



The Educational Attainments and Labour Market Outcomes of the Children of Immigrants in Ontario

Prepared by Teresa Abada and Sylvia Lin
for the Higher Education Quality Council of Ontario



An agency of the Government of Ontario

Disclaimer:

The opinions expressed in this research document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views or official policies of the Higher Education Quality Council of Ontario or other agencies or organizations that may have provided support, financial or otherwise, for this project.

Cite this publication in the following format:

Abada, T. and Lin, S. (2011). *The Educational Attainments and Labour Market Outcomes of the Children of Immigrants in Ontario*. Toronto: Higher Education Quality Council of Ontario.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	3
Introduction	4
Purposes of the Study.....	4
Models of Integration.....	5
What Accounts for the Difference in Socioeconomic Adaptation?.....	7
Data and Methodology.....	8
Results	10
Support Descriptive Statistics	10
Multivariate Analysis	13
Education	13
Unemployment among Males	16
Unemployment among Females	19
Income Earned by Males	21
Income Earned by Females	24
Discussion and Conclusion.....	27
References.....	30
Country List	33
Appendix 1: Other Characteristics of the Second and Third Generations	34
by Source Country, Ontario, 2006	
Appendix 2: Occupation Distribution of the Second and Third Generations.....	36
by Source Country, Ontario, 2006	

List of Tables

Table 1: Summary characteristics of the two generations by source country,.....	12
Ontario, 1996 and 2006	
Table 2: Odds ratios of educational attainment of second generation,	15
aged 25-34, Ontario	
Table 3A: Odds ratios of male unemployment of second generation,	17
aged 25-34, Ontario	
Table 3B: Odds ratios of female unemployment of second generation	20
aged 25-34, Ontario	
Table 4A: Coefficients of male employment income of second generation,.....	22
aged 25-34, Ontario	
Table 4B: Coefficients of female employment income of second generation,.....	25
aged 25-34, Ontario	

Abstract

Using the 2006 Census, this study examines the educational attainments and labour market outcomes (unemployment and income) of the children of immigrants aged 25 to 34 who are living in Ontario. We determine the roles of individual human capital and group-level characteristics and the extent to which they account for the differences in educational and labour force activity in Ontario. We find that most groups achieve higher levels of university completion rates than the third generation. However, the children of immigrants from Portugal, the United States and the Philippines have lower university attainments than the children of Canadian-born parents. Second-generation males, including those from Jamaica, Latin America, East Asia, the Philippines, India, South/Southeast Asia, West Asia and Arab/North African region, the United States and Eastern Europe have lower earnings than the third generation. Groups with lower educational outcomes are not necessarily disadvantaged in terms of earnings and employment – as observed among the Dutch and the Portuguese. In terms of employment rates and earnings, most second-generation women are not significantly different from their third-generation counterparts.

Introduction

Postsecondary education is regarded as essential for labour market integration. For immigrants, academic success is the key mechanism for upward mobility for their children, the path that will enable them to overcome the disadvantages that they, as parents, have encountered in the host society. The children of immigrants (also referred to as the second generation) constitute an increasing segment of the Canadian labour force, and it is no wonder that attention to their educational attainment and labour force outcomes has increased dramatically in the last few years. The 2006 Census reports this group accounts for 15.6 per cent of the population aged 15 and over (Statistics Canada, 2008a). Studies on the economic integration of the children of Canadian immigrants have focused mainly on the national level, but to date, little is known about how this process of integration is segmented in the subnational context. Variations in individual and collective resources and in organizational, governmental and civic support will hinge largely on the neighbourhood, cities, and provinces in which immigrants and their children live (Ellis & Almgren, 2009). The way in which these factors are intertwined with labour market structures and opportunities will impact the economic futures of the children of immigrants. In ascertaining the factors that account for these ethnic differences in labour market outcomes, our aim is to extend the literature on immigrant integration by examining how these group differences are further segmented at the subnational level.

Investigating ethnic segmentation in labour market outcomes is especially critical for Ontario, given that this province is the top choice for settlement among immigrants. According to the 2006 Census, foreign-born individuals constitute 28.3 per cent of the province's population, the highest proportion of any of the 10 provinces. In addition, over two-thirds (68.3 per cent) of foreign-born Ontarians live in Toronto (Chui, Tran, & Maheux, 2007). Determining economic integration among the children of immigrants in Ontario is vital for understanding how this province presents opportunities and constraints for each immigrant nationality.

Purposes of the Study

The purposes of this study are as follows:

1. To provide an overview of the socioeconomic characteristics of the second generation living in Ontario.

We will provide a descriptive analysis of 26 groups of individuals born in Canada who have at least one parent born outside of Canada. The details of the profile will include their educational background, unemployment rates and income.

2. To determine the roles of individual human capital and group-level characteristics and the extent to which these account for group differences in educational and labour force activity in Ontario.

We ask the question: Are there group differences in educational and labour force outcomes among the children of immigrants living in Ontario? How much does geographic location

account for these group differences? We will ascertain whether some individual and group-level characteristics are important for some second-generation groups but not for others.

Models of Integration

Immigration scholars have turned to different models of assimilation in order to understand the socioeconomic adaptation of the children of immigrants. The straight-line assimilation perspective emphasizes the natural process by which immigrants shed their cultural and behavioural patterns to adopt the norms and values specific to the host society (Alba & Nee, 1997). An implication of this model is that the third and higher generations are thought to be the most economically advantaged, so that, over time, immigrant groups would acquire a culture that is more similar to that of groups of British origin and would attain greater socioeconomic mobility with each successive generation (Alba & Nee, 1997; Boyd, 2009). The dissipation of ethnic traits, including minority language, would mean that immigrants and their children would have equal access to mainstream opportunity structures, notably educational and labour market institutions (Zhou, 1997).

The alternative framework proposed by others including Portes & Zhou (1993) and Zhou, (1997) is based on the concept of segmented pathways of integration for the children of immigrants. The following pathways make up this model: identification of the factors (i.e., human and social capital factors) that immigrants possess and the social context of the society that receives immigrants; specification of the barriers that the second generation must contend with; and prediction of the divergent pathways that arise from the interplay between the identified factors and the specified barriers (Portes, Fernandez-Kelly, & Haller, 2009, p. 1079). These different pathways include assimilation into mainstream society; upward mobility but with preservation of ethnic identities and the immigrant community's values; and downward assimilation into the underclass or urban poverty (Portes, Fernandez-Kelly, & Haller, 2005; Portes & Zhou, 1993).

The second generation is becoming increasingly diverse. Specifically, the countries of origin of the parental generation are increasingly diverse and parents have come from countries including Asia, Africa, Latin America and the Caribbean that, in the past, were not sources of immigrants to Canada. This signals the possibility that race and ethnicity have a great deal to do with one's place within a society's socioeconomic strata (Zhou, 1997). A report from the 2002 Ethnic Diversity Survey (Statistics Canada, 2003) reveals the realities that racial minorities face; regardless of generation status or length of residence, 20 per cent of persons who were visible minorities (non-white in colour) reported having experienced discrimination or unfair treatment in the five years preceding the survey due to their ethnicity, culture, race, skin colour, language, accent or religion. The question is whether certain ethnic groups have inferior outcomes relative to the children of Canadian-born parents (also known as the third generation) and whether these outcomes can be explained by individual human capital and social capital. Concerns for the integration of immigrants extend to the second generation and studies have been done to determine whether they will encounter the same social and economic obstacles as their parents did (Palameta, 2007).

In a number of European countries, evidence points to abysmal scenarios with implication for downward assimilation among the second generation. In France, higher unemployment rates

are noted among the children of immigrants (mostly Muslim) from former French colonies (Silberman, Alba, & Fournier, 2007). In Germany, second-generation Turkish and Yugoslavian youth are enrolled in vocational training in high proportions (Worbs, 2003). In the Netherlands, the jobless rate is about seven or eight times higher among Turkish and Moroccan youth when compared to unemployment rates for their Dutch counterparts (Crul & Doornik, 2003).

A different pathway of economic integration points to peculiar outcomes observed among some children of immigrants – specifically, the extraordinary socioeconomic achievement of individuals within some ethnic groups. These outcomes are especially prevalent among those coming from other non-European regions (including regions outside the United Kingdom), especially Asia, who have bypassed the traditional straight-line assimilation pathway (Boyd, 2002, 2009; Zhou & Kim, 2006). Studies carried out in the United States provide examples of ethnic segmentation in both educational and labour market outcomes (Portes, Fernandez-Kelly, & Haller, 2005, 2009; Rumbaut, 2005). In these studies, higher family incomes have been noted for Asians, including Chinese, Filipinos and other Asian Americans in comparison to Mexicans and Laotians in California, while in South Florida, middle-class Cubans enjoy higher median incomes when compared with Haitians and West Indians (Portes, Fernandez-Kelly, & Haller, 2009). These patterns point to segmented forms of assimilation, where some of the offspring of immigrant groups achieve upward mobility status, while some groups may experience forms of stagnation.

It is unclear whether the pathway to downward assimilation of some immigrant groups as demonstrated in the European context and the United States may even apply in Canada. Studies have found higher educational attainment (Boyd, 2009; Finnie & Mueller, 2009; Palameta, 2007) and higher earnings (Aydemir & Sweetman, 2008) among the second generation when compared to the third generation. The educational disadvantage that immigrant parents may have is not passed on to their children, so that in the context of the Canadian educational system, children of immigrants are encouraged to attain high levels of education (Aydemir, Chen, & Corak, 2008). As Krahn and Taylor (2005) show, visible-minority youth show higher educational aspirations than their Canadian-born, non-visible-minority counterparts, with the former expecting to obtain one or more university degrees.

Substantial variations are also noted by ethnicity and parents' country origin. Similar to the results of U.S. studies, Canadian evidence demonstrates exceptionally high academic achievement among the children of Asian immigrants. When comparing the region of parents' origin, the children of immigrants of Chinese, other Asian and African background were most likely to attend university. Moreover, first- and second-generation youth from the Americas (except the United States) had lower university participation rates than the third generation (Finnie & Mueller, 2009). This echoes another study focusing on ethnic differences in university education attainment, where some groups (particularly Chinese, South Asians and Koreans/Japanese) were found to have attained much higher levels of university education than the non-visible-minority second generation. But not everyone attains intergenerational educational mobility. For instance, a Canadian study found that Blacks and Filipinos were the only groups who did not surpass their parents' levels of education (Abada, Hou, & Ram, 2009). Despite the success stories that past studies point to regarding the academic achievements of the second generation, it is important to examine in detail how these translate into labour force

outcomes for these individuals, including unemployment and income. The children of immigrants do not have to contend with the lack of foreign credential recognition that their parents would have endured in the labour market, so ethnicity or country origin of the parents should not be so apparent, given the second generation's individual and group-level characteristics. But recent studies point to some groups that may be at risk for ethnic segmentation in the labour market. For example, second-generation men from the Caribbean and West Africa earn less than the Canadian average, given their above-average education (Aydemir, Chen, & Corak, 2008; Corak, 2008). Second-generation, visible-minority men were also more likely to be looking for work than their non-visible-minority counterparts (Kunz, 2003). This study examines these questions and determines to what extent differences in socioeconomic achievement by parents' country of origin are explained by contributing factors, including human capital and ethnic capital.

