

In: Ethnic Minorities  
Editor: Ana Pratt

ISBN: 978-1-63484-191-7  
© 2016 Nova Science Publishers, Inc.

*Chapter 2*

**ATTENDANCE OF RELIGIOUS SERVICES  
AMONG MUSLIMS AND CHRISTIANS  
A STUDY ON ETHNIC-RELIGIOUS  
CONCENTRATION AND DIVERSITY EFFECTS**

*Frans van der Slik<sup>1,\*</sup> and Geert Driessen<sup>2,†</sup>*

<sup>1</sup>Department of Linguistics, Radboud University,  
Nijmegen, The Netherlands

<sup>2</sup>TTS, Institute of Applied Social Sciences,  
Radboud University, Nijmegen, The Netherlands

**ABSTRACT**

This study examines the effects of neighborhood level and individual level characteristics on the attendance of religious services among first-generation Muslim immigrants and native Christians in the Netherlands. Using data from the 1999 measurement wave of the national PRIMA cohort study, which includes information on more than 10,000 families in the Netherlands, hypotheses deduced from the social integration thesis were tested. Two neighborhood features were analyzed, namely ethnic-religious concentration, which refers to the share of a certain ethnic-religious group in a neighborhood, and ethnic-religious diversity, which refers to the number of different ethnic-religious groups in a

---

\* E-mail: [f.v.d.slik@let.ru.nl](mailto:f.v.d.slik@let.ru.nl).

† Web: [www.geertdriessen.nl](http://www.geertdriessen.nl), E-mail: [g.driessen@its.ru.nl](mailto:g.driessen@its.ru.nl).

Complimentary Contributor Copy

neighborhood. Multilevel regression analyses pointed to not just different effects for Muslim immigrants and native Christians in general, but also for Turkish and Moroccan Muslims in particular. The analyses indicated that the religious concentration of the neighborhood had a very substantive effect on the church attendance of members of various Protestant denominations, while the impact of a neighborhood's religious concentration of native Catholics and Muslims was less impressive. In addition, religious diversity showed the expected negative effect for Catholics, while a positive effect of religious diversity was found for Moroccan Muslims, but not for Turkish Muslims. The language spoken at home and visiting the country of birth affected the religious participation of Muslims, while religious heterogamy affected the religious participation of Christians.

## INTRODUCTION

Since the second half of the past century, the Netherlands has faced a large influx of non-Western immigrants. In 2014, the largest ethnic minority groups in the Netherlands were of Turkish, Surinamese, Moroccan and Antillean origin, with 396,000, 348,000, 342,000 and 147,000 people, respectively, out of a total Dutch population of 16.8 million (CBS 2015). A vast majority of these immigrants adhere to non-Christian religions such as Islam and Hinduism. According to the latest available estimates in 2008, 825,000 people or about 5 percent of the Dutch population was Muslim (Maliepaard, Gijsberts and Lubbers 2012). Most of them are of Turkish or Moroccan origin; smaller groups originate from Surinam, Afghanistan, Iraq and Somalia. In total, almost half of the non-Western immigrants adhere to Islam. In addition, there are Muslims from Western countries and native Dutch Muslims. The absolute and relative number of Muslims is steadily growing due to (1) the de-churching among the Christian religions; (2) a higher fertility rate as compared to the native-Dutch population; and (3) the influx of asylum-seekers from Muslim countries and continuing family formation immigration. Given these paramount changes in Dutch society, it is quite remarkable that so few Dutch studies have been conducted into the relationship between religion and ethnicity. It is curious as well, because since the terrorist attacks in 2001, Islam has faced a huge amount of – almost exclusively negative – attention by the general public. Only recently, some large-scale studies on ethnic religions have been published in the Netherlands (Becker and De Wit 2000, Entzinger and Dourleijn 2008, De Hoon and Van Tubergen 2014, Maliepaard, Lubbers

and Gijsberts 2012, Maliepaard, Lubbers and Gijsberts 2010, Phalet and Ter Wal 2004, Phalet, Van Lotringen and Entzinger 2000, Van Tubergen 2006, 2007, 2013).

The lack of interest in ethnic religiosity is yet rather noteworthy for another reason. The process of secularization, which has been so typical of the developments within the Christian denominations in Dutch society for the past fifty years, seems to have passed by the Muslim community in the Netherlands almost completely (De Hoon and Van Tubergen 2014, Maliepaard, Gijsberts and Lubbers 2012). So, the lack of attention is regrettable because a variety of conditions that may explain the differences but also similarities between Christians and Muslims regarding the secularization process thus remain unexplored.

In the present study the focus is on the antecedents of religious participation of the two largest Islamic groups in the Netherlands, namely immigrants of Turkish and Moroccan descent, and of four native Christian denominations. The emphasis is primarily on contextual or neighborhood level effects, although some attention is paid to individual level antecedents. Studies which compare simultaneously neighborhood effects on immigrant and native religiosity are virtually non-existent in the Netherlands. We fill up this lacuna by comparing the outcomes for first-generation Muslim immigrants with those for native Dutch Christians.

### **The Dutch Religious Context**

Today, less than half of the native Dutch population consider themselves as being religious, while the religious demand, expressed in the belief that God or a transcendent reality exists, has decreased substantially, too (De Graaf and Te Grotenhuis 2008, Driessen 2007, Schmeets 2014). In addition, less than ten per cent of the native Dutch population now attends religious meetings on a weekly basis. There are clear indications that the process of secularization will continue in the future, since the likelihood that the younger generations are turning to apostasy is still increasing (De Graaf, Need and Ultee 2000, Norris and Inglehart 2004, Storm and Voas 2012, Te Grotenhuis and Scheepers 2001). A reversed trend of unchurched becoming church members can practically be ignored: religious switching has always been a rare phenomenon in the Netherlands (Need and De Graaf 2005). In short, from being one of the most religious West European countries till the 1950s, the Netherlands has in just a few decades turned into one of the most secularized countries in the

world (De Graaf, Need and Ultee 2000, Felling, Peters and Schreuder 1991, Lechner 1996, Norris and Inglehart 2004, Te Grotenhuis and Scheepers 2001).

What happens to immigrants' religiosity when they move from a highly religious country to a highly secular one such as the Netherlands? This question, first raised by Van Tubergen (2007), is of theoretical importance for at least two reasons. On the one hand, according to the "accommodation hypothesis," immigrants tend to adjust to the characteristics of the receiving country (De Vaus 1982, Connor 2008). In the typical Dutch secular context this would imply that immigrants become less religious. On the other hand, the influx of immigrants has resulted in an increase of religious heterogeneity because the number of different religious suppliers (mosques in particular) has risen rather spectacularly. In 2011, the Netherlands had approximately 450 mosques (CMO 2015), a number that is expected to increase in the near future. According to religious market theory (Stark and Iannacone 1994, Warner 1993), this increased supply would enhance competition on the religious market and should therefore result in higher rates of religious involvement, not just among immigrants but among the native Dutch population as well. At present, opinions regarding a possible religious revitalization differ (see Arts 2008, Schnabel, Bijl and De Hart 2008).

