ETHNICITY AND ECONOMIC INEQUALITIES IN QUEBEC: AN OVERVIEW

Jacques Ledent, Professor, Centre Urbanisation Culture Société, Institut national de la recherche scientifique, and Co-Director, Research Component: *Integration of Immigrants: Spatial Factors, Economy and Cohabitation*, Centre d'études ethniques des universités montréalaises, Montréal.

INTRODUCTION

Dealing with ethnic groups in Quebec is not a simple matter because of a lack of relevant data on such groups. The Statistics Canada website does include a huge data file drawn from the 2006 census that shows a large selection of demographic, cultural, labour force, educational and income characteristics for 101 ethnic groups. However, these groups represent a mixed bag of ethnic and cultural origins associated with the ancestors of census respondents and thus are very heterogeneous in nature. As a result, rather than looking at economic inequalities from a strictly ethnic standpoint, I approach this issue from a different angle, emphasizing two dimensions of immigrant background: (status/period of) immigration and visible minority (status/group). For each of these two dimensions, I will examine economic differences between relevant groups using i) labour market indicators such as participation and unemployment rates and ii) income indicators such as total income and prevalence of low income. In doing so, I will refer to the Census Metropolitan Area of Montreal (in short the Montreal CMA) rather than Quebec as a whole, since the Quebec population with an immigrant background is essentially concentrated in and around the city of Montreal. Indeed, according to the 2006 census, the Montreal CMA, which is home to 48% of the population aged 15 years and over living in Quebec, contains 88% of its immigrants and 91% of its visible minorities. Data from the 2006 census found on the Statistics Canada website are used exclusively for that purpose.

The paper has three sections. Section 1 addresses economic inequalities among the Montreal CMA population for the immigration dimension, whereas Section 2 pays attention to the same inequalities for the visible minority dimension. Section 3 examines further economic inequalities for both the immigration and visible minority dimensions—in particular, inequalities in the industry composition of the employed population. The paper concludes with a brief summary and discussion of the main results.

THE IMMIGRATION DIMENSION

Of a total of 2,967,700 persons of 15 years and over residing in the Montreal CMA, 693,400 are immigrants—that is, persons who have been granted the right to live in Canada permanently by the immigration authorities. In other words, slightly less than one person in four is an immigrant (23.7%). But, whereas one (big) half (55.4%) of all immigrants residing in the CMA in 2006 arrived in Canada before 1991, the other (small) half (44.6%) came in since, especially in the last quinquennial period (2001-2006), which saw the arrival of almost one in five immigrants (Statistics Canada, 2006).

Labour market

Panel A of Table 1, which is limited to the population 25-54 years old (reducing the population 15 years old and over to this subpopulation allows one to circumvent, to a large extent, the differences in age composition existing between the various subgroups related to the two immigrant background dimensions considered in this paper). It reveals that immigrants do not perform on the labour market as well as non-immigrants, especially females. For one thing, their participation rate is lower by 4% points for males and by as much as 12-13 points for females. Also, among those persons who participate in the labour market, immigrants are substantially more often unemployed than non-immigrants: twice as much for males (10.7% VS 4.8%) and even three times as much for females (12.2% VS 4.2%).

Moreover, for each gender the participation rate of immigrants tends to increase with duration of residence, although there appears to be a marginal decrease for males between the immigrant cohorts of the late and early nineties. In addition, the participation rate is quite low for the cohort of immigrants who arrived in the 2001-2006 period (about 8-9% points lower than for the previous quinquennial cohort), whereas immigrants who arrived before 1991, participate less (marginally for men) and are more often unemployed than non-immigrants.