What Accounts for the Differences in Socioeconomic Adaptation?

What determines the second generation's path to upward mobility while others experience stagnation are determined by the racial stratification, economic opportunities, spatial segregation and factors specific to immigrant groups including: financial and human capital, family composition and modes of incorporation or immigrants community differences (Portes, Fernandez-Kelly, and Haller, 2009; Portes & Zhou, 1993, p. 75). According to Portes and MacLeod (1999), these modes of incorporation are reflected in government policy and in the perceptions of different nationality groups. These two factors then interact with the cultural aspirations of its members – resulting in diverse ethnic communities. A community characterized by weak ethnic ties poses difficulties for immigrants who are trying to translate their human capital into their corresponding occupations. Conversely, groups that encounter little or no discrimination and that are characterized by strong social networks within a prosperous ethnic community can pave the way for their children to be competitive in the labour market (Portes, Fernandez-Kelly, & Haller, 2009). The extent to which an ethnic community has strong ties to its own culture conditions the potential achievement of the children of immigrants. In terms of human capital, differences in the academic and labour market outcomes reflect the human capital that parents possess (Portes & MacLeod, 1999). As noted by others, parents' education is an important determinant of children's success in occupational status and income, and it may be the most important determinant (Feliciano, 2005). Parents with more financial resources, such as formal education and occupational status, have access to good neighbourhoods and schools, as well as to supportive formal and informal organization (Zhou, 1997). These resources enable them to invest in their children's human capital skills, ensuring that their children have better opportunities and life chances. Human capital, as measured by socioeconomic status (SES), was found to be associated with transitioning from high school to postsecondary education, although immigrant status still played an independent role (Glick & White, 2004). Indeed, parents' education and SES play an important role in narrowing the gap in university enrolments between native-born Canadians of European descent and non-immigrants of African and Latin American backgrounds (Thiessen, 2009) and native-born Mexican Americans and white Americans (Warren, 1996). Thus, parents with more education and income will be in a more strategic position to steer their children toward achieving their educational goals.

Ethnicity as a source of social capital can provide the path for the second generation's educational and labour market success (Feliciano, 2005; Portes & Zhou, 1993). Aside from the parents' own human capital, children's educational attainment and labour market outcomes also depend on the average skills of the previous generation of the ethnic group. Strong external ethnic effects will lead to the persistence of ethnic differences in skills to the next generation (Borjas, 1992, 1993). A high-quality and advantageous ethnic environment enables access and exposure to social, economic and cultural factors that increase a second-generation individual's productivity while growing up (Borjas, 1992, 1994). On the other hand, the opportunities for the second generation may be dismal for those who grow up in poor inner-city neighbourhoods, due to the lack of exposure to role models, who would have been able to reinforce the role of education as a viable alternative to urban poverty and downward assimilation (Feliciano, 2005; Wilson, 1990). This study will examine the extent to which ethnic capital may also account for some of these group differences.

Data and Methodology

This study is based on the 1996 Census of Canada and the 2006 Census of Canada, and it focuses on the differences in educational attainment, unemployment and income among the children of immigrants in Ontario. The analytical sample included the second generation, aged 25 to 34 – namely, Canadian-born children of one or two immigrant parents. We also included children who had immigrated to Canada at age 12 or younger, known as the 1.5 generation, as they would also have gone through their middle-school years and beyond in the Canadian educational system. We chose this age group because most would have finished their education by age 35 in 2006 and would be at the entry level of their careers at that point. Within the selected sample, we categorized individual ethnic groups according to the mother's place of birth – or the father's if the mother had been born in Canada. We identified 26 groups of parents, each with a minimum sample size of at least five hundred people in Ontario, who had immigrated from one of the following countries or regions: United States, Jamaica, other Caribbean countries, Latin America, Scandinavia, Germany, the Netherlands, Greece, Italy, Portugal, the United Kingdom and Ireland, other Western/Southern European countries, Hungary, Poland, Croatia, other former Yugoslavian states, other Eastern European countries, China, other East Asian countries, the Philippines, India, other South/Southeastern Asian countries, Africa, North Africa/Arab region, West Asia/the Middle East, Australia and Pacific islands.¹ We compared socioeconomic indicators of each of these groups to our reference group, which consisted of the children of Canadian-born parents, known as the third generation. The third generation and higher are those born in Canada, aged 25 to 34, whose parents (and grandparents) are also born in Canada.

The three dependent variables in the study were as follows: highest educational attainment, unemployment status and employment income. Answers to the question from the 2006 Census about highest educational attainment provided detailed information about certificates, diplomas and degrees, which allowed us to conduct parallel logistic analyses for both total postsecondary

¹ Some northern African countries are grouped together with the Arab region, since the criteria for the study are also based on ethnicity, rather than on a purely geographical concept.

educational attainment and university degrees. For unemployment status, a logit model was used to examine the odds of being unemployed. We restricted the sample to those who were in the labour force, thus eliminating those who were attending school or staying home to take care of the family. Annual employment income from the 2006 Census consisted of all income, including self-employment (and excluding welfare transfers), with the sample being restricted to those who worked in the civilian sector and who had earned a non-zero income in the reference year. We used ordinary least squares (OLS) in the analysis of the natural logarithm of income.

Within each set of regressions, we included sets of explanatory variables and presented changes in group differences in educational, unemployment and earnings outcomes. Model 1 includes the set of explanatory variables related to birthplace of the parents. Model 2 added the second set of explanatory variables – that is, demographic controls, including gender (separate analyses were conducted for men and women when unemployment and income were examined), age, age-square, marital status, whether the respondent had children and generational status. Single (never married) served as the reference category for marital status. Generational status was coded as follows: generation 1.5 (those who had been born outside Canada but who had immigrated at age 12 or younger), generation 2 (those who had been born in Canada, with both parents being immigrants), generation 2.5 (Canadian-born children with one Canadian-born parent and one immigrant parent) and generation 3 (Canadian-born children with both parents being Canadian-born). Due to the equivalence of “generation 3” and the ethnicity group “Canada,” we used generation 2.5 as the reference group for generational status. The third set of explanatory variables concerned the areas of residence. The 2006 Census listed 13 CMAs (Census Metropolitan Areas) and 27 CAs (Census Agglomerations) in Ontario. We used economic regions as the criteria for grouping cities together² and ended up with the following areas or residence: Ottawa, Kingston-Peterborough, Toronto, Guelph-Kitchener (reference category), Hamilton-Niagara, London, Windsor, Northern and Northwestern Ontario and non-CMA/CA areas. The fourth set of explanatory variables reflected individual characteristics, such as language most often spoken at home. We categorized the language used by individuals as follows: English and/or French only (reference category), English/French with other non-official languages, and non-official language only. Although the use of a non-official (i.e., minority) language may appear to present a disadvantage, the use of a minority language may also represent a form of social capital, as it reflects access to the individual’s ethnic community and hence greater networks, which can facilitate success in the labour market (Golash-Boza, 2005).

When examining unemployment (the second dependent variable examined in this study), we included the educational level of the respondent, and for income (the third dependent variable being studied), and we added working activity and occupation classification. Educational level was coded into six groups: less than high school; high school graduates (reference category); trades and apprenticeship; college certificates or diplomas; bachelor’s degree; and certificates,

² The division “economic region” did not always coincide with that of “CMA/CA.” The exception was CMA 535 (consisting of Toronto, which was divided up among ER 30 (Toronto); ER 40 (Guelph-Kitchener); and ER50 (Hamilton-Niagara). However, we treated Toronto as a whole when grouping the CMA/CA regardless of the complication. Toronto CMA included peripheral areas such as York, Scarborough, Richmond Hill and Markham. Data were accessed at the University of Toronto Research Data Centre.

diplomas and degrees above bachelor's. Working activity controlled for full-time/part-time working status. Finally, we used the National Occupation Classification (NOC), in order to sort occupations into 10 groups: management; business, finance and public administration (reference category); natural and applied sciences; health; social science, education and government occupations; art, sports and culture; sales and services; trades and transportation; primary industries; and processing and manufacturing. The fifth (and last) set of variables was intended to capture "ethnic capital" (Borjas, 1992). It has been proposed that the average skills of the previous generation in an ethnic group has a "spillover" effect on the integration of the children of immigrants (Borjas, 1993). Therefore, the last model tries to ascertain the impact of ethnic capital as measured by the average percentage of individuals among the respondents' parents' generation who have a bachelor's degree (or with PSE credential in regressions on children's PSE attainment). Following Borjas' approach (1992) we derived the average percentage of university completion for male immigrants who had children aged 15 to 24 by country of birth from the 1996 Census. Then we merged the ethnic capital variable with the 2006 Census data by respondents' father's (or mother's if the father was not an immigrant) country of birth. For immigrants, we identified 108 countries (or regions) in the two censuses, and for Canadian-born parents, we identified 21 self-identified ethnicity groups. We anticipate that the second generation of ethnic groups, where the fathers' generation had higher levels of educational attainment, will be positively associated with higher educational attainments, lower unemployment and higher earnings.

Results

Descriptive Statistics

Table 1 provides the summary statistics for the selected variables in the analysis. The variables educational attainment, unemployment, and income have been broken down by the country of origin of the fathers' generation. The 2006 Census section presents figures for the children of immigrants, while the 1996 portion of the table presents characteristics of the fathers' generation. The most educated group are the children of Chinese immigrants, with 88 per cent having obtained a postsecondary education. This group also leads the way for completing at least a bachelor's degree – at 69 per cent. This is four times the rate of the group with the lowest percentage of individuals holding at least a bachelor's degree – namely, the Portuguese second generation, at 17 per cent. In terms of university completion rates, the most educated are visible-minority groups, with Chinese immigrant children at the top of the hierarchy, followed by East Asian and Indian immigrant children. A high proportion of African second-generation individuals have also obtained a university education, at 53 per cent, but a lower proportion of attainment of a university degree is observed among the children of immigrants from Jamaica (24 per cent) and other Caribbean countries (23 per cent). It should be noted, however, that 25 per cent of the third generation as a whole have completed a university degree (see "Children of Canadian-born parents" near the bottom of Table 1). Among European and Western source country/region groups, the highest levels of completion of at least a bachelor's degree are found among the Other Eastern European group (50 per cent), followed by Australia and Pacific islands (45 per cent), and Polish immigrant children (42 per cent). About 39 per cent of American and Greek immigrant children completed a university degree, while about one-third of Italians (32 per cent) and U.K./Irish (34 per cent) have obtained at least a bachelor's degree.

Differences in unemployment rates point to some groups being disadvantaged in the labour market, especially among men. While the unemployment rates for third-generation men hover at 5.5 per cent (see bottom of Table 1, fourth column), the percentages of second-generation men of Jamaican and West Asian/Middle Eastern background who are unemployed are 8.9 per cent and 8.2 per cent, respectively. Relatively high unemployment rates are also observed for the Scandinavian second generation men, at 7.2 per cent. Dutch immigrant men have the lowest unemployment rate (2.4 per cent), followed by Filipino (3.1 per cent) and Italian youth (3.8 per cent).

The highest female unemployment rates are observed among Latin Americans (8 per cent), followed by Jamaicans (7.7 per cent) and other South/Southeast Asians (7.6 per cent). The children of immigrants from the United States also have a high unemployment rate, at 7.1 per cent. The groups of women who have the lowest unemployment rates are the Hungarian (3.3 per cent), other Western/Southern Europe (4.1 per cent) and Dutch (4.3 per cent) immigrant children. These rates are lower than rates for the female third generation (i.e., female children of Canadian-born parents, at 6.4 per cent). Further group differences in income reveal the disadvantage that some immigrant children face in the labour market. Among males, Jamaican men have the lowest earnings (\$35,222.00), a figure which pales in comparison to the earnings of third-generation males (\$43,830.00). The next-lowest income earners among males are those with Other Caribbean background (\$36,721.00) and Latin Americans (\$39,147.00). The highest income earners among men are those of Croatian background (\$48,764.00) followed by those of Chinese (\$48,519.00) and those of Dutch background (\$48,336.00). Among women, Chinese second-generation individuals are the highest earners (\$43,198.00), followed by Indian women (\$40,380.00). There is little difference in income between the lowest earners (Caribbeans at \$29,885.00) and the third generation (\$31,472.00).

An examination of the background of the fathers' generation (1996 Census) reveals that the second generation and children of Canadian-born parents both surpass the parental generation's educational attainment. For example, 51 per cent and 18 per cent of third-generation fathers have completed some kind of postsecondary education and at least a bachelor's degree, respectively (see lower part of Table 1, 1996 Census data). A substantial proportion of their children pursued postsecondary education (63 per cent) and a bachelor's degree (25 per cent). (See lower part of Table 1 2006 Census) The same pattern can also be observed among the children of immigrants (See lower part of Table 1 2006 Census). While 53 per cent and 21 per cent of immigrant fathers attained a postsecondary education and a bachelor's degree, respectively (see lower part of Table 1, 1996 Census data), a much higher proportion of their children have gone on to attain postsecondary education (72 per cent) or at least a bachelor's degree (37 per cent) (see lower part of Table 1 2006 Census). The exceptions are American and Filipino immigrant children – the only two groups who do not exceed the university education level of the fathers' generation. The most educated immigrant males (i.e., fathers, see "1996 Census" portion of Table 1) are the Americans (48 per cent), followed by Filipinos (46 per cent) and Eastern Europeans (44 per cent).

Table 1
Summary characteristics of the two generations by source country, Ontario, 1996 and 2006
(Second generation and third generation, aged 25-34 in 2006 Census and the fathers' generation in 1996 census)

	2006 Census									1996 Census		
	Education		Unemployment Rate			Employment Income			Total	Education		Total
	% with PSE	% with BA and above	All	Male	Female	All	Male	Female		Fathers % with PSE	Fathers % with BA and above	
United States	69.3	38.91	6.29	5.51	7.14	38,880	45,086	32,034	19,545	73.62	48.25	15,285
Jamaica	67.75	24.18	8.23	8.88	7.65	33,283	35,222	31,626	18,050	48.62	7.57	20,980
Other Caribbean Countries	59.84	23.16	6.57	6.37	6.79	33,658	36,721	29,885	16,495	61.31	14.80	32,755
Latin (Central and South) America	70.93	30.91	7.56	7.11	7.97	36,559	39,147	34,126	28,345	43.18	14.77	19,770
Scandinavia	70.83	36.28	5.95	7.24	4.74	37,066	41,268	33,275	5,210	63.90	19.48	4,200
Germany	71.65	35.47	5.78	5.63	5.94	40,699	46,746	34,481	20,355	74.47	24.08	15,655
Netherlands	71.93	31.73	3.25	2.36	4.28	40,812	48,336	31,954	23,905	60.25	13.61	17,630
Greece	73.34	38.41	4.91	4.63	5.22	41,796	45,531	37,672	15,335	25.09	3.66	16,345
Italy	72.8	32.28	4.25	3.81	4.72	42,419	48,244	36,007	65,815	31.14	4.74	73,185
Portugal	54.65	17.32	4.16	3.86	4.50	36,706	40,607	32,317	29,390	11.65	0.65	35,115
U.K./Ireland	69.69	33.66	5.08	4.94	5.22	40,848	46,498	34,824	79,565	70.23	22.23	67,390
Other Western/Southern European Countries	71.94	36.69	4.08	4.06	4.10	41,212	46,318	36,231	12,495	60.52	17.72	11,090
Hungary	71.68	35.63	4.73	6.07	3.28	38,773	43,045	34,382	4,730	69.33	22.87	5,245
Poland	76.92	41.51	4.86	4.82	4.90	38,860	43,481	33,763	12,540	65.03	24.93	20,495
Croatia	78.15	37.05	5.58	5.99	5.12	43,915	48,764	38,639	6,180	52.25	6.14	7,315
Other Former Yugoslavian States	75.53	33.87	5.40	5.45	5.35	41,898	46,920	36,529	8,665	60.35	15.17	12,410
Other Eastern European Countries	80.11	50.18	6.08	5.97	6.20	41,720	47,993	34,989	9,955	81.00	44.05	15,010
China	87.56	69.16	4.86	5.29	4.40	45,923	48,519	43,198	21,515	48.61	25.81	43,710
Other East Asian Countries	83.6	61.54	5.77	6.58	4.86	40,265	44,259	35,955	5,395	66.84	43.50	8,065
Philippines	77.62	35.46	4.06	3.13	5.14	36,808	37,428	36,068	11,620	79.06	46.25	17,305

	2006 Census									1996 Census		
	Education		Unemployment Rate			Employment Income			Total	Education		Total
	% with PSE	% with BA and above	All	Male	Female	All	Male	Female		Fathers % with PSE	Fathers % with BA and above	
India	84.55	59.36	5.66	5.10	6.29	43,980	47,202	40,380	19,550	67.93	41.98	29,985
Other South/Southeast Asian Countries	77.00	48.12	7.76	7.94	7.56	38,644	41,646	35,469	21,245	47.52	25.40	34,935
Africa	82.77	53.08	6.53	6.76	6.31	41,442	45,427	37,556	10,220	69.34	31.74	16,080
Arab/North Africa	74.56	40.34	6.64	7.00	6.23	38,857	41,739	35,560	9,865	53.80	30.15	14,230
West Asia/Middle East	79.08	47.63	6.92	8.15	5.55	40,186	44,100	36,045	6,645	63.38	36.71	11,130
Australia and Pacific islands	75.6	45.04	2.41	X	X	39,585	46,525	32,067	1,865	69.18	37.11	1,830
All children of immigrant parents	72.45	37.05	6.12	5.72	6.54	40,099	44,724	35,150	484,495	53.19	20.50	567,145
Children of Canadian-born parents	62.71	25.22	5.91	5.48	6.38	37,876	43,830	31,472	695,240	51.00	17.95	771,080
Total	66.71	30.08	5.70	5.37	6.05	38,793	44,198	32,991	1,179,745	51.95	19.05	1,338,220

Multivariate Analysis

Education

Table 2 presents the regression results for educational attainment. Separate analyses were conducted for two dependent variables: (1) postsecondary education (including bachelor's degree) and (2) bachelor's degree and above. Note that for postsecondary education, only the baseline and final models are presented. Column i (under "Bachelor's degree and above") shows that the majority of second-generation young adults achieve higher levels of university attainment than the third generation (children of Canadian-born parents), while the children of Portuguese and Caribbean immigrants show lower university completion rates. Those of Portuguese and Caribbean background are 35 per cent and 11 per cent less likely (respectively) to complete a bachelor's degree than their third-generation counterparts. Among the European groups, it is notable that Eastern Europeans and the Polish second generation have odds of university completion that are three and two times higher, respectively than for the third generation. Almost all of visible-minority second generation (apart from those of Jamaican and Other Caribbean Countries background) also attain higher levels of university degrees than the third generation, and this is especially notable among those whose parents are from China, East Asia and India. Australians are two times more likely to obtain a university degree than the third generation. Looking at postsecondary attainment reveals that the majority (with the exception of

those of Portuguese and Other Caribbean background have completed either a college diploma or a bachelor's degree. Demographic characteristics (column ii under "Bachelor's degree and above") accounts for some of the group differences, though not in their entirety. The odds of obtaining a university degree are 1.89 times higher for women than for men. Generational differences are apparent as well, with those born in Canada being 11 per cent more likely to obtain a university degree, while those who came to Canada at age 12 or younger (the 1.5 generation) are 19 per cent less likely to have a bachelor's degree than members of the 2.5 generation.

It is well established that living in larger urban centres can account for the advantages that the second generation have over the third generation, with the children of immigrants having a greater geographic concentration in larger cities (Palameta, 2007). Ascertaining for differences in geographical location within Ontario (column iii) reveals lower university completion rates in Kingston, Hamilton, Windsor and Northwestern Ontario and non-CMA/CA areas when compared to Guelph-Kitchener. For Northwestern Ontario and non-CMA/CA areas especially, lower levels of university completion can be attributed to a lower demand for highly educated workers (Bollman, 1999). The coefficients are also reduced to non-significance among Italians and those from Latin America and they are reduced in magnitude among all the other groups, suggesting that geographical clustering of immigrants' children accounts for some of the educational advantage observed. However, for Jamaicans, the odds of university attainment are now significant and in the negative direction. This group is 27 per cent less likely to obtain a university degree than the third generation. Column iv shows that language spoken at home is associated with lower university completion rates for those who do not use one of the official languages when compared to those who use one or both official languages. However, home language, though significant, does not really explain group differences in educational achievement.

Ethnic capital (column v), as measured by the fathers' generation university completion is positively related to attainment of a university degree. It also accounts for lower university completion within the Jamaican and Caribbean second generation while explaining to some degree (though not entirely) the higher attainments of bachelor's degrees within some groups, notably within Eastern European, Chinese, East Asian, Indian, African and second generation. The lower university completion associated with living in Windsor and Hamilton and the 1.5 generation is accounted for by ethnic capital. Nevertheless, most groups acquire an educational advantage over their third-generation counterparts – though three groups show an educational disadvantage: the children of immigrants from the United States, the Philippines and Portugal. The same pattern is also observed when we account for post-secondary completion with the majority of children of immigrants showing an educational advantage over their third-generation counterparts (PSE column v). Some groups show lower attainments – in particular, those of U.K./Irish, German and American backgrounds. With the exception of the Americans, these groups (U.K./Irish and Germans) however have higher university completion rates.

Table 2
Odds ratios of educational attainment of second generation, aged 25-34, Ontario

	PSE (i) baseline	Bachelor's degree and above					PSE (v) + ethnic capital
		(i) baseline	(ii) + demog	(iii) + city	(iv) + language	(v) + ethnic capital	
United States (third gen ref)	1.306***	1.900***	1.867***	1.831***	1.807***	.670**	.756***
Jamaica	1.325***	0.985	0.959	0.734***	0.709***	1.023	1.504***
Other Caribbean Countries	0.929*	.895**	0.926	0.807***	0.863**	0.938	1.608***
Latin (Central and South) America	1.502***	1.411***	1.312***	1.01	0.977	1.175**	1.266***
Scandinavia	1.529***	1.795***	1.605***	1.504***	1.502***	1.55**	1.029
Germany	1.544***	1.709***	1.556***	1.448***	1.439***	1.318**	.870**
Netherlands	1.596***	1.450***	1.353***	1.465***	1.452***	1.667**	1.234***
Greece	1.711***	1.854***	1.444***	1.153***	1.216***	2.03**	2.827***
Italy	1.689***	1.497***	1.202***	1.002	1.014	1.625**	2.054***
Portugal	.754***	.654***	0.574***	0.477***	0.496***	.878*	1.465***
U.K./Ireland	1.437***	1.569***	1.442***	1.305***	1.284***	1.237**	.803***
Other Western/ Southern European Countries	1.620***	1.817***	1.606***	1.43***	1.42***	1.434**	1.113*
Hungary	1.626***	1.776***	1.583***	1.399***	1.41***	1.334**	1.036
Poland	2.038***	2.126***	2.115***	1.857***	1.959***	1.549**	2.025***
Croatia	2.326***	1.898***	1.501***	1.386***	1.436***	2.200**	2.082***
Other Former Yugoslavian States	1.839***	1.628***	1.375***	1.241***	1.293***	1.542**	1.614***
Other Eastern European Countries	2.458***	3.124***	3.003***	2.532***	2.575***	1.250**	1.504***
China	4.433***	6.915***	6.249***	4.84***	5.508***	4.80**	6.287***
Other East Asian Countries	2.926***	4.726***	4.133***	3.296***	3.425***	1.833**	2.773***
Philippines	2.120***	1.749***	1.636***	1.286***	1.273***	.575**	1.467***
India	3.401***	4.435***	3.88***	3.074***	3.316***	1.820**	2.622***
Other South/ Southeast Asian Countries	2.059***	2.860***	2.921***	2.311***	2.529***	2.243**	3.333***
Africa	2.971***	3.415***	3.259***	2.565***	2.571***	1.788**	2.227***
Arab/North Africa	1.868***	2.147***	1.976***	1.595***	1.691***	1.353**	2.247***
West Asia/Middle East	2.390***	2.902***	2.859***	2.227***	2.36***	1.537**	2.655***
Australia and Pacific islands	2.096***	2.386***	2.172***	1.892***	1.887***	0.835	1.13
Female (male ref)			1.885***	1.871***	1.869***	1.878**	1.796***
Age			1.018	0.975	0.972	0.974	1.190***
Age2			1	1.001	1.001	1	.998***
Married (Single never married ref)			1.747***	1.787***	1.775***	1.749**	1.949***
Divorced /separated /widowed			0.458***	0.478***	0.478***	.473**	.813***
With child (no children ref)			0.309***	0.343***	0.344***	.352**	.479***
1.5 generation (2.5 gen ref)			0.815***	0.761***	0.833***	.870**	1.009
2nd generation			1.109***	1.043 *	1.06**	1.082**	1.186***

	PSE (i) baseline	Bachelor's degree and above					PSE (v) + ethnic capital
		(i) baseline	(ii) + demog	(iii) + city	(iv) + language	(v) + ethnic capital	
Ottawa (Guelph-Kitchener ref)				1.93***	1.931***	1.953**	1.744***
Kingston				0.839***	0.839***	.844**	1.082**
Toronto				1.54***	1.546***	1.500**	1.330***
Hamilton				0.885***	0.885***	.874**	1.016
London				0.986	0.984	0.978	1.108***
Windsor				0.795***	0.794***	.814**	0.963
Northwestern Ontario				0.864***	0.864***	.892**	1.224***
Non-CMA/CA area				0.481***	0.49***	.524**	.828***
English/French with other language (Eng/Fre only ref)					0.584***	.588**	.780***
Other language only					0.613***	.636**	.564***
% of fathers with PSE/BA and above						1.035**	1.016
Sample size	232,675						
Pseudo R2	0.018	0.0338	0.0837	0.1049	0.1063	0.1122	0.0701

* $p < 0.05$ ** $p < 0.01$ *** $p < 0.001$

Unemployment among Males

Table 3A (column i) shows that male unemployment rates are higher for the children of Jamaican, Latin American, South/Southeast Asian and West Asian immigrants. Jamaican men, especially, are 52 per cent more likely to be unemployed than the children of Canadian-born parents. In contrast, the children of immigrant parents from the Netherlands, Italy, Portugal, the United Kingdom and Ireland, Western/Southern Europe and the Philippines show lower odds of being unemployed than the children of Canadian-born parents. The Dutch second generation are 60 per cent less likely to be out of work than their third-generation counterparts. The rest of the second generation is not significantly different from the third generation in their unemployment rates. Demographic characteristics (column ii) account for lower unemployment rates among the Western/Southern European second generation. In addition, the second generation is 12 per cent less likely to be unemployed than the 2.5 generation (those born to one Canadian and one immigrant parent) (See lower part Table 3A). Those who are married and divorced/separated also show lower odds of being unemployed than the single/never-married group.

Differences in geographical location within Ontario (column iii) reveal lower employment opportunities for men in smaller and medium-sized cities. In comparison to Guelph-Kitchener, the odds of being unemployed range from being higher by 28 per cent in Hamilton, 39 per cent in Kingston and 21 per cent in London. Living in Windsor, Northwestern Ontario, and a non-CMA/CA area also presents an employment disadvantage in comparison to living in Guelph-Kitchener. Speaking only one's own minority language (as opposed to using even just one of

the official languages) lowers the odds of being employed. The advantage of obtaining a postsecondary education is evident, as individuals with any kind of education beyond the high school level have lower likelihoods of being unemployed (see Table 3A, near bottom). Having completed a trades and apprenticeship program is not significantly related to employment outcomes. However, high school dropouts are 72 per cent more likely to be unemployed when compared to those who completed a high school education. The labour market disadvantage is also noted among Croatian, Eastern European and Indian men with their higher unemployment rates in comparison to those of their third-generation counterparts.

The educational characteristics of the father's generation ethnic group (column v) are associated with lower levels of unemployment within the second generation. However, even when we account for individual characteristics and the father's generation's educational attainment, most groups still show a labour market disadvantage when compared to the third generation. This is especially notable among visible minorities from Jamaica, India, East Asia, South/Southeast Asia, Africa and West Asia/Middle East. Immigrant children from Latin America, the United States, Germany and Eastern Europe also show higher unemployment rates than children of Canadian-born parents. It should be noted that the Italian, Portuguese and Dutch second generation have lower unemployment rates than their third-generation counterparts.

Table 3A
Odds ratios of male unemployment of second generation, aged 25-34, Ontario

	Male				
	(i) baseline	(ii) + demog	(iii) + city	(iv) + language, education	(v) + ethnic capital
United States (third gen ref)	0.88	0.913	0.915	0.994	1.823***
Jamaica	1.524***	1.487***	1.733 ***	1.787***	1.455***
Other Caribbean Countries	1.064	1.148	1.242	1.112	1.058
Latin (Central and South) America	1.201*	1.205	1.4***	1.521***	1.378***
Scandinavia	1.146	1.191	1.22	1.305	1.305
Germany	0.977	1.037	1.113	1.189	1.274*
Netherlands	.394***	0.472***	0.469***	0.507**	.477***
Greece	0.83	0.936	1.055	1.029	0.776
Italy	.644***	0.742***	0.816 *	0.824*	.635***
Portugal	.680***	0.781*	0.886	0.73**	.536***
U.K./Ireland	.820**	0.873*	0.948	1.012	1.051
Other Western/ Southern European Countries	.736*	0.788	0.843	0.9	0.895
Hungary	0.954	0.986	1.078	1.135	1.194
Poland	0.786	0.788	0.862	0.909	1.067
Croatia	1.174	1.288	1.37	1.453*	1.148
Other Former Yugoslavian States	0.89	0.978	1.059	1.096	1.009

	Male				
	(i) baseline	(ii) + demog	(iii) + city	(iv) + language, education	(v) + ethnic capital
Other Eastern European Countries	1.01	1.087	1.218	1.35*	2.078***
China	0.876	0.848	0.977	1.097	1.209
Other East Asian Countries	1.111	1.095	1.258	1.455	2.136***
Philippines	.589***	0.579**	0.662*	0.75	1.219
India	0.89	1.012	1.162	1.316*	1.914***
Other South/ Southeast Asian Countries	1.329***	1.321**	1.519***	1.604***	1.658***
Africa	1.289	1.277	1.463**	1.739***	2.151***
Arab/North Africa	1.101	1.106	1.206	1.242	1.324
West Asia/Middle East	1.444*	1.424*	1.662**	1.811***	2.317***
Australia and Pacific islands	0.748	0.772	0.856	0.917	1.463
Age		0.653***	0.665***	0.673***	.674***
Age ²		1.007***	1.006***	1.006***	1.006***
Married (single never married ref)		0.355***	0.359***	0.407***	.413***
Divorced /separated /widowed		0.872	0.853*	0.827**	.833**
With child (no children ref)		1.093*	1	0.86***	.842***
1.5 generation (2.5gen ref)		0.889	0.93	0.827*	.809**
2nd generation		0.88*	0.92	0.922	0.91
Ottawa (Guelph-Kitchener ref)			1.112	1.247**	1.236**
Kingston			1.385***	1.391***	1.388**
Toronto			1.105	1.182**	1.196**
Hamilton			1.281***	1.287***	1.230***
London			1.212*	1.244**	1.247**
Windsor			1.885***	1.927***	1.901***
Northwestern Ontario			1.863***	1.931***	1.894***
Non-CMA/CA area			1.959***	1.757***	1.659***
English/French with other language (Eng/ Fre only ref)				1.364*	1.348*
Other language only				1.523***	1.454***
Less than high school (high school ref)				1.724***	1.685***
Trades and apprenticeship				0.968	0.96
College				0.65***	.651***
Bachelor's				0.569***	.579***
Above bachelor's				0.61***	.622***
% of fathers with BA and above					.980***
Sample size	105,174				
Pseudo R2	0.0044	0.0308	0.037	0.0525	0.054

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

Unemployment among Females

Table 3B (column i) indicates that the European groups of females with lower unemployment rates than the third generation include the Dutch, Italian, Portuguese, U.K./Irish, Western/Southern Europe, Hungarian and Polish second generation. The Chinese and Australian/Pacific Islands second-generation also show lower odds of being unemployed than the children of Canadian-born parents (the third generation). By contrast, the children of Latin American immigrants are 20 per cent more likely to be unemployed than the third generation. The rest of the other groups are not significantly different from the third generation. Accounting for demographic characteristics (column ii) explains the lower unemployment rates among these groups, except for the Dutch and the Portuguese, both of whom are still about 25 per cent less likely to be unemployed in comparison to the third generation. By contrast (and accounting for demographic characteristics), South/Southeast Asian and Indian women have higher unemployment rates than the third generation. In addition, having children increases the odds of being unemployed in comparison to those with no children (see lower part of Table 3B). The generational differences (1.5 and second generation compared to the 2.5 generation) are not statistically significant.

Differences in geographical location within Ontario (column iii) also provide important information concerning women's employment. Living in Kingston, Hamilton, Windsor, Northwestern Ontario and non-CMA/CA areas increases the odds of being unemployed, compared to living in Guelph-Kitchener. We find that geographical differences do not account for any of the group differences in employment rates among women. Column iv shows that the use of a minority language (as opposed to speaking only the official languages) is positively associated with unemployment for women. Having a college education, a bachelor's degree or a higher credential is also beneficial, as these are associated with lower odds of being unemployed in comparison to having only a high school education. High school dropouts are 61 per cent more likely to be unemployed than those who obtained a high school diploma. Higher unemployment rates (previously not significant) are also noted among the children of Eastern European and African immigrants (column iv).

The educational background of the fathers' generation does not explain the employment outcomes of second generation women. Most groups are not significantly different from the third generation, but the children of immigrants from the United States, Latin America, Other Eastern European Countries, India, East Asia (excluding China), Other South/Southeast Asian Countries and Africa are more likely to be unemployed than their third-generation counterparts. The Dutch and Portuguese second generation are 23 percent and 38 percent less likely to be unemployed, respectively, than the third generation.

Table 3B
Odds ratios of female unemployment of second generation, aged 25-34, Ontario

	Female				
	(i) baseline	(ii) + demog	(iii) + city	(iv) + language, education	(v) + ethnic capital
United States (third gen ref)	1.13	1.24*	1.247*	1.275*	1.661***
Jamaica	1.187	1.108	1.167	1.239	1.136
Other Caribbean Countries	1.015	1.034	1.07	1.019	1
Latin (Central and South) America	1.2*	1.305**	1.371***	1.441***	1.382***
Scandinavia	0.668	0.768	0.776	0.814	0.814
Germany	0.913	1.063	1.086	1.125	1.159
Netherlands	.654***	0.753*	0.756*	0.794*	.772*
Greece	0.866	1.214	1.263	1.264	1.114
Italy	.673***	0.89	0.917	0.933	.831*
Portugal	.655***	0.735**	0.767*	0.707**	.616***
U.K./Ireland	.789***	0.91	0.933	0.961	0.977
Other Western/ Southern European Countries	.634**	0.764	0.785	0.831	0.83
Hungary	.569*	0.678	0.701	0.714	0.729
Poland	.724*	0.858	0.886	0.943	1.007
Croatia	0.761	1.039	1.058	1.102	0.992
Other Former Yugoslavian States	0.889	1.127	1.15	1.171	1.129
Other Eastern European Countries	1.006	1.241	1.288	1.372*	1.657**
China	.658***	0.914	0.953	1.03	1.069
Other East Asian Countries	0.859	1.212	1.258	1.361	1.602*
Philippines	0.754	0.868	0.903	0.966	1.193
India	0.949	1.289*	1.346*	1.413**	1.662***
Other South/ Southeast Asian Countries	1.089	1.271*	1.33*	1.369**	1.392**
Africa	0.971	1.186	1.237	1.361*	1.503**
Arab/North Africa	0.89	1.115	1.16	1.193	1.239
West Asia/Middle East	0.84	1.046	1.09	1.152	1.292
Australia and Pacific islands	.284*	0.33	0.334	0.357	0.434
Age		0.653***	0.656***	0.673**	.672***
Age ²		1.006***	1.006***	1.006**	1.006**
Married (single never married ref)		0.603***	0.604***	0.667***	.672***
Divorced /separated /widowed		0.999	0.997	0.985	0.992
With child (no children ref)		3.153***	3.073***	2.644***	2.622***
1.5 generation (2.5gen ref)		1.027	1.038	1.003	0.994
2nd generation		0.938	0.946	0.961	0.955
Ottawa (Guelph-Kitchener ref)			0.997	1.067	1.062
Kingston			1.321***	1.361***	1.36***
Toronto			1.047	1.081	1.087
Hamilton			1.138*	1.148*	1.152*

	Female				
	(i) baseline	(ii) + demog	(iii) + city	(iv) + language, education	(v) + ethnic capital
London			0.942	0.967	0.969
Windsor			1.212**	1.239**	1.232**
Northwestern Ontario			1.172*	1.212**	1.200*
Non-CMA/CA area			1.234***	1.18**	1.153*
English/French with other language (Eng /Fre only ref)				1.318*	1.305*
Other language only				1.068	1.052
Less than high school (high school only ref)				1.612***	1.600***
Trades and apprenticeship				1.055	1.056
College				0.733***	.735***
Bachelor's				0.69***	.695***
Above bachelor's				0.707***	.714***
% of fathers with BA and above					.992***
Sample size	98,577				
Pseudo R2	0.0031	0.0359	0.0368	0.0444	0.0446

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

Income Earned by Males

Table 4A (column i) shows that, with the exception of the second-generation individuals of Chinese background, visible minority men earn less than the third generation. An earnings advantage is observed among European groups, specifically those whose parents are from the Netherlands, Italy, the U.K./Ireland, Western and Southern Europe, Croatia and Eastern Europe. The rest are not significantly different from the children of the Canadian-born. Column ii shows that young immigrants who arrived in Canada at age 12 and earn less than the children of one immigrant parent and one Canadian parent (the 2.5 generation).

Column iii shows that differences in geographical location within Ontario account for higher earnings among some groups, particularly those whose parents are from Western/Southern and Eastern Europe, India, South/Southeast Asia and Africa. Those who reside in Ottawa, Kingston, Hamilton, London, Northwestern Ontario and non-CMA/CA areas have lower earnings than men who live in Guelph-Kitchener. Column iv shows that minority-language retention or speaking one's minority language along with one of the official languages is not advantageous for males, suggesting that language assimilation can be beneficial in that it points to higher earnings in the labour market. In addition, the pursuit of postsecondary education is clearly an advantage, in that men with postsecondary education have higher incomes than those who obtained only a high school diploma.

The importance of home language and educational background is evident, as these factors explain the higher earnings observed among the U.K./Ireland second generation. We also observe that some groups show an earnings disadvantage when we control for individual background characteristics, particularly for the children of immigrants from Hungary, East Asia, West Asia/Middle East. Column v shows that those working in management, natural sciences and health earn higher incomes than those involved in business, finance and public administration. Controlling for work status and industry occupation accounts for the lower earnings among the Hungarian second generation. We also observe an earnings disadvantage among the Arab/North African second generation.

Although significant, the educational background of the fathers' generation has only a small effect on men's income (see column vi). Even when we control for individual and group-level characteristics, most groups retain their lower earnings, and this is notable among some visible minorities, including the second generation whose parents immigrated from Jamaica, East Asian Countries (other than China), the Philippines, India, South/Southeast Asia, the Arab/North African region and West Asia/Middle East. American immigrant youth earn less than the third generation, while only a few groups of European men (including those from Portugal, Croatia and Italy) earn higher incomes than their third-generation counterparts.

Table 4A
Coefficients of male employment income of second generation, aged 25-34, Ontario

	Male					
	(i) baseline	(ii) + demog	(iii) + city	(iv) + language, education	(v) + occupation	(vi) + ethnic capital
United States (third gen ref)	-0.029	-0.02	-0.039	-0.081***	-0.046*	-.157***
Jamaica	-.220***	-0.142***	-0.207***	-0.216***	-0.143***	-.103***
Other Caribbean Countries	-.166***	-0.09***	-0.127***	-0.067*	-0.054*	-.043
Latin (Central and South) America	-.130***	-0.06**	-0.121***	-0.147***	-0.108***	-.087***
Scandinavia	-.003	-0.007	-0.015	-0.04	-0.021	-.018
Germany	0.044	0.022	-0.002	-0.034	-0.002	-.013
Netherlands	.117***	0.044*	0.054**	0.022	0.031	.045**
Greece	0.027	0.001	-0.055*	-0.045	-0.047*	0.01
Italy	.117***	0.079***	0.03*	0.032*	0.032*	.084***
Portugal	0.017	0.026	-0.025	0.07***	0.058***	.120***
U.K./Ireland	.066***	0.056***	0.027*	0	0.012	0.007
Other Western/ Southern European Countries	.087**	0.083**	0.05	0.024	0.024	0.026
Hungary	-.066	-0.052	-0.088	-0.111*	-0.066	-.073
Poland	0.011	0.117***	0.078**	0.051	0.066**	0.04
Croatia	.177***	0.174***	0.138***	0.114***	0.081**	.128***
Other Former Yugoslavian States	0.02	0.024	-0.02	-0.035	-0.023	-.004
Other Eastern European Countries	.069*	0.09**	0.043	-0.019	-0.014	-.094**
China	.069**	0.177***	0.118***	0.053*	0.012	-.002
Other East Asian Countries	-.115*	-0.024	-0.079	-0.159**	-0.095*	-.164***
Philippines	-.124***	-0.011	-0.073**	-0.114***	-0.09***	-.179***
India	0.023	0.053*	-0.006	-0.063*	-0.081***	-.149***
Other South/Southeast Asian Countries	-.066**	0.063*	0.005	-0.024	-0.036	-.049*
Africa	-.020	0.083*	0.03	-0.052	-0.012	-.052

	Male					
	(i) baseline	(ii) + demog	(iii) + city	(iv) + language, education	(v) + occupation	(vi) + ethnic capital
Arab/North Africa	-.106**	-0.007	-0.053	-0.069	-0.075*	-.098**
West Asia/Middle East	-.138**	-0.027	-0.091	-0.131**	-0.11*	-.153**
Australia and Pacific islands	-.013	0.017	-0.02	-0.058	-0.027	-.117
Age		0.378***	0.373***	0.369**	0.241***	.240***
Age ²		-0.005***	-0.005***	-0.005**	-0.003***	-.003***
Married (single never married ref)		0.354***	0.351***	0.296**	0.227***	.225***
Divorced /separated /widowed		0.067***	0.077**	0.109**	0.067***	.067***
With child (no children ref)		-0.018***	0.013	0.076**	0.049***	.051***
1.5 generation (2.5 ref)		-0.057***	-0.075***	-0.019	-0.034*	-.029*
2nd generation		0.008	-0.01	-0.012	-0.014	-.020
Ottawa (Guelph-Kitchener ref)			-0.037**	-0.095**	-0.059***	-.058***
Kingston			-0.212***	-0.215**	-0.158***	-.157***
Toronto			0.013	-0.024*	0.014	0.011
Hamilton			-0.079***	-0.081**	-0.049***	-.050***
London			-0.092***	-0.101**	-0.075***	-.076***
Windsor			-0.015	-0.02	0.008	0.01
Northwestern Ontario			-0.181***	-0.193**	-0.106***	-.103***
Non-CMA/CA area			-0.248***	-0.198**	-0.153***	-.147***
English/French with other language (Eng /Fre only ref)				-0.195**	-0.128***	-.127***
Other language only				-0.216**	-0.178***	-.173***
Less than high school (high school ref)				-0.248**	-0.205***	-.202***
Trades and apprenticeship				0.115**	0.097***	.098***
College				0.188**	0.169***	.167***
Bachelor's				0.335**	0.313***	.310***
Above bachelor's				0.337**	0.358***	.354***
Full-time working (part-time ref)					1.102***	1.103***
Management (finance and public admin ref)					0.118***	.118***
Natural science					0.14***	.140***
Health					0.155***	.153***
Social science, education, government					-0.133***	-.133***
Art, sport, culture					-0.285***	-.285***
Sales, services					-0.122***	-.121***
Trades					-0.013	-.013
Primary industry					-0.301***	-.300***
Manufacturing, processing					0.106***	.107***
% of fathers with BA and above						.004***
'Constant	10.406***	3.939***	4.098**	4.111***	5.127***	5.0680***
Sample size	94,254	94,254	94,254	94,254	93,480	93,480
R-squared	0.0048	0.0973	0.1073	0.1446	0.2778	0.2784
Root MSE	0.8690	0.8276	0.8231	0.8057	0.7259	0.7256

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

Income Earned by Females

Unlike the case for men, almost all second-generation women show an earnings advantage over the third generation (see Table 4B, column i). The earnings of those whose parents are from the United States, the Caribbean, Scandinavian countries, the Netherlands, Hungary and Australia are not significantly different from the earnings of the children of Canadian-born parents (the third generation). Column ii shows that women with at least one child earn less than those with no children. Higher earnings among second generation women are explained by demographic characteristics (and particularly for women of German, Greek, Polish and Eastern European background). The same pattern is observed among women of South/Southeast Asian, African, Arab/North African and West Asian backgrounds. However, second-generation women whose parents are from the United States and Scandinavian countries have an earnings disadvantage over the third generation.

From column iii, it is clear that living in Ottawa and Toronto incurs an income advantage when compared to living in Guelph-Kitchener. Second-generation women residing in other areas, including Kingston, Hamilton, Northwestern Ontario and non-CMA/CA areas face an income disadvantage. The rewards of living in large urban areas are apparent, accounting for higher earnings among women whose parents are from Latin America, Other Western/Southern European Countries and the Other former Yugoslavian states (excluding Croatia). Also, Jamaicans now show lower earnings although it is no longer statistically significant once we control for geographical differences.

As expected, second-generation women who have at least a bachelor's degree (see the lower part of Table 4B, column iv) have higher earnings than those who have only a high school diploma. Trades/apprenticeship qualifications, however, are associated with lower earnings. Using a minority language at home is also associated with lower earnings. Individual background characteristics explain the lower earnings observed among Caribbean women and the higher income for those children whose parents are from the Philippines and India. The earnings disadvantage is further noted among the second-generation Dutch, Eastern European, and West Asian women. From column v, it is clear that those working in management, natural science and health earn more than those in business, finance and administration. Industry occupational backgrounds explain higher earnings for second-generation women among the children of Chinese immigrants and lower income for the children of West Asian and Dutch immigrants. Column vi shows that ethnic capital is not significantly related to second-generation women's earnings. Most groups are not significantly different from the third generation when it comes to income. A few, however, earn less than the children of Canadian-born parents, including those whose parents are from the United States, Scandinavia, East Asia (excluding China) South/Southeast Asia and Africa. Children of immigrants from Italy and Portugal earn slightly more than the children of Canadian-born parents.

Table 4B
Coefficients of female employment income of second generation, aged 25-34, Ontario

	Female					
	(i) baseline	(ii) + demog	(iii) + city	(iv) + language, education	(v) + occupation	(vi) + ethnic capital
United States (third gen ref)	0.007	-0.062*	-0.078**	-0.114***	-0.064**	-.076**
Jamaica	.071**	0.056*	-0.039	-0.052	-0.042	-.038
Other Caribbean Countries	0.006	-0.006	-0.06*	-0.012	-0.025	-.024
Latin (Central and South) America	.178***	0.109***	0.02	-0.01	-0.021	-.019
Scandinavia	-.042	-0.117*	-0.133*	-0.162**	-0.132**	-.132**
Germany	.107***	0.021	-0.004	-0.034	-0.017	-.018
Netherlands	0.025	-0.043	-0.025	-0.064**	-0.023	-.021
Greece	.212***	0.037	-0.04	-0.048	-0.028	-.022
Italy	.227***	0.096***	0.04*	0.03	0.027*	.033*
Portugal	.119***	0.071***	0.012	0.08***	0.042*	.049*
U.K./Ireland	.139***	0.054***	0.026*	0.002	0.007	0.006
Other Western/ Southern European Countries	.156***	0.063*	0.028	-0.013	-0.001	-.001
Hungary	0.097	-0.013	-0.052	-0.068	-0.05	-.050
Poland	.130***	0.051	0.01	-0.04	-0.051	-.053
Croatia	.207***	0.044	0.022	-0.006	-0.003	0.002
Other Former Yugoslavian States	.205***	0.077*	0.04	0.029	0.001	0.003
Other Eastern European Countries	.126**	0.024	-0.033	-0.106**	-0.083**	-.092**
China	.395***	0.232***	0.147***	0.058*	0.008	0.006
Other East Asian Countries	.168***	-0.011	-0.089	-0.183**	-0.112**	-.120**
Philippines	.229***	0.16***	0.076*	0.031	-0.019	-.028
India	.307***	0.158***	0.078**	0.002	-0.018	-.026
Other South/ Southeast Asian Countries	.126***	0.038	-0.038	-0.082**	-0.114**	-.115***
Africa	.175***	0.063	-0.018	-0.112**	-0.127**	-.132***
Arab/North Africa	.136***	0.046	-0.019	-0.047	-0.047	-.049
West Asia/Middle East	.127**	0.034	-0.046	-0.091*	-0.058	-.063
Australia and Pacific islands	0.033	-0.042	-0.075	-0.128	-0.099	-.109
Age		0.448***	0.43***	0.403***	0.21**	.210***
Age ²		-0.007***	-0.006***	-0.006***	-0.003**	-.003***
Married (single never married ref)		0.166***	0.172***	0.114***	0.084**	.084***
Divorced /separated /widowed		0.015	0.028	0.074***	0.022	0.022
With child (no children ref)		-0.632***	-0.594***	-0.475***	-0.34**	-.340***
1.5 generation (2.5 gen ref)		0.03	0.008	0.043**	0.037**	.037**
2nd generation		0.035**	0.015	0.009	0.016	0.016
Ottawa (Guelph-Kitchener ref)			0.155***	0.091***	0.06**	.060***
Kingston			-0.1***	-0.111***	-0.078**	-.078***
Toronto			0.151***	0.116***	0.093**	.092***
Hamilton			-0.056***	-0.057**	-0.023	-.023
London			0	-0.012	-0.009	-.009
Windsor			-0.009	-0.014	0.024	0.024
Northwestern Ontario			-0.09***	-0.102***	-0.048**	-.047**

	Female					
	(i) baseline	(ii) + demog	(iii) + city	(iv) + language, education	(v) + occupation	(vi) + ethnic capital
Non-CMA/CA area			-0.113***	-0.071***	-0.044**	-.044***
English/French with other language (Eng/Fre only ref)				-0.047**	-0.053	-.053
Other language only				-0.125***	-0.113**	-.112***
Less than high school (high school ref)				-0.318***	-0.214**	-.213***
Trades and apprenticeship				-0.155***	-0.077**	-.077***
College				0.211***	0.131**	.131***
Bachelor's				0.423***	0.318**	.318***
Above bachelor's				0.437***	0.356**	.355***
Full-time working (part-time ref)					0.894**	.894***
Management (finance and public admin ref)					0.11**	.110***
Natural science					0.161**	.161***
Health					0.229**	.229***
Social science, education, government					-0.088**	-.088***
Art, sport, culture					-0.212**	-.212***
Sales, services					-0.293**	-.293***
Trades					-0.116**	-.116***
Primary industry					-0.382**	-.382***
Manufacturing, processing					0.053**	.053**
% of fathers with BA and above						0.00042
Constant	10.01206*	2.728***	2.971***	3.232***	5.57***	5.563***
Sample size	88,308	88,308	88,308	88,308	86,966	86,966
R-squared	0.0094	0.0983	0.1084	0.1500	0.3209	0.3209
Root MSE	0.9774	0.9326	0.9274	0.9055	0.7742	0.7742

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$ *** $p < .001$

Discussion and Conclusion

This study has found differences in education, unemployment and income by national origin groups among the children of immigrants. The majority of the second generation have higher university completion rates than the children of Canadian-born parents. The most educated are the Chinese, followed by the East Asian and Indian second generation. It should also be noted that most second-generation individuals attained some postsecondary education (including college and trades/diploma). The differences between groups are more pronounced when it comes to attainment of at least an undergraduate degree.

We found that differences in geographical location within Ontario did not fully explain differences in educational attainment between groups. As expected, living in non-CMA/CA areas are associated with lower levels of university completion, which can be attributed to a lower demand for highly educated workers in those locations (Bollman, 1999). The majority of the second generation, especially visible minorities, are concentrated in Toronto (see Appendix 1).

When looking at postsecondary education (including college/trades, as well as bachelor's degrees), second-generation individuals with a Caribbean background (including Jamaican background) had higher completion rates than the children of Canadian-born parents. However, when focusing only on university attainment, lower completion rates were found among these groups. These lower attainments were accounted for by ethnic capital, namely university completion rates of the fathers' generation. A recent study of immigrant youth from the Toronto District School Board found that Caribbean students were least likely to attend a postsecondary institution or to complete high school (Sweet, Anisef, Brown, Walters, & Phythian, 2010). The lower attainments among these groups call for further investigation of the barriers that they may encounter early on and throughout their high school years. As mentioned earlier, the quality of the ethnic environment can determine what is achievable in the host society. For ethnic communities with members of lower educational background or lower socioeconomic standing in general, the shortage of role models and the absence of institutional supports can hinder the pursuit of a higher education (Feliciano, 2005).

The lower likelihood of Portuguese youth pursuing a university education may be reflected in the lower proportion of Portuguese immigrants in management and professional occupations (Ornstein, 2000). As Table 1 shows, less than 1 per cent of the fathers' generation of this group completed a university degree, and only 12 per cent attained some kind of postsecondary education. Unlike the rest of the second generation, the Filipino and American second generations are the only groups that do not surpass the university attainment of the fathers' generation. The rest sustain their educational advantage, even when controlling for these individual and group-level characteristics. Past studies consistently show the resilience of the advantages among these groups in Canada and the United States. Qualitative studies point to the importance of ethnic institutions such as the church or language schools, which provide a place for enrichment of academic goals and family values and hence facilitate the pursuit of a university education (Zhou and Kim, 2006). As Boyd succinctly puts it (2009, p. 358) these observations are consistent with the immigrant success model, rather than with downward mobility or a linear path, whereby each successive generation does better than the previous one.

While success in educational attainment is notable among the children of immigrants, their labour market outcomes tell a somewhat different story. Second-generation males (especially those from Jamaica, India, East Asian Countries (other than China), South/Southeast Asian Countries, West Asia/Middle East, Latin America, Germany and Eastern Europe) show higher unemployment rates than the children of Canadian-born parents. However, the Italian, Portuguese and Dutch second generation have lower unemployment rates than their third-generation counterparts. For women, children of immigrants from the United States, Latin America, Eastern Europe, India, South/Southeast Asia and Africa are more likely to be unemployed than the children of Canadian-born parents. The longer settlement history among some European groups point to more established ethnic communities that could provide the resources for the parents' successful integration, and this could aid in the subsequent generation's route to economic mobility. On the other hand, the increasing diversity of the ethnic composition of immigrants and their children also signals the possibility that the discrimination endured by the first generation in the labour market may be apparent among the children of immigrants – particularly those of visible-minority origin. Future studies might examine these experiences in the workplace and determine the extent to which this possibility may play a role in the employment disparities between non-visible and visible minorities.

In terms of male income, some groups retain their earnings disadvantage even when we control for ethnic capital and other individual background characteristics. This is particularly so among those whose parents immigrated from Jamaica, Latin America, East Asia, (excluding China), the Philippines, India, South/Southeast Asia, Arab/North African Region, West Asian/Middle East, the United States and Eastern Europe. This finding is similar to that of a recent study (Picot & Hou, 2011), which also found second-generation visible-minority men earning less than the third generation, despite having attained higher educational credentials. However, few European men, including those from Portugal, Croatia and Italy, earn higher incomes than their third-generation counterparts.

Among women, few groups earn less than the children of Canadian-born parents, including those from the United States, Scandinavia, Eastern Europe, East Asia (excluding China), South/Southeast Asia and Africa. Children of immigrants from Italy and Portugal earn slightly more than the children of Canadian-born parents. Higher earnings among Chinese women and lower incomes among West Asian women are explained by the types of occupations they are involved in. Even though Portuguese second-generation individuals have lower educational attainments than the third generation, this does not necessarily translate into an earnings disadvantage. Further study is warranted regarding occupational segmentation among the children of immigrants to determine why some groups may face more labour market disadvantage than others.

An important finding pertains to various places of residence within Ontario and the opportunities (or lack thereof) they provide for the children of immigrants. For men, places of residence within Ontario explain the higher incomes among Western/Southern European and African men. For women, it explained the higher earnings among those whose parents immigrated from Latin America, Western/Southern Europe and the former Yugoslavian states (excluding Croatia). While living in a first-tier city tends to be associated with higher incomes, reports show increases in the proportion of recent immigrants choosing second- and third-tier cities (Frideres,

2006). Several studies have addressed various strategies for recruiting and retaining immigrants in locations outside the traditional immigrant gateway cities. These include Guelph (Mulholland, 2006), London, (Brochu & Abu-Ayyash, 2006) and Sudbury (Black, 2006), to name a few. The 2006 Census also reports that an increasing number of newcomers are choosing to settle outside Toronto, Montreal and Vancouver. For example, Ottawa-Gatineau remains the fifth choice of destination, attracting 3.2 per cent of recent immigrants, although this represents a slight decline from 4 per cent in 2001. While Hamilton's share of newcomers remained at 1.9 per cent, London's increased slightly – from 1 per cent to 1.2 per cent (Chui, Tran, & Maheux, 2007). As Appendix 1 shows, these medium-sized cities also have lower proportions of second-generation individuals, reflecting the smaller ethnic networks in these cities. It is likely that most children of immigrants will remain in places where they are in close proximity to their family networks and where economic opportunities are widely available. Therefore, in addition to addressing the barriers that immigrants face in these smaller centres, the labour market needs of their adult children will also have to be taken into account.

Most second-generation individuals surpassed their father's university attainment, with the exception of those from U.S. and Filipino origin groups. Regardless of having gone through the Canadian educational system, some groups exhibit higher unemployment rates and lower income and this is especially true for visible-minority males. Groups with lower educational outcomes are not necessarily disadvantaged in terms of earnings and employment rates, as observed among those of Dutch, Italian and Portuguese background. Most second-generation women are not significantly different from their third-generation counterparts in terms of employment rates and earnings.

References

- Abada, T., Hou, F., & Ram, B. (2009). Ethnic differences in educational attainment among the children of Canadian immigrants. *Canadian Journal of Sociology*, 34, 1-28.
- Alba, R., & Nee, V. (1997). Rethinking assimilation theory for a new era of immigration. *International Migration Review*, 31(4), 826-875.
- Aydemir, A., Chen, W.H., & Corak, M. (2008). Intergenerational education mobility among the children of Canadian immigrants. Analytical Studies Branch Research Paper Series, no. 316, Cat. no. F0019M. Ottawa, ON: Statistics Canada.
- Aydemir, A., & Sweetman, A. (2008). First and second generation immigration educational attainment and labor market outcomes: A comparison of the United States and Canada. *Research in Labor Economics*, 27, 215-70.
- Black, T. (2006). Approaches to attracting and retaining newcomers in the city of Greater Sudbury, Ontario. *Diverse Cities*, 2, 36-43.
- Bollman, R. (1999). Human capital and rural development: What are the linkages? Statistics Canada Agriculture Division Working Paper no. 39. Cat. no. 21-601-MIE1999039. Ottawa, ON: Statistics Canada
- Borjas, G. (1992). Ethnic capital and intergenerational mobility. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 107(1), 123-150.
- Borjas, G. (1993). The intergenerational mobility of immigrants. *Journal of Labor Economics*, 111, 113-135.
- Borjas, G. (1994). Long run convergence of ethnic skill differential: The children and grandchildren of the great migration. *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, 47(4), 553-573.
- Boyd, Monica. 2002. Educational attainments of immigrant offspring: Success or segmented assimilation? *International Migration Review*, 36 (4): 1037-1060
- Boyd, M. (2009). Social origins and the educational and occupational achievements of the 1.5 and second generations. *Canadian Review of Sociology*, 46, 339-369.
- Brochu, P., & Abu-Ayyash, C. (2006). Barriers and strategies for the recruitment and retention of immigrants in London, Ontario. *Diverse Cities*, 2, 27-30.
- Chui, T., Tran, K., & Maheux, H. (2007). Immigration in Canada: A portrait of the foreign born population, 2006 Census. Cat. no. 97-557-XIE. Ottawa, ON: Statistics Canada.
- Corak, M. (2008). Immigration in the long run: The education and earnings mobility of second generation Canadians. *IRPP Choices*, 14(13), 1-32.
- Crul, M., & Doornik, J. (2003). "The Turkish and Moroccan second generation in the Netherlands: Divergent trends between and polarization within the two groups. *International Migration Review*, 37(4), 1039-1064.
- Ellis J.M. & Almgren G. (2009). Local contexts and the second generation: Perspectives from the U.S. experience. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 35 (7), 1059-1076.

- Feliciano, C. (2005). "Does selective migration matter? Explaining ethnic disparities in educational attainment among immigrants' children. *International Migration Review*, 39(4), 841-871.
- Finnie, R., & Mueller, R.E. (2009). Access to post-secondary education in Canada among the children of Canadian immigrants. MESA Project Research Paper 2009-1. Toronto, ON: Canadian Education Project. Retrieved from www.mesa-project.org/research.php
- Frideres, J. (2006). Cities and immigrant integration: The future of second- and third-tier centres. *Our Diverse Cities*, 2, 3-8.
- Glick, J.E., & White, M. (2004). Parental aspirations and post-secondary school participation among immigrant and native youth in the United States. *Social Science Research*, 33, 272-299.
- Golash-Boza, T. (2005). Assessing the advantages of bilingualism for the children of immigrants. *International Migration Review*, 39, 721–753.
- Krahn, H., & Taylor, A. (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.
- Kunz, J. (2003). Being young and visible: Labour market access among immigrant and visible minority youth. Human Resources Development Canada Applied Research Branch Strategic Policy. Cat. no. RH63-1/581-08-03E-PDF.
- Mulholland, M.L. (2006). Guelph: A promising destination for newcomers. *Our Diverse Cities*, 2, 31-35.
- Ornstein, M. (2000). Ethno-racial inequality in Toronto: Analysis of the 1996 Census. Retrieved from http://www.utoronto.ca/diversity/pdf/ornstein_fullreport
- Palameta, B. (2007). Economic integration of immigrants' children. *Perspectives on Labour and Income*, 8, 5-16.
- Picot, G., & Hou, F. (2011). Seeking success in Canada and the United States: The determinants of labour market outcomes among the children of immigrants. Cat. no. 11F0019M — No. 331. Ottawa, ON: Statistics Canada.
- Portes, A., Fernandez-Kelly, P., & Haller, W. (2005). Segmented assimilation on the ground: The new second generation in early adulthood. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 28(6), 1000–1040.
- Portes, A., Fernandez-Kelly, P., & Haller, W. (2009). The adaptation of the immigrant second generation in America: A theoretical overview and recent evidence. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 35(7), 1077-1104.
- Portes, A., & MacLeod, D. (1999). Educating the second generation: Determinants of academic achievement among children of immigrants in the United States. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 25, 373-396.
- Portes, A., & Zhou, M. (1993). The new second generation: Segmented assimilation and its variants. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences*, 530, 74-96.
- Rumbaut, R. (2005). Turning points in the transition to adulthood: Determinants of educational attainment, incarceration, and early childbearing among the children of immigrants. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 28(6), 1041-1086.

- Silberman, R., Alba, R., & Fournier, I. (2007). Segmented assimilation in France? Discrimination in the labour market against the second generation. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 30(1), 1-27.
- Statistics Canada. (2003). Ethnic diversity survey: Portrait of a multicultural society. Cat. no. 89-593-XIE. Ottawa, ON: Statistics Canada.
- Statistics Canada. (2008a). Canada's ethnocultural mosaic, 2006 Census. Cat. no. 97-562-X. Ottawa, ON: Statistics Canada.
- Statistics Canada. (2008b). Report on the demographic situation in Canada, 2005 and 2006. Cat. no. 91-209-X. Ottawa, ON: Statistics Canada.
- Sweet, R., Anisef, P., Brown, R., Walters, D., & Phythian, K. (2010). Post high school pathways of immigrant youth. Toronto, ON: Higher Educational Quality Council of Ontario.
- Thiessen, V. (2009). The pursuit of post-secondary education: A comparison of First Nations, African, Asian, and European Canadian youth. *Canadian Review of Sociology*, 46 (1), 5-37.
- Warren, J.R. (1996). Educational inequality among white and Mexican-origin adolescents in the American Southwest: 1990. *Sociology of Education*, 69(2), 142-158.
- Wilson, W.J. (1990). *The truly disadvantaged: The inner city, the underclass and public policy*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Worbs, S. (2003). The second generation in Germany: Between school and labour market. *International Migration Review*, 37(4), 1011-1038.
- Zhou, M. (1997). Segmented assimilation: Issues, controversies and recent research on the new second generation. *International Migration Review*, 31(4), 975-1008.
- Zhou, M., & Kim, S. (2006). Community forces, social capital and educational achievement: The case of supplementary education in the Chinese and Korean immigrant communities. *Harvard Educational Review*, 76(1), 1-29.