### **Dutch Research on Immigrant Religiosity**

Becker, De Hart and Mens (1997) paid attention to the relationship between secularization and Islam in the Netherlands. They argue that a liberalization of Islam due to the influence of the typical Dutch secularized culture might be possible, yet maintain that a significant amount of apostasy is unlikely due to strong social control within the Dutch Muslim communities. Phalet, Van Lotringen and Entzinger (2000) found evidence that regarding their religiosity, young Turkish and Moroccan adults in the Netherlands differ in virtually every respect from young native Dutch adults. In contrast to the majority of young native Dutch adults, they exhibit extremely low rates of apostasy, consider themselves as religious, conform to the rules of their faith to a large extent, and attend religious services frequently. However, despite their higher rates of religiosity, young Moroccan and Turkish adults differ from each other, too.<sup>1</sup> On average, Moroccans score higher on a variety of

---

<sup>1</sup> For the sake of readability we will use the terms "Turks" and "Moroccans" and "Turkish" and "Moroccan" to refer to Dutch citizens of Turkish and Moroccan descent.

religious indices than young Turkish adults do. Also evidence was found that for Moroccans, religious self ascription is declining for younger generations, while it remains constant for Turkish generations. Notwithstanding this, Turkish and Moroccan Muslims do commit themselves firmly to Islam, not just as an expression of personal experience, but as an expression of cultural bounds with their country of origin and as a guiding principle for child rearing. Phalet and Güngör (2004) have noted that the majority of Turks are “lenient Muslims.” They take an individualistic and critical stance towards religious traditions and have chosen a modern interpretation of Islamic faith. This applies to a lesser extent to Moroccan Muslims. The majority of Moroccans are “strict Muslims,” while the remaining part is more lenient in their points of view. At least part of the younger Moroccan generations is more receptive to the influence of Dutch secularized society than are younger generations of Turkish descent (Maliepaard, Lubbers and Gijsberts 2010, Phalet, Van Lotringen and Entzinger 2000).

Research into the relationship between religious participation and ethnicity has been largely neglected (Driessen 2007, Schuh, Burchardt and Wohlrab-Sahr 2012). Until recently, there were, at least in the Netherlands, only a few large-scale samples available which allowed for a detailed analysis of various ethnic groups.

In the present study we make use of the Dutch Primary Education Cohort Study (“PRIMA”) data. This large-scale data base contains detailed information of students and their parents, not just on educational topics but also on parental background characteristics, including ethnicity and attendance of religious services. A possible drawback of secondary data bases might be that they are not well suited for purposes beyond their original scope. We are aware of this, yet want to emphasize that besides key variables on religious affiliation and participation, the main virtue of the database under study is its, at least for the Netherlands, detailed and unprecedented information on the neighborhood level regarding religious affiliation concentration. With the aid of these data we want to answer two main questions: (1) how do native Dutch and immigrants compare in respect of religious affiliation and church/mosque attendance? And (2) how can differences, if any, between these groups be explained? We hope to gain insight into the distribution of religious activities in the Netherlands and the explanation of differences between religious groups.

In our view, the outcomes will lead to a better understanding of the process of secularization among ‘old’ as well as ‘new’ religious groups in Dutch society, both as regards its acceleration and its delay.

## THEORY AND HYPOTHESES

### Social Integration Theory

Durkheim's (1951) social integration theory has been used as a basis for the development of hypotheses about religion (Need and De Graaf 1996, Te Grotenhuis and Scheepers 2001, Scheepers, Te Grotenhuis and Van der Slik 2002, Van Tubergen 2007). The central thesis is that the more individuals are integrated in a social group, the more likely they conform to the group's prevailing norms (Berry 2002). If this indeed is the case, it can be expected that the presence of fellow believers has a positive effect on a variety of religious expressions, such as church or mosque attendance (Ruiter and Van Tubergen 2010, Stark 1994, Need and De Graaf 1996, Van Tubergen 2007, also see Van Ingen and Moor 2015).

Van Tubergen (2007) has identified a variety of social settings that have been proposed in religious socialization research (Kelley and De Graaf 1997, Need and De Graaf 1996, Te Grotenhuis and Scheepers 2001), i.e., the neighborhood that people live in, their family, etcetera. Each of these settings may affect an individual's religion differently and we will test several hypotheses derived from social integration theory.

### Hypotheses on Social Settings

The primary social setting under study is the *neighborhood*. Neighborhoods are typically not made up of representative samples of the entire population. They are found to vary considerably regarding income, employment rates and housing quality (Van der Slik, Driessen and De Bot 2006), while the religious composition of Dutch neighborhoods can differ substantially, too. For historical reasons, the religious landscape of the Netherlands is rather diverse (see Hendrickx 1994). Roman Catholics dominate the southern provinces, though substantial numbers can also be found in the western and central provinces. A variety of orthodox Protestant denominations is concentrated in the central and the south-western provinces, while liberal Protestant denominations are typically found in the western and northern part of the country (Arts 2008). Unchurched are dispersed over all regions in the country, though higher concentrations are found in the larger cities. As a consequence, Protestant neighborhoods are generally more religiously diverse than neighborhoods in Catholic communities.

From the 1970s onwards, increasing numbers of Turkish and Moroccan Muslim immigrants have arrived in the Netherlands, and as in most host countries, they did not settle homogeneously over the country. They typically concentrated in areas based on three considerations (Bartel 1989), i.e., (1) close to ports of entry; (2) where family, friends and former fellow-villagers have migrated to; and (3) near where (mostly low-qualified) jobs were available. The vast majority of the Turkish and Moroccan immigrants in the Netherlands are poorly educated, originate from underdeveloped rural areas, and are concentrated in urban deprived neighborhoods of the Dutch cities. Although the numbers of Turkish and Moroccan immigrants are still slightly increasing, mainly because of the popularity of marrying a spouse from the country of origin, the rise of immigration is flattening out since 2005 as a result of the implementation of considerable stricter admission rules (Sterckx, Dagevos, Huijnk and Van Lisdonk 2014).

A neighborhood's religious composition may have important consequences for the religious commitment of its inhabitants. In areas with large concentrations of members of the own group, social control may be extensive, particularly regarding religious participation, because it concerns visible behavior. In addition, inhabitants may maintain high levels of religious participation in order to preserve their social status in their religious community. This "semi-voluntary thesis" (Ellison and Sherkat 1995) may not just be applicable to tight-knit orthodox Protestant communities. It might pose a plausible explanation for ethnic minority communities, too, in which its inhabitants have kinship bonds, and are partly economically interdependent due to local ethnic entrepreneurship. Conversely, living in a neighborhood inhabited by fewer members of the own religious group implies that people either are exposed to secular norms and values of non-affiliated native Dutch, or that they are exposed to the religious norms of other denominations or religions. Congruent with such a hypothesis, Van Tubergen (2007) found a significant neighborhood effect of non-Western immigrant concentration on immigrants' religious participation. Unfortunately, the data used by Van Tubergen did not allow for making a detailed distinction between concentrations of Muslim and non-Muslim ethnic minority groups. Consequently, the social integration thesis could not be tested adequately. In contrast, the data base used in the present study is suited to make such distinctions. We expect that *the degree of concentration of fellow Muslims in the neighborhood has a strong effect on Muslims' attendance of religious services* (H1a). In addition, it will be explored what the impact is of the concentration of other immigrant groups, both Muslim and non-Muslim.

As opposed to first-generation immigrants, native Dutch church members have been exposed to the secularized Dutch climate their entire life and it has been found that church members adapt to the religious characteristics of the context they live in (Kelley and De Graaf 1997). Hence, we hypothesize that *the degree of concentration of own Christian group members in the neighborhood has a strong effect on Christians' attendance of religious services* (H1b). The effect of the degree of concentration of members of other Christian denominations on religious participation will be explored as well.