STATUS/ PERIOD OF IMMIGRATION	MALES		FEMALES	
	Participation rate (%)	Unemployment rate (%)	Participation rate (%)	Unemployment rate (%)
Total	**90.6%**	**6.2%**	**81.5%**	**6.0%**
Non-immigrants	91.9%	4.8%	84.9%	4.2%
Immigrants	87.7%	10.7%	72.4%	12.2%
Before 1991	90.4%	6.8%	78.5%	7.8%
1991 to 1995	88.6%	8.8%	73.4%	11.5%
1996 to 2000	90.1%	10.4%	72.2%	12.8%
2001 to 2006	81.9%	18.6%	62.5%	20.9%
Non-permanent residents	73.7%	11.1%	58.9%	13.5%

b) Income indicators

STATUS/ PERIOD OF IMMIGRATION	TOTAL INCOME ($)		PREVALENCE OF LOW INCOME AFTER TAX IN 2005 (%)	
	Median value	Average value	Economic family members	Persons not in economic families
Total	**25,161**	**34,196**	**11.7%**	**37.5%**
Non-immigrants	27,782	36,204	8.8%	34.3%
Immigrants	19,414	28,269	21.3%	47.1%
Before 1991	22,388	32,981	10.3%	39.4%
1991 to 1995	17,554	23,996	22.1%	52.1%
1996 to 2000	18,119	24,195	25.1%	49.6%
2001 to 2006	13,178	18,715	43.2%	65.2%
Non-permanent residents	10,815	22,557	38.8%	76.5%

Income

As for income indicators, panel B of Table 1 paints a picture very similar to the one just described. First, for total income, median as well as average values are some $8,000 lower for immigrants than non-immigrants: $19,400 VS $27,800 for median values and $28,300 VS $36,200 for average values. Moreover, for immigrants, both values tend to increase with duration of residence, although those who arrived in the early nineties appear to do worse (slightly), not better than those who arrived in the late nineties. As for the values reached by the immigrants who arrived before 1991, they remain well below the corresponding values for non-immigrants. Finally, a direct comparison of median and average values of total income by status/period of immigration suggests that income is much less evenly distributed among immigrants than non-immigrants, as well as among immigrants arrived before 1991 than among those who arrived hereafter. In other words, there is a comparatively higher proportion of persons with high income among immigrants than non-immigrants, especially among those immigrants who arrived more than a quarter of a century ago.

These income inequalities appear again in the prevalence of low income. An economic family is a group of two or more persons who live in the same dwelling and are related to each other by blood, marriage, common-law or adoption. A couple may be of opposite or same sex. According to Statistics Canada, economic families (and thus their members) and persons not living in economic families, differentiated by size of family and area of residence, are said to have a low income if they spend 20% more than average of their after-tax income on food, shelter and clothing. First, far more immigrants than non-immigrants have low income: 21.3% VS 8.8% for economic family members and 47.1% VS 34.3% for persons not in economic families. Second, the longer the duration of residence, the less prevalent is low income, although the cohort of the early nineties fares slightly worse than the cohort of the late nineties, for persons not in economic families.

THE VISIBLE MINORITY DIMENSION

In the distant past, immigrants to Canada came mostly from Europe but, starting in the 1970s, the geographical origin of immigrants shifted to the rest of the world, where the population is predominantly non-white. Today, then, the majority of immigrants to Canada as well as Quebec belong to the visible minorities. According to the Employment Equity Act (1986), intended to underpin the federal government's employment equity programs, visible minorities are persons other than Aboriginal people who are non-Caucasian in race and non-white in skin colour. Such persons are classified in 10 categories (Chinese, South Asian, Black, Filipino, Latin American, Southeast Asian, Arab, West Asian, Korean and Japanese), but the relevant figures released by Statistics Canada also include an undefined category (visible minority *n.i.e.*). and a multiple category. For some time now, the Employment Equity Act has also been used to support programs that promote equal opportunity for everyone in the social, cultural and economic life of Canada. Statistics Canada also publishes some data with reference to population groups, which differ from visible minority groups to the extent that the individuals in the multiple category including a white response are allocated to one of the specific population groups (including one labelled as white).

