



## *Article*

---

# *The Urban Aboriginal Middle Income Group in Canada: A Demographic Profile*

*2012 UAKN Research Paper Series*

Dr. Amanda Parriag and Paul Chaulk  
*Amada Parriag & Associates*

---

The Urban Aboriginal Knowledge Network, the UAKN, is a community driven research network focused on the Urban Aboriginal population in Canada. The UAKN establishes a national, interdisciplinary network involving universities, community, and government partners for research, scholarship and knowledge mobilization. For more information visit: [www.uakn.org](http://www.uakn.org)



National Association  
of Friendship Centres  
Association nationale  
des centres d'amitié



Affaires autochtones et  
Développement du Nord Canada

Aboriginal Affairs and  
Northern Development Canada

## The Urban Aboriginal Middle Income Group in Canada: A Demographic Profile

### Introduction

The Aboriginal population in Canada is increasingly becoming urbanized. According to data from Statistics Canada, in 2006, 54 percent of Aboriginal people in Canada lived in an urban centre, a proportion that increased 50 percent from 1996. Of these urban Aboriginal people, 50 percent were First Nations, 43 percent were Métis and relatively few were Inuit (Statistics Canada, 2008). As well, in their analysis of Census data, Norris and Clatworthy (2011) show that that proportion of all Aboriginal people living in urban areas has increased from 13 percent to 53 percent between 1961 and 2006. While urbanization of Aboriginal people is an identified trend, there is still surprisingly little known about this group. Research is not clear on the impact of this urbanization. For example, in urban areas with substantial proportions of Aboriginal people, there has been a notable absence of businesses, culturally focused organizations, or services that are usually part of associated with areas of ethnic concentration. There has been a concurrent absence of opposition to Aboriginal people in these areas, such as that found in some inner city neighborhoods in U.S. cities (Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation, 2008). While some research has found that the urban Aboriginal population is happy with their place of residence (Environics Institute, 2010), other research has found that this group experiences much lower levels of income than that seen in the Census (Smylie, et al., 2011). The lack of understanding of the urban Aboriginal population is a huge gap in our knowledge base.

### Geography

Efforts are being made to increase this knowledge base at a broad level, particularly in the areas of geography, mobility, language, gender, age, and income. In 2006, First Nations people were 50 percent of the urban Aboriginal population across the country and 43 percent were Métis. Very few Inuit lived

in urban centres outside of the North (Statistics Canada, 2008). In Ontario, the population with the largest proportion of Aboriginal people, 70 percent of First Nations people lived off reserve in 2006. By comparison, 77.2 percent of Aboriginal people lived off-reserve, in urban areas, in 2006 (Ontario Trillium Foundation, 2011). Census data also showed that 62 percent of First Nations in British Columbia, 59 percent in First Nations in Alberta, 48 percent in Saskatchewan, 45 percent in Manitoba, 49 percent in Quebec, 44 percent in New Brunswick, 48 percent in Nova Scotia, 82 percent in Newfoundland and Labrador and 68 percent in First Nations in Prince Edward Island lived off-reserve in 2006. About 3 in 4 lived in urban areas in each of these jurisdictions (Statistics Canada, 2008).

About 90 percent of the urban Aboriginal population of Canada resides in one of 12 cities: Winnipeg, Edmonton, Vancouver, Calgary, Toronto, Saskatoon, Ottawa-Gatineau, Montreal, Regina, Thunder Bay, Sudbury and Hamilton (Norris & Clatworthy, 2011). In terms of geographic location, Winnipeg has the highest number of urban Aboriginal people, at 10 percent of the total city population. Edmonton, with Aboriginal people comprising 5 percent of its population, has the second largest number of Aboriginal people. Vancouver, Toronto, Calgary, Saskatoon and Regina also have large numbers of Aboriginal people. In these centres, Aboriginal people are not more than 9 percent of the total urban population. In smaller urban centres such as Thompson, Manitoba; Prince Rupert, British Columbia; and Prince Albert in Saskatchewan, the numbers of Aboriginal people are smaller but the proportion of the total population is between 34 and 36 percent of the total urban population (Statistics Canada, 2008, p. 13).

## Mobility

Recent research on mobility has uncovered findings that are adding depth to our understanding of this group. To start, it is becoming clear that the increasing urbanization of Aboriginal people is not the result of a mass exodus from reserves to cities. There is in fact an overall increase for populations on

reserves when the movement between reserves and urban areas is examined. Rather, it is that the choosing of one's ethnicity or "ethnic mobility" in combination with the higher birth rate that can account for the faster growth of the Aboriginal population compared to the non-Aboriginal population in urban areas (Guimond, Robitaille, & Senecal, 2009; Norris & Clatworthy, 2011).

The urban Aboriginal population is known to be more mobile than the urban non-Aboriginal population (45% vs. 21% having moved within the same urban community between 1991 and 1996), but there is a wide range of variation in mobility as a function of Aboriginal sub-group (Registered Indians, non-status Indians, Métis and Inuit) and geography in question, according to data from the 1996 Census and the 1991 Aboriginal Peoples Survey (APS) (Norris & Clatworthy, 2003, pp. 55-56). As a starting point, it appears that when Aboriginal people move to urban areas, they tend to settle there. Seventy percent of first generation urban Aboriginal people (Aboriginal people who were born and raised in another community, town city or reserve than the urban area they currently reside in) said that they have never moved back to their home community since moving to their current city of residence (EnviroNics Institute, 2010, p. 34).

Census data also suggests that the Registered Indian population off-reserve tends to move more than the on-reserve population or the non-Aboriginal population. One analysis showed that 66 percent of off-reserve Registered Indians had moved between 1991 and 1996; 29 percent moved between communities and 37 percent moved within the same community off reserve. In the Canadian population, 43 percent had moved in the same time period (20 percent migrants and 23 percent residential movers) (Norris & Clatworthy, 2003, p. 55). In another study, 25 percent of the Aboriginal population in Manitoba said that they were likely to move in the next 12 months, with off-reserve First Nations (33%) being most likely to say this (Adams, 2009).

The type of moves among Aboriginal people varies by geographic area as well. In large cities, urban Métis people were most likely to move within the same community (70%), followed by Registered Indians (65%), non-Status Indians (62%), non-Aboriginal people (55%) and Inuit (46%) (Norris & Clatworthy, 2003, p. 56). In comparison, 83 percent of Inuit moved within the same community in rural areas compared to 50 percent of all other Aboriginal people and 40 percent of non-Aboriginal people, in rural areas. In many cases, frequent moves among Aboriginal people appear to be tied to poverty and the strictures that this situation places on finding a residence (Urban Aboriginal Task Force, 2007).

## Language

Aboriginal language is often examined as it is seen as the essence of a culture and the method by which culture and traditions are passed down through generations. Urban Aboriginal people place a great deal of importance on being able to speak an Aboriginal language, although this is not necessarily tied to the ability to do so. More than ninety percent of Aboriginal respondents (92.5%) in one survey said it was important to speak an Aboriginal language although 50.5% said they could speak one (Urban Aboriginal Task Force, 2007, p. 83). It appears that ability to speak an Aboriginal language is lower in urban areas in comparison to non-urban areas. In 1996, only 9 percent of Aboriginal people in cities had an Aboriginal mother tongue and 12 percent had the ability to converse in their language (Norris, 2006, p. 203). By sub-group, in 2006, 12 percent of First Nations off-reserve and 51% percent of First Nations on-reserve could speak an Aboriginal language (Statistics Canada, 2008, p. 48). Among Métis, 2 percent in urban areas could speak an Aboriginal language compared to 6 percent in rural areas (Statistics Canada, 2008, p. 37). Only 15 percent of Inuit in urban areas spoke Inuktitut in 2006 while 84 percent of those in Inuit Nunangat could do so (Statistics Canada, 2008, p. 28).

## Gender and age

The distribution of gender and age among urban Aboriginal people is not well documented. One recent survey noted an overrepresentation of Aboriginal women survey respondents in urban areas, but this is not necessarily indicative of greater actual proportions of Aboriginal women relative to Aboriginal men in urban centres across the country (EnviroNics Institute, 2010). As many authors do, the national Association of Friendship Centres estimated that the proportion of women in urban areas could be considered in the context of the proportion of Aboriginal people who are women (51%) and the age of Aboriginal women overall (50% under the age of 25) (National Association of Friendship Centres).

In keeping with the younger overall Aboriginal population, research shows that 41 percent of off-reserve First Nations people (without specifying whether these are urban areas) are between 25 and 54 (Statistics Canada, 2008, p. 44) and 45 percent of Inuit people living in urban areas are 25 to 64 years of age (Statistics Canada, 2008, p. 23). Looking at five major urban centres, between 38 and 50 percent of the Aboriginal population but only 30 to 34 percent of the non-Aboriginal population in each instance is under 25 years of age (Urban Aboriginal Task Force, 2007, p. 56).

Clearly taken together there are still large gaps in knowledge of the gender and age of the urban Aboriginal population.

## Income

When income is examined among Aboriginal people, the focus is primarily on the income disparities between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal people and the issues that come with poverty among Aboriginal people. Aboriginal people as a whole have lower household incomes (Bopp, Bopp, & Lane Jr., 2003).

The median income for Aboriginal people in 2006 was \$18,962, which is 30 percent lower than the

\$27,097 median income for non-Aboriginal people. Further, this income disparity is narrowing very slowly over time. At this rate, it will take more than 60 years before the gap has been closed (Wilson & Macdonald, 2010, p. 3). Lower income suggests higher stresses, greater vulnerability to fluctuations in the housing market, and poorer health outcomes, among other issues (Statistics Canada, 2008; Ipsos-Reid, 2006; Brzozowski, Taylor-Butts, & Johnson, 2006).

