

4-28-2009

Synthesis Report on Canadian Youth: A Focus on Minority Youth

Zenaida R. Ravanera

The University of Western Ontario, ravanera@uwo.ca

Beaujot Roderic

The University of Western Ontario, rbeaujot@uwo.ca

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/pscpapers>

Recommended Citation

Ravanera, Zenaida R. and Roderic, Beaujot (2009) "Synthesis Report on Canadian Youth: A Focus on Minority Youth," *PSC Discussion Papers Series*: Vol. 23 : Iss. 4 , Article 1.

Available at: <https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/pscpapers/vol23/iss4/1>

Synthesis Report on Canadian Youth: A Focus on Minority Youth

Discussion Paper No. 09-04

Zenaida R. Ravanera and Roderic Beaujot
Population Studies Centre, Department of Sociology
University of Western Ontario
London, Ontario, N6A 5C2
Contact: ravanera@uwo.ca; Tel. 519-661-2111 ext. 85151

April 28, 2009

On the web in PDF format: <http://sociology.uwo.ca/popstudies/dp/dp09-04.pdf>

Report prepared for Multiculturalism and Human Rights Program, Department of Canadian Heritage.

The views expressed herein are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official policy of the Department of Canadian Heritage. Financial contribution from the Multiculturalism and Human Rights Program is gratefully acknowledged.

Populations Studies Centre
University of Western Ontario
London Ontario CANADA N6A 5C2

Executive Summary

Using data from the 2006 Census and the 2002 Ethnic Diversity Survey, this report provides demographic, economic, and socio-cultural profiles of young Canadians aged 15-24, with focus on visible minority groups, Aboriginal, Anglophone living in Quebec, and Francophone living in the rest of Canada. The profiles of young followers of various religions are also examined with the use of data from the 2001 Census.

The focus on the youth stems from a life course perspective recognizing that transitions in education, work, and family life in adolescence and early adulthood may differ for young Canadians belonging to minority groups from those in the majority. The use of aggregated data could provide comparative indicators of which groups of young Canadians are doing well in terms of education and work, and which groups may be lagging behind.

On the projections of visible minority

A comparison of the census population count in 2006 with the projections made by Statistics Canada confirms that visible minority population continues to increase with the actual population count in the 2006 census fitting the higher end projections. However the fit between the projection and the population count for 2006 varies by visible minority groups.

Visible Minority Youth

Of the 4.2 million aged 15-24 living in Canada in 2006, 785 thousand (or 18.7% of the total 15-24 years old) are visible minority. About 500 thousand (or 63.5% of the total visible minority) are from the three largest groups – Chinese, South Asian, and Black. The rest of the visible minority are Filipino, Latin American, Southeast Asian, Arab, West Asian, Korean, Japanese, and other visible minority or visible minority from more than one group.

A little more than half (51.2%) of the visible minority youth are immigrants, about a third of whom became landed immigrant in the last five years before the census (2001-2006). Immigration status varies by visible minority groups – West Asian and Arab have the highest with 84.8% and 64.8% immigrants respectively; in contrast, Japanese with 8% and Black with 39.6% have the lowest proportions.

Visible minority youth population has higher level of education, compared to not visible minority. The visible minority population has higher proportion with university education and the lower proportion with no certificate, diploma or degree. But, the not visible minority population has higher proportion employed, lower unemployment rate, and higher median income. The comparison holds true for both immigrant and non-immigrant populations, and thus, the economic disadvantage of the visible minority cannot be solely attributed to immigration status.

The visible minority youth are less satisfied with life, have lower trust in people, and experienced more discrimination, all in comparison with not visible minority population.

While fewer of them belong to sports club or team, more belong to religious-affiliated groups and ethnic associations.

The visible minority youth have a stronger sense of belonging to one's ethnic group, which is as expected. Less expected is that their sense of belonging to the town, city or municipality is stronger. Further, their sense of belonging to the Province, Canada, and North America are not much different from the not visible minority population. A measure of socio-cultural identity derived from these various measures of sense of belonging indicates that, in comparison to not visible minority, a greater proportion of the visible minority have *integrated* identity characterized by strong sense of belonging to one's ethnic group and to the wider society, and a lower proportion with *marginalized* identity, one with weak sense of belonging to both one's ethnic group and wider society. It would seem that in spite of disadvantages in the economic and social domains, the visible minority population have a strong sense of belonging to society.

But, the visible minority is a heterogeneous population and visible minority groups vary in economic and social integration. Some of the differences are:

- Of the 187 thousand **Chinese** aged 15-24, 40% are non-immigrants, about half are landed immigrants, and about 10% are non-permanent residents, most likely, with student permits. **High level of education is a defining characteristic of Chinese youth.** The lowest proportion with full employment and the very low median income of those who worked are probably indications of the greater preference for full time studies over work. Satisfaction with life is one of the lowest but trust in people is highest. A high proportion with *marginalized* and *separated* identities suggests a weak social integration of Chinese youth. This may be a true reflection of weaker tie to society but might also simply reflect a cultural trait of less exuberance in declaring strong feelings in general.
- There are 181 thousand **South Indian** youth, of whom about 96 thousand (53%) are immigrants. **The level of education is only marginally lower than that of the Chinese, but unlike the Chinese, a higher proportion of them work, many on full time basis.** The median income is higher than the average for visible minority. Though membership in sports club or team is low, membership in religious-affiliated groups is the highest. The level of satisfaction in life is one of the highest, and the proportion with *integrated* identity is very high with about 52% having a strong sense of belonging to one's ethnic group and the wider society.
- The **Black** population of 130 thousand youth, 50 thousand of whom are immigrants, is the most disadvantaged of the three largest visible minority groups. **In comparison to Chinese and South Indian, Black has lower education level.** The proportion who worked in 2005 and the median income is not much different from the average for visible minority, however, the unemployment rate is the highest. The Black population has the highest level of experience of discrimination, and the lowest level of trust in people in general. Sense of belonging to ethnic group is strong but is not matched by strong sense of belonging to the wider society, so that the Black youth have the highest level with *separated* identity (32%).

The other visible minority groups are smaller – with about 50 thousand or less population, each with unique means of integration to Canadian society.

Aboriginal Youth

The aboriginal population aged 15-24 of 212 thousand constitutes 5% of the total population of the same age group. The aboriginal youth population has a younger age structure than the non-aboriginal population. The three largest groups of aboriginal population are North American Indian with 125 thousand, Métis with 71 thousand, and Inuit with 11 thousand. North American Indian has more population on reserve than in rural or urban areas; more Inuit population live in rural area; and more Métis live in urban than either rural area or on reserve.

The education level and employment rate of aboriginal youth population is lower than that of non-aboriginal population. Of the three large aboriginal groups, Métis has the highest level with many more of them having had post-secondary education. The North American Indian comes next, with the Inuit having the lowest level. In general, aboriginals who live in urban areas have a higher proportion with secondary or post-secondary certificate, diploma, or degree than those who live on reserve or in rural area. While the unemployment rate of young Métis (15.3%) is only 3% higher than the non-aboriginal (12.4%), the unemployment rates of North American Indian (26.7%) and Inuit (26.0%) are more than double that of the non-aboriginal. The median income of aboriginal is about 0.80 of the median income of non-aboriginal youth.

Official Language Minority Youth

There are 85 thousand Anglophone in Quebec aged 15-24, which constitutes 9% of the Quebec's total population of the same age group. In ROC, there are 98 thousand Francophone making up 3% of the population aged 15-24. The proportions of population aged 15-19 and 20-24 are similar for Anglophone and Francophone in Quebec; for ROC, Francophone is older in that the proportion of 20-24 (50.6%) is higher than the 15-19 (49.4%) population; whereas Anglophone has higher proportion of 15-19 (51.9%) than 20-24 (48.1%) year old.

The language minority in Quebec and in ROC has higher level of education. Compared to Francophone, Anglophone in Quebec has higher proportion with University at bachelor's level or above. In ROC, compared to Anglophone, Francophone has higher proportion with university degree.

Indicators of labour force participation and work activity show differences in opposite direction, especially in Quebec. Participation and employment rates are lower, and unemployment rate is higher for Anglophone than for Francophone in Quebec. Likewise, the proportion with income and the level of income in 2005 are lower for Anglophone. In ROC, the differences are not as clear cut: compared to Anglophone, labour force participation is higher for Francophone but unemployment rate is also higher.

Youth of Various Religious Affiliations

Of the population aged 15-24, not counting those with no religious affiliation, Muslims with about 93 thousand (or about 2.3% of the total) are the most numerous next to Christians. Sikhs followed next with 44 thousand (1.1%), with the population of rest of the major religions (Buddhist, Hindu, Jewish) at around 40 thousand each. Christians and Jews are mainly not visible minority; Hindus and Sikhs are South Asians; and Buddhists are mainly Chinese and other visible minority not separately classified. Muslims are the most heterogeneous in terms of visible minority groups, and are comprised of South Asians, Blacks, and other visible minority including Arabs and West Asians.

Compared to Christians, followers of non-Christian religions all have higher proportion with university education, though Christians have the highest proportion with Trades certificate or College degree, along with highest labour force participation and total income. Jews have the highest level of education. Sikhs have the lowest education, but have the highest labour force participation and income among followers of non-Christian religions, with levels almost the same, or even slightly higher than Christians. Muslims have the lowest level of work activity with highest unemployment rate, and lowest levels of income and wages and salaries.

Like economic integration, social integration differs for each religion. Christians, being in the majority, has one of the highest proportions of membership in sports team or club, highest trust in people, and lowest level of experience of discrimination. Followers of other religions have experience of discrimination that is more than double that of Christians, but are integrated socially in other ways.

Conclusion

The profiles of young Canadians provide causes for celebration and for serious reflection about their situation. The generally more negative outcomes for the labour force integration and high levels of discrimination are most likely linked, with reduction of discrimination possibly leading to better work outcomes.

The challenges faced by the minorities could be viewed within the framework of multiculturalism, which of late has come under closer scrutiny. The present descriptive research is not specifically tailored toward providing definite evidence related to the multiculturalism discourse. However, there are hints, particularly in the findings about sense of belonging, pointing to the possibility that a multicultural ideology may be contributing to the social, and possibly, the economic integration of young minority Canadians.

Glossary of Terms

General terms

Youth – in this report, youth refers to the population aged 15-24 as of the census (or survey) reference date.

Terms from the 2006 Censusⁱ

Aboriginal Identity and Areas of Residence

Aboriginal identity -Refers to those persons who reported identifying with at least one Aboriginal group, that is, North American Indian, Métis or Inuit, and/or those who reported being a Treaty Indian or a Registered Indian, as defined by the Indian Act of Canada, and/or those who reported they were members of an Indian band or First Nation. In 1991 and previous censuses, the Aboriginal population was defined using the ethnic origin question (ancestry). The 1996 Census included a question on the individual's perception of his/her Aboriginal identity. The question used in the 2006 and 2001 censuses is the same as the one used in 1996.

On reserve - includes eight census subdivision (CSD) types legally affiliated with First Nations or Indian bands, i.e., Indian reserve (IRI), Indian settlement (S-E), Indian government district (IGD), terres réservées aux Cris (TC), terres réservées aux Naskapis (TK), Nisga'a village (NVL), Nisga'a land (NL) and Teslin land (TL), as well as 35 additional CSDs of various other types that are generally northern communities in Saskatchewan, the Northwest Territories and the Yukon Territory, which have large concentrations of Registered Indians.

Urban - an area with a minimum population concentration of 1,000 persons and a population density of at least 400 persons per square kilometre, based on the current census population count. All territory outside urban areas is classified as rural. On-reserve CSDs are excluded from this category. A census metropolitan area (CMA) is a large urban area and has a population of at least 100,000. Urban non-census metropolitan areas are smaller urban areas with a population of less than 100,000.

Rural - includes remote and wilderness areas and agricultural lands, as well as small towns, villages and other populated places with a population of less than 1,000. On-reserve CSDs are excluded from this category.

Education

Highest certificate, diploma or degree - refers to the highest certificate, diploma or degree completed based on a hierarchy which is generally related to the amount of time spent 'in-class'. For postsecondary schooling, a university education is considered to be a higher level of schooling than a college education, while a college education is considered to be a higher level of education than in the trades.

ⁱ The definition of terms is from the documentation that came with the censuses (2001 and 2006) and the Ethnic Diversity Survey prepared by Statistics Canada.

High school certificate or equivalent - includes persons who have graduated from a secondary school or equivalent; excludes persons with a postsecondary certificate, diploma or degree. Examples of postsecondary institutions include community colleges, institutes of technology, CEGEPs, private trade schools, private business colleges, schools of nursing and universities.

College, CEGEP or other non-university certificate or diploma - includes accreditation by non degree-granting institutions such as community colleges, CEGEPs, private business colleges and technical institutes.

Immigration and Visible Minority

Generation status - refers to the generational status of a person, that is, 1st generation, 2nd generation or 3rd generation or more.

Immigrants - persons who are, or have ever been, landed immigrants in Canada. A landed immigrant is a person who has been granted the right to live in Canada permanently by immigration authorities. Some immigrants have resided in Canada for a number of years, while others are recent arrivals. Most immigrants are born outside Canada, but a small number were born in Canada.

Non-Immigrants - persons who are Canadian citizens by birth. Although most Canadian citizens by birth were born in Canada, a small number were born outside Canada to Canadian parents.

Non-permanent residents - refers to people from another country who had a Work or Study Permit, or who were refugee claimants at the time of the census, and family members living in Canada with them.

Visible Minority - refers to the visible minority group to which the respondent belongs. The Employment Equity Act defines visible minorities as 'persons, other than Aboriginal peoples, who are non-Caucasian in race or non-white in colour'.

- South Asian – For example, East Indian, Pakistani, Sri Lankan, etc.
- South East Asian – For example, Vietnamese, Cambodian, Malaysian, Laotian, etc.
- West Asian – For example, Iranian, Afghan, etc.
- Not a visible minority -- Includes respondents who reported 'Yes' to the Aboriginal identity question as well as respondents who were not considered to be members of a visible minority group

Language

Anglophone or English - includes respondents who reported English only or English and one non-official language as the mother tongue i.e. the first language learned at home in childhood and still understood by the individual at the time of the census.

Francophone or French - includes respondents who reported French only or French and one non-official language as the mother tongue

English and French - includes respondents who reported English and French, with or without one non-official language, as the mother tongue.

Work Activity, Labour Force, and Income

Work activity in 2005 - refers to the number of weeks in which a person worked for pay or in self-employment in 2005 at all jobs held, even if only for a few hours, and whether these weeks were mostly full time (30 hours or more per week) or mostly part time (1 to 29 hours per week). The term '*full-year full-time workers*' refers to persons 15 years of age and over who worked 49 to 52 weeks (mostly full time) in 2005 for pay or in self-employment. '*Did not work in 2005*' includes persons who never worked, persons who worked prior to 2005 only, or persons who worked in 2006 only.

Labour force activity - refers to the labour market activity of the population (in this report, 15-24 years of age) in the week (Sunday to Saturday) prior to Census Day (May 16, 2006). Respondents were classified as Employed, Unemployed, or Not in the labour force. The labour force includes the employed and the unemployed.

Employed - persons who, during the week (Sunday to Saturday) prior to Census Day (May 16, 2006): (a) did any work at all for pay or in self-employment or without pay in a family farm, business or professional practice; (b) were absent from their job or business, with or without pay, for the entire week because of a vacation, an illness, a labour dispute at their place of work, or any other reasons.

Unemployed - persons who, during the week (Sunday to Saturday) prior to Census Day (May 16, 2006), were without paid work or without self-employment work and were available for work and either: (a) had actively looked for paid work in the past four weeks; or (b) were on temporary lay-off and expected to return to their job; or (c) had definite arrangements to start a new job in four weeks or less.

Not in the labour force - refers to persons who, in the week (Sunday to Saturday) prior to Census Day (May 16, 2006), were neither employed nor unemployed. It includes students, homemakers, retired workers, seasonal workers in an 'off' season who were not looking for work, and persons who could not work because of a long term illness or disability.

Participation rate - refers to the labour force in the week (Sunday to Saturday) prior to Census Day (May 16, 2006), expressed as a percentage of the population 15 years of age and over. The participation rate for a particular group (age, sex, marital status, geographic area, etc.) is the total labour force in that group, expressed as a percentage of the population 15 years of age and over, in that group. (Note: In this report, the age group refers to age 15-24.)

Employment rate - refers to the number of persons employed in the week (Sunday to Saturday) prior to Census Day (May 16, 2006), expressed as a percentage of the total population 15 years of age and over. The employment rate for a particular group (age, sex, marital status, geographic area, etc.) is the number employed in that group, expressed as a percentage of the population 15 years of age and over, in that group. (Note: In this report, the age group refers to age 15-24.)

Unemployment rate - refers to the unemployed expressed as a percentage of the labour force in the week (Sunday to Saturday) prior to Census Day (May 16, 2006). The unemployment rate for a particular group (age, sex, marital status, geographic area, etc.) is the unemployed in that group, expressed as a percentage of the labour force in that group, in the week prior to enumeration.

Total income - refers to the total money income received from the following sources during calendar year 2005 by persons 15 years of age and over: wages and salaries (total); net farm income; net non-farm income from unincorporated business and/or professional practice; child benefits; Old Age Security pension and Guaranteed Income Supplement; benefits from Canada or Quebec Pension Plan; benefits from Employment Insurance; other income from government sources; dividends, interest on bonds, deposits and savings certificates, and other investment income; retirement pensions, superannuation and annuities, including those from RRSPs and RRIFs; other money income.

Median income of individuals - the amount which divides the income size distribution of a specified group of income recipients into two halves, i.e., the incomes of the first half of individuals are below the median, while those of the second half are above the median. Median income is calculated from the unrounded number of individuals (e.g., males 15 to 24 years of age) with income in that group.

Term from the 2001 Census

Religion group – refers to the specific religious denominations, groups or bodies as well as other religiously defined communities or systems of belief. (Note: This report focuses on 6 religion groups: Christian, Muslim, Jewish, Buddhist, Hindu, and Sikh.)

Terms from the Ethnic Diversity Survey:

Ethnic or immigrant association - includes responses indicating participation in ethnic or immigrant associations formed for the purposes of socializing, promoting cultural activities, providing settlement assistance or sustaining heritage languages: for example, Immigrant Services Societies, ethnic school clubs, language classes in the respondent's ethnic or traditional language, etc.

Religious-affiliated group - includes responses indicating participation in churches, temples, synagogues, mosques, the Catholic Women's League, the Salvation Army, religious study groups, church choir, or other confessional, spiritual or meditation groups.

Sports club or team - includes responses indicating participation in competitive and recreational sports clubs and teams, exercise classes and fitness clubs, as well as activities such as hiking, golfing, horseback riding and yoga. It also includes reported sports that the respondent reported judging (like figure skating) or otherwise taking part in (child's soccer team).

