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ABSTRACT

This study analyzed the following aspects of migration:

a) Demographic and socioeconomic characteristics of Indian immigrants in the Windsor Metropolitan area.
b) Any changes in the above-mentioned characteristics within the immigrant group over time.
c) Mechanics of migration.
d) Migration experience of the immigrants.
e) Chances of return migration, source area association of the immigrants and satisfaction with Windsor.

The characteristics of the migrant showed that most of the migrants were young males and were married at the time of initial migration. But, most of them brought their wives afterwards. The migrants had good educational background and were mostly professionals. In the later years the percentage of skilled and semi-skilled workers increased significantly whereas the percentage of professionals decreased.

In the mechanics of migration it has been observed that most of the migrants had previous internal or international or both types of migration experiences before migrating to Canada, though recently more migrants (50%) came directly from the home country rather than by stage migration. Employment and economic situations in Canada were the most important reasons for choosing Canada as the migrants' destination. Lack of employment and poor opportunity for professional advancement were the most important reasons for leaving India.
The immigrants, besides sponsoring their wives and children, sponsored other members of their families too, thus causing chain migration. Though, by this process, the immigrants were probably trying to build up their own nest in this country, actually most of them wished to return to India. Considering, these immigrants' places of birth, it was observed that there was a strong source area association in the home country. Most of the immigrants were satisfied with Windsor and hence most of them belonged to the group of non-movers in terms of internal migration in Canada.
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CHAPTER 1

Introduction

Migration within human societies is recognized as one of the most important areas of contemporary research in population studies. Definitions on migration have varied according to the specific socio-cultural environment within which migrations take place. In some countries, a migrant is defined as "one whose place of residence is different from the place of birth." But the most common underlying element of all definitions is a change in residence for a specific time period, as pointed out by the United Nations Population Commission. Mangalam (1968) considered a change of residence as the most frequently stressed aspect of migration and Lee (1966) based his definition on any permanent or semi-permanent change in residence. Roseman (1971) tried to offer a more rational and refined geographical definition, as the most official definitions consider change of residence involving a movement across certain administrative boundaries or statistical area as migration. Ignoring man-made boundaries, Roseman (1971) classified two types of human movements: One, in which there is a total relocation of a person involving not only a change in residence but also a break in ties with the previous area of residence in terms of daily or weekly movements; second, 'reciprocal movements,' in which a person moves from home and proceeds to one or more locations and returns home. This is a weekly and/or daily movement cycle which might not change in some cases even when
a change in residence takes place. In all such cases, one could infer that migration has not taken place. Thus, migration in the geographical sense is not a function of crossing boundaries but involves a total displacement and establishment of a new cycle of 'reciprocal movements.'

Human migration can be divided into two sub groups - internal migration, when migration takes place within a country from state to state or province to province or even city to city.

International migration deals with migration of people from one country to another. When internal migration occurs within a country, the population of the country remains the same. But, in the case of international migration, the net population of a country changes from year to year according to the number of people that emigrated from and immigrated to the country. Both of these types of migration are important. In some cases, at certain times, international migrations are more important than internal migration since a country's economic growth and stability are greatly influenced when international migration occurs. But this is not always the case. In geography, the scholars with their concern for spatially expressed processes and phenomena are naturally attracted towards relocation of people both in terms of internal and international migration. Geographers, after Ravenstein (1885) have attempted many a time to build up theories and models leading to the concept of migration and also to explain variations in distance, direction of flows and volumes of
migration and characteristics of migrants; but, so far no theoretical framework regarding international migration has been constructed since laws controlling immigration differ from one country to another. Hence, most of the authors who dealt with international migration either modified the theories put forward to explain internal migration (e.g. Ravenstein, 1885) or, tried to build up models on their own (Koppel 1976; Conway 1980). For example, the factors Bogue (1959) put forward for internal migration were used partially and effectively in international studies dealing with Indian and Pakistani immigrants, by Nizamuddin in 1976. Also Wolpert (1966) in his article considered his ideas about 'reaction to stress' for analysing social factors which triggered internal migration, but the concept could be useful in investigating international migrations too. The present study followed the former alternative and borrowed the theoretical framework from studies on internal migration.

Among the studies that have been done on international migrants, very few are focused on Asians and Africans mainly because of lack of proper data which could be used for analysis. Most of the international migration studies have used census data which do not provide any information for gaining an understanding of the behavioral aspects of the decision-making process of the migrants. Also, in examining international migration, different ethnic groups and immigrants from different world regions should be studied separately and not lumped together. This is because each ethnic group has different demographic, socio-economic characteristics as well
as different behavioral patterns relating to reasons behind their decision-making process.

The present study deals with the international migration of Indians for several reasons. The first reason is that the author is of Indian origin and hence wanted to find out why the immigrants left India and settled in Windsor, as also their demographic, socio-economic and migration behavior characteristics. Moreover, unlike several other major immigrant groups entering Canada in the post-World War II period, such as British, French, Italians, (table 5), Indian immigrants were in general a more selective group in terms of educational and occupational categories (Jain 1971, Nizamuddin 1976). Since very little is known about these qualified, educated immigrants, it is necessary to investigate the reasons for their dissatisfaction with the home country which led them to migrate and settle in Canada.

Brief History of International Migration

In the past, until the end of the 19th century, when government regulations and immigration policies of different countries were not strict, massive international migrations occurred mainly from Europe to North America due to several reasons such as harvest failure and bad economic situations in the home countries and growing economic development of the receiving countries (McCain, 1972). Particularly after World War II, economic considerations have obtained increasingly important roles in international migration in terms of both
'push' and 'pull' factors. Migrants from the third world countries have been attracted to the developed countries because of better job opportunities, higher standards of living and better educational facilities. However, these countries are still not major sources of immigrants (Lanphier, 1979), mainly due to the selective immigration rules and regulations. Also, sometimes economic opportunities induce people even from developed countries to serve in the developing countries of the Middle East (Thomas, 1925).

While in the earlier stages of settlement in the New World, massive immigration from Northwest European countries (particularly from the countries which originally colonized the New World) occurred without any restrictions, many of these countries established stricter controls on immigration in terms of source areas and numbers. Selective immigration has been designed to discourage or to prevent immigration from certain countries on racial or ethnic or other grounds—for example, restrictions on coloured migrants such as Africans, and Indians into Britain (Sas, 1957) the quota systems of the United States immigration laws of the fifties which favoured Europeans to Africans (Sas, 1957). However, the United States also relaxed its quota system in 1966.

In countries like Canada, where population density has been very low in the past, the country required more people for the expansion of her economy and production. In the early 19th century, Canada mainly opened her door to United Kingdom, U.S.A., France and certain European countries.
During 1908, about 5000 Indians first entered Canada legally and most of them settled in British Columbia (Jain, 1971). Practically little discrimination existed against the Indians in the early years and they were paid equally with the native Canadian workers, and almost all of these Indians belonged to the Sikh religion (Jain, 1971). After this, around 1914, 376 Indians were denied admission in Canada due to lack of proper documents and as a result of this unhappy incident, the immigration of Indians was totally stopped. In 1916, only one Indian is recorded having entered in Canada (Jain, 1971). During the next three decades, very few Indians entered Canada - 5351 from 1900-1920, 422 in 1920 and 338 in 1930 (Chandrasekher) 1944).

It was in 1951, that for the first time Canada allowed migration from India by establishing a quota of 750 immigrants per year. In 1967, all the barriers to migrate from Asian countries were removed and the point system was introduced where each individual immigrant from any country was given points according to his/her qualification, merits, and intentions (Source: Control of Immigration Act, 1966). Under this policy, it seemed that the educated Asians were at an advantage and so immigration from Asian countries increased drastically after 1967, mainly consisting of a large number of well-educated Indians.

In 1976, in addition to the point system, policies on sponsorship, promoting family unification were given more importance than before. Now, in addition to the independent
category, the immediate family members of the migrants, dependents (under 18) and unmarried son or daughter (under 21) can be sponsored by any migrant already in Canada (see Appendix for further details on the point system of Canadian Immigration Act, 1976).

In 1981, of the 128,421 people who entered Canada in 1981 as immigrants, almost 40% were Asians compared to 8% Americans and 17% British (table 1). Thus, Asians seem to be the major group of immigrants in 1981 in Canada (Source: Statistics Canada, 1982).

TABLE 1
IMMIGRATION TO CANADA
BY COUNTRY OF LAST PERMANENT RESIDENCE
(1981)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of Last Permanent Residence</th>
<th>Number of Immigrants</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.K.</td>
<td>21,872</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>2,079</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>2,185</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>2,036</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>48,483</td>
<td>39.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>10,471</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>13,557</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>128,421</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Statistics Canada, Canadian Statistical Review, June 1982, Table 2, pp. 14).
### TABLE 2

**IMMIGRATION TO CANADA BY REGIONS OF LAST PERMANENT RESIDENCE, SELECTED YEARS.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source Areas</th>
<th>Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>363,673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>84.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>5,306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>430,389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since a breakdown on Asian groups in the 1981 data has not been published yet, it is not possible at this point to compare the total number of Indian immigrants within the Asian group who entered Canada during 1981, compared to the other ethnic groups. But table 2, shows that over the past years after World War II, the flow of Asian immigrants in Canada has been increasing steadily, as compared to the decreasing flow of Europeans (table 2).

Regarding Indian immigrants in Canada, table 3 shows that like the general trends of Asians, the number of Indian immigrants is increasing too in Canada with some fluctuations from year to year.

**TABLE 3**

**INDIAN IMMIGRANTS IN CANADA, BY YEAR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>5,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>5,313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>5,069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>9,203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>12,868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>10,144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>6,133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>5,486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>9,531</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Ministry of Culture & Recreation, Multicultural Development Branch, 1978).
In Windsor, CMA specifically, of the total population of 247,582 (1976 Census), 471 were Indians who came between 1972 and 1975 (table 4) compared to 255 who came between 1957 and 1971. The table further shows that though there was an increase in the number of Indian and Hong Kong Chinese immigrants, immigrants from U.K., U.S.A., Italy and Yugoslavia decreased drastically in numbers during the same period.