Next to religious/ethnic concentration, religious/ethnic diversity might also affect religious participation. According to Putnam's (2007) constrict theory, higher degrees of ethnic heterogeneity result in social anomy or social isolation, at least temporarily. "In colloquial language, people living in ethnically diverse settings appear to 'hunker down'- that is to pull in like a turtle" (Putnam 2007: 149). Concentration and diversity are not the same as sometimes is assumed. While concentration refers to the proportion of group members, ethnic diversity refers to the sheer number of different groups. A neighborhood populated by Turkish Muslims only, is less heterogeneous than a neighborhood inhabited by immigrants originating from many different countries. In line with constrict theory, religious participation will be lower in religiously highly diverse neighborhoods because people living in such neighborhoods are expected to withdraw from social life. We thus hypothesize that *religious diversity is negatively associated with attendance of religious services for both Muslims (H2a) and Christians (H2b)*.

Religious diversity may not just be studied at the meso or neighborhood level, but also at the micro level, i.e., within the family. Although in the present study the primary focus is on contextual effects, a limited number of individual effects will be examined as well. It has been found that religious heterogamy has a "secularizing" effect on church attendance (Hendrickx 1994, Petersen 1986, Williams and Lawler 2001). Although selection effects before marriage are likely to play a role, too, we assume that if spouses are members of different churches, they will decide to attend services less regularly and expand other, joint recreational activities rather than visiting religious services separately. In addition, married to an unchurched spouse may even have a stronger secularizing effect, because in this particular case one lacks the social support or the plausibility structure (Berger 1967) needed to sustain one's religious commitment (Petersen 1986).

Hence, we hypothesize that *for both Muslims (H3a) and Christians (H3b) religiously heterogamous individuals less often attend religious services than religiously homogamous individuals*.

An important aspect of the family setting for immigrants is whether they speak Dutch at home. Immigrants whose home language is Dutch are assumed to be accustomed to Dutch society to a larger degree than immigrants who speak their mother tongue at home. If immigrants speak Dutch at home it may be assumed that they also talk more often to native Dutch in their neighborhood, and probably watch Dutch broadcasting on a regular basis, too. In sum, these immigrants may be expected to be influenced by Dutch culture to a higher degree than immigrants who do not speak Dutch in their homes. We, therefore, hypothesize that *Muslims who speak Dutch in the family attend religious services less often than Muslims who speak their mother tongue in the family* (H4).

Next to these family settings, the role of several immigration related factors can be studied for immigrants. These include: proficiency in Dutch, length of residence, and visiting the country of birth. Immigrants with a poor command of the dominant native language will experience more difficulty in interacting with natives. Hence, they will interact with immigrants from their country of origin more often, who are more religious than native Dutch (Van Tubergen 2007). We, therefore, hypothesize that *the more proficient Muslims are in the Dutch language, the less often they attend religious services* (H5). Length of residence may also have an effect since it is argued that ethnic and religious involvement will weaken over time (Van Tubergen 2007). We, therefore, expect that *length of residence is inversely related to Muslims' religious participation* (H6). As regards visiting their country of origin, we should note that it is not uncommon for Turkish and Moroccan immigrants to undertake such visits during summer holidays. These visits may have a conserving effect on religious participation for at least two reasons. Firstly, staying in close contact with those who stayed behind may perpetuate the prevailing religious practices of the country of origin. Secondly, such visits may reinforce identification with the immigrant's reference group in the country of origin. Hence, we hypothesize that *the more often Muslims visit their country of origin, the more often they attend religious services* (H7).

## METHOD

### Sample

The data we employed stem from the national cohort study Primary Education ("PRIMA"). Within the PRIMA study, students have been traced

since the 1994/95 school year via the administration of various tests and questionnaires once every two years to the students and their parents, teachers and head teachers. A total of about 60,000 students from kindergarten, grade 2, grade 4 and grade 6 from 600 primary schools, or 9 per cent of all Dutch elementary schools, have been involved. For the present chapter, use is made of the data from the third PRIMA measurement wave during the school year 1998/99 (Driessen, Van Langen and Vierke 2000). The PRIMA sample is characterized by an overrepresentation of schools with students from disadvantaged social–ethnic backgrounds. This was intentionally done to guarantee inclusion of enough members from ethnic smaller groups in the sample and to grasp the typical situation of schools with high concentrations of ethnic minority students. For the present study, the analyses were not aimed at the students but at the parents of children in kindergarten. The sample thus contains data from 554 schools and a total of 10,680 parents. We used these elementary schools as proxies for the neighborhoods parents and their children live in. The justification for this lies in the fact that, although school choice in principle is unrestricted in the Netherlands, most students attend elementary schools in the direct proximity of their homes (Denessen, Driessen and Slegers 2005). Bussing programs for children from deprived families, for example, that would complicate the interpretation of school effects as neighborhood effects, are absent in the Netherlands.

### **Questionnaire**

In the parents' questionnaire, in addition to religious variables, information was asked about their social and ethnic background and a variety of participation and integration characteristics. We made use of the information on the fathers, and in case this information was unavailable (single parent families) we used the data on the mothers. We employed the fathers' data as the primary input, because the data on the mothers might be difficult to interpret in case mothers are Muslims. The position of Muslim women differs a priori from the position of Muslim men, and this is certainly the case regarding attendance of mosque services, because women are not required to attend mosque services. For this reason, the inclusion of gender by definition leads to results that are difficult to interpret in such analyses (see Dekker and Keuzenkamp 2006, Sullins 2006).

The response rate on the questionnaire was 73 per cent. Despite that the questionnaire was accompanied by an instruction in Turkish and Arabic, a

disproportionate part of lower educated immigrant parents did not participate in the survey. Elsewhere it has been shown, however, that, as a result of overrepresentation of parents from deprived families in the total sample at the one hand, and underrepresentation of parents with these kinds of characteristics that completed the questionnaire at the other hand, the final sample tends to representativity with regard to social and ethnic background (Driessen and Doesborgh 2003). This, of course, does not imply that those immigrant parents who have responded are a random sample with regard to other characteristics as well. Regrettably, the data are restricted in the sense that all participants were parents and also that they had at least one child enrolled in primary school. Such restrictions may incorporate the risk of finding outcomes not completely in line with those for the entire population. These limitations would not have been encountered if a large representative sample could have been analyzed. At present, such a data base does not exist for the Netherlands. Missing data have been imputed by means of average scores.

## Variables

The variables of central interest are religious affiliation, religious participation and ethnicity. In addition, we have constructed a number of indicators that will be used to test which factors affect religious participation. We provide an overview of the operationalization of these indicators below.

*Religious affiliation* was identified on the basis of the answer on the one-stage question: “Which church, denomination, or group with a particular philosophy of life, do you consider yourself to be a member of?” Answer categories were: (1) none, (2) Roman-Catholic, (3) Reformed Protestant, (4) Re-reformed Protestant, (5) Christian,<sup>2</sup> (6) Islamic, (7) Hinduism, (8) other.

*Ethnicity* was based on the country of birth: (1) the Netherlands (native Dutch), (2) Antillean, (3) Surinamese, (4) Turkish, (5) Moroccan, (6) other immigrant.

