Diverse Fortunes in Different Countries?: Earnings of White and Black Immigrant Generations in Canada and the United States*

by
Monica Boyd
Department of Sociology
University of Toronto
725 Spadina Avenue
Toronto, Ontario Canada

Abstract:
This paper contrasts the earnings of two racial immigrant groups in both the United States and in Canada: non-Hispanic whites, and blacks, age 25-44. Data are from the 2000 census of Population in the United States and the 2001 Census of Population in Canada. Three major conclusions of the study exist. First, excluding black foreign born women in the United States, the black population in both countries has weekly earnings that are often substantially lower than those observed for the white reference populations, defined as native born or third-plus generation. The largest differentials are found for male black immigrants arriving at age 15 or later. Second, considerable variation by country or region of birth exists, but it does not conform to a monolithic pattern in which earnings disparities are lower for blacks born in the Caribbean than in Africa. Third, country specific data for the foreign born indicate that the black-white earnings gap within generations tends to be higher in Canada than in the United States for the 1.5 generation, and to a lesser extent for those arriving at age 15 or later.

* Prepared for presentation at the 2005 annual meeting of the Population Association of America, March 31-April 2, Philadelphia. The author thanks graduate students Lisa Kaida, Stella Park and Deanna Pikkov for their research assistance in preparing this paper. The views expressed in the text rest with the author and do not reflect those of other individuals or organizations. Data should be considered preliminary.

Diverse Fortunes in Different Countries?: Earnings of White and Black Immigrant Generations in Canada and the United States

INTRODUCTION

With respect to immigration, United States and Canada share more than a common border and the cross-border movements of their inhabitants. As settlement countries, both countries have similar immigration histories and policies. Large flows of non-North American migrants in the late 1800s and early 1900s waxed, waned and then resurged during the course of the 20th century. International migration to both countries now occurs within the global context of unprecedented economic and communication flows, and it continues to be stimulated by warfare and the breakdown of nation states. However, current migration flows and their composition also reflect similar shifts in immigration policies during the 20th century. Starting in the 1960s, both the United States and Canada replaced national origins as a criterion of admissibility by those of family reunification and economic contribution. In subsequent decades, both countries formalized the admission of migrants on humanitarian grounds. As a consequence of all these factors, the composition of the foreign born population has become racially diverse in both countries.

Increasing numbers of migrants in the latter half of the 20th century and their diversity rekindle traditional interest in migrant labor market integration. The classic question of "how well do immigrants do economically" has been recast into specific questions that ask how racially defined groups do vis-à-vis a white majority and how immigrant racial minority offspring fare in North American labor markets. In answering these questions, considerable attention has been paid in the United States to Asian populations as over-achievers, representing the "model minorities", and to the uneven and disadvantageous labor integration of black immigrant populations. Yet, it is far from clear that models developed from American research hold to the same extent elsewhere, including Canada. First, comparative studies have not been as numerous as single country studies, thus thwarting attempts at generalizations. Second, country differences exist with respect to immigration policies, migrant reception policies, economic structures, race relations and racial stratification, thus shaping the context within which immigrant racial minorities experience integration. Still, similarities also exist; settlement countries today are post-industrial economies characterized by "good" and "bad" jobs, and certainly by low wage service industries. In most countries, skin color is a social signifier of difference, and as Robert Miles (1989) notes, offers the potential basis for the construction of the "other" and for economic stratification.

This paper contributes to a comparative perspective by contrasting the earnings of two racial immigrant groups in both the United States and in Canada: non-Hispanic whites, and blacks. Data are from the 2000 census of Population in the United States and the 2001 Census of Population in Canada. Prior to analyzing these data sets, I review U.S. studies in order to establish baseline conceptual and empirical models. I then review the many reasons for expecting similar or disparate findings in Canada. The absence of a pernicious racially based fault line suggests that black-white differences may be more muted in Canada than in the United States. However, unlike the United States, the

immigrant population in Canada is highly concentrated in three core cities (Montreal, Toronto, and Vancouver); and, recent arrivals have not been doing as well in the labor market as earlier cohorts arriving in the 1970s and 1980s.

AN AMERICAN MODEL IN A COMPARATIVE CONTEXT

In the United States, a growing body of research examines the labor market attainments of black immigrants using census data. This research represents the intersection of two dominant concerns in the field of inequality: racial stratification and immigration stratification. Studies of racial stratification in the United States find an entrenched black-white divide in American institutions, particularly in the labor market where the black population often is at a strong disadvantage compared to the white majority.

The field of immigrant stratification acknowledges that newcomers to a society often experience initial labor market dislocations, but frequently finds that such disadvantages dissipate over time as migrants integrate into the host society. The strongest version of this dissipation is contained in the straight-line theory of assimilation (Alba and Nee, 1997; Gans, 1997), which posits that over time immigrant groups acquire the values of the host society and experience social mobility. This model rests heavily on assumptions that structural barriers can be dismantled, and economic rewards derived from merit, particularly human capital skills of education and training rather than on ascribed characteristics such as country of origin, age and sex (Kollehlon and Eule, 2003). The model also implicitly privileges ethnicity as a dimension of difference rather than "race." This emphasis is rather important when thinking about pathways to migrant integration or assimilation. Cornell and Hartmann (2004) argue that ethnicity refers to cultural patterns, identities, and related behaviours of groups with a real or imaged history of shared descent. In contrast, race is constructed on the basis of phenotypical characteristics that are frequently selected by others to produce relations of ruling in which phenotypically defined groups are disadvantaged. Race is less subject to change than ethnicity, and thus it undergirds systems of social stratification characterized by relatively immutable (racial) hierarchies with respect to access to power, resources and rewards.

A race perspective on migration integration thus offers a different venue than one formulated in the straight-line assimilation model. Writing from the United States experience, Bashi and McDaniel (1997) argue that immigrants who enter the United States are assimilated not into a neutral set of social institutions but rather into a system of racial stratification. Stated somewhat differently, immigrants are forced to assimilate as members of different racial groups because of racial stratification. The implication is that white immigrants will be assimilated into "White America" and black immigrants will be assimilated as blacks. Theoretically, this point is implicit in the segmented assimilation perspective in which offspring of select black immigrant groups assimilate into a black underclass in American cities. As well the point speaks to the differences between ethnicity and race in the migrant integration process. Numerous studies of young second generation black Americans document the dilemmas of identities in which ethnic identities, such as Jamaican, West Indian. Jamaican-American, are invoked by youngsters

to avoid a racial African-American one (Foner, 2001; Kasinitz et. al, 2001; Stepick et al, 2001; Waters, 1999; Zephir, 2001).

The arguments that immigrants assimilate as members of racially defined groups and that "ethnic" labels may be used to offset ensuing disadvantages also is found with varying degrees of explicitness in recent census based research on the earnings of black immigrants in the United States. These studies have three features. First, some compare the earnings of black immigrants to white immigrants or to the white native born (Butcher, 1994; Daneshvary and Schwer, 1994; James, Romine and Terry, 2002; Model, Fisher and Silberman, 1999). In most instances, black migrants have lower earnings than the white foreign or native born. This latter finding is consistent with the argument that a racially stratified system exists. Second, studies also compare black immigrants to the black American born, by-passing white-black comparisons altogether (Djamba, 1999; Dodoo, 1997; Kalmijn, 1990). The strategy of comparing within racially defined groups appears to rest on an *a priori* understanding that a racial hierarchy does indeed exist and that understanding how well immigrants do therefore requires within-group comparisons. Third, in both sets of studies, researchers frequently differentiate earnings differentials within the black immigrant population by Caribbean and/or African birthplace, and several focus on the black-white differences in earning within the African immigrant population (Dodoo and Takyi, 2002; Kollehlon and Eule, 2003). Reasons for differentiating groups within the black immigrant population include the positive selection of some groups of immigrants, the cultural superiority of Caribbean blacks, and employer perceptions and favouritism (Dodoo, 1997; Dodoo and Takyi, 2002; Heron, 2001). Different birthplace groups may vary with respect to the factors influencing migration, with respect to their human capital and related productivity characteristics and in the extent to which groups are positively selected, all of which might affect earnings. In addition, following Sowell (1978), a cultural argument exists in which Caribbean black immigrants are viewed as more achievement oriented and thus more likely to have higher education and earnings, at least in relation to native born American blacks as a result of a different history of slavery and their demographic majority on the Caribbean islands (but see Kalmijn, 1996; Model, Fisher, and Silberman, 1999 for counter arguments). Finally, a negative stereotyping of African blacks and a positive stereotyping of Caribbean blacks may exist among employers (Dodoo, 1997; Heron, 2001).

The American focus on the black-white immigrant earnings gap is part of a larger existing concern about black white inequality. To a considerable extent, the black-white divide is seen as indicating the persistence of a racial system of stratification, one that is historically rooted in slavery and in the economic and political disenfranchisement of blacks for nearly 100 years after the American Civil War (1861-1865). Canada too had a history of black slavery but with a much smaller population of no more than several thousand during the late 1700s and early 1800s (Walker, 1980). Blacks also came to Canada in the aftermath of the American Revolution, where having fought in the British Army, they were promised land. The majority settled in Nova Scotia but again numbers were small (Milan and Tran, 2004; Walker, 1980). More came primarily to Ontario via the Underground Railroad prior to the Civil War. By the turn of the 20th century, Canada's black population stood at 17,500 compared to 8.8 million reported of African descent in the United States. Today, the black population in Canada numbers 662,000, or 2.2 percent of the total 2001 population compared to 36.4 million in the United States

representing 12.9 percent of the 2000 population (Milan and Tran, 2004; U.S. Bureau of the Census www.census.gov/prod/2001pubs/c2kbr01-5.pdf; United States. Department of Commerce and Labor, 1909: 52).

Although Canada's black population was, and remains, very small compared to the United States, it did not escape poor treatment by the white majority in Canada. Historical examples abound in which promises regarding land allocation were broken or altered; in which black immigrants from the United States were discouraged during the 1800s from agricultural settlement in the Canadian prairies, and where church and school segregation existed (Walker, 1980). The differential treatment of blacks persisted into the 20th century. As was the case in the United States, immigration policies prior to the 1960s were based on national origins, effectively excluding black migration. Select policies were drafted on occasion to permit entry of small numbers of black domestics from the Caribbean, but the accompanying discussions document that blacks were seen as different and inferior to the preferred white settler from Europe (Mackenzie, 1988). One of the most glaring outcomes of long term practices of exclusion existed in the segregated area known as Africville in Halifax, Nova Scotia (Claremont and Magill, 1999). Home to many descendents of the black Loyalists, many of the third-plus generation in Canada today continue to reside in Halifax.

While Canada's history of mistreating black minorities shares some similarities with that of the United States, one tenet is that it was far less influential in affecting attitudes and social structures than the corrosive American legacy of wide-spread slavery, and of Jim Crow laws accompanied by endemic and systemic racial violence, all targeted at a large black American population. Support for this supposition comes from studies on attitudinal differences in the two countries regarding injustice and inequality, the greater public opinion support for intermarriage in Canada, and the existence of Canada's multiculturalism policy since 1971 (Adams, 2003; Breton, 2003; Fleras and Elliot, 2003: Chapter 10; Kymlicka, 1995; Lipset, 1990; Reitz and Breton, 1994). The latter arose historically as an attempt to contain Quebec nationalism and a complement to official bilingualism policy. It provides an encompassing framework that validates and endorses cultural diversity of all other kinds along with language rights awarded the dominant English and French majorities within the country.