Among the population 15 years and over residing in the Montreal CMA, 448,300 persons, or a 15.1% proportion, belong to the visible minorities. They are, however, unevenly distributed across the various visible minority groups, with size differences between groups reflecting

somewhat differences in the timing of arrival. Thus, Blacks (28%) come ahead of four groups with roughly similar numerical importance—Arabs (16%), Latin-Americans (13%), Chinese (13%) and South Asians (12%)—followed by three other groups with single-digit proportions—South East Asians (8%), Filipinos (4%) and West Asians (3%). The two remaining groups (Koreans and Japanese) each amount to less than 1%.

Labour market

According to Table 2, the differences in labour market performance for the visible minority dimension are akin to those according to the immigration dimension. Just like immigrants compared with non-immigrants, visible minorities compared with non-visible minorities participate less in the labour market and are more often unemployed. The differences observed are wider for males than females, with orders of magnitude similar to those observed earlier.

VISIBLE MINORITY STATUS/GROUP	MALES		FEMALES	
	Participation rate (%)	Unemployment rate (%)	Participation rate (%)	Unemployment rate (%)
Total	**90.6**	**6.2**	**81.5**	**6.0**
Visible minority population	85.4	12.0	70.6	13.4
Chinese	79.8	8.3	68.7	10.2
South Asian	84.2	12.8	57.8	18.4
Black	87.2	11.9	78.5	12.8
Filipino	88.8	4.5	84.6	5.1
Latin American	87.5	10.9	71.1	15.0
Southeast Asian	87.6	7.3	71.2	10.7
Arab	85.7	18.0	63.1	18.9
West Asian	81.5	10.4	61.3	18.6
Korean	76.4	8.9	65.9	9.4
Japanese	86.9	7.5	64.6	5.6
Visible minority, *n.i.e.*	89.4	13.3	72.6	12.3
Multiple visible minority	85.5	8.9	74.4	12.8
Not a visible minority	91.7	5.1	83.8	4.7

More interesting are the differences in the participation and unemployment rates observed among the eight main visible minority groups in the Montreal CMA. First, for males, the participation rate is around or slightly above the visible minority average for six of the eight groups but somewhat lower (by 4-5% points) for the Chinese and West Asian groups. The unemployment rate, however, exhibits wide variations around the visible minority average (12.0%): it ranges from lower values for the Chinese (8.3%), Southeast Asian (7.3%) and especially Filipino (4.5%) groups to a higher value for the Arab group (18.0%). Thus, the Chinese group has both low participation and unemployment rates and the Arab group both high participation end unemployment rates, in contrast to the general pattern in which a high (low) unemployment rate coexists with a low (high) employment rate. This general pattern, however, is the norm for females with one exception. At one extreme is the Filipino group with a high participation rate (84.6%) and a low unemployment rate (5.1%). At the other extreme are the Arab, West Asian and South Asian groups which have a low participation rate (58-63%) and a high unemployment rate (18-19%), as opposed to visible minority averages of, respectively, 70.6% and 13.4%. The former observation is probably related to Citizenship and Immigration Canada's program for live-in caregivers (Guide 5290 – Live-in Caregivers, 2012), which more or less guarantees its beneficiaries a job for the first two years following their arrival in Canada. As for the latter observation, it has its source in the cultural and social traits of the geographic regions from which the three groups concerned originate (women with low education are often confined to household work). The one exception to the norm is the Black group with high participation and average unemployment.

Income

Visible minority status has a strong impact on total income: see Table 3. First, its median value is about $11,000 lower for the visible minority population than for the rest of the population ($16,400 VS $27,200), and its average value is more than $13,000 lower ($22,800 VS $36,100). Second, both the median and average values vary somewhat among the eight visible minority groups, but the intergroup differences observed for the two types of values bear no resemblance. On the one hand, the average values set the Southeast Asian group ($26,000) apart from the other groups, which are similar (varying from $20,200 for the West Asian group to $23,100 for the Chinese and Filipino groups). On the other hand, the median values suggest a wider variation among the eight visible minority groups, from the West Asian group ($12,900) to the Filipino group ($19,500), with the Southeast Asian group in the middle of the pack ($16,900). Income is therefore unevenly distributed in some groups such as the Chinese group and especially the Southeast Asian group, owing to the substantial proportion of highly educated immigrants from Vietnam who have a good job, especially in the health sector.