Country List

1. Canada
2. United States
3. Jamaica
4. Other Carribean Countries
5. Latin (Central and South) America
6. Scandinavia
7. Germany
8. Netherlands
9. Greece
10. Italy
11. Portugal
12. U.K./ Ireland
13. Other Western /Southern European Countries
14. Hungary
15. Poland
16. Croatia
17. Other Former Yugoslavian States
18. Other Eastern European Countries
19. China
20. Other East Asian Countries
21. Philippines
22. India
23. Other South/Southeast Asian Countries
24. Africa
25. Arab/North Africa Region
26. West Asia/Middle East
27. Australia and Pacific islands

Appendix 1

Other Characteristics of the Second and Third Generations by Source Country, Ontario, 2006

(Second generation and third generation, aged 25-34, in 2006 Census)

	Marital Status			With Child	Eng/Fre only	2006 Census, Ontario CMA/CA City Group										TOTAL
	Married	Divorced/ Separated / Widowed	Never Married			Ottawa	Toronto	Guelph- Kitchener	Hamilton- Niagara	London	Windsor	Kingston	Northern and Northwestern Ontario	Non CMA/CA Area		
United States	37.04	5.32	57.66	35.35	98.9	8.75	37.40	7.01	13.81	5.17	11.10	3.15	4.48	9.16	19,545	
Jamaica	18.34	4.57	77.09	33.38	99.03	2.96	87.56	2.60	3.77	0.80	0.64	0.47	0.61	0.58	18,050	
Other Caribbean Countries	38.68	5.33	55.99	36.44	73.33	5.76	57.41	5.97	9.64	5.21	7.61	1.09	0.73	6.55	16,495	
Latin (Central and South) America	25.24	5.04	69.71	27.98	98.98	5.24	83.17	3.72	3.60	1.57	0.55	0.67	0.42	1.04	28,345	
Scandinavia	36.85	4.32	58.83	31.86	98.08	6.53	43.95	10.84	6.91	3.45	1.63	6.05	10.94	9.69	5,210	
Germany	39.4	4.99	55.59	35.1	98.7	7.93	41.86	12.01	12.28	4.89	2.95	4.08	4.86	9.16	20,355	
Netherlands	53.48	5	41.52	46.04	99.27	5.98	24.39	10.90	18.93	8.76	4.71	4.71	2.57	19.05	23,905	
Greece	39.75	2.15	58.13	25.6	83.99	2.84	79.82	2.93	4.76	2.54	3.78	1.21	0.59	1.50	15,335	
Italy	44.97	3.35	51.68	31.73	93.94	4.03	68.09	3.49	12.16	1.75	4.73	0.66	3.52	1.57	65,815	
Portugal	46.63	4.49	48.88	38.28	84.31	2.19	68.15	8.74	8.42	5.58	2.57	1.57	0.68	2.13	29,390	
U.K./Ireland	39.02	5.28	55.7	34.56	99.59	7.59	45.47	10.17	14.06	5.61	3.14	4.17	2.80	6.99	79,565	
Other Western/ Southern European Countries	40.14	4.44	55.42	32.73	97.8	8.08	50.46	7.16	10.28	6.40	4.72	3.12	2.20	7.56	12,495	
Hungary	37.32	5.39	57.29	30.23	93.02	6.55	52.54	8.14	16.07	4.97	4.33	1.69	1.48	4.33	4,730	
Poland	31.1	4.11	64.79	23.29	76.59	5.22	59.69	7.50	13.36	4.86	3.43	1.20	2.03	2.71	12,540	
Croatia	39.08	4.21	56.72	25.73	88.19	2.99	56.23	6.15	19.66	2.67	6.39	0.40	2.51	3.16	6,180	
Other Former Yugoslavian States	38.14	3.69	58.17	28.97	85.8	2.94	56.09	8.37	17.14	2.83	7.67	0.46	2.02	2.48	8,665	
Other Eastern European Countries	36.72	4.72	58.51	26.22	87.64	8.29	62.48	8.09	8.29	2.86	3.26	2.11	2.21	2.41	9,955	
China	23.36	1.79	74.85	11.22	66.58	6.27	85.94	1.84	1.93	1.39	1.09	0.70	0.35	0.51	21,515	
Other East Asian Countries	22.15	1.58	76.27	11.49	84.24	3.43	84.06	2.50	3.89	2.59	0.93	1.85	X	X	5,395	
Philippines	28.44	2.24	69.28	23.88	91.18	3.74	82.79	2.58	4.43	1.25	3.18	0.60	0.60	0.82	11,620	
India	39.1	3.12	57.75	21.23	77.93	4.86	79.97	4.50	5.27	1.92	1.30	0.90	0.38	0.87	19,550	
Other South/ Southeast Asian Countries	28.69	3.67	67.66	20.66	67.33	7.84	76.23	5.08	5.13	2.38	1.98	0.59	0.38	0.42	21,245	
Africa	28.18	3.72	68.1	19.57	88.65	10.42	74.22	3.86	4.70	2.05	1.27	1.32	0.68	1.37	10,220	

	Marital Status			With Child	Eng/Fre only	2006 Census, Ontario CMA/CA City Group										TOTAL
	Married	Divorced/ Separated / Widowed	Never Married			Ottawa	Toronto	Guelph-Kitchener	Hamilton-Niagara	London	Windsor	Kingston	Northern and Northwestern Ontario	Non CMA/CA Area		
Arabic Region	36.14	3.19	60.67	25.54	79.07	19.01	54.13	3.14	5.83	6.34	9.63	0.61	0.51	0.86	9,865	
West Asia/Middle East	30.47	3.76	65.76	20.54	77.2	6.47	79.76	4.89	4.36	1.43	1.28	0.90	X	X	6,645	
Australia and Pacific islands	37.8	3.75	58.45	29.76	96.25	9.65	53.35	6.17	13.40	2.41	1.61	3.75	1.88	7.77	1,865	
All children of immigrant parents	37.1	4.16	58.73	30.17	89.92	6.04	62.03	6.40	9.88	3.75	3.63	1.97	2.02	4.27	484,505	
Children of Canadian-born parents	39.92	5.66	54.42	42.17	99.27	10.59	26.65	10.25	11.49	5.87	5.99	6.04	7.33	15.79	695,240	
Total	38.76	5.05	56.19	37.24	95.43	8.72	41.18	8.67	10.83	5.00	5.02	4.37	5.15	11.06	1,179,745	

Appendix 2
Occupation Distribution of the Second and Third Generations by Source Country, Ontario, 2006
(Second generation and third generation, aged 25-34, in 2006 Census)

	2006 Census, National Occupational Classification (NOC)									TOTAL
	Management	Business, finance and administration	Natural and applied sciences	Health	Social science, education, government	Art, culture, recreation and sport	Sales and service	Trades, transport, primary industry, processing, manufacturing, utilities	NA*	
United States	8.52	15.78	8.54	4.71	15.30	5.86	18.70	14.56	8.03	19,545
Jamaica	6.01	26.18	7.04	5.46	9.94	4.65	17.89	12.74	10.06	18,050
Other Caribbean Countries	6.64	20.04	7.49	4.82	7.82	3.67	16.88	22.79	9.82	16,495
Latin (Central and South) America	8.03	28.19	8.29	4.78	10.94	3.77	16.00	11.59	8.40	28,345
Scandinavia	8.73	16.60	9.40	9.21	11.32	5.37	16.70	16.03	6.53	5,210
Germany	9.85	16.14	8.30	5.94	13.73	5.11	17.24	17.19	6.48	20,355
Netherlands	8.83	14.10	8.12	6.71	12.34	3.74	16.31	23.51	6.32	23,905
Greece	12.72	21.94	6.78	4.70	14.05	3.62	17.15	12.06	7.01	15,335
Italy	10.92	20.85	6.56	4.06	14.40	3.18	17.02	16.90	6.11	65,815
Portugal	8.78	22.01	5.51	3.13	9.15	2.14	16.67	26.03	6.53	29,390
U.K./Ireland	10.38	17.21	8.23	5.58	12.90	5.08	18.05	16.50	6.05	79,565
Other Western/Southern European Countries	9.84	19.25	8.48	5.04	13.21	4.72	16.77	16.17	6.48	12,495
Hungary	10.36	17.44	8.56	X	12.79	6.03	16.38	16.07	X	4,730
Poland	8.89	18.54	11.36	5.42	12.88	4.78	14.55	16.83	6.70	12,540
Croatia	8.41	21.28	9.22	5.02	12.54	3.16	13.83	20.15	6.31	6,180
Other Former Yugoslavian States	11.43	18.18	9.81	4.62	10.96	3.81	15.64	17.77	7.79	8,665
Other Eastern European Countries	9.64	17.28	12.00	5.58	15.07	4.62	16.42	12.20	7.18	9,955
China	9.09	25.56	19.50	X	12.41	4.07	10.41	3.95	X	21,515
Other East Asian Countries	11.77	19.09	11.96	8.06	15.48	X	13.62	X	10.01	5,395

	2006 Census, National Occupational Classification (NOC)									TOTAL
	Management	Business, finance and administration	Natural and applied sciences	Health	Social science, education, government	Art, culture, recreation and sport	Sales and service	Trades, transport, primary industry, processing, manufacturing, utilities	NA*	
Philippines	7.96	25.09	12.22	8.35	8.78	5.98	15.15	9.90	6.58	11,620
India	11.13	23.43	12.46	8.06	13.94	3.15	11.66	8.01	8.21	19,550
Other South/ Southeast Asian Countries	7.79	24.69	13.84	6.00	8.90	2.92	14.05	11.16	10.66	21,245
Africa	9.74	22.85	11.40	8.07	14.53	3.96	14.33	7.44	7.63	10,220
Arabic Region	11.05	18.80	9.63	5.52	12.21	3.14	16.27	12.01	11.35	9,865
West Asia/Middle East	13.02	19.11	10.01	5.87	14.07	X	15.88	X	X	6,645
Australia and Pacific islands	9.92	19.57	10.72	X	14.75	X	15.01	X	9.38	1,865
All children of immigrant parents	9.59	20.46	9.14	5.47	12.43	4.11	16.21	15.19	7.39	484,495
Children of Canadian-born parents	8.03	15.95	6.80	5.79	11.38	3.28	19.10	21.93	7.74	695,240
Total	8.67	17.81	7.76	5.66	11.81	3.62	17.91	19.16	7.60	1,179,745

*Not applicable: proportion of the total employed who did not identify their occupations

