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ABSTRACT

Micro-level studies focusing on detailed analysis of the migration behaviour of the migrants provide a more realistic picture of a migration stream by looking for factors that influence each migrant. However, relatively few attempts have been made to explore migration at the local (micro) level. Researchers (in Canada) have been more concerned with the macro studies hence failing to identify certain aspects or factors that do affect individual migration stream.

The present study attempts to examine the demographic and socio-economic characteristics of the migrants and the behavioural aspects of the decision to migrate and choice of Windsor as a destination. Lastly, it attempts to explain in-migration in relation to a set of factors which attracted the migrants to Windsor during the period 1975-81. The study was done using a sample of 103 migrants to Windsor.

The results of the study showed that the females were slightly more mobile than males in the Windsor in-migration stream. In-migration was also higher for the young adults 18-30 years of age than for the older persons. It was also observed that married individuals were more in this migration stream than single individuals. The results also showed that most migrants were University trained, and those with the highest levels of educational qualification migrated the longest distances.
On behavioural aspects of the migrants, the study revealed that attraction of Windsor or consideration of pull factors differed according to age, marital status, educational qualification, size of family at migration, economic trends in Windsor and distance moved. Furthermore, migration behaviour partly depended on the presence of relatives/friends in Windsor before migration. It was however found that migration behaviour did not markedly differ on the basis of sex.

The main factors that influenced in-migration to Windsor in 1975-81, were employment, locational advantages, information, population and distance, and amenities.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Approximately five (4.74)\(^1\) in every ten persons change residences in Canada. Out of the five, slightly more than two (2.39)\(^2\) or 23.9 percent of the population are what Census Canada defines as migrants. A migrant is defined by Census Canada as a person who crosses a municipal boundary in the process of changing residences. Although the Census definition is not as comprehensive as the one used by the geographers and sociologists who define migration as involving more or less permanent shift of residences, within and between municipalities, it is however, adequate for examining inter-provincial and inter-metropolitan migration in Canada.

Migrants defined as above include both internal migrants and immigrants. This can further be divided up into several distinct migration streams\(^3\) - rural to urban, urban to urban, and return migrations. Such patterns are of interest to geographers. This is because of the increasing importance of migrations in determining population growth, demographic and socio-economic characteristics of the population at the receiving and source areas (towns, cities,

\(^1\) Census Canada Data 1971.
\(^2\) Census Canada Data 1971.
\(^3\) Migration stream is Population flow.
counties, provinces). Furthermore, with a decline in birth rates and a slow down in the natural increase of population of different regions of Canada, changes in population are increasingly due to migration.

The importance of migration is recognized not only as an important component in the distribution or redistribution of population but also in an attempt to explain the social and economic interactions among different regions. It is therefore important to understand the in- and out-migration of an area or region.

1.1 Purpose and Scope

Relatively few attempts have been made to explore migration at the micro-level (micro studies here, refer to those studies that focus on a limited area in terms of its migration interaction with other areas outside its boundary), in Canada. Most (published) studies on migration have centred on the national level, involving both inter-metropolitan and inter-regional or provincial migration (Lycan, 1969, '70; Stone, 1969, '71; Vanderkamp, et al 1968; Grant and Vanderkamp, 1976; Courchen, 1970). These studies and more include large aggregates of migrants with a wide variety of backgrounds and experiences. The conclusions in these studies are based on inferential analysis based on large aggregates for large and different areas. This in most cases does not provide the details of the factors affecting the individuals and their decision-
making process within those aggregates. On the other hand, local area studies focusing on detailed analysis of the individuals would provide a more realistic view of migration behaviour by looking for the factors influencing each migrant. Such studies will also bring out any similarities in the factors involved at the two different levels of migration - the macro and micro levels. Most researchers acknowledge this particular advantage of local area studies, in view of an inherent weakness of the macro level studies. Though the general theory of macro migration is sound, there are variations at different micro levels that can only be examined through studies such as this one.

The present study is an effort to overcome the weakness of the macro studies. It is also partly a result of the belief that in order to gain a better understanding of the migration stream(s), and the factors affecting each individual within a migration stream, a study at the micro level is necessary. Such is the nature of the present study. The purpose of this study is first, to examine the demographic and socio-economic characteristics of the migrants to Windsor between 1975-81. Secondly, to examine the behavioural aspect of the decision to migrate, and the choice of Windsor as a destination - i.e. develop a migration model explaining migration in relation to a set of factors which appear to be related to Windsor's attractiveness as perceived by the migrants. Thirdly, to look for similarities and differences among the migrants in this migration
stream and also to find out whether the results of the macro studies are applicable to this particular migration stream.

1.2 Importance of the Study

This study will provide an insight into the 'attractiveness' of the Windsor metropolitan area during the period between 1975-81. Such results will be useful to those concerned with trends in the changing economic, social and environmental conditions in Windsor, and with a view to providing an explanation for the factors which induced people to move to the city. This knowledge may be vital for planning and provision of housing and other services. Furthermore, by looking at the demographic and socio-economic characteristics of the migrants, the study will provide some empirical evidence about the factors that have promoted in-migration to Windsor through times of economic stress and prosperity. The results also might help demographers to examine their projections of future population more realistically. As Lowry (1966) stated, "Of all the uncertainties which plague population forecasting for local areas, the greatest relates to migration as a source of change", p. 2.

1.3 Area of Study

The area of study is Windsor metropolitan area (Figure 1.). The city of Windsor (Gateway city, Automobile Capital of Canada) is located
in the south-western end of an important economic region of Canada. Its population of 247,582 (Census Canada, 1976), is a diverse one in terms of culture and origin of the people - (English, French, Italians, other West and East Europeans, Middle Easterns, Chinese, East and West Indians, etc.). This composition suggests a high rate of in-migration and immigration.

Windsor basically depends on the automobile and other manufacturing industries. Therefore, resulting employment opportunities and incomes which have fluctuated with the fortunes of the automobile industry, have exerted varying degrees of pull or attraction to the people living in the towns and rural areas surrounding this city, and other parts of the country.

Windsor is an area which has experienced substantial out-migration for the last ten years. (This is more evident since 1975.) The press and most people have concerned themselves with reporting and pointing out this migration stream, the causes of which can be easily explained within the serious economic setbacks of the area. The economic set-backs have been most prominent in the last two years resulting in heavy out-migration. Inspite of the heavy out-migration, there has been some in-migration. It is therefore, important to identify and analyze the factors that have influenced the in-migrants in the recent past (a period of economic recession). This is an area that has received little or no attention by either the press or researchers.
The migration studies (not intra-migration) done so far on the area have been concerned with particular ethnic groups involved in international migration. K. Nizamuddin (1976), dealt with the question of the East Indian immigrants, and D. Williams (1978), studied the West Indian immigrants. These studies explained just a small percentage of in-migration to Windsor and only looked at international migration. C. Yum (1980), studied the variation in inter-metropolitan migration using 22 metropolitan areas in Canada (Windsor included). Such a study at the macro level has the weakness of failing to identify the particular factors that do affect each migrant or each migration stream. Indeed the author realized this and suggested that local level studies based on a behavioural approach are the best in explaining the individual migration streams. The weakness of the previous studies, familiarity with the area by the researcher, and other practical advantages, especially those relating to financial costs of collecting data in the field, are the main reasons behind the choice of Windsor as a study area.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The literature on human migration is extensive. It is however, largely of a fragmented nature because of the disciplinary view points employed, and the distinction among migrations at different levels, such as intra-urban, inter-urban, rural-urban, inter-regional, international, etc. In this section relevant studies both theoretical and empirical are examined.

2.1 Early and Modern Conceptual Attempts

Early Social Scientists in their attempts to explain migration, applied the physical laws to human migration. One of the most common applications is the gravity model. H. C. Carey (1858), made the earliest known formulation of the gravity concept of human interaction (migration). The basis of his formulation was the argument that social and physical phenomena are based on the same fundamental law. He argued that man, as the molecule society, is the subject of social science, as atoms are to matter the subject of natural sciences. He stated that, "the greater the number collected in a given area, the greater is the attractive force that is there exerted .... Gravitation is here, as everywhere in direct ratio of the mass, and the inverse of distance", p. 59.
Ravenstein (1885), in his celebrated papers on the laws of migration also recognized the relationship between migration and distance and population size of a place. He noted that, "the majority of the migrants proceed a short distance, and that migrants enumerated in a certain center of absorption will grow less as distance from the center increases", pp. 198-199. Later, Young (1928), in an attempt to improve on Ravenstein's idea observed that the relative number of migrants to a given area from each of several areas would vary directly with the force of attraction of the destination area and inversely with the square of the distance between the source and the terminal areas.

Zipf (1946), expressed the above concepts using the interaction model. The model states that two places interact with each other in proportion to their masses (population), and inversely according to the distance between them.

Equation:

\[ M_{ij} = k \frac{P_i P_j}{D_{ij}} \]

Where: \( M_{ij} \) = Migration between i and j
\( P_i \) = Population at place i
\( P_j \) = Population at place j
\( D_{ij} \) = Distance between place i and j
\( k \) = A constant

Stouffer (1940, '60), in his work on 'theory of intervening opportunities: a theory relating mobility to distance', tried to
elaborate and expand on the gravity model concept. He explained the relationship between migration and distance in terms of intervening opportunities. Stouffer believed that there was no necessary relationship between mobility and distance per se, but that the relationship depended on alternative attractions between the origin and destination.

Equation:

\[ M_i \rightarrow j = k \cdot \frac{M_i M_j}{M(I) a} \]

Where

- \( M_i \rightarrow j \) = Total migration from \( i \) to \( j \)
- \( M_i \) = Total in-migration to places located between \( i \) and \( j \)

Yet, another attempt to improve the interaction model came from Somermeijer (1963), who used Zipf's interaction hypothesis by dividing gross migration into directional flows with the help of indices. His indices of attractiveness included such features as per capita income, percent unemployment, degree of utilization, recreational resources and quality of dwellings. This by far is a better formulation than Stouffer's or Zipf's because of its consideration of social, spatial and economic factors. It is thus a model based on a more comprehensive multivariate approach.

Equation:

\[ M_i \rightarrow j = (1/2 \, k + c(F_j - F_i)) \frac{PiP_j}{Dij} \]

Where:

- \( c \) = Social distance
- \( F_iF_j \) = Indices
E. Lee's (1966) work is an elaboration of theory of migration within Ravenstein's framework. Lee provided further explanations about the process of migration and causes of migration. In his attempt to explain the causal factors of migration from a behavioural aspect, he gave four factors:

1. Factors associated with the area of origin.
2. Factors associated with the destination area.
3. Intervening obstacles.
4. Personal factors.

The factors at the origin and destination areas can be negative (push) or positive (pull) factors. Lee pointed out that these factors affect most people differently. For example, industries because of the employment opportunities they (may) offer can be classified as positive factors to young adults looking for employment. On the other hand however, these may be negative factors to the old with deteriorating health who are looking for cleaner air.

The intervening obstacles exist between every origin and destination places. One of the obstacles is distance between the two points. This obstacle has been studied most. Other types of obstacles can be immigration laws imposed by government, or restriction of movement, costs of transporting household goods or costs of disposing of properties at place of origin, and acquiring some at the destination place (eg. selling and buying a house). As in the case of the first two factors, these obstacles affect different people differently.
The personal factors are individual differences like age, education, marital status, etc. - and also difference in perception and appraisal of the environment. This conceptualization of migration as involving a set of factors (four) was the basis of nineteen hypotheses on the volume of migration and the counterstream, and characteristics of the migrants.

