

Discussion Paper Series

IZA DP No. 19008

October 2026

Immigrant Earnings and Labour-Market Positioning in a Transforming Digital Labour Market: Evidence from Canada, 1971–2021

Husame Doganay

University of Alberta

Saba Ranjbar

University of Alberta

Tony Fang

Memorial University of Newfoundland
and IZA@LISER

Arthur Sweetman

McMaster University
and IZA@LISER

Xingfei Liu

University of Alberta
and IZA@LISER

The IZA Discussion Paper Series (ISSN: 2365-9793) ("Series") is the primary platform for disseminating research produced within the framework of the IZA@LISER Network, an unincorporated international network of labour economists coordinated by the Luxembourg Institute of Socio-Economic Research (LISER). The Series is operated by LISER, a Luxembourg public establishment (établissement public) registered with the Luxembourg Business Registers under number J57, with its registered office at 11, Porte des Sciences, 4366 Esch-sur-Alzette, Grand Duchy of Luxembourg.

Any opinions expressed in this Series are solely those of the author(s). LISER accepts no responsibility or liability for the content of the contributions published herein. LISER adheres to the European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity. Contributions published in this Series present preliminary work intended to foster academic debate. They may be revised, are not definitive, and should be cited accordingly. Copyright remains with the author(s) unless otherwise indicated.

Immigrant Earnings and Labour-Market Positioning in a Transforming Digital Labour Market: Evidence from Canada, 1971–2021*

Abstract

Purpose: This paper examines immigrant earnings trajectories and labour-market positioning across industries and employment arrangements in six Canadian provinces, and how industry patterns relate to digital intensity, telework feasibility, and productivity-relevant allocation. *Design / Methodology / Approach:* Canadian Census microdata, 1971–2021, compare immigrant and native-born earnings across ten arrival cohorts by gender and age at arrival. For two recent cohorts, an earnings-based positioning measure combines industry mean annual earnings with full-time or part-time status; multinomial-logit average marginal effects are estimated. The study also maps 2021 industry employment shares to external digital-intensity and telework-feasibility classifications. Individual productivity, artificial-intelligence (AI) adoption, ICT use, and remote-work uptake are not observed. *Findings:* Entry earnings gaps and incomplete cohort convergence persist, especially among women and recent cohorts. Across the two positioning cohorts, immigrants are less likely than comparable native-born workers to hold full-time jobs in higher-earnings industries; gaps vary by source region and do not uniformly narrow. Education is associated with better positioning but does not eliminate gaps. Immigrant employment is more concentrated in many digitally intensive categories but less concentrated in several higher-earnings, high-telework-feasibility industries; digital intensity is not systematically related to immigrant employment shares. *Originality / Value:* The paper combines five decades of earnings evidence across ten cohorts with a two-cohort positioning measure and descriptive digital and telework mapping. It complements individual-level careers research by identifying structural differences in opportunity access with possible, unmeasured productivity implications.

JEL classification

J15, J24, J31

Keywords

immigrant earnings assimilation, labour-market allocation, industry positioning, remote work and digital intensity, labour-market inequality

Corresponding author

Saba Ranjbar

sranjba1@ualberta.ca

* This project is part of the funded project “The earnings growth of immigrants: the gender differences for the past 50 years and the role of behavioural influences on human capital investment”, which is under the larger federally funded research program “Migrant Integration in the Mid-21st Century: Bridging Divides” (funded by the Government of Canada through the Canada First Research Excellence Fund (CFREF), Toronto Metropolitan University).

1 Introduction

Research on immigrant labour-market integration has traditionally focused on earnings assimilation: the extent to which immigrants’ earnings converge toward those of native-born workers over time. A large literature documents that immigrants in Canada typically enter the labour market with substantial earnings disadvantages and experience varying degrees of convergence following arrival. However, convergence is often incomplete, and outcomes differ considerably across cohorts, gender groups, educational backgrounds, and regions of origin.

Although average earnings comparisons are informative, they may conceal substantial heterogeneity in labour-market trajectories. Earnings trajectories capture how workers’ skills are rewarded over time, while labour-market positioning reflects differential representation in industries with different earnings structures and to full-time versus part-time employment.

These issues have become increasingly important amid structural changes in the Canadian labour market. Technological change, digitalization, and the expansion of knowledge-intensive industries have altered employment opportunities across sectors (Acemoglu and Autor 2011; Autor 2014; Baruch 2004). Recent Canadian evidence also documents substantial differences across industries in remote-work feasibility and ICT¹ intensity (Deng et al. 2020; Mehdi and Morissette 2021; Liu and McDonald-Guimond 2021; Calvino et al. 2018; Fang et al. 2025; Fang et al. 2026).

These measures describe industry-level digital intensity and telework feasibility, not worker- or employer-level artificial-intelligence (AI) adoption. The paper therefore speaks about remote work, digitalization, and productivity-relevant labour-market allocation rather than by estimating the effects of AI.

Using repeated cross-sectional Census microdata, this paper examines immigrant–native earnings differences from 1971 to 2021 across ten arrival cohorts and gender groups. For the 1997–2000 and 2006–2011 cohorts, it additionally examines labour-market positioning at the cohort-entry census and approximately ten years later by combining industry mean annual earnings with full-time versus part-time employment status. The distribution of workers across industries is relevant to productivity debates because aggregate output may be affected when barriers prevent workers from entering sectors in which their skills would receive higher returns (Hsieh et al. 2019). Because the Census does not observe individual productivity, productivity

¹ICT stands for Information and Communications Technology.

implications are not directly tested.

The paper makes three main contributions. First, it traces immigrant earnings trajectories across ten arrival cohorts and five decades, providing a longer-term perspective than is common in this literature. Second, for the 1997–2000 and 2006–2011 cohorts, it develops a measure of labour-market positioning that combines industry earnings levels with full-time versus part-time employment. This measure places immigrant workers within the broader earnings structure of the economy and captures a dimension of labour-market inequality that is not visible from average earnings comparisons alone. For example, immigrants in the 2006–2011 cohort are between 9 and 14 percentage points less likely than comparable native-born workers to hold full-time positions in higher-paying industries at arrival, and four of the five source-region groups remain between 3 and 6 percentage points less likely to do so approximately ten years later. Third, the paper maps 2021 immigrant and native-born employment shares onto external industry-level measures of telework feasibility and digital intensity. This descriptive mapping shows that digital intensity has no systematic association with immigrant employment shares, while immigrants are less concentrated in two higher-earnings public-sector industries with comparatively high telework feasibility. Because individual AI adoption and remote-work participation are not observed, the mapping identifies differences in exposure rather than technological effects.

Section 2 reviews the literature and sets out the framework. Section 3 describes the data and estimation strategy, Section 4 presents the results, and Sections 5 and 6 discuss and conclude.

2 Background

2.1 The Related Literature

A large Canadian literature documents substantial entry earnings disadvantages and incomplete convergence among immigrants, consistent with theories of earnings assimilation developed by Chiswick [1978](#); Borjas [1985](#); Borjas [2015](#). More recent cohorts generally face larger initial gaps and slower subsequent convergence than earlier ones (Picot and Sweetman [2005](#); Aydemir and Skuterud [2005](#); Frenette and Morissette [2003](#); Green and Worswick [2010](#); Schaafsma and Sweetman [2001](#)), and outcomes vary substantially by gender, source region, and age at arrival (Crossman et al. [2021](#); Warman et al. [2015](#)). Education transferability, credential recognition, language ability, and years in Canada all shape these outcomes (Reitz [2001](#)).

A persistent theme in this literature is the underutilization of immigrant human capital. Highly educated immigrants are frequently employed below their qualification levels because of credential recognition, occupational licensing, employer screening, and imperfect transferability of foreign-acquired skills (Reitz 2001; Reitz 2005), and such mismatches shape longer-run earnings trajectories and employment positioning (Verbruggen et al. 2015). Immigrants are also unevenly distributed across sectors and employment arrangements, concentrating in segments of the labour market that differ in earnings potential, employment stability, and advancement opportunity; research on stratification finds them disproportionately represented in lower-paying occupations and at higher risk of low income (Green and Green 1999; Hou and Picot 2003), with access further shaped by language proficiency (Pendakur and Pendakur 2002).