However, research on urban Aboriginal people has recently uncovered some promising trends. It appears that there is an emerging urban Aboriginal middle income group (defined in the cited research as earning an annual household income of between \$40,000 and \$60,000); at least in the six cities in Ontario included in the Urban Aboriginal Task Force research. This research found that “25.4% of the local Aboriginal population is earning over \$40,000 per year and 12.3% is earning over \$60,000 per year” (Urban Aboriginal Task Force, 2007, p. 171). Among the cities where Aboriginal respondents live, the highest proportion of respondents earning over \$40,000 was in Barrie/Midland/Orillia (38%), with Ottawa (32%) and Sudbury (29%) having slightly lower proportions (Urban Aboriginal Task Force, 2007, p. 172).

The issue

Much of the national research on Aboriginal people in urban areas cannot be disaggregated into First Nations, Métis and Inuit people because it is not collected at this granular a level. This limits policy makers and service providers to providing services for the Aboriginal population as though it were one homogeneous population. As well, in spite of the understanding that much of the First Nations population lives off-reserve in urban areas, not much research has been undertaken to analyze the demography and makeup of this population on its own and relative to other Aboriginal people in urban areas. Some findings suggest that First Nations in urban areas are a markedly heterogeneous group,

making it difficult for them to find ethnic social cohesion, culture and language retention, and a community feeling in their urban setting (Clatworthy, 2000). Furthermore, a recent study of 725 First Nations in Hamilton, 90% of the survey sample had moved once in the preceding 5 years and over 50% of the population had moved 3 times in the same time frame. In this group, only 3% spoke an Aboriginal language at home. As well, 78.2% had personal incomes below \$20,000 in 2008 (Smylie, et al., 2011, pp. 32-33). Clearly, First Nations in Hamilton are not thriving. Given Clatworthy's (2000) findings, First Nations people overall in urban centres may not be thriving. And how are other Aboriginal people doing by comparison? We know that there is an urban Aboriginal middle income group, for example, but who comprises this group?

There is little information on the demography of urban Aboriginal people, the characteristics that have made them successful, and the extent to which the urban Aboriginal middle income group exists in cities across Canada. As well, there is little information on the differences between urban First Nations people compared to other urban Aboriginal people. While so much research on Aboriginal people focuses on the challenges that they face, this paper will have a more positive focus; uncovering the details of the promising middle income group of urban Aboriginal people and examining how they differ by First Nations and non-First Nations status as well as how they compare to non-Aboriginal people.

### Research Questions

This research will be conducted in order to gain a deeper understanding of the urban Aboriginal middle income group in Canada. Given that there is very little known about this group thus far, the research will focus on answering the following research questions:

- On a national level, how large is the urban Aboriginal middle income group, in absolute terms and relative to lower-income and higher-income urban Aboriginal people.
- In what regions and cities does the urban Aboriginal middle income group tend to be concentrated or absent? What is the comparative concentration of the lower-income and higher-income urban Aboriginal groups in these cities?
- What are the age, sex, mobility and language characteristics of the urban Aboriginal middle income group, and how do these characteristics compare to those of the lower and higher-income urban Aboriginal groups?
- Within each of these, are there differences for First Nations people relative to other Aboriginal people?
- Within each of these, are there differences for Aboriginal People relative to non-Aboriginal people?

## Method

This analysis focused on data from 2006 Aboriginal Peoples Survey and the 2006 Census. For this analysis, urban was defined as an area with a total population of at least 1,000 and a population density no fewer than 400 people per square kilometre. Aboriginal People were defined as those who responded positively to the identification questions in the APS and thus any persons in the Aboriginal identity population were included in this sample. It is important to note that the APS sample excludes First Nations living on-reserve. First Nations people were those who responded positively to the questions on

the Census “Are you a Treaty Indian or a Registered Indian as defined by the Indian Act of Canada?” and “Are you a member of an Indian Band or First Nation?” All other Aboriginal people were included in one category which included non-status First Nations, Métis and Inuit people. Within the Census data, the sample of interest was that of non-Aboriginal people in urban areas.

Income breaks in the APS were decided through applying the rule used in previous Statistics Canada studies to all Canadian households in the 2006 Census where middle income was defined by taking 75% to 150% of the income distribution, which was \$40,226 to \$80,451 in the 2006 Census. Lower and higher incomes were defined as the income below the lower boundary and above the higher boundary (Heisz, 2007). These same income categories were used with Census data for comparability purposes.

Statistics Canada conducted data runs from the APS for the Aboriginal population, stratified by urban versus rural status, by income, and by First Nations versus other Aboriginal status. Analyses were conducted on this data. An initial comparison was conducted of income for urban versus rural Aboriginal People in order to provide context. All remaining demographic analyses focused only on urban Aboriginal People. Census data was stratified in the same manner as the APS data and used for comparison purposes where available.

### Limitations

The data from the Aboriginal Peoples Survey (APS) appeared to inflate the numbers of Aboriginal people in the middle and higher income groups, based on the proportions in the groups in the Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal population and research demonstrating the much lower income of Aboriginal people compared to non-Aboriginal people (Smylie, et al., 2011). This inflation might have taken place because of the APS methodology. The APS survey uses a sampling frame constructed based on all

individuals who responded positively to the Aboriginal questions in the Census long form sample. The Census is known to have significant under-participation by First Nations community members, and “is known to under-represent persons who are homeless, transient or who have low literacy skills, all issues which have higher prevalence in First Nations populations, and all issues that are associated with lower income levels” (Smylie, et al., 2011, p. 35). Further, while the Census does include some on-reserve population, the APS does not include people living in on-reserve communities in the provinces and First Nations in the territories (Aboriginal Peoples Survey (APS)). As a result respondents to the APS would likely be those who are in the higher income levels.

Taken together, this still does not explain why the income levels of First Nations in this data were much higher than expected. Across Canada, in 2005, First Nations off-reserve had a median income of \$22,500 while on-reserve this dropped to \$14,000 (Statistics Canada, 2010). This means that the most affluent First Nations are those included in both the Census and the Aboriginal Peoples Survey.

It could well be that the higher income levels are due to the influence of ethnic mobility where some of those who are self-identifying as Aboriginal people are also in the higher income categories.

Further, these analyses were provided by Statistics Canada such that they were conducted on only one variable at a time. In this way, interrelationships between variables have not been identified or analyzed, leaving some gaps in our understanding of these variables.

Finally, a single definition of income classes was used with no consideration of cost of living in various regions, household size, etc.

## Analysis

Comparisons between sub-groups were analyzed using two-tailed z-tests of differences between two population proportions. These tests determine whether the difference between the two population proportions being compared is significantly different from zero. Due to the number of tests performed a more stringent criterion of  $\alpha = .01$  was used. This is an extremely reasonable approach according to both Harlow (2005) and Pagano (2010) when there is a need to protect the Type I error rate without increasing the probability of a Type II error too dramatically. Significant differences are noted in the tables. In order to focus on the most important trends given the power in the sample, only significant differences which are equal to or greater than 5 percent are discussed in the text.

## Results

### Description of Aboriginal People, non-Aboriginal People and Household Incomes across the Country

In order to situate the overall context for the Aboriginal middle income group it is important to understand where this group is situated compared to other income groups, how First Nations and other Aboriginal people compared on these incomes, and how Aboriginal income groups including the middle income group, compares to non-Aboriginal people. Table 1 presents the proportions of all Aboriginal people (excluding First Nations on-reserve) and their household incomes in urban, rural and Inuit Nunangat regions, as well as non-Aboriginal people in urban and rural regions.

As seen in table 1, there were similar proportions of Aboriginal (total Aboriginal, First Nations and other Aboriginal people alike) and non-Aboriginal people in the middle household income category (about a third). The differences between these groups were found in the higher and lower income household categories. Higher proportions of Aboriginal people compared to non-Aboriginal people were in lower income households, a difference that was driven in part by the proportion of First Nations in this

category. In fact, a plurality of First Nations were in the low household income category (and in urban areas) while on the other end of the spectrum a plurality of non-Aboriginal people were in the high household income category in urban areas.

<b>Table 1 - Aboriginal People, non-Aboriginal People and Household Incomes</b>					
<b>Population</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Low Income</b>	<b>Middle Income</b>	<b>High Income</b>
			<b>Less than \$20,000 to \$40,225</b>	<b>\$40,226 to \$80,451</b>	<b>above \$80,451</b>
<b>First Nations</b>	<b>Canada</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>41%</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>26%</b>
	Urban	100%	43% <sup>*†</sup>	32% <sup>*†</sup>	25% <sup>*†</sup>
	Rural	100%	36% <sup>*†</sup>	36% <sup>*†</sup>	27% <sup>*†</sup>
	Inuit Nunangat	100%	28% <sup>*</sup>	26% <sup>*†</sup>	46% <sup>*†</sup>
<b>Other Aboriginal</b>	<b>Canada</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>35%</b>	<b>35%</b>
	Urban	100%	31% <sup>†</sup>	34% <sup>*†</sup>	35% <sup>*†</sup>
	Rural	100%	30% <sup>*†</sup>	37% <sup>*†</sup>	33% <sup>*†</sup>
	Inuit Nunangat	100%	30%	35% <sup>†</sup>	35% <sup>*†</sup>
<b>Total Aboriginal</b>	<b>Canada</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>34%<sup>*</sup></b>	<b>31%</b>
	Urban	100%	35% <sup>*</sup>	34%	31%
	Rural	100%	32% <sup>*</sup>	37% <sup>*</sup>	31% <sup>*</sup>
	Inuit Nunangat	100%	30% <sup>*</sup>	34%	36% <sup>*</sup>
<b>Non-Aboriginal</b>	<b>Canada</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>26%<sup>n</sup></b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>39%<sup>n</sup></b>
	Urban	100%	26% <sup>n</sup>	34%	40% <sup>n</sup>
	Rural	100%	27% <sup>n</sup>	38% <sup>n</sup>	35% <sup>n</sup>

\* Statistically significant difference between area of Canada and all of Canada (excluding First Nations on-reserve),  $p < 0.01$ , Z-test of two population proportions

† Statistically significant difference between First Nations Off-Reserve and Other Aboriginal People within the same area of Canada,  $p < 0.01$ , Z-test of two population proportions

<sup>n</sup> Statistically significant difference between Total Aboriginal and Non-Aboriginal People within the same area of Canada,  $p < 0.01$ , Z-test of two population proportions

The remainder of these tables are focused on urban areas only. Note that the data for Aboriginal groups excludes First Nations on-reserve and that for non-Aboriginal people, while data were collected for on-reserve populations, this data was not included in the urban sample of interest.