STATUS/ PERIOD OF IMMIGRATION	TOTAL INCOME ($)		PREVALENCE OF LOW INCOME AFTER TAX IN 2005 (%)	
	Median value	Average value	Economic family members	Persons not in economic families
Total	**25,161**	**34,196**	**11.7%**	**37.5%**
Visible minority population	16,391	22,848	-	-
Chinese	14,789	23,130	26.8%	66.5%
South Asian	15,361	22,434	33.0%	58.9%
Black	18,109	22,701	26.1%	55.4%
Filipino	19,497	23,105	12.0%	54.5%
Latin American	17,144	21,168	27.3%	59.3%
Southeast Asian	16,857	26,017	21.3%	52.1%
Arab	14,669	22,590	36.5%	64.5%
West Asian	12,949	20,225	38.5%	61.6%
Korean	12,560	10,018	32.6%	74.8%
Japanese	17,367	46,070	20.6%	47.2%
Visible minority, *n.i.e.*	18,259	22,608	-	-
Multiple visible minority	17,556	24,424	-	-
Not a visible minority	27,205	36,126	8.0%	34.7%

Source: Statistics Canada, 2006 Census of Population
Total Income: Catalogue number 97-563-XCB2006007
Prevalence of low income: Catalogue number 97-564-XCB2006009

The prevalence of low income is high for those persons not living in economic families in all eight visible minority groups, varying relatively little from 52.1% for the Southeast Asian group to 66.5% for the Chinese group, versus 34.7% for the white population group. It is, however, somewhat less for economic family members, although the corresponding prevalence rate differs much more among groups, ranging from 12.0% for the Filipino group to 38.5% for the West Asian group, versus 8.0% for the white population group.

MORE ON INTERETHNIC INEQUALITIES

The interethnic economic inequalities just cited could well stem from differences in the socio-demographic composition of the groups. However, this is unlikely because those inequalities appear to be pervasive in a comparative analysis across immigration status of how two economic indicators (employment rate and labour income) closely related to those used above vary with several socio-demographic characteristics such as age, educational level and knowledge of the official languages (Zhu and Bélanger, 2010). In a nutshell, immigrants born in non-Western countries always perform worse than non-immigrants (and immigrants born in Western countries), although the gap between the two groups varies to some extent. It tends to decrease with age, it is much larger among individuals holding a university degree than among those not holding one, and finally it is wider among individuals knowing both official languages and even more among those knowing French only than among individuals knowing English only.

Also worth addressing here are the interethnic economic inequalities related to the various industries in which the employed population works. The industry distribution of this population does not vary drastically with either of the two immigrant background dimensions. Still, there are some important differences that are broadly similar for the two dimensions so that it is enough, for example, to dwell on the differences with immigration status (see Table 4). Some of those differences pertain to either gender. When compared with non-immigrants, immigrants are more often employed in *Administrative and support, waste management and remediation services* and especially in *Manufacturing*, although somewhat more in this case for females (14.9% VS 7.9%) than males (20.6% VS 16.5%). By contrast, they are less often employed in *Public administration*. But other differences are sex-specific. Thus for males, there is a comparatively higher concentration of immigrants in *Accommodation and food services* and a lower one in *Construction* for males, whereas for females there is a comparatively higher presence of immigrants in *Health care and social assistance* and a lower one in *Finance and insurance* as well as *Educational services.* Although based on 2001 data, additional insights into the differences in industry distribution by immigration status can be found in CAMO-PI (2007). As hinted earlier, similar differences can be found between employed persons who belong or not to the visible minorities, but nevertheless there are a few peculiarities. For example, the comparatively higher concentration of immigrants previously observed for males in *Accommodation and food service applies* to the visible minority population for both males and females.