A related literature asks whether immigrants’ skills match the occupations they hold rather than whether they reach higher-paying sectors; Canadian evidence indicates that a large share of STEM-educated immigrants work outside STEM occupations (Blit et al. 2020; Picot and Hou 2020)². The present analysis asks a more aggregate question. Occupational matching concerns whether an individual’s skills are used in the job they hold; industry positioning concerns whether immigrants as a group reach the higher-paying, full-time segments of the labour market at all. The two point to different mechanisms and different remedies — mismatch to credential recognition and licensing, unequal positioning to sectoral hiring practices, access to unionized employment, and employment-equity processes — so the second cannot be inferred from the first.

Industry positioning matters because industries differ substantially in earnings levels, as documented in Table A.1, and in employment arrangements, institutional structure, and exposure to structural change. Public administration and educational services are concentrated in the public sector, where collective bargaining coverage reached 76.7 percent in 2023 against 15.5 percent in the private sector (Statistics Canada 2024), and where entry to many occupations depends on formal credential recognition and licensing — barriers previous research identifies for immigrants entering regulated occupations in Canada (Reitz 2001; Reitz 2005). The Census contains no information on union status, hiring procedures, or occupational entry requirements, so these are possible explanations for the patterns in Section 4.4, not findings.

²Blit et al. 2020 report that about one-third of STEM-educated immigrants in Canada work in STEM occupations against about two-fifths of the native-born; Picot and Hou 2020, using later data and a different classification, find a smaller difference. The estimates are not directly comparable but point the same way.

Industries also differ in remote-work feasibility, ICT intensity, and digitally mediated work organization (Fang et al. 2025; Fang et al. 2026), and those with higher average earnings and greater knowledge intensity tend to rank higher on digital intensity (Calvino et al. 2018; Liu and McDonald-Guimond 2021). Deng et al. 2020 estimate that telework feasibility ranges from 5.6 percent in accommodation and food services to 85.3 percent in finance and insurance, against a national average of 38.9 percent, and observed working-from-home rates during the pandemic closely tracked this capacity (Mehdi and Morissette 2021).

2.2 Labour-Market Positioning: A Labour-Economics Perspective

The analysis adopts a labour-economics perspective on how immigrants and native-born workers are distributed across industries and employment arrangements. Positioning captures access to differently rewarded segments of the labour market, complementing analyses based only on individual earnings trajectories.

Industry mean annual earnings are used to classify industries, but they should not be interpreted as direct measures of worker or industry productivity. Annual earnings also reflect working hours, employment continuity, workforce composition, collective bargaining, and other institutional characteristics. The positioning measure therefore identifies industries in which labour receives higher average annual rewards; it does not establish whether workers are allocated efficiently or whether a different allocation would increase aggregate output.

A Roy-style sorting framework provides useful interpretive context (Roy 1951; Borjas 1987). Workers may enter industries in which their skills receive comparatively higher returns, but observed sorting may also reflect labour-market barriers. Previous research identifies foreign-credential recognition, occupational licensing, employer screening, and limited access to professional networks as potential barriers affecting immigrants' employment opportunities (Reitz 2001; Reitz 2005; Green and Green 1999; Pendakur and Pendakur 2002; Hou and Picot 2003). The present data cannot distinguish these mechanisms from preferences, comparative advantage, or other unobserved differences because workers' skills, preferences, and potential earnings in alternative industries are not observed.

Accordingly, the empirical analysis addresses two descriptive questions. First, conditional on observed characteristics, are immigrants less likely than native-born workers to be employed

full-time in higher-earnings industries? Second, do these differences narrow between the cohort-entry and follow-up censuses?

This perspective complements psychological and organizational approaches to career development, which emphasize individual agency and organizational context (Baruch 2022; De Vos et al. 2020; Guan et al. 2019; Verbruggen et al. 2015). The labour-economics lens instead highlights the market-level opportunity structures within which careers develop, including access to industries with different earnings structures, employment arrangements, digital intensity, and telework feasibility.

3 Method

3.1 Data and sample

This study uses repeated cross-sectional microdata from the Canadian Census Public Use Microdata Files (PUMFs) spanning 1971–2021. The files provide anonymized information on demographic characteristics, labour-market activity, industry, and income. Although some variables are grouped or top-coded for confidentiality, the data support an analysis of cohort earnings trajectories from 1971 to 2021 and comparable positioning analyses for the 1997–2000 and 2006–2011 cohorts at entry and follow-up.

Native-born Canadians are defined as individuals born in Canada, while immigrants are identified using indicators for landed immigrants and permanent residents.³ The analysis is restricted to wage-earning employees with positive annual earnings residing in Alberta, British Columbia, Manitoba, Ontario, Quebec, and Saskatchewan. Self-employed individuals and those reporting zero earnings are excluded to maintain comparability across standard employment relationships.

Immigrant cohorts are defined using the census immediately following arrival in Canada, with each cohort including immigrants who arrived during the years since the preceding census. Because the arrival-period categories available in the Public Use Microdata Files do not always align exactly with the five-year census intervals, the resulting cohort windows range from four to six years, as reported in Table 1. No cohort is defined for immigrants arriving between 1971

³For the 1971, 1981, and 1986 censuses, the data do not distinguish between permanent and temporary immigrants. Consequently, the immigrant category in these years includes all foreign-born individuals. Beginning in 1991, immigrants can be identified explicitly as landed immigrants/permanent residents.

and 1975 because a Public Use Microdata File is not available for the 1976 Census. Immigrants are restricted to those aged 25–44 at cohort entry, while the native-born comparison samples are constructed using the corresponding age ranges in each census wave. Since cohort members are first observed in the census following their arrival, they may already have been in Canada for up to five years at the time of entry and for approximately ten to fifteen years by the follow-up census. Accordingly, references below to outcomes ten years after arrival should be interpreted as outcomes observed in the census conducted ten years after the entry census.

The Census reports annual employment income for the calendar year preceding enumeration. All earnings are converted to constant 2021 dollars using the Consumer Price Index (CPI). To reduce the influence of extreme values and potential measurement error, the top 1 percent of earnings observations are trimmed in each census year.

Because the Census provides repeated cross-sectional rather than longitudinal data, individuals cannot be followed directly over time. Earnings trajectories are therefore approximated by comparing the same arrival cohorts across census waves. Accordingly, changes observed across census waves represent cohort-level changes and should not be interpreted as within-person career transitions.

3.2 Measures: defining relative labour-market positioning

Let $\bar{w}_{jt}$ denote mean annual earnings in industry j in census year t , expressed in constant 2021 dollars, for $j = 1, \dots, 17$ and $t \in 2001, 2006, 2011, 2016, 2021$. Define

$$\bar{w}_j = \frac{1}{5} \sum_t \bar{w}_{jt}, \quad \bar{w} = \frac{1}{17} \sum_{j=1}^{17} \bar{w}_j, \quad (1)$$

where $\bar{w}$ is the average of the industry-level mean earnings pooled across industries and census years. Industry j is classified as a high-income industry if $\bar{w}_j > \bar{w}$ and as a low-income industry otherwise.⁴ This procedure yields a threshold of \$55,653 in constant 2021 dollars.⁵

The threshold is calculated once on the pooled sample rather than separately by census year,

⁴Industry-level average earnings by census year, the industry averages pooled across years, and the resulting classification are reported in Table A.1.

⁵The threshold is an unweighted average across industries, so each industry contributes equally regardless of its employment share. Weighting industries by employment shares produces a lower threshold of approximately \$53,100, which would classify transportation and warehousing, construction, and the combined professional, scientific and technical services and administrative and support services category as high-income. Two industries also lie close to the baseline threshold: transportation and warehousing (\$55,516) and construction (\$55,256).

so that each industry retains the same classification throughout. Under a year-specific threshold an industry could change category because its earnings grew at a different rate from others', and a worker who changed neither job nor industry could appear to move between positioning categories.