These features of Canadian society suggest that the black-white divide and accompanying economic inequalities may be less than in the United States. If true, the earnings gaps between whites and blacks and between whites and black immigrants should be less in Canada than in the United States. Yet, the premises on which this supposition exists may be challenged. It could be argued that attitudes say little about levels of discriminatory behaviour – Canadian politeness may simply ensure that discrimination is hidden or covert (Reitz, 1988; also see Henry and Ginzberg, 1985 versus Henry, 1989). Multiculturalism policy also has its critics, who note that it merely grants cultural identities equal footing in the private sphere and that it receives a very low level of government funding for multicultural activities including anti-racist educational initiatives.

Certainly what is not contested is that black-white earnings gaps exist in Canada, both within and between the Canadian born and immigrant populations. From recent studies that investigate earnings of racially defined groups using 1991-1996 data, four general conclusions emerge: a) black women, both foreign born and Canadian born,

usually do not earn less than Canadian born women who are white; b) earnings gaps exist to the detriment of black foreign born and Canadian born men when comparisons are made with the earnings of Canadian born (white) men; c) the magnitude of the earnings penalty varies for black men by generational status, defined as Canadian born, arriving as children (age 0-14) and later. The percentage decrease relative to white native born men is largest for black Canadian-born men and for black immigrant men arriving at age 25 or later; d) the earnings gap also is largest for those arriving five years prior to the census, and declines substantially the longer the duration in Canada; e) the earnings gap between the Canadian born (primarily) white population and the black population is the largest of all comparisons that involve other groups such as the Chinese, and South Asians (Baker and Benjamin, 1997; Hum and Simpson, 1999; Pendakur and Pendakur, 1998; Reitz, 2001; Swidinsky and Swidinsky, 2002).

To date trans-border comparisons of black-white inequalities are few in number, focus on different segments of the immigrant population, and arrive at different and contradictory conclusions. Using 1980/1981 data for recent immigrants in urban areas, Reitz (1998:Table 2.2) finds that for men, black recent immigrant/white native born earnings ratios are considerably lower in the United States than in Canada, implying that the gap is greater in the United States.. For women, the black recent immigrant/white native born earnings ratios are nearly identical. Model, Fisher and Silberman (1999) analyze 1990/1991 data for Canada and the United States and find similar earnings gaps for black immigrant men from the Caribbean in both countries. Different findings are observed in a study by Baker and Benjamin (1997) which also uses 1990/1991 data and studies the earnings of both foreign born and native born men classified into various racial groups according to answers on the ancestry/ethnicity census questions. Compared to those in the United States, blacks in Canada faced significantly larger earnings deficits relative to the white population.

DATA AND DESIGN

This paper continues the comparative Canadian-United States focus on black-white earnings inequalities with more recent data that also permits more detail by birthplace origins. The data sets used in this analysis are the 5% PUMS files constructed from the United States 2000 Census of Population and available from IPUMs at the University of Minnesota, and the 2001 Canadian Census of Population database housed at Statistics Canada. This latter database permits a detailed analysis of the black population in Canada by birthplace or regions that corresponds with the United States analysis. The population under analysis excludes the institutionalized population, those living in collective dwellings, and those who are army officers or enlisted personnel, and those born abroad to American or Canadian parents, or deemed a Canadian citizen at birth (see Kalmijn, 1996 for similar restrictions). Canada does not have non-contiguous territories, and in order to advance the comparability of the analysis, the United States data excludes those born in the territories (including Puerto Rico). The population is further restricted to those age 25 to 44 and living in Census Metropolitan Areas (CMAs) in Canada and Metropolitan Areas (MAs) in the United States. Because immigration from non-European countries is fairly recent, occurring in the aftermath of the legislative changes of the 1960s and 1970s, the foreign born white and black populations in both Canada and the United States are relatively young, and this is particularly so for

immigrant offspring. The geographical restriction standardizes comparisons with the white majority native born population. Foreign born populations in both countries are urban while a larger percentage of native born whites reside outside large cities. Analyses that include all areas risk minimizing earnings differences when comparing the foreign born mostly residing in higher wage cities with the native born who also live in lower wage smaller communities (see Boyd, 1992).

The dependent variable is positive weekly earnings for 1999 (United States) or 2000 (Canada), for persons working one week or more in the year in which earnings data were collected[1]. Earnings are defined as the sum of wage and salary, self-employment income or farm income. Use of all earnings rather than non-farm employment income is necessitated by the earnings variables on United States 5% PUMS which groups self-employment and farm incomes together as business income. At the same time, given the restriction of the sample to those living in metropolitan areas, it is unlikely that farm income has much impact on the analysis. In assessing earnings, migrants who arrived in the year preceding the census and who may have partial U.S. or Canadian earnings are omitted from the analysis as are those who arrived during the census year, and who thus would have no earnings to declare for the year preceding the census.

The earnings determination model, used to assess the fortunes of white and black immigrant and immigrant origin groups, regresses positive logged (ln) weekly earnings on characteristics known to affect earnings. In keeping with earlier studies of black immigrants in the United States, these variables include four types of human capital variables: educational achievement, bachelor degree, experience, and language skills. Overall educational achievement is defined as years of schooling. It is calculated for the United States population using levels of schooling and an algorithm first used in Kalmijn (1996; also see: Dodoo, 1997; Dodoo and Takyi, 2002); a corresponding scale is developed for Canada. A second education variable is constructed as a dummy variable with the value 1 assigned if the respondent has a university bachelors degree or higher, and it is used to capture of the effects of credentials[2]. Experience, or more accurately potential experience, is defined from the algorithm (age – (years of schooling + 6)) and in

[1] Several American studies of black immigrants in the United States use hourly wages. This is possible with United States census data because respondents are ask to report the usual number of hours worked in the year preceding the census, which also is the year for which earnings are reported. The Canadian census asks respondents to report the hours they worked in the week preceding the census, and there is no guarantee that such reports correspond to hours worked in the preceding year for which earning are reported.

[2] The United States and Canadian censuses ask different questions on education generating two implications for comparative analysis. First, compared to the United States census, the Canadian census captures far more information about non-university post secondary education. This information is used to create a single years of schooling variable on the Canadian census database. However, in order to harmonize the cross-country comparisons, the same educational algorithm developed for the United States data was used with Canadian respondents, with one minor addition. Where persons reported having post-secondary but not university education, they were assigned 12.5 years of schooling. The data reported for educational attainments reflect this common metric between the two data sets. Analyses not presented here also were conducted for Canada using the single years of schooling variable, and multivariate results were very close to those presented in this paper. Second, the astute reader will notice that percentages indicating bachelors degrees are higher in the United States than in Canada. There is no ready explanation for this finding with respect to receipt of bachelors degree; however, one possibility is that – despite questionnaire examples of BS, AB etc - American respondents who graduated from two year community colleges that often are part of state educational systems may have declared themselves to have a degree.

keeping with human capital models, an experience-squared term is also used (Mincer, 1974). In terms of measuring language proficiency, large differences exist in the language questions asked by the United States and Canadian censuses. The result is an aggregated dummy variable in which respondents are coded 1 if they use another language in the home other than English for the United States and other than English and/or French for Canada. Persons who use only the dominant or official languages in the home are coded zero.

Two previous studies of foreign born blacks in the United States include occupation in their models of earnings determination (Daneshvary and Schwer, 1994; Dodoo and Takyi, 2002), but most studies do not. Occupation is not included in the model of earnings determination here. Occupation mediates the effects of education, language and other human capital skills and the question addressed in this paper is not how occupation mediates human capital skills but rather what differences remain between black and white groups after human capital related factors have been taken into account (see: Sakamoto, Wu and Tzeng, 2000). However, consistent with earlier studies, additional control variables used in the analysis are marital status, expressed as a dummy variable in which the currently married are coded 1; region of residence and select metropolitan areas. The latter two variables moderate the labor market effects associated with regions and specific cities. Period of immigration also is included (Butcher, 1994; Dodoo, 1997; Dodoo and Takyi, 2002; Kollehlon and Eule, 2003). That variable crudely captures the varying extent of the years spent by immigrants in the host countries and the period effects associated with time of entry. In Canada, for example, adult immigrants arriving during the 1990s have not done well in the labor market. The explanations are still under investigation, but the downturn in the economy during the early 1990s is thought to be a factor (Picot, 2004).

The groups of interest in this analysis are the black and white populations demarcated by birthplace and immigrant offspring status. A race question exists on the U.S. Census questionnaire, and single-only responses are selected (single only White and single only Black). The white population is further modified to exclude Hispanic whites in order to approximate the white population defined in the Canadian census. In Canada, groups are defined as white or black according to responses to the census question "what are you?" In addition to the category "white", ten additional precoded categories exist in accordance with Employment Equity requirements, and respondents are also allowed to write in other responses[3]. These "non-white" groups represent visible-minority populations in Canada, and Latin American is one of the ten pre-coded categories. In order to maximize correspondence in the "white categories of both countries, two procedures were followed with respect to Canadian data. First, single only "whites" and single only blacks were selected from the Canadian census, thereby omitting those who indicated they were Latin American, and other visible minority groups. Second, Canadian respondents who were single-only Arab and/or West Asian or white and Arab and/or West Asian were defined as part of the "white" population in this analysis. This addition is necessary because in the United States the Arab and the West Asian population is considered white and they are not separately tabulated in the corresponding census race question. In Canada, research finds no significant earnings differentials between the Arab

[3] The ten categories are: Chinese; South Asian; Black; Filipino; Latin American; Southeast Asian; Arab; West Asian; Japanese, and Korean.

and West Asian men and women and the corresponding non-visible minority populations (Hum and Simpson, 1999).

The capacity to define immigrant offspring varies between the United States and the Canadian censuses of 2000 and 2001. The term "immigrant offspring" refers to the 1.5 generation, or those who are foreign born but arrive in childhood or early adolescence; it also includes children of immigrants who are born in the host country, and known as the "second generation". In both countries, ages at immigration data are available from the censuses and are used to refine the foreign born population into two groups: the 1.5 generation and those who arrive later, primarily in adulthood. Because age at immigration data are not collected for migrants in Canada on a temporary basis, temporary migrants are deleted from the analysis for Canada. However, the US census asks questions on date of arrival for all foreign born, regardless of entry status[4].

Determining the second generation in an adult population requires questions on birthplace of parents in addition to the birthplace of respondents. Such questions were asked in the 1970 and 1971 censuses in both countries, but questions on the birthplace of parents were omitted from subsequent censuses until 2001 when the Canadian census again included them. As a consequence, data from the United States census of 2000 permits distinguishing between the native born, the 1.5 generation (the foreign born who arrive before the age of 15) and the residual foreign born, consisting of those who arrive at ages 15 or older[5]. Data from the Canadian census are used to define four groups: the Canadian born who do not have one or more foreign born parents (the third plus generation); the Canadian born who have at least one foreign born parent (the second generation) and the foreign born divided into the 1.5 generation and those arriving at ages 15 or older.