TABLE 4

IMMIGRATION TO WINDSOR CMA BY COUNTRY OF LAST PERMANENT RESIDENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1957-1971</th>
<th>1972-1975</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.K.</td>
<td>4939</td>
<td>971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.A.</td>
<td>4118</td>
<td>1912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>4606</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yugoslavia</td>
<td>1559</td>
<td>631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>471</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Ministry of Culture & Recreation, Multicultural Development Branch, August 1976, PP. I and II).

At present, the ethnic composition of Windsor CMA is as follows:

TABLE 5

ETHNIC COMPOSITION OF WINDSOR CMA, 1971

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>British</td>
<td>124,340</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>50,890</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>20,115</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukrainian</td>
<td>6,970</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>4,095</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This suggests that the city is British and French dominated while the number of Asians (Indians, Hong Kong Chinese) in the city is increasing considerably.

Since both in Canada and in Windsor, the number of Indian immigrants is increasing, the aim of the present study is to find out whether changes in the immigration regulations of Canadian immigration laws regarding sponsorship of dependents and relatives under 18 years of age, have affected the demographic, socio-economic and migration behavior patterns of Indian migrants in Windsor, Ontario, Canada.

Scope and Purpose

As previously stated, so far no laws or theories have been formulated in studies dealing with international migration. So far only case studies regarding different ethnic groups have been examined by many authors with a view to find some common grounds among them which might help in developing theories or laws governing international migration. Also, though in international migration, the barriers operating between the immigrants and their destination are of much greater intensity than those operating in internal migration, the migrants choose to migrate when they can overcome the legal, cultural, social and religious barriers. Thus, the theoretical rationale of this study is to determine who are international migrants, how they become international migrants, what are these migrants characteristics in terms of demographic, socio-economic and migration behavior, whether these characteristics change over time due to changes in the
immigration rules of the receiving countries. In the present study, it is put forward that the prospective migrants become international migrants only when they can overcome the strong barriers operating against them such as legal, cultural and economic barriers. This ability to overcome barriers improves with higher educational and professional levels as well as through sponsorship clauses favoring family reunification. Canada has been and still is one of the most important receiving countries for immigrants of many different ethnic groups since early 20th century (as was discussed earlier in this study). The immigrants possessed different characteristics peculiar to their own cultural group and when they settled in Canada or US, they showed different demographic and socio-economic characteristics. Among Asian immigrants, the Chinese and Japanese seem to be the two groups of considerable interest to the scholarly world (Li, 1979; Taft, 1936) but little attention has been given to immigrants from South Asia, including India, Pakistan, Bangladesh & Sri Lanka.

This study examines the migration selectivity and mechanics of migration of Indian immigrants in Windsor CMA. By 'Indian' it is meant East Indian people who were born in India, lived there for some time and later decided to migrate and are presently residing in Windsor Metropolitan Area.

In 1976, Nizamuddin studied the migration behavioral characteristics of Indian and Pakistani immigrants in Windsor, Ontario, Canada. In this study he dealt with two ethnic groups treating them as one, since when he collected the data
in 1975, there were very few immigrants in Windsor CMA from both these countries—only 230 families in total (Nizamuddin, 1976). Since then the number of Indian families alone has increased to over 400 families (according to the best estimate the author can make) and it would be worthwhile to make an in-depth study of this immigrant group. Thus, this study is a follow-up on the 1976 study with same additions and changes as follows: Indian immigrants were divided into two groups—those who arrived in Windsor before 1975 and the others who arrived in Windsor after 1975. A comparison was then made between these two groups in terms of migration selectivity and mechanics of migration, with a view to examine whether there have been any changes between these two groups before and after 1975. The concepts of return migration as well as Windsor's attractiveness to the immigrants were also introduced. Also, based on a 'a priori model' (which was lacking in the 1976 study), the hypotheses formulated were statistically tested for significance to accept or reject the hypotheses. Thus, the main thrust of this study is to determine whether there have been any changes in migration selectivity and mechanics of migration among Indian immigrants in Windsor CMA arriving before and after 1975.

The general purpose of the study is:

(a) To examine the changes in the types of migrants in Canada due to changes in Canadian immigration rules.

(b) To examine the changes in the demographic, socio-economic and migration behavioral characteristics of the
immigrants over time.

(c) To examine the causal factors involved in the decision to migrate to Canada/Windsor and any changes in these factors that might have occurred over time.

(d) To examine the relevance of information flows and chain/return migration.

(e) To examine Windsor's attractiveness to these migrants in order to determine further migration plans.

Specifically this study will investigate:

I. Changes in the types of Indian immigrants in Windsor CMA due to changes in Canadian immigration rules which after 1976 put more stress on sponsorship of immediate family members, dependents, and relatives under 18 years of age.

II. Changes that might have occurred in the characteristics of the Indian migrants in Windsor CMA in terms of age, sex, marital status, education, occupation and income at the time of their arrival and afterwards, over time (before 1975 and after 1975).

III. The mechanics of migration in terms of information flows, previous migration experiences of the migrants, chain/return migration, 'push' and 'pull' factors which induced these migrants to choose Canada/Windsor as their destination, and the propensity of the Indian immigrants to migrate again due to Windsor's lack of attractiveness.
Study Area

Windsor CMA with a population of 247,582 (1976 Census) is designated as a middle-sized urban complex and the entire city's economy is primarily based on the automobile and ancillary industries. It is located on the south-western tip of Canada in the province of Ontario, to the south of Detroit Metropolitan Area, U.S.A. The Detroit river serves as a natural boundary between U.S.A. and Canada to the north of Windsor. The city being at the border also serves as a gateway to both U.S.A. and Canada.

Windsor possesses a very mixed ethnic population, with British as the predominant group and French, Italians, Ukrainians following in order. Among the 2% of the population classified as Asians, the Chinese, Malaysians, Indians and Pakistanies are the main groups (Source: Green Paper, Vol. Imm. & Pop. Stats., 1976)(table 5). Other than Nizamuddin's study of 1976, very little is known about the Indian immigrants in Windsor C.M.A. For the above reason and the author's familiarity with the city, Windsor CMA was chosen as the study area for the case study of international migration of Indians in Canada.

Date Sources

Most of the previous studies on international migration were based on Census data. The present study cannot use census data for analysis for several reasons. The census of 1981 has not been fully published yet, while the 1976 census is not
FIGURE 1
MAP OF WINDSOR, CMA, 1976
detailed enough to provide a breakdown of Asian immigrant groups according to their ethnic origin or their demographic or socio-economic characteristics. Also, census data do not provide data on migration decision-making process for any immigrant group.

For the proposed study, most of the pertinent data were derived through a questionnaire survey of a randomly selected 25% sample of Indian immigrants in Windsor CMA. The questionnaire was designed to elicit information about age, sex, and marital status, education, occupation and income; 'push' and 'pull' factors for leaving India and choosing Canada/Windsor as their destination; other mechanics of migration related to various hypotheses formulated for this study.

The names, addresses and telephone numbers of the immigrants were collected from various cultural organizations (footnote), and 1981 telephone directory. The people of Indian ethnic origin from elsewhere, eg: West Indies, Africa, Malaysia, were excluded from the list. This method is considered to be reliable because in a middle-sized city like Windsor, where there are a few Indian organizations, most of the immigrants would be listed in at least one organization if not in more. Since, the immigrants port of entry might have been different in each case, the lists at the immigration office was not useful. Hence, the author had to follow the method given in detail under methodology.

Secondary sources such as Census of Canada, Statistics Canada were also used for comparisons where necessary.
Literature Review

Literature on both theoretical and empirical aspects of international migration is not very extensive as it is for internal migration. Most of the theoretical aspects of migration are directed towards internal migration chiefly, because factors affecting internal migration are easier to handle in terms of determination of factors, getting the data for analysis and analysis.

In the late 19th and early 20th century, distance decay models were the main concerns of the authors in determining the migrants' behaviors in relation to internal migrations.

Ravenstein's study of 1885, Lee's summary (1966) of Ravenstein's laws, Young's gravity model (1928), focus on distance in terms of internal migration. But in the present study and in many other international migration studies, distance is hardly a variable to be examined because instead of the distance as a barrier, legal, social, economic barriers operate with more strength on the international migrants. Hence, these studies are not too useful as far as their relevance to the central problem of this study (which is to find out why people migrate and what are these migrants' characteristics) is concerned.

Rose (1958) attempted to relate distance of migration to the sociological variable of socio-economic status of migrants, thereby tying migration theory to social stratification research. His hypothesis was that people of higher status seeking better job opportunities must move a greater
distance to find them than people with a lower level of skill and aspiration. In international migration studies however, it is the demand in the receiving countries which determines the type of migrants that come in. For the determination of socio-economic status of international migrants, these concepts of A. M. Rose can be applied and analysed.

Bogue (1959), in his study listed a number of factors which could induce potential migrants to reassess the pros and cons of migration to distant areas. Factors like offer of desirable employment, presence of relatives, cost of moving, etc., that Bogue used for analysing internal migration can also be used for analysis of 'push', 'pull' factors operating on an international migrant's decision-making process.

Sajaastad (1962) analysed migration in terms of cost-benefit analysis. He put monetary evaluations on all the 'push' and 'pull' factors in determining migration behavior. This theory was good for quantification but for international migration studies the cost-benefit analysis does not work much because here the migrants' perceptions of total situations are involved. The factors involved in international studies such as legal factors, social factors, cannot be evaluated in terms of money. However, Sajaastad had shown a new approach to migration studies after the era of distance decay models and their applications.

Hagerstrand (1966), in his theory assumed all migrants to be passive - i.e., they relied on information and encouragement given by friends and relatives who had already migrated,
before taking any decision on migration. Thus, the concept of information flows from destination to source areas as related to the type of people who supply this information and how much that affects a potential migrant's decision-making process is very much relevant for analysing international migration of Indians to Canada.

Wolpert (1967) defined three central concepts of migration behavior—the notions of place utility, the field theory approach and the life-cycle approach. This study has more important implications for international migration than all the previous studies. In the concept of place utility, he considered that the utility of the new place had to be greater than the utility (or disutility) of the previous place in order for a migration to take place. If a better alternative were not available, a person was most likely to stay at his old place. He also recognized the influence of friends and relatives in directing potential migrants as well as age, occupation and income as determinants of the migrants' characteristics. He used a "mover-stayer" method for determination of migration flows. These above mentioned concepts can be utilized for a better understanding of international migrants characteristics as well as their decision-making processes.