Combining industry earnings levels with employment type yields four employment-positioning categories, indexed as follows for use in Section 3.3: (0) low-income part-time employment, (1) low-income full-time employment, (2) high-income part-time employment, and (3) high-income full-time employment.

3.3 Analytic strategy

Let $Y_i \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$ denote the employment-positioning outcome for individual i , where category 0 corresponds to low-income part-time employment and is used as the reference outcome. The probability that individual i is observed in employment-positioning category j is given by the multinomial logit specification:

$$P(Y_i = j) = \frac{\exp(X_i\beta_j)}{\sum_{k=0}^3 \exp(X_i\beta_k)}, \quad j = 0, 1, 2, 3 \quad (2)$$

where X_i is a vector of individual characteristics and β_j is a category-specific coefficient vector.

For identification, the coefficient vector associated with the reference category ($j = 0$) is normalized to zero. The model therefore estimates the log-odds of being in employment-positioning category j relative to the reference category:

$$\log \left(\frac{P(Y_i = j)}{P(Y_i = 0)} \right) = X_i\beta_j, \quad j = 1, 2, 3. \quad (3)$$

The vector X_i contains age and age squared, education, gender, marital status, province of residence, region of origin for immigrants, and interactions of immigrant status with education and with gender.

Immigrant status is captured through a set of region-of-origin indicators, with native-born Canadians as the omitted reference group. A separate immigrant indicator is not included because it would be perfectly collinear with the set of region-of-origin indicators. Education and gender are interacted with immigrant status, allowing the corresponding marginal effects to be reported separately for immigrants and native-born workers. All estimates are weighted

using the Census PUMF individual weights, and heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors are reported.

Because multinomial logit coefficients are not directly interpretable, results are reported as average marginal effects on the predicted probability of occupying each category.

4 Results

4.1 Earnings trajectories

Table 1 shows substantial immigrant earnings disadvantages at the cohort-entry census and incomplete convergence at follow-up, particularly among women and more recent cohorts. The principal exception is the 1966–1970 cohort: immigrant women initially earned slightly more than native-born women, and by 1981 the cohort’s mean earnings exceeded those of the native-born comparison group overall and for both genders. Among the remaining cohorts, mean earnings generally increase between the entry and follow-up censuses, but immigrant–native differences usually remain.

[insert Table 1 about here]

4.2 Descriptive positioning patterns

Table 2 reports the distribution of workers across employment-positioning categories for immigrant and native-born workers by cohort and gender. Several patterns emerge. Native-born workers are more likely to be employed full-time in higher-paying industries, while immigrants are more concentrated in lower-paying employment categories, particularly at entry. Women are more frequently represented in part-time employment categories than men across both immigrant and native-born groups. The immigrant–native difference in full-time employment within higher-paying industries narrows over the ten-year period, from 4.18 percentage points to 2.05 for the 1997–2000 cohort and from 7.53 to 4.89 for the 2006–2011 cohort. Immigrants nevertheless remain less represented in this category at the follow-up census. The narrowing of the gap reflects a larger decline in the native-born share rather than an increase in the immigrant share, since the proportion employed full-time in higher-paying industries falls for both groups over the period. Because the industry classification is held fixed, as discussed in Section 3.2, this

common decline cannot be attributed to changes in the way industries are classified. Rather, it reflects a compositional shift in employment away from the industries identified as higher-paying in Table A.1, consistent with the broader structural changes in the Canadian labour market that motivate the industry-level analysis in Section 4.4.

[insert Table 2 about here]

4.3 Multinomial logit results

Table 3 reports the average marginal effects from the multinomial logit models for the two immigrant cohorts. Because native-born workers are the omitted region-of-origin category, each estimate is an adjusted difference relative to them. Marginal effects for all four categories are reported for both cohorts in the Appendix and show consistent patterns.

Several broad patterns emerge from the results. First, educational attainment is strongly associated with labour-market positioning across both cohorts. Relative to the omitted education category, higher levels of education are generally associated with higher predicted probabilities of full-time employment in higher-earnings industries. These associations are particularly pronounced among university-educated workers.

Second, the comparison between the cohort-entry and follow-up censuses does not show a uniform narrowing of immigrant–native differences in labour-market positioning. For the 1997–2000 cohort, the adjusted immigrant-native difference in the probability of full-time employment in a higher-paying industry narrows between the entry and follow-up cross-sections for immigrants from Africa (-0.167 to -0.096), the United States (-0.140 to -0.082, with the latter estimate no longer statistically significant), and Europe (-0.049 to -0.041). By contrast, the difference widens for immigrants from Asia and Oceania (-0.050 to -0.089) and Latin America (0.007 to -0.055). The two cross-sections therefore indicate convergence for some source-region groups but not for others. Because the data do not follow the same individuals and the models do not include a direct measure of years since migration, these differences cannot be attributed specifically to time in Canada; they may also reflect ageing, period conditions, or changes in cohort composition.

Third, substantial gender disparities persist across cohorts and census years. Men remain considerably more likely than women to occupy full-time positions in higher-paying industries, while women are more concentrated in part-time and lower-paying employment categories. These

gender differences appear for both immigrants and native-born workers and remain sizeable even after controlling for education, age, province, and marital status.

Fourth, the results reveal significant heterogeneity across immigrant groups by region of origin. Immigrants from Africa and from Asia and Oceania record the largest adjusted disadvantages in three of the four estimated columns: Africa ranks first for the 1997–2000 cohort both at arrival (-0.167) and at the ten-year follow-up (-0.096), and Asia and Oceania first at arrival for the 2006–2011 cohort (-0.140). Immigrants from Europe consistently show some of the smallest adjusted differences, while the estimates for Latin America vary more across columns. For the 1997–2000 cohort, there is no statistically significant difference at entry, whereas for the 2006–2011 cohort, immigrants from Latin America show the second-largest disadvantage at entry (-0.135). Estimates for immigrants from the United States are considerably less precise, with standard errors several times larger than those for the other regions. Although the point estimates are among the largest in 2001 and 2021, the estimate in the ten-year column for the 1997–2000 cohort is not statistically distinguishable from zero. While some immigrant groups experience partial improvement over time, immigrant–native differences in labour-market positioning remain substantial even after approximately ten years in Canada.

Section 4.4 asks whether these differences are also visible in representation across industries.

[insert Table 3 about here]

4.4 Industry composition, telework capacity, and digital intensity

As a separate 2021 descriptive analysis, this subsection examines how immigrant and native-born employment shares vary across industries with different earnings structures, telework feasibility, and digital intensity. Because its sample and purpose differ from the cohort-positioning models, Table 4 provides contextual evidence rather than a direct extension of the multinomial-logit results. Telework feasibility is the estimated share of jobs that could technically be performed from home, based on 2019 occupational and industry conditions; digital intensity identifies Census categories containing sectors in the top quartile of the OECD taxonomy (Calvino et al. 2018). Neither measures whether individual workers had access to remote work or actually worked from home. Neither measure enters the multinomial-logit models; the results describe

industry-level exposure, not effects of AI or digitalization.

Summing across industries classified as digitally intensive or partly digitally intensive, these sectors account for 39.02 percent of immigrant employment and 29.74 percent of native-born employment, a difference of 9.28 percentage points. Digital intensity therefore does not correspond to a general immigrant disadvantage. By contrast, among industries with unambiguously above-average telework feasibility, excluding combined categories reported as ranges, the immigrant employment share is 18.57 percent compared with 26.16 percent for native-born workers. This 7.59-point difference is driven principally by educational services and public administration. These aggregates are descriptive and are not adjusted for worker characteristics⁶.

[insert Table 4 about here]

5 Discussion

The findings contribute to research on immigrant labour-market integration and career development in three related ways: through the long-run earnings evidence, the earnings-based positioning measure, and the descriptive mapping of employment shares onto industry-level digital intensity and telework feasibility.