Separating the second generation from the third-plus generation is important for Canadian analyses of the earnings of the black immigrant population. In the United

---

[4] With respect to questions on time of arrival, the United States census does not distinguish between those foreign born in the United States who are there temporarily at the time of enumeration and those who are there on a permanent basis. A question "when did this person come to live in the United States?" is asked of all foreign born and persons in U.S. outlying areas regardless of their immigration and legal status. In contrast, the Canadian census asks respondents first if they ever have been a "landed immigrant," that is as a person who has been granted the right to live in Canada permanently by the immigration authorities. If an affirmative answer is give, a question is then asked about when the person first because a landed immigrant. Other respondents, who reply in the negative, are flowed around this date of immigration question. This procedure excludes information on year or period of immigration and age at immigration for all foreign born persons who are in Canada on temporary permits.

In addition, the United States is believed to have a sizeable population that lacks legal status with respect to residency. Recent estimates range from 4.7 million in 1998 (Batiz and Francisco, 2000) to 8.5 million in 2000 (Costanzo et al. 2002; Porter 2001) to 11 million with the date unspecified (Green and Martin, 2004). In Canada, as reported by newspapers, recent estimates range from 20,000 to 200,000 (Edmonton Journal, 2001, 2004; National Post, 2003; Teotonio, 2001; Lawton and Thompson, 2001). In both countries, the foreign born without legal entry status are likely to be included in census enumerations to the extent that households contain persons of mixed residency status and all individuals are recorded. The extent of census enumeration of the undocumented population remains uncertain, but the proportionately larger undocumented population in the foreign born population of the United States suggests that their inclusion in United States data may be higher than in Canadian data.

[5] The United States Current Population Survey, which is akin to the Canadian Labor Force Survey, has been collecting information on birthplace of parents in the March supplement since 1994. However, the size of the samples restricts the capacity to examine differences by region or country of origin.

States, the historical existence of a large black slave population left its legacy in a large black native born population. Among those in the United States who worked one week or more and had positive earnings, nearly nine out of 10 in the black population is native born, a figure that is not very different from that observed for the white population (Table 1). Similarly in Canada the majority of the corresponding white population is third-generation plus. However, only 6 percent of the black Canadian population in the analysis is third generation or higher, with 15 percent being Canadian born but with at least one foreign born parent. Altogether, two out of ten in the black population are Canadian born.

Table 1: Generational Distributions of Earners, by Race, United States and Canada.

	White [(a)] (1)	Black [(a)] (2)
United States		
Numbers, ' 000s	36,142	7,007
Percent	100.0	100.0
Native Born (2cd & 3rd plus)	95.8	89.2
Foreign Born, Arrived Age 0-14	1.1	2.3
Foreign Born, Arrived Age 15+	3.1	8.5
Canada		
Numbers, ' 000s	4112	136
Percent	100.0	100.0
Third-plus Generation	67.2	6.2
Second Generation	20.5	14.8
Foreign Born, Arrived Age 0-14	4.7	21.2
Foreign Born, Arrived Age 15+	7.5	57.8

(a) See text for definitions.

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2000 Census of Population, 5% PUMs file; Statistics Canada, 2001 Census of Population, Masterfile.

These country differences in the generational composition of the black populations raise the question asked in one of the early studies of black immigrants in the United States (Butcher, 1994): what is the appropriate reference group with which to compare black immigrant origin groups? The answer reflects the combination of conceptual issues, availability of data and different country demographics. Conceptually, a race perspective emphasizes comparisons with the longest residing white group, arguing that this group is not only the numerical majority but also commands the most resources and power. Assimilation theory also dictates that third-plus generation is the appropriate reference groups when examining earnings for other immigrant and immigrant origin groups. Defining a white third-plus reference group can be done with Canadian census data, but absence of a question on the birthplace of parents means that the reference group for the United States is the entire white native born population.

A derivative risk is that the analytical findings may reflect country differences in the selection of reference groups and in the classification of generation groups. Three responses exist. First, although the analysis emphasizes the earnings of black immigrant

and immigrant origin groups compared to white native born /3rd plus generations, part of the analysis uses white immigrants as a reference group, thereby using a common reference for both countries. Second, the impact of using different reference groups may be minimal given the relative impact of migration on the two countries. With a population nearly ten times larger than Canada, postwar immigration flows to the United States were approximately three to four times higher than those to Canada. Consequently, eleven percent of the American population in 2000 is foreign born compared to 17 percent in Canada. This suggests that the second generation in the United States is likely to form a smaller share of the native born population than in Canada. Third, harmonizing the classification system of generation groups by collapsing the second and third plus generation groups create new issues. In Canada with its different history of black settlement and immigration, the second generation is over twice as large as the third plus generation. To combine these groups is to heavily weight the Canadian born black population with the experiences of the second generation. However, second generation blacks are still quite young, have comparatively speaking higher education but, as is typical in the early stages of labor market experience, lower earnings. This distorts comparisons with the United States data in a different and potentially more misleading direction.

The analysis begins with a general comparison of white-black immigrant origin groups. It then expands the origins of the black immigrant and immigrant origin population. The selection of birthplace or ancestry origin groups rest on the size of the subpopulations and the need to make cross-national comparisons. Generally, specific birthplace groups were represented within the foreign born black population if there were at least 250 unweighted counts for each sex and for each country or region. Similar detail is not provided for the white population. The argument advanced by researchers is that the white population constitutes the category (or "hidden ethnicity") against which racial and ethnic "others" are classified (Cornell and Hartmann, 2004:35; also see Butcher, 1994), and that by implication, the nuances and implications of within-group variation for whites are muted.

THE VALUE OF COLOR

As might be expected, considerable variations in characteristics known to affect earnings exist by country, color, generation, and gender. Table 2 presents information related to the independent variables in this study for the earners in this study. In general, the following conclusions hold in both Canada and the United States

- The white population has a higher percentage that is currently legally married (excluding common law) than does the black population

- For both white and the black populations, groups that arrive at ages 15 or later are older on average than other generation groups; they also have more years of potential experience than do other groups but fewer years of duration in Canada and the United States.

- Groups that arrive after age 14 have the highest percentages with languages other than English (USA) or English and/or French (Canada) spoken in the home. The white foreign born population has higher percentages with other languages in the home compared to comparable group of black immigrants. These white-black differentials in part reflect black migration from English speaking Caribbean countries.

- The black native born population (US) and the black third-plus generation in Canada have the lowest educational attainments, measured as years of school. Excluding black women arriving in Canada after age 14, the black native-born/third-plus generation also has the lowest percentage with bachelor degrees or higher.

Country differences also exist, particularly with respect to age composition. The United States has slightly younger foreign born white and black populations, a characteristic that is associated with the lower percentages who are legally married in these groups. However, the ability to separate out the second generation in the Canadian data highlights the exceptionally young black second generation at least in that country. Of the population age 25-44, three out of five of the black second generation are below age thirty. Compared to other black generation groups, this young age profile in turn is responsible for other socio-demographic characteristics, including lower percentages married, higher educational attainments, fewer years of potential experience and lower earnings. The extreme age skew cautions against over-interpreting findings presented in this paper with respect to comparisons of the earnings of the black second generation (see Boyd, 2005a and 2005b).

The nineth and tenth columns of Table 2 presents average weekly earnings data for white and black generation groups in the United States and in Canada. The classic lower earnings of women compared to men are evident, but in addition it is clear that the black population – with the exception of women arriving as children – have lower earnings than either the non-Hispanic native born whites in the United States or the third-plus white generation in Canada (both groups including Arab and West Asian populations).

Inter-group comparison of earnings is presented in Table 3 by regressing logged (ln) weekly earnings and then transforming the results into percentage deviations[6]. The

[6] Converting earnings into logged (ln) earnings reduces the effects of skewed distributions and outliners. In the logged equation, the means are not arithmetic means but geometric means (calculated as "the nth root of the product of n values") and the b_is are the ratio of the geometric means. This has at least two implications for analyses of earnings. First, the greater the skew, the greater the difference between the arithmetic and geometric mean, with the result that straightforward earnings comparisons can differ depending on whether the earnings variable is coded in actual dollars or logged (see Hodson, 1985). Second, for interpretative purposes, the resulting unstandardized b coefficient can be interpreted as indicating the percentage increment in income (wages) that result from a unit change in the independent variable. However, despite the popular use of logged income in earning analysis, potential misinterpretation can arise. Only at low values of the b coefficients (usually coefficients of less than .15), does e^b approximates (1 + b), allowing b's to be interpreted as approximating percentages. Further, using dummy variables as independent variables negates this straightforward interpretation. Instead, if "percentage increment" discussions are desired, it is necessary to transform the semi-logged regression

Table 2: Socio-demographic Characteristics of the White and Black population, age 25-44, working 1 week or more in 1999/2000 with Positive Earnings, by Sex, Nativity and Generational Status, (Census) Metropolitan Areas, United States and Canada

	Mean Age (1)	% age 25-29 (2)	% Married (3)	Mean Yrs School (4)	% with Bachelors degree or higher (5)	Home[(b)] Language (6)	Years of Potential Exper-ience (7)	Duration (8)	1999 or 2000 Weekly Earnings (9)	Ratio of Weekly Earnings (10)
Women										
United States										
White, non-Hispanic Native Born	35.1	21.9	61.5	14.4	37.1	3.6	14.7	(na)	663	(rg)
White, non-Hispanic Foreign Born, arrive age 0-14	35.2	21.0	61.4	14.4	37.7	53.2	14.8	29.0	743	112
White, non-Hispanic Foreign Born, arrive age 15+	35.6	17.5	68.9	14.8	45.0	74.2	14.9	10.2	704	106
Black, Native Born	34.6	23.9	33.0	13.6	20.3	3.4	15.0	(na)	598	90
Black, Foreign Born, arrive age 0-14	33.2	30.8	37.0	14.4	33.9	31.8	12.9	24.3	696	105
Black, Foreign Born, arrive age 15+	36.0	15.1	48.8	13.4	22.7	50.6	16.6	11.9	606	91
Canada										
White[(c)], 3rd Plus Generation	35.2	21.5	68.4	13.6	26.6	0.1	15.6	(na)	691	(rg)
White[(c)], Second Generation	34.4	25.1	65.2	14.0	33.1	4.2	14.4	(na)	750	108
White[(c)], FB, arrived age 0-14	35.6	17.2	70.1	13.6	27.3	10.2	16.0	29.5	748	108
White[(c)], FB, arrived age 15+	36.6	12.1	79.3	13.8	33.7	48.2	16.8	10.7	649	94
Black, 3rd Plus Generation	35.0	21.7	43.1	13.1	16.1	0.4	15.9	(na)	652	94
Black, Second Generation	29.7	59.2	26.2	14.0	33.4	1.5	9.6	(na)	650	94
Black, FB, arrived age 0-14	33.5	23.9	40.7	13.6	22.1	3.3	14.0	25.2	710	103
Black, FB, arrived age 15+	36.1	13.6	51.0	12.7	12.3	21.2	17.3	11.3	556	80
Men										
United States										
White, non-Hispanic Native Born	35.2	20.8	61.3	14.3	35.0	3.6	14.9	(na)	1037	(rg)
White, non-Hispanic Foreign Born, arrive age 0-14	35.3	19.8	59.1	14.4	37.9	52.0	14.9	28.9	1168	113
White, non-Hispanic Foreign Born, arrive age 15+	35.8	15.6	68.4	14.9	48.5	72.8	14.9	10.1	1203	116
Black, Native Born	34.7	23.3	44.6	13.3	16.4	3.8	15.4	(na)	710	68
Black, Foreign Born, arrive age 0-14	33.1	31.7	42.4	13.9	27.4	34.6	13.2	24.2	832	80
Black, Foreign Born, arrive age 15+	36.1	14.6	53.8	13.6	28.6	60.6	16.6	11.5	738	71
Canada										
White[(c)], 3rd Plus Generation	35.2	21.4	66.0	13.3	22.5	0.1	15.9	(na)	968	(rg)
White[(c)], Second Generation	34.5	24.1	61.6	13.7	27.6	4.7	14.8	(na)	1043	108
White[(c)], FB, arrived age 0-14	35.5	17.6	65.6	13.4	25.0	10.6	16.1	29.4	1040	107
White[(c)], FB, arrived age 15+	36.6	10.9	76.8	13.9	34.8	50.8	16.7	10.2	940	97
Black, 3rd Plus Generation	35.0	19.6	60.2	12.9	13.6	0.4	16.1	(na)	771	80
Black, Second Generation	29.9	57.8	30.6	13.5	20.1	2.1	10.4	(na)	698	72
Black, FB, arrived age 0-14	33.5	24.1	50.9	13.3	17.8	4.0	14.2	25.3	788	81
Black, FB, arrived age 15+	36.4	10.8	64.3	13.2	19.7	24.2	17.2	10.5	688	71