The above approaches throw light on aspects of migration like volume of migration, characteristics of the migrants, and the factors that explain the movement (interactance), and a few like see's take into account some aspect of behaviour - the rest however, lack the procedures and tools to investigate the individual decision-making process. Some researchers have attempted to solve this particular weakness, outstanding among them are Hagerstrand, (1957) and Gould (1963). Gould pointed out that migration and other locational patterns are the physical expression of the individual human decision which are a product of attitudes, disposition, preferences, i.e. perception. The goal of this approach is to build predictive migration models which include the identification of the relevant stimuli of potential destinations. Furthermore, this approach also aimed at understanding the ways in which information about destinations is analyzed by the decision makers and the manner in which potential migrants choose a certain destination from a series of possible alternatives available to them.

Another attempt at building a model based on individual decision
making is by Wolpert (1965). In his attempt to predict 'where' an individual chooses to migrate, he argued that the decision maker's knowledge about different destinations was an important factor influencing the choice. He further pointed out that 'place utility' or the level of satisfaction that an individual considers to be available (enjoyable) at a certain destination, is of great importance in determining the choice among the alternative destinations. This approach examines the process of the decision to migrate and the choice of a destination.

Roseman (1971), also attempted to explain migration behaviour. He divided human movement into two types: 1. Daily movement by household with the home as a centre. 2. Shift of residence which changes the weekly (daily) movement-cycle. For the second type of human movement, he pointed out the importance of the decision-making unit, the place utility, and the information gathering process as important aspects of migration studies.

2.2 Empirical Studies

Migration is selective, or rather migrants are not a random sample of the population at the place of origin (Lee, 1966). The decision to migrate is influenced by personal demographic characteristics, socio-economic and spatial factors.
2.2.1 Demographic Factors

The majority of migration studies have pointed to greater mobility among the males than females (Shryock, Jr., 1964; Miller, 1966; Hamilton, 1959), although, this is not always true. Males are also more inclined to move greater distances than females. This lesser propensity to migrate among females is usually explained by social factors and related socio-cultural norms which often discourage female mobility. The explanation suggested is that family ties influence the female sex more than the males. Shryock, Jr., (1964) using United States census data, found males to be more mobile, but did discover that for female group, 14-19 years old, there was a significantly greater mobility than males by almost four percent. The study also found that female to male average annual mobility rates between 1944-48 and 1955-58 in the country were more pronounced in favour of the young women.

A. Miller, (1966), found that single women exhibited lower than average rates of inter-state migration in all groups. Hamilton (1959), found males in the Southern United States to be markedly more mobile to urban and rural non-farm areas. Grant and Vanderkamp (1976), using 1968-1969 migration data based on taxing province mailing region and mailing locality, found that females were slightly more mobile than males.

Apart from sex, age is another demographic factor influencing migration selectivity. Migration theory holds that selectivity in
migration is almost always according to age. Various studies have established this, (Thomas, 1938; Rose, 1955; Shryock, Jr., 1964; Lycan, 1969; Courchene, 1974). Thomas, (1938), found that young adults have a much higher propensity to migrate than other age groups. Shryock, Jr., (1964), using U.S. census data supported this conclusion, explaining selectivity in life cycle terms.

Young adults, 18-30 years of age, have generally fewer responsibilities such as family and/or established careers. They are therefore in a better position to migrate since they have fewer risks to security. As it so happens, in most cases they are looking for security in the form of employment.

2.2.2 Social Factors

Bogue et al (1957), related in-migration, out-migration and net migration rates to a number of social and economic factors.

There is a relationship between marital status and migration. Shryock, Jr., (1964), has noted that disruption of life cycle is frequently a cause of migration. Broken marriages or getting married are reasons that have been cited by migrants as cause of moving (Johnson, 1971). O. Ogden (1973), using data from France demonstrated the significance of this factor in migration selectivity.

Selectivity in migration tends to be associated with education. Ritchey, (1976), has noted that, "higher education level for an area's population also indicates a greater proportion of the population with
a propensity to migrate" (Shryock, Jr., 1964; Taeuber and Taeuber, 1965; Suval and Hamilton, 1965; Lycan, 1969, '70; McInnis, 1971).

Shryock, Jr., (1964), in his study of migration in the United States observed a marked association between education and migration. Taeuber and Taeuber, (1965), found that age selectivity in migration for the young adults implied a higher education level. Suval and Hamilton, (1965), concluded that there was a high correlation between education and migration. McInnis, (1971), found in Canada that inter-provincial migration was clearly selective of those with university education. Greenwood, (1975), and Schwartz (1975), have given an explanation that education reduces the importance of family ties - which normally restrain people from migrating.

Yet another important social factor in migration is kinship/friends. H. M. Choldin (1973), using data gathered for a multi-purpose social survey in Chicago, 1959-60, revealed the relationship between kinship and the process of migration. He found that many migrants especially those with lower levels of education were attracted to the city by kinship groups. Kinship/friends is a significant factor where low levels of education, low income and racial or ethnic minorities are concerned - mainly because
it eases the next migrants' physical and social adaptation. A migrant who comes on his/her own almost always has reasonable education or work experience to find work and support himself. This migrant in most cases can overlook this factor of kinship and friends, and attains self-sufficiency faster than those involved in the chain migration.

2.2.3 Economic Factors

Wage (income) differentials, employment and unemployment rates are some of the most accepted migration gauges. The economists often view migration as an equilibrant process whereby regions of different physical and economic resources, exchange people to stabilize supply and demand functions (Bort, 1960; Bogue, 1962).

White, (1974), in a study of Kentucky urban in-migration attraction pattern 1965-70, found the income factor a good indicator of in-migration. Gallaway, Gilbert and Smith (1967), found per capita income differences were a significant determinant of inter-state migration. Bogue (1977), Lycan, (1969, '70), have all shown the significance of the income factor to migration.

Employment and unemployment have frequently been cited as explanatory variables in migration studies. Several studies (Shryock, Jr., 1964; Oliver, 1964; Kelly, 1967; Lycan, 1969; Stone, 1969; Greenwood and Sweetland, 1972), have all found a positive relationship between employment and migration, and a negative relationship
between unemployment and migration. Areas of high in-migration tend to be areas of low unemployment and high employment. On the other hand, areas of high unemployment tend to be areas of high out-migration.

Bogue, (1977), in a study of migration to Chicago by sex and race reported that the overwhelming majority of reasons given for migration pertained to employment. Shryock, Jr., (1964) and Oliver, (1964) have both published works conforming the negative relationship between unemployment and migration. Lycan, (1969), has shown the importance of these two factors in determining migration patterns in Canada.

2.2.4 Spatial Factors

2.2.4.1 Distance and Population

The distance factor has long been recognized as having a negative relation to migration (Zipf, 1946; Olsson, 1965; Rogers, 1967). Olsson (1965), in a study of migration patterns in Sweden used distance as a dependent variable and found it to be highly correlated to the independent variables, income, employment, age, size of population at destination and education.

Population size of the destination has a positive relation with migration (Lowry, 1966; Lee, (1965); Stone, 1969; Lycan, 1969, '70). In all these studies and many other studies, the relative size of the
destinations has been reported as an important explanatory variable for the variation in migration.

2.2.4.2 Climate

Various studies have demonstrated that climate has a direct positive/negative influence on migration (Cebula, 1975; Olsson, 1965). Cebula (1975), in his study of migration economic opportunity and the quality of life in the United States, used cold weather and amount of sunshine in the state as variables in his model. He found climate (cold weather and amount of sunshine) to be significantly correlated to net migration.

2.2.4.3 Information

Frequently, a migrant's perception is based on the amount and quality of information available to him/her. Gould, (1963), pointed out that the perception (based on the nature of information) of the social and physical environment affects an individual's decision to migrate. Hagerstrand, (1957), in his migration study (relocation diffusion) demonstrated the importance of information to migration.

2.3 Canadian Studies

Canadian studies on migration have basically used the economic approach although, a few like Lycan, (1969), did try to explain
migration in terms of the socio-economic factors and the differences in population distribution.

Income and employment have been cited most often as causal factors for migrating. Courchene, (1970), concluded that inter-provincial migration was mainly a function of income differentials. Laber and Chance. (1971), supported his conclusions. Vanderkamp, (1968), found that migration was basically a product of unemployment differentials, i.e. areas of high unemployment were also areas of high out-migration. Stone (1969), also found the same economic factors to explain migration patterns in Canada.

McInnis, (1970), using the 1961 Census Canada data on educational levels, found that distance migrated was positively related to levels of education. The explanation he gave was that the market for the more highly educated is more national in scope and the higher educated individuals have access to better information concerning job opportunities.

Simmons, (1977), using Census Canada data attempted to describe and explain the pattern of migration flows in Canada. He found that in-migration rates were closely linked to job opportunities - being highest in Toronto and Montreal areas. The patterns of migration were found to be the responses to the social and economic change, and the destination options available to the migrants. He also found a hierarchical pattern of migration between cities, and between various urban regions. In Simmon's findings, Windsor has greater interaction with smaller places within Southwestern Ontario (West of London) than with other areas.
Marr, W. L. et al, (1977), using census data examined labour migration by birth place, language spoken, occupation and education. They found that migration rates are inversely related to a province's relative income and unemployment rank. The study also found that mobility tends to increase with knowledge of both official languages. The findings of this research also supported the distance factor and its effect on migration - migration rates were highest between geographically close provinces. Marr, et al, (1978) in this later work gave more insight to migration in Canada. The study concluded that the higher the level of education, the higher the significance of economic variables and the less effective are the methods designed to alleviate barriers of migration such as distance and language i.e. language, distance and other cultural factors play more significant roles for the less educated individuals.

McVey, W. W. Jr., (1978), using 1971 Public Use Sample Tape Census data found that there was significant difference between the non-migrant and the migrant educational statuses. Both the in-migrants and immigrants tend to be more educated and thus get the higher status occupations and had smaller family size than the non-migrants of the receiving communities.

Demko, (1974), studied migration behaviour based on 'cognition of Southern Ontario cities in a potential migration context'. Using a sample of 159 individuals, he tried to find out factors that influenced the mental images about cities and eventually the choice of a
destination city in case of a potential migrant. He found that different groups of people used different variables in ranking each city. Therefore, the choice or preference is difficult to determine using a specific set of factors. The study revealed that economic variables did not dominate in describing the images of the cities or in explaining the preferences but acted together with the socio-environmental factors.

2.4 Summary

The above review of migration studies shows four basic approaches: descriptive, social, economic, and multi-variance.

The descriptive approach is aimed at defining the volume of migration, (Ravenstein, 1885), and the characteristics of the migrants. This approach has been developed/refined into interaction theory, (Carey, 1858; Young, 1928; Stouffer, 1940; Zipf, 1946; Olsson, 1965; Lowry, 1966; Lee, 1966). The human interaction approach attempts to or is geared to predicting the amount or rate of migration between two or more places. It, however, does not answer questions like why people move, and why particular kinds of people (for example the young adults) are more often found among the movers.

The social approaches attempt to explain migration in social terms. They tend to stress the social structure of migration, value systems and decision making process, (Hagerstrand, 1957; Ross, 1962;
Wolpert, 1965; Lee, 1966). A good example is Wolpert's place utility concept which considers the level of satisfaction an individual can obtain at a certain location. This approach points out the relationship between social aspects and migration. It should, therefore, be noted that a purely social approach does not comprehend the migration patterns nor does it lead to comprehensive theory because it over-emphasizes only particular aspects of migration.

Economists explain migration in terms of economic differentials. Migration here is seen as a product of the search for employment and higher wages. In other words people move from areas of high unemployment and low wages to areas of high wages and employment opportunities, (Bogue, et al 1957; Olsson, 1965; Lowry, 1966). Such an approach makes the mistake of assuming that the migrant is always rational in his/her decision to migrate. Sjaastad (1962), saw this weakness and introduced the cost-benefit approach to migration. This approach takes into account other factors together with the economic ones. The argument behind this is that the decision to move depends on the costs and benefits of migrating which are a resultant of economic as well as social, and personal psychological factors.

The multivarience approach is one which combines all the other three (Rose, 1962; Somermeijer, 1963; Karp and Kelly, 1971; Bogue, 1971; Lycan, 1969, '70; White, 1974). Unlike the other three approaches, which attempt to explain migration using only a particular set of variable(s), for example economic variables or social ones, this
approach examines the effect of a variety of variables (a combination of variables social, economic, spatial or environmental). It is therefore, a more realistic and meaningful approach.
CHAPTER III
METHODOLOGY

A Priori Model:

As shown in the review of literature on migration, previous studies have attempted to test various hypotheses relating to factors that influence migration to or out of a certain place. Factors such as distance, population size of a place, income and employment, climate, information and other amenities - locational advantages like clean air, recreation etc. which are important in determining who migrates where and from where, have been examined. These factors can be represented in a diagramatic manner - A Priori Model (Figure 2). Some of these factors are the basis of the hypotheses to be tested in this study.

In the present study the overall objectives will be fulfilled through the testing of various hypotheses. These hypotheses examine the demographic and socio-economic characteristics of the migrants, and the factors that influenced their decision(s) to migrate to Windsor.

3.2 Variables and Hypotheses

The dependent variable is in-migration, the number of people/persons, aged 18 years and over (household/individuals), who moved
FIGURE 2

A PRIORI MODEL

where

DISTANCE - Physical distance in miles/kilometers
INFORMATION - About the destination
POPULATION SIZE(S) - Relative population size of a place
DEMOGRAPHIC/SOCIAL CHARACTERISTICS - Age, sex, education, marital status
ATTRACTIONNESS - Income, employment, climate, friends/relatives services locational advantages, social welfares
to Windsor between 1975-81 from areas in Canada. Migration is defined here as more or less permanent shift of residence between municipalities - (Windsor and other municipal areas rural or urban).

3.2.1 Independent Variables and Hypotheses

X1 Sex

It has been noted in previous studies that sex is an important factor in determining who moves i.e. migration selectivity (Shryock, Jr., 1964; Lee, 1966). Males (although not always) have a higher propensity to migrate than the females. Males are also more likely to move greater distances than the females. Given the occupational structure of the destination (Windsor) or rather due to the fact that employment in Windsor is based primarily on the industrial sector - occupations are more suitable for males than females. It is hypothesized here that the majority of the migrants to Windsor are males.

X2 Age and Marital Status

Migration selectivity is almost always according to age (Thomas, 1938; Ross, 1955; Shryock, Jr., 1964). The young population adults (18-30 years old), have generally fewer responsibilities such as family commitments or ties or established careers. They are, therefore, in a better position to move since they have fewer risks to
security, and as it so happens they are looking for security in the form of employment. Furthermore, given the hiring practices of employers, who prefer to hire the young rather than the old, it is hypothesized that the migrants are young adults and single.

X3 Education (Average education is high school diploma).

It is generally accepted that migration rates are higher for the more educated individuals, and that education is a basic factor in determining the migration distance (Taeuber and Taeuber, 1965; Lycan, 1969; McInnis, 1971). In other words, those with higher levels of education tend to move the longest distances. However, given the industrial nature of the Windsor labour-force it is assumed here that the majority of the migrants to Windsor had only attained the average level of education. Furthermore, since those with higher education always move the longest distances, it is further hypothesized that the migrants with higher educational qualifications, moved from more distant places than those with lower educational qualifications.

X4 Relative Size of a Place/Population

In human interaction the population sizes of the destinations influence the attraction force of the area - Gravity model, (Carey, 1858; Ravenstein, 1885; Zipf, 1946). The greater number of people collected at a given point (place), the greater the attractive force
that is exerted. Given the fact that Windsor is surrounded by smaller cities and towns or rural areas, with no bigger city within a distance of 150 miles on the Canadian side—it is expected that this factor greatly influenced the in-migration stream of the city. It is therefore, hypothesized that the majority of the migrants were drawn from cities smaller than Windsor and/or small towns/rural areas.

**X5 Distance**

The distance factor has long been known for its negative role in migration (Carey, 1858; Ravenstein, 1885; Zipf, 1946; Olsson, 1965). It was found that migrants enumerated at a particular point or destination will decrease as distance from the centre increases. However, others like Stouffer (1940, '60), have argued that there is no necessary relationship between migration and distance, but rather, that migration between two points depends on the intervening opportunities that exist between the origin and destination. Because of the nature of this study, it is impossible to measure the intervening opportunities. Therefore, the model adopted here is that of Zipf's, wherein it is assumed that the majority of the migrants to Windsor moved short distances.

**X6 Income**
X7 Employment

Migration is often viewed as an equilibrant process whereby regions of different economic resources exchange people as a result of the demand and supply functions (Boque, 1957; Lowry, 1966). Income and employment are commonly used as gauges of migration. Windsor being an industrially specialized urban centre, where industrial activities have for long been a source of employment and income for the local and regional population, it is assumed that the migrants would be attracted to Windsor because of a variety of employment opportunities. Furthermore, since industrial activities as opposed to the farm oriented or related activities of surrounding towns and cities, (on the Canadian side) are normally a good indicator of high income; it is hypothesized that the majority of the migrants earn higher incomes here in Windsor than at their last place of residence.

X8 Information

The migrant's perception of a place and eventually the choice of a destination is based on the amount of information available to him/her (Hagerstrand, 1957). In the present study, it is hypothesized that the migrants had reasonable information about Windsor before moving.
X9 Friends and Relatives

The relationship between kinship/friends and migration process is important and in most cases leads to chain migration (Choldin, 1973). The source of information about a destination or possible alternatives can be through friends or relatives. Moreover, the presence of friends and relatives can be helpful in the search for a job and in solving other adjustment problems. Windsor being a city with a diversified population (in form of ethnic background), it is expected that chain migration would have played an important role in this particular migration stream. It is therefore, hypothesized that the majority of the migrants might have had relatives/friends in Windsor before moving.

X10 Better Amenities (Housing, Social services, Welfare services, Recreation, Hospital, Schools, etc.)

It is not only the economic factors (income, employment, etc.) that attract people to certain destinations. People are attracted to certain places for different reasons, for example in search of better amenities. Since it is expected that the majority of the migrants were drawn from smaller towns and cities (X4), within a short distance of Windsor (X5); it can further be assumed that Windsor might be offering better amenities than these smaller places. It is therefore, hypothesized that better amenities have contributed
to the choice of Windsor as destination.

XII Locational Advantages

Windsor is located near a large metropolitan area (Detroit, Michigan). Its geographical location gives rise to accessibility to the large metropolitan area of Detroit (renowned for its variety of cultural attractions as well as shopping and other services). Such a location might have certain advantages that a migrant took into account when selecting his/her destination. It is therefore, hypothesized here that locational advantages associated with Windsor, being located near Detroit might have contributed to the place's attractiveness.

3.3 Model Specification

The model adopted here is slightly different from those in the literature on migration in that two common migration gauges are not included in this particular model. The two are income and climate. The income factor is left out on the basis that it is considered a secondary attraction.

It is logical to assume that the industrial activities of the Windsor area, as opposed to the farm oriented or related activities of the surrounding area (the towns and cities - where most migrants are expected to come from), are good indicators of high incomes.
Therefore, the hypothesis is that migrants earn higher incomes in Windsor than in their last place of residence. However, it is the activities (industrial employment), that generate these high incomes. Hence the migrants are attracted to Windsor by employment and not income per se. The few migrants who consider the income factor as a primary one are those that are transferred by their employers (on their own request or at the employer's decision), and these are migrants who are outside the scope of the present study. Another type of migrants who would consider this variable as an important one in the choice of the destination are those who have job offers already in two or more different destination places. Such migrants would decide on the destination using the income factor as a measure - i.e. the job that offers the highest income might most likely be the choice. Hence the destination place is selected partly on the basis of the income. It can, however, still be argued that the move is a result of the job offer. Therefore, the income variable is not included in the model, although it is expected that the migrants earn higher incomes in Windsor than at their last place of residence.

Climate is another common migration gauge left out of the model. Although several studies have shown the importance of this variable in explaining some particular migration patterns, it is not considered in the present study because of the following reasons: first, it is expected that the majority of the migrants moved short
distances ie. most migrants came from nearby areas (Hypothesis 5). Since there is no marked climatic difference between Windsor and the surrounding or nearby areas (Southern Ontario), climate cannot be an attraction factor. Second, as the literature shows, it is basically the old age group (retired individuals), who consider this variable as an attraction. In the present study, it is assumed that most migrants are young adults (Hypothesis 2). Lastly, the job seekers (those in need of a job), are rarely selective on the basis of climate. The unemployed worker can migrate west or north depending on the job availability. It is, therefore, unrealistic to include this variable in the Windsor in-migration model.

3.3.1 Model

\[ M_i + j = a + b_i P_i - b_2 D_{ij} + b_3 F + b_4 I_j + b_5 L_j + b_6 A_j \]

Where:

- \( M_i + j \) = Migration Ratio
- \( P_i \) = Population size of place \( i \)
- \( D_{ij} \) = Distance between origin (\( i \)) and destination \( j \) place of residence \( i \)
- \( E \) = Employment
- \( I_j \) = Information about \( j \)
- \( L_j \) = Locational advantages of \( j \)
- \( A_j \) = Amenities at \( j \)
3.3.2 Variable Definition and Measurement

The dependent variable migration ratio is calculated using the following equation:

\[ M_{i \to j} = \frac{\text{Number of Migrants from Area } i}{\text{Population of the Area } j} \times 1000 \]

The migration ratio obtained from this calculation is used as the \( Y \) in the regression analysis.

Sex here refers to males and females. This variable will be measured by assigning values to each category - for example, Male = 1, and Female = 2. Age is the number of years one has lived since birth. For easy measurement this variable was classified into five age groups. Each group was then given a value. Education is defined here as the number of years spent at school or the level (grade or degree attained) by the individual. This variable is classified as follows: elementary or grades 1-R, high school, college or post secondary, and university education. These classes were then given values for analysis purposes.

Distance is the highway mileage (kilometres) between the original place of residence and the destination (Windsor). The population size is the number of people living at the last place of residence.

Income here refers to the sum of earnings in dollars. The questionnaire did seek to find whether the migrants' income increases

"In all cases where a questionnaire is the source of data, there is always the problem of measuring the income variable. This is because most people are secretive about their real income. In this study, income groups were used in the questionnaire."
as a result of migrating to Windsor. The difference in income is between the income at the last place of residence and the immediate Windsor income.

The employment variable is calculated using the following equations: (First the employment ratio is calculated.)

\[
\text{Employment Ratio} = \frac{\text{Total Employment of the area } j}{\text{Total Labour force of the area } j}
\]

The employment ratio of the region is then divided by the employment ratio of Windsor to obtain a comparison (this final figure is used in the regression analysis).

\[
\frac{\text{Employment Ratio of } j}{\text{Employment Ratio of Windsor}}
\]

Better amenities are housing, recreation, school, social service etc. The research did seek to find out how the migrant(s) compare(s) the Windsor facilities with those of their last place of residence. The answers which were in the ranked manner (much better to no comment) were given assigned values (1 to 6) for analysis.

Locational advantages are not specifically defined here because of different perceptions on what might comprise advantages. The question on this variable is an open ended one – ie. the respondents were left to define what they thought were the locational advantages. Furthermore, the respondents were asked whether they considered these as contributions to the attractiveness of the place, and whether they did consider these advantages in selecting the destination. The yes
or no answer was then assigned a value.

3.4 Data Source

In a study of this nature, in view of the absence of a permanent register of in-migrants and out-migrants to a community - (Countries like Sweden and Denmark have permanent registers of people moving in and out of a community.) the research had first, to identify the in-migrants from various sources. Such sources are: city directories, community associations eg. ethnic associations that help their newly arrived members adapt themselves to the new place, community organization where the new migrants tend to gather, like the Y.M. and Y.W.C.A., and other organizations on which new in-migrants depend on for information or guidance - like the Welcome Wagon Limited, and lastly personal contacts of the known migrants. A list of the migrants was compiled from the sources and a random sample selected. The size of the sample (1 to 2 percent sample) was based on the total in-migrants to Windsor during the period 1971-1976.5

A questionnaire6 was then administered to the representative sample. Over 200 questionnaires were administered either by mail, personal interviews or telephone interviews. The method of survey was determined on the basis of practicability for each case. A total of 103 questionnaires were accepted as good questionnaires depending upon how fully the questions had been answered.

---

5Census Data show that 5252 migrants moved to Windsor in the 1971-76 period.

6See Appendix.
The questionnaire did seek information about two main aspects of migration. Firstly, it sought information on the demographic and socio-economic characteristics of the migrants, and secondly, it enquired into the factors that influenced the migrants to move to Windsor.

The secondary sources of data were Statistics Canada and Census Canada. The data from these two sources were employed to supplement some of the weaknesses that characterize the questionnaire source. For example, it was important that the population of the last place of residence be known. However, knowing that few people can give the exact answer to a question of that nature; the questionnaire sought only a ranked comparison - (where the response was either a Bigger or Equal or Smaller). This was considered by the researcher as insufficient for analysis purposes (especially the regression). Therefore, the exact population size(s) of the different former areas of residence was/were obtained from the Census Canada 1971 and 1976. Furthermore, Statistics Canada was the source for the data on employment.

3.5 Data Analysis

The study employs two different methods in the analysis of different types of data. For the data on migration selectivity - demographic and social characteristics of the migrants, simple
tabulations and cartographic techniques are employed in the examination of this data.

Tabulations are again employed in the analysis of the data dealing with the behavioural aspects of the migrants. A stepwise multiple regression analysis is the other method of analysis. This is done using the SPSS computer program.

The stepwise multiple regression analysis helps the researcher to predict a single dependent variable from the knowledge of one or more independent variables. It also allows the measure of dependent and independent variables according to the level of importance.
CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS

In the following chapter, an analysis of the data on demographic, socio-economic characteristics of the migrants, and the factors relating to the attractiveness of the Windsor area is carried out. The analysis is divided into three parts. The first part involves an examination of the data on migration selectivity i.e. demographic, and the socio-economic characteristics data. Cross tabulations of the data and cartographic techniques are employed in the examination of this data. The second part consists of the analysis of the data from the questionnaire on the attractiveness of the Windsor area. This is a descriptive analysis of the behavioural aspects of the migrants based on the cross tabulations of the raw data from the questionnaire. Lastly, the model is tested using a stepwise regression analysis.

4.1 Migration Selectivity Analysis

4.1.1 Sex

Although a number of migration studies have shown that males have a higher propensity to migrate than females, this is not always true. In the case of Canada, there are studies that support both
sides. Lycan (1969, '70), Stone (1969) and Vanderkamp et al (1976) studies showed that males in Canada had a slight dominance over females. On the other hand, C. Yum (1980), concluded that in the intermetropolitan migration in Canada, during the period 1971-76, females had a slight upper hand over males. In Yum's study, the in-migration rate of females was higher by 3.8% over that of males in the Windsor in-migration stream.

Table 1(a), based on sex by year of migration, shows a slight advantage in favour of males. There were more male respondents (those who answered the questionnaire). However, the data derived from these responses reveals that since there were more married males among the respondents (but for every married male there is a female), and the proportion of females was higher among the single and other marital status categories (widow/er, separated, common law/other), the total number of females who migrated to Windsor, was more than that of males (Table 1(b), Figure 3(a)). Since the female sex has a slight advantage, the hypothesis that the majority of the migrants to Windsor are males is rejected.

Some reasons can be advanced to explain why there were more male responses but in reality more female migrants in this in-migration stream. The possible reason to explain the presence of more males in the married category, hence the slight advantage as depicted in Table 1(a), is probably within the question of/or related to who answered the questionnaire in the case of married

71971-76 Census Data.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All numbers are in absolute values

Source: Questionnaire
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Single</th>
<th>Married</th>
<th>Divorced</th>
<th>Widow/Widower</th>
<th>Common Law/Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All numbers are in absolute values

Source: Questionnaire
FIGURE 3(a)

SEX BY MARITAL STATUS

Source: Author
individuals (migrants). In most cases as observed during the survey, males tended to answer the questionnaire. This is mainly due to the fact that the male is traditionally regarded as the head of the family. Therefore, the numbers shown in Table 1(a) based on the response by year of migration is in favour of the male sex.

Three reasons can be advanced to explain the presence of more female than male migrants in this migration stream. First, the female participation in the present day Canadian labour force (irrespective of the nature of work (job)) is increasing, and more so in urban areas. Therefore, the single female who traditionally was restrained in her movements by cultural and economic norms, is now more mobile and responds to economic attractions with equal enthusiasm as the male. Figure 3(b), shows that females responded almost in the same manner as the males to times of economic expansion and recession.

Second, is the manner of married individuals' mobility. (In this particular survey, the married migrants were more numerous than the single migrants.) The married couples are now more mobile than before. This is because of various reasons such as search for better housing, better jobs with better incomes etc. Hence the migration propensity for females has been increased.

Lastly, the presence of more female migrants in the Windsor in-migration stream may be due to the changes in the nature of employment or employers that may have taken place during the period of study. During the bad economic times for the automobile industry,
when this study was conducted, it could be that the main sources of employment have been in sectors other than the auto and related industries. These could be sectors that are more and/or equally attractive to females. Therefore, more females were attracted to Windsor than the males.

4.1.2 Age.

The fact that selectivity in migration is almost always according to age, with the young adults having higher propensities to migrate than the older people, has long been known and restated often. It is, however, not true for all areas. For example regions like Florida and the West Coast in Canada (i.e. Victoria-Vancouver) are known to be areas of attraction for the old people. In the present study, it was expected that the Windsor in-migration stream would be more favourable to the young adults because of the employment activities of the area.

Tables 2(a), (b), (c), and Figure 4(a), (b), (c) and (d), show the relationship between age and migration for the Windsor in-migration stream. The figures also represent tabulations of age data with other variables. Age is examined in terms of other variables in order to find possible explanations for the relationship revealed. As is evident from the tables, in-migration was higher among the young adults 18-30 years of age. This was also a group made up of
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Category</th>
<th>Number of Migrants</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-30 years old</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>60.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-54</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-65</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and over</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Questionnaire
### TABLE 2(b)

**AGE BY YEAR OF MIGRATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-30 Years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-54</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and over</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All numbers are in absolute values

Source: Questionnaire
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-30</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-54</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-over</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Questionnaire
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Single</th>
<th>Married</th>
<th>Divorced</th>
<th>Widow/Widower</th>
<th>Common Law/Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-30</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-54</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and over</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Questionnaire
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mainly the single individuals and the young married couples. These young adults are in most cases looking for new or better jobs. So the high in-migration rate for this group can be explained in terms of the search for employment. Generally, in-migration to Windsor during the 1975-81 period shows a decline in number of migrants with increase in age. Therefore, the hypothesis that the majority of the migrants are young adults is accepted.

For the middle aged groups, 35-44 and 45-54 years old, the people who belong to these age groups are less mobile. This is because many of them at this time in the life cycle have families with a number of children or dependents and/or secure jobs i.e. established careers. These two factors, (large) families and established careers, normally restrain this group in particular and most people in general from migrating. This is because costs (economic, social and psychological) may be quite high. On the other hand, the young, single/married without dependents or established careers experience low costs when they move.

For the elderly, 55-64 and 65 and over age groups, costs are even higher than those of the middle aged groups. This is because at this time in the life cycle, people find it harder to relocate, and by this time they often have stronger attachments to their homes. This probably is the reason why middle aged and elderly individuals are not in this in-migration stream.

This is also reflected by Census 1971-76 data both national and provincial levels. According to the 1971-76 Census data 70% of the migrants to Windsor were young adults.
4.1.3 Marital Status

The influence of marital status on migration selectivity has been demonstrated in several studies. The married individuals are more restrained from moving than the single individuals. This is because of moving costs, monetary and personal which increase with the size of the family.

It is however, evident from Table 3 and Figure 5(a) that the Windsor in-migration stream is different from what the literature says. According to Figure 5(a) 59 migrants or 57.3 percent of the migrants were married, 37 or 35.9 percent of the migrants were single at the time of migration. The other marital status categories (divorced/separated, widow/er, common law/other), together accounted for 7 or 6.9 percent of the migrants. These findings slightly differ from the national and provincial census data of 1971-76. However, based on the sample size of the survey and findings, the hypothesis that most migrants are single is rejected.

In this particular migration stream, there was a strong relationship between age (especially the young adults, 18-30 years old) and married status - Figure 5(b). This age group was also most dominant in the Windsor in-migration stream. In the middle age groups, married status is most common (this is true nationally and provincially). Therefore, the high married percentage among the young adults plus the high number of married individuals in the middle age groups
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Number of Migrants</th>
<th>(Percentages)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>35.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>57.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced/Separated</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widow/widower</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Law/Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>103</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Questionnaire
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partly explains why this migration stream had more married individuals than single individual migrants.

Furthermore, the size of family for the married individual migrants helps in explaining their mobility. According to Figure 5(c), 38.6 percent of the married couples in this migration stream had no other family member (only husband and wife - mainly the young adults 18-30 years old, and some middle aged individuals). 29.8 percent had three members in the family at the time of migration (wife, husband and probably a child), 19.3 percent had a family of four, 5.3 percent of the married migrants had a family of five, however, 7 percent of the married migrants had six or more (members in their families at the time of migration, these were mainly the middle aged group 41-54 years of age).

The fact that the majority of the migrants had small families (two or three persons) at the time of migration, is probably one of the main reasons why there were more married individuals than single migrants. The married individuals were able to move because monetary, social and psychological costs were low - migration costs increase with the size of the family.

4.1.4 Education

The relationship between education and migration has been one of the most consistent findings. Selectivity in migration depends
on the education level - i.e. migration rates are higher for the higher educated individuals. Furthermore, education and distance moved are highly correlated.

In the present study, it was assumed that the nature of the work (employment) in Windsor - (the automobile and other related industries) did not require the highly educated individuals. It was, therefore, hypothesized that the majority of the migrants had average educational qualifications - high school diploma. It was, however, acknowledged that those migrants with higher educational attainment might have moved the longest distances.

According to Figure 6(a), the highest number of migrants were university graduates (3-4 years of university education). The number of migrants with post secondary or college education was second highest, and this was followed by high school graduates, then those from/with graduate school or five and more years of university education, lastly came the elementary school or grades 1 to 8.

The findings presented in Figure 6(a) can be explained using the economic trends experienced by the Windsor area during the period under study. The fact that the average qualified migrants were not the most attracted individuals to Windsor, helps shed light on the industrial sector - especially the automobile industry (the mainstay of the study area). This means that the industrial sector had not been that important in terms of attracting job
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>Number of Migrants (Percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School/Grades 1 to 8</td>
<td>5 (4.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary/High School</td>
<td>27 (26.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Secondary/College</td>
<td>28 (27.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Education (1 - 4 years)</td>
<td>29 (28.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate School (5 or more years)</td>
<td>14 (13.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>103 100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Questionnaire
seekers (the industrial worker). This is probably because of the decline in the automobile industry. Since this employment sector is the most attractive to average educated individuals, the low number of migrants with such educational qualifications can be explained by the decline in the industry. On the other hand, employment sectors that require university educated individuals (even with the automobile industry) may have been important in attracting the university graduates during the study period. The hypothesis that the majority of migrants to Windsor had only average level of education qualification is rejected.

4.1.4.1 Education and Distance

Figure 6(b) shows the relationship between education and distance. The most travelled distance by all educational categories with the exception of university educated individuals was the shortest distance, 0-50 miles. The number of migrants who travelled the 51-150 miles distance decreased as compared to the 0-50 miles distance for all education categories except the university group where it showed an increase.

The number of migrants with elementary education decreased with distance from three to one for the 0-50 to 51-150 miles distance. This educational category was not represented in the remaining distance classes except the 601-1200 miles class. The number of
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migrants in the secondary/high school category decreased with distance, from under 50 to 51-150 miles distance, and then remained constant for the next two distance classes (51-150 and 151-300). This was followed by a decline for the next two distance classes (301-600 and 600-1200), then a rise in the last distance class. This rise could be due to the presence of relatives, therefore, chain migration irrespective of distance. On the other hand it could be a product of the classification used.

The number of migrants with post secondary/college education also decreased with increase in distance. The only notable educational category where the number of migrants was relatively high for the long distances, was for the university educated individuals. Therefore the hypothesis that the migrants with higher education qualification moved the longest distance is accepted.

4.2 Analysis of the Behavioural Aspects of the Migrants

In this section an attempt is made to describe the behavioural aspects of the migrants. The description is based on the cross tabulated data - whereby pull factors (reasons for Windsor's attraction) are cross tabulated with demographic and socio-economic characteristics data of the migrants, year of migration and distance - Tables 5(a) to h.
4.2.1 Pull Factors (Reasons for Windsor's Attractiveness)

From Table 5(a), the most important reason that attracted migrants to Windsor was employment. 78.6 percent of the migrants cited employment as one of the pull factors to Windsor. The second most important pull factor was 'other' (reasons) which were defined by the migrants, this accounted for 73.8 percent. The reasons given ranged from social ones such as marriage, presence of relatives, proximity to home, to economic reasons (cheaper to move to Windsor than other alternative destinations), to environmental attractions or the perceived attraction by the migrants.

Housing was the third most important pull factor with 45.6 percent of the migrants citing this reason. The other pull factors ranked in this order, Education 31.1 percent; Recreation 24.3 percent, Social and Public services, Transport and Climate, 18.4, 10.7 and 8.7 percent respectively.

Several reasons can be advanced to explain the order of importance of these pull factors. Employment was most important pull factor. This is a surprising finding in the face of the slump in industrial sector during the period under study. It can however, be explained by importance of other employment sectors which attracted the higher educated individual (Figure 6(a)). Furthermore, given the Windsor location - accessibility to the larger metropolitan centre of Detroit, which offers employment, recreation, shopping
**TABLE 5(a)**

**PULL FACTORS BY RESPONSE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Opportunities</td>
<td>78.6</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Acceptance</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>72.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>54.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>75.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>89.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>68.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>81.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Climate</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>91.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Reasons)</td>
<td>73.8</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All numbers are in percentages

Source: Questionnaire
and other related advantages, partly explain the considerable importance of 'other' reasons in the decision to migrate to Windsor. In the case of housing as a pull factor, Windsor's low and medium level rentals or the availability of housing at comparatively lower rents than in other major cities, plus low prices of housing (which is partly due to the slump in the automobile and related industries), explain the importance of the reason and attraction of Windsor to the migrants in this respect.

The importance of education as a pull factor can be explained by the presence of a university and the St. Clair College - both of which are important to the young migrants in this migration stream. Recreation is most important to the young adults and the elderly people. In this in-migration stream, the presence of high numbers of migrants belonging to the young adult group helps to explain the importance of this pull factor. On the other hand, the low ranking of the social and public services as a pull factor - can be explained by the fact that most of the migrants were young adults (under 30 years), with good educational levels and employment potential. Therefore, this factor was not very important to most migrants. It should also be remembered that social and public services tend to be important pull factors for the elderly persons, 65 years and over. However, this was a group that did not feature very much in the sample, so the insignificance of this factor can be explained within that respect.
Transport as a pull factor was also ranked rather low compared to the other factors. This could be due to the factor that most of migrants had their own private vehicles hence were not interested in public transport. It, however, should be noted that the type of migrants that are likely to consider this factor as an attraction are those in the old age group - who happen to have been very few in the sample used in the survey. It can further be assumed that the importance of this factor might have been affected by the bus strike that was going at the time of the survey. Unknowingly, the migrants might have answered the question concerning transportation with a biased feeling.

Climate is also a factor of greater consideration for the aged, so its low ranking might be due to less elderly migrants in this in-migration stream (according to the sample). However, this factor may have been insignificant because most of the migrants came from areas near Windsor. Areas with no marked climatic differences from that of Windsor, and these migrants were predominantly under 35 years of age, a group to whom climate is not important in selecting a destination.

It can generally be concluded that employment, some social or 'amenity' factors (housing, education, etc.), and other locational advantages were the most important pull factors of the Windsor area – i.e. in-migration in the Windsor metropolitan area 1975-81 can be
explained using some economic and social factors.

4.2.2 Pull Factors and Age of the Migrants

Table 5(b) shows the pull factors (attraction reasons) as cited by various age groups – i.e. migration behavioural aspects of the migrants according to age. From the table, it can be seen that, the importance of employment as a pull factor, generally decreases with the increase in age.

The literature on migration shows that employment (economic reasons) is/are normally a cause for migration among the younger people 18-30 years and 31-40 age groups. Further along in the life cycle, other reasons become almost equally important as employment in the decision to migrate and in the choice of destination. This is the trend shown by the data in the table. This pull factor accounted for 63, 24.7, 11.1, 3 and 1.2 percent for 18-30, 31-40, 41-54, 55-64 and 65+ age groups respectively.

The importance of social acceptance as a pull factor generally decreased with the increase in age, but the last two age groups (55-64 and 65+) showed a constant of 3.6 percent. The highest percentage 42.9 percent for the 18-30 age group could be explained within the behavioural attitudes of the young people. At this time in life, individuals are normally in search of social acceptance and identity. They could have just moved out of their parents'
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>18-30</th>
<th>31-40</th>
<th>41-54</th>
<th>55-65</th>
<th>65+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Opportunity (Employment)</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Acceptance</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and Public Services</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Climate</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Reasons)</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All numbers are in percentages

Source: Questionnaire
house to a place of their own, or they may be just forming a family of their own, hence a need for an agreeable social atmosphere.

Housing as an attraction factor was also found to be most important for the young age groups, 18-30 and 31-40 years - with 48.9 and 23.4 percent respectively. However, the importance of this pull factor showed the same trend as the previous one - a decrease which was followed by constant of 6.4 percent for the last two age groups.

The importance of recreation as an attraction was found to be stronger for the 18-30 age group (52 percent). The next three age groups showed a decrease, while the 65+ age group showed a rise in the importance of this factor. The table shows that this pull factor was most important for two age groups, 18-30 and 65 and over. The importance can be explained through the behavioural patterns of the individuals who belong to these age groups. The young would most likely consider things like sports, music (night life) as part of the attractions of a place. On the other hand, the elderly persons would consider parks, theatre and senior citizen activity centres as part of the attraction. It can clearly be seen that recreation as a pull factor was less important to the middle aged groups.

Transport was found to be most important as a pull factor for three age groups - 31-40, 41-54, and 65 and over. The first two
of the three groups have families with children, therefore, transport might be important in that respect. The last group (elderly persons) normally rely more heavily on public transport for their movements.

Education as a pull factor, was found to be important for the first three age groups, with 62.5, 21.9 and 15.9 percent respectively (note the decline in importance). These groups would be interested in this factor because of children in the case of families or those migrants who were interested in furthering their own education. It is evident that this factor was highly related to the age of the migrants.

The importance of social and public services as pull factor(s) also showed a decrease in importance with increase in the age, though it would have been expected to be more important for the individuals 65 years and over. For the 18-30 age group this factor has a value of 36.8 percent, then 21.1 percent for the next two age groups and 10.5 percent for the last two age groups. Climate as a pull factor did not show any particular variation according to age except for the 33.3 percent for the 31-40 age group as opposed to 22.2 percent for the rest of the age group. The uniform percentage for the other age groups was expected since most of the migrants came from places with no marked
climatic differences from Windsor.

Lastly, a package of 'other' reasons given as pull factors showed the same relationship to age as demonstrated by other pull factors. There was generally a decrease with increase in age. The only change from the pattern was a slight increase of 0.3 percent in the last age group of 65 years and over.

Table 5(b) clearly shows that attraction reasons or the perception of Windsor area and hence its choice as a destination was partly influenced by the age of the migrant - this reinforces the hypothesis on age as a migration selectivity gauge.

4.2.3 Pull Factors and Sex of the Migrants

Table 5(c) shows the attraction reasons according to sex of the migrants. In the case of three pull factors, employment, 'other' (reasons), and education, there was no marked differences between the sexes. Marked differences did occur in the following factors, climate, transport, social and public services, recreation and housing. This could be due to response bias which was in favour of males. Therefore, it is reasonable to generalize that reasons for moving to Windsor were not wholly influenced by the sex of the migrant.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Opportunity (Employment)</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>46.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Acceptance</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>39.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>38.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>36.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>46.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and Public Services</td>
<td>68.4</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Climate</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Reasons)</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>47.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All numbers are in percentages

Source: Questionnaire
4.2.4 Pull Factors and Marital Status of the Migrants

Table 5(d) shows the pull factor according to marital status of the migrants. Employment as an attraction to Windsor was most important for the married and single migrants - 54.3 and 40.7 percent respectively. The importance of this factor decreased along the line, 4.9 percent for the divorced/separated and nil for the other two remaining categories (widow(er) and common law/other). The explanation for this could be due to the fact that social factors usually replace economic factors in importance for the last three marital status categories. A person may be forced to move because of a broken marriage etc., in such cases economic reasons, employment and the like, rarely act as a prime attraction.

Social acceptance was most cited by the married and single groups, 60.7 and 28.6 percent respectively. The importance of this factor in these two groups hence the high values could be related to the age factor. This pull factor was also important for the divorced/separated and common law/other (7.1 and 3.6 percent respectively) - groups which normally consider the acceptance atmosphere.

Housing was most important for the married migrants (66 percent). This basically shows that housing is an important consideration in the process of migration for the family people. Among the other marital status groups, this factor was cited as follows: 25.5, 4.3 and 2.1 (twice) percent for the single, divorced, widow(er) and
**TABLE 5(d)**

**PULL FACTORS BY MARITAL STATUS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Single</th>
<th>Married</th>
<th>Divorced/Separated</th>
<th>Widow/er</th>
<th>Common Law/Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Opportunity</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Employment)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Acceptance</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and Public Services</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Climate</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Reasons)</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All numbers are in percentages

Source: Questionnaire
common law respectively.

Recreation as a pull factor was also most important for the married migrants (66 percent). This is probably because of family reasons or rather the need for children recreation. In the remaining marital status groups this pull factor was cited by the single and widow/er groups only - 36 and 4 percent, respectively. As already seen the single group was made up of the young people. These are the type of people who might be interested in sports and other recreation. On the other hand the widow/er group was basically the group over 55 years of age - individuals that enjoy some recreation. The fact that this pull factor was misrepresented in the case of the divorced/separated and common law groups could be due to sample size.

Transport as a pull factor was cited in this order, married 81.8 percent, single 9.1 percent, widow/er 6.2 percent and common law 2.8 percent. The high percentage for the married group could be due to the family needs.

The education pull factor was most important for the married group (59.4 percent). This value could be due to the need for a sound education system for the children, a factor that parents take into consideration, or partly a result of the need to improve educational qualification by the young adults in this marital status group. The single group had 37.5 percent, a figure that could be due to the fact that some of the single migrants came to
Windsor for employment as well as improving their skills at institutions like St. Clair College and the University. The 3.1 percent figure for the divorced/separated is possibly from those separated individuals who decided to get some educational qualification—something they were not able to do earlier.