#### Urban Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal Household Incomes by Jurisdiction

In this section we examined household income by jurisdiction for all Aboriginal people, then compared First Nations off-reserve in each jurisdiction to other Aboriginal people in each jurisdiction to see where the differences among Aboriginal people might lie. Finally, we compared Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal household incomes by jurisdiction across the country.

Aboriginal household incomes were roughly equally distributed across the low, middle and high income categories. Greater proportions of higher income Aboriginal households were in the Northwest Territories and Alberta, highest proportions of middle incomes were in Quebec followed by Nova Scotia and the greatest proportion of lower income households was in the Yukon followed by Saskatchewan.

About a third of both First Nations and other Aboriginal households were in the middle household income category. While results from Table 1 showed that the difference between the two groups was in the proportions in the higher and lower household income categories, Table 2 outlined the larger proportions of other Aboriginal people in the higher household income category in each jurisdiction examined other than in New Brunswick where there were similar proportions in the highest household income categories. Conversely, there were higher proportions of First Nations households in comparison to other Aboriginal households in the lower income category in every jurisdiction examined.

Comparing Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal household income by jurisdiction showed that the proportion of middle income households were generally similar across jurisdictions. In each jurisdiction other than Newfoundland and Labrador (where proportions were similar), there were lower proportions of Aboriginal people than non-Aboriginal people in the higher income category. In the lower income category, only in the Northwest Territories, British Columbia, Alberta and Saskatchewan were there significantly lower proportions of Aboriginal compared to non-Aboriginal households. In all other jurisdictions the proportions of Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal households were similar.

Results show that First Nations households are generally at lower income levels than the income levels of other Aboriginal households, across jurisdictions. As well, Aboriginal middle income household levels are similar to non-Aboriginal middle income household levels. The differences between these two groups are in the income extremes: there were generally fewer Aboriginal households in higher incomes categories. This difference was reflected in the proportion of lower income households in some jurisdictions.

<b>Table 2 - Urban Aboriginal (First Nations and other Aboriginal) and non-Aboriginal Household Income by Jurisdiction (%)</b>					
<b>Population</b>	<b>Jurisdiction (urban areas)</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Low Income</b>	<b>Middle Income</b>	<b>High Income</b>
			<b>Less than \$40,226</b>	<b>\$40,226 to \$80,451</b>	<b>above \$80,451</b>
<b>First Nations - Off Reserve</b>	<b>Canada</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>42.6%</b> <sup>†</sup>	<b>32.3%</b> <sup>†</sup>	<b>25.1%</b> <sup>†</sup>
	Newfoundland and Labrador	100.0%	42.3% <sup>†</sup>	27.7% <sup>*†</sup>	30.1% <sup>*†</sup>
	Prince Edward Island	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Nova Scotia	100.0%	43.6% <sup>†</sup>	33.1% <sup>†</sup>	23.3% <sup>*†</sup>
	New Brunswick	100.0%	44.8%	31.3%	24.0%
	Quebec	100.0%	43.6% <sup>†</sup>	36.7% <sup>*†</sup>	19.7% <sup>*†</sup>
	Ontario	100.0%	39.0% <sup>*†</sup>	31.4% <sup>*</sup>	29.6% <sup>*†</sup>
	Manitoba	100.0%	50.5% <sup>*†</sup>	31.2% <sup>*†</sup>	18.3% <sup>*†</sup>
	Saskatchewan	100.0%	55.4% <sup>*†</sup>	29.4% <sup>*†</sup>	15.2% <sup>*†</sup>
	Alberta	100.0%	34.5% <sup>*†</sup>	31.7% <sup>*†</sup>	33.8% <sup>*†</sup>

<b>Table 2 - Urban Aboriginal (First Nations and other Aboriginal) and non-Aboriginal Household Income by Jurisdiction (%)</b>					
<b>Population</b>	<b>Jurisdiction (urban areas)</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Low Income</b>	<b>Middle Income</b>	<b>High Income</b>
			<b>Less than \$40,226</b>	<b>\$40,226 to \$80,451</b>	<b>above \$80,451</b>
	British Columbia	100.0%	43.8% <sup>*†</sup>	34.6% <sup>*</sup>	21.6% <sup>*†</sup>
	Yukon	100.0%	47.6% <sup>*</sup>	26.2% <sup>*†</sup>	26.2% <sup>†</sup>
	Northwest Territories	100.0%	30.8% <sup>*†</sup>	21.4% <sup>*</sup>	47.8% <sup>*†</sup>
	Nunavut	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Other Aboriginal</b>	<b>Canada</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>30.6%</b> <sup>†</sup>	<b>34.3%</b> <sup>†</sup>	<b>35.1%</b> <sup>†</sup>
	Newfoundland and Labrador	100.0%	32.2% <sup>*†</sup>	32.1% <sup>*†</sup>	35.7% <sup>†</sup>
	Prince Edward Island	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Nova Scotia	100.0%	38.4% <sup>*†</sup>	36.2% <sup>*†</sup>	25.4% <sup>*†</sup>
	New Brunswick	100.0%	43.6% <sup>*</sup>	32.7% <sup>*</sup>	23.7% <sup>*</sup>
	Quebec	100.0%	33.4% <sup>*†</sup>	38.0% <sup>*†</sup>	28.6% <sup>*†</sup>
	Ontario	100.0%	30.3% <sup>†</sup>	31.7% <sup>*</sup>	38.0% <sup>*†</sup>
	Manitoba	100.0%	33.2% <sup>*†</sup>	33.6% <sup>*†</sup>	33.2% <sup>*†</sup>
	Saskatchewan	100.0%	36.9% <sup>*†</sup>	34.6% <sup>†</sup>	28.5% <sup>*†</sup>
	Alberta	100.0%	21.8% <sup>*†</sup>	34.3% <sup>†</sup>	43.9% <sup>*†</sup>
	British Columbia	100.0%	30.6% <sup>†</sup>	35.1% <sup>*</sup>	34.3% <sup>*†</sup>
	Yukon	100.0%	45.2% <sup>*</sup>	0.0% <sup>*†</sup>	54.8% <sup>*†</sup>
	Northwest Territories	100.0%	0.0% <sup>*†</sup>	19.7% <sup>*</sup>	80.3% <sup>*†</sup>
	Nunavut	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Total Aboriginal</b>	<b>Canada</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>35.1%</b>	<b>33.5%</b>	<b>31.3%</b>
	Newfoundland and Labrador	100.0%	35.8%	30.5% <sup>*</sup>	33.7% <sup>*</sup>
	Prince Edward Island	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Nova Scotia	100.0%	39.8% <sup>*</sup>	35.3% <sup>*</sup>	24.8% <sup>*</sup>
	New Brunswick	100.0%	44.0% <sup>*</sup>	32.3% <sup>*</sup>	23.7% <sup>*</sup>
	Quebec	100.0%	35.6% <sup>*</sup>	37.7% <sup>*</sup>	26.7% <sup>*</sup>
	Ontario	100.0%	33.5% <sup>*</sup>	31.6% <sup>*</sup>	34.9% <sup>*</sup>
	Manitoba	100.0%	40.7% <sup>*</sup>	32.6% <sup>*</sup>	26.7% <sup>*</sup>
	Saskatchewan	100.0%	46.4% <sup>*</sup>	31.9% <sup>*</sup>	21.6% <sup>*</sup>
	Alberta	100.0%	26.6% <sup>*</sup>	33.3%	40.1% <sup>*</sup>
	British Columbia	100.0%	36.6% <sup>*</sup>	34.9% <sup>*</sup>	28.5% <sup>*</sup>
	Yukon	100.0%	47.2% <sup>*</sup>	22.1% <sup>*</sup>	30.6%
	Northwest Territories	100.0%	19.5% <sup>*</sup>	20.8% <sup>*</sup>	59.7% <sup>*</sup>
	Nunavut	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Non-Aboriginal</b>	<b>Canada</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>26.3%</b> <sup>n</sup>	<b>33.5%</b>	<b>40.2%</b> <sup>n</sup>
	Newfoundland and Labrador	100.0%	32.6% <sup>n</sup>	35.2% <sup>n</sup>	32.2% <sup>n</sup>

<b>Table 2 - Urban Aboriginal (First Nations and other Aboriginal) and non-Aboriginal Household Income by Jurisdiction (%)</b>					
<b>Population</b>	<b>Jurisdiction (urban areas)</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Low Income</b>	<b>Middle Income</b>	<b>High Income</b>
			<b>Less than \$40,226</b>	<b>\$40,226 to \$80,451</b>	<b>above \$80,451</b>
	Prince Edward Island	100.0%	34.0%	38.0%	28.0%
	Nova Scotia	100.0%	33.7% <sup>n</sup>	35.4%	30.9% <sup>n</sup>
	New Brunswick	100.0%	32.4% <sup>n</sup>	36.5% <sup>n</sup>	31.1% <sup>n</sup>
	Quebec	100.0%	31.7% <sup>n</sup>	36.2% <sup>n</sup>	32.1% <sup>n</sup>
	Ontario	100.0%	23.6% <sup>n</sup>	31.7%	44.7% <sup>n</sup>
	Manitoba	100.0%	27.3% <sup>n</sup>	36.9% <sup>n</sup>	35.8% <sup>n</sup>
	Saskatchewan	100.0%	27.1% <sup>n</sup>	35.2% <sup>n</sup>	37.7% <sup>n</sup>
	Alberta	100.0%	19.8% <sup>n</sup>	32.0% <sup>n</sup>	48.1% <sup>n</sup>
	British Columbia	100.0%	27.3% <sup>n</sup>	33.9% <sup>n</sup>	38.8% <sup>n</sup>
	Yukon	100.0%	16.8% <sup>n</sup>	29.3% <sup>n</sup>	53.9% <sup>n</sup>
	Northwest Territories	100.0%	8.3% <sup>n</sup>	17.9% <sup>n</sup>	73.8% <sup>n</sup>
	Nunavut	100.0%	8.2% <sup>n</sup>	16.7% <sup>n</sup>	75.2% <sup>n</sup>
	Nunavut	100.0%	8.2% <sup>n</sup>	16.7% <sup>n</sup>	75.2% <sup>n</sup>

\* Statistically significant difference between urban areas of each jurisdiction and all urban areas of Canada (excluding First Nations on-reserve),  $p < 0.01$ , Z-test of two population proportions

† Statistically significant difference between First Nations Off-Reserve and Other Aboriginal People within the same jurisdiction,  $p < 0.01$ , Z-test of two population proportions

<sup>n</sup> Statistically significant difference between Total Aboriginal and Non-Aboriginal People within the same area of Canada,  $p < 0.01$ , Z-test of two population proportions

Urban Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal Household Income by Census Metropolitan Area (CMA) and Census area (CA)

We started by examining urban Aboriginal households across Canada by CMAs and CAs. Then we looked at First Nations households in comparison to other urban Aboriginal households across Canada. Finally we examined Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal households across Canada. While data for a large number of census areas and census metropolitan areas were available, only data for CMAs and CAs with

a substantial population of Aboriginal persons were included in our final table. As such, income data for nine CA/CMAs was examined (See Table 3).