(a) See text for additional description of the population under study.
(b) Home language refers to the percentage with a language other than English spoken at home. See text.
(c) In order to correspond to the US population of non-Hispanic whites, the White population includes Arab and West Asians and excludes other visible minority groups including those declaring themselves as Latin American. See text.
(na) Not applicable.
(rg) Reference group.

first model presents the actual (logged) group specific earnings as deviations from that of the white reference group, defined as native born non-Hispanic whites in the United States and the third-plus white (excluding Latin American and other visible minority groups and including Arab and West Asian groups) group in Canada. The second model adjusts earnings for differences in the composition of the various groups with respect to years of schooling, university degrees, years of potential experience, home language, marital status, city and region of residence, and period of immigration. The analysis and selection of reference groups are specific for men and women. The actual regression results that underlie these and other tables appear in the appendix. Unless stated otherwise through the use of the (ns) symbol, all the deviations presented represent b

coefficients produced by OLS regression routines (Giles, 1982; Halvorsen and Palmquist, 1980; Kennedy, 1981). Using a formula appearing in Halvorsen and Palmquist (1980), these calculated percentages are reported in this paper whenever earnings are coded into natural logarithms.

coefficients that are statistically significant (at the .05 level or less) in relation to the designated reference group.

Table 3: Percentage Deviations of (ln) Weekly Earnings, White and Black Population Age 25-44, Working 1 or more weeks in 1999[a] by Sex, Generation Status, Age at Immigration, (Census) Metropolitan Areas, United States, 2000 and Canada, 2001.

	Women		Men	
	Gross[b] (1)	Net[c] (2)	Gross[b] (3)	Net[c] (4)
White Reference Group				
United States				
White, non-Hispanic Native Born	(rg)	(rg)	(rg)	(rg)
White, non-Hispanic Foreign Born, arrive age 0-14	8.1	5.7	7.6	5.4
White, non-Hispanic Foreign Born, arrive age 15+	(ns)	4.0	6.7	(ns)
Black, Native Born	-8.8	(ns)	-30.9	-20.0
Black, Foreign Born, arrive age 0-14	9.6	1.7	-20.1	-14.6
Black, Foreign Born, arrive age 15+	-5.9	4.4	-28.9	-24.1
Canada				
White[d], 3rd Plus Generation	(rg)	(rg)	(rg)	(rg)
White[d], Second Generation	8.4	(ns)	5.0	-1.4
White[d], FB, arrived age 0-14	5.4	(ns)	6.0	(ns)
White[d], FB, arrived age 15+	-11.7	(ns)	-8.8	-8.0
Black, 3rd Plus Generation	-17.9	-13.5	-18.6	-15.2
Black, Second Generation	-9.6	-13.7	-31.6	-22.2
Black, FB, arrived age 0-14	-4.0	-11.9	-22.4	-23.6
Black, FB, arrived age 15+	-25.6	-13.9	-31.9	-29.7

(a) See text for additional description of the population under study.
(b) Unadjusted for the effects of other variables known to affect earnings.
(c) Controlling for education, potential experience, language in the home, marital status, city of residence, region of residence and period of immigration.
(d) In order to correspond to the US population of non-Hispanic whites, the White population includes Arab and West Asians and excludes other visible minority groups including those declaring themselves as Latin American. See text.
(ns) Regression coefficient is not significantly different from that of the White 3rd+ generation at p=0.05 level or lower.
(rg) Reference group
Source: Statistics Canada, 2001 Census of Population 2B File.

In the United States, both white and black foreign born women who arrive as children (ages 0-14) and reside in Metropolitan Areas have actual (ln) weekly earnings that are nearly 10 % higher than those observed for white non-Hispanic native born women; foreign born women arriving later in life do not fare as well – white foreign born women have approximately the same average earnings while black women arriving after age 14 earn about 6 percent less. Multivariate models shows what the differences in earnings would be if groups had the same distributions of human capital skills, geographical residence and period of immigration. Both black and white foreign born women, regardless of whether they are from the 1.5 generation or migrate later, would have higher weekly earnings than do native born white women (Table 3, column 1). Likewise, white non-Hispanic 1.5 generation men earn about 5 percent more than the white native born reference population and earnings are comparable between the native born white men and foreign born white men migrating after age 14 once human capital and demographic characteristics are taken into account (Table 3, column 4). However, the picture is less sanguine for black men. Even after taking into account variables that influence earnings, black native born men earn 20 percent less than white native born men. The earning gap declines slightly for men who arrived as children or young

adolescents to a 15 percent loss, but increases again to 24 percent for black men arriving after age 14.

In Canada, the consequences of being black extend to women as well as to men. Compared to white third-plus generation women, white second generation and 1.5 generation women actually have earnings that are 5 to 8 percent higher; in contrast black third plus generation have (ln) earnings that are nearly 18 percent lower; the deficit dips for the second and1.5 generation but rises again for black foreign born women who immigrate after age 14 (Table 2, column 1). When generational differences in human capital skills, geography and period of immigration are taken into account, a bifurcated and almost monolithic portrait appears for women. If all groups had the same set of characteristics, the earnings of white women, including the foreign born immigrating after age 14 would not be different from those of white third-plus generation women; however the earnings of black women across all generations would be 12 to 15 percent lower than those of third plus population of white women. The image is more varied for men. If all groups of men were similar in human capital and other characteristics, the weekly (ln) earnings of white foreign born men arriving after age 14 would be approximately 8 percent lower than those observed for third-plus generation white men. But, again, as was the case in the United States, the differentials are sharpest for black men of all generations. Controlling for human capital factors known to influence earnings, the third plus generation of black men in Canada would earn 15 percent less than the comparable group of white men, with the differential rising across generations[7]. Black foreign born men arriving after age 14 would have weekly earnings that are approximately 30 percent lower than those of white men from the third-plus generation in Canada.

NOT CUT FROM THE SAME CLOTH

As a number of earlier studies note, the black immigrant and immigrant origin populations are quite heterogeneous. Although the Caribbean islands are a substantial source of black migrants in North American, migration from Africa has not been inconsequential. Even within the Caribbean and African regions, considerable country variation exists in regard to the causes of migration and with respect to migrant characteristics, including language. As a result, the black immigrant and immigrant origin populations are internally very diverse.

Table 4 shows the different source countries and regions for the black generation groups in the United States and in Canada. Following the strategy of Kalmijn (1996), the experiences of Caribbean immigrant offspring in the United States are captured by separating persons who indicate Caribbean ancestry from the native born black populations that do not[8]. Among the foreign born population in both countries, blacks

---

[7] Again, the fact that the black second generation is very young means that little should be read into the magnitude of difference for this group. Where populations are highly skewed on a variable (such as age or potential experience) and have few numbers in older or more experienced groups, controlling on age or experience will not standardize or remove the skew.

[8] Based on the two ancestry responses available on the United States PUMS; because African-American and African Black are categories that the native born population resident for many generations may use to describe their origins, a similar classification was not made for those listing these ancestries. Numbers for those who give specific African country ancestries are too small for analysis.

from the Caribbean predominate. Approximately three quarters of immigrants arriving as children or young adolescents are from the Caribbean as are over 60 percent among those immigrating at ages 15 or older. However, in Canada proportionally more immigrants are from Jamaica than in the United States. The greater volume of African migrants among those immigrating at ages 15 or later in both countries permit examining specific origin groups for this population. Compared with the United States, Canada has a higher percentage of African immigrants from Ethiopia and other East African countries (including Eritrea and Somalia), a finding that perhaps reflects Canada's humanitarian policies and the chain migration that subsequently results.

Table 4: Origins of the Black Population within Generation Groups, Age 25-44, Working 1 Week or More in 1999/2000 with Positive Earnings, (Census) Metropolitan Areas, United States and Canada

	USA (1)	Canada (2)
Black, Native Born	100.0	(na)
Jamaican Ancestry	0.4	(na)
Other Caribbean, S.Am. Ancestry[a]	1.0	(na)
All Other	98.6	(na)
Black, Second Generation[b]	(na)	100.0
Jamaica	(na)	39.9
Other Caribbean,S.Am.	(na)	45.7
All Other	(na)	14.3
Black, Foreign Born, arrive age 0-14[c]	100.0	100.0
Haiti	12.8	11.8
Jamaica	26.7	44.2
Other Caribbean, S.Am.	33.9	23.9
All African Countries	7.9	6.1
All Other Areas	18.6	14.1
Black, Foreign Born, arrive age 15+[c]	100.0	100.0
Haiti	16.5	13.6
Jamaica	19.4	28.5
Trinidad and Tobago	5.4	5.5
Guyana	3.5	3.9
Other Caribbean, S.Am.	18.1	9.7
Ghana (Africa)	4.1	6.2
Ethiopia	4.0	7.2
Other East African Countries	4.9	11.1
All Other African Countries	20.7	10.6
All Other Areas	3.6	3.6

(a) First and second responses to the USA census question "What is this persons's ancestry or ethnic origin?". Analysis excludes "Puerto Rican" responses.
(b) Designated country/region of birth for father and/or mother in the Canadian census.
(c) Country of birth of respondent. Countries are grouped according to the classification found in Appendix J, 2001 Canadian Cesus Dictionary.
(na) Not applicable.
Source: US Bureau of Census, 2000 5% Census PUMS. Statistics Canada, 2001 Census of Population.

Several earlier studies of immigrant blacks in the United States observe that higher earnings penalty may exist for blacks born in Africa compared to those who are Caribbean born or who are Africa white (Dodoo, 1997; Dodoo and Takayi, 2002; Kollehlon and Eule, 2003). Explanations include cultural differences in the Caribbean and African populations, different human capital skills, and greater employer discrimination against black immigrants from Africa. However, an additional factor that needs to be considered is the

context of exit. Although it is true that economic degradation and poverty motivate migration from many regions of the world, parts of Africa are major sites of humanitarian based flows. Currently, Eritrea, Ethiopia and Somalia are areas where famine and war provide powerful motives for migration compared to countries such as Ghana where precarious economic conditions exist (Mensah, 2002; also see Tabutin and Schoumaker, 2004). In general, migrants who are part of humanitan based flows face greater integration difficulties, in part because of the trauma associated with sudden and forced leaving and the difficulties of acquiring educational and related labor market documents (Boyd, 2003; Wanner, 2003).

What are the white and black earnings gaps when distinctions are made by country and region of origin? Are immigrants from Africa more disadvantaged in terms of earnings disparities with whites than are those from the Caribbean? Using the classification found in Table 4, univariate and multivariate analyses show the persistence of gender and generational differences in the amount of black-white earnings inequality (Table 5). In the United States, the actual (ln) earnings of black native born women with Caribbean ancestry cannot be said to be significantly different from those of white non-Hispanic native born women once adjustments are made for group differences in human capital skills, in the percentages who are currently married, in geographical distribution and in period of immigration (Table 5, column 2). Among the black foreign born population that migrated at age 15 or later, a mixed pattern is observed. If all groups had the same set of human capital and demographic characteristics, black women from some Caribbean countries and from some African countries would have higher actual earnings than white native born women while for others the differences would not be statistically significant.

As is true in the highly aggregated comparison of white and black earnings (Table 3), a more negative scenario exists for black men in the United States. All generation and birthplace groups have lower earnings than do white native born men; however, the earnings penalties tend to be greatest for those black men who migrate at age 15 or later. In some cases, the lower earnings reflect the mix of skills and demographic characteristics. Multivariate analysis shows that if all men had the same set of human capital skills and demographic characteristics, the black-white earnings gap would be lower for native born men and those arriving as children or young adolescents than for foreign born men arriving later.

Based as they are on disaggregated countries of birth and regions, the United States findings do not confirm a distinctive pattern in which African born blacks are at a greater earnings disadvantage than are Caribbean born blacks. Similar observations can be made with respect to the white-black earnings disparities in Canada, particularly for those arriving after age 14. It does appear, however, that migrants born in select countries or areas are more likely than others to experience lower earnings when compared with the white reference population. With some variability by gender and generation status, migrants from Haiti, Ethiopia and Other East African countries (of which Somalia is a major source country) have earnings well below those of white native or third plus generations. Some of the earnings gap reflects the human capital skills and other demographic characteristics of migrants from these countries, but in Canada at least, these differentials persist even after statistically adjusting for the effects of these other variables. These findings suggest that apart from other explanations of black white income differences, context of exit may matter for subsequent integration.

Table 5: Percentage Deviations of (logged) Weekly Earnings of White and Black Population Age 25-44, Working 1 or more weeks in 1999[a] from the White Reference Population by Sex, Detailed Nativity and Generation Status, (Census) Metropolitan Areas, United States, 1999 and Canada, 2000.

	Women		Men	
	Gross[b] (1)	Net[c] (2)	Gross[b] (3)	Net[c] (4)
USA				
White, non-Hispanic Native Born	(rg)	(rg)	(rg)	(rg)
White, non-Hispanic Foreign Born, arrive age 0-14	8.1	5.6	7.6	5.2
White, non-Hispanic Foreign Born, arrive age 15+	(ns)	4.2	6.6	(ns)
Black, Native Born				
Jamaican Ancestry	12.9	(ns)	-22.3	-15.0
Other Caribbean, S.Am. Ancestry[d]	7.5	(ns)	-27.0	-17.3
All Other	-9.0	-3.2	-31.0	-20.1
Black, Foreign Born, arrive age 0-14[e]				
Haiti	11.7	(ns)	-18.3	-13.4
Jamaica	13.0	(ns)	-19.1	-15.0
Other Caribbean, S.Am.	7.3	(ns)	-22.3	-15.7
All African Countries	(ns)	(ns)	-22.2	-14.0
All Other Areas	13.5	(ns)	-15.5	-12.1
Black, Foreign Born, arrive age 15+[e]				
Haiti	-19.6	(ns)	-37.2	-26.2
Jamaica	(ns)	7.2	-26.1	-21.2
Trinidad and Tobago	(ns)	(ns)	-21.9	-21.0
Guyana	12.4	11.8	-25.4	-26.8
Other Caribbean, S.Am.	-12.6	(ns)	-33.6	-21.3
Ghana (Africa)	(ns)	19.0	-23.3	-20.6
Ethiopia	-13.2	(ns)	-34.3	-26.1
Other East African Countries	-15.3	(ns)	-31.7	-21.7
All Other African Countries	(ns)	5.6	-24.0	-29.2
All Other Areas	18.8	20.8	-13.4	-14.6
Canada				
White[f], 3rd Plus Generation	(rg)	(rg)	(rg)	(rg)
White[f], Second Generation	8.4	(ns)	5.0	-1.4
White[f], FB, arrived age 0-14	5.4	(ns)	6.0	-1.5
White[f], FB, arrived age 15+	-11.7	(ns)	-8.8	-8.9
Black, 3rd Plus Generation	-17.9	-13.5	-18.6	-15.2
Black, Second Generation[b]				
Jamaica	-9.0	-13.7	-30.7	-22.0
Other Caribbean,S.Am.	-7.6	-12.0	-33.7	-22.2
All Other	-17.4	-19.0	-27.0	-22.2
Black, Foreign Born, arrive age 0-14[e]				
Haiti	(ns)	(ns)	-41.7	-29.5
Jamaica	-9.8	-18.7	-20.6	-24.1
Other Caribbean, S.Am.	(ns)	-12.1	-22.3	-25.2
All African Countries	-14.7	(ns)	-37.1	-32.6
All Other Areas	18.7	(ns)	(ns)	-9.8
Black, Foreign Born, arrive age 15+[e]				
Haiti	-31.5	(ns)	-47.9	-37.0
Jamaica	-20.6	-17.2	-26.6	-27.6
Trinidad and Tobago	-8.5	(ns)	-12.7	-18.9
Guyana	-13.1	-10.4	-14.9	-19.7
Other Caribbean, S.Am.	-26.7	-20.1	-27.5	-27.7
Ghana (Africa)	-28.4	(ns)	-27.3	-27.5
Ethiopia	-43.0	-24.7	-42.4	-37.1
Other East African Countries	-35.9	-18.6	-42.3	-37.9
All Other African Countries	-27.8	-14.0	-29.3	-30.8
All Other Areas	(ns)	(ns)	(ns)	-13.3

(a) See text for additional description of the population under study.
(b) Unadjusted for the effects of other variables known to affect earnings.
(c) Controlling for education, potential experience, language in the home, marital status, city of residence, region of residence and period of immigration.
(d) First and second responses to the census question "What is this persons's ancestry or ethnic origin?". Analysis excludes "Puerto Rican' responses.
(e) Country of birth of respondent.
(f) In order to correspond to the US population of non-Hispanic whites, the White population includes Arab and West Asians and excludes other visible minority groups including those declaring themselves as Latin American. See text.
(rg) Reference group
(ns) Regression coefficient is not significantly different from that of the white reference population at p=0.05 level.
Source: US Bureau of Census, 2000 5% Census PUMS. Statistics Canada, 2001 Census of Population.

What do the findings suggest about the extent of black-white earnings disparities in the United States versus Canada? Two caveats exist before reaching any conclusions. First, comparing results for the second generation in Canada to any other group is risky given that over 60 percent of these wage earners from the Caribbean are under the age of 30. Second, the degree of black-white earnings differences for the 1.5 generations and those immigrating at age 15 or later have to be understood within the context of other earnings differentials between immigrants and the native born. In the United States, white non-Hispanic foreign born women actually earn more than their native born counterparts, as do foreign born men immigrating as children (the 1.5 generation) (Table 5, row 3 and 4). In Canada, however, foreign born white men have earnings below those of their white third generation counterparts as do foreign born women arriving at age 15 or later. The seemingly larger earnings disparities of black immigrants in Canada have to be understood as a further extension of what already is a discounting for white immigrants. Stated another way, if black-white earnings disparities in Canada are larger than those observed in the United States, it is partly because they build on an already pre-existing pattern in which even white immigrants have lower earnings rather than the higher earnings observed in the United States. Similar findings are observed in an analysis of US-Canadian 1990/1991 census data (Baker and Benjamin, 1997).

One way to standardize country comparisons is to ask what the differentials are when white immigrant groups are the reference point. Answering this question still preserves the selection of the white population as the reference group but removes country differences in the more general immigrant-native born comparisons. When this is done, the pattern is one in which a negative black-white earnings disparity exists and is larger in Canada than in the United States for 1.5 generation men from Caribbean and African countries and for 1.5 generation women from the Caribbean excluding Haiti (Table 6, columns 2 and 4). However, a more nuanced conclusion emerges for those immigrating at age 15 or later (Table 7). Among male immigrants, black origin groups in both countries have earnings that are significantly lower than those found for white men who immigrate after age 14. However, black-white disparities are lower for black origin groups in Canada compared to those in the United States with two notable exceptions: those born in Ethiopia and other East African countries. For men born in these countries the pattern is reversed and earnings disparities are higher. In general earnings black white disparities are higher in Canada than in the United States for women migrating at ages 15 or later. Two notable exceptions are those born in Trinidad and Tobago.

Conclusion

Overall, three major conclusions of the study exist. First, excluding black foreign born women in the United States, the black population in both countries has weekly earnings that are often substantially lower than those observed for the white reference population. The largest differentials between the black population and the white native born (USA) or third-plus generation (Canada) are found for male black immigrants arriving at age 15 or later. Second, considerable variation by country or region of birth exists, but it does not conform to a monolithic pattern in which earnings disparities are lower for blacks born in the Caribbean than in Africa. Third, although the Canadian second generation in the black population is very young and may not be comparable to the black population that is American born with Caribbean ancestry, country specific data for the foreign born

Table 6: Percentage Deviations of (ln) Weekly Earnings of White and Black Immigrant Population (arrived at age 0-14) Age 25-44, Working 1 or more weeks in 1999(a) from the White Foreign Born Reference Population by Sex, Detailed Nativity Status, (Census) Metropolitan Areas, United States, 1999 and Canada, 2000.