Table of Contents

<i>Executive Summary</i>	<i>ii</i>
<i>Table of Contents</i>	<i>x</i>
<i>List of Tables</i>	<i>xi</i>
<i>List of Appendix Tables</i>	<i>xiii</i>
Introduction.....	1
A. On the Demographic projections of visible minorities to 2017.....	1
B. Visible Minority Youth.....	3
1. Demographic Profile.....	3
2. Socio-economic and Educational Profiles.....	6
Education.....	6
Work Activity.....	8
3. Civic Participation and Attitudinal Profiles.....	12
4. Summary Discussion of Visible Minority Youth.....	16
C. Aboriginal Youth.....	19
1. Demographic Profile.....	19
2. Socio-economic and Educational Profiles.....	20
3. Summary Discussion of Aboriginal Youth.....	22
D. Official Language Minority Youth.....	23
1. Demographic Profile.....	23
2. Socio-economic and Educational Profiles.....	25
3. Summary Discussion of Official Language Minority Youth.....	27
E. Youth of Various Religious Affiliations.....	28
1. Demographic Profile.....	28
2. Socio-Economic and Educational Profiles.....	30
3. Civic Participation and Attitudinal Profiles.....	32
4. Summary Discussion of Youth of Various Religious Affiliations.....	35
F. On youth radicalization in Canada.....	36
Conclusion.....	37
<i>List of References</i>	<i>38</i>
<i>Appendix Tables</i>	<i>42</i>

List of Tables

A. Projections of visible minority population

1. Table A1: 2006 census count and projections under various scenarios by visible minority status **2**

B. Visible Minority Youth

2. Table B1: Total population and population aged 15-24 by visible minority status and sex **3**
3. Table B2: Population aged 15-24 by visible minority and generation status **4**
4. Table B3: Population aged 15-24 by visible minority and immigration status **5**
5. Table B4: Immigrant population aged 15-24 by visible minority status and period of immigration **5**
6. Table B5: Population aged 15-24 by visible minority status and highest certificate **7**
7. Table B6: Proportion (%) of population aged 15-24 with university or college degree by visible minority status, immigrant status, and sex **8**
8. Table B7: Proportion (%) of population aged 15-24 who worked in 2005 by visible minority status, immigrant status, and sex **9**
9. Table B8: Proportion (%) of population aged 15-24 who worked full time in 2005 by visible minority status, immigrant status, and sex **10**
10. Table B9: Unemployment rates in May 2006 of population aged 15-24 by visible minority status, immigrant status, and sex **11**
11. Table B10: Median income of population aged 15-24 with income in 2005 by visible minority status, generation status, and sex **12**
12. Table B11: Membership in religious-affiliated group, ethnic association, and sports club or team by Visible minority, Canadians aged 15-24 in 2002 **13**
13. Table B12: Proportion (%) very satisfied with life, with trust in people, and experienced discrimination by Visible minority, Canadians aged 15-24 in 2002 **14**
14. Table B13: Proportion (%) with strong sense of belonging to ethnic group, town or city, province, Canada, and North America by Visible minority, Canadians aged 15-24 in 2002 **15**
15. Table B14: Types of identity by Visible minority, Canadians aged 15-24 in 2002 **16**

C. Aboriginal Youth

16. Table C1: Population aged 15-24 by Sex and Aboriginal Identity **19**
17. Table C2: Population 15-24 by aboriginal identity and 5-year age group **20**
18. Table C3: Population aged 15-24 by aboriginal identity and place of residence **20**
19. Table C4: Population aged 15-24 by aboriginal identity and highest certificate **21**
20. Table C5: Proportion (%) of population aged 15-24 with college and university education by aboriginal identity and area of residence **21**
21. Table C6: Population aged 15-24 by aboriginal identity and labour force activity **22**

22. Table C7: Population aged 15-24 with employment income in 2005 by aboriginal identity, work activities and median income **22**

D. Official Language Minority Youth

23. Table D1: Population aged 15-24 in Quebec and Rest of Canada by mother tongue and sex **24**
24. Table D2: Population aged 15-24 in Quebec and Rest of Canada by mother tongue and age groups **24**
25. Table D3: Population aged 15-24 in Quebec and Rest of Canada by mother tongue and immigration status **25**
26. Table D4: Distribution of population aged 15-24 in Quebec and Rest of Canada by mother tongue, sex and highest certificate **26**
27. Table D5: Distribution of Population aged 15-24 in Quebec and Rest of Canada by mother tongue, sex and labour force activity **26**
28. Table D6: Distribution of population aged 15-24 in Quebec and Rest of Canada by mother tongue, sex, income and work activity **27**

D. Youth of Various Religious Affiliations

29. Table E1: Population aged 15-24 in 2001 by religion and sex **28**
30. Table E2: Population aged 15-24 in 2001 by religion and age group **29**
31. Table E3a: Population aged 15-24 in 2001 by religion and visible minority indicators: Percent distribution of visible minority population by religion **29**
32. Table E3b: Population aged 15-24 in 2001 by religion and visible minority indicators: Percent distribution of religion by visible minority group **30**
33. Table E4: Population aged 15-24 in 2001 by religion and generation status **30**
34. Table E5: Population aged 20-24 in 2001 by religion and highest certificate **31**
35. Table E6: Population aged 20-24 in 2001 by religion and labour force activity in reference week **31**
36. Table E7: Population aged 20-24 in 2001 by religion and work activity in 2000 **32**
37. Table E8: Population aged 20-24 in 2001 by religion and income in 2000 **32**
38. Table E9: Membership in religious-affiliated group, ethnic association, and sports club or team by religion, Canadians aged 15-24 in 2002 **33**
39. Table E10: Proportion (%) very satisfied with life, have trust in people, and experienced discrimination by religion **34**
40. Table E11: Proportion (%) with strong sense of belonging to ethnic group, town or city, province, Canada, and North America by religion, Canadians aged 15-24 in 2002 **34**
41. Table E12: Types of identity by religion, Canadians aged 15-24 in 2002 **35**

List of Appendix Tables

Appendix Tables on Visible Minority Youth

1. Appendix Table B1: Population aged 15-24 by highest certificate, visible minority status and sex **42**
2. Appendix Table B2: Proportion (%) of population aged 15-24 with university or college degree by visible minority status, immigrant status, and sex **43**

Appendix Tables on Aboriginal Youth

1. Appendix Table C1: Population aged 15-24 by aboriginal identity, sex and highest certificate **44**
2. Appendix Table C2: Population aged 15-24 by aboriginal identity, area of residence and highest certificate **45**
3. Appendix Table C3: Population aged 15-24 by aboriginal identity, sex, and labour force activity **46**
4. Appendix Table C4: Population aged 15-24 with employment income in 2005 by aboriginal identity, sex, work activities and median income **47**

Appendix Tables on Youth of Various Religious Affiliations

1. Appendix Table E1: Population aged 15-19 in 2001 by religion, sex, and highest certificate **48**
2. Appendix Table E2: Population aged 20-24 in 2001 by religion, sex, and highest certificate **49**
3. Appendix Table E3: Population aged 15-19 in 2001 by religion, sex, and labour force activity in reference week **50**
4. Appendix Table E4: Population aged 20-24 in 2001 by religion, sex, and labour force activity in reference week **51**
5. Appendix Table E5: Population aged 15-19 in 2001 by religion, sex, and work activity in 2000 **52**
6. Appendix Table E6: Population aged 20-24 in 2001 by religion, sex, and work activity in 2000 **53**
7. Appendix Table E7: Population aged 15-19 in 2001 by religion, sex, and income in 2000 **54**
8. Appendix Table E8: Population aged 20-24 in 2001 by religion, sex, and income in 2000 **55**

Introduction

The processes by which individuals integrate into the economic, social, and political fabric of society differs by age and life course stages (Ravanera and Rajulton, 2006). As part of this integration process, young people, in their transition to adulthood, go through a number of events such as completion of schooling and entry into the labour force. This transition is influenced not only by individual and family characteristics but also by the structural and cultural contexts, which differs by age and life course stages (Ravanera, Rajulton, and Turcotte, 2003). In times of economic downturn, for example, the young who are new entrants to the labour force often inequitably bear the brunt of labour structuring (Morissette, 1998). They thus consistently have higher level of unemployment than older people who have been in the labour force longer.

The youth stage is also a period of identity formation or the process of gaining a clear and coherent sense of knowing oneself, which is also influenced by personal, social, and contextual factors (Kaspar and Noh, 2001). An underlying assumption about the concern over religious radicalization, for example, is that young people are influenced either by extremism imported from foreign countries or by negative experiences in their new country of residence (Bramadat and Wortley, 2008), a concern that is not often mentioned for older people.

The focus on the minority groups stems from an assumption that transitions in education, work, and family life and the process of identity formation differ for young Canadians belonging to minority groups compared to those in the majority. That is, just as the influence of economic and cultural context differ by age, so too could they differ by minority status, defined by ethnicity, language, or religion. This proposition is often examined at the level of individuals using survey data. The use of aggregated census data could provide comparative indicators of which groups of young Canadians are doing well in terms of education and work, and which groups may be lagging behind. These could in turn be useful as background information for consideration of policies on integration of young people into society.

As immigration increases the diversity of Canadian population, it becomes imperative that the situations of those in the minority are better understood. Of particular concern is the participation in society's economic, social, and political life. Using data from the 2006 Census and the 2002 Ethnic Diversity Survey, this report provides demographic, economic, and socio-cultural profiles of young Canadians aged 15-24, with focus on visible minority groups, Aboriginal, Anglophone living in Quebec, Francophone living in the rest of Canada, and followers of major religions.

A. On the Demographic projections of visible minorities to 2017

In 2005, Statistics Canada made projections of visible and religious minorities from 2001 to 2017 using micro-simulation with various assumptions regarding fertility, mortality, and migration (Belanger and Caron Malenfant, 2005). The projections were made using 5 scenarios with various assumptions about the change in the demographic components.

The projections are for all age groups combined. While we use the population count for all age groups (see Table B1 below), our report focuses on Canadian youth aged 15-24. Thus, the

comparison we make between the population count and the various projections is rough and preliminary. A more careful comparison and examination of the differences between the census count and projections is required to make definitive conclusions.

To examine how well the projections compare with actual number of population, we compare the projections made in 2006 with the population count from the 2006 Census. This gives an indication of what would be the likely scenario for subsequent projection periods. Table A1 shows the 2006 census population and the projections under the 5 scenarios for visible minorities, with Scenario A showing the lowest projection and Scenario S, the highest. (Note that Table A1 excludes non-permanent residents; the population for all age groups shown in Table B1 below include non-permanent residents. And, comparison by religion cannot be made as the 2006 census did not collect data on religion.)

The **low** projection in Scenario A (4794.1) is the closest to the total population of visible minority counted in Census 2006 (4890.5). However, as a proportion of the total population (15.8%), the **high** projection in Scenario C (15.7%) makes a better fit. This is because the total population in the 2006 census (30975.7) is lower than the projected population even in Scenario A (31483.1), and why this is so is not immediately apparent, and needs to be examined further.

The 2006 population counts of Chinese, Black, and “Others” are lower than the lowest projections for 2006; whereas the counts of South Asian, Filipino, Southeast Asian, and especially Latin American are closest to the high projections. In contrast, the counts for Arab, West Asian, Korean, and Japanese are closer to the low projections. On the whole, however, the census population count in 2006 confirms that visible minority population continues to increase with actual population generally closer to the higher end projections. This indicates that by 2006 the visible minority population is well on its way to the projected 19% to 23% of the total population in 2017.

Table A1: 2006 census count and projections under various scenarios by visible minority status

	2006 Census		Projections for 2006 by Scenario (in 000)									
			A		B		C		D		S	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Total - Population	30975.7	100.0	31483.1	100.0	31976.4	100.0	31974.8	100.0	32588.4	100.0	32462.7	100.0
Total visible minority	4890.5	15.8	4794.1	15.2	5030.7	15.7	5030.2	15.7	5296.4	16.3	5383.8	16.6
Chinese	1181.0	3.8	1239.0	3.9	1304.0	4.1	1303.8	4.1	1371.9	4.2	1406.4	4.3
South Asian	1238.0	4.0	1160.7	3.7	1226.0	3.8	1226.0	3.8	1300.8	4.0	1322.4	4.1
Black	758.8	2.4	763.0	2.4	789.4	2.5	789.3	2.5	822.3	2.5	823.8	2.5
Filipino	394.6	1.3	370.9	1.2	389.2	1.2	389.1	1.2	408.2	1.3	416.9	1.3
Latin American	282.2	0.9	243.1	0.8	252.5	0.8	252.5	0.8	264.2	0.8	268.8	0.8
Southeast Asian	234.5	0.8	222.8	0.7	228.9	0.7	228.8	0.7	236.4	0.7	237.1	0.7
Arab	254.3	0.8	249.9	0.8	265.8	0.8	265.8	0.8	284.5	0.9	289.3	0.9
West Asian	152.3	0.5	150.5	0.5	163.5	0.5	163.5	0.5	175.7	0.5	182.8	0.6
Korean	121.0	0.4	119.8	0.4	127.7	0.4	127.7	0.4	137.7	0.4	141.3	0.4
Japanese	73.0	0.2	71.3	0.2	73.2	0.2	73.2	0.2	75.4	0.2	75.6	0.2
Others	200.8	0.6	202.9	0.6	210.4	0.7	210.4	0.7	219.3	0.7	219.3	0.7
Not visible minority	26085.2	84.2	26689.0	84.8	26945.7	84.3	26944.6	84.3	27292.0	83.7	27079.0	83.4

"Others" include multiple visible minority and minority not elsewhere classified

Non-permanent residents are excluded from both the 2006 population count and from the projections.

Sources: Census of Canada, 2006. Table 97-562-XCB2006011 - 20% sample data;

Population projections of visible minority groups Canada, provinces and regions, 2001-2017, Statistics Canada, Demography Division

B. Visible Minority Youth

The 2006 Census tables used in this report categorize visible minority groups into: Chinese, South Asian, Black, Filipino, Latin American, Southeast Asian, Arab, West Asian, Korean, and Japanese, with two other categories for the rest of visible minority population – visible minority not included elsewhere (referred to as n.i.e. in the tables), and multiple visible minority consisting of individuals who belong to more than one visible minority group. “Not a visible minority” is the last category also shown in the tables to cover all who do not belong to any visible minority group.

1. Demographic Profile

The 2006 Census counts 4.21 million population aged 15-24, of whom 2.14 million are men and 2.06 are women (Table B1). Of these total, 785 thousand are visible minority population, with men (at 400 thousands) outnumbering women (at 385 thousands). The Chinese (with 187 thousands population), South Asians (181 thousands), and Blacks (130 thousands) are the three most numerous visible minority groups, constituting about 3% to 4% each of the population aged 15-24.

The proportion of visible minority among the 15-24 at 18.7% is somewhat higher than the proportion of visible minority among all age groups at 16.2% (Table B1). This is an indication that the visible minority population has a younger age structure than the total population. This is also seen in population aged 15-24 as a proportion of the total population of all ages. Most of the visible minority groups have population aged 15-24 constituting 14% to 20% of the population, which proportions are higher than that of the non-visible minority (13.1%). The exceptions are Filipino with the same proportion as the non-visible minority (13.1%) and Japanese with lower proportion at 12.7%.

Table B1: Total population and population aged 15-24 by visible minority status and sex

	Male		Age 15-24 Female		Both sexes		All Age Groups Both sexes		Age 15-24 as % of all age groups
Total - Population	2145570	100.0	2062245	100.0	4207810	100.0	31241030	100.0	13.5
Total visible minority population	400015	18.6	385340	18.7	785360	18.7	5068090	16.2	15.5
Chinese	97230	4.5	89695	4.3	186925	4.4	1216570	3.9	15.4
South Asian	92195	4.3	89215	4.3	181410	4.3	1262865	4.0	14.4
Black	65060	3.0	64950	3.1	130015	3.1	783800	2.5	16.6
Filipino	27360	1.3	26525	1.3	53885	1.3	410695	1.3	13.1
Latin American	26035	1.2	25855	1.3	51885	1.2	304245	1.0	17.1
Southeast Asian	19095	0.9	19175	0.9	38270	0.9	239935	0.8	16.0
Arab	21550	1.0	19430	0.9	40980	1.0	265550	0.9	15.4
West Asian	15175	0.7	14015	0.7	29190	0.7	156695	0.5	18.6
Korean	15075	0.7	13870	0.7	28945	0.7	141890	0.5	20.4
Japanese	4835	0.2	5450	0.3	10295	0.2	81300	0.3	12.7
Visible minority, n.i.e.	5475	0.3	5905	0.3	11375	0.3	71420	0.2	15.9
Multiple visible minority	10930	0.5	11250	0.5	22180	0.5	133120	0.4	16.7
Not a visible minority	1745550	81.4	1676905	81.3	3422455	81.3	26172935	83.8	13.1

Source: Census of Canada, 2006. Table 97-562-XCB2006008 - 20% sample data

About 15% of the population aged 15-24 are first generation Canadians, 18.7% are 2nd generation – born inside Canada to one or both parents born outside of Canada, and 66.3% are 3rd generation (Table B2). Majority (58.1%) of visible minority population were not born in Canada whereas only 5% of the population not belonging to visible minority were born outside of Canada. Among the visible minority groups, the Japanese stand out as having the highest proportion of 3rd generation at 41%, followed by Black with 8.4%.

Table B2: Population aged 15-24 by visible minority and generation status

	Total	1st generation	2nd generation	3rd or higher
Total Population	4207810	628845 14.9	787085 18.7	2791880 66.3
Total visible minority population	785360	456190 58.1	301915 38.4	27250 3.5
Chinese	186925	112350 60.1	68535 36.7	6035 3.2
South Asian	181405	101440 55.9	78225 43.1	1745 1.0
Black	130015	57730 44.4	61340 47.2	10945 8.4
Filipino	53885	32910 61.1	20385 37.8	585 1.1
Latin American	51880	35765 68.9	15650 30.2	470 0.9
Southeast Asian	38270	18830 49.2	18820 49.2	615 1.6
Arab	40985	29565 72.1	10775 26.3	645 1.6
West Asian	29190	25840 88.5	3220 11.0	130 0.4
Korean	28945	24145 83.4	4595 15.9	210 0.7
Japanese	10290	3430 33.3	2645 25.7	4220 41.0
Visible minority, n.i.e.	11380	5470 48.1	5510 48.4	395 3.5
Multiple visible minority	22180	8705 39.2	12215 55.1	1260 5.7
Not a visible minority	3422455	172655 5.0	485165 14.2	2764635 80.8

Source: Census of Canada, 2006. Table 97-562-XCB2006010 - 20% sample data

Counted among the 1st generation are immigrants and non-permanent residents. Some 549 thousands population aged 15-24 are immigrants² defined as persons who have been granted the right to live in Canada permanently by immigration authorities, of whom nearly three-quarters (402 thousands) are visible minority (Table B3). The largest in number are the Chinese and South Asian, with more than 90 thousand immigrants each. All visible minority groups, with the exception of Japanese, have 40% or higher proportion of immigrants. West Asian (that includes Afghans and Iranians) has the highest proportion with 84.8% and Arabs, the next highest with 64.8%. (Although the counts differ, the relative sizes of visible minority youth are similar to that of the second generation aged 15 and older described by Jantzen (2008)).

There are some 66 thousand 15-24 years old population who are non-permanent residents, defined in the census as “persons from another country who, at the time of the census, held a Work or Study Permit or who were refugee claimants, as well as family members living with them in Canada” (Table B3). More than three-quarters (78.3%) of non-permanent residents are visible minority. The Chinese have the highest non-resident population with about 19 thousand, and Koreans the next highest with 6.6 thousand, constituting 10.3% of the Chinese and 22.9% of the Korean 15-24 year old populations. These Chinese and Korean non-permanent residents are most likely students (rather than refugee claimants).

² The census notes states that “Most immigrants are born outside Canada, but a small number were born in Canada”, presumably while waiting for the authority to grant the right to live in Canada.

Table B3: Population aged 15-24 by visible minority and immigration status

	Total Population	Non-immigrants		Immigrants		Non-permanent residents	
		Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Total - Population	4207815	3592440	85.4	549255	13.1	66115	1.6
Total visible minority population	785355	331585	42.2	401985	51.2	51785	6.6
Chinese	186925	75240	40.3	92430	49.4	19260	10.3
South Asian	181410	80390	44.3	95570	52.7	5445	3.0
Black	130010	72680	55.9	51485	39.6	5850	4.5
Filipino	53885	21060	39.1	31630	58.7	1195	2.2
Latin American	51885	16150	31.1	31330	60.4	4400	8.5
Southeast Asian	38270	19555	51.1	16910	44.2	1800	4.7
Arab	40985	11720	28.6	26555	64.8	2705	6.6
West Asian	29190	3355	11.5	24765	84.8	1070	3.7
Korean	28945	4885	16.9	17430	60.2	6630	22.9
Japanese	10290	6995	68.0	920	8.9	2375	23.1
Visible minority, n.i.e.	11375	5940	52.2	5090	44.7	340	3.0
Multiple visible minority	22180	13615	61.4	7850	35.4	715	3.2
Not a visible minority	3422455	3260855	95.3	147270	4.3	14325	0.4

Source: Census of Canada, 2006. Table 97-562-XCB2006011 - - 20% sample data

Majority of the immigrant population aged 15-24 (about 286 thousand or 52%) were granted landed immigrant status between 1991 and 2000 (Table B4). Among the visible minority, a third (about 133 thousand) became landed immigrant in 2001 to 2006. South East Asian (including Vietnamese, Cambodian, Malaysian, Laotian, etc.) stands out as having the highest proportion (41%) who became landed immigrants before 1991; the next highest with 26.8% is Latin American.

Table B4: Immigrant population aged 15-24 by visible minority status and period of immigration

	Total Immigrants	Before 1991		1991 to 2000		2001 to 2006	
		Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Total immigrant population	549255	96115	17.5	285565	52.0	167575	30.5
Total visible minority population	401985	60780	15.1	208120	51.8	133090	33.1
Chinese	92430	13835	15.0	55760	60.3	22830	24.7
South Asian	95570	8975	9.4	47730	49.9	38865	40.7
Black	51485	6915	13.4	26460	51.4	18105	35.2
Filipino	31630	3930	12.4	16460	52.0	11240	35.5
Latin American	31330	8395	26.8	13675	43.6	9260	29.6
Southeast Asian	16910	6930	41.0	6465	38.2	3515	20.8
Arab	26555	4865	18.3	13775	51.9	7910	29.8
West Asian	24765	2640	10.7	12425	50.2	9705	39.2
Korean	17430	1140	6.5	8610	49.4	7680	44.1
Japanese	920	155	16.8	435	47.3	335	36.4
Visible minority, n.i.e.	5090	925	18.2	2695	52.9	1475	29.0
Multiple visible minority	7850	2060	26.2	3615	46.1	2175	27.7
Not a visible minority	147270	35340	24.0	77445	52.6	34490	23.4

Source: Census of Canada, 2006. Table 97-562-XCB2006011 - 20% sample data

2. Socio-economic and Educational Profiles

Education

Age is a major determinant of the level of education: secondary schooling would have been completed only by those 18 years or older, and only those in their 20s would have completed a post-secondary schooling. A more refined analysis of education would thus require a separate analysis by age groups (say, 15-19 and 20-24). However, the census tabulations by education and visible minority status are available only for the 10-year age group 15-24. In the discussion below on differences in levels of education, therefore, we assume that the distribution of population by age group does not vary greatly among the visible minority groups (an assumption that needs to be examined when data become available through the public use micro-data file).

As of the census date in 2006, of the population aged 15-24, 39.9% have not received any certificate or diploma, 36.6% has a high school diploma as their highest certificate, and the rest have had post-secondary education with 15.3% having received college or trade certificate, and 8.5% a university degree (Table B5). In general, visible minority population has higher level of education than the not visible minority as seen in the lower proportion of population with no certificate, diploma or degree (34% vs. 41.3%), and a higher proportion with high school or university certificate. Only in the trade or college certificate has the not visible minority population a higher proportion than the visible minority (the former with 16.1% and the latter with 11.8%).

However, there are big differences among the visible minority groups. The visible minority groups that lead in levels of education are Chinese, followed by South Asian, and Arab, with 18.3%, 16.7% and 15.8% respectively who have had university education. Arab also has a high proportion with trade or college certificate, which at 15.4% is only slightly lower than Latin American with highest proportion at 15.6%. But, Latin American also stands out as having the lowest proportion with university certificate, diploma, or degree of 5.6%.

Black (with 41.6%) has the highest proportion with no certificate, diploma or degree, which, interestingly, is not much higher than the proportion among the not visible minority (41.3%). Furthermore, the proportion with university education among the Black (7.2%) is almost the same as that of the not visible minority (7.3%); and the proportion with high school diploma is higher in the Black by 2.3%. It is in the proportion with trade certificate or college diploma wherein the not visible minority has higher proportion by about 2.5% (that is, 16.1% for not visible minority, and 13.6% for Black).

Table B5: Population aged 15-24 by visible minority status and highest certificate

	Total	No certificate, diploma or degree		High school certificate or equivalent		College or trades certificate or diploma ¹		University ²	
Total Population	4207810	1679020	39.9	1528010	36.3	643545	15.3	357230	8.5
Total visible minority population	785355	267075	34.0	319055	40.6	92760	11.8	106460	13.6
Chinese	186925	55485	29.7	79875	42.7	17285	9.2	34275	18.3
South Asian	181410	56515	31.2	74595	41.1	20090	11.1	30210	16.7
Black	130015	54060	41.6	48935	37.6	17665	13.6	9345	7.2
Filipino	53885	17905	33.2	22295	41.4	7005	13.0	6675	12.4
Latin American	51885	20705	39.9	20150	38.8	8105	15.6	2930	5.6
Southeast Asian	38270	13845	36.2	15480	40.4	5255	13.7	3685	9.6
Arab	40980	12365	30.2	15810	38.6	6330	15.4	6475	15.8
West Asian	29190	10505	36.0	11490	39.4	3120	10.7	4070	13.9
Korean	28950	10190	35.2	12440	43.0	2520	8.7	3795	13.1
Japanese	10295	3215	31.2	4550	44.2	1175	11.4	1345	13.1
Visible minority, n.i.e.	11375	4090	36.0	4605	40.5	1735	15.3	940	8.3
Multiple visible minority	22180	8195	36.9	8825	39.8	2470	11.1	2690	12.1
Not a visible minority	3422455	1411940	41.3	1208955	35.3	550785	16.1	250775	7.3

Note: 1 also includes apprenticeship, CEGEP, and other non university certificate or diploma

2 also includes certificate or diploma below bachelor, bachelor or higher certificate, diploma or degree

Source: Census of Canada, 2006. Table 97-562-XCB2006017 - 20% Sample Data.

As is well known, the education level of immigrants is higher than that of non-immigrants, possibly an outcome of the selection process of immigration. This is seen in the proportion of immigrants with post-secondary diploma (that is, college and university degree combined) of 18.8% that is higher than that of non-immigrants with 16.9% (Table B6). The difference by immigration status is greater among the not visible minority at 3.4% (that is, 20.3% - 16.9%) than the visible minority at 1.9% (18.8% - 16.9%).

Latin American stands out as having the biggest difference of 6.3% between immigrants (16.0%) and non-immigrants (9.7%), with the difference bigger for females than for males. However, the differential by immigration status does not always go in the same direction. For Filipino, Black, and Korean, the proportion with post-secondary degree is higher among non-immigrants, with Korean having the biggest difference of 4.7% (that is, 20.1% for non-immigrants and 15.4% for immigrants).

Another often noted observation is that females tend to have higher education than males. As can also be seen in Table B6, female population has a greater proportion with college or university degree (20.6%) than the male population (14.1%), with the difference greater for not visible minority (7.0%) than for visible minority (4.6%). For all visible minority groups, the difference favours the females; the greatest gap being among the Japanese with 8% and the Filipino with 7.1%. The smallest difference between males and females is among the West Asian. (For more details on education by immigration status and sex, please see Appendix Table B1: Population aged 15-24 by sex, visible minority status and highest certificate; and Appendix Table B2: Proportion (%) of population aged 15-24 with university or college degree, by visible minority status, immigrant status, and sex).

Table B6 : Proportion (%) of population aged 15-24 with university or college degree¹ by visible minority status, immigrant status, and sex

	Total		Total	Non-immigrant			Immigrants		
	Males	Females		Males	Females	Total	Males	Females	Total
Total - Population	14.1	20.6	17.3	13.5	20.3	16.9	16.3	21.5	18.8
Total visible minority population	16.0	20.6	18.2	14.7	19.0	16.8	16.0	20.7	18.3
Chinese	19.6	23.2	21.4	18.1	20.6	19.3	19.9	23.3	21.5
South Asian	17.0	21.8	19.3	16.5	21.5	19.0	16.3	21.7	19.0
Black	11.9	17.2	14.5	11.4	17.0	14.2	11.3	16.4	13.9
Filipino	12.8	19.9	16.3	14.6	17.7	16.2	11.4	19.0	15.0
Latin American	11.8	16.9	14.3	8.0	11.3	9.7	13.1	18.9	16.0
Southeast Asian	14.9	18.3	16.6	12.2	16.9	14.5	16.6	19.4	18.1
Arab	21.0	26.2	23.5	14.7	22.4	18.4	21.7	26.7	24.1
West Asian	16.0	17.1	16.5	12.5	14.0	13.4	15.4	17.2	16.3
Korean	13.9	19.1	16.3	18.8	21.4	20.1	13.8	17.2	15.4
Japanese	14.8	22.8	18.9	14.8	19.2	16.8	7.5	26.7	18.4
Visible minority, n.i.e.	14.0	20.0	17.1	13.5	20.9	17.4	13.8	19.3	16.7
Multiple visible minority	14.8	18.9	16.9	13.8	17.1	15.5	15.6	21.3	18.6
Not a visible minority	13.7	20.7	17.1	13.4	20.4	16.9	17.1	23.7	20.3

Note: ¹ include College, CEGEP, or other non-university diploma, and university certificate, diploma or degree, and does not include Apprenticeship or trade certificate or diploma, and university certificate below bachelor
Source: Census of Canada, 2006. Table 97-562-XCB2006017 - 20% Sample Data.

Work Activity

An indicator of integration into the labour force from the census is whether or not a person worked for pay or in self-employment in 2005, either as full-time or part-time employment. Of the population aged 15-24, 70.7% had worked in 2005, with a much higher proportion among the not visible minority (74.0%) than among the visible minority (56.2%) (Table B7). Filipino with 66.0% had the highest proportion, followed by Japanese (60.3%) and Latin American (60.4%), and Korean the lowest (37.3%).

Immigration status is a major determinant of work activity – the proportion with work among immigrants is only 59.9%, whereas it is 73.1% for non-immigrants, a difference of 13.2%. That non-immigrants have higher proportions who have worked is true for most of the visible minority groups, with the biggest differences to be found among Koreans, Japanese, and Chinese. The exceptions, that is, with immigrants having higher proportion employed than non-immigrants, are Filipino, Latin American, Southeast Asian, and West Asian. The proportion who had worked in 2005 for Latin American immigrants, for example, is 66.7%, whereas that of Latin American non-immigrants is 54.2%, a difference of 12.5%.

For not visible minority, compared to females, males had higher proportion who worked in 2005 regardless of immigration status. For the visible minority groups, however, the direction of the differences in work activity by gender varies by immigration status. With few exceptions, among non-immigrants, females have higher proportion employed whereas among immigrants males have higher proportion. The Japanese is the exception among non-immigrants with males having higher proportion who worked, albeit the difference is small (0.8%). For immigrants, the exceptions are the Chinese and Filipino, with the proportion higher among females by 4.4% for the former, and 0.6% for the latter.

Table B7 : Proportion of population aged 15-24 who worked in 2005 by visible minority status, immigrant status, and sex

	Total*			Non-immigrant			Immigrants		
	Males	Females	Total	Males	Females	Total	Males	Females	Total
Total - Population	70.9	70.5	70.7	73.2	73.0	73.1	60.6	59.1	59.9
Total visible minority population	56.0	56.5	56.2	59.4	62.0	60.6	57.0	55.9	56.5
Chinese	48.4	52.1	50.2	59.6	62.7	61.1	46.0	50.4	48.1
South Asian	60.7	58.4	59.6	61.0	62.4	61.7	61.5	55.5	58.5
Black	57.5	58.3	57.9	57.8	60.8	59.3	58.8	57.3	58.1
Filipino	65.7	66.4	66.0	64.1	64.5	64.3	67.0	67.6	67.2
Latin American	61.5	59.3	60.4	52.5	55.8	54.2	68.7	64.7	66.7
Southeast Asian	56.6	59.6	58.1	51.8	58.7	55.2	65.1	64.9	65.0
Arab	51.2	50.9	51.0	57.8	61.0	59.4	51.7	48.7	50.3
West Asian	57.6	54.6	56.2	52.1	54.9	53.7	59.1	55.5	57.3
Korean	38.0	36.5	37.3	60.5	64.7	62.3	41.9	41.3	41.6
Japanese	66.1	55.9	60.8	75.5	74.7	75.0	56.3	50.5	52.4
Visible minority, n.i.e.	65.8	60.3	63.0	65.7	60.6	63.1	66.9	61.1	63.9
Multiple visible minority	59.4	65.2	62.4	59.4	65.9	62.6	62.4	66.6	64.6
Not a visible minority	74.3	73.7	74.0	74.6	74.1	74.3	70.4	67.9	69.2

Note - * includes also non-permanent residents.

Source: Census of Canada, 2006. Table 97-562-XCB2006014 - 20% Sample Data

Another indicator of economic integration into society is the proportion who worked full time in 2005. As with the total proportion employed shown in Table B7, the not visible minority has higher proportion employed full time with 35.1% as against 22.4% among the visible minority population (Table B8). The two groups with the lowest proportion working full time are Korean with 11.2% and Chinese with 18.7%. Filipino, Latin American, and Southeast Asian lead with about 27% employed full time. While full time work may be regarded as a means of economic integration, this may not always be desirable at age 15-24. This is because an alternative to working full time is studying full time. Furthermore, the full time jobs for the young may be those that do not require advanced training and experience; that is, low paying jobs.

Among the not visible minority, non-immigrants have a higher proportion employed full time (35.3%) than immigrants (30.8%), whereas among visible minority, immigrants (with 24.3%) have 2.9% advantage over non-immigrants (21.4). This is true for almost all visible minority groups, except for Chinese, Japanese, Korean, and Arab with non-immigrants having higher proportion employed full-time than immigrants.

As for gender differences, for all visible minority and immigration statuses, the proportion employed full time is higher for males than for females, with Latin American having the biggest difference and Chinese the smallest.

**Table B8 : Proportion of population aged 15-24 who worked full time in 2005
by visible minority status, immigrant status, and sex**

	Total			Non-immigrant			Immigrants		
	Males	Females	Total	Males	Females	Total	Males	Females	Total
Total - Population	37.2	28.1	32.7	38.7	29.1	34.0	29.3	22.7	26.1
Total visible minority population	24.7	20.0	22.4	23.6	19.2	21.4	27.0	21.6	24.3
Chinese	19.7	17.6	18.7	23.4	19.9	21.7	19.5	17.5	18.5
South Asian	27.5	22.5	25.0	23.1	19.2	21.2	31.1	25.0	28.1
Black	25.0	19.9	22.4	22.8	18.8	20.8	28.7	22.0	25.3
Filipino	29.2	25.3	27.3	25.6	18.9	22.2	31.3	27.8	29.6
Latin American	32.5	20.4	26.5	23.0	15.5	19.3	37.7	23.5	30.6
Southeast Asian	28.9	25.1	27.0	23.1	20.1	21.6	37.2	32.0	34.5
Arab	21.9	16.5	19.4	24.1	18.4	21.3	21.8	16.1	19.1
West Asian	23.7	15.8	19.9	19.0	14.3	16.7	24.7	16.2	20.7
Korean	13.4	8.7	11.2	22.1	16.3	19.4	14.5	9.0	11.9
Japanese	29.5	19.4	24.2	33.7	23.8	29.0	20.0	18.1	18.9
Visible minority, n.i.e.	32.8	24.0	28.3	29.4	20.4	24.6	35.5	28.5	31.9
Multiple visible minority	23.7	21.6	22.6	23.4	20.7	22.1	25.0	23.0	24.0
Not a visible minority	40.0	30.0	35.1	40.3	30.2	35.3	35.8	25.7	30.8

Note - * includes also non-permanent residents.

Source: Census of Canada, 2006. Table 97-562-XCB2006014 - 20% Sample Data

While it is useful to know the levels of work activity in the year prior to the census, a more current indicator of labour activity is unemployment rate in the week prior to Census Day, providing an indication of unfilled need for employment. The unemployment rate of the not visible minority (12.8%) is lower by 2.9% than that of the visible minority (15.7%) (Table B9). This advantage for the not visible minority is similar to that shown in the work activity, and holds for both non-immigrants and immigrants.

Black has the highest unemployment rate for both non-immigrants (19.2%) and immigrants (19.4%), and Filipino, the lowest with about 11% unemployment rate for both immigrants and non-immigrants. Arab has the next highest but mainly for immigrants (18.9%) as the non-immigrants have an unemployment rate (12.6%) that is only slightly higher than that of not visible minority (12.3%). The opposite is true for Latin American – the unemployment rate for non-immigrants (16.8%) is almost 6% higher than for immigrants (10.9%). (Recall from the discussion above that compared to immigrants, Latin American non-immigrants also has lower proportion with university degree; whereas Arab immigrants have higher education than non-immigrants).

With few exceptions, males have higher unemployment rates than females for all visible minority and immigration statuses. The exceptions are South Asian, West Asian and Korean with female unemployment rates being higher: the difference by gender is small (ranging from less than 1% to 2.3%) except for West Asian non-immigrants with female unemployment (20.2%) that is 6.2% higher than the male's (14.0%).

Table B9: Unemployment rates of population aged 15-24 by visible minority status, immigrant status, and sex

	Total			Non-immigrants			Immigrants		
	Males	Females	Total	Males	Females	Total	Males	Females	Total
Total - Population	13.3	12.2	12.8	13.2	11.9	12.5	14.5	14.3	14.4
Total visible minority population	16.4	15.0	15.7	17.0	13.9	15.4	15.8	15.5	15.7
Chinese	17.7	13.7	15.7	16.5	12.4	14.5	18.4	14.3	16.3
South Asian	15.4	16.1	15.8	16.0	14.1	15.1	15.2	17.5	16.3
Black	20.6	18.6	19.6	21.1	17.4	19.2	19.5	19.4	19.4
Filipino	11.1	10.4	10.7	11.1	10.8	11.0	11.2	10.5	10.9
Latin American	12.9	12.1	12.6	20.0	13.8	16.8	10.8	11.1	10.9
Southeast Asian	15.6	12.7	14.1	17.5	11.8	14.6	13.8	13.1	13.4
Arab	17.9	16.4	17.2	13.9	11.4	12.6	19.0	18.6	18.9
West Asian	15.1	17.6	16.3	14.0	20.2	16.9	15.3	17.3	16.2
Korean	16.1	16.7	16.3	14.7	13.7	14.3	15.4	16.4	15.9
Japanese	10.3	9.3	9.9	10.3	8.6	9.5	14.0	4.2	10.0
Visible minority, n.i.e.	16.8	10.9	13.8	16.8	9.3	12.8	17.0	12.5	14.8
Multiple visible minority	18.5	14.8	16.5	18.9	15.0	16.8	17.3	14.4	15.7
Not a visible minority	12.8	11.7	12.3	12.8	11.7	12.3	11.4	11.5	11.5

Source: Census of Canada, 2006. Table 97-562-XCB2006017 - 20% Sample Data.

The median income of those employed in 2005 was about 1.3 higher for not visible minority (\$8693) than for visible minority (\$6842) (Table B10). The higher median income of the not visible minority is seen for both first and second generations. (For consistency, it would have been preferable to classify the income by immigration status but the data available from the census is by generation status only). Among visible minority groups, Filipino has the highest median income (\$8425), and Korean the lowest (\$3571).

On the whole, the median income of the second generation (\$8162) is 1.16 higher than that of the first generation (\$6986). The exceptions to this are the median incomes of the Black, Filipino, Latin American, and Southeast Asian which are higher for the first than the second generation. These median incomes of the latter three groups are higher than the median incomes of the not visible minority. While at first glance this seems to be an advantage, this could be an indication of a greater proportion with full time employment in low paying jobs.

Worth noting in view of the employment indicators discussed above is the income of the second generation Latin American, which at \$6244 is the lowest among all visible minority. For the first generation, the Korean has the lowest median income (\$2856).

With few exceptions, males have higher median income than females. The exceptions are the Black with females having higher income than males for both first and second generations. The other exceptions are Southeast Asian and West Asian women in the second generation and Chinese in the first generation.

Table B10: Median income of population Aged 15-24 with income in 2005 by visible minority status, generation status, and sex

	Total			Second Generation			First Generation		
	Males	Females	Total	Males	Females	Total	Males	Females	Total
Total - Population	8830	7992	8382	8429	7971	8162	7140	6828	6986
Total visible minority population	6924	6779	6842	7287	7233	7260	6560	6386	6454
Chinese	5417	5618	5531	7459	7079	7236	4034	4477	4263
South Asian	7655	6911	7260	7439	7132	7298	7806	6622	7199
Black	6954	7353	7175	6641	7123	6932	7267	7515	7416
Filipino	8536	8351	8425	8409	8080	8269	8620	8489	8562
Latin American	8544	7492	7941	6257	6217	6244	9414	7886	8535
Southeast Asian	7719	8029	7965	6674	7504	7062	8826	8505	8648
Arab	6475	5993	6241	7504	7389	7465	6011	5394	5725
West Asian	6409	6138	6319	6427	6535	6530	6410	6131	6307
Korean	3569	3586	3571	7436	7218	7366	2869	2777	2856
Japanese	8188	7178	7623	9876	8655	8857	4012	2935	3327
Visible minority, n.i.e.	8411	7848	8079	7942	8626	8271	9059	7330	7924
Multiple visible minority	7259	7423	7364	7316	7549	7437	6805	7383	7131
Not a visible minority	9311	8208	8693	9127	8373	8708	8541	7832	8158

Source: Census of Canada, 2006. Table 97-563-XCB2006007 - 20% Sample Data

3. Civic Participation and Attitudinal Profiles

For indicators of social integration, we use data provided through the 2002 Ethnic Diversity Survey for population aged 15-24, and examined the following: membership in organizations satisfaction with life as a whole, trust in people, experience of discrimination, and sense of belonging. For membership in organizations, we looked specifically into religious affiliated groups and ethnic associations in line with the interests on visible minority groups, and sports clubs or teams, since sports are of great interest to the young (Ravanera, 2008). Again in line with the interest on visible minority, we focused on sense of belonging to one's ethnic group, and on sense of belonging to the town, city, or municipality, province, Canada, and North America. We used these variables on sense of belonging to derive an indicator of cultural identity (a measure that is explained below) and examined the differentials by visible minority groups.

The number of survey respondents allows for analysis using separate categories for most of the visible minority groups examined thus far – Chinese, South Asian, Black, Filipino, Latin American, Southeast Asian, and Arab. Japanese has fewer respondents than the other visible minority groups separately categorized but, except for one table where Japanese is combined with visible minority not elsewhere classified, the sample size is still large enough to allow analysis of the Japanese category as a separate category. The West Asian and Korean groups used in the 2006 census as separate categories are subsumed within a mixed group (the visible minority n.e.i.).

On the whole, membership in religious affiliated groups is very low – only 4.3% of the population aged 15-24 are members (Table B11). Membership among visible minority is double (7.1%) that of the not visible minority (3.6%) but varies greatly ranging from a low of 1.8% for Southeast Asian and 2% for Latin American, and a high of 9.5% for Arab and 11.6% for South Asian. Membership in ethnic associations is even lower at 1.5% for the total population, with membership higher in visible minority (4.3%) than for not visible minority (0.9%). Interestingly,

the highest membership is among Southeast Asian (6.3%), which has the lowest membership in religious affiliated groups.

In contrast to membership in religious affiliated groups and ethnic associations, membership in sports club or team is higher among not visible minority (34.7%) than for visible minority (27.0%). Arab has the highest with 34.1% that is almost as high as that of the not visible minority. The three groups with the lowest membership in sports teams are Southeast Asian (17.4%), South Asian (22.2%), and Filipino (24.6%).

Table B11 : Membership in religious-affiliated group, ethnic association, and sports club or team by Visible minority, Canadians aged 15-24 in 2002

	Religious-Affiliated Groups			Ethnic Associations			Sports Club or Team		
	Weighted Total	No. of Members	% of Total	Weighted Total	No. of Members	% of Total	Weighted Total	No. of Members	% of Total
Total	3487580	149080	4.3	3513895	54100	1.5	3487585	1160265	33.3
Total visible minority	638565	45595	7.1	643480	27695	4.3	638570	172545	27.0
Chinese	158880	7135	4.5	159185	6060	3.8	158880	43605	27.4
South Asian	123930	14435	11.6	125950	6220	4.9	123930	27470	22.2
Black	96225	6015	6.3	97685	4690	4.8	96225	28795	29.9
Filipino	41150	2855	6.9	41150	1930	4.7	41150	10130	24.6
Latin American	45225	890	2.0	45225	2515	5.6	45225	13310	29.4
Southeast Asian	35275	630	1.8	35865	2265	6.3	35275	6140	17.4
Arab	40850	3885	9.5	41310	1730	4.2	40850	13935	34.1
Japanese	8505	345	4.0	8505	515	6.1	8510	2740	32.2
Other visible minority	68995	7485	10.9	68995	1265	1.8	68995	20500	29.7
Multiple visible minority	19530	1920	9.8	19610	505	2.6	19530	5920	30.3
Not in a visible minority	2849015	103485	3.6	2870405	26400	0.9	2849015	987730	34.7

Note: Weighted numbers rounded to multiples of 5.

Source: 2002 Ethnic Diversity Survey

Another set of indicators of social integration are satisfaction with life³, trust in people, and experience of discrimination, which favour the not visible minority (Table B12). Compared to the total visible minority, the not visible minority has higher proportion very much satisfied with life (by 6.4 percentage points) and a higher proportion that trust people in general (by 3.2 percentage points). A much more dramatic difference is the experience of discrimination which is almost 4 times higher (at 37%) among visible minority than for the not visible minority (10.8%).

³ Questions asked in the survey were: For life satisfaction: "Using a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 means not satisfied at all and 5 means very satisfied, all things considered, how satisfied are you with your life as a whole these days?" For trust in people "Generally speaking, would you say that most people can be trusted or that you cannot be too careful in dealing with people?" And, for discrimination: "In the past 5 years, do you feel that you have experienced discrimination or been treated unfairly by others in Canada because of your ethnicity, culture, race, skin colour, language, accent or religion? (Statistics Canada, 2005).

These indicators show many differences among visible minority groups. For satisfaction with life, the proportions for Latin American (49.3%), South Asian (44.9%), and Black (45.0%) are higher than that of not visible minority (44.4%). The Black's high proportion very much satisfied with life is interesting in that the group has also the lowest trust in people (32.4%) and the highest proportion that experienced discrimination (51.9%). Next to Black, Arab (with 32.8%) has the next lowest proportion of population who trusts people in general.

Another contrast is exhibited by Chinese and Japanese that have the highest levels of trust in people (60.7% and 56.8% respectively) but low satisfaction with life (25.4% and 19.1% for Chinese and Japanese respectively). Filipino has a very high level of trust in people (56.1%), the lowest proportion that experienced discrimination (28.5%), but moderately low proportion very much satisfied with life (34.7%).

Table B12 : Proportion (%) very satisfied with life, have trust in people, and experienced discrimination by Visible minority, Canadians aged 15-24 in 2002

	Satisfaction with life			Trust in people in general			Experienced discrimination		
	Total	N	%	Total	N	%	Total	N	%
Total	3474005	1495515	43.0	3430450	1663440	48.5	3477760	543575	15.6
Total Visible minority	634235	234590	37.0	623845	286140	45.9	636270	235430	37.0
Chinese	158680	40290	25.4	152945	92830	60.7	158590	55455	35.0
South Asian	123220	55355	44.9	121880	54050	44.3	123735	42450	34.3
Black	94980	42785	45.0	94635	30620	32.4	94915	49245	51.9
Filipino	40410	14030	34.7	40955	22955	56.1	41025	11685	28.5
Latin American	44845	22095	49.3	42995	16555	38.5	45225	13900	30.7
Southeast Asian	35275	8890	25.2	34785	12755	36.7	35275	13435	38.1
Arab	40850	16270	39.8	40750	13355	32.8	40850	13305	32.6
Japanese	8505	1620	19.1	8465	4805	56.8	8505	2810	33.1
Other visible minority	67940	24925	36.7	66935	29345	43.8	68620	25525	37.2
Multiple visible minority	19530	8330	42.7	19500	8870	45.5	19530	7620	39.0
Not in a visible minority	2839765	1260925	44.4	2806600	1377305	49.1	2841490	308140	10.8

Note: Weighted numbers rounded to multiples of 5.
Source: 2002 Ethnic Diversity Survey

The measures thus far discussed have been used as indicators of social integration including participation (membership in organizations), social capital (trust in people in general), and social recognition (experience of discrimination). These measures no doubt capture different dimensions of social integration, and the varying levels within and between visible minority groups are possibly indicators of the variety of ways that one could be integrated into the society.

Another often used indicator of social integration is sense of belonging⁴. The survey asked a number of questions on sense of belonging, for example, to ethnic or cultural group as follows: "Some people have a stronger sense of belonging to some things than others. Using a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is not strong at all and 5 is very strong, how strong is your sense of belonging to

⁴ Another indicator of social integration is Canadian identity used, for example, by Reitz and Banerjee (2007). Jebwab (2008b) has pointed to some of the problems with the measure, particularly its not being correlated with sense of belonging to Canada.

your ethnic or cultural group(s)?" Similar questions were asked for sense of belonging to town, city or municipality, province, Canada, and North America.

As could be expected the proportion with strong sense of belonging to one's ethnic group or community is higher (by 22.7 percentage points) for visible minority than for not visible minority (Table B13). Somewhat unexpected however is the visible minority's stronger sense belonging to the town, municipality or city (by almost 10 percentage points). The sense of belonging of the not visible minority is only higher in the province (and only by 2.4 percentage points), whereas the sense of belonging to Canada (around 69%) and to North America (about 49%) are almost the same for both visible and not visible minority.

Sense of belonging varies greatly among ethnic minority groups. The sense of belonging to North America is highest for Latin American (65.4%) and Filipino (60.5%) and lowest for Chinese (40.5%) and Southeast Asian (46.5%). For sense of belonging to ethnic group, town, city or municipality, province, and Canada, Arab has the highest and East Asian the lowest.

Table B13 : Proportion (%) with strong sense of belonging to ethnic group, town or city, province, Canada, and North America by Visible minority, Canadians aged 15-24 in 2002

	Total	Ethnic Group		Town or City		Province		Canada		North America	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Total	3513890	1623675	46.2	1572030	44.7	1836120	52.3	2435080	69.3	1720350	49.0
Visible minority	643485	417765	64.9	339085	52.7	323765	50.3	446770	69.4	318015	49.4
Chinese	159185	96345	60.5	77190	48.5	70350	44.2	103075	64.8	64465	40.5
South Asian	125950	89930	71.4	79370	63.0	73035	58.0	96205	76.4	67465	53.6
Black	97685	64595	66.1	48865	50.0	42640	43.6	61715	63.2	47205	48.3
Filipino	41150	28280	68.7	24560	59.7	25790	62.7	32440	78.8	24885	60.5
Latin American	45220	32670	72.2	25175	55.7	25100	55.5	30430	67.3	29590	65.4
Southeast Asian	35870	17765	49.5	13425	37.4	13560	37.8	22565	62.9	16665	46.5
Arab	41310	31265	75.7	28765	69.6	28740	69.6	34670	83.9	21125	51.1
Other visible minority	77505	45835	59.1	33690	43.5	36015	46.5	52260	67.4	37675	48.6
Multiple visible minority	19610	11085	56.5	8045	41.0	8535	43.5	13415	68.4	8940	45.6
Not in a visible minority	2870405	1205910	42.0	1232945	43.0	1512355	52.7	1988310	69.3	1402335	48.9

Note: Weighted numbers rounded to multiples of 5.

Source: 2002 Ethnic Diversity Survey

To get a summary measure of sense of belonging, we created types of identities from sense of belonging to one's own ethnic group and sense of belonging to the wider society patterned after types of acculturation strategies proposed by Berry and colleagues (Berry, 2008; Phinney *et al.*, 2006; Ravanera and Rajulton, 2008). We derived the variable sense of belonging to the wider society from sense of belonging to town, city or municipality, province, Canada, and North America through factor analysis. Then, using sense of belonging to one's ethnic group, and sense of belonging to wider society we came up with a 2x2 table deriving 4 types of identities as follows:

Figure 1: Types of Ethnic/Cultural Identity

Sense of belonging to ethnic group	Sense of belonging to wider society	
	Weak	Strong
Weak	<i>Marginalized Identity</i>	<i>Assimilated Identity</i>
Strong	<i>Separated Identity</i>	<i>Integrated Identity</i>

These categories are used as measure of social integration with a *marginalized identity* being the least socially integrated – that is, with a weak sense of belonging to both ethnic group and wider society, and *integrated identity* a strong sense of belonging to both. In deriving the types of identity, we use the values between 1 to 3 of sense of belonging to one’s ethnic group as “weak” and 4 and 5 as “strong”, and for sense of belonging to wider society, we use a factor score of less than or equal to zero as “weak” and greater than zero as “strong”.

For all visible minority combined, the identity with the highest proportion is *integrated* (41.4%), while *assimilated* (12.6%) is the lowest (Table B14). For the not visible minority, the identity with the highest proportion (36.4%) is *marginalized identity* and *separated* (14.9%), the lowest. These distributions by types of identities could be interpreted in a number of ways. One that stands out is supportive of multiculturalism; that is, the high proportion with strong sense of belonging to one’s

Table B14: Types of identity by Visible minority, Canadians aged 15-24 in 2002

	Total Weighted N*	Margin- alized	Separa- ted	Assimi- lated	Integra- ted
Total	7802	33.5	16.8	18.9	30.7
Visible minority	1409	20.4	25.7	12.6	41.4
Chinese	353	27.2	28.0	10.8	34.0
South Asian	277	14.1	22.4	11.9	51.6
Black	209	15.8	32.1	13.4	38.8
Filipino	91	19.8	20.9	8.8	50.5
Latin American	97	13.4	19.6	11.3	55.7
Southeast Asian	81	34.6	27.2	16.0	22.2
Arab	90	7.8	20.0	16.7	55.6
Other visible minority	167	22.8	28.1	16.8	32.3
Multiple visible minority	44	34.1	20.5	6.8	38.6
Not in visible minority	6393	36.4	14.9	20.3	28.4

* Fractional weights calculated as: Weight/Mean weight for aged 15-24.
Source: 2002 Ethnic Diversity Survey

ethnic group among visible minority group (as seen in Table B13 above) does not preclude a strong sense of belonging to the wider community, evidenced by the higher proportions of visible minority with *integrated* identity. This is particularly true for Latin American, Arab, and South Asian, with more than 50% having *integrated* identity. Arab has also the highest proportion with assimilated identity (16.7%) among the visible minority groups.

Southeast Asian has the highest proportion (34.6) with *marginalized* identity followed by the Chinese (27.2%). These two groups also have the next to highest levels of separated identity (at 27.2% and 28.0% for Southeast Asian and Chinese respectively), with Black having the highest with 32.1%.

4. Summary Discussion of Visible Minority Youth

Of the 4.2 million population aged 15-24 living in Canada in 2006, 785 thousand are visible minority, 63.5% or about 500 thousand are from the three largest groups – Chinese, South Asian, and Black. The rest of the visible minority are Filipino, Latin American, Southeast Asian, Arab, West Asian, Korean, Japanese, and other visible minority or visible minority from more than one group. A little more than half (51.2%) of the visible minority youth are immigrants, about a third of whom became landed immigrant in the last five years before the census (2001-2006). Immigration status varies by visible minority groups – West Asian and Arab have the highest

with 84.8% and 64.8% immigrants respectively; in contrast, Japanese with 8% and Black with 39.6% have the lowest proportions.

Looking at socio-economic integration, compared to not visible minority, visible minority youth has higher level of education⁵, indicated by the greater proportion with university education and the smaller proportion with no certificate, diploma or degree. But, the not visible minority youth has higher proportion employed, lower unemployment rate, and higher median income. The comparison holds true for both immigrant and non-immigrant youth populations, and thus, the economic disadvantage of the visible minority cannot be solely attributed to immigration status.

Indicators of social integration present a more equivocal portrait provided by data from the 2002 Ethnic Diversity Survey. The visible minority youth are less satisfied with life, have lower trust in people, and experienced more discrimination, all in comparison with not visible minority population. While fewer of them belong to sports club or team, more belong to religious-affiliated groups and ethnic associations. As can be expected, the sense of belonging to one's ethnic group is stronger. Less expected is that their sense of belonging to the town, city or municipality is stronger, and that the sense of belonging to the Province, Canada, and North America are not much different from the not visible minority population. A measure of socio-cultural identity derived from these various measures of sense of belonging indicates that, in comparison to not visible minority, a greater proportion of the visible minority have *integrated* identity characterized by strong sense of belonging to one's ethnic group and to the wider society, and a lower proportion with *marginalized* identity, one with weak sense of belonging to both one's ethnic group and wider society. It would seem that in spite of disadvantages in the economic and social domains, the visible minority population do have a strong sense of belonging to society.

But, the visible minority is a heterogeneous population and visible minority groups vary in economic and social integration. The differences in economic integration by ethnic groups have been well documented, particularly for the second generation visible minority who for the most part are doing well but that variations by ethnic groups exist (see for example, Boyd, 2002, 2008; Corak, 2008; and for the US, Kao and Tienda, 1995). Nevertheless, there is benefit to examining the tabulated data from the census, augmented by data from the Ethnic Diversity, for snap shots of levels of integration of the various groups.

Of the 187 thousand **Chinese** aged 15-24, 40% are non-immigrants, about half are landed immigrants, and about 10% are non-permanent residents, most likely, with student permits. High level of education is a defining characteristic of Chinese youth. The lowest proportion with full employment and the very low median income of those who worked are probably indications of the greater preference for full time studies over work. Satisfaction with life is one of the lowest but trust in people is highest. A high proportion with *marginalized* and *separated* identities suggests a weak social integration of Chinese youth. This may be a true reflection of weaker tie to society but might also simply reflect a cultural trait of less exuberance in declaring strong feelings in general.

⁵ Krahn and Taylor (2005: 429) suggest that high education of the visible minority is high aspiration that is in turn a product of affirmation of their cultural group while "showing openness to members of other cultural group", a manifestation of multiculturalism.

There are 181 thousand **South Indians**, of whom about 96 thousand (53%) are immigrants. The level of education is only marginally lower than that of the Chinese, but unlike the Chinese, a higher proportion of them worked, many on full time basis. The median income is higher than the average for visible minority. Though membership in sports club or team is low, membership in religious-affiliated groups is the highest. The level of satisfaction in life is one of the highest, and the proportion with *integrated* identity is very high with about 52% having a strong sense of belonging to one's ethnic group and the wider society.

The **Black** population of 130 thousand youth, 50 thousand of whom are immigrants, is the most disadvantaged of the three largest visible minority groups. In comparison to Chinese and South Indian, Black has lower education level. The proportion who worked in 2005 and the median income is not much different from the average for visible minority, however, the unemployment rate is the highest. The Black population has the highest level of experience of discrimination, and the lowest level of trust in people in general. Sense of belonging to ethnic group is strong but is not matched by strong sense of belonging to the wider society, so that the Black youth have the highest level with *separated* identity (32%).

The other visible minority groups are smaller – with about 50 thousand or less population, each with unique means of integration to Canadian society. A summary discussion is made for Filipino and Latin American, the groups with over 50 thousand population.

Of the **Filipino** population of 54 thousand, about 30 thousand are immigrants, more than a third of whom arrived in 2001-2006. The education profile of Filipino is not much different from the average for visible minority, which is at a higher level than that of the not visible minority. Filipino immigrants, along with Southeast Asian and Latin American, have highest work activity, with high proportion on full time basis. Filipino immigrants also have the lowest unemployment rate, and one of the highest median incomes. (As noted above, however, the median income of less than \$9,000 may be an indication that many of them may be working at low-paying, insecure jobs, which may be at the expense of pursuing higher education.) Filipino has high level of trust in people and the lowest proportion with experience of discrimination, though at 28.5% is still almost 3 times higher than the level for not visible minority. Sense of belonging to ethnic group and wider society is strong such that 50% have *integrated* identity.

Sixty percent of **Latin American** population of 52 thousand are immigrants, more than a quarter of whom (about 8 thousand) arrived before 1991. Of the visible minority groups, Latin American has the highest proportion with trade or college education (15%), but has the lowest proportion with university education (5.6%). Latin American immigrants are better integrated into the work force with immigrants having lower unemployment rate, higher work activity, and higher income than non-immigrants. This is similar to the advantage observed for Filipino immigrants, though the differences by immigration status are larger for Latin American than for Filipino. Latin American has the highest score for satisfaction with life, and their sense of belonging to both ethnic group and the wider

society is strong such that, along with Arab, Latin American has the highest proportion with *integrated* identity (55.7%).

While our analysis shows positive aspects of social integration, particularly strong sense of belonging to the wider society of visible minority youth, high levels of discrimination remain and need to be addressed. Mock (2006) suggests that combating racial discrimination could be done within the framework of multiculturalism, including society's commitment and resources.

C. Aboriginal Youth

While the not visible minority is shown to be advantaged over the visible minority, the not visible minority consists of heterogeneous groups; some of them are as disadvantaged as the visible minority. One such group is the aboriginal population, and the demographic and socio-economic profiles of the aboriginal population aged 15-24 are discussed in the following section.

1. Demographic Profile

The 2006 census counted 212 thousand population aged 15-24 with aboriginal identity (Table C1). The aboriginal population has younger age structure than the non-aboriginal. While the aboriginal population aged 15-24 constitute 5% of the total Canadian population of the same age group, the total aboriginal population of 1.17 million make up only 3.8% of the total population; furthermore, the population aged 15-24 is 13.3% of the non-aboriginal population, whereas the same age group is 18.1% of the aboriginal population. North American Indian is the largest group making up 58.9% of the aboriginal population, Métis is second largest (33.6%), Inuit, the third largest (5.0%), and the remaining 2.6% are other aboriginals or have more than one aboriginal identity.

Table C1: Population aged 15-24 by sex and aboriginal identity

	Females		Age 15-24 Males		Both sexes		All Age Groups Both sexes		Age 15-24 as % of all age groups
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	
Total - Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal	2062245	100.0	2145565	100.0	4207815	100.0	31241030	100.0	13.5
Total Aboriginal population	106365	5.2	105640	4.9	212005	5.0	1172790	3.8	18.1
North American Indian single resp.	62465	3.0	62365	2.9	124835	3.0	698025	2.2	17.9
Métis single response	36085	1.7	35150	1.6	71235	1.7	389780	1.2	18.3
Inuit single response	5210	0.3	5335	0.2	10555	0.3	50480	0.2	20.9
Multiple Aboriginal identity resp.	745	0.0	695	0.0	1445	0.0	7740	0.0	18.7
Aboriginal responses n.i.e.	1855	0.1	2075	0.1	3935	0.1	26760	0.1	14.7
Non-Aboriginal population	1955875	94.8	2039920	95.1	3995805	95.0	30068240	96.2	13.3

Source: Census of Canada, 2006. Table 97-558-XCB2006006

A breakdown of the population aged 15-24 by 5-year age groups (15-19 and 20-24), gives further indication of the younger age structure of the aboriginal population (Table C2). For non-aboriginal population, the 15-24 population is almost equally divided into the two 5-year age groups. For aboriginal population, however, 55.7% are in age group 15-19. The percentages are even higher for North American Indian (56.7%) and for Inuit (56.9%).

Table C2: Population 15-24 by aboriginal identity and 5-year age group

Total - Area of Residence	15-24		15-19		20-24	
	N	N	%	N	%	
Total - Aboriginal & non-Aboriginal population	4207815	2135920	50.8	2071895	49.2	
Total Aboriginal identity population	212005	118105	55.7	93900	44.3	
North American Indian single response	124835	70840	56.7	53995	43.3	
Métis single response	71235	38490	54.0	32745	46.0	
Inuit single response	10555	6005	56.9	4550	43.1	
Multiple Aboriginal identity responses	1445	750	51.9	695	48.1	
Aboriginal responses nie	3935	2025	51.5	1910	48.5	
Non-Aboriginal identity population	3995805	2017810	50.5	1977995	49.5	

Source: Census of Canada, 2006. Table 97-558-XCB2006006

While majority or 66.9% of the non-aboriginal population live in Urban Census Metropolitan Areas (CMA), only 31.5% of aboriginal population do so (Table C3). The highest proportion (44.7%) of North American Indian lives on reserve and next highest in Urban CMA (26.9%). Métis are the most urbanized with 42.6% living in CMA and 29.5% in non-CMA. Most Inuit (61.4%) live in rural areas and only 8.8% of them live in CMA.

Table C3: Population aged 15-24 by aboriginal identity and area of residence

	All	On reserve		Rural	Urban- Non-CMA		Urban - CMA		
	Areas	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Total - Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal	4207815	59980	1.4	728955	17.3	680050	16.2	2738820	65.1
Total Aboriginal population	212005	57055	26.9	40170	18.9	47890	22.6	66885	31.5
North American Indian single resp.	124835	55830	44.7	13080	10.5	22380	17.9	33545	26.9
Métis single response	71235	735	1.0	19145	26.9	21030	29.5	30325	42.6
Inuit single response	10555	65	0.6	6480	61.4	3070	29.1	930	8.8
Multiple Aboriginal identity resp.	1445	25	1.7	300	20.8	450	31.1	665	46.0
Aboriginal responses n.i.e.	3935	390	9.9	1160	29.5	965	24.5	1420	36.1
Non-Aboriginal population	3995805	2925	0.1	688795	17.2	632155	15.8	2671920	66.9

Source: Census of Canada, 2006. Table 97-558-XCB2006006

2. Socio-economic and Educational Profiles

The proportion of aboriginal population with no certificate, diploma, or degree at 62.6% is 1.6 times higher than for non-aboriginal population with 38.7% (Table C4). The disadvantage extends to the proportion with diploma or degree. The proportions with high school certificate or diploma at 25.8%, college (9.2%), or university degree (2.4%) are lower for aboriginal population, which for non-aboriginal are 36.9%, 15.6%, and 8.8% respectively. However, the aboriginal population has a higher proportion in age 15-19; the gaps would have been smaller had the age structure been similar to that of the non-aboriginal population.

Of the three major groups of aboriginals, Métis has higher levels of education, followed by the North American Indian, and Inuit the lowest. For proportion with college or trades education, for example, Métis has 12.1%, North American Indian, 7.6%, and Inuit 7.1%. There are gender differences in education levels with females having somewhat higher levels than the males.

(Gender differences in education, work, and income could be found in Appendix Tables C1, C3, and C4 and will not be discussed in the text.)

Table C4: Population aged 15-24 by aboriginal identity and highest certificate

	Total	No certificate, diploma or degree	High school certificate or equivalent	College or trades certificate or diploma¹	University²				
Total - Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal	4207815	1679020	39.9	1528010	36.3	643555	15.3	357225	8.5
Total Aboriginal population	212010	132670	62.6	54785	25.8	19540	9.2	5010	2.4
North American Indian single resp.	124835	85410	68.4	28055	22.5	9450	7.6	1910	1.5
Métis single response	71240	36330	51.0	23490	33.0	8595	12.1	2815	4.0
Inuit single response	10555	8060	76.4	1640	15.5	750	7.1	100	0.9
Multiple Aboriginal identity resp.	1445	810	56.1	390	27.0	200	13.8	45	3.1
Aboriginal responses n.i.e.	3940	2055	52.2	1205	30.6	540	13.7	140	3.6
Non-Aboriginal population	3995805	1546350	38.7	1473220	36.9	624015	15.6	352220	8.8

Note: 1 includes apprenticeship, CEGEP, and other non university certificate or diploma

2 includes certificate or diploma below bachelor, bachelor or higher certificate, diploma or degree

Source: Census of Canada, 2006. Table 97-560-XCB2006036 - 20% Sample Data.

The proportion attaining post-secondary education is lower for population on reserve, as compared to population in rural and urban areas (Table C5, see also Appendix Table C2 for details). For all aboriginal population aged 15-24, on reserve, 5.8% has apprenticeship, College or other non-university certificate or diploma, whereas in rural and urban areas, this proportion is 9.7% and 10.7% respectively. With one exception, the Métis has higher levels of education in all types of areas of residence, followed by North American Indian. The exception is Inuit living on reserve that has a high proportion (15.4%) with college education; there are however very few Inuit living on reserve.

Table C5: Proportion (%) of population aged 15-24 with college and university education by aboriginal identity and area of residence

All areas of residence	All Areas		On reserve		Rural		Urban	
	College¹	Univ.²	College¹	Univ.²	College¹	Univ.²	College¹	Univ.²
Total - Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal	15.3	8.5	6.2	1.0	15.2	4.8	15.5	9.4
Total Aboriginal population	9.2	2.4	5.8	0.7	9.7	2.2	10.7	3.2
North American Indian single resp.	7.6	1.5	5.8	0.7	8.5	1.8	9.1	2.3
Métis single response	12.1	4.0	7.5	2.7	11.5	3.0	12.3	4.4
Inuit single response	7.1	0.9	15.4	0.0	5.9	0.3	9.0	2.1
Multiple Aboriginal identity resp.	13.8	2.4	0.0	0.0	11.7	0.0	14.3	3.1
Aboriginal responses n.i.e.	13.9	3.4	9.0	0.0	13.4	3.9	14.7	3.6
Non-Aboriginal population	15.6	8.8	12.5	6.5	15.5	4.9	15.6	9.6

Note: 1 includes apprenticeship, CEGEP, and other non university certificate or diploma

2 includes certificate or diploma below bachelor, bachelor or higher certificate, diploma or degree

Source: Census of Canada, 2006. Table 97-560-XCB2006036 - 20% Sample Data.

As with education, work activity indicators show a disadvantaged aboriginal youth population (Table C6). The employment rate of aboriginal population (40.7%) is 0.70 of the rate for non-aboriginal (58.0%); and unemployment rate is 1.7 higher at 21.6% for aboriginal and 12.4% for non-aboriginal. Métis have the highest participation rate (65.5%) and employment rate (55.5%) and the lowest unemployment rate (15.3%). Unlike education, work activity indicators show a slightly better picture for Inuit than for North American Indian.

Table C6: Population aged 15-24 by aboriginal identity and labour force activity

	Population	In the labour force	Participation rate	Employment rate	Unemployment rate
Both Sexes					
Total - Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal	4207815	2757975	65.5	57.2	12.8
Total Aboriginal population	212010	110070	51.9	40.7	21.6
North American Indian single resp.	124835	55460	44.4	32.6	26.7
Métis single response	71240	46665	65.5	55.5	15.3
Inuit single response	10555	4865	46.1	34.1	26.0
Multiple Aboriginal identity resp.	1445	830	57.4	52.6	8.4
Aboriginal responses n.i.e.	3940	2250	57.1	44.9	21.1
Non-Aboriginal population	3995805	2647905	66.3	58.0	12.4

Source: Census of Canada, 2006. Table 97-559-XCB2006027 - 20% Sample Data

Another set of socio-economic indicators includes levels of full-time employment and median income (Table C7). Full-time employment of aboriginal youth population (18.0% of employed population) is not much different from that of non-aboriginal population (18.7), with Métis having an even higher proportion (20.5%). However, at age 15-24 a full time employment may be detrimental in the long run, particularly if secondary schooling is foregone. Among those employed, whether full-time or on other work arrangements, the median income of aboriginal population is lower than the non-aboriginal – the median income of aboriginal population (\$6285) is 0.79 that of the non-aboriginal (\$7941). For those employed full year, full time, the salary of aboriginal (\$19399) is 0.88 of the income of non-aboriginal (\$22043). Métis has the highest median income; with the next highest the Inuit for full-time, full year employment, and the North American Indian for all other work arrangements.

Table C7 : Population aged 15-24 with employment income in 2005 by aboriginal identity, work activities and median income

	All Work Activities		Full year, full time			All Other Activities		
	Pop. w/ income	Median income	Pop. w/ income	% of Total	Median income	Pop. w/ income	% of Total	Median income
Total - Aboriginal & non-Aboriginal population	3005010	7881	560575	18.7	21967	2444435	81.3	6216
Total Aboriginal identity population	119250	6285	21500	18.0	19399	97750	82.0	4871
North American Indian single response	59475	5324	9440	15.9	17860	50035	84.1	4165
Métis single response	50390	7637	10345	20.5	20684	40040	79.5	5765
Inuit single response	6055	5437	1030	17.0	19423	5030	83.1	4012
Multiple Aboriginal identity responses	920	7204	225	24.5	16726	685	74.5	4148
Aboriginal responses nie	2410	7440	460	19.1	20036	1955	81.1	5789
Non-Aboriginal identity population	2885760	7941	539075	18.7	22043	2346685	81.3	6277

Source: Census of Canada, 2006. Table 97-563-XCB2006061 - 20% Sample Data

3. Summary Discussion of Aboriginal Youth

The aboriginal population aged 15-24 of 212 thousand constitutes 5% of the total population of the same age group. The aboriginal population has a younger age structure than the non-aboriginal population. The three largest groups of aboriginal population are North American Indian with 125 thousand, Métis with 71 thousand, and Inuit with 11 thousand. North American

Indian has more population on reserve than in rural or urban areas; more Inuit population live in rural area; and more Métis live in urban than either rural area or on reserve.

The education level of aboriginal population is lower than that of non-aboriginal population. Of the three large aboriginal groups, Métis has the highest level with many more of them having had post-secondary education. The North American Indian comes next, with the Inuit having the lowest level. In general, aboriginal who live in urban areas has higher proportion with secondary or post-secondary certificate, diploma, or degree than those who live on reserve or in rural area.

While the unemployment rate of young Métis (15.3%) is only 3% higher than the non-aboriginal (12.4%), the unemployment rates of North American Indian (26.7%) and Inuit (26.0%) are more than double that of the non-aboriginal. The median income of aboriginal is about 0.80 of the median income of non-aboriginal.

D. Official Language Minority Youth

We have examined the demographic and socio-economic profiles of minority groups in Canada as a country; that is, visible minority and aboriginal populations. Another minority group specific to provinces is based on language; that is, Anglophone in Quebec, and Francophone in the rest of Canada (hereafter referred to as ROC)⁶. In the next sections, we examine the demographic and socio-economic profile of these minority groups using data on mother tongue from the 2006 census.

1. Demographic Profile

There are 85 thousand Anglophone aged 15-24 in Quebec representing 2.0% of Canadian population or 9% of Quebec population of the same age (Table D1). In ROC, there are 98 thousand Francophone, which is 2.3% of the Canadian population or 3% of ROC population. Those who have both English and French mother tongue, of whom about 8 thousand live in Quebec and about 9 thousand in ROC, constitute less than 1% of the Canadian population aged 15-24. In the subsequent discussion, we will mainly focus on those with only one mother tongue as those who are bilingual, by definition, are not minority in Quebec nor in ROC as they can belong to one or the other language group, if they choose to.

⁶ This analysis differs from Jantzen (2008) in that she examined the diverse mother tongues (or allophone) of those whose first official language is either English or French. Similarly, Ferron (2008) examined the impact in the community of recent immigrants whose mother tongue is other than English or French.

Table D1: Population aged 15-24 in Quebec and Rest of Canada by mother tongue¹ and sex

Quebec	Males			Females			Both Sexes		
	N	%	%	N	%	%	N	%	%
Total - Mother tongue	480525	22.4	100.0	464245	22.5	100.0	944770	22.5	100.0
English	43145	2.0	9.0	42330	2.1	9.1	85470	2.0	9.0
French	382755	17.8	79.7	369020	17.9	79.5	751775	17.9	79.6
English and French	3915	0.2	0.8	3655	0.2	0.8	7570	0.2	0.8
Rest of Canada									
Total - Mother tongue	1665025	77.6	100.0	1597995	77.5	100.0	3263035	77.5	100.0
English	1316285	61.3	79.1	1254945	60.9	78.5	2571240	61.1	78.8
French	48775	2.3	2.9	48915	2.4	3.1	97700	2.3	3.0
English and French	4560	0.2	0.3	4760	0.2	0.3	9315	0.2	0.3

Note: 1 Although included in the total, the population with non-official language mother tongue is not shown in the table.

Source: Census of Canada, 2006. Table 97-555-XCB200605 - 20% Sample Data

In Quebec, the proportions of population aged 15-19 (50.3%) and aged 20-24 (49.7%) for Anglophone are almost the same as those for Francophone – 50.6% for population aged 15-19 and 49.4% for those aged 20-24 (Table D2). In ROC, Francophone is somewhat older than Anglophone. The proportions aged 15-19 and 20-24 for Francophone are 49.4% and 50.6% respectively, whereas for Anglophone, the proportions are 51.9% for population aged 15-19 and 48.1% for those aged 20-24.

Table D2: Population aged 15-24 in Quebec and Rest of Canada by mother tongue¹ and age groups						
	15-24		15-19		20-24	
	Total	N	%	N	%	%
Quebec						
Total - Mother tongue	944770	474110	50.2	470660	49.8	
English	85470	42955	50.3	42515	49.7	
French	751775	380290	50.6	371485	49.4	
English and French	7565	3890	51.4	3675	48.6	
Rest of Canada						
Total - Mother tongue	3263045	1661810	50.9	1601235	49.1	
English	2571245	1333200	51.9	1238045	48.1	
French	97700	48230	49.4	49470	50.6	
English and French	9340	4710	50.4	4630	49.6	

Note: 1 Although included in the total, the population with non-official language mother tongue is not shown in the table.

Source: Census of Canada, 2006. Table 97-555-XCB200605 - 20% Sample Data

The proportions of immigrants among both Anglophone and Francophone in Quebec and ROC are low, ranging only from 2% to 6% (Table D3). In Quebec, the proportion of Anglophone immigrant is 6%, which is higher than the proportion of Francophone immigrant (2.2%). In ROC, the proportion of Anglophone immigrant is almost similar (4.4%) to the Francophone immigrant (4.6%).

Table D3: Population aged 15-24 in Quebec and Rest of Canada by mother tongue¹ and immigration status

	Total		English		French		English & French	
Quebec								
Total Population	944765	100.0	85470	100.0	751775	100.0	7565	100.0
Non-immigrants	858880	90.9	78605	92.0	731490	97.3	6805	90.0
Immigrants	73820	7.8	5140	6.0	16445	2.2	725	9.6
Non-permanent Residents	12070	1.3	1725	2.0	3840	0.5	35	0.5
Rest of Canada								
Total Population	3263045	100.0	2571245	100.0	97695	100.0	9335	100.0
Non-immigrants	2733555	83.8	2448240	95.2	92395	94.6	8440	90.4
Immigrants	475430	14.6	112105	4.4	4465	4.6	775	8.3
Non-permanent Residents	54045	1.7	10890	0.4	830	0.8	100	1.1

Note: 1 Although included in the total, the population with non-official language mother tongue is not shown in the table.

Source: Census of Canada, 2006. Table 97-555-XCB200605 - 20% Sample Data

2. Socio-economic and Educational Profiles

In general, the proportion with certificate, diploma, or degree of any kind is higher in Quebec (63.2%) than ROC (59.2) (Table D4). The difference lies mainly in the proportion with College, CEGEP or other non-university, for which the proportion in Quebec (17.9%) is double that in ROC (8.9). In Quebec, Anglophone has higher education level than Francophone. Anglophone has higher proportion with certificate of any kind at 67.4%, College, CEGEP or other non-university at 19.1%, and university degree at bachelor's level or above at 8.1%; the corresponding figures for Francophone are 62.6%, 17.8% and 5.8% respectively. In ROC, Francophone has higher proportion of population with certificate of any kind at 62.6; College, CEGEP, or other non-university at 12.2%, and university degree at 7.3%; whereas, Anglophone has 58.0%, 8.9%, and 6.1% respectively. These indicate that in terms of education, the language minority population is doing better in both Quebec and ROC. (Note however that in ROC, Francophone has older age structure than Anglophone, which could account for part of the advantage over the Anglophone.)

For all types of certificates, females have higher proportion than males for both Anglophone and Francophone in Quebec and in ROC.

Table D4: Distribution of population aged 15-24 in Quebec and Rest of Canada by mother tongue, sex and highest certificate

	All Mother Tongue			English			French		
	Total	Males	Females	Total	Males	Females	Total	Males	Females
Quebec									
Certificate, diploma or degree ¹	63.2	59.7	66.8	67.4	65.3	69.6	62.6	58.7	66.7
College, CEGEP or other non-university	17.9	14.8	21.0	19.1	17.4	20.9	17.8	14.4	21.4
University at bachelor's level or above	5.6	4.0	7.2	8.1	5.8	10.4	5.1	3.6	6.7
Rest of Canada									
Certificate, diploma or degree ¹	59.2	57.0	61.5	58.0	55.7	60.3	62.6	60.0	65.2
College, CEGEP or other non-university	8.9	7.8	10.0	8.9	7.7	10.1	12.2	11.5	12.9
University at bachelor's level or above	6.7	4.9	8.4	6.1	4.4	7.8	7.3	5.0	9.7

Note: 1 includes all certificate: (1) high school certificate or equivalent, (2) apprenticeship or trades certificate or diploma, (3) College, CEGEP or other non-university certificate, (4) university certificate or diploma below bachelor, (4) university certificate or diploma at bachelor's level or above. This is complement of "no certificate, diploma, or degree".

Source: Census of Canada, 2006. Table 97-555-XCB200605 - 20% Sample Data

In contrast to education, the labour force indicators show the opposite – the language minority population has lower labour force participation than the majority (Table D5). In Quebec, Anglophone has lower participation rate than Francophone (59.4% vs. 65.4%), lower employment rate (50.5% vs. 58.0%), and higher unemployment rate (15.0% vs. 11.3%). Similarly in ROC, Francophone has higher unemployment rate than Anglophone (13.7% vs. 12.8%), although Francophone does have higher participation (70.1% vs. 68.6%) and employment rates (60.5% vs. 59.9%). These trends hold for males and females.

Table D5: Distribution of Population aged 15-24 in Quebec and Rest of Canada by mother tongue, sex and labour force activity

	All Mother Tongue			English			French		
	Total	Males	Females	Total	Males	Females	Total	Males	Females
Quebec									
Participation Rate	63.4	63.3	63.5	59.4	59.0	59.8	65.4	65.3	65.6
Employment Rate	55.8	55.0	56.6	50.5	49.1	52.0	58.0	57.2	58.9
Unemployment Rate	12.0	13.2	10.9	15.0	16.8	13.1	11.3	12.4	10.2
Rest of Canada									
Participation Rate	66.2	66.3	66.1	68.6	68.6	68.6	70.1	70.3	70.0
Employment Rate	57.6	57.4	57.8	59.9	59.6	60.1	60.5	60.0	61.0
Unemployment Rate	13.0	13.4	12.6	12.8	13.1	12.4	13.7	14.5	12.8

Source: Census of Canada, 2006. Table 97-555-XCB200605 - 20% Sample Data

These labour force indicators refer to the week before the census and are more volatile than the indicators of work activity for 2005 (Table D6). The work activity indicators show a similar picture for Quebec though not for ROC. In Quebec, compared to Francophone, Anglophone has lower work activity and lower level of income. For example, the proportion with employment income is 66.6% for Anglophone, while it is 72.6% for Francophone. Similarly, the proportion of

population who worked full time is 10.7% for Anglophone but 14.1% for Francophone. These differences are in the same direction for males and females.

In ROC, the difference between language groups are small, although most indicators do show that compared to Anglophone, Francophone has higher income and higher proportion who worked in 2005. For example, the proportion with \$20,000 or higher income is 16.8% for Francophone but 15.4% for Anglophone. There are gender differences. For females, the indicators show that Francophone women have higher work activity and income than Anglophone women, though the differences are small. The direction of differences between Francophone men and Anglophone men are small and do not go in the same direction.

Table D6: Distribution of population aged 15-24 in Quebec and Rest of Canada by mother tongue, sex, income and work activity

	All Mother Tongue			English			French		
	Total	Males	Females	Total	Males	Females	Total	Males	Females
Quebec									
With income	77.9	77.7	78.2	75.9	75.0	76.9	79.0	78.8	79.3
With \$20,000 and higher income	13.7	16.5	10.9	11.3	12.4	10.1	14.6	17.8	11.4
With employment income	70.4	70.4	70.4	66.6	65.6	67.7	72.6	72.6	72.7
Worked full year, full time in 2005	13.3	14.9	11.6	10.7	11.8	9.6	14.1	15.9	12.3
Worked part year or part time in 2005	52.7	51.0	54.5	51.4	49.3	53.5	54.4	52.5	56.3
Rest of Canada									
With income	80.4	80.0	80.7	81.6	81.2	82.0	82.1	80.7	82.6
With \$20,000 and higher income	14.7	17.9	11.4	15.4	18.9	11.7	16.8	20.6	12.9
With employment income	71.7	71.8	71.6	74.4	74.5	74.3	75.2	74.4	75.3
Worked full year, full time in 2005	13.3	15.0	11.6	14.2	16.0	12.4	14.4	16.1	12.5
Worked part year or part time in 2005	54.0	52.5	55.7	56.4	54.7	58.1	56.7	54.1	58.6

Source: Census of Canada, 2006. Table 97-555-XCB200605 - 20% Sample Data

3. Summary Discussion of Official Language Minority Youth

There are 85 thousand Anglophone in Quebec aged 15-24, which constitutes 9% of the Quebec's total population of the same age group. In ROC, there are 98 thousand Francophone making up 3% of the population aged 15-24. The proportions of population aged 15-19 and 20-24 are similar for Anglophone and Francophone in Quebec; for ROC, Francophone is older in that the proportion of 20-24 (50.6%) is higher than the 15-19 (49.4%) population; whereas Anglophone has higher proportion of 15-19 (51.9%) than 20-24 (48.1%) year old.

The proportion of immigrant population is low for either Francophone or Anglophone. In Quebec, Anglophone has higher proportion of immigrants (6.0%) than Francophone (2.2%). In ROC, the proportions of immigrants are almost the same – 4.4% for Anglophone and 4.6% for Francophone.

The language minority in Quebec and in ROC has higher level of education; that is, compared to Francophone, Anglophone in Quebec has higher proportion with University at bachelor's level or above. In ROC, compared to Anglophone, Francophone has higher proportion with university degree.

Indicators of labour force participation and work activity show differences in opposite direction, especially in Quebec. Participation and employment rates are lower, and unemployment rate is higher for Anglophone than for Francophone in Quebec. Likewise, the proportion with income and the level of income in 2005 are lower for Anglophone.

In ROC, the differences are not as clear cut: compared to Anglophone, labour force participation is higher for Francophone but unemployment rate is higher. From indicators for work activity in 2005, Francophone seems to have slight advantage over the Anglophone. However, Francophone in ROC has older age structure, which could explain their work activity advantage over Anglophone.

E. Youth of Various Religious Affiliations

Immigration in the past few decades has brought populations whose religions are not Christian, constituting minority groups based on religion. In this section, we describe the demographic and socio-economic profiles of followers aged 15-24 of six religions – Christian, Muslim, Jewish, Buddhist, Hindu, and Sikh – based on data from the public use micro-data file (PUMF) of the 2001 Census, the most recent census that collected data on religion. Included in the tables are combined followers of all other religions, and those with no religious affiliation. Also included though also not discussed are those whose information on religion were suppressed in the PUMF, mainly residents of Atlantic Provinces and the Territories, most of whom are Christians. The descriptions focus on the six major religions.

1. Demographic Profile

In 2001, excluding the population with no religious affiliation, the 93 thousand Muslims aged 15-24, constituting 2.3% of the population of the same age, is the second largest religious group, next to Christianity (Table E1). Jewish, Buddhist, Hindu, and Sikh each have about 40 to 44 thousand population, or 1% each of the population aged 15-24.