Roseman (1971) employed a behavioral perspective in the consideration of migration at all scales excluding international migration, with the aim of characterizing various aspects of the phenomenon as parts of a total process. He considered two movements - the reciprocal movement and the
total displacement of residence known as migration. In this study he explained who makes the decision to migrate and why. Where does a migrant receive the information about his destination? What are the factors that he considers before choosing his new place of habitation? These are the questions which can be dealt with in any international migration study and hence these concepts can be applied to the present study also.

Ole Gade (1970) pointed out that some of the earlier studies have tended to assume that immigration is a means of attaining a state of spatial equilibrium in terms of income and employment. He also mentioned the fact that several studies showed low correlation between immigration, unemployment and low levels of income - meaning thereby that immigrants are usually employed in the receiving countries with higher income levels compared to the natives of the receiving countries.

Thus, until early seventies most of the theoretical views on international migration were descriptive and did not take help of statistics to support their ideas. From the middle of 1970, this approach changed and formulation of specific hypotheses, testing these hypotheses and thus supporting their ideas came into play.

Koppel (1976) argued for the feasibility of placing migrant behavior more firmly in a matrix of equivalent behaviors through a presentation of the outlines of a sociogenic approach to migration. He developed two models based
on the relationships between population classes and the structural variables such as population loss and gain (in terms of solidarity), differentiation and centrality. This study is written in a very technical manner, and made it difficult to digest. This study was useful in a way that some positive hypotheses were formulated and tested and thus the methodology was more modern and scientific rather than purely descriptive analysis.

Lucas (1979) attempted to provide a summary of some of the economic issues related to international migration and looked at the causes and economic consequences of international migration.

Conway (1980) studied the notion of stepwise migration which implied spatial relocation by steps or stages from a migrant's origin to an intended destination. The discussion was concerned with the specification and measurement of stepwise migration. It was argued that geographically similar stepwise patterns of migration were best distinguished on the basis of locational choices made by individual households. He tried to develop a possible theoretical scheme for the movement of immigrants in a stepwise migration. Since, immigration experience(s) of migrants is one of the key points for discussion in the study of Indian migration in Canada, this concept of stepwise migration is relevant to our study.

Thus, the salient ideas of the above studies that apply to international migration are related to the nature and characteristics of the migrants, and to the factors that
affect the potential migrants' decision-making process. However, most of these studies are descriptive and do not use specific hypotheses. Also, legal aspects - i.e., the immigration policies of the receiving countries, are never dealt with in any of the studies, but these seem to form an important factor affecting international migration studies.

While theoretical studies on international migration are scarce, there exists a respectable body of empirical studies. Among the empirical studies there are quite a few dealing with migration between developed countries (Lines, 1978; Simone, 1981; Li, 1979; Byrne, 1973 and Ganio, 1969, etc.). However, very few studies have been concerned with migration from Third World countries, particularly from East and South East Asia.

The few studies that have been done regarding migration from the East and South East Asia to the developed countries like U.S. and Canada, deal mainly with the demographic and socio-economic characteristics of the migrants and the reasons for their coming to these countries (Gillion, Lanphier, Desbarats, Li, etc.).

Review of empirical literature can be arranged under several groups. In the studies about international migrations in the pre-industrial era of colonization of new lands, authors such as Taft (1936), Arlettaz (1979), Swiereuga (1980) mainly focussed on the distribution, history and some demographic characteristics such as age, sex of the migrants. These studies did not tell about migrant selectivity and decision-making mechanism, which happen to be the two most important
concerns in the present study of Indian immigrants in Canada.

In the Post-industrial era, international migrations among European countries and also from European countries to the new world and Canada in particular, studies such as Margio and Solomone (1978), Zuberzycki (1961), Simone (1981) and Lines (1978), focussed on the demographic, socio-economic and migration decision-making process.

Zuberzycki (1961) was primarily concerned with the demographic and economic characteristics of the Greek immigrants to Australia in terms of changing balance of the sex structure, occupational structure and geographical distribution. The author believed that Greek immigrants had assimilated with the Australian social structure because of their success in economic life and a feeling of security.

Margio and Solomone (1978) explored the general pattern of Italian immigration to Louisiana, U.S., from 1900 to 1920 and after. They described the occupational attributes of the immigrants in five settlements in the U.S. The majority of the immigrants were from Sicily rather than from the mainland and most of them; soon after arrival in the U.S. became small merchants in every aspect of the food industry. The size of these immigrant population, their distinctive cultural values and social experiences made it possible for them to make their niche in the economic life of Louisiana. After 1920, the drastic reduction of the flow of Italian immigrants to U.S. - due to the change of immigration laws of U.S. to quota system, showed the effects of immigration policies of
receiving countries on international migration.

Lines (1978) discussed the British immigration to the U.S. since 1920. Little was known or recorded regarding motives or experiences of individual British migrant in U.S. The Britains almost always knew someone personally or indirectly in the U.S. The chief reasons given in the study for the emigration of the British were dissatisfaction with home conditions in terms of conveniences, shortages, restraints, inefficiencies and high taxes. The 'pull' factors were better jobs and improvements in future in terms of better living conditions.

Rockett (1980) examined the relationship between educational and occupational status of immigrants and natives of U.S. The effects of ethnicity, age, family and marital status on occupation and income were also discussed in the study. The relationship between short-term mobility and the emigration of the foreign born from the U.S. was also studied.

Simone (1981) dealt with the assimilation process of Italian immigrants in Toronto, Canada compared to the Italian immigrants in the U.S. In Toronto, the Italians maintained their old customary Italian ways and cultures and by the 1930's the first wave of Italians in Canada who arrived in the 1920's were beginning to adapt to their new conditions. Though the process of adaptation to the new environment after migration are not concerns of the proposed study, assimilation in terms of occupation and income as brought out by Simone has some relevance in the present study regarding
Indian migration to Canada:

International migrations from the Third World countries to the Developed countries, a phenomenon mainly of the post-War II period brought out the features such as migrant selectivity and the decision-making process of the migrants, which happen to be the main concerns of the present study.

Gillion (1956) based his study on Indian government documents and discussed the characteristics of the Indians who emigrated to Fiji as well as their sources of origin, Punjab in the home country. Thus, the idea of source area association was brought out in this study.

Wrong (1967) observed that in recent times, people from the Third World countries are migrating to developed countries due to availability of land, job opportunities and higher standards of living. This concept is more elaborately analysed in the study of Indian immigrants in Canada, and was recognized as one of the key variables of the decision-making processes of Indian international migrants.

Jayawardena (1968) studied the characteristics of East Indian immigrants in Guyana, East Africa, Fiji, Nepal, and found that Indian communities in the first two countries constituted a radical contrast to the Indians in the rest of the countries mentioned above. The study showed that the structure, values, interethnic group relations and policies in the host society though changing in themselves, had the most constant and pervasive consequences for the social organization of overseas Indian communities in the new.
environments. Thus, the characteristics of Indian immigrants abroad (e.g., East Africa, Fiji, etc.) can be studied for Indian immigrants in Canada too, to see whether the characteristics of the immigrants in Canada differ from those in the other above-mentioned countries.

Brunton's (1971) study on Mexican migrants described the settlement pattern of the Mexicans in the U.S. In this study, the pattern of decision-making process was related to three stages in one's life cycle - 1) at the time of marriage, whether to migrate or settle, 2) when the children reached school age, and 3) at old age. The methodology of the study was based upon personal interviews, observations and simple tabulation of data.

Ramcharan (1974) studied the effects of the racial background of the West Indian immigrants in separating them from the other immigrant groups in Toronto, Canada. The study was based on statistical analysis of questionnaire data and dealt with the adaptation process and psychological aspects of migration of West Indians in Toronto. While the study was of sociological nature, the methodology of questionnaire survey leading to formulation of hypotheses and their testing offers a significant advancement in approaches to the study of migrant adjustment processes.

Nizamuddin (1976) in a study of Indian and Pakistani immigrants in Windsor, analysed the demographic, socio-economic characteristics of these two groups as a whole, and also tried to discover the 'push' and 'pull' factors behind
their decisions to migrate. The migration selectivity theories and the behavioral theories of Wolpert for examining the nature of the decision-making process were combined together to provide the framework for an in-depth study of Indian and Pakistani immigrants in Canada.

Williams (1979) in her study of Jamaican migration to Windsor, Ontario, Canada analysed the same aspects as the previous study. When the above two studies were compared, it was found that though the demographic and socio-economic characteristics of these two groups were more or less the same in terms of age, sex, marital status, educational and occupational levels, the main 'pull' factors in case of Indian/Pakistani group were better salary and better promotion prospects; whereas, for the Jamaicans, to be near friends/relatives seemed to be the main drawing force while the opportunities for employment ranked second in importance. Regarding the 'push' factors, Jamaicans emigrated primarily to seek adventure and travel; but, the other group emigrated primarily because of poor salary in their home countries and poor prospects of promotion.

The above two studies contributed a great deal towards the development of the concept and methodology of the present study. However, a thorough statistical analysis was lacking in both these studies which made them both open to comments regarding their significance and importance in the scholarly literature.

Li (1979), in his study of the Chinese immigrants in
Canada between 1930 and 1958 argued that occupational structure of the Chinese was shaped by certain demand conditions in Canada. The migration of Chinese labourers in Canada, for example, was facilitated by a strong demand for manual labour and the impoverished conditions in feudal China. Institutional racism which reflected discrimination, limited the range of choices available to the Chinese and imposed constraints on their economic situations. The rise of ethnic businesses such as laundries and restaurants might be seen as a result of the extended family system helping in the small businesses and also might be seen as an adaptation to a hostile environment.

In 1979, Desbarats in her study of Thai migration to Los Angeles, U.S., observed that although the Thais constituted only the fifth largest Asian immigrant group in Los Angeles, the twenty fold increase in their numbers during the last ten years was unmatched by any other immigrant group, at least until American withdrawal from Vietnam in spring 1975. The demographic characteristics of the Thai migrants as revealed in this study show that half of the Thais were from 20-29 years of age and 74% were women probably representing a true 'War bride' phenomenon (footnote).