	Women		Men	
	Gross[b] (1)	Net[c] (2)	Gross[b] (3)	Net[c] (4)
USA				
White, Foreign Born, arrive age 0-14	(rg)	(rg)	(rg)	(rg)
Black, Foreign Born, arrive age 0-14[d]				
Haiti	(ns)	(ns)	-24.1	-15.6
Jamaica	(ns)	(ns)	-24.8	-15.8
Other Caribbean, S.Am.	(ns)	(ns)	-27.8	-17.4
All African Countries	(ns)	(ns)	-27.7	-19.0
All Other Areas	(ns)	(ns)	-21.5	-14.9
Canada				
White[e], Foreign Born, arrive age 0-14	(rg)	(rg)	(rg)	(rg)
Black, Foreign Born, arrive age 0-14[d]				
Haiti	(ns)	(ns)	-45.0	-28.4
Jamaica	-14.4	-17.3	-25.1	-22.9
Other Caribbean, S.Am.	(ns)	-10.5	-26.7	-23.9
All African Countries	-19.1	(ns)	-40.6	-31.7
All Other Areas	12.5	(ns)	(ns)	(ns)

(a) See text for additional description of the population under study.
(b) Unadjusted for the effects of other variables known to affect earnings.
(c) Controlling for education, potential experience, language in the home, marital status, city of residence, region of residence and period of immigration.
(d) Country of birth of respondent.
(e) In order to correspond to the US population of non-Hispanic whites, the White population includes Arab and West Asians and excludes other visible minority groups including those declaring themselves as Latin American. See text.
(rg) Reference group
(ns) Regression coefficient is not significantly different from that of the white reference population at p=0.05 level.
Source: US Bureau of Census, 2000 5% Census PUMS. Statistics Canada, 2001 Census of Population.

Table 7: Percentage Deviations of (ln) Weekly Earnings of White and Black Immigrant Population (arrived at age 15+) Age 25-44, Working 1 or more weeks in 1999(a) from the White Foreign Born Reference Population by Sex, Detailed Nativity Status, (Census) Metropolitan Areas, United States, 1999 and Canada, 2000.

	Women		Men	
	Gross[b] (1)	Net[c] (2)	Gross[b] (3)	Net[c] (4)
USA				
White, Foreign Born, arrive age 15+	(rg)	(rg)	(rg)	(rg)
Black, Foreign Born, arrive age 15+[d]				
Haiti	-19.0	-4.4	-41.2	-26.7
Jamaica	(ns)	-5.4	-30.7	-30.0
Trinidad and Tobago	(ns)	-7.8	-26.8	-28.4
Guyana	13.3	(ns)	-30.1	-32.8
Other Caribbean, S.Am.	-12.0	-10.2	-37.8	-27.1
Ghana (Africa)	(ns)	18.3	-28.1	-19.7
Ethiopia	-12.6	(ns)	-38.4	-27.6
Other East African countries	-14.7	(ns)	-36.0	-25.0
All Other African Countries	(ns)	(ns)	-28.7	-28.6
All Other Areas	19.7	10.6	-18.8	-21.4
Canada				
White[e], Foreign Born, arrive age 15+	(rg)	(rg)	(rg)	(rg)
Black, Foreign Born, arrive age 15+[d]				
Haiti	-22.5	-8.0	-42.9	-27.7
Jamaica	-10.2	-15.3	-19.5	-22.7
Trinidad and Tobago	(ns)	(ns)	(ns)	-11.9
Guyana	(ns)	(ns)	(ns)	-13.4
Other Caribbean, S.Am.	-17.0	-18.8	-20.5	-22.2
Ghana (Africa)	-18.9	(ns)	-20.2	-17.5
Ethiopia	-35.5	-25.1	-36.8	-32.1
Other East African countries	-27.5	-18.5	-36.7	-33.8
All Other African Countries	-18.3	-14.1	-22.5	-23.0
All Other Areas	13.8	(ns)	(ns)	(ns)

(a) See text for additional description of the population under study.
(b) Unadjusted for the effects of other variables known to affect earnings.
(c) Controlling for education, potential experience, language in the home, marital status, city of residence, region of residence and period of immigration.
(d) Country of birth of respondent.
(e) In order to correspond to the US population of non-Hispanic whites, the White population includes Arab and West Asians and excludes other visible minority groups including those declaring themselves as Latin American. See text.
(rg) Reference group
(ns) Regression coefficient is not significantly different from that of the white reference population at the p=0.05 level.
Source: US Bureau of Census, 2000 5% Census PUMS. Statistics Canada, 2001 Census of Population.

indicate that the black-white earnings gap tends to be higher in Canada than in the United States within the 1.5 generation. But excluding migrants from East Africa, the gap is lower in Canada for men arriving as older adolescents or adults.

This last finding presents an interpretative challenge, one that is not resolved here. The vernacular that a black-white divide is less developed in Canada implies that the earnings gap in Canada should be less than observed n the United States for most, if not all, black origin immigrant groups. Yet, this holds only for men who migrated to Canada at age 15 or later and who are not from East Africa and Haiti. Analysts seeking to explain an increased earnings gap between entering immigrants and the Canadian born suggest that the trend reflects factors such as deteriorating educational quality in the origin countries, poor language skills of immigrants, a temporal decline in the economic returns to years of schooling and a discounting of foreign labor market experience, the major recessions during the early 1990s and strong competition from increasingly well educated Canadian born (Picot, 2004). But these are factors that should apply less to the 1.5 generation where comparisons of black earnings to those of the 1.5 generation white population reveal larger disparities, particularly among men in Canada than in the United States.

Bibliography

Adams, Michael. 2003. *Fire and Ice: The United States, Canada and the Myth of Converging Values.* Toronto: Penguin Canada.

Alba, Richard and Victor Nee. 1997. Rethinking Assimilation Theory for a New Era of Immigration. *International Migration Review* 31:826-874.

Baker, Michael and Dwayne Benjamin. 1997. Ethnicity, Foreign Birth and Earnings: A Canada/US Comparison. Pp. 218-313 in Michael G. Abbott, Charles M. Beach and Richard P. Chaykowski (eds) *Transition and Structural Change in the North American labor market*. Kingston, Ontario: IRC Press, Industrial Relations Centre and John Deutsch Institute for the Study of Economic Policy, Queens University.

Bashi, Vilna and Antonio McDaniel. 1997. A theory of immigration and racial stratification. *Journal of Black Studies* 27(5): 668-82.

Batiz, Rivera; and Francisco L. 2000. Underground on American soil: undocumented workers and US immigration policy. *Journal of International Affairs* 53:485-501.

Boyd, Monica. 2005a. (forthcoming) The Earnings Attainments of Canada's Immigrant Offspring. Paper to be presented at the annual meetings of the Canadian Population Society, June 1-3, London, Ontario.

Boyd, Monica. 2005b (in progress). Generations in Transition: The Educational, Occupational and Earnings of Young Immigrants and Immigrant Offspring. Statistics Canada.

Boyd, Monica. 2003. Blurring the Line or Widening the Gap? High Skilled Refugees in Canada. *Proceedings of the 2001 Symposium of the Federation of Canadian Demographers*. Ottawa, Canada.

Boyd, Monica. 1992. Gender, Visible Minority and Immigrant Earnings Inequality: Reassessing and Employment Equity Premise. Pp. 279-321 in Vic Satzewich (ed.), *Deconstructing a Nation: Immigration, Multiculturalism and Racism in the 1990s Canada*. Toronto: Fernwood Press.

Breton, Raymond. 2003. "Social Capital and the Civic Participation of Immigrants and Members of Ethno-Cultural Groups". Paper presented at the Conference on The Opportunities and Challenges of Diversity: A Role for Social Capital? Montreal.

Butcher, Kristen F. 1994. Black Immigrants in the United-States - a Comparison with Native Blacks and Other Immigrants. *Industrial & Labor Relations Review* 47(2): 265-284.

Chui, Tina and Danielle Zietsma. 2003. Earnings of Immigrants in the 1990s. *Canadian Social Trends* No. 70, Autumn: 24-26. Statistics Canada Catalogue No. 11-008.

Clairmont, Donald H. J. and Dennis William Magill. 1999. *Africville : the life and death of a Canadian black community*. 3rd edition. Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press.

Costanzo, J., C.J. Davis, C. Irazi, D.M. Goodkind, and R.R. Ramirez. 2002. Evaluating Components of International Migration: The Residual Foreign Born. Population Division Working Paper No. 61. Washington, DC: U.S. Bureau of the Census.

Cornell, Stephen and Douglas Hartmann 2004. Conceptual Confusions and Divides: Race, Ethnicity and the Study of Immigration. *Not Just Black and White: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives on Immigration, Race, and Ethnicity in the United States.* Nancy Foner and George M. Fredrickson. New York, Russell Sage Foundation.

Daneshvary, Nasser and R. Keith Schwer .1994. Black Immigrants in the U.S. Labor Market: an Earnings Analysis. *Review of Black Political Economy* 22(3): 77-98.

Djamba, Yanki K. 1999. African immigrants in the United States: a socio-demographic profile in comparison to native blacks. *Journal of Asian and African Studies* 34(2): 210-304.

Dodoo, F. Nii-Amoo. 1997. Assimilation Differences among Africans in America. *Social Forces* 76(2): 527-46.

Dodoo, F. Nii-Amoo. and Baffour K. Takyi. 2002. Africans in the Diaspora: black-white earnings differences among America's Africans. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 25(6): 913-941.

Edmonton Journal (no author). 2001. Growing illegal immigrant numbers beg tough question: What should we do with 200,000 souls in the twilight zone? *Edmonton Journal* Pp. B.13 May 27.

Edmonton Journal (no author). 2004. Proposal would grant amnesty to illegal immigrants. *Edmonton Journal* Pp. A.11 Sep 12.

Fleras, Augie and Jean Leonard Elliott. 2003. *Unequal Relations: An Introduction to Race and Ethnic Dynamics in Canada*. Toronto: Prentice Hall.

Foner, Nancy (ed.). 2001. *Islands in the City: West Indian Migration to New York.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Gans, Herbert J. 1992. Second-Generation Decline: Scenarios for the Economic and Ethnic Futures of the Post- 1965 American Immigrants. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 15:173-192.

Giles, Dave E. A. 1982. The Interpretation of Dummy Variables in Semi-Logarithmic Equations: Unbiased Estimation. *Economics letters* 10(2): 77-79.

Green, Alison; and Jack Martin. 2004. Uncontrolled Immigration and the U.S. Health Care System. *Journal of Social, Political and Economic Studies* 29:225-41.

Halvorsen, Robert and Raymond Palmquist. 1980. The Interpretation of Dummy Variables in Semilogarithmic Equations. *American Economic Review* 70 (3): 474-475.

Henry, Frances and Effie Ginzberg. 1985. *Who Gets the Work?: A test of racial discrimination in employment.* Toronto: Urban Alliance on Race Relations and the Social Planning Council of Metropolitan Toronto.

Henry, Frances. 1989. "Who gets the work in 1989?". Background Paper. Ottawa: Economic Council of Canada.

Heron, Melanie P. 2001. *The Occupational Attainment of Caribbean Immigrants in the United States, Canada and England*. New York: LFB Scholarly Publishing LLC.

Hodson, Randy. 1985. Some Considerations Concerning the Functional Form of Earnings. *Social Science Research* 14 (4):374-394.