For all Aboriginal households, the largest proportion in the high income category was found in Ottawa-Gatineau and Toronto. In the middle income category, the highest proportion of households was found in Montreal and Calgary. And the highest proportion of lower income households was in both Saskatoon and Regina.

Results showed that there were higher proportions of other Aboriginal households in the higher income category, compared to First Nations households in every CMA and CA, other than in Ottawa-Gatineau where there was no difference between the two groups. A slightly different pattern was found in the middle income category where there were no differences between the household incomes of the two groups in Ottawa-Gatineau, Toronto, Winnipeg and Calgary. However, in the remaining jurisdictions there were higher proportions of other Aboriginal households in the middle income category compared to First Nations households.

Looking at all urban Aboriginal households compared to urban non-Aboriginal households by CMA and CA, other than in Ottawa-Gatineau where proportions are similar, there are higher proportions of non-Aboriginal compared to Aboriginal people in the higher income category in every jurisdiction. In the middle income category, there are higher proportions of non-Aboriginal households compared to Aboriginal households in Regina but there are lower proportions of non-Aboriginal households compared to Aboriginal households in Calgary. There are no differences between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal households in other CMAs and CAs. And other than Montreal and Ottawa-Gatineau, there

are higher proportions of Aboriginal households compared to non-Aboriginal households in every CMA and CA in the lower income category.

Again, there is a general trend where First Nations households are proportionately lower income in comparison to other Aboriginal households, across CMAs and CAs. Non-Aboriginal households are also generally higher income than Aboriginal households. Ottawa-Gatineau appears to be an outlier to these trends, holding the wealthiest Aboriginal households, and where Aboriginal, First Nations, other Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal households have income parity.

Population	CA/CMA	Total	Low Income	Middle Income	High Income
			Less than \$40,226	\$40,226 to \$80,451	above \$80,451
<b>First Nations - Off Reserve</b>	<b>Canada</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>42.6%</b> <sup>†</sup>	<b>32.3%</b> <sup>†</sup>	<b>25.1%</b> <sup>†</sup>
	Montréal	100.0%	39.2% <sup>*†</sup>	38.4% <sup>*†</sup>	22.5% <sup>*†</sup>
	Ottawa - Gatineau	100.0%	28.4% <sup>*†</sup>	34.5% <sup>*</sup>	37.0% <sup>*†</sup>
	Toronto	100.0%	35.9% <sup>*†</sup>	28.7% <sup>*</sup>	35.4% <sup>*†</sup>
	Winnipeg	100.0%	50.9% <sup>*†</sup>	32.9%	16.1% <sup>*†</sup>
	Regina	100.0%	58.1% <sup>*†</sup>	25.9% <sup>*†</sup>	16.0% <sup>*†</sup>
	Saskatoon	100.0%	57.8% <sup>*†</sup>	29.7% <sup>*†</sup>	12.5% <sup>*†</sup>
	Calgary	100.0%	34.2% <sup>*†</sup>	36.2% <sup>*</sup>	29.6% <sup>*†</sup>
	Edmonton	100.0%	39.1% <sup>*†</sup>	31.2% <sup>*†</sup>	29.7% <sup>*†</sup>
	Vancouver	100.0%	43.4% <sup>†</sup>	31.9% <sup>†</sup>	24.7% <sup>†</sup>
<b>Other Aboriginal</b>	<b>Canada</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>30.7%</b> <sup>†</sup>	<b>34.3%</b> <sup>†</sup>	<b>35.0%</b> <sup>†</sup>
	Montréal	100.0%	27.6% <sup>*†</sup>	40.0% <sup>*†</sup>	32.3% <sup>*†</sup>
	Ottawa - Gatineau	100.0%	24.7% <sup>*†</sup>	33.5% <sup>*</sup>	41.8% <sup>*†</sup>
	Toronto	100.0%	25.2% <sup>*†</sup>	28.0% <sup>*</sup>	46.9% <sup>*†</sup>
	Winnipeg	100.0%	32.5% <sup>*†</sup>	33.7% <sup>*</sup>	33.8% <sup>*†</sup>
	Regina	100.0%	33.2% <sup>*†</sup>	31.9% <sup>*†</sup>	34.9% <sup>*†</sup>
	Saskatoon	100.0%	35.2% <sup>*†</sup>	39.1% <sup>*†</sup>	25.7% <sup>*†</sup>
	Calgary	100.0%	19.5% <sup>*†</sup>	37.4% <sup>*</sup>	43.1% <sup>*†</sup>
	Edmonton	100.0%	24.3% <sup>*†</sup>	34.2% <sup>†</sup>	41.6% <sup>*†</sup>
	Vancouver	100.0%	28.0% <sup>*†</sup>	34.0% <sup>*†</sup>	38.0% <sup>†</sup>

<b>Table 3 - Urban Aboriginal (First Nations and other Aboriginal) and non-Aboriginal Household Income by Census Area/Census Metropolitan Area (%)</b>					
<b>Population</b>	<b>CA/CMA</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Low Income</b>	<b>Middle Income</b>	<b>High Income</b>
			<b>Less than \$40,226</b>	<b>\$40,226 to \$80,451</b>	<b>above \$80,451</b>
<b>Total Aboriginal</b>	<b>Canada</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>35.1%</b>	<b>33.6%</b>	<b>31.3%</b>
	Montréal	100.0%	29.3% <sup>*</sup>	39.8% <sup>*</sup>	30.9% <sup>*</sup>
	Ottawa - Gatineau	100.0%	25.7% <sup>*</sup>	33.8%	40.4% <sup>*</sup>
	Toronto	100.0%	28.5% <sup>*</sup>	28.2% <sup>*</sup>	43.3% <sup>*</sup>
	Winnipeg	100.0%	40.1% <sup>*</sup>	33.4% <sup>*</sup>	26.5% <sup>*</sup>
	Regina	100.0%	46.5% <sup>*</sup>	28.7% <sup>*</sup>	24.8% <sup>*</sup>
	Saskatoon	100.0%	47.4% <sup>*</sup>	34.0%	18.6% <sup>*</sup>
	Calgary	100.0%	24.3% <sup>*</sup>	37.0% <sup>*</sup>	38.7% <sup>*</sup>
	Edmonton	100.0%	30.1% <sup>*</sup>	33.0% <sup>*</sup>	36.9% <sup>*</sup>
	Vancouver	100.0%	34.0% <sup>*</sup>	33.2% <sup>*</sup>	32.8% <sup>*</sup>
<b>Non-Aboriginal</b>	<b>Canada</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>26.3%</b> <sup>n</sup>	<b>33.5%</b> <sup>n</sup>	<b>40.2%</b> <sup>n</sup>
	Montréal	100.0%	31.1% <sup>n</sup>	35.2% <sup>n</sup>	33.8% <sup>n</sup>
	Ottawa - Gatineau	100.0%	21.5% <sup>n</sup>	29.8% <sup>n</sup>	48.7% <sup>n</sup>
	Toronto	100.0%	22.9% <sup>n</sup>	30.0% <sup>n</sup>	47.1% <sup>n</sup>
	Winnipeg	100.0%	26.3% <sup>n</sup>	36.5% <sup>n</sup>	37.1% <sup>n</sup>
	Regina	100.0%	22.8% <sup>n</sup>	34.4% <sup>n</sup>	42.8% <sup>n</sup>
	Saskatoon	100.0%	26.8% <sup>n</sup>	35.1% <sup>n</sup>	38.1% <sup>n</sup>
	Calgary	100.0%	18.4% <sup>n</sup>	31.2% <sup>n</sup>	50.4% <sup>n</sup>
	Edmonton	100.0%	20.9% <sup>n</sup>	31.9% <sup>n</sup>	47.2% <sup>n</sup>
	Vancouver	100.0%	26.8% <sup>n</sup>	32.2% <sup>n</sup>	40.9% <sup>n</sup>

<sup>\*</sup> Statistically significant difference between urban areas of CA/CMA and all urban areas of Canada (excluding First Nations on-reserve),  $p < 0.01$ , Z-test of two population proportions

<sup>†</sup> Statistically significant difference between First Nations Off-Reserve and Other Aboriginal People within the same CA/CMA,  $p < 0.01$ , Z-test of two population proportions

<sup>n</sup> Statistically significant difference between Total Aboriginal and Non-Aboriginal People within the same area of Canada,  $p < 0.01$ , Z-test of two population proportions

Urban Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal Household Income by Age

In this section we compared urban Aboriginal people by age and by income across urban regions in Canada. We followed this with an examination of urban First Nations households by age and by income, in comparison to other urban Aboriginal households in Canada. Finally, we compared Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal households by age and income.