The dependent variable *religious participation* was measured by means of frequency of attendance of religious services, for example in a church,

---

<sup>2</sup> In the questionnaire the term “Christian” was used to identify persons who consider themselves Christian in a general sense, i.e., not being a member of a specific church or denomination (Catholic or Protestant). No answer category was available for other Protestant churches than Reformed and Re-reformed despite that a large variety of other Protestant churches exist in the Netherlands.

synagogue or mosque: (1) (almost) never, (2) several times a year, (3) one till three times a month, (4) at least once a week. We recoded these answer categories into estimated attendances per year, with scores of 1, 3, 24, and 60 respectively. The advantage of this procedure is that religious participation can be considered as an interval scale which can be analyzed with conventional linear regression procedures. However, the transformation is based on only four categories and the distribution proved to be non-normal. Therefore, religious participation can also be treated as an ordinal variable, in which case an ordered logit regression procedure is more appropriate. We conducted such analyses but because the outcomes of these analyses were virtually identical to those of the conventional linear regression analyses and are more difficult to interpret we present only the latter.<sup>3</sup>

*Religious concentration.* We have information of parental religious background. In order to get an indication of the religious make-up of the neighborhood where the parents reside, their religious background was aggregated using data of their children's classmates' parents. A neighborhood's religious concentration is expressed as *percentages of religiously affiliated or religiously non-affiliated*. We have constructed the following measures: percentage native Dutch non-affiliated; percentage native Dutch Catholics; percentage native Dutch Reformed Protestants; percentage native Dutch Re-reformed Protestants; percentage native Dutch other Christians; percentage Turkish Muslims; percentage Moroccan Muslims; percentage other immigrant Muslims; percentage immigrant non-Muslims (of Surinamese or Antillean descent in particular).<sup>4</sup>

*Religious diversity.* The indicator for parental religiosity was also used to express the number of different religious groups in a neighborhood, corrected for their size. A Herfindahl index was calculated as a measure for religious heterogeneity. The index is defined as  $1 - ((p_{\text{group } 1})^2 + (p_{\text{group } 2})^2 + (p_{\text{group } 3})^2 + \dots + (p_{\text{group } n})^2)$ . The nine religious groups listed above were included. In case of nine groups the religious diversity measure can range from 0 to 0.89. A value of 0 implies no diversity at all, i.e., the neighborhood is inhabited by members of one religious group only, whereas 0.89 implies that in that

<sup>3</sup> Results of the ordered logit analyses can be obtained from the first author.

<sup>4</sup> These variables have dummy-like characteristics, i.e., they are practically mutually dependent. If, for example, a neighborhood is inhabited by 50 per cent Protestants and 30 per cent Catholics, then the percentage of Muslims and unchurched can never exceed 20 per cent. For this reason, the variables cannot be analyzed simultaneously and we made selections of what we considered to be theoretically relevant.

particular neighborhood, members of all nine religious groups are present in equal proportions.

*Family setting.* Two indicators were available that pertain to the family setting. We have constructed two types of *religious heterogamy*. Either the father was married to a non-affiliated wife, or the father was married to a wife who was affiliated to another denomination or religion. The reference category included fathers who were religious homogamous.<sup>5</sup> *Home language* involved the language parents usually speak to each other: (1) Dutch, Dutch dialect, or Frisian, or (0) a foreign language.

*Immigration related factors.* *Command of Dutch* was measured as the average self-assessment regarding the modalities speaking, understanding, reading and writing: (1) not at all to poor, (2) reasonably well, (3) good to excellent. *Length of residence* in the Netherlands: (1) up to 5 years, (2) 5 – 9 years, (3) 10 – 14 years, (4) 15 – 19 years, (5) 20 – 24 years, (6) 25 years or more (but not always), or (7) entire life. *Frequency of visiting country of birth* during the past 5 years: (1) never or once, (2) twice, (3) three times, (4) four times, or (5) five times or more.

## RESULTS

### Religiosity and Ethnicity

In Table 1, we provide the distributions of religious affiliation broken down by ethnicity. It can be seen in Table 1 that more than 30 per cent of the respondents were non-affiliated, 30 per cent were Roman-Catholic, more than 13 per cent were Reformed or Re-reformed Protestants, and 18 per cent were Muslim. Large differences regarding non-affiliation were found between the ethnic groups. Almost 40 per cent of the native Dutch were non-affiliated, whereas only 1 per cent of the Turks and Moroccans indicated that they were non-affiliated. Turks and Moroccans are Muslim almost without exception. Within the total sample, Islam with 18.4 per cent is the second largest community, whereas the Catholic community with 30.5 per cent of the sample is the largest.

---

<sup>5</sup> In case mothers were unavailable (divorced, deceased), the father's answer was used. In addition, we constructed a dummy variable, measuring as to whether the mother was present or not. Exploratory analyses revealed that the effect of this "mother not present" variable was not significant in either of the analyses. So we decided not to include it in the final analyses.

Table 1. Religious affiliation by ethnicity (percentages)

Ethnicity	Church membership								Total ( <i>n</i> = 100%)
	Non-affiliated	Catholic	Reformed Protestant	Re-reformed Protestant	Other Christian	Muslim	Hindu	Other	
Native Dutch	39.0	37.3	10.9	6.5	4.0	0.7	0.0	1.5	7,797
Antillean	13.6	63.2	3.2	0.8	12.8	3.2	0.0	3.2	125
Surinamese	4.6	22.2	5.2	0.0	7.8	17.0	39.9	3.3	306
Turkish	0.8	1.1	0.1	0.0	2.2	95.0	0.2	0.7	920
Moroccan	1.0	2.3	0.0	0.0	0.3	96.3	0.0	0.1	731
Other	19.6	21.5	1.1	0.9	11.7	35.0	2.6	7.6	801
Total	30.3	30.5	8.2	4.9	4.4	18.4	1.4	1.9	10,680

Complimentary Contributor Copy

In Table 2, we present attendance of religious services in average times a year, broken down by affiliation and ethnicity. Numerical considerations did allow us to make a distinction only between the total group attendees and the largest ethnic groups for each religious group.

Table 2 shows that Re-reformed attended religious services most often, followed by Muslims and other Christians. Catholics seldom attended church services which is consistent with previous Dutch findings. In fact, their average number of attendances per year was only somewhat higher than the average attendance of the non-affiliated Dutch. Moroccan Muslims visited mosque services more often than Turkish Muslims.

Table 3 provides the distribution of members of various religious communities within neighborhoods in terms of percentages. The data reveal that neighborhoods varied considerably regarding their religious composition. An average neighborhood was inhabited for the most part by Catholics and non-affiliated native Dutch, but, as can be seen in Table 3, some neighborhoods were strongly populated by other religious communities.

**Table 2. Attendance of religious services by denomination and ethnicity (mean times per year)**

Denomination	Ethnicity	Mean	SD	n
Non-affiliated	Total	1.7	4.9	3241
	Dutch	1.6	4.5	3029
Catholic	Total	6.3	11.5	3257
	Dutch	5.8	10.5	2911
Reformed Protestant	Total	16.5	22.1	881
	Dutch	16.7	22.3	851
Re-reformed Protestant	Total	36.9	25.0	518
	Dutch	37.1	25.0	510
Other Christian	Total	29.3	27.0	469
	Dutch	30.2	27.4	313
Islam	Total	31.5	26.2	1969
	Turkish	31.7	25.7	874
	Moroccan	38.3	25.8	703
Hindu	Total	8.9	16.2	146
Other	Total	22.0	26.1	19.9

**Table 3. Ethnic Religious concentration and diversity of neighborhoods  
(n = 554)**

	<b>Range</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>
% Turkish Muslims	0 – 85	8.8	16.0
% Moroccan Muslims	0 – 100	7.3	14.5
% Other immigrant Muslims	0 – 50	3.5	7.7
% Other immigrant non-Muslims	0 – 100	10.6	14.4
% Non-affiliated	0 – 100	29.0	25.2
% Catholics	0 – 100	23.9	28.2
% Reformed Protestants	0 – 83	9.0	15.7
% Re-reformed Protestants	0 – 93	4.8	12.3
% Other Christians	0 – 50	3.1	7.0
Religious diversity (Herfindahl index)	0 – 0.83	0.56	0.19

Religious diversity ranged from 0 to 0.83, with an average of 0.56 ( $SD = 0.19$ ). Given that maximum diversity occurs in case of a score of 0.89, this shows that a neighborhood's religious heterogeneity may vary substantially.