Table E1: Population aged 15-24 in 2001 by religion and sex

	Total			Female			Male		
	Number	% ^a	% ^b	Number	% ^a	% ^b	Number	% ^a	% ^b
Total	3981665	100.0		1946200	100.0		2035470	100.0	
Total - All Religions	3660025	91.9	100.0	1786500	91.8	100.0	1873525	92.0	100.0
Christian	2626875	66.0	71.8	1301850	66.9	72.9	1325030	65.1	70.7
Muslim	92700	2.3	2.5	44675	2.3	2.5	48020	2.4	2.6
Jewish	40315	1.0	1.1	18995	1.0	1.1	21320	1.0	1.1
Buddhist	42210	1.1	1.2	19865	1.0	1.1	22350	1.1	1.2
Hindu	41265	1.0	1.1	21015	1.1	1.2	20255	1.0	1.1
Sikh	44055	1.1	1.2	22390	1.2	1.3	21670	1.1	1.2
All other religions	15750	0.4	0.4	8735	0.4	0.5	7015	0.3	0.4
No religious affiliation	756850	19.0	20.7	348985	17.9	19.5	407870	20.0	21.8
Missing information*	321645	8.1		159700	8.2		161945	8.0	

* Detailed information on religion for Atlantic and Territories are not available in Census PUMF
^a - includes those with missing information on religion; ^b - calculated without the missing information.
 Numbers are rounded to nearest multiple of 5; % calculated before rounding.

Source: 2001 Census Public Use Micro-data File

Christian, Muslim, and Jewish have younger population with higher proportion in the age group 15-19 years old; that is, 52.3%, 53.0%, and 53.2% respectively, than in the age group 20-24 (Table E2). The proportion in the age group 20-24 is higher for Hindu and Sikh with 53.4% and 56.4% respectively. Buddhist has a population that is divided almost equally between the two age groups.

Table E2: Population aged 15-24 in 2001 by religion and age group

	Total	15-19		20-24	
		Number	%	Number	%
Total - All religions	3981665	2039410	51.2	1942255	48.8
Christian	2626875	1375085	52.3	1251790	47.7
Muslim	92700	49150	53.0	43545	47.0
Jewish	40315	21430	53.2	18885	46.8
Buddhist	42210	20745	49.1	21465	50.9
Hindu	41265	19215	46.6	22050	53.4
Sikh	44055	19190	43.6	24870	56.4
All other religions	15750	7025	44.6	8725	55.4
No religious affiliation	756850	357920	47.3	398930	52.7
Missing information*	321645	169650	52.7	151990	47.3

* Detailed information on religion for Atlantic and Territories are not available in the 2001 Census Public Use Micro-data File
Numbers are rounded to nearest multiple of 5; % calculated before rounding.

Source: 2001 Census Public Use Micro-data File

The distribution of visible minority groups by religion shows that the not visible minority and Black are mostly Christian and majority of Chinese has no religious affiliation. South Asian is the most diverse in terms of religion with 25.3% Hindu, 30.7% Sikh, 24.5% Muslim, and 13.5% Christian (Table E3a).

Table E3a : Population aged 15-24 in 2001 by religion and visible minority status
Percent distribution of visible minority population by religion

	Total		Chinese		South Asian		Black		Other visible minority		Non-visible minority	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Total	3980665	100.0	151080	100.0	139265	100.0	110315	100.0	226745	100.0	3353260	100.0
Christian	2626470	66.0	42485	28.1	18740	13.5	85570	77.6	130770	57.7	2348900	70.0
Muslim	92695	2.3	-	-	34135	24.5	7275	6.6	38385	16.9	12530	0.4
Jewish	40315	1.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	39795	1.2
Buddhist	42135	1.1	19075	12.6	1630	1.2	-	-	18980	8.4	2450	0.1
Hindu	41265	1.0	-	-	35180	25.3	-	-	4640	2.0	-	-
Sikh	44055	1.1	-	-	42755	30.7	-	-	-	-	-	-
All other religions	15750	0.4	-	-	1225	0.9	-	-	1965	0.9	11820	0.4
No religious affiliation	756665	19.0	87295	57.8	4635	3.3	12460	11.3	28745	12.7	623530	18.6
Missing information*	321310	8.1	1115	0.7	890	0.6	4300	3.9	2520	1.1	312490	9.3

Note: - nil or sample size less than 30

* Detailed information on religion for Atlantic and Territories are not available in Census PUMF

Numbers are rounded to nearest multiple of 5; % calculated before rounding.

Source: 2001 Census Public Use Micro-data File

Likewise, the distribution of religion by visible minority status shows that the Jewish and Christian are mostly not visible minority; and Hindu and Sikh are mainly South Asian (Table E3b). Buddhist is mainly Chinese (45.3%), South Asian (3.9%) or other visible minority (45.0%). The most diverse is Muslim with 36.8% South Asian, 7.9% Black, 41.4% other visible minority (mostly, Arab and West Asian), and 13.5% not visible minority.

Table E3b : Population aged 15-24 in 2001 by religion and visible minority status
Percent distribution of religion by visible minority group

	Total		Chinese		South Asian		Black		Other visible minority		Non-visible minority	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Total	3980665	100.0	151080	3.8	139265	3.5	110315	2.8	226745	5.7	3353260	84.2
Christian	2626470	100.0	42485	1.6	18740	0.7	85570	3.3	130770	5.0	2348900	89.4
Muslim	92695	100.0	-	-	34135	36.8	7275	7.9	38385	41.4	12530	13.5
Jewish	40315	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	39795	98.7
Buddhist	42135	100.0	19075	45.3	1630	3.9	-	-	18980	45.0	2450	5.8
Hindu	41265	100.0	-	-	35180	85.2	-	-	4640	11.2	-	-
Sikh	44055	100.0	-	-	42755	97.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
All other religions	15750	100.0	-	-	1225	7.8	-	-	1965	12.5	11820	75.0
No religious affiliation	756665	100.0	87295	11.5	4635	0.6	12460	1.6	28745	3.8	623530	82.4
Missing information*	321310	100.0	1115	0.3	890	0.3	4300	1.3	2520	0.8	312490	97.3

Note: - nil or sample size less than 30

* Detailed information on religion for Atlantic and Territories are not available in Census PUMF

Numbers are rounded to nearest multiple of 5; % calculated before rounding.

Source: 2001 Census Public Use Micro-data File

In terms of generation status, Christian, as can be expected, has the highest proportion of 3rd generation with 70.6% (Table E4). Muslim, Buddhist, and Hindu are mostly first generation immigrants. Sikh is almost equally divided into second generation and first generation immigrants. The most diverse is the Jewish, with 40.8% 3rd generation, 40.1% 2nd generation, and 19.1% 1st generation immigrants.

Table E4: Population aged 15-24 in 2001 by religion and generation status

	Total	First generation		2nd generation - both parents born outside of Canada		2nd generation - one parent born outside of Canada		Third generation and over	
		Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Total	3980665	535030	13.4	419560	10.5	346260	8.7	2679815	67.3
Christian	2626470	263095	10.0	271750	10.3	236175	9.0	1855455	70.6
Muslim	92700	70205	75.7	20270	21.9	1590	1.7	630	0.7
Jewish	40315	7680	19.1	7605	18.9	8565	21.2	16460	40.8
Buddhist	42135	28855	68.5	10760	25.5	705	1.7	1820	4.3
Hindu	41265	25615	62.1	14835	36.0	555	1.3	260	0.6
Sikh	44055	20930	47.5	22045	50.0	595	1.3	485	1.1
All other religions	15750	3115	19.8	1300	8.2	1450	9.2	9885	62.8
No religious affiliation	756665	108415	14.3	67060	8.9	83500	11.0	497690	65.8
Missing information*	321310	7120	2.2	3930	1.2	13130	4.1	297130	92.5

Source: 2001 Census Public Use Micro-data File

2. Socio-Economic and Educational Profiles

To examine the differences in education and work profile by religion, we focus on the age group 20-24, rather than a combined 15-24 age group, as the population distribution by age group differs by religion. Tabulation by 5-year age group is made possible by the availability of the public use micro-data file for the 2001 Census. (The information for age 15-19 can be found in

Appendix Tables E1, E3, E5, and E7, and tabulation for age group 20-24 by sex, Appendix Tables E2, E4, E6, and E8).

Jewish has the highest education level, evidenced by highest proportion with university education (28.1%), and lowest proportion with no degree (8.1%) (Table E5). Next highest in terms of education is Hindu (22.9%) followed by Muslim (20.1%). Christian has the lowest proportion with university education (12.5%) but has the highest in Trades certificate or College degree (29.5%). Sikh has the highest proportion with no degree (23.7%) and also the next lowest proportion with university degree (15.2%). Females have higher education than males and the differences by religion are similar for males and females (Appendix Table 8).

Table E5: Population aged 20-24 in 2001 by religion and highest certificate

Both Sexes	Total		No degree		High school		Trades or College		University	
	Number	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	
Total	1942257	363439	18.7	811829	41.8	508951	26.2	258038	13.3	
Christian	1251792	218407	17.4	507894	40.6	369392	29.5	156099	12.5	
Muslim	43546	7345	16.9	20815	47.8	6631	15.2	8755	20.1	
Jewish	18884	1521	8.1	8458	44.8	3598	19.1	5307	28.1	
Buddhist	21466	3738	17.4	10533	49.1	3374	15.7	3821	17.8	
Hindu	22051	3343	15.2	10133	46.0	3527	16.0	5048	22.9	
Sikh	24869	5899	23.7	11246	45.2	3933	15.8	3791	15.2	
All other religions	8726	2634	30.2	3753	43.0	1263	14.5	-	-	
No religious affiliation	398932	89926	22.5	177057	44.4	79680	20.0	52269	13.1	
Missing information	151991	30626	20.1	61940	40.8	37553	24.7	21872	14.4	

Note: - nil or sample size less than 30

* Detailed information on religion for Atlantic and Territories are not available in Census PUMF

Numbers are rounded to nearest multiple of 5; % calculated before rounding.

Source: 2001 Census Public Use Micro-data File

The picture for labour force participation is opposite that for education: Sikh, with the lowest education level, has the lowest unemployment rate (10.7%), and has a participation rate (82.4%) at the same level as Christian (82.6%) (Table E6). Muslim, with third highest education level, has the lowest participation (61.0%) and employment (49.3%) and the highest unemployment rate (19.1%).

Table E6: Population aged 20-24 in 2001 by religion and labour force activity in reference week

	Total	In the labour force	Participation rate	Employment rate	Unemployment rate
Total	1942255	1567585	80.7	70.3	12.9
Christian	1251790	1034525	82.6	73.0	11.6
Muslim	43545	26550	61.0	49.3	19.1
Jewish	18885	12910	68.4	59.1	13.5
Buddhist	21465	13225	61.6	53.0	14.0
Hindu	22050	15590	70.7	61.3	13.3
Sikh	24870	20490	82.4	73.6	10.7
All other religions	8725	6755	77.4	60.8	21.4
No religious affiliation	398935	316980	79.5	69.3	12.8
Missing information	151990	120560	79.3	61.8	22.1

Source: 2001 Census Public Use Micro-data File

While information on labour force participation refers only to the week before the 2001 Census, the work activity that refers to the year 2000 shows a similar picture. Christian has the highest proportion (55.5%) who worked full time, and Sikh comes close second with 54.6% (Table E7). Jewish has the highest proportion who worked mainly part time (40.4%), while for other religions, the proportions who worked mainly part time are all within the narrow range of about 28% to 32%.

Table E7: Population aged 20-24 in 2001 by religion, and work activity in 2000

	Total Number	Worked mainly full time		Worked mainly part time	
		Number	%	Number	%
Total	1942255	1066580	54.9	591805	30.5
Christian	1251790	694635	55.5	398540	31.8
Muslim	43545	13870	31.8	12985	29.8
Jewish	18885	7830	41.5	7635	40.4
Buddhist	21465	8080	37.6	5970	27.8
Hindu	22050	10210	46.3	6305	28.6
Sikh	24865	13580	54.6	7020	28.2
All other religions	8725	4085	46.8	2410	27.6
No religious affiliation	398935	223170	55.9	111130	27.9
Missing information	151990	91115	59.9	39810	26.2

Source: 2001 Census Public Use Micro-data File

Consistent with the trend in labour force and work activity, Sikh has the highest median wages and salaries of \$11,515, although Christian does have the highest total income of \$13,730 (Table E8). Muslim has the lowest total income – the mean income of \$8700 is 65% of the mean for the total population; and also the lowest wages and salaries – the median income of \$7480 is 70% of the median for the total population.

Table E8: Population aged 20-24 in 2001 by religion and income in 2000

	Total Income		Wages and Salaries			
	N	Mean	% w/ W &			Mean
			N	Salaries	Median	
Total	1942255	13375	1624490	83.6	10605	13805
Christian	1251790	13730	1070965	85.6	11000	14005
Muslim	43545	8700	26965	61.9	7480	11265
Jewish	18885	11570	15320	81.1	7865	12030
Buddhist	21465	9455	14160	66.0	9000	12355
Hindu	22050	11145	16295	73.9	9000	13360
Sikh	24870	12705	19970	80.3	11515	14525
All other religions	8725	10745	6420	73.6	8400	11455
No religious affiliation	398930	13955	326585	81.9	11885	14605
Missing information	151990	11635	127810	84.1	8205	11060

Source: 2001 Census Public Use Micro-data File

3. Civic Participation and Attitudinal Profiles

The data from the 2002 Ethnic Diversity Survey show that each religion has a different mix of membership in the three types of organizations examined: religious-affiliated groups, ethnic associations, and sports club or team (Table E9). Muslim has the highest level of membership in sports club or team (with 35.6%), and also has relatively high membership in religious-affiliated

groups (9.9%), and ethnic associations (3.0%). Jewish has the highest membership in religious-affiliated groups (20.7) and third highest membership in sports club or team (31.6%). Hindu has high membership in religious-affiliated groups (11.7%) and ethnic associations (11.1%) but, relative to the other religions, lower membership in sports teams (21.4%). Buddhist has the lowest membership in religious-affiliated groups (3.4%), one of the lowest in ethnic associations (1.8%) and sports team (21.4%). Although Sikh has somewhat high membership in religious-affiliated groups (7.4%), the membership in sports club or team (18.9%) is the lowest. Christian has the highest membership in sports club or team (34.7%) and low on the other two types of organizations.

Table E9 : Membership in religious-affiliated group, ethnic association, and sports club or team by religion, Canadians aged 15-24 in 2002

	Religious-Affiliated Groups			Ethnic Associations			Sports Club or Team		
	Weighted Total	No. of Members	% of Total	Weighted Total	No. of Members	% of Total	Weighted Total	No. of Members	% of Total
Total	3466100	146990	4.2	3488865	53705	1.5	3466105	1157830	33.4
Christian	2385165	118085	5.0	2398425	36465	1.5	2385165	827650	34.7
Muslim	81760	8085	9.9	82080	2435	3.0	81760	29120	35.6
Jewish	40270	8335	20.7	41120	745	1.8	40270	12730	31.6
Buddhist	43990	1490	3.4	44615	795	1.8	43990	10190	23.2
Hindu	36025	4230	11.7	36025	4005	11.1	36025	7725	21.4
Sikh	44655	3290	7.4	45955	945	2.1	44655	8440	18.9
Other religions	16540	460	2.8	16540	200	1.2	16540	2960	17.9
No religious affiliation	817695	3020	0.4	824100	8115	1.0	817690	259010	31.7

Note: Weighted numbers rounded to multiples of 5.

Source: 2002 Ethnic Diversity Survey

Sikh has the highest proportion very satisfied with life (55.1%), and Buddhist the lowest (31.4%) (Table E10). As for trust in people in general⁷, Christian has the highest proportion (48.6%), followed closely by Jewish (47.5%); Muslim with 37.4% has the lowest. Given that most Christians are not visible minority, the proportion with experience of discrimination is lowest at 13.4%. The proportions for the rest of the religions are more than double, ranging from 30.5% for Jewish to 44.5% for Buddhist.

⁷ Trust in people in general is often used as indicator of social capital. For a more detailed analysis of the relation between religion and social capital, see Jebwab, 2008a.

Table E10 : Proportion (%) very satisfied with life, have trust in people, and experienced discrimination by religion Canadians aged 15-24 in 2002

	Satisfaction with life			Trust in people in general			Experienced discrimination		
	Very satisfied			Trust People			Yes		
	Total	N	%	Total	N	%	Total	N	%
Total	3453245	1492130	43.2	3410190	1662550	48.8	3457930	547040	15.8
Christian	2375745	1093500	46.0	2355750	1145010	48.6	2379515	319795	13.4
Muslim	81570	38085	46.7	80820	30230	37.4	81430	30495	37.5
Jewish	39990	14505	36.3	39265	18665	47.5	39695	12120	30.5
Buddhist	43990	13825	31.4	40400	18030	44.6	43990	19585	44.5
Hindu	35460	14445	40.7	35255	16155	45.8	35945	11670	32.5
Sikh	44710	24660	55.1	43820	19215	43.9	44710	14110	31.6
Other religions	16540	3580	21.6	16540	9075	54.9	16540	7860	47.5
No religious affiliation	815235	289535	35.5	798330	406170	50.9	816100	131395	16.1

Note: Weighted numbers rounded to multiples of 5.

Source: 2002 Ethnic Diversity Survey

The range of proportions of population feeling strong sense of belonging to Canada is small with 68.6% for Christian as the lowest, and 78.8 for Sikh as the highest (Table E11). But, for strong sense of belonging to one's ethnic group, town or city, province, and North America, the proportions vary greatly by religion. Given the Christian composition of mostly not visible minority, the sense of belonging to one's ethnic group is lowest at 48.4%; Sikh with 82.5% has the highest proportion. For town or city and for province, Jewish has the lowest proportion feeling strong sense of belonging, with again, Sikh having the highest. Muslim has the lowest proportion feeling a strong sense of belonging to North America (43.7%), and Hindu (61.9%), the highest.

Table E11: Proportion (%) with strong sense of belonging to ethnic group, town or city, province, Canada, and North America by religion, Canadians aged 15-24 in 2002

	Total	Ethnic Group		Town or City		Province		Canada		North America	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Total	3488860	1613290	46.2	1557045	44.6	1827725	52.4	2428330	69.6	1715725	49.2
Christian	2398425	1159815	48.4	1115605	46.5	1305870	54.4	1646180	68.6	1206120	50.3
Muslim	82080	57740	70.3	47025	57.3	44860	54.7	63340	77.2	35890	43.7
Jewish	41120	24665	60.0	18065	43.9	15010	36.5	28615	69.6	23645	57.5
Buddhist	44615	29660	66.5	19620	44.0	22330	50.0	30950	69.4	20375	45.7
Hindu	36025	26935	74.8	22345	62.0	22580	62.7	28370	78.7	22310	61.9
Sikh	45955	37900	82.5	32935	71.7	31755	69.1	36200	78.8	26500	57.7
Other religions	16540	9135	55.2	6785	41.0	10995	66.5	11050	66.8	7135	43.1
No religious affiliation	824100	267440	32.5	294665	35.8	374330	45.4	583630	70.8	373755	45.4

Note: Weighted numbers rounded to multiples of 5.

Source: 2002 Ethnic Diversity Survey

As explained above, we used the measures of sense of belonging to derive types of identity. As can be seen in Table E12, Sikh and Christian are mirror images of each other for proportions with socio-culturally *integrated* identity (that is, with strong sense of belonging both to one's ethnic group and to wider society), and *assimilated* identity (that is, with strong sense of belonging to the wider society but weak for belonging to one's ethnic group). Christian has lowest for *integrated* identity (32.3%) and highest for *assimilated* (albeit, just 18.5%). In contrast, Sikh has highest for *integrated* (65.0%), and lowest for *assimilated* (7.0%) identity.

Table E12: Types of identity by religion, Canadians aged 15-24 in 2002

	Total Weighted N*	Margin- alized	Separa- ted	Assimi- lated	Integra- ted
Total	7763	33.5	16.8	19.0	30.7
Christian	5346	31.8	17.3	18.5	32.3
Muslim	177	13.6	28.8	13.6	44.1
Jewish	90	26.7	23.3	11.1	38.9
Buddhist	100	25.0	25.0	8.0	42.0
Hindu	80	7.5	23.8	15.0	53.8
Sikh	100	8.0	20.0	7.0	65.0
Other religions	36	22.2	36.1	19.4	22.2
No religious affiliation	1834	43.9	12.6	22.6	20.9

* Fractional weights calculated as: Weight/Mean Weight for aged 15-24.
Source: 2002 Ethnic Diversity Survey

Christian has also the highest proportion with *marginalized* identity; that is, 31.8% have weak sense of belonging to both one's ethnic group and to the wider society; Hindu and Sikh have the lowest with 7.5% and 8.0% respectively. Christian has the lowest proportion with *separated* identity at 17.3%, and Muslim the highest with 28.8%; however, other religions' proportions with *separated* identity are not much lower from the Muslim, all within 20% to 25% range.

4. Summary Discussion of Youth of Various Religious Affiliations

Of the population aged 15-24, not counting the 'no religious affiliation' as a religion category, Muslim with about 93 thousand population (or about 2.3% of the total) is the most numerous next to Christian. Sikh followed next with 44 thousand (1.1%), and the rest of the major religions are close behind, each with about 40 thousand population. Christian and Jewish are mainly not visible minority; Hindu and Sikh are South Asian; and Buddhist is mainly Chinese and other visible minority not separately classified. Muslim is the most heterogeneous in terms of visible minority groups, and is comprised of South Asian, Black, and other visible minority including Arab and West Asian.

Compared to Christian, non-Christian religions all have higher proportion with university education, though Christian has the highest proportion with Trades certificate or College degree, along with highest labour force participation and total income. Jewish has the highest level of education. Sikh has the lowest education, but has the highest labour force participation and income among non-Christian religions, with levels almost the same, or even slightly higher than Christian. Muslim has the lowest level of work activity with highest unemployment rate, and lowest levels of income and wages and salaries.