INDUSTRY	MALES		FEMALES	
	Non-immigrants	Immigrants	Non-immigrants	Immigrants
All industries	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**
11 Agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting	0.6	0.5	0.4	0.2
21 Mining and oil and gas extraction	0.2	0.1	0.0	0.0
22 Utilities	1.2	0.4	0.7	0.2
23 Construction	8.7	4.3	1.4	0.7
31-33 Manufacturing	16.5	20.6	7.9	14.9
41 Wholesale trade	6.9	6.6	4.1	5.1
44-45 Retail trade	11.3	10.2	13.7	11.6
48-49 Transportation and warehousing	7.2	6.8	2.7	2.2
51 Information and cultural industries	4.0	3.3	3.7	2.5
52 Finance and insurance	3.4	2.9	6.4	4.9
53 Real estate and rental and leasing	2.0	2.0	1.6	1.7
54 Professional, scientific and technical services	8.7	9.8	7.6	7.5
55 Management of companies and enterprises	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.2
56 Administrative and support, waste management and remediation services	4.4	6.0	3.2	5.2
61 Educational services	4.4	4.8	10.3	8.0
62 Health care and social assistance	4.5	4.2	17.4	18.9
71 Arts, entertainment and recreation	2.4	1.4	2.4	1.2
72 Accommodation and food services	4.5	9.1	6.1	7.0
81 Other services (except public administration)	4.0	4.6	5.0	5.7
91 Public administration	5.1	2.3	5.0	2.5

SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

In 2006, the economic inequalities for the immigration dimension in the Montreal CMA population (and thus the Quebec population) are clear: immigrants are not as well off as non-immigrants. But this was not always the case. As recently as 1981 (Cousineau and Boudarbat, 2009) and even 1986 (Labelle *et al.*, 2007), the situation was totally the opposite with immigrants faring better than non-immigrants. It so happened that, in the wake of the 1970s shift in the origin of the immigrants from Europe to the rest of the world, that those immigrants born in several groups of countries more or less associated with the various visible minority groups began to experience economic difficulties, which are well documented as early as 1986 (Labelle *et al.*, 2007) and especially 1991 (CCCI, 1993). This resulted in a deterioration of the economic situation of immigrants vis-à-vis non-immigrants which, besides leading to the reversal already mentioned, has continued unabated to this day. Reasons for this deterioration are numerous and thus cannot be easily summarized here. Nevertheless, globalization is probably the main culprit, because it led to a substantial reduction in the need for unqualified workers (traditionally immigrants) and, from there, to a shift in the selection of immigration. From being tied to professions in demand (which magnified an immigrant's chances of getting a job), such selection moved to emphasizing human capital, thus making it more difficult for an immigrant to land a job, owing to lacking recognition of credentials and work experience coming on top of creeping discrimination associated with being a member of the visible minorities. This difficulty, however, tends to diminish with duration of residence, although more or less rapidly according the visible minority group (Renaud *et al.*, 2003).

This being said, the longer the duration of residence of immigrants (the earlier the period of immigration), the better is their economic situation, although those immigrants who arrived in the early nineties appear to do marginally worse on some indicators (especially income indicators) than those who arrived in the late nineties. Moreover, the more recent immigrants, those who arrived between 2001 and 2006, perform substantially less than those arrived in the previous quinquennial period. Interestingly, these two underachieving cohorts are also cohorts with a comparatively higher volume so that one can hypothesize that their economic difficulties are somewhat linked to a labour supply that is too large for a labour demand which typically requires time to adjust itself to the shock introduced in the economic system.

Finally, given the economic difficulties encountered by the immigrants coming from countries associated with the various visible minority groups, the inequalities observed for the visible minority dimension are even more manifest than for the immigration dimension. Belonging to a visible minority leads to a lower economic performance with wide intergroup disparities. But, although these disparities may vary with the indicator used, the Filipino group is generally on top and the West Asian group at or near the bottom.

REFERENCES

CAMO-PI. [2007] *Portrait de la situation des personnes actives salariées dans l'ensemble des secteurs d'activité économique pour la région métropolitaine de Montréal et l'île de Montréal: résultats d'une analyse statistique.* Montréal: Comité d'adaptation de la main d'œuvre – Personnes immigrantes.