To check for potential problems of multicollinearity in the forthcoming analyses, we present the correlations between the religious composition measures in Table 4. Although these correlations are, with a few exceptions significant, the overlap between them never exceeds 15 per cent, implying that the risk of impeding multicollinearity can be ignored.

### **Hypotheses Tested**

Some of our hypotheses can be tested for immigrants only because the characteristics they refer to are exclusively associated with (the consequences of) immigration. Other, more general hypotheses can also be tested for the native Dutch population.

**Table 4. Correlations between neighborhood measures of ethnic religious concentration and diversity ( $n = 554$ )**

	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1% Turkish Muslims	.31	.20	.06 <sup>#</sup>	-.31	-.26	-.27	-.20	-.16	.22
2% Moroccan Muslims		.25	.07 <sup>#</sup>	-.33	-.24	-.26	-.19	-.16	.16
3% Other immigrant Muslims			.21	-.20	-.22	-.22	-.15	-.13	.23
4% Other immigrants non-Muslims				-.22	-.22	-.22	-.16	-.10 <sup>#</sup>	.15
5% Non-affiliated					-.30	-.03 <sup>#</sup>	-.13	-.04 <sup>#</sup>	-.15
6% Catholics						-.25	-.22	-.21	-.38
7% Reformed							.29	.23	.16
8% Re-reformed								.30	.08 <sup>#</sup>
9% Other Christians									.20
10 Religious diversity									

All  $p$ 's < 0.01 except #.

Complimentary Contributor Copy

**Table 5. Parameters of multi-level models for attendance of religious services of Turkish and Moroccan Muslims**

	Turkish Muslims ( <i>n</i> = 874)		Moroccan Muslims ( <i>n</i> = 704)	
	B	SE	B	SE
<i>Family setting</i>				
Religious homogeneity	Reference			
- Spouse different church	-2.03	9.58	-20.11	11.35
- Spouse unchurched	-14.75	14.70	-10.33	8.78
Home language	-14.08**	4.11	-10.14**	3.19
Proficiency in Dutch	0.33	1.58	1.32	1.67
Length of residence	-0.77	0.67	0.65	0.68
Visiting country of birth	-0.41	0.65	2.33**	0.74
<i>Neighborhood setting</i>				
% Turkish Muslims	20.62***	6.24	-10.09	5.98
% Moroccan Muslims	24.73***	6.57	25.30***	6.22
% Other immigrant Muslims	30.22**	12.10	21.26*	10.80
% Other immigrant non-Muslims	14.22	8.70	-15.51	8.84
Religious diversity	1.17	9.67	25.32**	9.55
Intercept	19.66*	8.70	5.29	8.72
<i>Explained variance as compared to null model:</i>				
Individual level	8.5%		9.5%	
Neighborhood level	35.7%		34.2%	

\*  $p < 0.05$ ; \*\*  $p < 0.01$ ; \*\*\*  $p < 0.001$ .

Because we had variables at the individual level at our disposal as well as at the neighborhood level, we made use of multilevel analysis (statistical package MLwiN 2.18).<sup>8</sup>

In Table 5, we present the research outcomes regarding the religious attendance of Moroccan and Turkish Muslims. Before performing our central analyses, we checked which part of the variance in religious participation is accounted for by neighborhood factors. For Moroccan Muslims, this is 8 per

<sup>8</sup> In order to calculate the explained variances for the various models, we followed the procedures advocated by Snijders and Bosker (1999: 99-105), which take neighborhood size into account.

cent, and for Turkish Muslims this is twice that amount, namely 16 per cent. These variance components are, though quite common, not very substantial and indicate that the religious participation of Dutch Muslims can only to a some extent be attributed to the influence of the secularized climate of Dutch society. Nevertheless, some remarkable differences between Turkish and Moroccan Muslims can be observed. Mosque attendance of Turkish Muslims appeared to increase when the percentage Muslims in the neighborhood increased. It does not matter whether these Muslims were of the own ethnic group or of other groups (Moroccan or other immigrant Muslims). For Moroccan Muslims, however, the presence of more Turkish Muslims in the neighborhood did not increase the likelihood of visiting the mosque more often, since the effect of the concentration of Turkish Muslims in the neighborhood was not significant. Apparently, in Dutch neighborhoods, Turkish and Moroccan Muslims react differently to each other's presence, and, thus, it makes sense to differentiate between them in empirical research. Another interesting finding was that the presence of other immigrant non-Muslims in the neighborhood had no effect on the religious participation of Turkish and Moroccan Muslims. The fact that a neighborhood is inhabited by a variety of immigrant groups is apparently not of importance for mosque attendance, but rather the fact that the neighborhood is inhabited by groups with a similar religious tradition. These outcomes thus qualify the results of Van Tubergen's (2007) study who found that concentration of immigrants affects mosque attendance. It has to be emphasized, however, that the effect of the presence or absence of Muslims in the immediate neighborhood on mosque attendance is rather small. *Hypothesis H1a* appears thus to be confirmed only partially for Dutch Muslims. Quite remarkably, and in clear contradiction with *hypothesis 2a*, religious diversity has a positive rather than a negative effect on mosque attendance of Moroccan Muslims. The more religious diverse a neighborhood is, the more Moroccans visit a mosque. As already noted, 16 per cent of the variance of mosque attendance by Turkish Muslims is accounted for by neighborhood factors. Of this 16 per cent, 35.7 per cent can be explained by the presence of fellow believers. So, in total almost 6 per cent ( $=35.7\% \times 0.16$ ) of the variation in mosque attendance of Turkish Muslims can be explained by the presence or absence of fellow believers in the neighborhood. For Moroccan Muslims this percentage is even smaller: 3 per cent ( $=34.2\% \times 0.08$ ).

Although in the predicted direction, *Hypothesis 3a* that pertains to religious heterogamy was rejected, because the effects of religious heterogamy were not significant. It has to be noted however, that the likelihood of finding

significant effects was rather small. Explorative analyses revealed that Dutch Muslims marry almost without exception within the own religious group. *Hypothesis H4* was supported. Turkish and Moroccan Muslims who speak Dutch at home less often attend religious services more.

As far as the immigration related factors are concerned, only the hypothesis with respect to visiting the country of birth (*H7*) was supported for Moroccan Muslims. The more frequent they visit their country of birth, the more often they attend mosque services. Both proficiency in Dutch (*H5*) and length of residence (*H6*) were unrelated to religious participation.