Like economic integration, social integration differs for each religion. Christian, being in the majority, has one of the highest proportions of membership in sports team or club, highest trust in people, and lowest level of experience of discrimination. Followers of other religions have experience of discrimination that is more than double that of the Christian population, but are integrated socially in other ways:

- Muslim has the highest membership in sports team, and one of the highest proportions with strong sense of belonging to Canada. Muslim has the lowest trust in people.
- Jewish has also very high membership in sports teams, highest membership in religious affiliated organizations, and very high trust in people.
- Hindu has lower membership in sports team but has the highest proportion of membership in ethnic associations, and along with Sikh, has the strongest sense of belonging to Canada.
- Sikh has lowest membership in sports team or club but has the highest level of satisfaction with life as a whole, has strongest sense of belonging, not only to Canada but also to one's ethnic group, town or city, and province, and thus, has the highest proportion with *integrated* identity.
- Buddhist has average levels for most of the indicators of social integration, with the exception of having the lowest level of satisfaction with life and the highest proportion with experience of discrimination.

F. On youth radicalization in Canada

In the report “Religious Youth Radicalization in Canada”, Bramadat and Wortley (2008a, 2008b) have shown that the five religions they examined, namely Christianity, Islam, Hinduism, Sikhism, and Judaism have teachings and religious leaders who throughout history were associated with both violence and non-violence. Their main conclusion is that religious radicalization is limited in extent and that it is inappropriate to associate the radicalization with any single religion. Rather, Bramadat and Wortley (2008:6) enjoin Canadians to consider seriously “the possibility that the root causes of youth religious radicalization may be similar to the root causes of youth crime. That is, youth who are subjected to inequality, intolerance and discrimination are more likely to develop perceptions of injustice and feeling of social alienation than youth who are not subjected to such strains.”

This report provides data for some of what Bramadat and Wortley listed as “cause for optimism” and “cause for concern” (2008a: 27-31). The demographic, economic and socio-cultural profiles of Canadian youth show that there is cause for concern in that visible and religious minority youth is disadvantaged in terms of work activity, income, and experience of discrimination, findings that are well-known and simply confirmed by the latest available census and survey data. But there is cause for optimism that includes higher education of visible and religious minority, and the various ways of social integration into society. In particular, many of the minority youth

feel a strong sense of belonging to both their ethnic group and to the wider society, factors that could reduce the strain brought about by the disadvantages of belonging to minority groups. This implies that one's ethnic group does not preclude (and possibly even enhances) belonging to the mainstream society, which is the underlying assumption for the policy of multiculturalism (Jebwab, 2008b).

The analysis that we have done, and indeed the data that we used, do not provide much insight as to what brings about a strong sense of belonging of the visible and minority youth to Canadian society. Studies of religious minority still have some way to go and Dib (2008) suggests that a multidisciplinary approach towards research on religion is necessary. However, the research that has already been done, particularly qualitative research, points to Canada's multiculturalism policy as one of the reasons for the strong sense of belonging. In the case of Muslims, for example, a comparison made by Imam Zijad Delic (2008: 96) of Bosnia, France, and Canada suggests that Canada's "constructive integration" is more in line with "Islamic formative principles" than the policy of systematic exclusion in Bosnia and the official policy of assimilation in France. Similarly, the young second generation Muslims interviewed by Rubina Ramji (2008: 108) give credit to Canada's multiculturalism as it permits them "to live their lives as their religious convictions see fit". Ramji also mentions that her respondents' attitude toward discrimination was "to ignore it as the manifestation of others' ignorance, and certainly not to accept it as a feature of the society in which they lived". As Dib (2006:41) notes: "Canada's multicultural approach does not endeavour to forcefully assimilate religious and visible minorities, but rather recognizes the importance of pluralism and diversity in social cohesion by constantly building common spaces and wide avenues of voluntary integration".

While we have pointed to multiculturalism as one of the possible factors that engender sense of belonging among followers of religious groups, multiculturalism itself as a policy, ideology, and practice is dynamic and subject to evaluation and adjustments (Jebwab, 2006). As Gall (2006) points out, religious issues, and how they are dealt with in law or in practice, have implications for multiculturalism. Seljak (2008) pleads for Canadian solutions to the issues, arguing that the separation of Church and State does not solve, and could be barriers, to finding solutions to religion-based discrimination and intolerance.

Conclusion

The demographic and socio-economic profiles of Canadians aged 15-24 with focus on minorities have confirmed many of what we already know. Visible and religious minorities have become a large part of the population, and their numbers will continue to grow in the coming years. We also know that in terms of education, the minorities are doing well, even better than the not visible minority; but that labour force participation and income lag behind.

Juxtaposing the socio-cultural profile with the demographic and socio-economic profiles, we get a somewhat similar picture. While indicators such as sense of belonging, life satisfaction, and membership in organizations show a positive picture for minorities, the high level of discrimination mars the positive picture.

Underneath these two general observations are the differences among the visible minority groups. The two largest groups, Chinese and South Indians, lead the other minorities particularly in economic integration. Blacks are the most disadvantaged in the economic domain, as well as in the level of discrimination experienced. The language minorities in the provinces – Anglophone in Quebec, and Francophone in the ROC – are not significantly disadvantaged. Aboriginals are significantly disadvantaged in terms of education, work, and possibly social integration, though like visible minority there are differences among groups, with the Métis doing better than North American Indians than Inuit.

There are thus both causes for celebration and for serious reflection about the situation of the minority youth. The labour force integration and discrimination are most likely linked, that is, reduction of discrimination might lead to better work outcomes.

The challenges faced by the minorities could be viewed within the framework of multiculturalism, which of late has come under closer scrutiny. There are proponents on both sides of the debate. Will Kymlicka (2007), for example, has well enunciated the positive aspects in the academic milieu, and Michael Adams (2007) in the popular discourse. On the other hand, Joppke and Morawska (2003) propose that there is nothing in multiculturalism that is much different from policies and practices of liberal nation-states.

Empirical research such as what we have done is not specifically tailored toward providing definite evidence one way or the other. However, there are hints, particularly in the findings about sense of belonging, pointing to the possibility that a multicultural ideology may be contributing to the social, and possibly, the economic integration of young Canadians.

List of References

- Adams, Michael. 2007. *Unlikely Utopia: The Surprising Triumph of Canadian Pluralism*. Toronto: Viking Canada. 240 p.
- Belanger, A. and E. Caron Malenfant. 2005. Population projections of visible minority groups, Canada, provinces and regions, 2001-2017. Catalogue no. 91-541-XIE. Statistics Canada. Ottawa: Ministry of Industry. 86p.
- Berry, John W. Acculturation and Adaptation of Immigrant Youth. 2008. *Canadian Diversity* 6(2): 50-53.
- Boyd, Monica, 2002. "Educational Attainments of Immigrant Offspring: Success or Segmented Assimilation?" *International Migration Review* 36(4): 1037-1060.
- Boyd, Monica. 2008. Variations in Socioeconomic Outcomes of Second Generation Young Canadians. *Diversity* 6(2): 20-24.
- Bramadat, Paul and Scot Wortley. 2008a. Religious Youth Radicalization in Canada. Multiculturalism Report # 23. Report submitted to the Strategic Policy, Research and Planning

Directorate, Multiculturalism and Human Rights Program, Department of Canadian Heritage. 79 pages.

Bramadat, Paul and Scot Wortley. 2008b. Religious Youth and Radicalization in Canada. *Diversity* 6(1): 47-73.

Corak, Miles. 2008. Immigration in the Long Run: The Education and Earnings Mobility of Second-Generation Canadians. *IRPP Choices* 14 (13).

Delic, Imam Zijad. 2008. Constructive Integration of Canadian Muslims: Comparison with Canada, Bosnia, and France. *Diversity* 6(1): 87-102.

Dib, Kamal. 2006. Now that Religious Diversity is Upon Us ... Canada's Multiculturalism Model is Increasingly Relevant. *Diversity* 5(2): 39-43.

Dib, Kamal. 2008. Religious Diversity and Security in a Pluralistic Society: A Canadian Research Approach. *Diversity* 6(1): 74-86.

Ferron, Danielle. 2008. Immigrants: A Source of Vitality for Official Language Minority Communities. *Diversity* (Spring 2008): 14- 17.

Gall, Gerald L. 2006. Religion and Multiculturalism. *Diversity* 5(2): 69-74.

Jantzen, Lorna. 2008. Who is the Second Generation? A Description of their Ethnic Origins and Visible Minority Composition by Age. *Diversity* 6(2): 7-12.

Jantzen, Lorna. 2008. The Relationship Between Diversity and Official Language Minorities. *Diversity* (Spring, 2008): 9-13.

Jebwab, Jack. 2006. Multiculturalism Issues in Canada: Thirty Five Years of Canadian Multiculturalism 1971-2006. *Diversity* 5(2): 11-12.

Jebwab, Jack. 2008a. Religion and Social Capital in Canada. *Diversity* 6(1): 25-46.

Jebwab, Jack. 2008b. The Rise of the Unmeltable Canadians? Ethnic and National Belonging in Canada's Second Generation. *Diversity* 6(2): 25-34.

Joppke, Christian and Ewa Morawska. 2003. *Toward Assimilation and Citizenship: Immigrants in Liberal Nation-States*. NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Kao, G. and M. Tienda. 1995. Optimism and Achievement: The Educational Performance of Immigrant Youth. *Social Science Quarterly*, 76(1): 1-19.

Kaspar, V. and Noh, S. 2001. Discrimination and Identity: An Overview of Theoretical and Empirical Research. Commissioned by the Department of Canadian Heritage for the Ethnocultural, Racial, Religious, and Linguistic Diversity and Identity Seminar Halifax, Nova

Scotia November 1-2 2001. Pp. 1-48. Accessed on April 22, 2009 at:
<http://canada.metropolis.net/events/ethnocultural/publications/discrim.doc>

Krahn H. and A. Taylor. 2005. Resilient Teenagers: Explaining the High Educational Aspirations of Visible Minority Youth in Canada. *Journal of International Migration and Integration* 6(3-4): 405-434.

Kymlicka, W. 2007. *Multicultural Odysseys: Navigating the New International Politics of Diversity*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Mock, Karen R. 2006. Racism, Racial Discrimination and Multiculturalism. *Diversity* 5(2): 34-38.

Morissette, R. 1998. The declining labour market status of young men. In M. Corak (ed), *Labour markets, social institutions, and the future of Canada's children*. Ottawa: Statistics Canada Catalogue No. 89-553. Pp. 31-50.

Phinney, Jean S., John W. Berry, Paul Vedder, and Karmela Liebkind. 2006. Pp.71-116 in Berry, John W., Jean S. Phinney, David L. Sam, and Paul Vedder (eds) *Immigrant Youth in Cultural Transition: Acculturation, Identity, and Adaptation Across National Contexts*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Ramji, Rubina. 2008. Creating a Genuine Islam: Second Generation Muslims Growing Up in Canada. *Diversity* 6(2): 104-109.

Ravanera, Z. 2008. Social Capital, Social Integration and Political Participation of Young Canadians. Paper presented at the 2008 European Population Conference in the session on *Integration Processes of Migrants*, Barcelona, July 9-11.

Ravanera, Z. and Rajulton, F. 2006. Social Integration over the Life Course: Influences of Individual, Family, and Community Characteristics. In K. McQuillan and Z. R. Ravanera (eds) *Canada's Changing Families: Implications for Individuals and Society*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press. Pp. 264-292.

Ravanera, Z. and Rajulton, F. 2008. Discrimination and Sense of Belonging: Exploring the Relationship Using the Ethnic Diversity Survey. Paper presented at the National RDC Conference on *Comings and Goings: Migration, Policy and Society*, Ottawa, October 17-18.

Ravanera, Z., F. Rajulton and P. Turcotte. 2003. Youth Integration and Social Capital: An Analysis of the General Social Surveys on Time Use. *Youth and Society* 35(2): 158-82.

Reitz, J. and R. Banerjee. 2007. Racial Inequality, Social Cohesion, and Policy Issues in Canada. In K. Banting, T. Courchene and F. L. Seidle (eds). *Belonging, Diversity, Recognition and Shared Citizenship in Canada*. Montreal: Institute for Research on Public Policy, 2007. Pp. 489-545.

Seljak, David. 2008. Secularization and the Separation of Church and State in Canada. *Diversity* 6(1): 6-24.

Statistics Canada. Ethnic Diversity Survey, 2002 [machine readable data file]. Ottawa, ON: Statistics Canada [producer and distributor] 4/13/2005.

Appendix Tables

Appendix Table B1: Population aged 15-24 by sex, visible minority status and highest certificate

Males	Total	No certificate, diploma or degree		High school certificate or equivalent		College or trades certificate or diploma¹		University²	
Total Population	2145570	909280	42.4	781710	36.4	314245	14.6	140325	6.5
Total visible minority pop.	400020	142165	35.5	165800	41.4	45355	11.3	46695	11.7
Chinese	97230	29315	30.2	42885	44.1	9340	9.6	15685	16.1
South Asian	92200	30350	32.9	38400	41.6	10080	10.9	13360	14.5
Black	65060	28635	44.0	24780	38.1	7945	12.2	3695	5.7
Filipino	27355	9660	35.3	11630	42.5	3410	12.5	2650	9.7
Latin American	26030	11105	42.7	10095	38.8	3690	14.2	1140	4.4
Southeast Asian	19095	7340	38.4	7755	40.6	2400	12.6	1600	8.4
Arab	21550	6670	31.0	8765	40.7	3200	14.8	2910	13.5
West Asian	15175	5590	36.8	5925	39.0	1640	10.8	2025	13.3
Korean	15080	5555	36.8	6655	44.1	1250	8.3	1620	10.7
Japanese	4840	1555	32.1	2350	48.6	460	9.5	475	9.8
Visible minority, n.i.e.	5470	2055	37.6	2280	41.7	770	14.1	370	6.8
Multiple visible minority	10930	4325	39.6	4280	39.2	1165	10.7	1165	10.7
Not a visible minority	1745550	767120	43.9	615905	35.3	268890	15.4	93635	5.4
Females									
Total Population	2062245	769740	37.3	746295	36.2	329300	16.0	216905	10.5
Total visible minority pop.	385340	124915	32.4	153255	39.8	47410	12.3	59765	15.5
Chinese	89700	26170	29.2	36990	41.2	7945	8.9	18585	20.7
South Asian	89215	26165	29.3	36195	40.6	10010	11.2	16845	18.9
Black	64950	25430	39.2	24155	37.2	9715	15.0	5660	8.7
Filipino	26530	8240	31.1	10665	40.2	3590	13.5	4025	15.2
Latin American	25850	9595	37.1	10055	38.9	4410	17.1	1790	6.9
Southeast Asian	19175	6505	33.9	7725	40.3	2855	14.9	2090	10.9
Arab	19435	5695	29.3	7040	36.2	3130	16.1	3565	18.3
West Asian	14015	4910	35.0	5565	39.7	1490	10.6	2045	14.6
Korean	13870	4640	33.5	5780	41.7	1270	9.2	2175	15.7
Japanese	5450	1660	30.5	2200	40.4	715	13.1	875	16.1
Visible minority, n.i.e.	5905	2040	34.5	2330	39.5	965	16.3	575	9.7
Multiple visible minority	11250	3870	34.4	4545	40.4	1305	11.6	1530	13.6
Not a visible minority	1676905	644820	38.5	593050	35.4	281890	16.8	157140	9.4

Source: Census of Canada, 2006. Table 97-562-XCB2006017 - 20% Sample Data.

Note: 1 also includes apprenticeship, CEGEP, and other non university certificate or diploma

2 also includes certificate or diploma below bachelor, bachelor or higher certificate, diploma or degree

Source: Census of Canada, 2006. Table 97-562-XCB2006017 - 20% Sample Data.

**Appendix Table B2 : Proportion (%) of population aged 15-24 with university or college degree¹
by visible minority status, immigrant status, and sex**

University	Total			Non-immigrant			Immigrants		
	Males	Females	Total	Males	Females	Total	Males	Females	Total
Total - Population	4.7	8.2	6.4	4.2	7.5	5.8	7.2	10.7	8.9
Total visible minority population	7.6	10.9	9.2	6.7	9.8	8.2	7.5	10.8	9.1
Chinese	11.8	15.9	13.8	10.4	14.0	12.1	12.5	16.2	14.3
South Asian	8.6	12.6	10.6	8.4	12.4	10.3	7.8	12.5	10.2
Black	3.3	5.6	4.4	2.9	5.7	4.3	3.2	4.6	3.9
Filipino	4.1	9.1	6.6	5.5	8.6	7.1	3.0	7.6	5.2
Latin American	2.7	5.1	3.9	1.2	3.0	2.1	2.7	5.1	3.9
Southeast Asian	5.5	7.2	6.3	4.5	6.8	5.6	5.7	7.0	6.3
Arab	9.3	13.4	11.2	5.9	9.8	7.8	9.5	13.4	11.4
West Asian	9.1	9.6	9.4	8.3	7.5	7.9	8.1	9.6	8.8
Korean	7.2	11.3	9.2	10.6	15.3	12.7	7.2	9.6	8.3
Japanese	7.3	11.8	9.7	8.3	11.4	9.7	2.5	9.5	6.5
Visible minority, n.i.e.	3.8	6.4	5.1	4.5	6.8	5.7	3.0	5.6	4.4
Multiple visible minority	7.0	10.3	8.6	6.5	8.4	7.5	7.3	12.9	10.2
Not a visible minority	4.1	7.5	5.8	3.9	7.3	5.6	6.4	10.5	8.4
Trade or College									
Total - Population	9.4	12.5	10.9	9.4	12.8	11.0	9.1	10.8	9.9
Total visible minority population	8.5	9.7	9.0	8.0	9.2	8.6	8.6	9.9	9.2
Chinese	7.8	7.3	7.6	7.7	6.6	7.2	7.4	7.0	7.2
South Asian	8.4	9.1	8.7	8.1	9.2	8.6	8.5	9.1	8.8
Black	8.6	11.5	10.1	8.5	11.3	9.9	8.1	11.8	10.0
Filipino	8.7	10.7	9.7	9.1	9.1	9.1	8.4	11.4	9.9
Latin American	9.1	11.8	10.4	6.8	8.3	7.6	10.4	13.8	12.1
Southeast Asian	9.3	11.1	10.2	7.7	10.1	8.9	10.9	12.4	11.7
Arab	11.7	12.9	12.2	8.8	12.5	10.5	12.2	13.2	12.7
West Asian	6.9	7.5	7.1	4.2	6.6	5.5	7.3	7.6	7.5
Korean	6.6	7.8	7.2	8.2	6.0	7.4	6.6	7.6	7.0
Japanese	7.4	10.9	9.3	6.5	7.7	7.1	5.0	17.1	11.9
Visible minority, n.i.e.	10.1	13.6	12.0	9.0	14.1	11.7	10.8	13.7	12.3
Multiple visible minority	7.9	8.6	8.2	7.3	8.7	8.0	8.3	8.4	8.4
Not a visible minority	9.6	13.1	11.3	9.5	13.1	11.3	10.6	13.2	11.9

Note: ¹ include College, CEGEP, or other non-university diploma, and university certificate, diploma or degree, and does not include Apprenticeship or trade certificate or diploma, and university certificate below bachelor
Source: Census of Canada, 2006. Table 97-562-XCB2006017 - 20% Sample Data.

Appendix Table C1: Population aged 15-24 by aboriginal identity, sex and highest certificate

	Total	No certificate, diploma or degree		High school certificate or equivalent		College or trades certificate or diploma¹		University²	
Males									
Total - Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal	2145570	909280	42.4	781710	36.4	314250	14.6	140325	6.5
Total Aboriginal population	105640	68975	65.3	25620	24.3	9440	8.9	1605	1.5
North American Indian single resp.	62370	44335	71.1	12785	20.5	4710	7.6	530	0.8
Métis single response	35150	19020	54.1	11185	31.8	3990	11.4	955	2.7
Inuit single response	5340	4140	77.5	770	14.4	370	6.9	40	0.7
Multiple Aboriginal identity resp.	695	395	56.8	200	28.8	100	14.4	0	0.0
Aboriginal responses n.i.e.	2080	1075	51.7	675	32.5	260	12.5	65	3.1
Non-Aboriginal population	2039925	840305	41.2	756090	37.1	304810	14.9	138720	6.8
Females									
Total - Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal	2062245	769735	37.3	746300	36.2	329300	16.0	216905	10.5
Total Aboriginal population	106365	63695	59.9	29165	27.4	10105	9.5	3405	3.2
North American Indian single resp.	62465	41075	65.8	15275	24.5	4735	7.6	1375	2.2
Métis single response	36085	17310	48.0	12310	34.1	4600	12.7	1865	5.2
Inuit single response	5210	3920	75.2	870	16.7	370	7.1	55	1.1
Multiple Aboriginal identity resp.	745	415	55.7	190	25.5	105	14.1	35	4.7
Aboriginal responses n.i.e.	1860	980	52.7	525	28.2	285	15.3	65	3.5
Non-Aboriginal population	1955880	706040	36.1	717130	36.7	319205	16.3	213500	10.9

Note: 1 includes apprenticeship, CEGEP, and other non university certificate or diploma

2 includes certificate or diploma below bachelor, bachelor or higher certificate, diploma or degree

Source: Census of Canada, 2006. Table 97-560-XCB2006036 - 20% Sample Data.