Cousineau, J.-M. & Boudarbat, B. [2009] La situation économique des immigrants au Québec. *Relations industrielles/Industrial relations*, 64(2): 230-249.

Labelle, M., Field, A.-M. & Icart, J.-C. [2007] *Les dimensions d'intégration des immigrants, des minorités ethnoculturelles et des groups racisés au Québec.* Document de travail présenté à la Commission de consultation sur les pratiques d'accommodement reliées aux différences culturelles, Québec.

CCCI. [1993] *L'immigration et le marché du travail. Un état de la question.* Montréal: Québec, Conseil des communautés culturelles et de l'immigration.

Renaud, J., Piché, V. & Godin, J.-F. [2003] L'origine nationale et l'insertion économique des immigrants au cours de leurs dix premières années au Québec. *Sociologie et sociétés*, 35(1): 165-184.

Statistics Canada, 2006 Census of Population, Catalogue number 97-562-XCB2006017.

Zhu, N. & Bélanger, A. [2010] *L'emploi et le revenu des immigrants à Montréal: analyse des données du recensement de 2006.* Rapport d'étude N°3 remis à Emploi-Québec. Montréal: INRS, Centre-Urbanisation, Culture et Société.

ETHNICITÉ ET INÉGALITÉS ÉCONOMIQUES AU QUÉBEC: UN APERÇU

Les données existantes permettent difficilement d'analyser d'un point de vue strictement ethnique les inégalités économiques chez les personnes issues de l'immigration. Aussi cet article aborde-t-il la question en référence aux deux principales dimensions de l'origine immigrée, soit le statut (et la période) d'immigration et le statut (et le groupe) de minorité visible. À cet effet, il examine les écarts affichés entre les divers groupes associés à chacune de ces deux dimensions par plusieurs indicateurs économiques liés au marché du travail et au revenu. Cet examen fait appel aux données du recensement de 2006 relatives à la Région Métropolitaine de Recensement de Montréal (ci-après la RMR de Montréal) qui abrite la très grande majorité de la population québécoise de 15 ans et plus issue de l'immigration: neuf personnes sur dix, tant pour les immigrants que les personnes appartenant à une minorité visible.

Statut/période d'immigration

Dans la RMR de Montréal, près d'une personne sur quatre (24%) est un immigrant, c'est-à-dire une personne ayant obtenu des autorités compétentes le droit de s'établir au Canada de manière permanente. Mais, alors que plus de la moitié des immigrants (55%) sont arrivés au Canada avant 1991, moins de la moitié sont arrivés après cette date, surtout lors de la dernière période quinquennale (2001-2006) qui a vu l'entrée de près d'un immigrant sur cinq. Si l'on s'en tient à la population des 25-54 ans (afin de réduire l'influence de la structure par âge), il appert que les immigrants participent moins souvent au marché du travail et sont plus souvent en chômage que les non-immigrants et ce, bien plus chez les femmes que chez les hommes. De plus, le taux de participation des immigrants augmente tandis que leur taux de chômage diminue avec la durée d'établissement. Cependant, les immigrants masculins arrivés dans la première moitié des années quatre-vingt-dix ont un taux de participation moins élevé que ceux arrivés dans la seconde moitié de la même décennie. De tels écarts intergroupes s'observent également face au revenu des 15 ans et plus, qu'il s'agisse du revenu total des individus ou de la prévalence du faible revenu chez les familles économiques (et les personnes qui y vivent) et chez les personnes vivant hors famille économique. Selon Statistique Canada, les familles économiques (et les personnes qui y vivent) et les personnes vivant hors famille économique, différenciées suivant la taille de la famille et le lieu de résidence, sont considérées comme ayant un faible revenu si elles consacrent à la nourriture, le logement et l'habillement une proportion de leur revenu après impôt 20% plus élevée que la moyenne. Une famille économique est un groupe de deux personnes ou plus liées par le sang, le mariage, l'union libre ou l'adoption qui résident dans un même logement. En effet, les immigrants performent moins bien que les non-immigrants. De plus, leur performance tend à s'améliorer avec la durée d'établissement, quoiqu'elle s'inverse entre les deux moitiés des années quatre-vingt-dix. Par ailleurs, la comparaison directe des valeurs moyenne et médiane du revenu total suggère que cet indicateur est plus inégalement réparti chez les immigrants que chez les non-immigrants, en particulier chez les immigrants arrivés avant 1991.