Table 6 shows the results of the analyses for the native Dutch, broken down for the largest Christian communities in the Netherlands. Again, before performing the final analyses, we checked which part of the variance in religious participation was accounted for by social context factors. For Catholics we found this to be 16 per cent, for Reformed Protestants this was 30 per cent, for Re-reformed Protestants 56 per cent and for other Christians 45 per cent. For Re-reformed Protestants and other Christians in particular, these are substantial percentages, indicating that religious participation depends by no means solely on individual characteristics. These outcomes are also remarkable when one keeps in mind that Catholicism has been characterized as a collectivist religion, while Protestantism generally is seen as an individualistic faith (cf. Greeley, 1989). The religious concentration hypothesis (*H1b*) was supported for all Christian groups except for Catholics. A high concentration of fellow-believers in the immediate proximity had a strong positive effect on individual religious participation, while, conversely, a high concentration of non-affiliated was associated with less frequent church attendance. It is of particular relevance that the presence of larger numbers of Re-reformed Protestants and other Christians – but not of Catholics and Reformed Protestants – increased the likelihood of attending church services not just for the own but for all denominations, because their presence exhibited the highest levels of religious participation. Interestingly, the neighborhood setting hypothesis was rejected for Catholics, because higher concentrations of Catholics in the neighborhood did not result in increased church attendance. On the other hand, and quite remarkably, the religious diversity hypothesis (*H2b*) was only supported for Catholics, implying that the more diverse a neighborhood's religious make-up is, the less likely it is that Catholics attended church.<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> Initially, the presence of fellow believers had a significant effect for Catholics, too, but this effect was explained away when religious diversity was included in the model.

**Table 6. Parameters of multi-level models for attendance of religious services of native Dutch Catholics, Reformed and Re-reformed Protestants, and Other Christians**

	Native Dutch											
	Catholic (n = 2,911)			Reformed Protestant (n = 851)			Re-reformed Protestant (n = 510)			Other Christian (n = 313)		
	B	SE		B	SE		B	SE		B	SE	
<i>Family setting</i>												
Religious homogamy												
- Spouse different church	-2.06**	0.82		-6.85***	1.93		-13.26***	3.23		-18.03***	6.39	
- Spouse unchurched	-3.26***	0.82		-10.27***	3.05		-16.67***	4.30		-19.01**	6.36	
<i>Neighborhood setting</i>												
% Catholics	0.61	1.68		10.11	5.20		7.68	8.57		6.09	9.37	
% Reformed	1.54	3.22		23.29***	5.11		19.50**	7.46		9.12	8.00	
% Re-reformed	35.43***	4.75		33.93***	7.09		41.01***	7.38		56.66***	8.26	
% Other Christians	25.82***	7.86		51.75***	12.23		72.38***	16.84		61.71***	14.73	
Religious diversity	-9.24***	2.29		-0.12	7.67		-6.27	10.56		4.70	12.13	
Intercept	9.33***	1.95		2.24	5.58		16.87*	7.65		8.32	9.09	
<i>Explained variance as compared to null model:</i>												
Individual level	8.0%			18.3%			38.9%			32.3%		
Neighborhood level	33.3%			46.7%			66.6%			77.4%		

\* $p < 0.05$ ; \*\* $p < 0.01$ ; \*\*\* $p < 0.001$ .

Complimentary Contributor Copy

We already noted that about half of the variation in church attendance of Re-reformed and other Christians was accounted for by neighborhood factors. For the Re-reformed it was found that 37 per cent ( $=66.6\% \times 0.56$ ) can be attributed to the proportion of Re-reformed Protestants and other Christians in the neighborhood.

The larger the share of people belonging to these two denominations in the immediate living environment, the more often people attended church services. For the other Christians the outcomes allow the conclusion that 35 per cent ( $=77.4\% \times 0.45$ ) of the variation in church attendance of other Christians can be explained by the proportion of Re-reformed and other Christians in the neighborhood.

Conversely, the larger the share of non-affiliated and the share of members of other denominations in the neighborhood, the less frequent their religious participation is (cf. note 4).

Church attendance cannot be explained very well by making use of the data available at the individual level. For example, no more than 17 per cent ( $=38.9\% \times 0.44$ ) of the variation in church attendance for Re-reformed Protestants was explained. It is quite striking that for Catholics it was not the presence of other Catholics in the neighborhood had an effect on individual church attendance, but rather the presence of higher concentrations of Re-reformed Protestants and other Christians. A similar observation can be made for Reformed Protestants: in addition to the presence of church members of their own church, it appears that the presence of Re-reformed and other Christians (but not Catholics) is important for explaining their church attendance. Apparently, the presence of these Christians is a stimulus for members of all denominations to attend church services more often. The variation in church attendance of Catholics, however, can be explained less well by means of the presence of church members in the neighborhood: 5 per cent ( $=33.3\% \times 0.16$ ). Finally, *Hypothesis H3b* on religious heterogamy was supported for all Christian denominations. Being married to a non-affiliated spouse or a spouse who is a member of another church affects religious participation negatively.

## CONCLUSION

One of the main findings of the present study was that the strength of neighborhood effects, i.e., the presence or absence of members of one's own religious group in predicting religious participation, varied strongly between

Complimentary Contributor Copy

religious groups. They were hardly of any relevance for Muslims and Catholics, while they were of major importance for various Protestant denominations.

Muslims living in a neighborhood with low concentrations of Muslims exhibit virtually equally high levels of religious participation as Muslims living in neighborhoods with high concentrations of Muslims. Potential explanations for these unanticipated results might be the following. Immigrants, religiously socialized in their country of origin, where high levels of religious participation are the norm (Van Tubergen 2007), may be relatively immune against the secularizing influences of the host country for at least two reasons. First, immigrants may be less affected by their current social context because they identify themselves with a reference group (see Hyman and Singer 1968), not necessarily present in their immediate proximity (Merton 1968). Identification with a distant reference group may be particularly salient in case immigrants are faced with various forms of discrimination in the host country, but is also more easily to maintain when, like in the Netherlands, satellite TV and internet is commonly available. Moreover, for young Muslims virtual communities on social media like Facebook or Twitter may become as important as their physical environment (cf. Thompson 2011). Another explanation for the relative immunity of immigrants against the secularizing effect of Dutch society may be the high rates of marrying a spouse from the country or even village of birth (Hooghiemstra 2003). Socialized in a highly religious country, these imported brides and grooms may form an effective barrier against the secularizing effects of Dutch society on their spouses' religious participation.

For Reformed and Re-reformed Protestants and other Christians, neighborhood effects were of much greater importance in explaining the variance in church attendance than for Muslims. For each of the three Christian groups, the presence or absence of members of one's own group in the neighborhood is important for the explanation of individual church attendance. This might be considered as evidence for integration in, and confirmation of the own religious community, but only in as far as own group members live in their immediate proximity. The frequency of church attendance is much lower if Re-reformed Protestants and other Christians reside with other unchurched Dutch. In addition, for all Christians, including Catholics, a strong effect of the presence of frequently participating Re-reformed Protestants and other Christians was observed.

For Catholics, neighborhood effects were found to be only very limited, comparable to the strength of neighborhood effects for Moroccan and Turkish

Muslims. In terms of conforming to religious behaviors like attending religious services, the Catholic community in the Netherlands is – as we have seen – one of the most secularized ones, whereas the Muslim and Protestant communities appear to be the least secularized ones. So, it seems that for Dutch Catholics the relative absence of neighborhood effects exemplifies in just another way that its community's ties are weakening, at least with respect to church attendance.

One might raise objections against our decision to study neighborhood effects of Muslim immigrants and native Christians simultaneously. Remember however that a main focus of our study was on factors that may accelerate or delay the widespread secularization in Dutch society. Our line of reasoning is that if neighborhood effects constitute such a factor, one wants to get the bigger picture.

The remaining hypotheses received partial support. In some cases the outcomes were not statistically significant while in others the findings were contrary to the expectations. The hypotheses regarding religious heterogamy were supported for Christians only, while the religious diversity hypothesis was only confirmed for Catholics. For Moroccan Muslims we found a difficult to explain positive effect of religious diversity: the more religious diverse their neighborhood is, the more Moroccan Muslims visit mosques.