5.1 Five Decades of Earnings and Cohort Convergence

The ten-cohort analysis shows that immigrant earnings generally increase between the cohort-entry and follow-up censuses, but convergence is incomplete for most cohorts. The persistence of earnings differences is particularly pronounced among women and more recent arrivals. The earliest cohort provides an important contrast: immigrants arriving in 1966–1970 achieved comparatively strong earnings growth, suggesting that convergence has not followed a uniform pattern across admission periods.

The five-decade horizon extends the usual focus on one or two recent cohorts by showing that immigrant–native earnings differences vary across historical labour-market contexts. These comparisons describe cohort-level changes rather than individual career progression because the

⁶The Census PUMF does not separately identify the components of the combined categories. Administrative and support services is classified as digitally intensive but has much lower telework capacity than professional, scientific and technical services (35.1 versus 83.9 percent), and the components also differ in earnings levels; the components of finance and real estate span the full range of both measures. The combined rows are descriptive mappings and are not evidence about any individual sector.

Census files are repeated cross-sections. Nevertheless, they demonstrate that longer residence does not necessarily produce similar earnings outcomes across cohorts, gender groups, and periods.

5.2 Earnings-Based Positioning and Structural Career Opportunities

The positioning analysis adds a structural dimension to the earnings results. For the 1997–2000 and 2006–2011 cohorts, immigrants are generally less likely than comparable native-born workers to hold full-time positions in higher-earnings industries. The differences vary by source region and do not uniformly narrow between the cohort-entry and follow-up censuses. Higher education is associated with better positioning, but it does not eliminate the immigrant–native differences.

These findings complement individual-level approaches to career development, which emphasize agency, adaptability, and organizational context (Baruch and Rousseau 2019; De Vos et al. 2020; Guan et al. 2019; Verbruggen et al. 2015). The labour-economics perspective instead highlights the market-level opportunity structures within which careers develop, including access to industries with different earnings structures and employment arrangements. Industry positioning is therefore distinct from occupational matching: it describes group-level access to higher-earnings sectors and full-time employment, not whether an individual’s skills correspond to the occupation held.

The findings establish unequal earnings-based positioning, not inefficient allocation or productivity loss. Because the data do not observe individual productivity, preferences, detailed skill use, or potential outcomes in alternative industries, the analysis cannot determine whether the observed differences reflect labour-market barriers, comparative advantage, or other sorting processes.

5.3 Digital Intensity, Telework Feasibility, and Policy Implications

The descriptive industry mapping produces a more differentiated picture of structural change. Industries classified as digitally intensive or partly digitally intensive account for 39.02 percent

of immigrant employment and 29.74 percent of native-born employment. Digital intensity therefore does not correspond to a general immigrant disadvantage. By contrast, among industries with unambiguously above-average telework feasibility, excluding combined categories reported as ranges, the corresponding shares are 18.57 percent for immigrants and 26.16 percent for native-born workers. This difference is driven principally by educational services and public administration, two higher-earnings industries in which immigrants are underrepresented.

These patterns identify areas for further investigation rather than establishing particular policy mechanisms or remedies. Immigrants' lower representation in educational services and public administration motivates closer examination of factors such as foreign-credential recognition, professional licensing, public-sector recruitment and employment-equity practices, access to professional networks, and the availability of bridging or retraining programs. The persistence of positioning differences after controlling for educational attainment also suggests that differences in formal education alone do not account for the observed gaps. However, the Census data do not measure hiring practices, union access, credentialing decisions, discrimination, program participation, or professional-network access. The analysis therefore cannot determine which mechanisms produce the documented differences or which interventions would be effective.

The observed positioning differences also raise questions about whether barriers to higher-earnings opportunities have productivity implications. The present evidence does not answer those questions: it documents earnings, employment arrangements, and industry-level exposure to digital intensity and telework feasibility rather than productivity effects.

5.4 Limitations and Future Research

The analysis is descriptive and relies on repeated cross-sectional Census data. It does not follow individuals across jobs or industries and therefore cannot identify within-person career transitions or causal effects of time in Canada.

The Census does not provide direct measures of productivity, AI adoption, ICT use or skills, digital-task intensity, remote-work participation, union status, hiring procedures, or occupational entry requirements.

Future research could combine longitudinal worker data with occupation- and task-level measures of digital work, remote-work participation, credential use, and within-industry mobility. Occupational and skill matching is an especially important extension. Linking the

industry-positioning measure to detailed information about occupations and skill use would help determine whether the patterns documented here reflect occupational mismatch, institutional barriers, comparative advantage, or other sorting processes.

6 Conclusion

Using repeated cross-sectional Census microdata, this paper traces immigrant earnings across ten arrival cohorts from 1971 to 2021 and examines labour-market positioning for the 1997–2000 and 2006–2011 cohorts. Three findings emerge. Immigrant entry earnings disadvantages persist and convergence remains incomplete, particularly for women and recent arrivals. Immigrants are less likely than comparable native-born workers to hold full-time positions in higher-earnings industries, and the difference remains after ten years and after controlling for education, age, province, and marital status. Digital intensity shows no clear relationship with immigrant employment shares, but immigrants remain under-represented in public administration and educational services, two higher-paying sectors with high telework capacity.

Taken together, these findings indicate that immigrant labour-market inequality in Canada is reflected not only in earnings differences, but also in unequal positioning across industries and employment arrangements. Understanding immigrant integration therefore requires attention to both earnings convergence and the broader labour-market structures that shape access to long-run economic opportunities. These patterns raise questions about whether barriers to higher-earnings opportunities may also have productivity implications. The present analysis does not answer those questions: it measures earnings-based positioning and industry-level exposure to digital intensity and telework feasibility, not productivity, AI adoption, or individual remote-work participation. Future research using linked employer–employee administrative data or surveys that jointly measure worker skills, employer requirements, and hiring practices could help identify the mechanisms underlying these positioning differences.

Tables

Table 1: Mean Total Earnings of Natives and Immigrant Cohorts With Age at Entry 25–44 by Gender (2021 Dollars)

At Entry							
Year	Immigrant Cohort	Native	Immigrant	Native Male	Immigrant Male	Native Female	Immigrant Female
1971	1966-1970	41,631	37,301	52,723	46,442	21,827	22,439
1981	1976-1980	47,913	34,843	60,747	45,403	30,958	21,540
1986	1981-1986	44,839	27,576	55,817	34,802	31,657	19,099
1991	1987-1990	46,472	29,434	56,532	34,951	35,425	23,221
1996	1991-1996	44,223	23,564	52,619	28,144	35,124	18,742
2001	1997-2000	48,533	34,182	57,510	42,196	39,153	25,413
2006	2001-2005	47,542	27,709	55,804	34,682	39,053	21,165
2011	2006-2011	49,935	30,493	57,055	37,351	42,588	24,119
2016	2012-2016	53,895	36,607	61,848	43,465	45,553	29,529
2021	2017-2021	54,418	43,631	60,834	50,401	47,839	36,381
10 Years After Entry							
Year	Immigrant Cohort	Native	Immigrant	Native Male	Immigrant Male	Native Female	Immigrant Female
1981	1966-1970	52,476	54,307	67,798	68,751	30,987	34,575
1991	1976-1980	52,527	49,177	65,491	61,270	38,000	36,008
1996	1981-1986	50,860	43,260	61,729	52,647	38,994	33,359
2001	1987-1990	54,574	45,327	65,244	52,612	43,379	37,646
2006	1991-1996	56,831	44,066	67,281	52,818	46,377	35,373
2011	1997-2000	60,126	52,294	69,408	61,051	50,968	43,343
2016	2001-2005	65,592	55,755	75,337	64,893	55,909	46,082
2021	2006-2011	67,989	53,190	76,146	61,803	59,921	44,895

Note: Authors' calculations from Canadian Census PUMFs, 1971 and 1981–2021, for individuals with positive total earnings in Alberta, British Columbia, Manitoba, Ontario, Quebec, and Saskatchewan. Earnings are expressed in 2021 dollars, and the top 1% of observations are trimmed. Cohort entry is the first census following arrival. Where age is reported in intervals, continuous age is approximated using within-bin medians derived from censuses reporting age continuously.