Ainsi, les inégalités selon le statut d'immigration sont claires: les immigrants réussissent moins bien que les non-immigrants. Mais cela ne fut pas toujours le cas. Aussi récemment que 1981 et même 1986, la situation inverse s'observait. Cependant dans la foulée du déplacement de l'origine géographique des immigrants, de l'Europe vers le reste du monde, survenu dans les

années soixante-dix, le recensement de 1986 et surtout celui de 1991 ont mis en évidence que les immigrants en provenance des pays le plus souvent identifiés avec les pays de provenance des minorités visibles étaient confrontés à des difficultés économiques. Depuis, ces difficultés se sont amplifiées au point d'entraîner l'inversion notée ci-dessus et ont continué de s'aggraver par la suite.

Statut/groupe de minorité visible

Dans la RMR de Montréal, un peu moins d'une personne sur sept âgée de 15 ans et plus (15%) appartient aux minorités visibles, c'est-à-dire est une personne autre qu'un autochtone qui n'est pas de race caucasienne ou n'a pas la peau blanche. Cependant, la population des minorités visibles est inégalement répartie entre les huit groupes à la présence signifiante. Ainsi le groupe noir (28%) arrive en tête devant quatre groupes d'importance plus ou moins similaire – arabe (16%), latino-américain (13%), chinois (13%) et sud-asiatique (12%) – loin devant les groupes sud-asiatique (8%), philippin (4%) et asiatique occidental (3%).

Tout d'abord, chez les 25-54 ans, les personnes appartenant aux minorités visibles performent moins bien sur le marché du travail que celles n'y appartenant pas, les écarts de participation et de chômage entre les deux groupes s'apparentant à ceux précédemment observés entre les immigrants et les non-immigrants. Plus intéressante est l'observation des mêmes écarts entre les principaux groupes de minorité visible. Généralement, plus le taux de participation est élevé, plus le taux de chômage est faible. Cette affirmation vaut presque toujours chez les femmes où l'on retrouve à un extrême le groupe philippin, plus performant, et à l'autre extrême les groupes arabe, asiatique occidental et sud-asiatique, moins performants. En revanche, elle se vérifie moins chez les hommes pour lesquels la participation au marché du travail varie assez peu avec le groupe de minorité visible. Ainsi, participation et chômage sont moins élevés pour le groupe chinois et à l'inverse plus élevés pour le groupe arabe. Par ailleurs, chez les 15 ans et plus, appartenir aux minorités visibles plutôt que ne pas y appartenir mène à un revenu total moins beaucoup moins élevé (16 400$ VS 27 200$ sur la base de la valeur médiane) et en une plus forte prévalence du faible revenu. De plus, alors qu'ils sont minimes sur la base de la valeur moyenne (quoique le groupe asiatique du sud-est présente une valeur comparativement plus élevée), les écarts de revenu total enregistrés entre les huit principaux groupes de minorité visible sont assez substantiels sur la base de la valeur médiane: le revenu total médian s'étage entre 12 900$ pour le groupe asiatique occidental et 19 500$ pour le groupe philippin, tandis que le groupe asiatique du sud-est, malgré sa valeur moyenne comparativement plus élevée, se situe au milieu du peloton (16 900$).

Plus encore que les inégalités économiques observées selon le statut d'immigration, celles observées selon le statut de minorité visible sont nettement tranchées: appartenir aux minorités visibles résulte en une moindre réussite économique, avec d'importants écarts entre les groupes qui tendent à changer avec l'indicateur considéré. Néanmoins, le groupe philippin réussit généralement le mieux, tandis que le groupe asiatique occidental réussit moins bien, sinon le moins bien.