Some issues have to be raised that might offer an explanation for the outcomes of this study. Regarding the question on religious affiliation it is not entirely clear how people have interpreted the answer category "other Christian." This category was intended to provide a possibility for non-affiliated Dutch who nevertheless consider themselves Christian. But given their high visibility in the neighborhood at the one hand, and their high rates of church attendance at the other, it seems not unlikely that this category was rather popular among church members of small orthodox Protestant churches who are reluctant to consider themselves as members of the mainstream Protestant denominations, as well. In future research a less ambiguous mode of questioning would be preferable. Secondly, based on a literature review, we have formulated a number of hypotheses in terms of causal effects. Perhaps this does not have to be correct in all cases. For example, the observed relation between neighborhood composition and religious participation might be the result of selection effects. Religiously active church members might prefer to live in neighborhoods with high concentrations of members of their own religious group. Elsewhere, however, it has been documented that residential choice is determined more strongly by other factors, such as income and housing quality (Bartel 1989, Van Tubergen 2007). Thirdly, objections can be

raised against the way religious participation has been operationalized. This has been done rather crudely. Based on the answers of the respondents, the number of religious services people attend to in a year has been estimated. In order to check the consequences of the estimation procedure, we also used ordered logit analyses. The outcomes were similar to those reported here. Other forms of religious participation, like praying, or being involved in charity activities might, however, be studied as well. Unfortunately, these measures were unavailable. Fourthly, and finally, religious beliefs and religious attitudes or orientations were not included in this study, though it is commonly known that these expressions of individual faith are strongly correlated with church attendance. We would agree that this is an omission, but on the other hand the present study has made it evident once again that a social-psychological inspired attitude-behavior model is insufficient to explain individual behavior. Whether people visit religious meetings depends in various degrees on the religious composition of their neighborhood. It thus has become clear that this variety in context effects for Protestants, Catholics and Muslims may affect the process of secularization in different ways for these religious groups. Moreover, this study has uncovered one of the secularization mechanisms that has not been studied adequately in the past: the degree to which neighborhood effects occur, signals the sensitivity of religious groups to the process of secularization. The questions that now arise are the following. Are neighborhood effects on religious involvement going to increase for Dutch Muslim communities in the near future now the number of wedding partners originating from the country of birth are decreasing? And second, can social media become as important or even take over the role the neighborhood in the near future?

## REFERENCES

- Arts, K. (2008). Ontwikkelingen in kerkelijkheid en kerkbezoek (1999-2008). In H. Schmeets and R. van der Bie (Eds.), *Religie aan het begin van de 21ste eeuw* (pp. 41-46). Den Haag: CBS.
- Bartel, A. (1989). Where do the new immigrants live? *Journal of Labor Economics*, 7, 371-391.
- Becker, J., De Hart, J. and Mens, J. (1997). *Secularisatie en alternatieve zingeving in Nederland*. Den Haag: SCP.

- Becker, J., and De Wit, J. (2000). *Secularisatie in de jaren negentig. Kerklidmaatschap, veranderingen in opvattingen en een prognose*. Den Haag: SCP.
- Berger, P. (1967). *The sacred canopy*. New York: Doubleday.
- Berry, J. (2002). Conceptual approaches to acculturation. In K. Chun, P. Organista and G. Marin (Eds.). *Acculturation: Advances in theory, measurement and applied research* (pp. 17-37). Washington, DC: APA.
- CBS (2015). *Bevolking*. Available at [www.statline.nl](http://www.statline.nl). Accessed May, 28 2015.
- CMO (2015). *Moskeeën in Nederland*. Available at <http://www.cmo.nl/islam-nl/index.php/islam-in-nl/moskeeen>. Accessed May, 28, 2015.
- Connor, P. (2008). Increase or decrease? The impact of the international migratory event on immigrant religious participation. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 47, 243-257.
- De Graaf, N. D., and Te Grotenhuis, M. (2008). Traditional Christian and belief in the supernatural: Diverging trends in the Netherlands between 1979 and 2005? *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 47, 585-598.
- De Graaf, N. D., Need, A., and Ultee, W. (2000). Levensloop en kerkverlating: Een nieuwe en overkoepelende verklaring voor enkele empirische regelmatigheden. *Mens and Maatschappij*, 75, 229-257.
- De Hoon, S., and 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, 194-206.
- De Vaus, D. (1982). The impact of geographical mobility on adolescent religious orientation: An Australian study. *Review of Religious Research*, 23(4), 391-403.
- Dekker, P., and Keuzenkamp, S. (2006). Maatschappelijke participatie. In S. Keuzenkamp and A. Merens (Eds.), *Sociale atlas van vrouwen uit etnische minderheden* (pp. 211-233). Den Haag: SCP.
- Denessen, E., Driessen, G., and Slegers, P. (2005). Segregation by choice? A study of group-specific reasons for school choice. *Journal of Education Policy*, 20, 347-368.
- Driessen, G. (2007). Trends in religious affiliation of parents of primary school children in the Netherlands in the period 1995-2005. Exploration of correlation with sex, ethnicity and socio-economic background. *Journal of Empirical Theology*, 20, 232-249.

- Driessen, G., and Doesborgh, J. (2003). Voor- en Vroegschoolse Educatie en cognitieve en niet-cognitieve competenties van jonge kinderen. Nijmegen: ITS.
- Driessen, G., Van Langen, A., and Vierke, H. (2000). Basisonderwijs: Veldwerkverslag, Leerlinggegevens en oudervragenlijsten. Basisrapportage PRIMA-cohortonderzoek. Derde meting 1998/99, Nijmegen: ITS.
- Durkheim, E. (1951). *Le Suicide*. New York: Free Press.
- Ellison, C., and Sherkat, D. (1995). The “semi-involuntary institution” revisited: Regional variations in church participation among Black Americans. *Social Forces*, 75, 1415-1437.
- Entzinger, H., and Dourleijn, E. (2008). De lat steeds hoger: De leefwereld van jongeren in een multi-etnische stad. Assen: Van Gorcum.
- Felling, A., Peters, J., and Schreuder, O. (1991). Dutch religion. The religious consciousness of the Netherlands after the cultural revolution. Nijmegen: ITS.
- Greeley, A. (1989). Protestant and Catholic: Is the analogical imagination extinct? *American Sociological Review*, 54, 485-502.
- Hendrickx, J. (1994). The analysis of religious assortative marriage. An application of design techniques for categorical models. Nijmegen: KUN.
- Hooghiemstra, E. (2003). Trouwen over de grens. Achtergronden van partnerkeuze van Turken en Marokkanen in Nederland. Den Haag: SCP.
- Hyman, H., and Singer, E. (Eds.) (1968). Readings in reference group theory and research. New York: Free Press.
- Kelley, J., and De Graaf, N. D. (1997). National context, parental socialization, and religious belief: Results from 15 nations. *American Sociological Review*, 62, 639-659.
- Lechner, F. (1996). Secularization in the Netherlands? *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 35, 252-264.
- Maliepaard, M., Lubbers, M., and Gijsberts, M. (2010). Generational differences in ethnic and religious attachment and their interrelation. A study among Muslim minorities in the Netherlands. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 33, 451-472.
- Maliepaard, M., Gijsberts, M., and Lubbers, M. (2012). Reaching the limits of secularization? Turkish- and Moroccan-Dutch Muslims in the Netherlands 1998-2006. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 51, 359-367.
- Merton, R. (1968). *Social theory and social structure*. New York: Free Press.