Table 2: Industry Positioning Composition of Immigrant Cohorts of 1997–2000 and 2006–2011 and Native-Born Wage Earners: Entry and Ten-Year Follow-Up, by Gender and Immigration Status (%)

Industry Category	Year	Overall %		Male %		Female %	
		Native	Imm.	Native	Imm.	Native	Imm.
<i>Cohort: 1997–2000</i>							
<i>2001 (Age at Entry: 25–44)</i>							
Part-time & Low-income Industry	2001	8.78	9.80	2.85	4.86	14.88	15.44
Full-time & Low-income Industry	2001	33.01	35.42	28.92	33.55	37.22	37.56
Part-time & High-income Industry	2001	5.05	5.80	2.46	3.34	7.71	8.61
Full-time & High-income Industry	2001	53.15	48.97	65.77	58.25	40.19	38.40
Sample Size		134,147	7,179	67,984	3,700	66,163	3,479
<i>2011 (10 Years Later)</i>							
Part-time & Low-income Industry	2011	7.83	8.68	2.70	4.11	12.63	13.25
Full-time & Low-income Industry	2011	42.99	44.84	44.28	44.55	41.78	45.13
Part-time & High-income Industry	2011	3.31	2.66	1.19	1.37	5.30	3.94
Full-time & High-income Industry	2011	45.87	43.82	51.82	49.97	40.29	37.68
Sample Size		93,341	5,259	45,108	2,604	48,233	2,655
<i>Cohort: 2006–2011</i>							
<i>2011 (Age at Entry: 25–44)</i>							
Part-time & Low-income Industry	2011	8.94	13.00	4.88	7.34	13.08	18.50
Full-time & Low-income Industry	2011	46.52	48.88	48.26	48.37	44.74	49.37
Part-time & High-income Industry	2011	3.73	4.85	2.12	3.62	5.37	6.04
Full-time & High-income Industry	2011	40.81	33.28	44.74	40.68	36.81	26.08
Sample Size		90,083	4,552	45,481	2,282	44,602	2,270
<i>2021 (10 Years Later)</i>							
Part-time & Low-income Industry	2021	7.62	10.78	3.04	4.30	12.00	16.72
Full-time & Low-income Industry	2021	55.95	57.63	53.17	56.43	58.61	58.73
Part-time & High-income Industry	2021	1.12	1.17	0.62	0.73	1.60	1.59
Full-time & High-income Industry	2021	35.30	30.41	43.17	38.54	27.79	22.96
Sample Size		77,037	6,005	37,661	2,915	39,376	3,090

Note: Authors' calculations from Canadian Census PUMFs, 2001, 2011, and 2021. The sample comprises wage-earning employees with positive earnings in Alberta, British Columbia, Manitoba, Ontario, Quebec, and Saskatchewan. Immigrants are aged 25–44 at the cohort-entry census and 35–54 at follow-up; native-born comparison samples use the same age ranges. Cohort entry is the first census following arrival, and the top 1% of earnings observations are trimmed. Industries are harmonized to two-digit NAICS 2017 v3.0 using official Statistics Canada concordances. NAICS 55 is excluded because it is not consistently available across census years.

Table 3: Marginal Effects for High-Income/Full-Time Positioning, at Arrival & After 10 Years

	1997–2000 Cohort		2006–2011 Cohort	
	2001	2011	2011	2021
Age	0.024** (0.003)	0.020* (0.012)	0.060** (0.005)	0.015 (0.013)
Age ²	-3×10^{-4} ** (4×10^{-5})	-2×10^{-4} (1×10^{-4})	-0.001** (1×10^{-4})	-2×10^{-4} (1×10^{-4})
<i>Education for Natives</i>				
High School Diploma	0.036** (0.005)	0.085** (0.006)	0.065** (0.007)	0.089** (0.007)
Below Bachelor's Degree	0.011** (0.004)	0.079** (0.005)	0.071** (0.006)	0.083** (0.007)
Bachelor's Degree	0.054** (0.004)	0.227** (0.006)	0.218** (0.007)	0.093** (0.007)
Above Bachelor's Degree	0.085** (0.007)	0.278** (0.007)	0.233** (0.008)	0.038** (0.008)
<i>Education for Immigrants</i>				
High School Diploma	0.036** (0.005)	0.079** (0.005)	0.052** (0.005)	0.082** (0.006)
Below Bachelor's Degree	0.011** (0.004)	0.072** (0.005)	0.058** (0.005)	0.079** (0.006)
Bachelor's Degree	0.055** (0.004)	0.222** (0.006)	0.188** (0.006)	0.090** (0.006)
Above Bachelor's Degree	0.089** (0.007)	0.278** (0.007)	0.205** (0.007)	0.041** (0.007)
Native Male	0.125** (0.003)	0.125** (0.003)	0.106** (0.003)	0.157** (0.003)
Immigrant Male	0.119** (0.004)	0.118** (0.004)	0.107** (0.003)	0.153** (0.004)
<i>Province</i>				
Quebec	-0.005 (0.003)	-0.016** (0.004)	-0.007* (0.004)	2×10^{-4} (0.004)
Manitoba	-0.019** (0.007)	-0.011 (0.008)	-0.009 (0.008)	-0.029** (0.008)
Saskatchewan	-0.035** (0.007)	-0.004 (0.009)	0.011 (0.009)	-0.007 (0.009)
Alberta	-0.020** (0.004)	-0.029** (0.005)	-0.013** (0.005)	-0.043** (0.005)
BC	-0.078** (0.004)	-0.086** (0.005)	-0.082** (0.005)	-0.061** (0.005)
Married	0.033** (0.003)	0.028** (0.004)	0.041** (0.003)	0.026** (0.004)
<i>Region of Origin</i>				
The USA	-0.140** (0.041)	-0.082 (0.075)	-0.091** (0.046)	-0.142** (0.043)
Latin America	0.007 (0.019)	-0.055** (0.023)	-0.135** (0.018)	-0.038** (0.016)
Europe	-0.049** (0.017)	-0.041** (0.016)	-0.111** (0.017)	-0.030* (0.017)
Asia / Oceania	-0.050** (0.008)	-0.089** (0.009)	-0.140** (0.009)	-0.052** (0.008)
Africa	-0.167** (0.016)	-0.096** (0.024)	-0.114** (0.018)	-0.062** (0.019)
N	141,326	98,600	94,635	83,042

Notes: ** Significant at the 5% level; * significant at the 10% level. Standard errors are robust to heteroskedasticity.

Table 4: Industry Annual Earnings, Immigrant Representation, and Digital Labour-Market Characteristics

Industry	Mean Earnings (\$)	Native-born share (%)	Immigrant share (%)	Telework feasibility (%)	Digitally Intensity
Agriculture and related	44,547.1	1.42	0.63	3.9	No
Mining and oil and gas	100,761.8	1.58	0.60	23.9	No
Utilities	105,178.4	1.02	0.53	38.6	No
Construction	59,193.1	7.98	4.67	11.1	No
Manufacturing	60,265.3	8.91	11.78	19.1	Partly
Wholesale trade	66,827.3	3.50	3.68	57.3	No
Retail trade	38,359.4	11.09	10.63	22.0	No
Transportation and warehousing	57,604.4	4.66	5.75	24.5	No
Information and culture	68,975.7	2.09	2.31	68.5	Partly
Finance and real estate ^a	71,008.1	5.50	7.92	47.8–85.3	Partly
Professional and administrative services ^a	58,448.8	9.72	13.60	35.1–83.9	Yes
Educational services	58,756.8	9.81	6.73	84.6	No
Health care and social assistance	51,750.1	13.94	15.06	28.8	No
Arts and recreation	34,738.1	1.72	0.82	40.1	No
Accommodation and food services	23,541.5	4.50	6.87	5.6	No
Other services	45,311.4	3.52	3.41	31.4	Partly
Public administration	77,193.2	9.04	5.03	58.2	No
Average	60,144.7	100	100	–	–

Notes: Authors' calculations from the 2021 Canadian Census PUMF for wage-earning employees aged 25–44 with positive annual earnings in six provinces; the top 1% of earnings observations is trimmed. Employment figures are within-group industry shares. The earnings figure in the final row is the unweighted mean across the 17 reported industry categories. Telework feasibility is based on 2019 estimates of jobs that could technically be performed from home and does not measure actual remote-work participation or individual access. Digital-intensity classifications are mapped from Calvino et al. 2018. "Partly" identifies combined Census categories containing both digitally intensive and other sectors. For combined categories marked with ^a, telework ranges show the lowest and highest values of the component sectors; these ranges are not directly comparable with the single-industry estimates and are excluded from telework-feasibility rankings.