Yu (1980), in studying Filipino migration to U.S., found that about 30% of the Filipino's in America are professionals, technical and kindred workers. For the most part these professionals were physicians, surgeons, pharmacists, dentists and nurses. In contrast to an average of 11% of professional
workers among all other immigrant groups within U.S. in 1970, the Filipinos had almost 30% professionals. The Filipino immigrants' low visibility (i.e., low number) in the U.S. is perhaps due to their paucity in the retail business or barriers of immigration regulations.

Regarding "Return Migration", Appleyard (1962) showed some confusion in the measures of return migration of U.K. citizens to Australia due to the differences in the definition of an immigrant in U.K. and Australia. The demographic and social characteristics of the returnees were studied from a 20% sample survey of the returnees in U.K. It was observed that 81% of the workers were under 46 years of age when they returned to Britain, 76% had occupations in professional, intermediate and skilled class and 67% had emigrated to Australia after 1955. The rate of actual returns of the British citizens to Britain was found out to be only 14.8%.

Thus, the idea of return migrants' as applied to international migrants of the British from Australia, can also be applied to the return migrants of Indian immigrants from Canada back to India.

Thus, these empirical studies form the building blocks in the present study for evolving a theory of international migration in terms of: a) concepts derived from these studies, b) methodology, c) characteristics of migrants, and d) the migrants' decision-making process.

International migrants are the ones who migrate to a foreign country by overcoming legal, social, economic barriers.
They usually have migration experiences in the home country. They are young, adult males having specific occupational and educational characteristics according to their ethnic origin. After considering the 'push', 'pull' factors, these potential migrants, migrate to their chosen destinations and later supply information to the source areas thereby forming chain migrants. If over time these migrants are satisfied by the conditions in the destinations, they remain there. Otherwise, they either migrate elsewhere or return to their home countries as "return immigrants." These are the concepts derived from the above studies.

The methodology involved analyses of government documents, census data or questionnaire survey data. In recent times (in the 1970's and 1980's) statistical analyses are being used to strengthen the studies.

A Priori Model

Based on the theoretical and empirical literature reviewed, the following a priori model is formulated to determine the international migration mechanism. The model (p. 32) can be analysed as follows: All countries have some potential migrants in response to some prevailing push factors in their source areas. Depending upon the intensity of the perception of these push factors, a bulk of them join the stream of internal migrants and remain within the country, whereas a smaller number join the stream of direct international migrants. Both these groups have to go through certain kinds of barriers before they can become actual migrants.
FIGURE 2
A PRIORI MODEL
Some of these barriers are common for both internal and international migrants like economic and social barriers. But, some of the barriers are not common to both, namely, legal barriers imposed by immigration rules of the receiving countries that operate on the international migrants do not operate on internal migrants at all. Also, the intensity of the common barriers is much greater for international migrants. In any case, when these internal and direct international migrants are able to overcome these barriers mentioned in the diagram, they become international migrants. Otherwise they join the internal migrants again. The thickness of the arrows in this model indicate the bulk of migrants. Thus, the international migrant stream is smaller in volume than internal migrant stream.

Based on this a priori model, the following hypotheses were formulated regarding the international migrants from India to Windsor, Canada, keeping the purpose of the study in mind.

Hypotheses
1. The increase in the number of Indian immigrants in Windsor since 1976 is due to the increase in family reunion and sponsorship of dependents and immediate family members.
2. As a result, immigrants from India in Windsor CMA are changing in characteristics in terms of their age, sex and marital status as follows:
   a) the age groups of the migrants are changing from older working age-groups to younger working age groups at the time of migration.
b). a balance of sex structures is coming into effect.
c) most of the immigrants were unmarried at the time of migration.

3. With an increase in the number of immigrants:
   a) the educational qualifications of the immigrants are becoming more diversified with increasing representation of persons with lower educational levels.
   b) the occupational structure is also becoming more diversified.
   c) the income groups are changing both vertically and horizontally (see footnote).

4. Excluding the sponsored immigrants, most of the independent immigrants had previous internal or international migration experiences or both, which means that stage migration has been a common feature among Indian immigrants.

5. With the increase in the number of the Indian immigrants, the source area association in the home country became very prominent - meaning that the immigrants from India were derived increasingly from a certain specific region(s) in India.

6. i) migrants had prior information about (a) Canada, b) Windsor before migration.
   ii) the information about Canada/Windsor was derived mostly from friends or relatives and played an important part in the immigrants' decision-making process.

7. Occupation-related attractions induced many migrants to settle in Canada/Windsor.
8. Unfavorable perceptions of economic and career related conditions led most migrants to emigrate from India.
9. Indian immigrants propensity to settle in Windsor is dependent upon their level of satisfaction with Windsor and its attractions.

Methodology

After the hypotheses were formulated, a detailed questionnaire was developed in such a way that each question would throw light on some aspect of these hypotheses. Next, a sample survey was carried on in the following manner: First, all the names from the membership lists of all different Indian cultural organizations were collected, being careful not to repeat names. Then, these names were checked out in the telephone directory and some more names were discovered and added. Thus, a grand list of 400 families was obtained. A 25% random sample was chosen (using random numbers' table) from a total of 400 families. Since the population size of Indian immigrant families was 400, a 25% sample (i.e., 100 families) was considered to be an adequately representative sample providing a fairly reliable profile of the characteristics of Indian immigrants in Windsor.

The questionnaire survey was carried out in several stages. First, the immigrants who happened to be in the sample were contacted by telephone and were asked for an appointment for the author to interview them personally. Personal interviews were carried out since mail surveys have a low response rate, and are also time consuming and some of
the questions included in the questionnaire were difficult to be answered by the migrants. Hence, personal interviews was the best choice. Since the author herself was of Indian origin, she faced no difficulty in getting the appointments or interviewing the immigrants. In this manner, 100 such interviews were conducted (with only two refusals; but, two more were picked to complete the 100 surveys), using the questionnaire specially prepared for the purpose. The data tabulated from the answers of the respondents in the questionnaire were used for analysis to prove or disprove the hypotheses. Simple tabulations (using numbers and percentages), cross-tabulations and various tests of significance were used for the purpose of the analysis of data. A rank order technique was used to examine which factor(s) induced the Indian migrants to leave India and settle in Windsor, Canada.

\( \chi^2 \)-2 sample tests were used for nominal scale date for significance tests between two groups. Kolmogorov-Smirnov 2 sample tests were used for ordinal scale data for significance tests between two groups. \( \chi^2 \) 2x2 contingency tables were used in cross-tabulations for determining significance between the two immigrant groups. Lastly, the Wilcoxon Matched Pair Sign-Rank tests were used to determine the significance of the ranks of 'push' and 'pull' factors.
FOOTNOTES

1. According to Indian Census Code, a migrant is one who is enumerated at a place other than that of his place of birth.

2. The United Nations Population Commission defined migration as movements of persons between areas, involving changes in residence over a certain specific period of time.

3. Census of Canada, 1976, defined migrants as movers who on the Census day June 1, 1976 were residing at a different census subdivision from the one five years earlier.

4. Vertically means the change in the number of income groups in vertical order. Horizontal means the change in the total number of persons in each income group.

5. a) Hindu Mandir - A religious organization of Hindus from India.

   b) Sikh Cultural Society - A religious/cultural organization.

   c) India-Canada Student organization - Had mostly students (who were not taken into count) but had some immigrants listed too as members.

   d) Cultures of India - A purely cultural organization of Indian as well as others interested in Indian culture.

6. War brides - During Vietnam War, many American soldiers were sent to Thailand for resting and recreation purposes. These soldiers became engaged or married to Thai women who later followed their husbands into America as 'war brides'.
CHAPTER II
CHAPTER II

ANALYSIS

The analysis that follows in this chapter is divided into several parts. The first part tests the hypotheses pertaining to the demographic characteristics and the changes in these characteristics among the Indian immigrants over time. The second part tests the hypotheses relating to the socioeconomic characteristics and changes in these characteristics over time among the same immigrant group. The third part deals with migration selectivity, stage migration, information flows and the reasons for leaving India and choosing Windsor, Canada as a place of destination.

The hundred responses were divided into two groups. Fifty-four respondents happened to be in group I, in which the immigrants came to Windsor before 1975 and 46 were in group II in which the immigrants came to Windsor after 1975. The year 1975 was chosen as the dividing line for the purpose of comparison because that was the year when Nizamuddin collected his data on Indian and Pakistani immigrants. Since 1975, no study has been done regarding Indian immigrants in Windsor CMA. The author, thus, in this study, having her own sample, tries to find out whether there have been any significant changes among the Indian immigrants in relation to their demographic, socio-economic and migration behavioral characteristics since the 1975 survey was conducted and the study completed in 1976.
Since 1975, when Nizamuddin's survey was conducted, the number of immigrants in Windsor CMA has increased from 230 families of Indians and Pakistanis (approximately 30%), to over 400 families of immigrants from India alone. This indicated that at the present time, i.e., in 1982 (if an Indian family consists of three members on average) there are at least 1200 Indian individuals in Windsor CMA. The exact figure of Indian immigrants in Windsor CMA is not available yet in the 1981 census; hence it is not possible at this point to compare this estimate to the actual figure. However, when compared to the average Canadian family size of 3.6 people per family (1981 census), the average Indian family size in 1982 in Windsor is 3.5 people per family. In 1975 however, compared to the average Canadian family of 3.5 people per family, average Indian family size in Windsor was 3.1 people per family. Thus, it seems that the Indian immigrants family size is smaller than average Canadian family size and changed from 3.1 to 3.5 people per family over time.

Table 6 shows that the immigrants brought their wives with them or within one year of their arrival in Canada. Sixty-eight point five percent sponsored their wives before 1975 and 89.1% sponsored their wives after 1975. They also sponsored their parents, brothers, sisters, nephews and in-laws into Canada (see Appendix for Canadian Immigration Laws 1976). Table 7 shows that before 1975 54 immigrants sponsored 42 other immigrants and after 1975, 46 immigrants sponsored only 14 other types of immigrants, other than their wives.
and children.

Thus, the null hypothesis, $H_0$ states that the increase in the number of Indian immigrants in Windsor CMA is not due to increase in family reunion and sponsorship of dependents and immediate family members.

When a Chi Square 2 Sample Test was conducted on Table 6, it was observed that at 0.05 significance level, Chi Square obs. (11.55) > Chi Square crit. (5.99). Hence, the $H_0$ was rejected and it was inferred that increase in family members increased the number of Indian immigrants in Windsor CMA.