- Need, A., and De Graaf, N. D. (1996). Losing my religion: A dynamic analysis of leaving the church in the Netherlands. *European Sociological Review*, 12, 87-99.
- Need, A., and De Graaf, N. D. (2005). Zich bekeren en wisselen van kerkgenootschap. *Mens and Maatschappij*, 80, 288-304.
- Norris, P., and Inglehart, R. (2004). Sacred and secular. Religion and politics worldwide. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Petersen, L. (1986). Interfaith marriage and religious commitment among Catholics. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 48, 725-735.
- Phalet, K., and Güngör, D. (2004). Moslim in Nederland. Religieuze dimensies, Etnische relaties en burgerschap: Turken en Marokkanen in Rotterdam. Den Haag: SCP.
- Phalet, K., and Ter Wal, J. (2004). Moslim in Nederland. Den Haag: SCP.
- Phalet, K., Van Lotringen, C., and Entzinger, H. (2000). Islam in de multiculturele samenleving: Opvattingen van jongeren in Rotterdam. Utrecht: Universiteit van Utrecht, European Research Centre on Migration and Ethnic Relations.
- Putnam, R. (2007). E Pluribus Unum: Diversity and Community in the Twenty-first Century. *Scandinavian Political Studies*, 30, 137-174.
- Ruiter, S., and Van Tubergen, F. (2010). Religious attendance in cross-national perspective: A multilevel analysis of 60 countries. *American Journal of Sociology* 115, 863-895.
- Scheepers, P., Te Grotenhuis, M., and Van der Slik, F. (2002). Education, religiosity and moral attitudes: Explaining cross-national effect differences. *Sociology of Religion*, 63, 157-176.
- Schmeets, H. (2014). De religieuze kaart van Nederland, 2010-2013. Den Haag: CBS.
- Schnabel, P., Bijl, R., and De Hart, J. (Eds.) (2008). Betrekkelijke betrokkenheid. Den Haag: SCP.
- Schuh, C., Burchardt, M., and Wohlrab-Sahr, M. (2012). Contested secularities: Religious minorities and secular progressivism in the Netherlands. *Journal of Religion in Europe*, 5, 349-383.
- Snijders, T., and Bosker, R. (1999). Multilevel analysis. An introduction to basic and advanced multilevel modeling. London/ Thousand Oaks/ New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- Stark, R. (1994). *Sociology*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Stark, R., and Iannaccone, L. (1995). A supply-side reinterpretation of the "secularization" of Europe. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 33, 230-252.

- Sterckx, I., Dagevos, J., Huijnk, W., and Van Lisdonk, J. (2014). Huwelijksmigratie in Nederland. Achtergronden en leefsituatie van huwelijksmigranten. Den Haag: SCP.
- Storm, I., and Voas, D. (2012). The intergenerational transmission of religious service attendance. *Nordic Journal of Religion and Society*, 25, 131-150.
- Sullins, D. (2006). Gender and religion: Deconstructing universality, Constructing complexity. *American Journal of Sociology*, 112, 838-880.
- Te Grotenhuis, M., and Scheepers, P. (2001). Churches in Dutch: Causes of religious disaffiliation in the Netherlands, 1937-1995. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 40, 591-606.
- Thompson, R. (2011). Radicalization and the use of social media. *Journal of Strategic Security*, 4, 167-190.
- Van der Slik, F., Driessen, G., and De Bot, K. (2006). Ethnic and socioeconomic class composition and language proficiency: A longitudinal multilevel examination in Dutch elementary schools. *European Sociological Review*, 22, 293-308.
- Van Ingen, E., and Moor, N. (2015). Explanations of changes in church attendance between 1970 and 2009. *Social Science Research*, 52, 558-569.
- Van Tubergen, F. (2006). Religious affiliation and attendance among immigrants in eight Western countries: Individual and contextual Effects. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 24, 1-22.
- Van Tubergen, F. (2007). Religious affiliation and participation among immigrants in a secular society: A study of immigrants in the Netherlands. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 33, 747-765.
- Van Tubergen, F. (2013). Religious change of new immigrants in the Netherlands: The event of migration. *Social Science Research*, 42, 715-725.
- Warner, R. (1993). Work in progress toward a new paradigm for the sociological study of religion in the US. *American Journal of Sociology*, 98, 1044-1093.
- Williams, L., and Lawler, M. (2001). Religious heterogamy and religiosity: A comparison of interchurch and same-church individuals. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 40, 465-478.

SOCIAL JUSTICE, EQUALITY AND EMPOWERMENT

# Ethnic Minorities

Perceptions, Cultural Barriers  
and Health Inequalities

Ana Pratt  
Editor



NOVA

Complimentary Contributor Copy

**SOCIAL JUSTICE, EQUALITY AND EMPOWERMENT**

**ETHNIC MINORITIES**  
**PERCEPTIONS,**  
**CULTURAL BARRIERS AND**  
**HEALTH INEQUALITIES**

**ANA PRATT**  
**EDITOR**



Complimentary Contributor Copy

Copyright © 2016 by Nova Science Publishers, Inc.

**All rights reserved.** No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means: electronic, electrostatic, magnetic, tape, mechanical photocopying, recording or otherwise without the written permission of the Publisher.

We have partnered with Copyright Clearance Center to make it easy for you to obtain permissions to reuse content from this publication. Simply navigate to this publication's page on Nova's website and locate the "Get Permission" button below the title description. This button is linked directly to the title's permission page on [copyright.com](http://copyright.com). Alternatively, you can visit [copyright.com](http://copyright.com) and search by title, ISBN, or ISSN.

For further questions about using the service on [copyright.com](http://copyright.com), please contact:

Copyright Clearance Center

Phone: +1-(978) 750-8400

Fax: +1-(978) 750-4470

E-mail: [info@copyright.com](mailto:info@copyright.com).

#### **NOTICE TO THE READER**

The Publisher has taken reasonable care in the preparation of this book, but makes no expressed or implied warranty of any kind and assumes no responsibility for any errors or omissions. No liability is assumed for incidental or consequential damages in connection with or arising out of information contained in this book. The Publisher shall not be liable for any special, consequential, or exemplary damages resulting, in whole or in part, from the readers' use of, or reliance upon, this material. Any parts of this book based on government reports are so indicated and copyright is claimed for those parts to the extent applicable to compilations of such works.

Independent verification should be sought for any data, advice or recommendations contained in this book. In addition, no responsibility is assumed by the publisher for any injury and/or damage to persons or property arising from any methods, products, instructions, ideas or otherwise contained in this publication.

This publication is designed to provide accurate and authoritative information with regard to the subject matter covered herein. It is sold with the clear understanding that the Publisher is not engaged in rendering legal or any other professional services. If legal or any other expert assistance is required, the services of a competent person should be sought. FROM A DECLARATION OF PARTICIPANTS JOINTLY ADOPTED BY A COMMITTEE OF THE AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION AND A COMMITTEE OF PUBLISHERS.

Additional color graphics may be available in the e-book version of this book.

#### **Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data**

Names: Pratt, Ana.

Title: Ethnic minorities : perceptions, cultural barriers and health inequalities / Ana Pratt, editor.

Other titles: Ethnic minorities (Nova Science Publishers)

Description: Hauppauge, New York : Nova Science Publishers, Inc., [2015] |

Series: Social justice, equality and empowerment | Includes index.

Identifiers: LCCN 2015041895 | ISBN: 978-1-63484-192-4 (eBook)

Subjects: LCSH: Ethnic groups. | Minorities. | Race discrimination. | Race relations.

Classification: LCC GN495.4 .E8438 2015 | DDC 305.8--dc23 LC record available at <http://lccn.loc.gov/2015041895>

*Published by Nova Science Publishers, Inc. † New York*

**Complimentary Contributor Copy**