As seen in Table 4, the oldest Aboriginal people were the most likely to be in the lower income category and those between the highest proportions in the middle income category were 25 and 44 years of age. The largest proportions in the high income category were Aboriginal people between 45 and 54 years of age.

To understand where the differences were occurring within the Aboriginal population, we compared First Nations and other Aboriginal household income by age. With a few exceptions at the extremes, there were generally lower proportions of First Nations compared to other Aboriginal households in the higher and middle income categories. In contrast there were greater proportions of First Nations people compared to other Aboriginal people in the lower income category.

A very similar trend was seen in comparisons between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal urban people across Canada where there were proportionately fewer Aboriginal than non-Aboriginal people in either the high and middle income categories and proportionately higher Aboriginal compared to non-Aboriginal people in the low household income category.

Similar to the pattern seen with other factors that were tested in this paper, the trend was that First Nations tended to have lower household incomes compared to other Aboriginal people, across many age

groups. As well, Aboriginal household incomes tended to be lower than non-Aboriginal household incomes.

<b>Table 4 - Urban Aboriginal (First Nations and other Aboriginal) and non-Aboriginal Income by Age (%)</b>					
<b>Population</b>	<b>Age Group</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Low Income</b>	<b>Middle Income</b>	<b>High Income</b>
			<b>Less than \$40,226</b>	<b>\$40,226 to \$80,451</b>	<b>above \$80,451</b>
<b>First Nations - Off Reserve</b>	<b>Canada (urban areas)</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>42.6%<sup>†</sup></b>	<b>32.3%<sup>†</sup></b>	<b>25.1%<sup>†</sup></b>
	Between the ages of 15 and 19	100.0%	38.7% <sup>*†</sup>	34.4% <sup>*†</sup>	26.9% <sup>*†</sup>
	Between the ages of 20 and 24	100.0%	50.6% <sup>*†</sup>	27.3% <sup>*†</sup>	22.1% <sup>*†</sup>
	Between the ages of 25 and 34	100.0%	42.5% <sup>†</sup>	35.3% <sup>*†</sup>	22.2% <sup>*†</sup>
	Between the ages of 35 and 44	100.0%	38.0% <sup>*†</sup>	34.6% <sup>*†</sup>	27.4% <sup>*†</sup>
	Between the ages of 45 and 54	100.0%	38.7% <sup>*†</sup>	30.3% <sup>*†</sup>	31.1% <sup>*†</sup>
	Between the ages of 55 and 64	100.0%	47.2% <sup>*†</sup>	30.7% <sup>*</sup>	22.1% <sup>*†</sup>
	Age 65 and over	100.0%	56.9% <sup>*†</sup>	27.7% <sup>*†</sup>	15.4% <sup>*</sup>
<b>Other Aboriginal</b>	<b>Canada (urban areas)</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>30.7%<sup>†</sup></b>	<b>34.3%<sup>†</sup></b>	<b>35.0%<sup>†</sup></b>
	Between the ages of 15 and 19	100.0%	23.0% <sup>*†</sup>	34.0% <sup>*</sup>	43.0% <sup>*†</sup>
	Between the ages of 20 and 24	100.0%	37.0% <sup>*†</sup>	29.0% <sup>*†</sup>	34.0% <sup>*†</sup>
	Between the ages of 25 and 34	100.0%	33.3% <sup>*†</sup>	38.8% <sup>*†</sup>	27.9% <sup>*†</sup>
	Between the ages of 35 and 44	100.0%	25.4% <sup>*†</sup>	37.7% <sup>*†</sup>	36.9% <sup>*†</sup>
	Between the ages of 45 and 54	100.0%	24.5% <sup>*†</sup>	31.2% <sup>*†</sup>	44.4% <sup>*†</sup>
	Between the ages of 55 and 64	100.0%	37.0% <sup>*†</sup>	30.7% <sup>*</sup>	32.3% <sup>*†</sup>
	Age 65 and over	100.0%	51.5% <sup>*†</sup>	32.7% <sup>*†</sup>	15.8% <sup>*</sup>
<b>Total Aboriginal</b>	<b>Canada (urban areas)</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>35.1%</b>	<b>33.6%</b>	<b>31.3%</b>
	Between the ages of 15 and 19	100.0%	29.3% <sup>*</sup>	34.1% <sup>*</sup>	36.6% <sup>*</sup>
	Between the ages of 20 and 24	100.0%	42.3% <sup>*</sup>	28.3% <sup>*</sup>	29.3% <sup>*</sup>
	Between the ages of 25 and 34	100.0%	36.7% <sup>*</sup>	37.5% <sup>*</sup>	25.8% <sup>*</sup>
	Between the ages of 35 and 44	100.0%	30.2% <sup>*</sup>	36.5% <sup>*</sup>	33.3% <sup>*</sup>
	Between the ages of 45 and 54	100.0%	29.5% <sup>*</sup>	30.9% <sup>*</sup>	39.6% <sup>*</sup>
	Between the ages of 55 and 64	100.0%	40.7% <sup>*</sup>	30.7% <sup>*</sup>	28.6% <sup>*</sup>
	Age 65 and over	100.0%	53.4% <sup>*</sup>	31.0% <sup>*</sup>	15.7% <sup>*</sup>
<b>Non-Aboriginal</b>	<b>Canada (urban areas)</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>26.3%<sup>n</sup></b>	<b>33.5%</b>	<b>40.2%<sup>n</sup></b>
	Between the ages of 15 and 19	100.0%	20.8% <sup>n</sup>	30.3% <sup>n</sup>	49.0% <sup>n</sup>
	Between the ages of 20 and 24	100.0%	29.6% <sup>n</sup>	29.0% <sup>n</sup>	41.5% <sup>n</sup>
	Between the ages of 25 and 34	100.0%	25.2% <sup>n</sup>	37.7%	37.2% <sup>n</sup>
	Between the ages of 35 and 44	100.0%	21.8% <sup>n</sup>	34.1% <sup>n</sup>	44.1% <sup>n</sup>
	Between the ages of 45 and 54	100.0%	20.1% <sup>n</sup>	30.2% <sup>n</sup>	49.7% <sup>n</sup>

<b>Table 4 - Urban Aboriginal (First Nations and other Aboriginal) and non-Aboriginal Income by Age (%)</b>					
<b>Population</b>	<b>Age Group</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Low Income</b>	<b>Middle Income</b>	<b>High Income</b>
			<b>Less than \$40,226</b>	<b>\$40,226 to \$80,451</b>	<b>above \$80,451</b>
	Between the ages of 55 and 64	100.0%	26.6% <sup>n</sup>	34.1% <sup>n</sup>	39.2% <sup>n</sup>
	Age 65 and over	100.0%	45.7% <sup>n</sup>	34.5% <sup>n</sup>	19.8% <sup>n</sup>

\* Statistically significant difference between urban areas by age group and all urban areas of Canada

by age group (excluding First Nations on-reserve),  $p < 0.01$ , Z-test of two population proportions

† Statistically significant difference between First Nations Off-Reserve and Other Aboriginal People within the same age group,  $p < 0.01$ , Z-test of two population proportions

<sup>n</sup> Statistically significant difference between Total Aboriginal and Non-Aboriginal People within the same area of Canada,  $p < 0.01$ , Z-test of two population proportions

#### Urban Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal Household Income by Gender

This section focuses on household income differences between all urban Aboriginal men and women, First Nations men and women and other Aboriginal men and women and all urban Aboriginal men and women compared to non-Aboriginal men and women.

Looking at all Aboriginal people, there were higher proportions of men and lower proportions of women in the highest and middle income categories (Table 5). Aboriginal women, however were overrepresented in the lower income category in comparison to Aboriginal men.

There were lower proportions of First Nations men and women compared to other Aboriginal men and women in the high and middle income categories and higher proportions of First Nations men and women in the lower income category.

In the high income category, both Aboriginal men and women were proportionately less well represented compared to non-Aboriginal men and women. Conversely in the lower income category Aboriginal men and women were proportionately more well-represented compared to non-Aboriginal men and women. More Aboriginal men and less Aboriginal women, in comparison to their non-Aboriginal counterparts, were in the middle income category.

Taken together these results suggest that while Aboriginal women have lower incomes than Aboriginal men, this difference is not as great as the difference found simply by having First Nations status. As well, when compared to the Canadian population at large, Aboriginal men and women have lower incomes overall except for in the middle income category where there is some gender difference.

<b>Table 5 - Urban Aboriginal (First Nations and other Aboriginal) and non-Aboriginal Household Income by Gender (%)</b>					
<b>Population</b>	<b>Gender</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Low Income</b>	<b>Middle Income</b>	<b>High Income</b>
			<b>Less than \$40,226</b>	<b>\$40,226 to \$80,451</b>	<b>above \$80,451</b>
<b>First Nations - Off Reserve</b>	<b>Canada (urban areas)</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>42.6%<sup>†</sup></b>	<b>32.3%<sup>†</sup></b>	<b>25.1%<sup>†</sup></b>
	Male	100.0%	38.8% <sup>*†</sup>	34.1% <sup>*†</sup>	27.2% <sup>*†</sup>
	Female	100.0%	45.5% <sup>*†</sup>	31.0% <sup>*†</sup>	23.5% <sup>*†</sup>
<b>Other Aboriginal</b>	<b>Canada (urban areas)</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>30.7%<sup>†</sup></b>	<b>34.3%<sup>†</sup></b>	<b>35.0%<sup>†</sup></b>
	Male	100.0%	27.3% <sup>*†</sup>	34.9% <sup>*†</sup>	37.8% <sup>*†</sup>
	Female	100.0%	33.5% <sup>*†</sup>	33.8% <sup>*†</sup>	32.7% <sup>*†</sup>
<b>Total Aboriginal</b>	<b>Canada (urban areas)</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>35.1%</b>	<b>33.6%</b>	<b>31.3%</b>
	Male	100.0%	31.5% <sup>*</sup>	34.6% <sup>*</sup>	34.0% <sup>*</sup>
	Female	100.0%	38.0% <sup>*</sup>	32.7% <sup>*</sup>	29.2% <sup>*</sup>
<b>Non-Aboriginal</b>	<b>Canada (urban areas)</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>26.3%<sup>n</sup></b>	<b>33.5%</b>	<b>40.2%<sup>n</sup></b>
	Male	100.0%	23.9% <sup>n</sup>	34.1% <sup>n</sup>	42.0% <sup>n</sup>
	Female	100.0%	28.6% <sup>n</sup>	33.0% <sup>n</sup>	38.5% <sup>n</sup>

\* Statistically significant difference between urban areas by gender and all urban areas of Canada by gender, (excluding First Nations on-reserve),  $p < 0.01$ , Z-test of two population proportions

† Statistically significant difference between First Nations Off-Reserve and Other Aboriginal People within the same gender,  $p < 0.01$ , Z-test of two population proportions

<sup>n</sup> Statistically significant difference between Total Aboriginal and Non-Aboriginal People within the same area of Canada,  $p < 0.01$ , Z-test of two population proportions

### Aboriginal Income by Mobility

We investigated data on the number of moves in the previous five years by the income breakdowns for urban Aboriginal people. As seen in Table 6, urban Aboriginal households with high incomes were different that urban Aboriginal people across Canada in that they were much less likely to have moved four or more times in the last five years. There were no differences of note in the middle income household category. Urban Aboriginal people in lower income households were more likely than Aboriginal people across Canada to move five or more times. Overall, mobility increased as income decreased at the income extremes.

<b>Table 6 - Urban Aboriginal (First Nations and other Aboriginal) Household Income by Mobility (%)</b>					
<b>Population</b>	<b>Number of times moved in the past five years</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Low Income</b>	<b>Middle Income</b>	<b>High Income</b>
			<b>Less than \$20,000 to \$40,225</b>	<b>\$40,226 to \$80,451</b>	<b>above \$80,451</b>
<b>Aboriginal</b>	<b>Canada (urban areas)</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>34.4%</b>	<b>32.7%</b>	<b>32.9%*</b>
	<b>None</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>29.8%*</b>	<b>32.5%</b>	<b>37.7%*</b>
	<b>One</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>32.9%*</b>	<b>32.7%</b>	<b>34.5%*</b>
	<b>Two</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>35.8%*</b>	<b>32.4%</b>	<b>31.8%*</b>
	<b>Three</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>35.8%*</b>	<b>33.9%*</b>	<b>30.3%*</b>
	<b>Four</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>39.8%*</b>	<b>32.2%</b>	<b>28.0%*</b>
	<b>Five</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>42.5%*</b>	<b>33.6%*</b>	<b>23.9%*</b>
	<b>Six or more</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>47.9%*</b>	<b>34.3%*</b>	<b>17.8%*</b>

\* Statistically significant difference between urban areas by number of times moved in the past five years and all urban areas of Canada by the number of times moved in the past five years gender, (excluding First Nations on-reserve),  $p < 0.01$ , Z-test of two population proportions

#### Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal Income by Education

Household income by education levels was examined for all Aboriginal households, for First Nations compared to other Aboriginal households and for Aboriginal households compared to non-Aboriginal households.

Looking at Table 7, urban Aboriginal university graduates were most likely in the higher household income category compared to all Aboriginal people across Canada. There were no notable differences by education for urban Aboriginal people in the middle income category. In the lower household income category, there were lower proportions of urban Aboriginal people with post-secondary education and higher proportions of urban Aboriginal people with some high school or less.

There were smaller proportions of First Nations compared to other Aboriginal people in the high income category regardless of education level. In the middle household income category, there were smaller proportions of First Nations who had some high school and greater proportions of First Nations who had completed university. And in the lower income category, there were larger proportions of First Nations than other Aboriginal people in every education category other than the university graduates category.

Finally, comparing Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal people showed that there were smaller proportions of Aboriginal people with high income compared to non-Aboriginal people across all education categories. There were higher proportions of Aboriginal than non-Aboriginal people in the middle income category

and in the lower income category, there were higher proportions of Aboriginal than non-Aboriginal people other than for university graduates where proportions were not notably different.

These results suggest that education links well to income overall among Aboriginal people. First Nations have lower incomes generally in comparison to other Aboriginal people. Further, Aboriginal people have lower incomes than non-Aboriginal people, across education levels.

<b>Table 7 - Urban Aboriginal Household Income (First Nations and other Aboriginal) by Education (%)</b>					
<b>Population</b>	<b>Highest education level completed</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Low Income</b>	<b>Middle Income</b>	<b>High Income</b>
			<b>Less than \$40,226</b>	<b>\$40,226 to \$80,451</b>	<b>above \$80,451</b>
<b>First Nations - Off Reserve</b>	<b>Canada (urban areas)</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>42.5%</b> <sup>†</sup>	<b>32.4%</b> <sup>†</sup>	<b>25.1%</b> <sup>†</sup>
	Elementary or less	100.0%	100.0%*	0.0%*	0.0%*
	Some high school	100.0%	53.1%*†	28.7%*†	18.2%*†
	Completed high school	100.0%	42.5%†	33.0%*	24.5%*†
	Completed post-secondary non-university	100.0%	36.0%*†	35.3%*†	28.7%*†
	Completed university	100.0%	23.5%*†	36.0%*†	40.5%*†
<b>Other Aboriginal</b>	<b>Canada (urban areas)</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>30.6%</b> <sup>†</sup>	<b>34.3%</b> <sup>†</sup>	<b>35.1%</b> <sup>†</sup>
	Elementary or less	100.0%	100.0%*	0.0%*	0.0%*
	Some high school	100.0%	38.6%*†	35.1%*†	26.3%*†
	Completed high school	100.0%	31.9%*†	33.5%*	34.6%*†
	Completed post-secondary non-university	100.0%	27.9%*†	36.6%*†	35.5%*†
	Completed university	100.0%	20.8%*†	30.5%*†	48.7%*†
<b>Total Aboriginal</b>	<b>Canada (urban areas)</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>35.0%</b>	<b>33.6%</b>	<b>31.4%</b>
	Elementary or less	100.0%	100.0%*	0.0%*	0.0%*
	Some high school	100.0%	45.1%*	32.2%*	22.7%*
	Completed high school	100.0%	35.8%*	33.3%*	30.9%*
	Completed post-secondary non-university	100.0%	30.7%*	36.2%*	33.2%*
	Completed university	100.0%	21.5%*	32.0%*	46.5%*
<b>Non-Aboriginal</b>	<b>Canada (urban areas)</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>27.0%</b> <sup>n</sup>	<b>33.3%</b> <sup>n</sup>	<b>39.7%</b> <sup>n</sup>

<b>Table 7 - Urban Aboriginal Household Income (First Nations and other Aboriginal) by Education (%)</b>					
<b>Population</b>	<b>Highest education level completed</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Low Income</b>	<b>Middle Income</b>	<b>High Income</b>
			<b>Less than \$40,226</b>	<b>\$40,226 to \$80,451</b>	<b>above \$80,451</b>
	Elementary or less & some high school*	100.0%	39.5% <sup>n</sup>	33.2% <sup>n</sup>	27.4% <sup>n</sup>
	Completed high school	100.0%	26.9% <sup>n</sup>	34.5% <sup>n</sup>	38.6% <sup>n</sup>
	Completed post-secondary non-university	100.0%	24.6% <sup>n</sup>	36.4%	39.0% <sup>n</sup>
	Completed university	100.0%	17.4% <sup>n</sup>	27.4% <sup>n</sup>	55.2% <sup>n</sup>

\* Statistically significant difference between urban areas by highest education level completed and all urban areas of Canada by highest education level completed, (excluding First Nations on-reserve), p<0.01, Z-test of two population proportions

† Statistically significant difference between First Nations Off-Reserve and Other Aboriginal People within the same highest education level completed, p<0.01, Z-test of two population proportions

<sup>n</sup> Statistically significant difference between Total Aboriginal and Non-Aboriginal People within the same area of Canada, p<0.01, Z-test of two population proportions

#### Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal Income by Employment Status

We examined the employment status of urban Aboriginal people by low, middle and high income household status. The data was provided in three categories; essentially, those who were employed or temporarily absent from their job, and those who were unemployed and either looking for work or not looking for work. We began the analysis by examining all urban Aboriginal people, then looked at First Nations and other Aboriginal people and finally, we compared the income of all urban Aboriginal people to non-Aboriginal people by their employment status.

Not surprisingly, as shown in Table 8, there were higher proportions of urban Aboriginal people with high incomes who were working or temporarily absent from a job than those who were unemployed, when compare to all Aboriginal people. There were notably lower proportions of urban Aboriginal people in the middle income category who were unemployed and not looking for employment, compared to Aboriginal people nationally. In the low income category, there were smaller proportions of urban Aboriginal people who were employed compared to Aboriginal people nationally, and greater proportions that were unemployed, regardless of the reason for unemployment.

Fewer First Nations compared to other Aboriginal people were in the high income category regardless of employment status. Fewer unemployed First Nations were in the middle income category, compared to other Aboriginal people. More First Nations were in the low income category regardless of employment status, when compared to other Aboriginal people.

Aboriginal people were less likely than non-Aboriginal people to have high income and more likely than non-Aboriginal people to be in the low income category, regardless of employment status. However there were no notable differences between the two groups in the middle income category.

Results indicate that employment and income are strongly linked for Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal people. However, Aboriginal people are more likely to have lower incomes in comparison to non-Aboriginal people and other Aboriginal people are more likely than First Nations to have higher income regardless of employment status.

<b>Table 8 - Urban Aboriginal (First Nations and other Aboriginal) and non-Aboriginal Household Income by Employment (%)</b>					
<b>Population</b>	<b>Employment Status</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Low Income</b>	<b>Middle Income</b>	<b>High Income</b>

**Table 8 - Urban Aboriginal (First Nations and other Aboriginal) and non-Aboriginal Household Income by Employment (%)**

			Less than \$40,226	\$40,226 to \$80,451	above \$80,451
<b>First Nations - Off Reserve</b>	<b>Canada (urban areas)</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>42.7%<sup>†</sup></b>	<b>32.2%<sup>†</sup></b>	<b>25.1%<sup>†</sup></b>
	Worked for pay or in self-emp., or temp. absent from job	100.0%	31.9% <sup>*†</sup>	36.3% <sup>*†</sup>	31.9% <sup>*†</sup>
	Respondent does not have job, is looking for work	100.0%	54.5% <sup>*†</sup>	26.9% <sup>*†</sup>	18.6% <sup>*†</sup>
	Respondent does not have job, is not looking for work	100.0%	59.4% <sup>*†</sup>	26.3% <sup>*†</sup>	14.3% <sup>*†</sup>
<b>Other Aboriginal</b>	<b>Canada (urban areas)</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>30.6%<sup>†</sup></b>	<b>34.3%<sup>†</sup></b>	<b>35.1%<sup>†</sup></b>
	Worked for pay or in self-emp., or temp. absent from job	100.0%	24.6% <sup>*†</sup>	35.7% <sup>*†</sup>	39.7% <sup>*†</sup>
	Respondent does not have job, is looking for work	100.0%	37.6% <sup>*†</sup>	33.3% <sup>*†</sup>	29.1% <sup>*†</sup>
	Respondent does not have job, is not looking for work	100.0%	46.2% <sup>*†</sup>	30.3% <sup>*†</sup>	23.5% <sup>*†</sup>
<b>Total Aboriginal</b>	<b>Canada (urban areas)</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>35.1%</b>	<b>33.5%</b>	<b>31.4%</b>
	Worked for pay or in self-emp., or temp. absent from job	100.0%	27.1% <sup>*</sup>	35.9% <sup>*</sup>	37.0% <sup>*</sup>
	Respondent does not have job, is looking for work	100.0%	45.5% <sup>*</sup>	30.3% <sup>*</sup>	24.2% <sup>*</sup>
	Respondent does not have job, is not looking for work	100.0%	51.9% <sup>*</sup>	28.6% <sup>*</sup>	19.5% <sup>*</sup>
<b>Non-Aboriginal</b>	<b>Canada (urban areas)</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>27.0%<sup>n</sup></b>	<b>33.3%<sup>n</sup></b>	<b>39.7%<sup>n</sup></b>
	Worked for pay or in self-emp., or temp. absent from job	100.0%	18.5% <sup>n</sup>	33.8% <sup>n</sup>	47.7% <sup>n</sup>
	Respondent does not have job, is looking for work	100.0%	37.1% <sup>n</sup>	31.2% <sup>n</sup>	31.7% <sup>n</sup>
	Respondent does not have job, is not looking for work	100.0%	42.1% <sup>n</sup>	32.6% <sup>n</sup>	25.4% <sup>n</sup>

\* Statistically significant difference between urban areas by employment status and all urban areas of Canada by employment status, (excluding First Nations on-reserve), p<0.01, Z-test of two population proportions

† Statistically significant difference between First Nations Off-Reserve and Other Aboriginal People within the same employment status, p<0.01, Z-test of two population proportions

<sup>n</sup> Statistically significant difference between Total Aboriginal and Non-Aboriginal People within the same area of Canada, p<0.01, Z-test of two population proportions

## Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal Income by Language

We examined income by language in two ways; first, looking generally at whether urban Aboriginal people and non-Aboriginal people selected English, French, both English and French or neither English and French as their official language; and, secondly, by looking at the proportion of urban Aboriginal people who could speak or understand an Aboriginal language.

There were lower proportions of urban Aboriginal people who spoke only French in the high income category and higher proportions in the middle income category, as seen in Table 9. In the low income category there were lower proportions of bilingual urban Aboriginal people.

As with other factors, examined in this paper, there were lower proportions of First Nations than other Aboriginal people in the high income category regardless of official language. In the middle income category there were no notable differences. More First Nations than other Aboriginal people were in the low income category if they spoke solely English or French.

Comparing urban Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal people in the high income category, results showed that while there were fewer Aboriginal people who spoke English or French alone, compared to non-Aboriginal people, there were more Aboriginal than non-Aboriginal people in this income category who were bilingual. While there were no notable differences in the middle income category, there were more Aboriginal than non-Aboriginal people who spoke only English or French. However fewer bilingual Aboriginal than non-Aboriginal people were in this income category.

These results suggested that bilingualism was a great asset for Aboriginal people with regards to income.

<b>Table 9 - Urban Aboriginal Household Income (First Nations and other Aboriginal) by Official Language (%)</b>					
<b>Population</b>	<b>Language</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Low Income</b>	<b>Middle Income</b>	<b>High Income</b>
			<b>Less than \$40,226</b>	<b>\$40,226 to \$80,451</b>	<b>above \$80,451</b>
<b>First Nations - Off Reserve</b>	<b>Canada (urban areas)</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>42.6%</b> <sup>†</sup>	<b>32.4%</b> <sup>†</sup>	<b>25.1%</b> <sup>†</sup>
	English only	100.0%	43.8% <sup>*†</sup>	31.5% <sup>*†</sup>	24.6% <sup>*†</sup>
	French only	100.0%	47.9% <sup>*†</sup>	34.8% <sup>*†</sup>	17.4% <sup>*†</sup>
	Both English and French	100.0%	32.0% <sup>*†</sup>	37.1% <sup>*†</sup>	30.9% <sup>*†</sup>
	Neither English nor French	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Other Aboriginal</b>	<b>Canada (urban areas)</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>30.7%</b> <sup>†</sup>	<b>34.3%</b> <sup>†</sup>	<b>35.0%</b> <sup>†</sup>
	English only	100.0%	30.6% <sup>†</sup>	33.4% <sup>*†</sup>	36.0% <sup>*†</sup>
	French only	100.0%	34.3% <sup>*†</sup>	39.1% <sup>*†</sup>	26.6% <sup>*†</sup>
	Both English and French	100.0%	29.7% <sup>*†</sup>	34.8% <sup>*†</sup>	35.5% <sup>*†</sup>
	Neither English nor French	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Total Aboriginal</b>	<b>Canada (urban areas)</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>35.1%</b>	<b>33.6%</b>	<b>31.3%</b>
	English only	100.0%	36.3% <sup>*</sup>	32.6% <sup>*</sup>	31.1% <sup>*</sup>
	French only	100.0%	37.4% <sup>*</sup>	38.1% <sup>*</sup>	24.5% <sup>*</sup>
	Both English and French	100.0%	30.2% <sup>*</sup>	35.3% <sup>*</sup>	34.5% <sup>*</sup>
	Neither English nor French	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Non-Aboriginal</b>	<b>Canada (urban areas)</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>26.3%</b> <sup>n</sup>	<b>33.5%</b>	<b>40.2%</b> <sup>n</sup>
	English only	100.0%	24.4% <sup>n</sup>	32.8% <sup>n</sup>	42.8% <sup>n</sup>
	French only	100.0%	30.7% <sup>n</sup>	36.1% <sup>n</sup>	33.2% <sup>n</sup>
	Both English and French	100.0%	35.3% <sup>n</sup>	35.7% <sup>n</sup>	29.0% <sup>n</sup>
	Neither English nor French	100.0%	40.5%	31.6%	27.9%

\* Statistically significant difference between urban areas by language and all urban areas of Canada by language, (excluding First Nations on-reserve), p<0.01, Z-test of two population proportions

† Statistically significant difference between First Nations Off-Reserve and Other Aboriginal People within the same language, p<0.01, Z-test of two population proportions

<sup>n</sup> Statistically significant difference between Total Aboriginal and Non-Aboriginal People within the same area of Canada, p<0.01, Z-test of two population proportions

Table 10 outlines the data for ability of urban Aboriginal people across Canada to speak and understand, understand only or neither speak nor understand an Aboriginal language. While there were no notable differences between urban Aboriginal people in middle income households and urban Aboriginal people

in middle income households across Canada, there were clearly fewer urban Aboriginal people who could speak and understand an Aboriginal language in high-income households; and, greater proportions of urban Aboriginal people who could speak and understand an Aboriginal language in low-income households.

<b>Table 10 - Urban Aboriginal Household Income (First Nations and other Aboriginal) by Aboriginal Language (%)</b>					
<b>Population</b>	<b>Ability to speak an Aboriginal Language</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Low Income</b>	<b>Middle Income</b>	<b>High Income</b>
			<b>Less than \$40,226</b>	<b>\$40,226 to \$80,451</b>	<b>above \$80,451</b>
<b>Aboriginal</b>	<b>Canada (urban areas)</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>34.9%</b>	<b>33.6%</b>	<b>31.5%</b>
	Speak and understand	100.0%	51.3%*	29.1%*	19.6%*
	Understand only	100.0%	38.4%*	33.2%*	28.4%*
	Neither speak nor understand	100.0%	31.0%*	34.6%*	34.4%*

\* Statistically significant difference between urban areas by ability to speak and Aboriginal language and all urban areas of Canada by ability to speak and Aboriginal language, (excluding First Nations on-reserve),  $p < 0.01$ , Z-test of two population proportions

## Discussion

It does seem that there is a definite urban Aboriginal middle income group in Canada that is similar in many ways to the non-Aboriginal middle income group. The very fact that there were fewer differences at the middle income level between these two groups suggests that Aboriginal people in this income bracket are doing as well as non-Aboriginal people at least when comparing using the factors captured in the Census and the APS surveys. Whether this is a signal that more Aboriginal people are moving from lower to higher incomes through the middle income category cannot be not known without a longitudinal analysis. What we do know is that differences between urban Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal people in Canada were more often found at the income extremes, generally with more

Aboriginal people in the low income category and fewer in the higher income category. This is the pattern that has been seen for some time and does not come as a surprise. (Heisz, 2007)

It is interesting to place the findings from these data in context. That is, all of the data aside from the first table was focused on specific urban areas of Canada. That would imply that issues of being located at a prohibitive distance from employment are limited. Yet, there still were many differences between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal people at the margins of income levels. Recall that this paper includes individual breakdowns for income for Aboriginal (First Nations and other Aboriginal people) and non-Aboriginal people in Canada by a number of demographic factors such as age, gender, location, education, employment. The purpose of these analyses is to determine the extent to which these factors explained differences between these groups, particularly with regard to the middle income category.

It was perhaps not surprising to see higher proportions of Aboriginal household incomes in the high income category in the Northwest Territories and Alberta. The lower proportions in the Yukon and in Saskatchewan were more surprising. This suggests that while the economies of the latter jurisdictions are doing well, that Aboriginal people are still being left out of the growth, either due to insufficient skill development, discrimination, or other factors.

Ottawa-Gatineau seemed to be the one CMA with the wealthiest Aboriginal households, and where First Nations, other Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal households have income parity. This would likely be due to the large proportion of federal government employees in this area. Federal departments have higher salaries compared to the private sector, which would contribute to higher incomes for Aboriginal people. The finding that Aboriginal people have higher incomes when they are bilingual would make sense here as the federal government also has a bilingualism policy.

Not surprisingly, Aboriginal people who are in the workforce were most likely to be in either the middle or the high income categories compared to those not in the workforce, similarly to the case for non-Aboriginal people. The proportion in the middle income group was similar between Aboriginal persons and non-Aboriginal persons in the workforce though there was still a gap in terms of the proportion of working people in the upper income group. Clearly there are factors beyond participation in the workforce contributing to income disparity.

Overall, for many of the factors that were examined, Aboriginal people are not doing as well as non-Aboriginal people. There are variations in the pattern but outside of the middle income category, Aboriginal people are more likely in the lower income category and less likely in the higher income category. Language is the one variable where the pattern is completely different. Here being bilingual was a distinct advantage only for Aboriginal people while being unilingual English was an advantage for non-Aboriginal people. As well, an interesting finding was that Aboriginal people who spoke and Aboriginal language were less likely to be in the higher income categories. This can imply that Aboriginal people who are less connected to their culture are more likely to succeed in the broad Canadian culture. It could also be that older and younger Aboriginal people are more likely to hold a closer cultural connection but these are also coincidentally the least wealthy age groups. Without an analysis that includes the interaction between age and language, it is impossible to be able to properly understand this relationship.

Looking within the group of Aboriginal people, a striking finding was that quite often the First Nations group had lower income levels than other Aboriginal people. This difference was consistent, even at higher education levels. This suggests that there are systemic factors among First Nations that impact

their economic place within Canadian society that go well beyond an ability to gain an education and subsequently earn an income. While one can postulate that these might be the social, psychological and emotional effects of colonization, residential schooling and cultural adjustment that First Nations deal with far more often than do other Aboriginal people, this is but one hypothesis that would need to be examined. Analysis of Census and the APS is simply not a good approach to test this hypothesis as these questionnaires have limited items on the issues of residential schooling. Further qualitative analysis would perhaps be more useful here. Furthermore, these findings suggest that supports for First Nations in particular need to be provided well beyond making education more accessible but also focus on overcoming other less obvious barriers.

## Conclusion

Overall, there were similar patterns throughout the data where Aboriginal people tended to be in the lower income categories more so than non-Aboriginal people. This is a finding that has been repeated in the research for some time now, suggesting that the issues that are impacting Aboriginal people and their success which are not yet resolved.

Positively, however, while there are still clear income disparities between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal people, and between First Nations and other Aboriginal people, the research on the burgeoning urban Aboriginal middle income group is supported in this paper. The issue is how Aboriginal people can be supported to grow further and to move into the higher income group. While education and training could be part of the answer, there are other factors at play. This phenomenon must be better understood and more options must be considered if Aboriginal people are to participate fully in economic growth and development in Canada.

## Bibliography

- Aboriginal Peoples Survey (APS)*. (n.d.). Retrieved March 3, 2012, from Statistics Canada: <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/cgi-bin/imdb/p2SV.pl?Function=getSurvey&SDDS=3250&lang=en&db=imdb&adm=8&dis=2>
- Adams, C. (2009). Voice of Manitoba's Aboriginal Peoples: Links to Perceptions on Health, Economic Outlook and Mobility. *Canadian Diversity*, 7 (3), 69-76.
- Bopp, M., Bopp, J., & Lane Jr., P. (2003). *Aboriginal Domestic Violence in Canada*. Retrieved 12 9, 2011, from The Aboriginal Healing Foundation Research Series, Aboriginal Healing Foundation: <http://www.fourworlds.ca/pdfs/DomesticViolence.pdf>
- Brzozowski, J.-A., Taylor-Butts, A., & Johnson, S. (2006, June). *Victimization and Offending Among the Aboriginal Population in Canada*. Retrieved 9 29, 2011, from Juristat, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Statistics Canada, Catalogue No.85-002-XIE, Vol. 26, no. 3: <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/85-002-x/85-002-x2006003-eng.pdf>
- Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation. (2008, April). *Neighborhood Effects and Concentration Levels of Aboriginal People in Large Canadian Cities*. Retrieved April 25, 2012, from Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation: <http://www.cmhc-schl.gc.ca/odpub/pdf/65674.pdf?fr=1335376384796>
- Clatworthy, S. (2000, November). *First Nation Affiliation Among Registered Indians Residing in Select Urban Areas*. Retrieved March 2, 2012, from Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada: <http://publications.gc.ca/collections/Collection/R2-299-2003E.pdf>
- Enviroics Institute. (2010). *Urban Aboriginal Peoples Study Main Report*. Toronto: Enviroics Institute.
- Guimond, E., Robitaille, N., & Senecal, S. (2009). Aboriginal People in Canadian Cities: Why are They Growing so Fast? *Canadian Issues*, Winter, 11-17.
- Harlow, L. L. (2005). *The Essence of Multivariate Thinking: Basic Themes and Methods*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Inc.
- Heisz, A. (2007, May). *Income Inequality and Redistribution in Canada: 1976 to 2004*. Retrieved January 10, 2012, from Statistics Canada: <https://docs.google.com/a/parriag.com/viewer?a=v&pid=gmail&attid=0.1&thid=135fa5537beb0ed7&mt=application/pdf&url=https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ui%3D2%26ik%3D2c7a3dacdb%26view%3Dat%26th%3D135fa5537beb0ed7%26attid%3D0.1%26disp%3Dsafe%26realattid%3D930>
- Ipsos-Reid. (2006). *Aboriginal Women and Family Violence*. Ottawa: Indian and Northern Affairs. Ministry of Aboriginal Affairs. (n.d.). *Ministry of Aboriginal Affairs Quick Facts First Nations in Ontario*. Retrieved March 3, 2012, from Ministry of Aboriginal Affairs: [http://www.aboriginalaffairs.gov.on.ca/english/services/datasheets/first\\_nations.asp](http://www.aboriginalaffairs.gov.on.ca/english/services/datasheets/first_nations.asp)
- National Association of Friendship Centres. (n.d.). *Urban Aboriginal Women: Social Determinants of Health and Well-Being*. Retrieved April 25, 2012, from Labrador Affairs Office, Newfoundland and Labrador: <http://www.laa.gov.nl.ca/laa/news/pdf/NAFC-UrbanAboriginalWomen.pdf>

- Norris, M. J. (2006). Aboriginal Languages in Canada: Trends and Perspectives on Maintenance and Revitalization. In J. P. White, S. Wingert, D. Beavon, & P. Maxim, *Aboriginal Policy Research: Moving Forward, Making a Difference Volume 3* (pp. 197-226). Toronto: Thompson Educational Publishing, Inc.
- Norris, M. J., & Clatworthy, S. (2003). Aboriginal Mobility and Migration Within Urban Canada: Outcomes, Factors and Implications. In D. Newhouse, & E. Peters, *Not Strangers in These Parts: Urban Aboriginal Peoples* (pp. 51-78). Policy Research Initiative.
- Norris, M. J., & Clatworthy, S. (2011). Urbanization and Migration Patterns of Aboriginal Populations in Canada: A Half Century in Review (1951 to 2006). *Aboriginal Policy Studies*, 1 (1), 13-77.
- Ontario Trillium Foundation. (2011). *Aboriginal Communities in Profile*. Retrieved 04 24, 2012, from Ontario Trillium Foundation:  
[http://www.trilliumfoundation.org/en/knowledgeSharingCentre/resources/Aboriginal\\_Profile\\_Ontario.pdf](http://www.trilliumfoundation.org/en/knowledgeSharingCentre/resources/Aboriginal_Profile_Ontario.pdf)
- Pagano, R. R. (2010). *Understanding Statistics in the Behavioral Sciences*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Smylie, J., Firestone, M., Cochran, L., Prince, C., Maracle, S., Morley, M., et al. (2011, April). *Our Health Counts: Urban Aboriginal Health Database Research Project Community Report First Nations Adults and Children*. Retrieved 03 02, 2012, from St. Michael's Hospital:  
<http://www.stmichaelshospital.com/pdf/crich/our-health-counts-report.pdf>
- Statistics Canada. (2008, January ). *Aboriginal Peoples in Canada in 2006 : Inuit, Metis and First Nations, 2006 Census*. Retrieved 1 16, 2012, from Statistics Canada: <http://www12.statcan.ca/census-recensement/2006/as-sa/97-558/pdf/97-558-XIE2006001.pdf>
- Statistics Canada. (2010, June 21). *Aboriginal Statistics at a Glance*. Retrieved March 4, 2012, from Statistics Canada: <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/89-645-x/2010001/income-revenu-eng.htm>
- Urban Aboriginal Task Force. (2007). *Urban Aboriginal Task Force Final Report*. The Ontario Federation of Indian Friendship Centres, The Ontario Metis Aboriginal Association, The Ontario Native Women's Association.
- Wilson, D., & Macdonald, D. (2010, April). *The Income Gap Between Aboriginal Peoples and the Rest of Canada*. Retrieved 1 15, 2012, from Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives:  
<http://www.policyalternatives.ca/sites/default/files/uploads/publications/reports/docs/Aboriginal%20Income%20Gap.pdf>