Again, when a Chi Square 2 Sample Test was done on Table 7 under $H_0$: most of the dependents are not sponsored, it was found that at 0.05 level, Chi Square obs. (10.103) > Chi Square crit. (7.82). Hence the $H_0$ was rejected and it was inferred that the immigrants sponsored other immigrants thus leading to an increase in the total number of Indian immigrants in Windsor CMA.

The increase in the number of people in an Indian family (as discussed earlier) also stresses this above point.

Thus, the hypothesis that the increase in the number of Indian immigrants in Windsor CMA is due to the increase in family reunion and sponsorship of dependents and immediate family is true and leads us to believe that in recent years more Indian immigrants are arriving in Windsor CMA as sponsored immigrants rather than as independent immigrants.
### TABLE 6

**TIME OF ARRIVAL OF SPOUSES OF IMMIGRANT GROUPS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spouse Came</th>
<th>Before 1975</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>After 1975</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With the immigrant</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After the immigrant</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>67.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 7

**SPONSORED IMMIGRANTS FROM INDIA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Before 1975</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>After 1975</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brothers/Sisters</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nephews</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-laws</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Age

It has been noted both in internal and international migration studies that young adults are most proven to migrate (Lee, 1970). The reasons for that may be that young adults have fewer responsibilities in the source areas, have greater adaptability to new and different environments and conditions. Also, in the case of immigration to Canada, immigration regulations allocate higher points for the young adult immigrants (see appendix for the point chart). Again, in the receiving countries the young adults entering the labour force can maximize the benefits of migration for a longer period of their life and can also make long term contributions to the receiving countries economies (Trewartha, 1969).

Table 8 shows that at the time of initial migration, 83% (before 1975) and 91% (after 1975) of the immigrants were below 35 years of age. This increase in percentage is because higher points were given to people under 35 years of age after 1976 (see appendix for the points chart). Table 8 also shows that though in the previous years most of the migrants (20%) were under 25 years of age, in the recent years, over 65% were below 25 years of age. This leads us to believe that the age groups of the migrants are changing from older working age groups to younger working age groups.

When a Kolmogorov-Smirnov 2 Sample Test was conducted on Table 8, it was found that at 0.05 level $D_{max}$ (0.45) $D_{crit}$ (0.27) under the $H_0$: the age groups are not changing from older working age groups to younger working age groups.
### TABLE 8

**AGE STRUCTURE OF THE IMMIGRANTS BEFORE AND AFTER 1975**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Groups</th>
<th>Before 1975</th>
<th>After 1975</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>38.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 9

**SEX STRUCTURE OF IMMIGRANTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Before 1975</th>
<th>After 1975</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>93.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Since $D_{max} > D_{crit}$, the $H_o$ was rejected and it was inferred that there is a significant difference in the age groups of the immigrants and the difference occurred in the age group of 20-25 years and the age structure is changing from older working age groups to younger working age groups. The reason for the change in the age structure of the immigrants may be that in the years before 1975 most of the migrants came as independent migrants and were already well established educationally and professionally in their home country and so migrated at a later age. But the immigrants who arrived in Windsor after 1975 were able to migrate at an earlier age since they belonged mostly to the sponsored category.

**Sex Structure**

Ravenstein (1885) and others subsequently have stated that in short distance journeys, women are more prone to migrate than men. This has been generally true for internal migration, but for international migration, more men migrate than women over longer distances (Nizamuddin, 1976). Table 9 shows that before 1975, 93% and after 1975 91% of the immigrants were males. Thus the null hypothesis states that balance of sex structure is not coming into effect with passage of time among Indian immigrants in Windsor CMA.

When a Chi Square 2 Sample Test was conducted on Table 9, it was observed that at 0.05 level Chi Square obs. ($0.37 < \chi^2$) Chi Square crit. (3.84). Hence, the $H_o$ is accepted and it is inferred that balance of sex structure is not coming into effect and migration from India is still male dominated.
A point to be noted here is that since the author interviewed the heads of families there is a possibility of bias in the study which is unavoidable since in an Indian family the head is always a male. This dominance of males among independent immigrants is however rectified by the fact that females - mainly wives and children, have joined the independent immigrants soon after they have settled down.

**Marital Status**

Table 10 shows that the percentage of unmarried immigrants from India has increased from 35% to 43% over the years. The null hypothesis thus stated here is that most of the immigrants were married at the time of migration and there is no significant difference in the marital status of the immigrant groups over the years.

When a Chi Square 2 Sample Test was done on Table 10, it was observed that at 0.05 level, Chi Square obs. (1.46) < Chi Square crit. (5.99). Hence the Ho was accepted and it was inferred that most of the immigrants were married at the time of migrant and there was no significant difference in the marital status of the Indian immigrants over the years.

Regarding age, sex and marital status of Indian immigrants, when comparison was made with the 1976 study by K. Nizamuddin, the only important change was in the marital status. Whereas he found that most of the Indian and Pakistani immigrants in Windsor CMA were unmarried males below 30 years of age, the present study infers that most of the Indian immigrants in Windsor CMA were married males under 35 years at
TABLE 10
MARITAL STATUS OF IMMIGRANT GROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Before 1975</th>
<th>After 1975</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>62.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 11
EDUCATIONAL COMPOSITION OF IMMIGRANT GROUPS AT THE TIME OF MIGRATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Before 1975</th>
<th>After 1975</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>38.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Degree</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant
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**Educational Composition**

It has been observed by many authors earlier that migration is dependent upon educational levels of the migrants. Migrants with higher educational levels tend to migrate farther. This tendency that is widespread in the case of internal migration has become more accentuated in international migrations in recent times when the receiving countries started restricting immigration in the interest of their national labour market needs and preference was given to the highly qualified people who were in short supply. In Canada, after 1966, immigration regulations were so designed as to allow only highly educated migrants from the Third World countries to immigrate in Canada.

Table 11 shows that before 1975, 37% had professional degrees including Ph.D. degrees. But after 1975, this dropped to 23% and there was a drastic increase in the proportion of high school and college educated immigrants under 30 years of age from 33% (before 1975) to 59% (after 1975). However, the proportion of people having Ph.D.'s and other professional degrees dropped from 26% (before 1975) to 24% (after 1975) in the age group under 30 (appendix).

When a Chi Square 2 x 2 contingency table was done, the Chi Square obs. (0.03) < Chi Square crit. (3.84) at 0.05 level. Thus, though in recent years there is an increase in immigrants with lower (high school and college) educational levels, this increase is not significant.
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A point to be noted here is that college education in Indian terms usually means post-secondary education in a college with a view to obtain a Bachelor's degree (general or honours), as opposed to college education in Canada which usually means technical schools offering diplomas in various fields.

The above observations suggest that in the previous years migrants were independent and entered Canada on the basis of their own high educational qualifications. This is because educated migrants were more aware of the opportunities available in Canada, especially people with Ph.D.'s and other professional degrees found it difficult to adjust to the lack of professional attitudes and advancement in the developing countries like India and ultimately looked for opportunities in the developed countries. In the later years, however, since most of the migrants were sponsored and were in younger age groups, they were less educated.

Regarding post migration educational improvements, the survey revealed that in both the groups an insignificant proportion (2-4%) of the migrants improved their educational qualifications after migration. Hence a cross-tabulation was not done.

**Occupational Structure**

Previous works regarding occupational composition of immigrants postulate that professionals tend to migrate more than officials or managers because of demands for professionals in the receiving countries (Trewartha, 1969). Also, skilled
### TABLE 12

**OCCUPATIONAL STRUCTURE OF THE IMMIGRANTS GROUPS AT THE TIME OF MIGRATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Before 1975</th>
<th></th>
<th>After 1975</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled/Semi-Skilled</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>47.8*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant

### TABLE 13

**OCCUPATIONAL COMPOSITION OF IMMIGRANT GROUPS 1982**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Before 1975</th>
<th></th>
<th>After 1975</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled/Semi-Skilled</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24.0*</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>46.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and semi-skilled workers are more prone to migrate than unskilled labourers due to selective immigration policies of receiving countries. Not only does the demand for these above-mentioned groups of people in the receiving countries pull migrants out of their country but, as other studies have found, when the general economic conditions of the home country were bad, the prospective migrants who were professionals, skilled/semiskilled workers, generated a desire to migrate (Thomas, 1941).

Table 12 shows that there has been a drop in proportion of professional and managerial class from 52% to 45% over the years; whereas, in the skilled/semiskilled group the proportion has increased drastically from 27% (before 1975) to 47% (after 1975). When, Table 12 was compared to Table 13, to compare the occupational composition of the Indian immigrants after migration, it was observed that in the professional and managerial class the proportion rose to 70% in the previous group but dropped to 41% in the later group. The proportion of the skilled/semiskilled workers more or less remained the same in both the groups.

When a Chi Square 2 Sample Test was conducted on Table 12, it was observed that Dmax (0.12) < Dcrit (0.27); hence the Hₒ that there was no significant difference in the occupational composition of the immigrants was accepted. However, it was also noted in the same test that at the skilled/semi-skilled workers' level there was a significant change over the years. Hence, it is inferred that the occupational
structure of the two immigrant groups is not becoming diversified, even though the proportion of skilled and semi-skilled workers has increased significantly.

From the time of arrival to the time of survey (i.e., 1982), there was a change in the occupational levels of the previous group. The 28 people (from the previous group) increased to 39 people in the professional and managerial category whereas, in the technical and skilled/semiskilled level, the number remained more or less the same. But, in the latter group (after 1975), the numbers at each level remained more or less the same. This suggests that, in the previous group a significant number (11) has moved up in occupation to professional and managerial levels; but, in the latter group, the vertical movement is insignificant (tables 12, 13), probably because they have not had the time to move up yet.

(N.B. A detailed breakdown of various occupations under major categories in 1982 is given in the appendix).

**Income Levels**

Incomes of the Indian immigrant families in Windsor CMA can provide indications of their economic well-being and status in Canada. When the income groups of both the immigrant groups were compared, there seemed to be diversification in both horizontal and vertical directions. From table 14, it is clear that at the time of immigration, most of those in the previous group had incomes between $6500 and $15,000, whereas most of those in the latter group earned
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between $15,000 and $45,000. This suggests that the latter group was earning more than the earlier group. However, Consumer Price Index reveals that the purchasing power of one Canadian dollar decreased considerably from 1975 to 1982. The value of a dollar in 1975 in terms of 1971 dollar was 0.76 cents and in 1982 was 0.39 cents. Hence, though the recent Indian immigrants were thought to be earning more, since the purchasing power of a dollar decreased by nearly 50%, their income is probably the same today for the same job compared to that before 1975. This table further shows that in both groups none of the immigrants were in the two highest income brackets at the time of migration. When this was compared to table 15, it was observed that 27.7% of the previous group and 6.4% of the latter group are in the highest two income brackets today. This leads us to believe that, over time, some of the immigrants by virtue of acquiring experience and seniority, did move up into the highest income brackets.

Thus, due to the differences in experience and seniority the incomes of the immigrant groups changed from lower income groups to higher income groups - diversification in income levels thus came into effect. When compared to average Ontario Canadian family income of $24,528 of 1980 (in 1971 dollars), the average income of $37,000 per Indian immigrant family was significantly higher than the provincial average.

In 1975 too, compared to Canadian national average of $15,000 (in 1971 dollars) the Indian immigrants earned on an average $21,000 - i.e., higher than average Canadian income (Nizamuddin, 1976).
## TABLE 14

INCOME LEVELS OF IMMIGRANT GROUPS AT THE TIME OF MIGRATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Level</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$6500</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$6500-$10000</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10001-$15000</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.0*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15001-$40000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>32.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20001-$30000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30001-$45000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$45000-$55000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$55000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Level</th>
<th>Percentage Before 1975</th>
<th>Number Before 1975</th>
<th>Percentage After 1975</th>
<th>Number After 1975</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$6500-$10000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10001-$15000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15001-$20000</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20001-$30000</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30001-$45000</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$45001-$55000</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$55001 and over</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIGURE 9

INCOME GROUPS OF IMMigrants
AFTER MIGRATION, 1982

SOURCE: AUTHOR
A point to be noted here is that the average family incomes of a Canadian family is not strictly comparable to average family income of an Indian immigrant family because in an Indian family usually the head of the family is the only earning member while in a Canadian family usually both the husband and the wife are earning members.

When a Kolmogorov-Smirnov 2 Sample Test was performed on table 14, $D_{\text{max}} (0.59) > D_{\text{crit}} (0.27)$ at 0.05 level of significance. Hence, the null hypothesis was rejected and it was inferred that there was significant difference in the incomes of the two immigrant groups and the significance started at $10,001$ to $15,000$ income level, meaning thereby that the income levels of the immigrant groups are changing. When cross-tabulations were done (appendix) among age, education, occupation and income levels of the two immigrant groups it was observed that before 1975 most of the migrants who were between 25-40 years of age had college education or had professional degrees including Ph.D. degrees. However, since Chi Square obs. $(2.23) < Chi$ Square crit. $(3.84)$, the difference is not significant at 0.05 level. After 1975, though it was shown earlier in this study that younger adults with lower educational qualifications were arriving in recent years, the Chi Square 2x2 contingency test showed that there was no significant difference, since Chi Square obs. $(0.03) < Chi$ Square crit. $(3.84)$ at 0.05 level.

When a cross-tabulation between occupation and income of immigrants at the time of migration was performed, before 1975
there was a significant difference at the income level of $6500-$10000 for the professional and managerial occupations compared to skilled/semiskilled workers. But after 1975, the income level of the immigrant group (i.e., professional and managerial) rose to $15,000 to $20,000. The Chi Square 2x2 contingency test showed that for both these groups the Chi Square obs. (6.81; 3.92) > Chi Square crit. (3.84). Hence the differences in the groups were significant at 0.05 level.

For both the groups, the situations somewhat changed after migration. For the former group the difference was still significant since Chi Square obs. (5.71) was > Chi Square crit. (3.89). But the income levels rose to $20,000 to $30,000. However, for the latter group, though the income levels rose to $40,000 to $30,000, the difference was not significant since in the Chi Square 2x2 contingency test, Chi Square obs. (1.44) was < Chi Square crit. (3.84) at 0.05 level.

When the education, occupation and income of the Indian immigrant groups were compared to 1976 study, the findings showed that there were changes in the educational levels of the immigrants with more immigrants having school and college education in the recent years. As a result the proportion of skilled and semi-skilled workers was increased leading to a more vertical diversification of the income groups in the later years.
Mechanics of Migration

The decision-making behaviour of a potential migrant becomes clearer if we examine the migrants' previous migration experience, their information sources and satisfaction with these information, the 'push' and 'pull' factors which induce them to emigrate from one country and reside in another since all these factors are closely related to and help a migrant in the decision-making process.

When considering migration experience, the ideas of step-wise migration and direct migration come into play. In step-wise migration, the migrant resides at one or a few places before he reaches his destination. But, in direct migration, the migrant migrates from the source area directly to his destination. Chain migration occurs when there is a relationship between a previous migrant and a later migrant.

It has been observed by Nizamuddin (1976) that people who have had previous migration experience in their home country are more prone to international migration because once their initial inhibitions regarding mobility are broken down, the migrants find it easier to change their residence internationally.

Table 16 shows that before 1975 of the pre-immigrants about 74% had lived away from their home town within India, and after 1975 50% lived away from home mainly in search of higher education and/or better job opportunities in bigger cities. However, direct migration increased after 1975. This is because, in the recent years the migrants are being sponsored in Canada at an earlier age and thus they did not need
to go through the processes of internal migration within India.

When a Kolmogorov-Smirnov 2 Sample Test was performed with table 16, $D_{\text{max}} (0.24) < D_{\text{crit}} (0.33)$, which meant that there was no significant difference in the two groups regarding migration experience within India even though the table showed that 74% of the immigrants before 1975 and 50% after 1975 had migration experience.

When stage migration is considered, Table 17 shows that before 1975 51.8% of the immigrants had international migration experience before migrating to Canada. But after 1975, this percentage decreased to 45.4%. However, the significance test using Chi Square showed no significant difference in the reduction of the proportion as Chi Square obs. $(1.32) < \chi^2$ Chi Square crit. $(7.82)$ at 0.05 level. Thus, people who have had previous migration experience in their home country, have fewer ties with their home and have higher aspiration levels and find it psychologically, socially and professionally easier to move on to another country. Also, these migrants who settled in Canada after living in U.K. or U.S.A. or any other country came due to the decline in their level of satisfaction with these countries.

In conclusion one could say that most of the migrants, generally, irrespective of the years of arrival, had previous internal, or international or both types of migration experiences before migrating to Canada, but there was no significant change in the migration experience of the Indian immigrants over time.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Before 1975</td>
<td>After 1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Always lived at home before migration.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Lived at one place away from home.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Lived at two places away from home.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Lived at three places away from home.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Lived at more than three places away from home.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 17
INTERNATIONAL MIGRATIONAL EXPERIENCE OF INDIAN MIGRANTS IN WINDSOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BEFORE 1975</th>
<th></th>
<th>AFTER 1975</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. S. A.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. K.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Germany</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Sources of Information

Ravenstein (1885) noted in his study that people migrated only when they became aware of better opportunities elsewhere. In this respect, the information that Indian immigrants received from various sources carried a great deal of weight in their decision-making process. Table 18 shows that before 1975, 20.3% and after 1975 52.4% of the immigrants received their information regarding various opportunities in Canada such as employment opportunities, educational facilities, etc. from friends and/or relatives. News media and other sources proved to be quite negligible. However, regarding information about Windsor, the percentage of people who received information about Windsor from friends and/or relatives was even higher (66.3% before and 86.1% after 1975). This suggests that people who migrated to Windsor after 1975 by receiving relevant information about Windsor mainly depended on their relatives and friends and hence were more susceptible to chain migration.

When a Chi Square 2 Sample Test was performed on Table 18, for both Canada and Windsor the Chi Square obs. (7.55, 5.78) < Chi Square crit. (7.82) and hence the null hypothesis was accepted that there were no significant differences in the two groups regarding their source of information. However, in both the groups the immigrants received information about Canada/Windsor primarily from relatives and friends.
### TABLE 18

**SOURCES OF INFORMATION FOR THE IMMIGRANT GROUPS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Before 1975</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>After 1975</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Re. Canada</td>
<td>Re. Windsor</td>
<td>Re. Canada</td>
<td>Re. Windsor</td>
<td>Re. Windsor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatives</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Media</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
'Push' and 'Pull' Factors

When determining the reasons behind a migrant's decision to migrate and choosing a destination for future resettlement, the two terms 'push' and 'pull' are used regarding the migrant's behaviour. The 'push' factors determine the reasons behind leaving one's own country and the 'pull' factors determine the reasons for choosing a certain country for re-establishing oneself.

Nizamuddin (1976) developed a rank-order technique in his study to assess the importance of each factor in migrant's decision-making process. In this study, since the questionnaire used gave mainly qualitative data, it was necessary to quantify the data for statistical analysis. Nizamuddin's method of ranking factors is used here with slight modifications.

The relative importance of factors is given weightage points as follows: Extremely Important = 10; Very Important = 5; Important = 1 and Not Important = 0 (see footnote 2). Since among the 'push' factors one factor is mentioned under 'other', which means that for a certain person none of the few stated reasons were important factors at all but he had his own reason(s) for emigrating from India which he stated under 'other' (see questionnaire in Appendix). But because this answer was not given in any order of importance, it was given 5 points which is midway between important and extremely important. According to the answers given by each person, he is given points and finally the total points
received by each factor are summed up. For example, if person A had answered that for him factors 1 and 2 were very important, he would receive 5 for factor 1 and 5 for factor 2. Again, if person B answered that all the four factors were important for him he received 1 point for each factor. The results thus showed the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Person C might have answered that for him factor 1 was extremely important, factor 2 very important and the other factors were not important at all. In this case he received 10, 5, 0 and 0. When summed up, factor 1 got a score of 16 followed by factor 2 which indicated that for this group of Indian immigrants factor 1 was the most important 'push' factor. The same process was followed when the importance of the 'pull' factors was determined.

Table 19 shows that economic and job-related factors were perceived as the most important factors by the immigrants in their decision to migrate from India, both before and after 1975. A sense of adventure was the third important factor for the previous group whereas it tied into the second factor in points and thus in order too, for the latter
TABLE 19
"PUSH" FACTORS FOR TWO IMMIGRANT GROUPS
SUM OF POINTS AND RANK-ORDER OF "PUSH" FACTORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Sum Of Points</th>
<th>Rank Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Before 1975</td>
<td>After 1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Lack of Satisfactory Employment.</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Poor Opportunity For Promotion And Or Professional Advancement.</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Deterioration in Personal Financial Conditions</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Family Instability (Other than financial)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Other:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Lack of a sense of adventure</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Lack of educational opportunities</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Missing family members</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
immigrant group. The role of 'sense of adventure' becomes more important in the later years because of the age of the latter migrants who were younger than the previous group and hence were more of an adventorous nature.

When a Wilcoxon Matched Pair Sign Rank test was performed on Table 19, \( Tobs (6.0) > Tcrit (2.0) \) and hence by rejecting the null hypothesis it can be inferred that there was significant difference in the ranking of factors within the two groups of immigrants.

Table 20 suggests that before 1975, offer of a job and chances of advancement were the most important 'pull' factors. This is because more professionals and highly educated migrants came in the earlier years (as shown earlier in this study). But after 1975, though offer of a job was still an important factor, educational facilities of Canada became a primary 'pull' factor. This indicates that in the later years more high school graduates immigrants arrived in Windsor, and they were more interested in acquiring higher educational qualifications before they started looking for appropriate jobs.

When the Wilcoxon Matched Pair Sign Rank test was performed on table 20, it was observed that \( Tobs (6) > Tcrit (0) \) and hence by rejecting the null hypothesis, it was inferred that there was significant difference in the ranking of 'pull' factors for choosing Canada as Indian migrants' destination.

When the immigrants were asked to list the importance of factors which led them to decide to settle in Windsor CMA, job opportunities ranked first for the previous group and
### TABLE 20
"PULL" FACTORS FOR CHOOSING CANADA BY IMMIGRANT GROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUM OF POINTS</th>
<th>RANK ORDER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before 1975</td>
<td>After 1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Offer of a Job</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Chances of Advancement in the Profession</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Better Educational Facilities For Self/Spouse</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Children to be near friends/relatives</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Adequate Information about Canada</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Relative absence of racism</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIGURE 12

INFORMATION SOURCES OF IMMIGRANTS

(REGARDING WINDSOR)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>BEFORE 1975</th>
<th>AFTER 1975</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FRIENDS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RELATIVES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHERS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
increased salary ranked first for the latter group (Table 21). This is because in the earlier years more educated professionals came and being educated looked for better job opportunities; but in the latter group, most of the migrants came to Windsor due to its automotive and related industries and hence higher salary carried greater weight to the migrants.

When Wilcoxon Matched Pair Sign Rank test was performed \( Tobs (7.5) < Tcrit (8) \) and hence the null hypothesis was accepted and it was inferred that there was no significant difference in the ranking of 'pull' factors for Windsor CMA.

**Source Area Association**

It is observed by the author that in Windsor CMA, the Indian immigrants came mostly from the state of Punjab (a state in India) followed by people from the state of Gujarat and then a few South Indian states like Mabarashka, Madras, Kerals. The people from different states were differentiated by their state of birth in the home country. Table 22 shows that before 1975, 46% of the migrants and after 1975 56% came from the state of Punjab. This indicates that since more and more people are coming from the same source chain migration is coming into effect. Towns like Jullandur, Hoshiarpur, Batala seemed to be the most common sources of immigrants from Punjab. Thus, the hypothesis that the immigrant groups emigrated from certain regions within India (leading to the phenomenon of chain migration) is true.
TABLE 21
"PULL" FACTORS FOR CHOOSING WINDSOR
BY IMMIGRANT GROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sum Of Points</th>
<th>Rank - Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before 1975</td>
<td>After 1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Job Opportunities</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Increased Salary</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) To be near friends/relatives</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Educational Opportunities</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Preference for a Small City</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Warm Weather</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Low Living Costs</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Near U. S. Border</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Less Racism</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) Less Crime</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TABLE 22

BREAKDOWN OF IMMIGRANTS BY STATES IN INDIA  
(IN PERCENTAGE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATES</th>
<th>Punjab</th>
<th>Gujarat</th>
<th>U. P.</th>
<th>Bihar</th>
<th>Sn. States</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before 1975</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After 1975</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIGURE 13

MAP OF INDIA SHOWING DIFFERENT STATES
Levels of Satisfaction

It has been stated in this study before that most of these immigrants had migration experiences and hence are susceptible to migration again. Whether they would remain in Windsor throughout their life or whether they will move again depends on their satisfaction with Windsor. Table 2 suggests that in the earlier group 54% were satisfied with Windsor and 46% were not. In the later years, the satisfaction level rose to 74%. This suggests that over time, Indian immigrants are becoming more and more satisfied with Windsor possibly due to its fewer racial problems or its nearness to the U.S. border and Detroit Metropolitan Area. Also, in the recent years since more direct immigration from India is occurring due to more sponsorship with less migration experience as well as with lower educational qualifications are coming, they seem to be satisfied with Windsor because dissatisfaction comes to a person's mind when he perceives something better than another. Hence, since the migrants in the recent years had little or no migration experience before coming to Windsor, they cannot compare Windsor to any other city and so are satisfied with Windsor. Moreover, with larger numbers in the community of Indian settlers, there is greater internal socialization and a feeling of security, which might also have some role in the higher satisfaction levels in the post-1976 group. When a 2x2 contingency table was made, the Chi Square obs. (4.23) > Chi Square crit. (3.84) and hence the null hypothesis was rejected and it was inferred that there
TABLE 23
SATISFACTION LEVEL OF IMMIGRANT GROUPS
(REGARDING WINDSOR).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BEFORE 1975</th>
<th></th>
<th>AFTER 1975</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>53.9</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>74.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
was significant differences in the satisfaction levels of the two migrant groups regarding Windsor CMA.

Among the people who were dissatisfied with Windsor, Table 24 shows that both before and after 1975, most of the migrants were dissatisfied with Windsor because of its bad economy. Bad weather conditions, pollution, developing racism were some of the other reasons for dissatisfaction with Windsor. In the previous group, 35% showed dissatisfaction due to Windsor's bad and unstable economy but in the latter group only 15% showed dissatisfaction due to the same reason. Table 25 further shows that most of these dissatisfied migrants (over 75%), belonged to the professional workers' group. Mostly engineers who have worked in the automotive and related industries in Windsor are dissatisfied with Windsor rather than skilled or semi-skilled workers because of their higher expectations and unstable condition of auto industry in Canada.

But though some of the migrants are dissatisfied with Windsor, most of them can be considered non-movers, that is, they do not wish to migrate again in the immediate future.

Table 26 shows that of the pre-1975 group almost 84% were non-movers and of the post-1975 group almost 74% were non-movers.

When a Chi Square sample test was performed on table 26 it was found that Chi Square obs. (0.83) < Chi Square crit. (3.84). Hence by accepting the null hypothesis it was inferred that there was no significant difference in the two groups regarding the non-movers. This leads us to believe
### TABLE 24

POSSIBLE REASONS FOR DISSATISFACTION WITH WINDSOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Before 1975</th>
<th>After 1975</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Bad Economy</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>35.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Pollution</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Developing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Others</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 25

OCCUPATIONAL TYPES OF DISSATISFIED IMMIGRANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Before 1975</th>
<th>After 1975</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional and Managerial</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>76.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled/ Semi-Skilled</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BEFORE 1975</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movers</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Movers</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>83.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 26**

IMMIGRANTS NEAR-FUTURE MIGRATION PLANS
that most of the immigrants were quite satisfied with Windsor CMA and were settled here. So, they did not have any future plans to resettle elsewhere.

Return Migration

Whether these settled migrants would ever want to return to India is a difficult question to answer because they have and most of their children have adjusted themselves to the culture and life-style of Windsor, and believe that they would be misfits in the home country if they ever returned. Though table 27 clearly shows that most of the migrants wanted to return to India some day, the author during her personal interviews felt that actually most of them were yet undecided. However, the three reasons given by the respondents as to why they wanted to return to India were emotional attachments, to spend old-age with relatives and to bring up children (especially daughters) in the traditional Indian culture. Similarly the immigrants who did not want to return to India had their reasons too. The primary reasons were better jobs, income and higher standard of living in Canada and Windsor. Other reasons were assimilation of children with Canadian culture and life style, better educational facilities and a sense of obligation to Canada.

When a Chi Square 2 Sample test was performed, it was observed that Chi Square obs (9.19) > Chi Square crit (5.99). Hence by rejecting the null hypothesis it was inferred that there was significant difference within the two immigrant groups regarding return migration.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Before 1975</th>
<th></th>
<th>After 1975</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want to Return</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>54.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do Not Want to Return</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>43.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When a comparison of this study was done with Nizamuddin's 1976 study regarding the mechanics of migration, it was observed that the Indian migrants to Canada still had previous migration experiences; they obtained information about their destinations from sources such as friends and relatives; bad economic conditions in the home country and better facilities of Canada (in almost all aspects such as education, living conditions, etc.) were still the main 'push' and 'pull' factors in the decision-making process. However, the concepts of return migration, source area association, Indian immigrants' satisfaction with Windsor, reasons for their dissatisfaction were introduced in the present study. Also various statistical techniques as tests were used for significance tests to reject or accept the specific hypotheses, which was totally lacking in the previous study. An attempt was thus made in this study to discover any changes that might have occurred among Indian immigrants in Windsor CMA in terms of their migration selectivity and decision-making process.
FOOTNOTES

1. Purchasing power of a consumer dollar bears an inverse relationship to the movement of the Consumer Price Index. One dollar of 1971 was worth 76 cents in 1975 and in 1982 March it is worth 39 cents (Source: Statistics Canada CPI for 1975, 1982). Hence, the same basket of goods which cost $100.00 in 1971, would cost about $256.00 in 1982 March.

2. This idea of quantifying the qualitative form of data is entirely subjective and arbitrary. However, the author consulted with someone more knowledgeable in statistics, before arriving at it. The author believes that 'Very Important' is five times more important than 'Important.' Whereas the difference between 'Very Important' and 'Extremely Important' is less and hence 'Extremely Important' is only twice as important as 'Very Important' but ten times more important than 'Important.'