Hum, Derek and Wayne Simpson. 1999. Wage Opportunities for visible Minorities in Canada. *Canadian Public Policy* 25 (3): 379-394.

James, Franklin J., Jeff Romine, and Phyllis Resnick Terry. 2002. Big City Labor Markets and Immigrant Economic Performance. *Policy Studies Journal* 30(1): 107-131.

Kalmjin, Matthijs. 1996. The Socioeconomic Assimilation of Caribbean American Blacks. *Social Forces* 74(3): 911-930.

Kasinitz, Philip, Juan Battle, and Ines Miyares. 2001. Fade to Black: The children of West Indian immigration in Southern Florida. Pp. 267-300 in Ruben C. Rumbaut and Alejandro Portes (eds) *Ethnicities: Children of Immigrants in America.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Kennedy, Peter E. 1981 Estimation with Correctly Interpreted Dummy Variables in Semilogarithmic Equations. *American Economic Review* 71 (4): 801.

Kollehlon, Konia T. and Edward E. Eule. 2003. The Socioeconomic Attainment Patterns of Africans in the United States. *International Migration Review* 37(4): 1163-1190.

Kymlicka, Will. 1995. *Multicultural Citizenship.* New York: Oxford University Press Inc.

Lawton, Valerie and Allan Thompson,. 2001. Still in Canada? No one knows ; But most illegal immigrants don't pose security risk. *Toronto Star* Pp. A.01 Oct 7.

Lipset, Seymour Martin. 1990. *Continental divide : the values and institutions of the United States and Canada*. New York: Routledge.

Mackenzie, Ian. 1988. Early Movements of Domestics from the Caribbean and Canadian Immigration Policy. A Research Note. *Alternate Routes. A Journal of Critical Research* 8: 124-143.

Mensah, Joseph. 2002. *Black Canadians: History, experiences, social conditions*. Halifax: Fernwood Press.

Milan, Anne and Kelly Tran. 2004. Blacks in Canada: A long history. *Canadian Social Trends* No. 71, Spring: 2-5. Statistics Canada Catalogue No. 11-008.

Mincer, Jacob. 1974. *Schooling, Experience and Earnings*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Model, Susan, Gene Fisher and Roxanne Silberman. 1999. Black Caribbeans in Comparative Perspective. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 25(2): 187-212.

Myles, Robert. 1989. *Racism*. London: Routledge.

National Post (Editorial). 2003. No amnesty for illegal immigrants. *National Post* Pp. A.21 Nov 13.

Penakur, Krishna and Ravi Pendakur. 1998. The colour of money: earnings differentials among ethnic groups in Canada. *Canadian Journal of Economics* 31 (3): 518-548.

Picot, Garnett. 2004. The Deteriorating Economic Welfare of Immigrants and Possible Causes. Analytical Studies Branch research paper series. Catalogue no 11F0019MIE – No. 222. Ottawa: Statistics Canada

Porter, E. 2001. Illegal Immigrants May Total 8.5 Million. *Wall Street Journal*, August 14, p. A4.

Reitz, Jeffrey G. 1988. Less racial discrimination in Canada, or simply less racial conflict?: Implications of comparisons with Britain. *Canadian Public Policy.* 14(4): 424-441.

Reitz, Jeffrey G. 1998. *Warmth of Welcome*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Reitz, Jeffrey G. 2001. Immigrant Success in the Knowledge Economy: Institutional Change and the Immigrant Experience in Canada, 1970-1995. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57(3) 579-613.

Reitz, Jeffrey G. and Raymond Breton. 1994. *The Illusion of Difference: Realities of Ethnicity in Canada and the United States.* Toronto: CD Howe Institute.

Sowell, Thomas. 1978. Three Black Histories. Pp. 7-64 in Thomas Sowell (ed.) with the assistance of Lynn D. Collins *Essays and Data on American Ethnic Groups*. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute.

Sakamoto, Arthur, Huei-Hsia Wu and Jessie M. Tzeng. 2000. The Declining Significance of Race Among American Men During the Latter Half of the Twentieth Century. *Demography* 37(1):41-51.

Stepick, Alex, Carol Dutton Stepick, Emmanuel Eugene, Deborah Teed and Yves Labissiere. 2001. Shifting Identities and Intergenerational Conflict: Growing up Haitian in Miami. Pp. 229-266 in Ruben C. Rumbaut and Alejandro Portes (eds) *Ethnicities: Children of Immigrants in America.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Swidinsky, Robert and Michael Swidinsky. 2002. The relative earnings of visible minorities in Canada. *Industrial Relations.* 57(4): 630-659.

Tabutin, Dominique and Bruno Schoumaker. 2004. The Demography of Sub-Saharan Africa from the 1950s to the 2000s. *Population-E* 59(3-4):457-556

Teotonio, Isabel. 2001. Illegal immigrants are 'always on the run'. *Toronto Star* Pp. A.06 Dec 16.

United States Department of Commerce and Labor. 1909. *Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1908.* Washington D. C.: Government Printing Office.

Walker, James W. St.G. 1980. *A History of Blacks in Canada: A Study Guide for Teachers and Students.* Hull, Que.: Canadian Government Publishing Center.

Wanner, Richard A. 2003. Entry class and the earnings attainment of immigrants to Canada, 1980-1995. *Canadian Public Policy* 29 (1): 53-71.

Waters, Mary C. 1994. Ethnic and Racial Identities of 2nd-Generation Black Immigrants in New-York-City. *International Migration Review* 28(4): 795-820.

Waters, Mary C. 1999. *Black Identities: West Indian immigrant dreams and American realities.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press and Russell Sage Foundation.

Zephir, Flore. 2001. *Trends in Ethnic Identification among Second-Generation Haitian Immigrants to New York City.* Westport, CT: Bergin and Garvey.

Appendix A: Logged (ln) weekly earnings for Whites and Blacks who worked 1 or more weeks in 1999, by nativity, age at immigration (for foreign born who arrived in US before 1999), with White non-Hispanic native born as a reference group, age 25-44, United States, 2000.

	Women				Men			
	Model 1 (1)		Model 2 (2)		Model 1 (3)		Model 2 (4)	
	B	Std. Error	B	Std. Error	B	Std. Error	B	Std. Error
Constant	6.169	0.001	4.881	0.009	6.641	0.001	4.947	0.008
Group								
White, non-Hispanic Native Born	(rg)		(rg)		(rg)		(rg)	
White, non-Hispanic Foreign Born, arrive age 0-14	0.078	0.009	0.055	0.010	0.074	0.008	0.052	0.008
White, non-Hispanic Foreign Born, arrive age 15+	-0.008	0.006	0.039	0.015	0.064	0.004	0.006	0.013
Black, Native Born	-0.092	0.002	-0.032	0.002	-0.370	0.002	-0.223	0.002
Black, Foreign Born, arrive age 0-14	0.092	0.013	0.017	0.014	-0.225	0.013	-0.158	0.014
Black, Foreign Born, arrive age 15+	-0.061	0.007	0.043	0.016	-0.341	0.006	-0.275	0.013
Years of Schooling			0.086	0.001			0.077	0.000
% with University Education			0.214	0.003			0.226	0.002
Yrs of Potential Experience			0.024	0.001			0.055	0.001
Yrs of Potential Experience, Sq'd/100			-0.042	0.002			-0.114	0.002
% of speaking language other than Eng at home			-0.030	0.004			-0.066	0.003
% Currently married			-0.091	0.002			0.261	0.001
Metropolitan Area								
Boston			-0.116	0.007			-0.044	0.006
New York, N.E. New Jersey			(rg)				(rg)	
Nassau Co,NY			-0.110	0.008			0.043	0.007
Newark,NJ			-0.059	0.009			0.055	0.008
Washington DC			0.003	0.007			0.037	0.006
Miami-Hialeah, FL			-0.129	0.012			-0.109	0.011
Ft. Lauderdale-Hollywd-Pmonao B			-0.097	0.010			-0.065	0.009
Atlanta			-0.104	0.007			-0.008	0.006
Chicago-Gary-Lake,Ill			-0.099	0.006			0.005	0.006
Los Angeles-Long Beach			-0.111	0.007			-0.074	0.006
All other SMSAs			-0.241	0.005			-0.165	0.004
Region of Residence								
North & NorthEast			(rg)				(rg)	
E&W North Central			-0.030	0.003			-0.026	0.002
South Atlantic			-0.023	0.003			-0.075	0.003
E &W South Central			-0.025	0.003			-0.050	0.003
Mountain & Pacific			0.044	0.003			0.022	0.002
Period of Immigration								
Native born or immigrated before 1975			(rg)				(rg)	
1975-79			0.014	0.015			0.022	0.013
1980-84			-0.032	0.015			0.021	0.013
1985-89			-0.081	0.016			-0.007	0.014
1990-94			-0.145	0.017			-0.043	0.014
1995-98			-0.210	0.017			-0.106	0.014
Adjusted R Sq'd	0.002		0.132		0.029		0.224	

(rg) Reference group

Source: US Bureau of Census, 2000 5% Census PUMS.

Appendix B: Logged(ln) weekly earnings for Whites and Blacks who worked 1 or more weeks in 2000, by Nativity, Age at Immigration (for foreign born who arrived in Canada before 2000), with White Canadian-born 3rd-Plus Generation as a reference group, age 25-44, Canada, 2001.

	Women				Men			
	Model 1 (1)		Model 2 (2)		Model 1 (3)		Model 2 (4)	
	B	Std. Error	B	Std. Error	B	Std. Error	B	Std. Error
Constant	6.238	0.002	4.633	0.017	6.590	0.001	5.056	0.014
Group								
White[(a)], 3rd Plus Generation	(rg)		(rg)		(rg)		(rg)	
White[(a)], Second Generation	0.080	0.004	0.001	0.004	0.049	0.003	-0.015	0.003
White[(a)], FB, arrived age 0-14	0.053	0.007	0.005	0.008	0.058	0.007	-0.014	0.007
White[(a)], FB, arrived age 15+	-0.124	0.006	-0.020	0.016	-0.092	0.005	-0.083	0.015
Black, 3rd Plus Generation	-0.198	0.032	-0.145	0.031	-0.206	0.032	-0.165	0.030
Black, Second Generation	-0.101	0.021	-0.147	0.021	-0.380	0.020	-0.251	0.019
Black, FB, arrived age 0-14	-0.040	0.017	-0.126	0.018	-0.254	0.017	-0.269	0.018
Black, FB, arrived age 15+	-0.296	0.011	-0.149	0.018	-0.385	0.011	-0.353	0.017
Years of Schooling			0.079	0.001			0.060	0.001
% with University Education			0.189	0.006			0.216	0.005
Yrs of Potential Experience			0.049	0.001			0.055	0.001
Yrs of Potential Experience, Sq'd/100			-0.115	0.002			-0.109	0.002
% of speaking language other than Eng at home			-0.141	0.008			-0.189	0.007
% Currently married			0.016	0.003			0.254	0.003
Census Metropolitan Area								
Montreal			0.088	0.006			0.092	0.005
Toronto			0.186	0.004			0.090	0.004
Vancouver			0.173	0.011			0.135	0.010
All other CMA			(rg)				(rg)	
Region of Residence								
Atlantic Prov			-0.148	0.008			-0.214	0.007
Quebec			-0.089	0.006			-0.227	0.005
Ontario			(rg)				(rg)	
Manitoba & Sask			-0.096	0.007			-0.147	0.006
Alberta			-0.014	0.005			0.019	0.005
BC			-0.083	0.010			-0.140	0.009
Period of Immigration								
Canadian born and immigrated before 1975			(rg)				(rg)	
1975-79			-0.011	0.014			0.022	0.013
1980-84			-0.069	0.016			-0.027	0.015
1985-89			-0.105	0.017			-0.040	0.016
1990-94			-0.176	0.018			-0.088	0.017
1995-99			-0.290	0.018			-0.174	0.017
Adjusted R Sq'd	0.005		0.091		0.006		0.123	

(a) In order to correspond to the US population of non-Hispanic whites, the white population includes Arab and West Asians and excludes other visible minority groups including those declaring themselves as Latin American. See text.