The social and public services as a pull factor was most cited by the married migrants (63.2 percent), followed by the single individuals (21.1 percent), and the remaining marital status groups had 5.3 percent each. In the case of climate as a pull factor, this factor was cited as follows: married 55.6 percent, single, widow/er, common law/other - 22.2, 11.1 and 11.1 percent respectively.

'Other' reasons as pull factors were also most cited by the married group, followed by the single individuals, 55.5 and 35.5 percent respectively. The high percentages for the married group in all pull factors could be partly a result of the presence of more migrants in the sample. However, there is a clear indication that the marital status factor influenced the decision making process of the migrants and the choice of the destination.

4.2.5 Pull Factors and Size of the Family at Migration

The tabulation in Table 5(e), shows some relationship between housing and the size of the family, and transport and the size of the family. Housing as a pull factor was most cited by the three-member families, followed by the two-persons and six persons families
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>2 Persons</th>
<th>3 Persons</th>
<th>4 Persons</th>
<th>5 Persons</th>
<th>6 and More Persons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Opportunity (Employment)</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Acceptance</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and Public Services</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Climate</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Reasons)</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All numbers are in percentages

Source: Questionnaire
43.8, 25.0 and 12.5 percent respectively. Transport as an
attraction was most cited by the six person families (37.5 percent).
This could be due to the needs of such families.

4.2.6 Pull Factors and Educational Qualifications of the Migrants

Table 5(f) demonstrates selectivity as a result of educational
levels of the migrants. According to the table, employment as a
pull factor was almost equally cited by three educational level
categories - secondary/high school, post secondary/college, and
university 3-4 years - 25.9, 24.4, 24.7 respectively. The 16.0
percent and 4.9 percent for the graduate (5 and more years) and
elementary school are probably due to small numbers of migrants
with such educational qualification in the sample.

In the case of the social acceptance as a pull factor, it is
clear that this factor is less important to the university educated
individuals. The possible reason to explain this could be the
fact that university educated individuals are more adaptable to
different social situations than other groups. This pull factor
was cited as follows: elementary school 10.7 percent, secondary/
high school 35.7 percent, post secondary/college 32.1 percent,
university and graduate both 10.7 percent each. The 10.7 percent
is quite a low figure when you consider the fact that university
graduates were the majority of migrants.

Recreation was also less important to the university educated
TABLE 5(f)

PULL FACTORS BY EDUCATION LEVEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Elementary School</th>
<th>Secondary/High School</th>
<th>Post-Secondary/College</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>Graduate School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Opportunity</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Employment)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Acceptance</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and Public Services</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Climate</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Reasons)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All numbers are in percentages

Source: Questionnaire
individuals - 12.0 percent each. This factor was, however, of much significance among the post secondary/college (36.0 percent), secondary/high school (32.0 percent), and elementary school (8.0 percent) migrants. Transport as a pull factor was most cited by the elementary school group - 54.5 percent, followed by post secondary/college 27.3 percent. The university educated migrants registered a 9.1 percent each.

Education as a pull factor was important for secondary/high school group of migrants - 46.9 percent. This is probably because the high school group of migrants may consider improving their education or gaining special skills through programs offered at places such as St. Clair College.

The importance of the social and public services as a pull factor decreased with higher education. This is true, in the sense that it is mostly the less educated individuals that rely on services like welfare etc. The low figure for the elementary school group is probably due to the sample. This pull factor was cited as follows: elementary 5.6 percent, secondary/high school 39.8 percent, post secondary/college 33.8 percent, university 15.5 percent and graduates 5.3 percent.

The climatic attraction, as expected did not differ with the level of education. 'Other' reasons of attraction tended to be more important for the non-university educated migrants.

In conclusion, it can be stated that, educational levels of
of the migrants had an influence on the choice of the destination, i.e. the attractiveness measure of the area depended partly on the level of education.

4.2.7 Pull Factors and Year of Migration

The tabulation in Table 5(g), was done on the basis of identifying the relationship between economic trends and attraction factors. From the table, it can be seen that attractions such as employment were most important during the period of prosperity. Employment showed a rise during the good economic years 1977-78. This pull factor was cited as follows: 1975 - 8.6 percent, 1976 - 12.3 percent, 1977 - 21.0 percent, 1978 - 35.8 percent, 1979 - 8.6 percent, and 1980-81 - 13.6 percent. The high figure for 1980-81 could be due to the fact that a two year figure was used. Other economic related pull factors like housing and education, showed an economic trend similar to that of employment. To a certain extent the choice of the destination and the factors considered related to the economic situation at the destination (Windsor).

4.2.8 Pull Factors and Distance Moved

Table 5(h), demonstrates the relationship between the distance moved by the migrants and the pull factors or attractions considered. All pull factors were most important for the migrant who moved the
TABLE 5(g)

PULL FACTORS BY YEAR OF MIGRATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Opportunity</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Employment)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Acceptance</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and Public</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Climate</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Reasons)</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All numbers are in percentages

Source: Questionnaire
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>0-50</th>
<th>51-150</th>
<th>151-300</th>
<th>301-600</th>
<th>601-1200</th>
<th>1201+ Miles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Opportunity (Employment)</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Acceptance</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and Public Services</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Climate</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Reasons)</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All numbers are in percentages

Source: Questionnaire
shortest distance, except the climatic factor. This reveals two important facts: first, is that Windsor has more to offer than all the smaller places nearby (within the 50 mile distance). Second is the fact that climate was important for those migrants who moved the longest distances. This is because there is no marked climatic difference between Windsor and the nearby places.

For employment as a pull factor, the 11.1 percent for the 1201+ distance category, shows that this factor is equally important irrespective of the distance. The importance of housing, recreation, transport and social and public services as pull factors tended to decline with the increase in distance. Education however, was cited highly for both the shortest and longest distances, 37.5 and 21.9 percent respectively. This indicates that this factor is equally important irrespective of distance.

The social and public services as a pull factor was most important for those migrants who moved the shortest distance - 42.1 percent, and its importance generally decreases with increase in distance. Climate however, was to a certain extent important for those migrants who moved the longest distances. This is partly because of some climatic differences between the migrants' original places and Windsor. 'Other' reasons as attraction factors also showed a decline in importance as distance migrated increased.

In conclusion, it can be stated that the distance factor did play a role in the behavioural aspects of the migrants ie. depending
on the distance to be moved certain pull factors were taken into consideration by the migrant.

4.3 Secondary Pull Factors

In the present study, two variables were considered as secondary pull factors. The two are: the presence of relatives/friends in Windsor, and income. These two are analyzed in this section.

4.3.1 Presence of Relatives/Friends

69.9 percent of the respondents indicated that they had relatives or friends in Windsor before moving, and 30.1 percent did not have anybody in Windsor. Therefore the hypothesis that most of the migrants had relatives/friends in Windsor is accepted.

As observed during the survey this variable did play an indirect role in attracting some of the migrants. However, measuring the degree of importance is outside the scope of the present study. An attempt is made to explain the behavioural aspects of the migrants in relationship to this variable.

Table 6(a) shows the relationship between this relatives/friends and education level of the migrant. This variable was most important to the migrants with lower levels of education. It was cited by 80 and 81.5 percent of the migrants with elementary school and secondary/high school levels of education respectively, and only
21.4 percent among the graduates. This variable could have acted as a pull factor to the migrants with lower levels of education while it was less important for the highly educated migrants. This can be explained by the fact that the more educated individuals are more independent, while the lower educated individual might rely on relatives and friends as a form of encouragement before moving.

There was also a relationship between this variable and the year of migration. According to Table 6b, the year 1978, one which had most migrants did not have the highest cited value for this variable. This could be due to the fact that economic reasons as pull factors were most important. On the other hand, the years of economic depression are fairly represented, probably because the migrants did rely on some help from relatives/friends at the destination.

This variable was also related to the ethnic background of the migrants (Appendix A1). Furthermore, the variable showed a relationship with most spoken language in the area - English (Appendix A2).

The relationship between this variable and the age of the migrant is shown to be strongest for the 18-30 years old, with 74.2 percent value - Appendix A3. However, as in the case of other pull factors, there was no marked differences between sexes in this variable - Appendix A3. This shows that the female migrant is no longer bound by the family ties. She is more independent in her movement as the male counterpart.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>Relatives</th>
<th>No Relatives</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary or High School</td>
<td>81.5</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Secondary/College</td>
<td>72.4</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Education</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate and 5+</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>78.6</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col. Total</td>
<td>69.9</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All numbers in percentages

Source: Questionnaire
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Migration</th>
<th>Relatives</th>
<th>No Relatives</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>34.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980-81</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col. Total</td>
<td>69.1</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All numbers are in percentages

Source: Questionnaire
In conclusion, it can be stated that relatives/friends as a pull factor had some influence on the migrants.

4.3.2 Income

From (Table 7), it becomes apparent that incomes in Windsor were higher than those in the previous place of residence for most migrants. Therefore, the migrants might have considered the employment opportunities and the economic benefits (incomes). A simple chi-square test was however, employed to test whether there was any difference between the two sets of data.

A four by seven chi-square table was used to test whether there were any differences between the distribution. The observed $X^2$ was 29.6 and $X$ critical was 16.4. Therefore, there was a difference between the two sets of data. The hypothesis that the migrants earn higher incomes in Windsor than in their last place of residence is accepted.

4.4 Factors Influencing In-migration to the Windsor Area

The final objective of the study was to develop a migration model explaining migration to Windsor in terms of a set of factors which the migrants considered. In order to measure the influence of the selected variables on the rate of in-migration to Windsor, a stepwise regression analysis was employed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Group</th>
<th>Before Windsor</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>In Windsor</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $6500 @ year</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$6501 to $10000 @ year</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10001 to $15000 @ year</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15001 to $20000 @ year</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20001 to $30000 @ year</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30001 to $45000 @ year</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$45000 +</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( \alpha = 0.05 \)

\( X^2 = 29.6 \)

\( \text{df} = 4 \)

\( \text{Chi square} = 16.4 \)

Source: Questionnaire
The summary table of the stepwise regression analysis (Table 8) shows that five independent variables were significant at 95 percent level.

The first, independent variable entered in the regression was locational advantages. This produced a multiple $R$ of 0.356 and $R^2$ of 0.127; this variable, therefore, explains 21 percent of the total variance. As expected the relationship between the dependent and independent variable was positive.

In the second step, the employment variable was added to the regression equation and a multiple $R$ of 0.656 and $R^2$ of 0.430 was produced. This showed a negative relationship because of the nature of the data used. The 1976 Statistics Canada data showed an advantage for the places of origin in terms of employment. Though the places of origin might have had the advantage in aggregated data, individual perceptions of the employment situation in Windsor were different. This is shown by the fact that 78.6\textsuperscript{10} percent of the migrants cited this variable as an attraction. Therefore, the interpretation of the relation is a positive one.

The third variable added to the regression was amenities. This produced a multiple $R$ of 0.668 and $R^2$ of 0.446. This variable accounted for slightly over three percent of the total variance in the dependent variable, and as expected the relationship was positive.

In the fourth step of the computation, population/distance was

\[\text{\textsuperscript{10}See Table 5(a).}\]
### TABLE 8

**SUMMARY TABLE OF STEPWISE REGRESSION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step Number</th>
<th>Variable Entered</th>
<th>Multiple R</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>Increase in $R^2$</th>
<th>Significance (0.05)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Locational Advantage</td>
<td>0.356</td>
<td>0.127</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>0.658</td>
<td>0.430</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Amenities</td>
<td>0.668</td>
<td>0.446</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Population/Distance</td>
<td>0.704</td>
<td>0.496</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Information</td>
<td>0.773</td>
<td>0.598</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Questionnaire
added to the regression, yielding a multiple $R$ of 0.704 and $R^2$ of 0.496. This variable as expected had a negative relationship with dependent variable. This variable accounted for 8.3 percent of the total variance in the dependent variable.