A Appendix

Table A.1: Mean Annual Earnings by Industry and Year, 2001–2021 (\$2021)

Industry	Mean Wage				
	2001	2011	2021	Pooled	Class
Agriculture and related	35,398.5	39,548.7	44,547.1	39,831.4	Low
Mining and oil and gas	77,962.6	93,156.3	100,761.8	90,626.9	High
Utilities	78,769.2	93,514.8	105,178.4	92,487.5	High
Construction	50,680.5	55,893.4	59,193.1	55,255.7	Low
Manufacturing	55,194.1	59,253.8	60,265.3	58,237.7	High
Wholesale trade	55,072.6	62,198.5	66,827.3	61,366.1	High
Retail trade	33,437.8	36,290.8	38,359.4	36,029.3	Low
Transportation and warehousing	52,835.4	56,106.6	57,604.4	55,515.5	Low
Information and culture	59,349.2	64,112.2	68,975.7	64,145.7	High
Finance and real estate	54,779.1	61,627.2	71,008.1	62,471.5	High
Professional and administrative services	49,109.1	54,378.9	58,448.8	53,978.9	Low
Educational services	53,258.8	58,640.7	58,756.8	56,885.4	High
Health care and social assistance	43,812.1	50,700.5	51,750.1	48,754.2	Low
Arts and recreation	32,913.6	34,693.3	34,738.1	34,115.0	Low
Accommodation and food services	24,038.3	25,258.6	23,541.5	24,279.5	Low
Other services	37,879.4	43,869.1	45,311.4	42,353.3	Low
Public administration	61,066.5	71,061.8	77,193.2	69,773.8	High
Average	50,326.9	56,488.6	60,144.7	55,653.4	–

Note: Authors’ calculations from Canadian Census PUMFs, 2001, 2011, and 2021, for wage-earning employees aged 25–44 with positive earnings in six provinces. The top 1% of earnings observations are trimmed in each year, and earnings are expressed in 2021 dollars. For comparability, NAICS 52 and 53 are combined, as are NAICS 54 and 56. “Pooled” is the unweighted mean of each industry’s annual earnings across the three census years. The \$55,653.4 threshold is the unweighted mean of the 17 pooled industry values and is applied in every census year.

Table A.2: Marginal Effects by Industry Positioning, 1997-2000 Cohort at Arrival and After Ten Years

	2001				2011			
	Low-income Industry		High-income Industry		Low-income Industry		High-income Industry	
	Part-time	Full-time	Part-time	Full-time	Part-time	Full-time	Part-time	Full-time
Age	-0.008** (0.002)	-0.012** (0.003)	-0.005** (0.001)	0.024** (0.003)	-0.004 (0.007)	-0.014 (0.012)	-0.003 (0.004)	0.020* (0.012)
Age ²	1×10^{-4} ** (2×10^{-5})	1×10^{-4} ** (4×10^{-5})	1×10^{-4} ** (2×10^{-5})	-3×10^{-4} ** (4×10^{-5})	4×10^{-5} (1×10^{-4})	1×10^{-4} (1×10^{-4})	3×10^{-5} (5×10^{-5})	-2×10^{-4} (1×10^{-4})
<i>Education for Natives</i>								
High School Diploma	-0.018** (0.003)	-0.019** (0.005)	3×10^{-4} (0.002)	0.036** (0.005)	-0.033** (0.004)	-0.056** (0.006)	0.004* (0.001)	0.085** (0.006)
Below Bachelor's Degree	-0.017** (0.003)	0.012** (0.004)	-0.006** (0.002)	0.011** (0.004)	-0.034** (0.004)	-0.045** (0.006)	-0.001 (0.002)	0.079** (0.005)
Bachelor's Degree	-0.043** (0.003)	-0.015** (0.004)	0.004** (0.002)	0.054** (0.004)	-0.062** (0.004)	-0.181** (0.007)	0.016** (0.002)	0.227** (0.006)
Above Bachelor's Degree	-0.068** (0.003)	-0.041** (0.006)	0.024** (0.003)	0.085** (0.006)	-0.077** (0.004)	-0.222** (0.007)	0.021** (0.003)	0.278** (0.007)
<i>Education for Immigrants</i>								
High School Diploma	-0.020** (0.004)	-0.017** (0.005)	0.001 (0.002)	0.036** (0.005)	-0.035** (0.005)	-0.047** (0.006)	0.003** (0.001)	0.079** (0.005)
Below Bachelor's Degree	-0.020** (0.003)	0.015** (0.004)	-0.005** (0.002)	0.011** (0.004)	-0.037** (0.004)	-0.036** (0.006)	2×10^{-4} (0.001)	0.072** (0.005)
Bachelor's Degree	-0.049** (0.003)	-0.010** (0.004)	0.005** (0.002)	0.055** (0.004)	-0.066** (0.005)	-0.170** (0.007)	0.014** (0.002)	0.222** (0.006)
Above Bachelor's Degree	-0.079** (0.005)	-0.035** (0.007)	0.025** (0.003)	0.089** (0.007)	-0.084** (0.006)	-0.212** (0.008)	0.018** (0.003)	0.278** (0.007)
Native Male	-0.101** (0.002)	0.016** (0.003)	-0.040** (0.001)	0.125** (0.003)	-0.101** (0.002)	0.016** (0.003)	-0.040** (0.001)	0.125** (0.003)
Immigrant Male	-0.108** (0.005)	0.023** (0.004)	-0.034** (0.003)	0.119** (0.004)	-0.088** (0.014)	3×10^{-4} (0.003)	-0.030** (0.004)	0.118** (0.004)
<i>Province</i>								
Quebec	-0.010** (0.002)	0.015** (0.003)	5×10^{-4} (0.001)	-0.005 (0.003)	-0.019** (0.002)	0.035** (0.004)	-4×10^{-4} (0.001)	-0.016** (0.004)
Manitoba	0.017** (0.004)	-0.006 (0.006)	0.008** (0.003)	-0.019** (0.007)	-0.011** (0.004)	0.012 (0.008)	0.010** (0.003)	-0.011 (0.008)
Saskatchewan	0.010** (0.004)	0.006 (0.007)	0.019** (0.004)	-0.035** (0.007)	-0.019** (0.004)	0.019** (0.009)	0.004 (0.003)	-0.004 (0.009)
Alberta	0.002 (0.002)	0.006 (0.004)	0.011** (0.002)	-0.020** (0.004)	0.001 (0.003)	0.020** (0.005)	0.009** (0.002)	-0.029** (0.005)
BC	0.029** (0.003)	0.026** (0.004)	0.023** (0.002)	-0.078** (0.004)	0.023** (0.003)	0.045** (0.005)	0.018** (0.002)	-0.086** (0.005)
Married	0.001 (0.002)	-0.042** (0.003)	0.008** (0.001)	0.033** (0.003)	0.008** (0.002)	-0.048** (0.004)	0.012** (0.001)	0.028** (0.004)
<i>Region of Origin</i>								
The USA	0.026 (0.025)	0.079* (0.041)	0.034* (0.020)	-0.140** (0.041)	0.078 (0.056)	-0.026 (0.081)	0.029 (0.031)	-0.082 (0.075)
Latin America	0.008 (0.011)	-0.017 (0.018)	0.002 (0.009)	0.007 (0.019)	0.029** (0.014)	0.036 (0.024)	-0.010 (0.007)	-0.055** (0.023)
Europe	0.014* (0.008)	0.038** (0.012)	-0.003 (0.005)	-0.049** (0.017)	-0.016** (0.008)	0.075** (0.016)	-0.018** (0.004)	-0.041** (0.016)
Asia / Oceania	0.011** (0.005)	0.045** (0.008)	-0.006* (0.003)	-0.050** (0.008)	0.015** (0.005)	0.085** (0.010)	-0.011 (0.002)	-0.089** (0.009)
Africa	0.064** (0.016)	0.091** (0.020)	0.011 (0.010)	-0.167** (0.016)	0.007 (0.016)	0.085** (0.026)	0.004 (0.010)	-0.096** (0.024)
N	141,326	141,326	141,326	141,326	98,600	98,600	98,600	98,600

Notes: ** Significant at 5% level, * Significant at 10% level.
Standard Errors are robust to heteroskedasticity.

Table A.3: Marginal Effects by Industry Positioning, 2006-2011 Cohort at Arrival and After Ten Years

	2011				2021			
	Low-income Industry		High-income Industry		Low-income Industry		High-income Industry	
	Part-time	Full-time	Part-time	Full-time	Part-time	Full-time	Part-time	Full-time
Age	-0.023** (0.003)	-0.022** (0.005)	-0.015** (0.002)	0.060** (0.005)	-0.010 (0.007)	-0.005 (0.014)	-2×10^{-4} (0.003)	0.015 (0.013)
Age ²	3×10^{-4} ** (4×10^{-5})	3×10^{-4} ** (1×10^{-4})	2×10^{-4} ** (3×10^{-5})	-0.001** (1×10^{-4})	1×10^{-4} (1×10^{-4})	1×10^{-4} (1×10^{-4})	3×10^{-6} (3×10^{-5})	-2×10^{-4} (1×10^{-4})
<i>Education for Natives</i>								
High School Diploma	-0.034** (0.005)	-0.036** (0.007)	0.006** (0.002)	0.065** (0.007)	-0.031** (0.005)	-0.060** (0.008)	0.001 (0.002)	0.089** (0.007)
Below Bachelor's Degree	-0.049** (0.005)	-0.025** (0.007)	0.003 (0.002)	0.071** (0.006)	-0.043** (0.005)	-0.037** (0.007)	-0.003* (0.002)	0.083** (0.007)
Bachelor's Degree	-0.080** (0.005)	-0.164** (0.007)	0.026** (0.003)	0.218** (0.007)	-0.056** (0.005)	-0.032** (0.008)	-0.005** (0.002)	0.093** (0.007)
Above Bachelor's Degree	-0.094** (0.005)	-0.186** (0.008)	0.048** (0.003)	0.233** (0.008)	-0.070** (0.005)	0.038** (0.009)	-0.006** (0.002)	0.038** (0.008)
<i>Education for Immigrants</i>								
High School Diploma	-0.045** (0.007)	-0.013* (0.008)	0.007** (0.002)	0.052** (0.005)	-0.042** (0.007)	-0.043** (0.008)	0.002 (0.002)	0.082** (0.006)
Below Bachelor's Degree	-0.067** (0.007)	0.004 (0.007)	0.004** (0.002)	0.058** (0.005)	-0.060** (0.007)	-0.016** (0.008)	-0.003 (0.002)	0.079** (0.006)
Bachelor's Degree	-0.108** (0.008)	-0.112** (0.008)	0.033** (0.003)	0.188** (0.006)	-0.080** (0.007)	-0.005 (0.008)	-0.005** (0.002)	0.090** (0.006)
Above Bachelor's Degree	-0.132** (0.008)	-0.131** (0.009)	0.058** (0.005)	0.205** (0.007)	-0.100** (0.008)	0.065** (0.009)	-0.006** (0.002)	0.041** (0.007)
Native Male	-0.090** (0.002)	0.012** (0.003)	-0.028** (0.001)	0.106** (0.003)	-0.094** (0.002)	-0.053** (0.003)	-0.010** (0.001)	0.157** (0.003)
Immigrant Male	-0.124** (0.005)	0.052** (0.004)	-0.035** (0.003)	0.107** (0.003)	-0.129** (0.005)	-0.015** (0.005)	-0.009** (0.001)	0.153** (0.004)
<i>Province</i>								
Quebec	-0.019** (0.002)	0.025** (0.004)	0.002 (0.002)	-0.007* (0.004)	-0.013** (0.002)	0.015** (0.004)	-0.002* (0.001)	2×10^{-4} (0.004)
Manitoba	0.006 (0.005)	-0.002 (0.009)	0.006 (0.003)	-0.009 (0.008)	0.014** (0.005)	0.014 (0.009)	0.002 (0.002)	-0.029** (0.008)
Saskatchewan	-0.023** (0.005)	0.009 (0.009)	0.004 (0.004)	0.011 (0.009)	0.008 (0.005)	-0.004 (0.010)	0.004 (0.002)	-0.007 (0.009)
Alberta	-0.010** (0.003)	0.023** (0.005)	4×10^{-4} (0.002)	-0.013** (0.005)	0.026** (0.003)	0.012** (0.006)	0.005** (0.001)	-0.043** (0.005)
BC	0.020** (0.003)	0.049** (0.005)	0.012** (0.002)	-0.082** (0.005)	0.029** (0.003)	0.026** (0.006)	0.006** (0.001)	-0.061** (0.005)
Married	-0.018** (0.002)	-0.022** (0.003)	-0.002* (0.001)	0.041** (0.003)	0.002 (0.002)	-0.030** (0.004)	0.001* (0.001)	0.026** (0.004)
<i>Region of Origin</i>								
The USA	0.073** (0.037)	0.041 (0.051)	-0.022** (0.011)	-0.091** (0.046)	0.029 (0.033)	0.102** (0.049)	0.011 (0.015)	-0.142** (0.043)
Latin America	0.059** (0.015)	0.072** (0.021)	0.004 (0.008)	-0.135** (0.018)	0.034** (0.011)	0.007 (0.017)	-0.003 (0.003)	-0.038** (0.016)
Europe	0.048** (0.014)	0.051** (0.019)	0.013* (0.007)	-0.111** (0.017)	0.022** (0.011)	0.014 (0.018)	-0.006** (0.003)	-0.030* (0.017)
Asia / Oceania	0.055** (0.007)	0.087** (0.010)	-0.003 (0.003)	-0.140** (0.009)	0.039** (0.006)	0.011 (0.009)	0.002 (0.002)	-0.052** (0.008)
Africa	0.111** (0.018)	-0.018 (0.021)	0.021** (0.009)	-0.114** (0.018)	0.060** (0.012)	1×10^{-4} (0.016)	0.002 (0.004)	-0.062** (0.019)
N	94,635	94,635	94,635	94,635	83,042	83,042	83,042	83,042

Notes: ** Significant at 5% level, * Significant at 10% level.
Standard Errors are robust to heteroskedasticity.