(rg) Reference group

Source: Statistics Canada: 2001 Canadian Census of Population

Appendix C: Logged (ln) weekly earnings for Whites and Blacks who worked 1 or more weeks in 1999, by Sex,Ancestry or Birthplace, Age at immigration (for foreign born who arrived in US before 1999), with White non-Hispanic native born as a reference group, age 25-44, United States, 2000.

	Women				Men			
	Model 1 (1)		Model 2 (2)		Model 1 (3)		Model 2 (4)	
	B	Std. Error	B	Std. Error	B	Std. Error	B	Std. Error
Constant	6.169	0.001	4.619	0.008	6.641	0.001	4.705	0.007
Groups								
White, non-Hispanic Native Born	(rg)		(rg)		(rg)		(rg)	
White, non-Hispanic Foreign Born, arrive age 0-14	0.078	0.009	0.055	0.010	0.074	0.008	0.051	0.008
White, non-Hispanic Foreign Born, arrive age 15+	-0.008	0.006	0.041	0.015	0.064	0.004	0.003	0.013
Black, Native Born								
Jamaican Ancestry	0.121	0.031	-0.005	0.029	-0.252	0.030	-0.163	0.027
Other Caribbean, S.Am. Ancestry[a]	0.072	0.020	0.000	0.018	-0.314	0.020	-0.190	0.018
All Other	-0.095	0.002	-0.033	0.002	-0.371	0.002	-0.224	0.002
Black, Foreign Born, arrive age 0-14[b]								
Haiti	0.110	0.033	0.052	0.032	-0.203	0.035	-0.143	0.032
Jamaica	0.122	0.022	0.027	0.022	-0.212	0.024	-0.162	0.023
Other Caribbean,S.Am.	0.070	0.020	-0.001	0.020	-0.252	0.022	-0.171	0.021
All African Countries	-0.004	0.046	-0.026	0.044	-0.251	0.043	-0.151	0.039
All Other Areas	0.127	0.043	0.031	0.040	-0.169	0.043	-0.129	0.039
Black, Foreign Born, arrive age 15+[b]								
Haiti	-0.218	0.017	-0.007	0.022	-0.466	0.016	-0.304	0.019
Jamaica	0.013	0.014	0.070	0.019	-0.302	0.015	-0.238	0.018
Trinidad & Tobago	0.022	0.027	0.030	0.029	-0.248	0.029	-0.236	0.029
Guyana	0.117	0.034	0.112	0.035	-0.294	0.036	-0.312	0.034
Other Caribbean, S. Am.	-0.135	0.017	-0.019	0.021	-0.410	0.015	-0.240	0.018
Ghana (Africa)	-0.006	0.037	0.174	0.038	-0.265	0.029	-0.230	0.029
Ethiopia	-0.142	0.036	0.070	0.036	-0.420	0.030	-0.303	0.029
Other East Africa	-0.166	0.035	0.043	0.036	-0.382	0.028	-0.245	0.028
All Other African Countries	-0.017	0.017	0.055	0.022	-0.274	0.013	-0.345	0.017
All Other Areas	0.172	0.038	0.189	0.038	-0.144	0.039	-0.158	0.037
Years of Schooling			0.086	0.001			0.077	0.000
% with University Education			0.214	0.003			0.226	0.002
Yrs of Potential Experience			0.024	0.001			0.055	0.001
Yrs of Potential Experience, Sq'd/100			-0.042	0.002			-0.114	0.002
% of speaking language other than Eng at home			-0.030	0.004			-0.063	0.003
% Currently married			-0.091	0.002			0.261	0.001
Metropolitan Area								
Boston			0.126	0.006			0.121	0.005
Nassau Co,NY			0.242	0.005			0.164	0.004
Newark,NJ			0.131	0.007			0.208	0.006
Washington DC			0.182	0.008			0.220	0.007
Miami-Hialeah, FL			0.243	0.005			0.203	0.005
Ft. Lauderdale-Hollywd-Pomonao B			0.116	0.012			0.055	0.010
Atlanta			0.144	0.009			0.098	0.008
Chicago-Gary-Lake,Ill			0.136	0.005			0.157	0.005
Los Angeles-Long Beach			0.142	0.004			0.170	0.004
All other SMSAs			0.130	0.006			0.092	0.005
New York			(rg)				(rg)	
Region of Residence								
E&W North Central			0.023	0.003			0.075	0.003
South Atlantic			-0.007	0.003			0.049	0.002
E &W South Central			-0.002	0.003			0.025	0.003
Mountain & Pacific			0.067	0.003			0.097	0.002
North & NorthEast			(rg)				(rg)	
Period of Immigration								
Native born or immigrated before 1975			(rg)				(rg)	
1975-79			0.014	0.015			0.022	0.013
1980-84			-0.032	0.015			0.023	0.013
1985-89			-0.083	0.016			-0.007	0.014
1990-94			-0.148	0.017			-0.041	0.014
1995-98			-0.215	0.017			-0.103	0.014
Adjusted R Sq'd	0.002		0.132		0.029		0.224	

(a) First and second responses to the census question "What is this persons's ancestry or ethnic origin?". Analysis excludes "Puerto Rican" responses.
(b) Country of birth of respondent.
(rg) Reference group
Source: US Bureau of Census, 2000 5% Census PUMS.

Appendix D: Logged(ln) weekly earnings for Whites and Blacks who worked 1 or more weeks in 2000, by Sex, Birthplace and Generational Status (for for foreign born who arrived in Canada before 2000), with White Canadian-born 3rd-Plus Generation as a reference group, age 25-44, Canada, 2001.

	Women				Men			
	Model 1 (1)		Model 2 (2)		Model 1 (3)		Model 2 (4)	
	B	Std. Error	B	Std. Error	B	Std. Error	B	Std. Error
Constant	6.238	0.002	4.632	0.017	6.590	0.002	5.055	0.014
Group								
White[a], 3rd Plus Generation	(rg)		(rg)		(rg)		(rg)	
White[a], Second Generation	0.080	0.004	0.000	0.004	0.049	0.003	-0.015	0.003
White[a], FB, arrived age 0-14	0.053	0.007	0.004	0.008	0.058	0.007	-0.015	0.007
White[a], FB, arrived age 15+	-0.124	0.006	-0.023	0.016	-0.092	0.005	-0.093	0.015
Black, 3rd Plus Generation	-0.198	0.032	-0.145	0.031	-0.206	0.032	-0.165	0.030
Black, Second Generation[b]								
Jamaica	-0.094	0.033	-0.148	0.032	-0.367	0.032	-0.248	0.030
Other Caribbean,S.Am.	-0.079	0.032	-0.128	0.030	-0.411	0.030	-0.251	0.028
All Other	-0.191	0.056	-0.211	0.054	-0.315	0.053	-0.251	0.050
Black, Foreign Born, arrive age 0-14[c]								
Haiti	-0.047	0.050	0.040	0.049	-0.540	0.051	-0.350	0.049
Jamaica	-0.103	0.025	-0.207	0.026	-0.231	0.027	-0.276	0.026
Other Caribbean,S.Am.	-0.004	0.036	-0.129	0.035	-0.252	0.034	-0.290	0.033
All African Countries	-0.159	0.076	-0.134	0.073	-0.463	0.065	-0.395	0.061
All Other Areas	0.171	0.048	0.000	0.046	-0.008	0.044	-0.103	0.042
Black, Foreign Born, arrive age 15+[c]								
Haiti	-0.378	0.027	-0.046	0.030	-0.652	0.030	-0.463	0.031
Jamaica	-0.231	0.019	-0.189	0.023	-0.309	0.021	-0.323	0.024
Trinidad & Tobago	-0.088	0.044	-0.045	0.045	-0.135	0.045	-0.209	0.044
Guyana	-0.140	0.052	-0.110	0.052	-0.162	0.053	-0.220	0.052
Other Caribbean, S. Am.	-0.311	0.031	-0.224	0.033	-0.322	0.037	-0.325	0.037
Ghana (Africa)	-0.334	0.043	-0.087	0.044	-0.318	0.041	-0.321	0.041
Ethiopia	-0.562	0.044	-0.283	0.045	-0.552	0.035	-0.463	0.036
Other East African Countries	-0.445	0.033	-0.206	0.036	-0.550	0.030	-0.476	0.032
All Other African Countries	-0.326	0.039	-0.151	0.041	-0.347	0.028	-0.367	0.030
All Other Areas	0.005	0.056	-0.027	0.056	-0.079	0.053	-0.143	0.052
Years of Schooling			0.079	0.001			0.061	0.001
% with University Education			0.188	0.006			0.216	0.005
Yrs of Potential Experience			0.049	0.001			0.055	0.001
Yrs of Potential Experience, Sq'd/100			-0.115	0.002			-0.109	0.002
% of speaking language other than Eng at home			-0.142	0.008			-0.181	0.007
% Currently married			0.016	0.003			0.254	0.003
Census Metropolitan Area								
Montreal			0.086	0.006			0.093	0.005
Toronto			0.188	0.004			0.088	0.004
Vancouver			0.173	0.011			0.135	0.010
All other CMA			(rg)				(rg)	
Region of Residence								
Atlantic Prov			-0.149	0.008			-0.214	0.007
Quebec			-0.089	0.006			-0.226	0.005
Ontario			(rg)				(rg)	
Manitoba & Sask			-0.095	0.007			-0.147	0.006
Alberta			-0.014	0.005			0.019	0.005
BC			-0.084	0.010			-0.140	0.009
Period of Immigration								
Canadian born and immigrated before 1975			(rg)				(rg)	
1975-79			-0.008	0.014			0.024	0.013
1980-84			-0.069	0.017			-0.021	0.015
1985-89			-0.102	0.018			-0.033	0.016
1990-94			-0.173	0.018			-0.081	0.017
1995-99			-0.286	0.018			-0.168	0.017
Adujusted R Sq'd	0.006		0.091		0.007		0.123	

(a) In order to correspond to the US population of non-Hispanic whites, the White population includes Arab and West Asians and excludes other visible minority groups including those declaring themselves as Latin American. See text.
(b) Designated country/region of birth for father and/or mother
(c) Country of birth of respondent.
(rg) Reference group
Source: Statistics Canada: 2001 Canadian Census of Population.