In the last step, information was added to the regression, resulting in a multiple $R$ of 0.773 and $R^2$ of 0.598. This variable accounted for almost 17 percent of the total variance in the dependent variable, and the relationship was positive.

It can therefore, be summarized that 59.8 percent (approximately 60 percent) of the migration from 44 regions to Windsor could be explained using five variables, employment, locational advantages at the destination, information, population of the origin and distance between Windsor and the origin place of residence, and amenities in Windsor.

4.4.2 Study of Residuals

When dealing with multivariate analysis, researchers are faced with the question of whether they have met the assumptions of the model i.e. if there are errors in prediction - which may suggest looking for new predictive variables. The need for new predictive variables arises out of the unexplained variance.

In the present study, the regression model explains only 59.8 percent of the total variance leaving 40.2 percent unexplained. An explanation of the remaining variance is necessary, but before looking
for new variables, an analysis of the residuals is important.

The importance of studying residuals is that they give the researcher a tool for determining how well the model approximates the assumptions upon which it is based, and what errors could have been encountered. Furthermore, residuals provide a tool for examining other variables as possible alternatives for inclusion in the model.

Tables 9 and 10, show the in-migration streams to Windsor that were underpredicted and those that were overpredicted. An observation of these two tables reveals three sub-in-migration streams of the total migration stream to Windsor. The first, is the stream from smaller areas (in terms of population size) than Windsor, located near Windsor (0-150 miles). The second is the stream from the smaller areas located far from Windsor. The third sub-migration stream is from areas that are bigger than Windsor. The streams from smaller areas located near Windsor were found to be underpredicted, while those migration streams from the smaller places far from Windsor, and the bigger areas were overpredicted.

The over and underpredicted streams may be due to various reasons. One of these reasons could be the fact that secondary pull factors were not included in the model. The secondary attraction variables such as income and presence of friends in the destination area.
TABLE 9

OVERPREDICTED MIGRATION STREAMS

Ottawa to Windsor
Sarnia to Windsor
Fredericton to Windsor
Owensound to Windsor
Guelph to Windsor
Waterloo to Windsor
Sault St. Marie to Windsor
London to Windsor
Sudbury to Windsor
Brantford to Windsor
Welland to Windsor
Woodstock to Windsor
Barrie to Windsor
Thunder Bay (Fort William) to Windsor
Peterborough to Windsor
Burlington to Windsor
Fort Erie to Windsor
Oshawa to Windsor
Kitchener to Windsor
Brockville to Windsor
Kingston to Windsor
Simcoe to Windsor
Montamaguy to Windsor
North Bay to Windsor
Distant Urban Areas
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Migration Stream</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chatham to Windsor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Catherines to Windsor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Colborne to Windsor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quebec to Windsor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montreal to Windsor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leamington to Windsor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrow to Windsor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex to Windsor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toronto to Windsor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tilbury to Windsor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Thomas to Windsor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingsville to Windsor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tillsonburg to Windsor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandon to Windsor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton to Windsor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niagara Falls to Windsor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bancroft to Windsor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratford to Windsor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blenheim to Windsor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4.3 Summary

In-migration in Windsor metropolitan during the period 1975-81 was mainly influenced by five variables. Most migrants were attracted to Windsor because of employment. Though, Windsor employment rates compare unfavourably with other places (in Canada), for the period of study, it is still true that employment was the main pull factor for the area. The question arises that, why is/was there such a high unemployment rate in Windsor while at the same time migrants are/were attracted because of employment? The possible explanations could be within the issue of how people perceive certain jobs and related incomes.

A laid off auto-worker (in Windsor) may find it more profitable to earn the unemployment benefits which might be better in terms of hourly wage than another job (not industrial type). On the other hand a farm or other type of worker from nearby places, may view the same job and the pay as a good climb up the ladder. In such a situation we have a possible migrant attracted to Windsor.

At the same time since most migrants were the highly educated individuals, other employment sectors in Windsor must have been significant, hence the employment attraction for the area that otherwise has a generally high unemployment ranking in the country.

Location advantages was another pull factor that influenced in-migration to Windsor. This variable basically depended on what
the migrants considered locational advantages. These in most cases were related to the Detroit metropolitan area. The advantages of such a location ranged from shopping, employment to recreation.

Information was the other factor that influenced the decision and choice of destination. According to Gould (1963), the decision to migrate and the choice of a destination is partly influenced by what information the possible migrant has about a place. Appendix A(4) shows that 75 percent of the migrants from the shortest distance moved (less than 50 miles) had personal knowledge about Windsor. The fact that these migrants had a personal knowledge might have greatly influenced their choice of Windsor as opposed to other alternative destinations.

The other factors that influenced in-migration to Windsor are population of and the distance between the original place of residence and Windsor. It was found out that most migrants moved short distances and the majority were from places smaller than Windsor. This may be due to the fact that Windsor offers better employment and amenities than the smaller places. The last factor that attracted the migrants to Windsor was amenities.
CHAPTER V
CONCLUSION

The main objectives of the study were: firstly, to examine demographic and socio-economic characteristics of the migrants to Windsor between 1975-81. Secondly, to examine the behavioural aspect of the decision to migrate, and the choice of Windsor as a destination - thus develop a migration model explaining migration in relation to a set of factors which appear to be related to Windsor's attractiveness. Thirdly, look for similarities and differences among the migrants in this migration stream, and also find out whether the results of the macro studies are applicable to this particular migration stream. The findings of the study are summarized here.

5.1 Characteristics of the Migrants

The study revealed that there were more female migrants than male migrants in the Windsor immigration stream. This is in agreement with C. Yum's (1980) research findings, but contrasts with the Lycan (1969, '70) and Vanderkamp (1976) findings.

Three reasons have been suggested as possible explanations for the findings. First, the fact that female participation in the
present day Canadian labour force has increased. With more female participation, this has resulted in more female mobility. Second is the fact that married individuals are more mobile than before. (In the study it was found that there were more married than single migrants.) This partly explains why the migration propensity of females has increased. Third the possibility that during the period of study - the bad economic years for the auto and related industries, (the employment sector most attractive to the males) other employment sectors more favourable to the females might have attracted these migrants. All in all, contrary to some other past studies findings, there were more female migrants than males.

As expected, the study found that in-migration to Windsor was in favour of the young adults - 18 - 30 years of age. This is the group which in most cases moves in search of employment. On the other hand the other age groups, the middle aged and elderly (31 years and over) tend to be more restricted because of family ties and established careers. Given the attractions that Windsor has to offer (employment, recreation, etc.) and the hiring practices, it is possible to explain why there were more young migrants in this migration stream.

The other finding of the study was that there were more married than single migrants to Windsor. Although the literature on migration (O. Ogden, 1973) indicates that the married individuals are more restrained from moving (because of families) than the single
individuals, this is not true of the 1975-81 Windsor in-migration stream. Through cross-tabulations of data, possible reasons to explain the findings were arrived at. It was found that age and marital status were strongly related, especially the young adults - 18 - 30 years of age. This group had the most married individuals. Since this was also the most dominant group in this migration stream, the high figure of married individuals could be explained within this respect. The married migrants were also found to have small families. Since costs of moving tend to be higher for large families, the smaller families' reason could be used to explain why the married individuals were more in this migration stream.

One other finding of the study is that the in-migration stream to Windsor during 1975-81 was dominated by university educated migrants. The reason given to explain this was the decline of the auto and related industries. The bad economic years for the industrial sector - the biggest attraction for the average educated individual - the industrial worker, help to explain why less average educated migrants were attracted. It was also found out that the migrants with the highest levels of educational qualification moved the longest distances.

5.2 Behavioural Aspects of the Migrants (Similarities and Differences)

Using a number of pull factors the study attempted to analyze the
behavioural aspects of the migrants. A descriptive analysis based on cross-tabulated data between pull factors and the demographic, socio-economic characteristics of the migrants, year of migration and distance moved was used. The pull factors used were: employment, 'other' (reason), housing, education, recreation, social and public services, transport and climate -(the listing is according to importance of the pull factor).

It was found that selection of pull factors by migrants or attraction to Windsor was influenced by the age of the migrant. Different age groups considered different attractions in their choice of Windsor as destination. This is in agreement with what the literature says on age as a migration selectivity gauge. On the sex factor, there was no marked differences between the female and male migrants as regards three pull factors - employment, 'other' (reasons), and education. However, differences existed in regards to the remaining pull factors. This could be due to the response bias. Based on the findings, it can be concluded that attraction to Windsor was not wholly influenced by the sex factor. The research also found out that marital status and the size of the family at migration partly accounted for the pull factors considered by the migrants in their selection of the destination - Windsor.

The attractions (pull factors) considered in the process of selecting Windsor as a destination were also partly a product of the educational level attained by the migrant. It was found that migrants
with different levels of education considered different pull factors (except the case of employment which is an attraction to all levels of education). It was also found that the economic trends (decline and prosperity) of the destination (Windsor) during the period under study were related to the pull factors given by the migrants: The pull factor slightly differed according to the year of migration. Since the years under study differed economically, it can be concluded that attraction to Windsor was partly a product of the economic situation in the area. Furthermore, the pull factors were related to the distance moved by the migrant.

Apart from what were considered primary pull factors, secondary pull factors (attractions) were included in the study. The behavioural aspects of the migrants in relation to these secondary attractions were sought for too. One of the secondary pull factors was the presence of relatives/friends in Windsor. It was found that most migrants had either some relatives or friends. The possible explanation given is the fact that the majority came from places not very far from Windsor. This secondary pull factor was also related to the educational level of the migrant, the year of migration, ethnicity and language most spoken at home. As regards the income pull factor, it was found that most migrants earn higher incomes in Windsor than in their last place of residence.

5.3 Factors which influenced in-migration to Windsor

The factors found to have influenced in-migration to or the
choice of Windsor as a destination during the period 1975-81 are: employment, locational advantage, information, population and distance, and amenities. Although the general economic situation in Windsor was relatively bad in terms of employment as compared to other cities in Canada, employment proved to be the dominant attraction of most migrants. Therefore, the hypothesis that the migrants were attracted to Windsor by employment opportunities is accepted.

The study fell short of identifying (in each individual migrant case) what employment sector attracts him/her. It can however, be generalized that sectors other than the automobile industry were the main attraction. This is because of the slump in the automobile industry during the period under study.

Locational advantages of Windsor were also important contributors to the attraction of the place. The geographical location of Windsor makes it impossible to perceive its attraction within the limits of metropolitan Windsor. The migrants viewed Windsor in relation to the Detroit metropolitan area, hence the hypothesis that Detroit might have contributed to the destination's attractiveness is true.

It was found that the migrant's perception of Windsor area and eventually its choice as a destination was also partly a product of the information they knew about Windsor. Furthermore, the population size of Windsor, and the distance between the former place of residence and Windsor were two variables which partly influenced in-
migration to the Windsor area during the period 1975-81. It was found that most of the migrants came from smaller cities/towns than Windsor - hence a kind of hierarchical migration. These smaller cities/towns are also located not very far from Windsor (within a distance of 0 to 100 miles). Lastly, since the majority of the migrants came from smaller places (Windsor being bigger does offer better amenities than these former places of residence), amenities were the other attraction to the Windsor area.

Lastly, on the future plans of the migrants - in the questionnaire, the last question inquired about immediate plans. The migrants were asked whether they intended to move out or stay in Windsor. 45.6 percent were undecided, 32.1 percent had no plans of leaving Windsor and only 22.3 percent had immediate future plans of moving out of Windsor. The possible explanations could be, the attachment these migrants have developed for Windsor, hence restrain from migrating. On the other hand it could be due to the hope that the economy will improve or a reassuring note that the situation is not as bad as it is made to appear.

