *Generations of Exclusion. Mexican Americans, Assimilation and Race*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

146. Terriquez V. 2015. Dreams Delayed: Barriers to Degree Completion among Undocumented College Students. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 41(8): 1302-23
147. Thomas, KJA. 2009. Parental Characteristics and the Second Schooling Progress of the Children of Immigrant and US-born Blacks. *Demography* 46(3): 513-34
148. Tienda M, Singer A. 1995. Wage Mobility of Undocumented Workers in the United States. *International Migration Review* 29: 112-38
149. Torrekens C, Jacobs D. 2016. Muslims' religiosity and views on religion in six Western European countries: does national context matter?. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 42:2 325-40
150. Tran VC, Valdez NM. 2017. Second-Generation Decline or Advantage? Latino Assimilation in the Aftermath of the Great Recession. *International Migration Review* 51(1): 155-90
151. Tran, VC. 2018. Social Mobility Across Immigrant Generations : Recent Evidence and Future Data Requirements. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*. Online first
152. Tucci I, Jossin A, Keller C, Groh-Samberg O. 2013. L'entrée sur le marché du travail des descendants d'immigrés : une analyse comparée France-Allemagne. *Revue Française de Sociologie* 54(3): 567-76.
153. Vallejo JA. 2012. *Barrios to Burbs: The Making of the Mexican American Middle Class*. Palo Alto: Stanford University Press
154. Van der Bracht K, Coenen A, Van de Putte B. 2015. "The Not-in-My-Property Syndrome: The Occurrence of Ethnic Discrimination in the Rental

- Housing Market in Belgium. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 41(1): 158-75
155. Van Kerckem K, Van de Putte Bart, Stevens P. 2013. On Becoming “Too Belgian”: A Comparative Study of Ethnic Conformity Pressure Through The City-As-Context Approach *City & Community* 12(4): 335-60
156. Van Tubergen F, Mentiox T. 2014. Minority Language Proficiency of Adolescent Immigrant Children in England, Germany, the Netherlands, and Sweden. *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie* 66 Supplement 1: 241-62
157. Van Tubergen F. 2015. Ethnic Boundaries in Core Discussion Networks: A Multilevel Social Network Study of Turks and Moroccans in the Netherlands. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 41(1): 101-16
158. Villarreal A, Tamborini CR. 2018. Immigrants’ Earnings Assimilation: Evidence From Longitudinal Earnings Records. *American Sociological Review* 83(4): 686-715
159. Vertovec S, Wessendorf S (eds). 2010. *The Multiculturalism Backlash: European Discourses, Policies and Practices*. London and New York: Routledge
160. Waters MC, Jiménez TR. 2005. “Assessing Immigrant Assimilation: New Empirical and Theoretical Challenges” *Annual Review of Sociology* 31: 105-25
161. Waters MC, Pineau MG (eds). 2015. *The Integration of Immigrants into American Society*. Panel on the Integration of Immigrants into American Society, Committee on Population. Division of Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press

162. White MJ, Glick JE. 2009. *Achieving Anew: How New Immigrants Do in American Schools, Jobs, and Neighborhoods*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation
163. Wilson D, Burgess S, Briggs A. 2011. The dynamics of school attainment of England's ethnic minorities. *Journal of Population Economics* 24: 681-700
164. Wimmer A, Soehl T. 2014. Blocked Acculturation: Cultural Heterodoxy Among Europe's Immigrants. *American Journal of Sociology* 120(1): 146-86
165. Yoshikawa H. 2011. *Immigrants Raising Citizens: Undocumented Parents and Their Children*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation