

## **OCCUPATIONAL SEGREGATION AND INEQUALITY BETWEEN NATIVE AND NON-NATIVE CANADIANS, 1971<sup>1</sup>**

E. HUGH LAUTARD,  
Department of Sociology,  
University of New Brunswick,  
Fredericton, New Brunswick,  
Canada, E3B 6E5.

### **ABSTRACT/RESUME**

Analysis of hitherto unreleased 1971 census data reveals extreme occupational differentials between native and non-native Canadians. The findings include results at the provincial level and for both sexes, and distinguish the Inuit from Indians, nonstatus from status Indians, and on/off reserve residence.

L'analyse de certaines données fournies par le recensement national de 1971, données qui n'ont pas été rendues publiques jusqu'ici, révèle d'extrêmes écarts, sur le plan du travail, entre la situation des Canadiens d'origine indigène et les autres. Les résultats fournis par cette analyse comprennent ceux trouvés au niveau provincial et concernant les deux sexes, et font la distinction entre les Inuit et les Indiens, entre les personnes d'origine indigène ayant le statut d'Indien, et celles qui ne l'ont pas, et entre les individus résidant ou non sur les réserves.

Regardless of whether ethnic relations in Canada are conceived as producing a cultural mosaic or a "melting pot," native Indians and Inuit are unequivocally at the greatest disadvantage. In his pioneer study of ethnic stratification in Canada, Porter (1965) found the natives, as a group, alone at the very bottom of the Vertical Mosaic. Similarly, even the most recent and serious challenge to Porter's ethnic-mosaic thesis notes "the extraordinary persistence of distorted occupational distributions of the native population," whose circumstances are acknowledged as "the most deprived... in [the] country" (Darroch, 1979:9, 11). Previous studies, however, raise more questions than they answer concerning ethnic stratification, particularly with regard to native/non-native differentials. The largest gap in our knowledge arises from the failure to pay the same attention to woman as to men. Porter (1965), for example, in his discussion of Ethnic Affiliation and Occupational Class, devotes one small table and barely two paragraphs to females. Darroch (1979) reanalyzes Porter's data for 1931, 1951 and 1961 and Forcese's (1975) data for men and women combined as of 1971. The results for the latter year and thus incomparable with those based on Porter's male-only figures for the previous census years and reveal nothing about ethnic stratification among either sex.

Although it is possible to make a useful distinction between Indians living on reserves and those living off reserves (cf. Canada. Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, 1980:133-147), this implies the prior and equally important distinction between "status" Indians, registered as members of Indian Bands recognized under the Indian Act, who may reside either on or off their reserves, and 'nonstatus' Indians, who have no recognition under the Indian Act and therefore no reserve land. As well, there is the basic distinction to be made between Indians on the one hand and the Inuit, or Eskimos, on the other. Finally, there is the question of regional variation in native/non-native differentials, which remain unexamined below the national level. Although the importance of regional variation and of the on/off-reserve residence, the status/nonstatus-Indian and the Indian-Inuit distinctions are recognized by the Task Force on Labour Market Development established in July 1980, its Report reflects the absence of comprehensive studies with comparisons based on these distinctions (Canada Employment and Immigration Commission, 1981:95-98).

Inadequate, too, are the distinctions made in the occupational dimension of the data usually analyzed in ethnic-stratification research. First there is the failure to examine differences at the most detailed level available. For example, Porter used a crude classification, consisting of six broad occupational groups. This scheme, of course, facilitated comparisons of the occupational distributions of the ethnic groups studied. Nor was Porter's scheme entirely inappropriate for 1931, the earliest year he studied, when over one-third (36 percent) of the total male labor force was in agriculture. By 1961, however, the shift out of agriculture (left with 12 percent) resulted in over half (58 percent) of the male labor force being in the residual, "All others" category (Table 1). Such crude classification masks many crucial differences and puts into question, for example, the apparent similarity between the distribution of the French and that of the total labor force.

TABLE 1: OCCUPATIONAL DISTRIBUTION OF SELECTED ETHNIC GROUPS (MALES): CANADA, 1961.

Occupational Category	Total Labor Force	Ethnic Group			
		British	French	Jewish	Indian
Professional and financial	9%	11%	7%	16%	1%
Clerical	7	8	7	7	1
Personal service	4	3	4	2	6
Primary and unskilled	10	8	13	1	45
Agriculture	12	11	11	1	19
All others	58	59	59	74	29
Totals	100%	100%	101%	101%	101%

aMay not sum to 100 percent because of rounding.

Source: Based on Porter (1965:564).

Yet another kind of distinction inadequate in previous studies of occupational differentials among ethnic groups is that between mere difference on the one hand and *inequality* on the other. Admittedly, much inequality may be inferred from Table 1. In 1961, Indians were underrepresented in professional and financial occupations, where the British and particularly the Jews were overrepresented. Conversely, Indians were overrepresented in primary and unskilled work, where the British and especially the Jews were underrepresented. The relative rank of other occupational categories, however, remains ambiguous, as do the implications of disproportionate representation therein. For example, is the overrepresentation of Indians in agriculture an advantage or a disadvantage for the natives? The answer would depend, among other things, on the relative proportions of Indians and non-natives owning farms as opposed to being employed on others' farms. For ethnic stratification based on occupational inequality can be revealed only by *ordinal* data, which provide a ranking of all occupations, usually in terms of prestige, as indicated by the average levels of education and income associated with each job. Blishen (1958, 1967) and Blishen and McRoberts (1976) have prepared and revised such a socioeconomic ranking of the detailed occupations used in the 1951, 1961 and 1971 Censuses.

Although Porter (1965) examined some of Blishen's (1958) data on ethnic

TABLE 2: OCCUPATIONAL CLASS DISTRIBUTION OF SELECTED ETHNIC GROUPS (BOTH SEXES): CANADA, 1951

Occupational Class	Total Labor Force	British	French	Jewish	Indian & Inuit
1 (Highest)	1%	1%	1%	3%	0%
2	11	12	10	36	1
3	6	8	4	10	1
4	7	10	5	10	1
5	34	36	31	18	12
6	20	17	25	20	13
7 (Lowest)	21	17	25	4	72
Totala	100	101	101	101	100

aMay not sum to 100 percent because of rounding.

Source: Blishen (1958:531).

inequality in 1951 (the only year for which the ranking was then available), the data failed to distinguish males and females. Nevertheless, these rank distributions, some of which are reproduced in Table 2, confirm the extreme disadvantage of native people in Canada, 72 percent of whom are in the lowest occupational rank. The highest corresponding figure among the eleven other ethnic categories included in Blishen's (1958) data is 34 percent, for Asians (not shown in Table 2). The proportion of Asians (28 percent) in the upper four classes combined, however, exceeded that of the total labor force (25 percent). Table 2 also confirms the relatively high overall rank of Jewish Canadians, but the breadth of the classes can suggest only a slight advantage for the British and a slight disadvantage for the French.

Although Darroch (1979) analyzed ranked occupational data for 1901 prepared by Blishen (1970), the data were for birthplace and immigration, rather than for ethnicity, thus providing no updating of information on the relative occupational rank of native Canadians. These data for 1961 are shown for the first time in Table 3, which presents occupational distributions for Indians and the total labor force by sex. Although the extreme disadvantage of Indians clearly persisted until 1961, and characterized the relative ranks of both sexes, a question arises with respect to the disadvantage of Indian men (*vis-à-vis* all males), as compared with the disadvantage of Indian women (*vis-à-vis* all females). Proportionally there are slightly more Indian men in the lower two classes combined (94 percent) than Indian women (87 percent). The same relation holds, however, between all males and all females, for whom the equivalent figures are 63 and 61 percent, respectively.

TABLE 3: OCCUPATIONAL CLASS DISTRIBUTION OF INDIANS AND TOTAL LABOR FORCE, BY SEX: CANADA, 1961.

Occupational Class a	Male		Female	
	Total Labor Force	Indian	Total Labor Force	Indian
1 (Highest)	4%	0%	7%	2%
2	4	0	2	0
3	9	1	12	3
4	20	4	28	8
5	32	17	25	27
6 (Lowest)	31	77	26	60
Total <sup>b</sup>	100%	99%	100%	100%

aBlisshen (1967).

bMay not sum to 100 percent because of rounding.

Source: Dominion Bureau of Statistics (1964: Table 21).

This kind of problem in such analyses calls for the application of a summary measure, or index, of the differentials under consideration. Measurement of this type, however, is rare in studies of ethnic stratification. Indeed, Darroch's challenge to Porter is based largely on indexing Porter's own data. Applying a summary measure of inequality to the rankings in Table 3 yields a value of -51 as the index of the status of Indian men and -44 for Indian women (relative to all males and all females, respectively). The minus signs reflect the Indian disadvantage, while the larger (absolute) size of the index for males indicates that in these data the native/non-native differential is more pronounced among men than women.

Most summary indexes, however, are affected by the grouping of the data to which they are applied. Although, as noted above, Darroch (1979) did not analyze ethnic inequality, he did apply a summary measure of segregation (i.e., the "mere difference" between unranked occupational distributions, referred to above. As Darroch himself points out, the value of this "index of dissimilarity" increases with the number of categories to which it is applied: "other things equal, dissimilarity indexes based on a larger number and more refined categories tend to be greater than indexes based on more gross categories" (1979:12; his emphasis). This property of the dissimilarity index, of course, puts Darroch's own findings in doubt. For example, with Porter's broad occupational classification, he calculates the level of native/non-native segregation among males in 1961 at 45. The corresponding value computed with the original, detailed occupational distributions is 56; the equivalent index for

females is 48.

Another factor affecting such indexes is the uneven occupational distribution of the total labor force (cf. Tables 1,2, and 3). To remove the "structural effects" of overall occupation composition, which usually serve to reduce measured segregation and inequality, the data are "standardized on occupation." This is done by assigning an equal number of workers to each occupational category (or rank) according to the original within-category native/non-native distribution (e.g., Gibbs, 1965:163-164). The standardized indexes of native/non-native segregation for 1961 are 65 among males and 73 among females, suggesting that in 1961 overall occupational composition was masking a substantial amount of the segregation measured among males and females. The corresponding figures for 1951 are 71 among males, 80 among females. Using detailed and standardized data to index the relative disadvantages of Indians in 1961 yields values of -65 for men and -68 for women. The corresponding indexes for 1951 are -81 and -86, respectively.<sup>2</sup> Thus occupational segregation and inequality between native and non-native Canadians apparently declined over the 1950's, though both remained very high. (The formulas and interpretations of the indexes of segregation and inequality are given in the next section.)

An adequate assessment of the relative occupational status of native Canadians, then, would require indexing of both segregation and inequality at the most detailed level available and distinguishing Inuit from Indians, status from nonstatus Indians and on/off-reserve residence. The analysis should focus on each sex separately and, wherever possible, the investigation should be conducted at the provincial level, in order to determine the regional variation in the differentials observed at the national level. The following section describes the data and methods used for such a study of native/non-native occupational differentials in Canada as of 1971.

## DATA AND METHODS

Separate data for Inuit, status and nonstatus Indians and on/off-reserve residence are collected by the Census, but not published with occupational breakdowns. Custom tabulations of unpublished Census data, however, are available at cost for 1971. Accordingly, detailed occupational distributions as of 1971 were acquired for natives and non-natives. These cross-classifications included breakdowns by sex and province, and distinguished between Inuit and Indian, status and nonstatus Indians, and on- and off-reserve residence for status Indians. Given the 1971 Census definition of ethnicity as paternal ancestry in a single cultural group and the inherently mixed character of Métis ethnicity, "Métis" was excluded from the 1971 Census ethnic classification. Persons declaring themselves as either "Métis" or "half-breed" *and* living on reserves were included by Statistics Canada, with "non-band" - i.e. nonstatus-Indians (Statistics Canada, 1976:18-19). Métis, therefore cannot be distinguished in this analysis.

Inasmuch as occupation segregation and inequality can be measured only for those who have an occupation, the data to be analyzed are restricted to

TABLE 4: EXPERIENCED NATIVE AND NON-NATIVE LABOR FORCE, BY SEX:  
CANADA AND SELECTED PROVINCES, 1971.

Province	Non-Native	Indian					Nonstatus Indian	Inuit
		Total Indian	Status Indian					
			Total Status Indian	On Reserve	Off Reserve			
MALE								
Canadaa	5,211,625	33,945	25,055	13,215	11,045	8,910	2,155	
Que.	1,317,535	4,300	2,775	1,290	1,480	1,520	540	
Ont.	1,996,730	9,070	7,225	3,305	3,925	1,840	245	
Man.	246,140	4,155	3,065	1,890	1,175	1,085	20	
Sask.	230,835	3,410	2,530	1,565	965	885	15	
Alta.	414,250	4,330	2,520	1,545	990	1,810	10	
B.C.	549,640	6,685	5,420	3,115	2,305	1,260	65	
FEMALE								
Canadaa	2,628,380	12,665	8,955	3,015	5,660	3,715	900	
Que.	618,190	1,780	990	250	745	790	240	
Ont.	1,085,755	3,795	2,815	775	2,035	985	95	
Man.	130,610	1,285	915	400	520	365	10	
Sask.	107,450	1,135	840	300	540	295	10	
Alta.	211,735	1,635	1,000	500	500	635	15	
B.C.	272,765	2,320	1,870	670	1,190	450	25	

aIncludes Atlantic Provinces and the Yukon and Northwest Territories.

Source: Special tabulation of 1971 Census data.

persons 15 years of age and over who stated an occupation in which they were either employed or looking for work, excluding those who had last worked prior to January 1, 1970 or who had never worked. The numbers of such persons in each category are shown in Table 4. Omitted from this study are the Atlantic Provinces and the Territories, where the size of almost every native group is too small to yield dependable results. It may be noted that not all totals or subtotals in Table 4 equal the sum of the individual figures. This results from Census policy of random rounding of final digits up or down to zero or five.

In the country as a whole, status Indians comprise about three-quarters of all Indians counted by the Census. The proportion is slightly lower for females (71 percent) than for males (74 percent), perhaps reflecting loss of status by Indian women marrying men without Indian status (Canada. Department of Indian affairs and Northern Development, 1980:94). Provincially the status/nonstatus ratio varies for both sexes, but status Indians are everywhere in the majority, reflecting in part perhaps that on Indian reserves and in the North the 1971 Census collected the information on ethnicity and occupation by

complete enumeration rather than by sampling.

On average, status Indian male workers are only slightly more likely to reside on their reserves (53 percent) than off, except in Quebec and Ontario, perhaps reflecting relatively greater off-reserve employment opportunities in those provinces. In contrast, barely one-third (34 percent) of Canada's female status Indian workers live on reserves. As for males, however, the lowest on-reserve percentages are in Quebec (25 percent) and Ontario (28 percent). Most off-reserve residence involves migration of young adults to obtain employment in urban areas, although this would not account completely for the much lower on-reserve proportions for women, the explanation for which is beyond the scope of this study.

Even at the national level, there will be very few Inuit in our analysis (2,155 males, 900 females). Although Indians are much more numerous than the Inuit, the status-nonstatus and on/off-reserve distinctions have produced some very small groups, particularly among the women. The low numbers of natives in Table 4 reflect not only the relatively small native populations (about 300,000 Indians and 18,000 Inuit), but also the comparatively lower native labor force participation rates. The roughly 36,000 Indian and Inuit males in Table 4, for example, represent only 42 percent of all native males 15 years of age and over; the equivalent figure for non-native men is 70 percent. Among women the corresponding rates are 16 percent for natives, 35 percent for non-natives.

For purposes of the occupational analysis of the present study, however, the effect of the low numbers of native workers in the various categories distinguished is mitigated by three things. First, there is considerable clustering of natives in a relatively small number of occupations. For example, over three-quarters (77 percent) of Indian males are concentrated in seventy occupations, each containing more than a hundred Indian men. Such clustering is even more pronounced among Indian women, 74 percent of whom are found in thirty occupations, each containing more than a hundred female Indian workers. Second, as noted above, much of this information on occupation and ethnicity was collected by complete enumeration rather than by sampling, thus eliminating much error. Third, the relatively small number of natives is offset by the nature of the indices to be used in this analysis, in that their calculation is based *jointly* on the distributions of natives *and non-natives*. Nevertheless, in some native categories in some provinces the numbers are too small to yield dependable results. Since the calculation of the segregation index involves percentage differences, segregation will not be reported where the number of natives does not exceed 600 males or 300 females (clustering being greater among the latter). Because the inequality index is based on *cumulative* proportions and therefore is not as dependent on the number in individual cells, inequality will be reported for all groups numbering over 300 males and 100 females. Should these criteria seem overly stringent, it must be appreciated that the random rounding procedure, mentioned above, "can totally distort the actual shape and nature of a distribution with an overall low 'n' " (Lanphier, 1980:58). Thus, although the provincial breakdown is a gross one indeed,



smaller units would result in even lower subclass frequencies, many of which would be too small for analysis.

The segregation of each category of natives from non-natives is measured with the index used by Darroch (1979:8), the commonly used index of dissimilarity (D), for which the formula is

$$D = 100 (\sum |X_i - Y_i|) / 2$$

where  $Y_i$  is the proportion of non-natives in each occupation,  $X_i$  is the proportion of natives in each occupation, and the summation is of the absolute differences (i.e., disregarding minus signs). A calculated value of this index of segregation represents the percentage of natives (or non-natives) who would have to change occupations in order to have no occupation segregation (i.e., for both natives and non-natives to have identical occupation distributions).

The occupational distributions are then ordered according to the Blishen socioeconomic ranking (Blishen and McRoberts, 1976) and native/non-native inequality measured by the index of inequality used by Darroch (1979:13-14), the index of net difference (ND), one formula for which is

$$ND = 100 \left( \sum_{i=2}^n X_i - \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} Y_i \right)$$

where  $Y_i$  is the cumulated proportion of non-natives at each occupational rank,  $X_i$  is the cumulated proportion of natives at each occupational rank, and the summations are over the specified occupational ranks. ND varies from -100 through zero to +100. Negative values indicate the extent to which the probability of a native being in a lower occupational rank than a non-native exceeds the opposite probability. Positive values - highly unlikely, of course - would indicate the opposite relation, zero overall equality. Darroch would interpret a value of -30 as indicating a "decisive" disadvantage, while Duncan (1952:268) has taken -20 as measuring "very" disproportionate situations. Even the latter interpretation might be overly conservative in this study, since the Blishen ranks are based on the average levels of education and income and therefore tend to overestimate the occupational rank of natives, most of whom have much less education and earn much less than the average worker.

Prior to computing the segregation and inequality indexes the data are standardized on occupation, as explained above, to eliminate the influence of overall occupational composition on the differentials measured. The standardization of the data serves as a partial control for the structural differences prevailing between the largely urban native groups and the mainly urban non-native population. These differences would be most pronounced in the comparisons involving the Inuit and on-reserve Indians. In contrast, off-reserve residence among Indians is largely a result of migration to urban areas in response to relatively greater employment opportunities (McGahan, 1982:123). As well, it must be emphasized that, unlike the examples in the previous section, all indexes reported below are calculated for natives versus non-natives, never for natives versus the total population, which of course would include the natives

themselves.

The central feature of this study, then, is the application of summary indexes of segregation and inequality to hitherto unavailable occupational data on native peoples in Canada. The following section presents the results of this analysis, which distinguishes Inuit from Indians and on/off-reserve residence for status Indians, who in turn are distinguished from nonstatus Indians. As far as possible, the investigation is conducted at the provincial level and carried out for each sex separately.

## RESULTS

Before examining the results of the analysis of occupational segregation

TABLE 5: OCCUPATIONAL DISTRIBUTION OF INDIANS AND TOTAL LABOR FORCE, BY SEX: CANADA, 1971.

Occupational Group	Male		Female	
	Total Labor Force	Indian	Total Labor Force	Indian
Management and administration	6%	2%	2%	2%
Professional and technical	11	7	20	17
Clerical	8	4	36	23
Sales	11	3	9	5
Service	10	10	17	34
Transportation	6	6	. .a	1
Farming	8	10	4	4
Fishing, hunting and trapping	0.5	4	. .a	. .a
Other Primary	2	14	. .a	1
Production processes	35	40	11	13
Total <sup>b</sup>	98%	100%	99%	100%

aLess than 0.5 percent.

bMay not sum to 100 percent because of rounding.

Source: Statistics Canada (1975 :Table 4).

and inequality between native and non-native Canadians in 1971, it is useful to consider the general occupational differences between at least the Indian and total populations. Because the 1971 Census used a new occupational classification, the data presented in Table 5 are not comparable with those in Table 1, except perhaps for agriculture, where greater similarity between the Indian and total distributions is indicated. Otherwise, significant differences remain. Proportionally, among males there are one-third as many Indians as all workers [in management and administration, and fewer in professional and technical occupations, half as many in clerical jobs and roughly a quarter as many in sales. In service and transport Indian representation matches that of the total labor force. Compared with all men, there are eight times as many Indian men in fishing, hunting and trapping, and seven times as many in other nonagricultural primary pursuits. Production processes account for a larger share of Indians than of the total labor force.

The distribution of Indian women is similar to all women in management and administration, but Indian females are underrepresented in the professional and technical, the clerical and the sales categories. At the same time, there are proportionally twice as many Indian women in service jobs and more in transport and nonagricultural primary occupations and in production processes. When examining these figures and the indexed native/non-native differentials, it should be borne in mind that occupational data for natives include many more times as many unemployed workers as do data for non-natives: estimates of Indian unemployment range from over twice the national level for all Indians to thirteen times that of the total population among middle-aged, off-reserve residents (Canada, Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, 1980:59; McGahan, 1982:126).

#### Native/non-native occupational segregation.

The occupational segregation of Indian men indicated in Table 5 is confirmed by the persistently high indexes for Indian men in Table 6, where the values represent the percentages of natives (or non-natives) who would have to change jobs to have identical occupational distributions. There is evidence in Table 6, moreover, of considerable variation by status, residence and province. Although at the national level nonstatus Indian males are slightly less segregated from non-natives (58) than are status Indian males (62), the opposite relation holds provincially. The indexes for status Indian men range from a low of 66 in Ontario to 81 in Saskatchewan and Alberta, while those for nonstatus Indian males vary from 70 in Ontario to 87 in Saskatchewan. As one would expect, however, given the greater off-reserve employment opportunities, status Indian men living off their reserves are less segregated occupationally from non-native males than those residing on reserves. There is, however, considerably more provincial variation in off-reserve segregation, which ranges from a low of 64 in Ontario to a high of 86 in Alberta, for the national average of 74. Occupational segregation of Indian men on reserves ranges from a low of 79 in Ontario to a high of 89 in Saskatchewan, for the national average of 83. Evidently,

TABLE 6: STANDARDIZED INDEXES OF OCCUPATIONAL SEGREGATION<sup>a</sup> OF NATIVES FROM NON-NATIVES, BY SEX: CANADA AND SELECTED PROVINCES, 1971.

Province	Indian					Inuit
	Total Indian	Status Indian			Nonstatus Indian	
		Total Status Indian	On Reserve	Off Reserve		
MALE						
Canada	54	62	83 <sup>b</sup>	74 <sup>b</sup>	58	87
Que.	59	70	83	76	71	. . c
Ont.	61	66	79	64	70	. . c
Man.	74	79	86	83	83	. . c
Sask.	77	81	89	84	87	. . c
Alta.	76	81	87	86	83	. . c
B.C.	67	71	82	73	81	. . c
FEMALE						
Canada	62	71	90 <sup>b</sup>	85 <sup>b</sup>	74	90
Que.	80	87	. . c	89	86	. . c
Ont.	74	77	90	79	85	. . c
Man.	84	85	91	90	90	. . c
Sask.	84	87	. . c	88	. . c	. . c
Alia.	83	87	90	89	89	. . c
B.C.	80	84	91	85	90	. . c

<sup>a</sup>The indexes represent the percentage of natives or non-natives which would have to change jobs to have identical occupational distributions of natives and non-natives. Standardization eliminates the effect of overall occupational structure on the segregation measured.

<sup>b</sup>weighted mean of provincial indexes; national data unavailable.

<sup>c</sup>Number too small for analysis.

residential and occupational segregation go hand in hand. Among all Indian males segregation varies from 59 in Quebec to 77 in Saskatchewan; the national figure is 54, much higher than that for Inuit men (87). Provincially, there is among Indian men, then, a consistent provincial pattern, in which their occupational segregation is lower in Quebec, Ontario and British Columbia than in the Prairie Provinces. Among nonstatus Indians in British Columbia, however, the degree of segregation (81) is closer to that in the other Western provinces,

with an average of 84, than either Quebec (71) or Ontario (70).

A similar, though less consistent, provincial pattern emerges in the occupational segregation of Indian women, which is higher but less variable than that observed among men. Like those for men, off-reserve segregation indexes for women are consistently lower than the corresponding on-reserve figures; the national averages are 85 and 90, respectively. The on-reserve indexes for Manitoba and British Columbia are both 91, the highest value in Table 6. Like Indian men provincially, status Indian women are less segregated from non-native females (71) than are nonstatus Indian women (74); the only exception is

TABLE 7: OCCUPATIONAL CLASS DISTRIBUTION OF NATIVES AND NON-NATIVES, BY SEX: CANADA, 1971.

Occupational class	Non-Native	Indian			Inuit
		Total Indian	Status Indian	Nonstatus Indian	
MALE					
1 (Highest)	4%	1%	1%	1%	-- <sup>b</sup>
2	12	4	3	5	3
3	10	4	3	4	5
4	21	12	9	14	11
5	23	26	40	27	18
6 (Lowest)	31	53	44	49	65
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
FEMALE					
1 (Highest)	3%	1%	1%	1%	1%
2	9	5	5	5	4
3	23	15	15	16	13
4	22	16	17	15	8
5	20	26	26	25	26
6 (Lowest)	23	37	57	38	48
Total <sup>c</sup>	100%	100%	101%	100%	100%

<sup>a</sup>Blishen and McRoberts (1976).

<sup>b</sup>Less than 0.5 percent.

<sup>c</sup>May not sum to 100 percent because of rounding.

Source: Special tabulation of 1971 Census data.

Quebec. The segregation of Inuit women (90) is three points greater than that of Inuit men (87). Differences in the number and definition of Census occupations between 1961 and 1971 notwithstanding, the occupational segregation of native Canadians probably decreased over the decade. The values of 54 and 62 for all Indian men and women, respectively, are lower than the corresponding figures (65 and 73) reported above for 1961. The status, residence and provincial distinctions made in the present study, however, have revealed instances of occupational segregation approaching the maximum measurable.

#### Native/non-native occupational inequality.

The degree of disadvantage associated with the segregation considered above is revealed by the analysis of native/non-native occupational inequality. Again, however, before examining the indexes calculated with the detailed occupational rankings, it is useful to consider the broad, occupational-class distributions of natives and non-natives in the country as a whole as of 1971. These distributions, presented in Table 7, suggest that the occupational disadvantages to Indians may have decreased since 1961 (cf. Table 3, above). The proportions of both status and nonstatus Indians of both sexes found in the two bottom classes in 1971 (Table 7) are lower than in 1961 (Table 3). However, the proportion of non-natives in the bottom two classes decreased also. Again, one must turn to indexes to summarize the complex relations prevailing in these data.

Although Table 8 does indicate less occupational disadvantage for Indian men (-45) compared with their situation in 1961 (-65), it should be remembered that any (absolute) value of 20, and certainly of 30, or more indicates a great degree of inequality. The relative disadvantages associated with both status and on/off-reserve residence are consistent with the relative segregation observed: the lower degrees of nonstatus and off-reserve occupational segregation are accompanied by less inequality among nonstatus (-43) than status (-48) Indian males, and off-reserve inequality averages -45 compared to -53 on reserves. Such provincial patterns as may be discerned in the highly variable native/non-native inequality indexes for men differ somewhat from those observed among the measures of segregation. In Table 8, the inequality indexes for Quebec are consistently below the national figures. Depending on the status and residence distinctions - if any - being made, the inequality measured in the other provinces is generally greater than that found at the national level. The greatest levels of inequality involving Indian men are found in Ontario (on-reserve only), Manitoba (total, status and off-reserve) and Saskatchewan (nonstatus). The greatest degree of native/non-native inequality to be found by this study is that for Inuit males in Quebec (-85), slightly greater than the national index for Inuit men (-80).

Despite being more segregated occupationally from non-natives than are native men, native women experience generally less occupational disadvantage - and in a few instances a slight advantage - vis-a-vis non-native females, perhaps reflecting their participation in such professions as teaching, nursing and social work. As found among Indian men, however, and despite the greater segregation

TABLE 8: STANDARDIZED INDEXES OF OCCUPATIONAL INEQUALITY<sup>a</sup> BETWEEN NATIVES AND NON-NATIVES, BY SEX: CANADA AND SELECTED PROVINCES, 1971.

Province	Native Indian					Inuit
	Total Native Indian	Status Indian			Nonstatus Indian	
		Total Status Indian	On Reserve	Off Reserve		
MALE						
Canada	-45	-48	-53 <sup>b</sup>	-45 <sup>b</sup>	-43	-80
Que.	-33	-57	-41	-32	-16	-83 <sup>c</sup>
Ont.	-50	-58	-68	-46	-31	.. <sup>c</sup>
Man.	-55	-59	-52	-60	-49	.. <sup>c</sup>
Sask.	-55	-52	-54	-53	-67	.. <sup>c</sup>
Alta.	-49	-42	-29	-47	-55	.. <sup>c</sup>
B.C.	-47	-50	-55	-40	-42	.. <sup>c</sup>
FEMALE						
Canada	-34	-38	-41 <sup>b</sup>	-26 <sup>b</sup>	-28	-37
Que.	-8	+2	-15	-8	-7	-38 <sup>c</sup>
Ont.	-42	-40	-51	-29	-12	.. <sup>c</sup>
Man.	-34	-42	-41	-21	-52	.. <sup>c</sup>
Sask.	-50	-49	-69	-41	-73	.. <sup>c</sup>
Alta.	-0.4	-19	+2	-20	+5	.. <sup>c</sup>
B.C.	-43	-37	-58	-31	-27	.. <sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup>The indexes represent the extent to which the probability of a native being in a lower occupational rank than a non-native exceeds the opposite probability. Standardization eliminates the effect of overall occupational-rank structure on the inequality measured. <sup>b</sup>weighted mean of provincial indexes; national data unavailable. <sup>c</sup>Number too small for analysis.

of nonstatus, as compared with status, Indian women, the latter are more disadvantaged vis-a-vis non-native females than the former (-38, as compared to -41). Interprovincial variation in native/non-native occupational inequality among women exhibits a pattern like that traced among men, in that Quebec has lower inequality values than observed at the national level, as do British Columbia when controlling for status, Manitoba (off-reserve only) and Ontario (nonstatus only), while the greatest degrees of inequality are found without exception in Saskatchewan. Unlike the results for males, the provincial indexes showing the least disadvantage to Indian women are those for Alberta (except for the status and off-reserve categories). As observed among men, however, the disadvantage to Inuit is greater than that to (all) Indian women both at the national level and in Quebec, although the degree of difference is much less than among males.