5.4 Limitation of the Study

In a study of this nature, the basic limitation is the source of data on who is/are the migrant(s). There is always the problem of identifying the migrants. Many of the available sources of
information that can be used to identify the migrants are inadequate and in some cases not public i.e. personal information, is held confidential according to the law. There is therefore a need for a more reliable source of information on who the migrants are. This problem could be solved through the institutionalization of something like a permanent register of people moving in and out of a community/city.

The problem of lack of information on who is/are the migrant(s) does partly affect the sample size. In this case the 1971-76 Census data figure was used to determine the sample size. However, there is no exact way of telling how many migrants moved to Windsor between 1975-81 (mid-1981). So a study like this one done before the publication of more recent Census data relies on past Census figures.

On the other hand, the study is limited in sample size because of costs in collecting data and time. Any researcher prefers a bigger sample—which is always more representative. However, costs are normally a limitation. Better funding of such studies could probably allow bigger samples.

5.5 Further Direction of Research

Micro/local studies of this nature focusing on detailed analysis of the individual migrants are the best for understanding individual migration streams. However, more education gains could
be made through comparative local studies. Therefore, further research should be directed towards the study of different migration streams on a comparative basis and from a micro approach rather than the macro approach that has commonly been used.

Apart from studying in-migration streams, it would be better to understand out-migrations from a particular place. Such studies are possible only if the researcher can find out where the individuals from a certain city/community relocated themselves. However, research of that nature would only be possible if a better method (other than the Census) of monitoring those who are migrants is instituted.
APPENDIX A
SUPPLEMENT TABLES
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>Relatives</th>
<th>No Relatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17/2</td>
<td>17/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopian</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scandinavian</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukrainian</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South European</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish and Irish</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Indian</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese and Japanese</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asians</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All numbers are in percentages.

Source: Questionnaire
APPENDIX A (2)

LANGUAGE AND PRESENCE OF RELATIVES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Relatives</th>
<th>No Relatives</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>72.3</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>80.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col. Total</td>
<td>69.9</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Questionnaire
### APPENDIX (3)

**SEX OF MIGRANT AND PRESENCE OF RELATIVES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Relatives</th>
<th>No Relatives</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>69.6</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>54.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>70.2</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>45.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### AGE OF MIGRANT AND PRESENCE OF RELATIVES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Relatives</th>
<th>No Relatives</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-30 years old</td>
<td>74.2</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>60.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40 years old</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-54 years old</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64 years old</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+ years old</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Questionnaire
## APPENDIX A(4)

### NUMBER OF MIGRANTS BY DISTANCE MOVED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Number of Migrants</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 50 miles</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>(31.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 - 150 miles</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>(24.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151 - 300 miles</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>(17.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301 - 600 miles</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>(8.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>601 - 1200 miles</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(2.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1201 + miles</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>(15.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>103</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Questionnaire
APPENDIX A(5)

EDUCATION LEVEL AND SOURCE OF INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>Personal Visit/Knowledge</th>
<th>Relatives</th>
<th>Friends</th>
<th>News Media</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary/High School</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Secondary</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Education (3-4 Years)</td>
<td>75.9</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate School (5 and More Years)</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All numbers are in percentages

Source: Questionnaire
### APPENDIX A(6)

**SOURCE OF INFORMATION BY DISTANCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mile (Distance)</th>
<th>Personal</th>
<th>Relatives</th>
<th>Friends</th>
<th>News Media</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Percent Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-50</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-150</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151-300</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301-600</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.33.3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1201-Over</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All numbers are in percentages

Source: Questionnaire
APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE
PART I

Demographic and socio-economic characteristics

1) Where were you born?
   a) Country of birth ____________________________
   b) Province ____________________________ District _____________
   c) City __________________________________
   d) Rural: 1. Township ____________________________
             2. County ____________________________

2) What is your date of birth? ____________________________

3) Sex: Male ____ Female ____

4) When did you come to Windsor? Date ____________________________

5) What ethnic group do you feel your family belongs to?
   ________ Canadian or American ________ Polish Ukrainian and other East European
   ________ British (British Isles) ________ Southern European (Greek, Spanish, Yugoslavian etc.)
   ________ French ________ Scotish, Irish
   ________ Italian ________ Native Indian
   ________ German ________ East Asia (Chinese, Japanese, etc.)
   ________ Scandinavian (Swede, Danish, Fin etc.) ________ South Asia (Indian, Pakistan, etc.)
   ________ Other (Specify) ________

6) What language is most commonly spoken in your home?
   ________ English ________ French
   ________ Other (Specify) ____________________________

7) Did you form a new household when you moved to Windsor? e.g. Got married etc.
   a) Yes _____ b) No* _________

*If NO, skip to 10
8) If YES (#7), what type of household did you form?
   a) Married ____
   b) Moved out from parents' household ____
   c) Got divorced ____
   d) Widow/widower ____
   e) Other ____

9) Was this the reason for moving from your previous place of residence?
   a) Yes ____ b) No ____

10) What was your marital status at the time you migrated to Windsor?
    a) Single ____ b) Married ____
    c) Divorced ____ d) Separated ____
    e) Widow/widower ____
    f) Common law/other ____

   If a) "Single" skip to 12

11) What was the size of your family (excluding yourself) at the time of your coming to Windsor?
    a) 1 person ____ b) 2 persons ____
    c) 3 persons ____ d) 4 persons ____
    e) 5 and over persons ____

12) What was your level of education when you migrated to Windsor?
    a) Elementary school 1 to 8 years or (Grades 1-8) ____
    b) Secondary and high school 4 to 5 years or (Grades 9-13) ____
    c) Post-secondary non-university or college ____ years
    d) University education
       1) 1 to 3 years ____
       2) 4 years ____
       3) 5 or more years ____

13) Did you undertake any education or vocational training after coming to Windsor?
    a) Yes ____ b) No ____

   If YES, please specify: Type ____ How long? ____
14) How far is your last place of residence from Windsor?

Place (Name) ____________________ Province ____________________ Miles/Kilometers
Approximate distance from Windsor ___________ (Country)

15) Before coming to Windsor, were you:

a) *Employed ______
   b) Unemployed ______ 1) Looking for a job ______
   c) *Self-employed ______
   d) Retired ______

*Answer Part 1 in the table below.

16) Immediately after coming to Windsor, what kind of job did you do? Refer to table Part 2 below.

17) Currently are you:

a) *Employed ______
   b) Unemployed ______ 1) Looking for a job ______
   c) *Self-employed ______
   d) Retired ______

*Answer Part 3 in the table below.

The table is to investigate the occupational status prior coming to Windsor and while in Windsor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Part 1 Before Windsor</th>
<th>Part 2 Immediately in Windsor</th>
<th>Part 3 Presently in Windsor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional, Technical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager/Administrator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales worker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craftsman/Forman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operative Non Transport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operative Transport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labourer Farm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labourer Non-Farm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager Farm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service worker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
18) If unemployed or retired at present, what was the usual or previous occupation? __________________ (According to classification in Table)

19) Did your move to Windsor involve a change in the nature of your work/job? e.g. Change from saleswork to manager etc.

   a) Yes ___   b) No ___

If NO skip to 20

   If YES, 1) Did the job improve your family income? Yes ___  No ___

   2) Did the new job in Windsor improve your social status? Yes ___  No ___

20) If your move to Windsor did not involve a change in the nature of work/job, was the job in Windsor in anyway better than your previous one? (Please specify)

   Did your family income increase? Yes ___  No ___

   Did the job in Windsor improve your social status? Yes ___  No ___

21) 1) What was your approximate annual family income before coming to Windsor?

   2) What was your annual family income soon after coming to Windsor?

   3) Where would you rank your annual family income?

   Table for Question 21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income per year</th>
<th>Before Windsor</th>
<th>Soon After</th>
<th>Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $6,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$6,501 to $10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,001 to $15,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,001 to $20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,001 to $25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,001 to $30,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,001 to $45,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$45,001 to $55,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$55,001 and over</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
22) If you are currently laid off or retired please give your approximately family income before being laid off or retiring.

$_________ to $_________ (Use the income groups given for Question 21)

PART 2

Decision making process and factors related

23) Who made the decision to move/migrate?

a) Self
b) Husband/wife
c) Father/mother
d) Employer

*Only in case of 'employer', answer remaining parts of the question and then stop.

If employer, was the transfer at your request?

a) Yes  b) No

If your answer is YES, answer the next question and if NO, please do not answer any more questions. Thank you for your cooperation.

If YES, what attracted you to Windsor? (Please rank your reasons)

1. Job satisfaction
2. Chance of promotion
3. Recreation/sports
4. Education
5. Transport
6. Housing
7. Friends/relatives
8. Social acceptance

If you have answered the 'YES' part of Question 23, please do not answer any more question. Thank you for your cooperation.
24) What conditions existed in your previous place of residence that made you decide to move? (Rank your answers)

- Lack of employment opportunities  
- Lack of good housing  
- Lack of social acceptance  
- Poor recreation  
- Bad weather conditions (e.g., too cold)  
- Lack of opportunities for advancement in job

25) Did you consider any other place before moving to Windsor? e.g. Place near home?

- Yes  
- No

26) In your opinion what attracted you to Windsor? (Rank your answers)

- Job opportunities (Availability of jobs)  
- Social acceptance  
- Housing  
- Recreation  
- Transport  
- Education  
- Social/Public services  
- Good climatic conditions  
- Others (specify)

27) Are you a return migrant i.e. Did you live in Windsor before?

- Yes  
- No

28) At the time of your arrival here, how did you rate Windsor in comparison with your previous place of residence?

- Very much better  
- Much better  
- Better  
- Same  
- Worse
29) Please indicate your present rating of Windsor.

Excellent ______
Very good _____
Good _____
Fair _____
No comment _____

30) How do services e.g. Welfare services, public transport, schools, housing, shopping, recreation etc. in Windsor compare with those of your last place of residence?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Transport</th>
<th>Housing</th>
<th>Shopping</th>
<th>Recreation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Much better</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worse</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No-comment</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31) Before moving to Windsor, did you have any relative(s) or friend(s) living here?

a) Yes ______ b) No ______

If YES, what was their role in your decision to come to Windsor?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

32) What was your source of information about Windsor? (Before moving)

a) Personal knowledge (visit) ______
b) Relatives ______
c) Friends ______
d) News media ______
e) Other ______

33) How did you rank your source of information about Windsor in these aspects?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Job availability</th>
<th>Housing</th>
<th>Recreation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
34) Windsor is located near Detroit city (Michigan-U.S.A.). In your opinion do you see any advantages arising from such location?
   a) Yes ___  b) No ___
   If YES, what are these locational advantages?
   1) ____________________________________________
   2) ____________________________________________
   3) ____________________________________________

35) In your opinion would you consider these locational advantages as part of the attractiveness of Windsor metropolitan area?
   a) Yes ___  b) No ___

36) Did you consider the locational advantages while selecting the destination?
   a) Yes ___  b) No ___

37) How does the climate of Windsor compare with that of your last place of residence?
   a) Excellent ___
   b) Better ___
   c) Same ___
   d) Worse ___

38) Did you consider climatic conditions of Windsor before making the decision to migrate?
   a) Yes ___  b) No ___

39) How does the size(population) of your last place of residence compare with that of Windsor?
   a) Bigger ___
   b) Equal ___
   c) Smaller ___

40) Do you intend to move out of Windsor in the near future?
   a) Yes ___  b) No ___  c) I do not know ___
   If YES, why? (Give reasons)
   1) ____________________________________________
   2) ____________________________________________
   3) ____________________________________________
   Where? ___________ (Place) ___________ (Province)

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION
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