References

- Acemoglu, D. and D. Autor (2011). “Skills, tasks and technologies: Implications for employment and earnings”. In: *Handbook of labor economics*. Vol. 4. Elsevier, pp. 1043–1171. DOI: [10.1016/S0169-7218\(11\)02410-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-7218(11)02410-5).
- Autor, D. H. (2014). “Skills, Education, and the Rise of Earnings Inequality among the ‘Other 99 Percent’”. In: *Science* 344.6186, pp. 843–851. DOI: [10.1126/science.1251868](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1251868).
- Aydemir, A. and M. Skuterud (2005). “Explaining the Deteriorating Entry Earnings of Canada’s Immigrant Cohorts, 1966–2000”. In: *Canadian Journal of Economics / Revue canadienne d’économique* 38.2, pp. 641–672. DOI: [10.1111/j.0008-4085.2005.00297.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0008-4085.2005.00297.x).
- Baruch, Y. (2004). “Transforming careers: from linear to multidirectional career paths: organizational and individual perspectives”. In: *Career development international* 9.1, pp. 58–73. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1108/13620430410518147>.
- (2022). *Managing Careers and Employability*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd. ISBN: 9781529751840.
- Baruch, Y. and D. M. Rousseau (2019). “Integrating psychological contracts and ecosystems in career studies and management”. In: *Academy of Management Annals* 13.1, pp. 84–111. DOI: [10.5465/annals.2016.0103](https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2016.0103).
- Blit, J., M. Skuterud, and J. Zhang (2020). “Can skilled immigration raise innovation? Evidence from Canadian cities”. In: *Journal of Economic Geography* 20.4, pp. 879–901. DOI: [10.1093/jeg/lbz029](https://doi.org/10.1093/jeg/lbz029).
- Borjas, G. J. (1985). “Assimilation, Changes in Cohort Quality, and the Earnings of Immigrants”. In: *Journal of Labor Economics* 3.4, pp. 463–489. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2534922>.
- (1987). “Self-Selection and the Earnings of Immigrants”. In: *American Economic Review* 77.4, pp. 531–553.
- (2015). “The Slowdown in the Economic Assimilation of Immigrants: Aging and Cohort Effects Revisited Again”. In: *Journal of Human Capital* 9.4, pp. 483–517. DOI: [10.1086/676461](https://doi.org/10.1086/676461).
- Calvino, F., C. Criscuolo, L. Marcolin, and M. Squicciarini (2018). *A Taxonomy of Digital Intensive Sectors*. Tech. rep. 2018/14. OECD Publishing. DOI: [10.1787/f404736a-en](https://doi.org/10.1787/f404736a-en).
- Chiswick, B. R. (1978). “The Effect of Americanization on the Earnings of Foreign-Born Men”. In: *Journal of Political Economy* 86.5, pp. 897–921. DOI: [10.1086/260717](https://doi.org/10.1086/260717).

- Crossman, E., F. Hou, and G. Picot (2021). “Are the gaps in labour market outcomes between immigrants and their Canadian-born counterparts starting to close?” In: *Economic and Social Reports* 1.4, pp. 1–19. DOI: [10.25318/36280001202100400004-eng](https://doi.org/10.25318/36280001202100400004-eng).
- De Vos, A., B. I. Van der Heijden, and J. Akkermans (2020). “Sustainable careers: Towards a conceptual model”. In: *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 117, p. 103196. DOI: [10.1016/j.jvb.2018.06.011](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2018.06.011).
- Deng, Z., R. Morissette, and D. Messacar (2020). *Running the economy remotely: Potential for working from home during and after COVID-19*. Tech. rep. 45-28-0001-2020001. Statistics Canada. URL: <https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/45-28-0001/2020001/article/00026-eng.htm>.
- Fang, T., T. Mehdi, R. Morissette, and T. Schirle (2025). *Determinants and Effects of Remote Work Arrangements: Evidence from an Employer Survey*. IZA Discussion Paper 18020. Bonn, Germany: IZA Institute of Labor Economics. URL: <https://docs.iza.org/dp18020.pdf>.
- (2026). *Remote Work Intensity and Wages: Evidence from a Representative Canadian Labour Force Survey*. IZA Discussion Paper 18643. Bonn, Germany: IZA Institute of Labor Economics. URL: <https://docs.iza.org/dp18643.pdf>.
- Frenette, M. and R. Morissette (2003). *Will They Ever Converge? Earnings of Immigrant and Canadian-Born Workers over the Last Two Decades*. Analytical Studies Branch Research Paper Series 215. Catalogue no. 11F0019MIE2003215. Statistics Canada. URL: <https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/en/pub/11f0019m/11f0019m2003215-eng.pdf>.
- Green, A. G. and D. A. Green (1999). “The Economic Goals of Canada’s Immigration Policy: Past and Present”. In: *Canadian Public Policy* 25.4, pp. 425–451. URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3552422>.
- Green, D. A. and C. Worswick (2010). “Entry Earnings of Immigrant Men in Canada: The Roles of Labour Market Entry Effects and Returns to Foreign Experience”. In: *Canadian Immigration: Economic Evidence for a Dynamic Policy Environment*. Ed. by T. McDonald, E. Ruddick, A. Sweetman, and C. Worswick. Queen’s Policy Studies Series 67. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen’s University Press, pp. 77–110.
- Guan, Y., M. B. Arthur, S. N. Khapova, R. J. Hall, and R. G. Lord (2019). “Career boundarylessness and career success: A review, integration and guide to future research”. In: *Journal of vocational behavior* 110, pp. 390–402. DOI: [10.1016/j.jvb.2018.05.013](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2018.05.013).

- Hou, F. and G. Picot (2003). *The Rise in Low-income Rates Among Immigrants in Canada*. Research Paper 198. Statistics Canada. URL: <https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/en/catalogue/11F0019M2003198>.
- Hsieh, C.-T., E. Hurst, C. I. Jones, and P. J. Klenow (2019). “The Allocation of Talent and U.S. Economic Growth”. In: *Econometrica* 87.5, pp. 1439–1474. DOI: [10.3982/ECTA11427](https://doi.org/10.3982/ECTA11427).
- Liu, H. and J. McDonald-Guimond (2021). “Measuring digital intensity in the Canadian economy”. In: *Economic and Social Reports* 1.2. DOI: [10.25318/36280001202100200003-eng](https://doi.org/10.25318/36280001202100200003-eng).
- Mehdi, T. and R. Morissette (2021). “Working from home in Canada: What have we learned so far?” In: *Economic and Social Reports* 1.10. DOI: [10.25318/36280001202101000001-eng](https://doi.org/10.25318/36280001202101000001-eng).
- Pendakur, K. and R. Pendakur (2002). “Language as Both Human Capital and Ethnicity”. In: *International Migration Review* 36.1, pp. 147–177. DOI: [10.1111/j.1747-7379.2002.tb00075.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1747-7379.2002.tb00075.x).
- Picot, G. and F. Hou (2020). *A Canada–U.S. Comparison of the Economic Outcomes of STEM Immigrants*. Analytical Studies Branch Research Paper Series 2020016. Catalogue no. 11F0019M. Statistics Canada. URL: <https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/11f0019m/11f0019m2020016-eng.htm>.
- Picot, G. and A. Sweetman (2005). *The Deteriorating Economic Welfare of Immigrants and Possible Causes: Update 2005*. Research Paper 262. Statistics Canada. URL: <https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/en/catalogue/11F0019M2005262>.
- Reitz, J. G. (2001). “Immigrant Skill Utilization in the Canadian Labour Market: Implications of Human Capital Research”. In: *Journal of International Migration and Integration* 2.3, pp. 347–378. DOI: [10.1007/s12134-001-1004-1](https://doi.org/10.1007/s12134-001-1004-1).
- (2005). “Tapping Immigrants’ Skills: New Directions for Canadian Immigration Policy in the Knowledge Economy”. In: *Law and Business Review of the Americas* 11, p. 409. URL: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:54699872>.
- Roy, A. D. (1951). “Some Thoughts on the Distribution of Earnings”. In: *Oxford Economic Papers* 3.2, pp. 135–146. DOI: [10.1093/oxfordjournals.oep.a041827](https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordjournals.oep.a041827).
- Schaafsma, J. and A. Sweetman (2001). “Immigrant earnings: age at immigration matters”. In: *Canadian Journal of Economics* 34.4, pp. 1066–1099. DOI: [10.1111/0008-4085.00113](https://doi.org/10.1111/0008-4085.00113).

- Statistics Canada (2024). *Quality of Employment in Canada: Collective Bargaining Coverage Rate, 2023*. Tech. rep. Catalogue no. 14-28-0001. Statistics Canada. URL: <https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/14-28-0001/2024001/article/00010-eng.htm>.
- Verbruggen, M., H. van Emmerik, A. Van Gils, C. Meng, and A. de Grip (2015). “Does early-career underemployment impact future career success? A path dependency perspective”. In: *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 90, pp. 101–110. DOI: [10.1016/j.jvb.2015.08.002](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2015.08.002).
- Warman, C., A. Sweetman, and G. Goldmann (2015). “The Portability of New Immigrants’ Human Capital: Language, Education, and Occupational Skills”. In: *Canadian Public Policy* 41.S1, S64–S79. DOI: [10.3138/cpp.2013-055](https://doi.org/10.3138/cpp.2013-055).