Like segregation, then, inequality between native and non-native Canadians appears to have decreased over the 1960s: the values of -45 and -34 for all Indian men and women, respectively, are lower than the corresponding figures reported above for 1961 (-65 and -68). Nevertheless, the inequality indexes for 1971 are very high.

## DISCUSSION

The results of this analysis of hitherto unreleased Census data document high levels of native/non-native occupation segregation, particularly among females, the Inuit, nonstatus Indians, status Indians living on their reserves, and of Indians generally in the Prairie Provinces. Overall occupation rank tends to be lower for males, for Inuit, for status Indians (especially on reserves) and west of Quebec, excluding Alberta.

Although both formal explanation of these findings and policy recommendations are beyond the scope of this study, the results reported here lend themselves to use in making decisions in the areas of development, employment and affirmative action. To the extent that such programs are aimed at native peoples, the findings of this study could be used in selecting specific target groups and in assigning regional priorities. In basing decisions on the results of this analysis, however, it must be remembered that accompanying native/non-native occupational segregation and inequality (probably underestimated here) are enormous differentials in unemployment, income and power, such that no category of natives anywhere in Canada can be ignored in policy formulation or program implementation. Moreover, the full potential of this study will be realized only in conjunction with an equivalent analysis of 1981 Census data, thus providing indicators of interdecade trends for use in guiding consultation and in program design.

## NOTES

1. The research reported in this paper was funded by the New Brunswick Human Rights Commission. The author is grateful for the support of the Commission, the research assistance of Nancy Burnham and Tom Henderson, and the comments of anonymous reviewers.
2. Indexes based on detailed data for 1951 and 1961 result from my collaboration in the study of ethnic stratification with Donald Loree.

## REFERENCES

Blishen, Bernard R.

- 1958 "The construction and use of an occupational class scale." *Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science* 24 (November):



519-531.

1967 "A socio-economic index for occupations in Canada." *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* 4 (February) :41-53.

1970 "Social class and opportunity in Canada." *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* 7 (May) :110-127.

Blishen, Bernard R., and Hugh A. McRoberts

1976 "A revised socioeconomic index for occupations in Canada." *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* 13 (February) : 71-79.

Canada Employment and Immigration Commission

1981 *Labour Market Development in the 1980's*. Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services.

Canada, Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development

1972 *Schedule of Indian Reserves and Settlements*. Ottawa: Information Canada.

1980 *Indian Conditions: A Survey*. Ottawa: Minister of Indian and Northern Affairs.

Darroch, A. Gordon

1979 "Another look at ethnicity, stratification and social mobility in Canada." *Canadian Journal of Sociology* 4 (Winter) :1-25.

Dominion Bureau of Statistics

1953 *Ninth Census of Canada, 1951. Vol. IV. Labour Force: Occupations and Industries*. Ottawa: Queen's Printer.

1964 *1961 Census of Canada, Vol. III, Part I (Bulletin 3.1-15) Labour Force: Occupations by Sex, Showing Birthplace, Period of Immigration and Ethnic Group: Canada and Provinces*. Ottawa: Queen's Printer.

Duncan, Otis Dudley

1952 "Urbanization and retail specialization." *Social Forces* 30 (March): 267-271.

Gibbs, Jack P.

1965 "Occupational differentiation of Negroes and whites in the United States." *Social Forces* 44 (December) :159-165.

Forcese, Dennis

1975 *The Canadian Class Structure*. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson.

Lanphier, C. Michael

1980 *Ethnicity and Occupational Prestige Ranking*. Toronto: Institute for Behavioural Research, York University.

McGahan, Peter

1982 *Urban Sociology in Canada*. Toronto: Butterworths.

Porter, John

1965 *The Vertical Mosaic: An Analysis of Social Class and Power in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Statistics Canada

1975 *1971 Census of Canada, Vol. III, Part 3 (Bulletin 3.3-7) Occupations by Sex, Showing Birthplace, Period of Immigration, and Ethnic Group, for Canada and Provinces*. Ottawa: Information Canada.

1976 *1971 Census of Canada, Vol. I, Part 3 (Bulletin 1.5-1) Population: Introduction to Volume I (Part 3)*. Ottawa: Information Canada.

Are you sure you want to remove Occupational segregation and inequality between native and non-native Canadians, 1971 from your list? There's no description for this book yet. Can you add one?