Appendix Table C2: Population aged 15-24 by aboriginal identity, area of residence and highest certificate

All areas of residence	Total	No certificate, diploma or degree		High school certificate or equivalent		College or trades certificate or diploma ¹		University ²	
Total - Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal	4207810	1679015	39.9	1528010	36.3	643555	15.3	357230	8.5
Total Aboriginal population	212010	132670	62.6	54785	25.8	19540	9.2	5010	2.4
North American Indian single resp.	124835	85410	68.4	28060	22.5	9455	7.6	1920	1.5
Métis single response	71240	36335	51.0	23490	33.0	8600	12.1	2820	4.0
Inuit single response	10555	8060	76.4	1640	15.5	745	7.1	100	0.9
Multiple Aboriginal identity resp.	1445	810	56.1	390	27.0	200	13.8	35	2.4
Aboriginal responses n.i.e.	3935	2055	52.2	1200	30.5	545	13.9	135	3.4
Non-Aboriginal population	3995805	1546350	38.7	1473220	36.9	624010	15.6	352225	8.8
On reserve									
Total - Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal	59980	44760	74.6	10930	18.2	3690	6.2	600	1.0
Total Aboriginal population	57050	43425	76.1	9895	17.3	3325	5.8	410	0.7
North American Indian single resp.	55830	42565	76.2	9650	17.3	3220	5.8	390	0.7
Métis single response	735	505	68.7	165	22.4	55	7.5	20	2.7
Inuit single response	65	55	84.6	10	15.4	10	15.4	0	0.0
Multiple Aboriginal identity resp.	25	15	60.0	10	40.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Aboriginal responses n.i.e.	390	285	73.1	65	16.7	35	9.0	0	0.0
Non-Aboriginal population	2925	1335	45.6	1030	35.2	365	12.5	190	6.5
Rural									
Total - Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal	728960	347600	47.7	236025	32.4	110660	15.2	34665	4.8
Total Aboriginal population	40170	25230	62.8	10165	25.3	3900	9.7	870	2.2
North American Indian single resp.	13075	8730	66.8	2995	22.9	1110	8.5	235	1.8
Métis single response	19145	10485	54.8	5870	30.7	2205	11.5	565	3.0
Inuit single response	6485	5280	81.4	805	12.4	380	5.9	20	0.3
Multiple Aboriginal identity resp.	300	190	63.3	75	25.0	35	11.7	0	0.0
Aboriginal responses n.i.e.	1160	540	46.6	420	36.2	155	13.4	45	3.9
Non-Aboriginal population	688790	322370	46.8	225860	32.8	106760	15.5	33800	4.9
Urban									
Total - Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal	3418870	1286655	37.6	1281050	37.5	529200	15.5	321960	9.4
Total Aboriginal population	114790	64015	55.8	34725	30.3	12315	10.7	3730	3.2
North American Indian single resp.	55925	34110	61.0	15415	27.6	5110	9.1	1285	2.3
Métis single response	51360	25340	49.3	17450	34.0	6330	12.3	2235	4.4
Inuit single response	4000	2730	68.3	830	20.8	360	9.0	85	2.1
Multiple Aboriginal identity resp.	1115	605	54.3	310	27.8	160	14.3	35	3.1
Aboriginal responses n.i.e.	2385	1225	51.4	715	30.0	350	14.7	85	3.6
Non-Aboriginal population	3304080	1222640	37.0	1246325	37.7	516885	15.6	318230	9.6

Note: 1 includes apprenticeship, CEGEP, and other non university certificate or diploma

2 includes certificate or diploma below bachelor, bachelor or higher certificate, diploma or degree

Source: Census of Canada, 2006. Table 97-560-XCB2006036 - 20% Sample Data.

Appendix Table C3: Population aged 15-24 by aboriginal identity, sex, and labour force activity

	Population	In the labour force	Participation rate	Employment rate	Unemployment rate
Males					
Total - Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal	2145570	1407685	65.6	56.9	13.3
Total Aboriginal population	105640	56785	53.8	41.4	23.0
North American Indian single resp.	62370	29045	46.6	33.6	27.8
Métis single response	35150	23605	67.2	55.9	16.8
Inuit single response	5340	2525	47.3	33.6	28.9
Multiple Aboriginal identity resp.	695	405	58.3	51.1	12.3
Aboriginal responses n.i.e.	2080	1205	57.9	45.4	21.6
Non-Aboriginal population	2039925	1350900	66.2	57.7	12.9
Females					
Total - Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal	2062245	1350290	65.5	57.5	12.2
Total Aboriginal population	106365	53280	50.1	40.0	20.1
North American Indian single resp.	62465	26415	42.3	31.5	25.4
Métis single response	36085	23060	63.9	55.0	13.9
Inuit single response	5210	2335	44.8	34.5	23.1
Multiple Aboriginal identity resp.	745	425	57.0	55.0	4.7
Aboriginal responses n.i.e.	1860	1045	56.2	44.6	20.6
Non-Aboriginal population	1955880	1297010	66.3	58.4	11.9

Source: Census of Canada, 2006. Table 97-559-XCB2006027 - 20% Sample Data

Appendix Table C4: Population aged 15-24 with employment income in 2005 by aboriginal identity, sex, work activities and median income

	All Work Activities		Full year, full time			All Other Activities		
	Pop. w/ income	Median income	Pop. w/ income	% of Total	Median income	Pop. w/ income	% of Total	Median income
Males								
Total - Aboriginal & non-Aboriginal population	1534285	8659	321720	21.0	23986	1212560	79.0	6591
Total Aboriginal identity population	60850	7108	11605	19.1	20963	49250	80.9	5311
North American Indian single response	30630	5990	5190	16.9	19002	25435	83.0	4521
Métis single response	25410	8640	5520	21.7	23018	19885	78.3	6455
Inuit single response	3085	6006	540	17.5	19807	2545	82.5	4583
Multiple Aboriginal identity responses	415	11080	120	28.9	17956	295	71.1	5670
Aboriginal responses nie	1315	7432	230	17.5	18607	1090	82.9	5870
Non-Aboriginal identity population	1473435	8720	310120	21.0	24050	1163315	79.0	6646
Females								
Total - Aboriginal & non-Aboriginal population	1470725	7159	238850	16.2	19768	1231875	83.8	5968
Total Aboriginal identity population	58400	5642	9895	16.9	17849	48500	83.0	4432
North American Indian single response	28850	4827	4245	14.7	16456	24600	85.3	3974
Métis single response	24980	6658	4825	19.3	18686	20155	80.7	5133
Inuit single response	2975	4921	490	16.5	18983	2485	83.5	3756
Multiple Aboriginal identity responses	505	5853	110	21.8	16357	395	78.2	3591
Aboriginal responses nie	1090	7445	230	21.1	20074	865	79.4	5419
Non-Aboriginal identity population	1412325	7215	228955	16.2	19851	1183375	83.8	5999

Source: Census of Canada, 2006. Table 97-563-XCB2006061 - 20% Sample Data

Appendix Table E1: Population aged 15-19 in 2001 by religion, sex, and highest certificate

	Total		No degree		High school		Trades or College		University	
	Number	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	
Both sexes										
Total	2039411	1396624	68.5	569267	27.9	68243	3.3	5277	0.3	
Christian	1375085	927186	67.4	390825	28.4	54359	4.0	2715	0.2	
Muslim	49152	31828	64.8	15877	32.3	1039	2.1	-	-	
Jewish	21431	14162	66.1	6602	30.8	556	2.6	-	-	
Buddhist	20743	13581	65.5	6606	31.8	519	2.5	-	-	
Hindu	19215	11687	60.8	6935	36.1	333	1.7	-	-	
Sikh	19190	11953	62.3	6753	35.2	335	1.7	-	-	
All other religions	7023	5164	73.5	1563	22.3	259	3.7	-	-	
No religious affiliation	357919	255485	71.4	93893	26.2	7575	2.1	-	-	
Missing information	169653	125578	74.0	40213	23.7	3268	1.9	-	-	
Male										
Total	1056001	746686	70.7	276438	26.2	30616	2.9	2261	0.2	
Christian	704778	491834	69.8	187901	26.7	23931	3.4	1112	0.2	
Muslim	26446	17617	66.6	8086	30.6	-	-	-	-	
Jewish	11417	7598	66.5	3559	31.2	-	-	-	-	
Buddhist	10713	7302	68.2	3188	29.8	-	-	-	-	
Hindu	9710	5930	61.1	3596	37.0	-	-	-	-	
Sikh	9498	6493	68.4	2745	28.9	-	-	-	-	
All other religions	3344	2487	74.4	709	21.2	-	-	-	-	
No religious affiliation	192674	140838	73.1	47790	24.8	3565	1.9	-	-	
Missing information	87421	66587	76.2	18864	21.6	1747	2.0	-	-	
Female										
Total	983414	649939	66.1	292829	29.8	37630	3.8	3016	0.3	
Christian	670308	435352	64.9	202924	30.3	30428	4.5	1604	0.2	
Muslim	22706	14211	62.6	7790	34.3	-	-	-	-	
Jewish	10014	6564	65.5	3042	30.4	-	-	-	-	
Buddhist	10031	6279	62.6	3419	34.1	-	-	-	-	
Hindu	9507	5758	60.6	3340	35.1	-	-	-	-	
Sikh	9690	5459	56.3	4008	41.4	-	-	-	-	
All other religions	3680	2678	72.8	854	23.2	-	-	-	-	
No religious affiliation	165246	114647	69.4	46103	27.9	4011	2.4	-	-	
Missing information	82232	58991	71.7	21349	26.0	-	-	-	-	

Note: - nil or sample size less than 30

* Detailed information on religion for Atlantic and Territories are not available in Census PUMF

Numbers are rounded to nearest multiple of 5; % calculated before rounding.

Source: 2001 Census Public Use Micro-data File

Appendix Table E2: Population aged 20-24 in 2001 by religion, sex, and highest certificate

	Total	No degree		High school		Trades or College		University	
Male									
Total	979468	213719	21.8	429328	43.8	236665	24.2	99756	10.2
Christian	620251	129264	20.8	268092	43.2	167780	27.1	55115	8.9
Muslim	21576	3410	15.8	10793	50.0	3443	16.0	3930	18.2
Jewish	9904	892	9.0	4265	43.1	1891	19.1	2856	28.8
Buddhist	11635	2146	18.4	6266	53.9	1481	12.7	1742	15.0
Hindu	10544	2043	19.4	4973	47.2	1411	13.4	2117	20.1
Sikh	12170	3044	25.0	5898	48.5	1742	14.3	1486	12.2
All other religions	3670	1259	34.3	1335	36.4	-	-	-	-
No religious affiliation	215195	53823	25.0	97157	45.1	40104	18.6	24111	11.2
Missing information	74523	17838	23.9	30549	41.0	18182	24.4	7954	10.7
Female									
Total	962785	149719	15.6	382502	39.7	272285	28.3	158279	16.4
Christian	631541	89143	14.1	239802	38.0	201612	31.9	100984	16.0
Muslim	21971	3935	17.9	10023	45.6	3188	14.5	4825	22.0
Jewish	8979	629	7.0	4193	46.7	1707	19.0	2450	27.3
Buddhist	9831	1592	16.2	4267	43.4	1893	19.3	2079	21.1
Hindu	11507	1300	11.3	5160	44.8	2116	18.4	2931	25.5
Sikh	12697	2855	22.5	5347	42.1	2191	17.3	2304	18.1
All other religions	5054	1374	27.2	2418	47.8	-	-	-	-
No religious affiliation	183738	36103	19.6	79901	43.5	39576	21.5	28158	15.3
Missing information	77467	12788	16.5	31391	40.5	19370	25.0	13918	18.0

Note: - nil or sample size less than 30

* Detailed information on religion for Atlantic and Territories are not available in Census PUMF

Numbers are rounded to nearest multiple of 5; % calculated before rounding.

Source: 2001 Census Public Use Micro-data File

Appendix Table E3: Population aged 15-19 in 2001 by religion, sex, and labour force activity in reference week

	Total	In the labour force	Partici- pation rate	Employ- ment rate	Unemploy- ment rate
Both Sexes					
Total	2039410	1018565	49.9	42.5	15.0
Christian	1375085	717950	52.2	45.2	13.5
Muslim	49150	16325	33.2	27.1	18.4
Jewish	21430	7745	36.1	31.0	14.4
Buddhist	20745	7160	34.5	30.0	12.9
Hindu	19215	7270	37.8	30.9	18.4
Sikh	19190	7905	41.2	34.6	16.0
All other religions	7025	3230	46.0	33.8	-
No religious affiliation	357920	179365	50.1	41.8	16.7
Missing information	169655	71620	42.2	32.1	24.1
Male					
Total	1056000	526620	49.9	42.2	15.4
Christian	704780	368955	52.4	45.1	13.8
Muslim	26445	8790	33.2	26.9	-
Jewish	11420	4185	36.7	30.8	-
Buddhist	10715	3520	32.8	28.0	-
Hindu	9710	3740	38.5	30.9	-
Sikh	9500	3670	38.7	33.2	-
All other religions	3345	1635	48.8	36.6	-
No religious affiliation	192675	96115	49.9	41.3	17.2
Missing information	87420	36005	41.2	30.7	25.4
Female					
Total	983410	491950	50.0	42.7	14.6
Christian	670305	348995	52.1	45.2	13.2
Muslim	22705	7535	33.2	27.3	17.7
Jewish	10015	3560	35.6	31.1	-
Buddhist	10030	3640	36.3	32.2	-
Hindu	9505	3525	37.1	30.9	-
Sikh	9690	4230	43.7	36.0	-
All other religions	3680	1595	43.4	31.3	-
No religious affiliation	165245	83245	50.4	42.3	16.1
Missing information	82230	35615	43.3	33.5	22.7

Note: - nil or sample size less than 30

* Detailed information on religion for Atlantic and Territories are not available in Census PUMF
Numbers are rounded to nearest multiple of 5; % calculated before rounding.

Source: 2001 Census Public Use Micro-data File

Appendix Table E4: Population aged 20-24 in 2001 by religion, sex, and labour force activity in reference week

	Total	In the labour force	Participation rate	Employment rate	Unemployment rate
Male					
Total	979470	813615	83.1	71.7	13.6
Christian	620250	526010	84.8	74.4	12.3
Muslim	21575	14640	67.9	56.2	17.2
Jewish	9905	6490	65.5	55.4	-
Buddhist	11635	7070	60.8	51.9	-
Hindu	10545	7650	72.5	64.1	-
Sikh	12170	10130	83.2	72.3	13.2
All other religions	3670	-	-	64.6	-
No religious affiliation	215195	176640	82.1	71.4	13.0
Missing information	74525	61910	83.1	61.9	25.5
Female					
Total	962785	753975	78.3	68.9	12.1
Christian	631540	508520	80.5	71.7	10.9
Muslim	21970	11915	54.2	42.6	21.5
Jewish	8980	6420	71.5	63.2	-
Buddhist	9830	6155	62.6	54.3	-
Hindu	11505	7940	69.0	58.7	14.9
Sikh	12700	10360	81.6	74.9	-
All other religions	5055	3675	72.7	58.0	-
No religious affiliation	183735	140340	76.4	66.9	12.5
Missing information	77465	58650	75.7	61.6	18.6

Note: - nil or sample size less than 30

* Detailed information on religion for Atlantic and Territories are not available in Census PUMF
Numbers are rounded to nearest multiple of 5; % calculated before rounding.

Source: 2001 Census Public Use Micro-data File

Appendix Table E5: Population aged 15-19 in 2001 by religion, sex, and work activity in 2000

Both Sexes	Total	Worked mainly full time		Worked mainly part time	
		Number	Number	%	Number
Total	2039410	265210	13.0	870255	42.7
Christian	1375085	177940	12.9	617070	44.9
Muslim	49150	3410	6.9	15100	30.7
Jewish	21430	2340	10.9	8340	38.9
Buddhist	20745	1705	8.2	5715	27.5
Hindu	19215	1295	6.7	6675	34.7
Sikh	19190	1895	9.9	7050	36.7
All other religions	7025	1600	22.8	1855	26.4
No religious affiliation	357920	48200	13.5	148860	41.6
Missing information	169650	26820	15.8	59590	35.1
Male					
Total	1055995	161200	15.3	433510	41.1
Christian	704775	108410	15.4	305910	43.4
Muslim	26445	1890	7.1	7565	28.6
Jewish	11415	1595	14.0	4335	38.0
Buddhist	10715	1145	10.7	2630	24.6
Hindu	9710	850	8.8	3295	34.0
Sikh	9500	925	9.8	3375	35.5
All other religions	3345	670	20.0	855	25.5
No religious affiliation	192675	29575	15.4	76400	39.7
Missing information	87420	16135	18.5	29140	33.3
Female					
Total	983410	104010	10.6	436745	44.4
Christian	670310	69530	10.4	311160	46.4
Muslim	22705	1520	6.7	7535	33.2
Jewish	10015	745	7.4	4005	40.0
Buddhist	10030	555	5.6	3080	30.7
Hindu	9505	445	4.7	3380	35.6
Sikh	9690	965	10.0	3675	37.9
All other religions	3680	930	25.3	1000	27.2
No religious affiliation	165245	18625	11.3	72455	43.8
Missing information	82230	10690	13.0	30450	37.0

Source: 2001 Census Public Use Micro-data File

Appendix Table E6: Population aged 20-24 in 2001 by religion, sex, and work activity in 2000

	Total	Worked mainly		Worked mainly	
		full time		part time	
Male					
Total	979465	606565	61.9	247315	25.2
Christian	620250	390215	62.9	161815	26.1
Muslim	21575	8190	38.0	6375	29.5
Jewish	9905	4195	42.3	3780	38.2
Buddhist	11635	4775	41.1	2780	23.9
Hindu	10545	5235	49.7	3005	28.5
Sikh	12170	7085	58.2	3005	24.7
All other religions	3670	2000	54.5	855	23.2
No religious affiliation	215195	134995	62.7	49565	23.0
Missing information	74525	49865	66.9	16140	21.7
Female					
Total	962790	460015	47.8	344490	35.8
Christian	631540	304420	48.2	236725	37.5
Muslim	21970	5680	25.8	6610	30.1
Jewish	8980	3640	40.5	3855	42.9
Buddhist	9830	3305	33.6	3190	32.4
Hindu	11510	4975	43.2	3300	28.7
Sikh	12700	6495	51.1	4010	31.6
All other religions	5055	2085	41.2	1560	30.8
No religious affiliation	183735	88175	48.0	61565	33.5
Missing information	77465	41250	53.2	23675	30.6

Source: 2001 Census Public Use Micro-data File

Appendix Table E7: Population aged 15-19 in 2001 by religion, sex, and income in 2000

Both Sexes	Total Income		Wages and Salaries			
	N	Mean	N	% w/ W & Salaries	Median	Mean
Total	2039410	3250	1168815	57.3	3000	4865
Christian	1375085	3330	816410	59.4	3045	4875
Muslim	49150	2270	19110	38.9	2910	4860
Jewish	21430	3500	11085	51.7	3000	4795
Buddhist	20745	2490	8120	39.2	3500	5180
Hindu	19215	3050	8750	45.5	3130	5765
Sikh	19190	3240	9500	49.5	3500	5845
All other religions	7025	2990	3490	49.7	3000	4860
No religious affiliation	357920	3480	202925	56.7	3000	5205
Missing information	169650	2455	89420	52.7	2300	3780
Male						
Total	1056000	3470	611950	57.9	3030	5235
Christian	704775	3590	424510	60.2	3250	5265
Muslim	26445	2255	9905	37.4	3000	5080
Jewish	11420	3915	6225	54.5	2940	5375
Buddhist	10715	2770	4150	38.7	4000	6015
Hindu	9710	3130	4480	46.1	2410	6090
Sikh	9500	3445	4565	48.1	4000	6335
All other religions	3345	2660	1520	45.5	3000	4955
No religious affiliation	192675	3645	110095	57.1	3000	5540
Missing information	87420	2570	46500	53.2	2500	4030
Female						
Total	983410	3010	556865	56.6	3000	4455
Christian	670305	3060	391900	58.5	3000	4450
Muslim	22705	2285	9205	40.5	2695	4615
Jewish	10015	3025	4860	48.5	3000	4050
Buddhist	10030	2195	3975	39.6	3000	4305
Hindu	9505	2965	4270	44.9	3600	5425
Sikh	9690	3045	4935	50.9	3500	5390
All other religions	3680	3285	1965	53.5	3000	4785
No religious affiliation	165245	3290	92830	56.2	3000	4810
Missing information	82230	2330	42920	52.2	2055	3505

Source: 2001 Census Public Use Micro-data File

Appendix Table E8: Population aged 20-24 in 2001 by religion, sex, and income in 2000

	Total Income		Wages and Salaries % w/ W &			
	N	Mean	N	Salaries	Median	Mean
Male						
Total	979470	14950	835555	85.3	12000	15500
Christian	620250	15395	541115	87.2	12700	15770
Muslim	21575	9965	14640	67.9	8000	12020
Jewish	9905	11550	7750	78.3	7300	12045
Buddhist	11635	10085	7485	64.3	10000	13705
Hindu	10545	12085	8020	76.1	10000	14180
Sikh	12170	14020	9795	80.5	12000	16055
All other religions	3670	11220	2745	74.7	9700	12655
No religious affiliation	215195	15575	179705	83.5	13000	16435
Missing information	74525	12825	64295	86.3	10000	12245
Female						
Total	962785	11775	788935	81.9	9885	12010
Christian	631540	12095	529845	83.9	10000	12205
Muslim	21970	7460	12320	56.1	7000	10365
Jewish	8980	11590	7570	84.3	8390	12010
Buddhist	9830	8715	6675	67.9	7010	10840
Hindu	11505	10280	8275	71.9	8000	12565
Sikh	12700	11440	10175	80.1	10480	13050
All other religions	5055	10395	3680	72.8	8000	10555
No religious affiliation	183735	12065	146880	79.9	10000	12365
Missing information	77465	10485	63515	82.0	7000	9865

Source: 2001 Census Public Use Micro-data File