3. After arrival in Canada, not many Indian immigrants went for higher education to improve their qualifications.
CHAPTER III
CHAPTER III

Conclusions from Analysis

In this study, an attempt has been made to determine some characteristics of Indian immigrants and to find out the reasons behind their leaving India and choosing Canada as their destination.

The results of the analysis showed that most of the migrants were between sixteen and thirty-five years of age when they migrated with average family size increasing from 3.1 to 3.5 persons per family. Of the immigrants who came to Windsor before 1975, 83% were between sixteen and thirty-five years old and after 1975 this percent increased to 91%. Of the pre-1975 migrants 62.9% were married males and 35.2% were unmarried males. However, in the later years only 56.6% were married males and 43.5% were bachelors. This suggests that most of the migrants from India were young, married people under 35.

At the time of initial migration, majority of the migrants had at least college degrees. People with Masters' degrees, Ph.D. and other professional degrees formed another large percentage. This is mainly due to two reasons: a) educated immigrants were more aware of the better facilities in Canada and b) immigration laws of Canada awarded more points for educated immigrants, which was a major factor in getting immigration. Due to the fact that Indian immigrants were educated at the time of migration, they were absorbed in highest paid occupations and income groups changed both vertically and horizontally.
 Majority of the migrants were well informed about the opportunities available in Canada through their friends or relatives before coming to Canada. The most important 'push' factors for leaving India in the first place were lack of employment and poor opportunity for promotion, sense of adventure, financial problems, or family instability ranked low in influencing the migrants' decision-making process to leave India. Offers or expectations of jobs, better educational facilities and chances of advancement were the most important 'pull' factors for choosing Canada as these immigrants' destination; whereas, job opportunities and higher salary were the primary factors in the migrants' choice of Windsor as a destination in Canada. The role of these factors changed over time.

Most of the Indian immigrants had previous migration experience before coming to Canada - mainly in U.S.A., U.K. and West Germany internationally and at least at one place in the home country. However, in the latter years about 50% of the migrants came directly from India - mainly from the states of Punjab and Gujarat. The Indian immigrants in Windsor CMA were quite satisfied with the city and are more or less settled here. However, most of them ultimately wished to return to India due to emotional attachments to the country and fear of spending old age in Canada.

Limitations of the Study

In this study, when the survey was being conducted, most of the time the head of the household was interviewed. This might have biased the study in determining the sex ratio of
the immigrants. But, it was also observed that most of the Indian spouses were sponsored and were housewives.

It is the suspicion of the author that the grand list of the immigrants' list was not complete due to several reasons. Firstly, from the last names of Indian origin, it was difficult to tell whether some member was Indian or Pakistani, or came from Bangladesh, West Indies or East Africa. Since both Bangladesh and Pakistan were once parts of India, many of the Hindus and Moslems had same surnames. Since using surnames were the only way of determining whether a person was Indian or not, this was quite a difficult task. So, sometimes the author had to take chances over the telephone while making the appointments, so that she could be sure that the respondent was of Indian origin. Also, Indian christians who were listed in the telephone directory by their christian names could not be identified as also some other Indians whose phone numbers were unlisted and hence could not be contacted for appointments. Considering these flaws, the author thinks that the grand list of Indian immigrants is still incomplete.

Due to the nature of the questionnaire which was based on nominal or weak ordinal scale data, none of the most powerful efficient significant tests could be used for analysis. So, Chi Square, Kolmogorov-Smirnov 2 Sample Tests, Wilcoxon Matched Pair Sign-Rank Test and Chi Square 2x2 contingency table were used.

For the purpose of comparison, the author sometimes had
to use secondary sources of data which were available in Census of Canada or Statistics Canada, etc. Hence, unfair though it might seem, the author had to compare some data from the seventies to 1982 questionnaire data which were not strictly comparable. Thus, this seems to be a flaw in the data source.

In the theoretical weakness of the study, it can be said that there is still a lack of a comprehensive theoretical framework which can be depended upon. Hence, this is still an empirical study, by necessity.

Return migration concept cannot be examined with this type of data. It needs further probing - meaning thereby that the study of return migrants of Indian immigrants should be based on the actual returnees (as from Australia) rather than the new settlers who have a positive feeling about returning to India; but, actualization of that feeling can be better assessed when it has already happened.

Also, a complete family profile at the time of arrival and at the time of the survey would give us a better view of the immigrants family structure and the changes that they have gone through.

**Directions for Further Research**

The present study is an attempt to study international migration of Indians in Canada. However, this study can lead to various other aspects of international migration such as distribution, assimilation and interaction processes for a better understanding of the subject. The locational aspects in terms of residential concentrations and changes of the
immigrants in Canada and a comparison among various ethnic groups regarding their different characteristics can be other approaches. Return migrants and their characteristics can be also looked into to see whether they possess different characteristics than migrants and non-migrants. Though the questions regarding the education, occupation and income of the spouses of the immigrants were included in the questionnaire of the present study, they were not used for analysis - these could be used in later studies for analysing the characteristics of the spouses of the migrants. Further studies on return migrants of Indian immigrants from Canada has still to be pursued in more detail.
APPENDIX A

RESULTS OF TESTS

Age: Table 8.
Dmax = 0.44
Dcrit at 0.05 level of significance = 0.27
Since Dmax > Dcrit., reject H0

Sex: Table 9.
Chi Square obs. = 0.37
Chi Square crit. = 3.84 with df = 1 and at 0.05 level
Since Chi Square obs. < Chi Square crit., reject H0

Marital Status: Table 10.
Chi Square obs. = 1.46
Chi Square crit. = 5.99 at 0.05 level and df = 2
Since Chi Square obs. < Chi Square crit., accept H0

Sponsored Wives: Table 6
Chi Square obs. = 11.55
Chi Square crit. = 5.99 at 0.05 level
Since Chi Square obs. > Chi Square crit., reject H0

Sponsored Relatives: Table 7.
Chi Square obs. = 10.103
Chi Square crit. = 7.82 at 0.05 level and df = 3
Since Chi Square obs. > Chi Square crit., reject H0

Education: Table 11.
Dmax = 0.26
Dcrit. = 0.27
Since Dmax > Dcrit., accept H0 at 0.05 level

Occupation: Table 12.
Dmax = 0.12
Dcrit. = 0.27 at 0.05 level
Since Dmax > Dcrit., accept H0

Income: Table 14.
Dmax = 0.59
Dcrit. = 0.27 at 0.05 level
Since Dmax > Dcrit., reject H0

Migration Experience in India: Table 16.
Dmax = 0.24
Dcrit = 0.27
Since Dmax > Dcrit., accept H0
## Satisfactory with Windsor - Table 23

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B1975</th>
<th>A1975</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12 = 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>34 = 62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi Square obs. = 4.23
Chi Square crit. = 3.84 at 0.05 level
Since Chi Square obs. > Chi Square crit., reject $H_0$.

**Return Migrants:** Table 27.
Chi Square obs. = 9.19
Chi Square crit. = 5.99 at 0.05 level
Since Chi Square obs. > Chi Square crit., reject $H_0$.

**Cross Tabulations - Age with Education**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Before 1975</th>
<th>After 1975</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chi Square obs.</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi Square crit.</td>
<td>3.84 at 0.05 level</td>
<td>3.84 at 0.05 level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Income with Occupation - At the Time of Migration**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Before 1975</th>
<th>After 1975</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chi Square obs.</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>6.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi Square crit.</td>
<td>3.84 at 0.05 level</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**After Migration**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Before 1975</th>
<th>After 1975</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chi Square obs.</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi Square crit.</td>
<td>3.84 at 0.05 level</td>
<td>3.84 at 0.05 level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
International Migration Experience: Table 17.
Chi Square obs. = 1.32
Chi Square crit. = 7.82
Since Chi Square obs. < Chi Square crit., accept H_o

Information Sources: Table 18.
Canada - Chi Square obs. = 7.55
Chi Square crit. = 7.82 at 0.05 level and df = 3
Since Chi Square obs. < Chi Square crit., accept H_o

Information Sources: Table 18.
Windsor - Chi Square obs = 5.78
Chi Square crit. = 7.82 at 0.05 level and df = 3
Since Chi Square obs < Chi Square crit., accept H_o

Wilcoxon Matched Pair Sign-Rank Test
Push Factors: Table 19.
Tobs. = 6.0
Tcrit. = 2.0 at 0.05 level, when N = 7
Since Tobs. > Tcrit., reject H_o

Pull Factors (Re Canada) Table 20.
Tobs. = 8.0
Tcrit. = 0 at 0.05 level, when N = 6
Since Tobs. > Tcrit., reject H_o

Pull Factors (Re Windsor) Table 21.
Tobs. = 7.5
Tcrit. = 8 at 0.05 level, when N = 10
Since Tobs. < Tcrit., accept H_o

MOVERS/NONMOVERS - 2x2 CONTINGENCY TABLE 26

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B1975</th>
<th>A1975</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nonmovers</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movers</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi Square obs. = 0.83
Chi Square crit. = 3.84
Since Chi Square obs. > Chi Square crit., reject H_o
APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE

1) Year of leaving India
2) Year of arrival in Canada
3) Year of arrival in Windsor (if different from 2)
4) Year of birth
5) Place of birth:
   a) Country
   b) Province/State/District
   c) City
   d) Rural: Tehsil
6) Sex: Male Female
7) List family members living with you now
   Relation: Wife Children (Numbers ) Parents Mother Other
   Year of immigration to Canada: Year Year Year
8) Educational levels:
   A. Respondent - Before Migration
      Level Degree/Diploma Year Year After Migration Degree/Diploma Country
   B. Spouse

If you came to Windsor directly from India, do not answer 9, 10.
9) A. Before coming to Canada, were you
    a) Employed/Self-Employed  b) Unemployed  c) Retired
    If employed/self-employed
    (i) Nature of work  ii) For how long? Years
    B. Before coming to Canada, was your spouse
    a) Employed/self-employed  b) Unemployed  c) Housewife
    If employed/self-employed
    (i) Nature of work  ii) For how long? Years
10) A. What type of job did you take soon after you came to Canada before
    coming to Windsor
    (i) Type of work  ii) Duration: Years
    B. (If applicable) What type of job did your spouse take soon after
    coming to Canada, before coming to Windsor
    (i) Type of work  ii) Duration: Years
11) A. Before coming to Windsor, were you
    a) Employed/Self-Employed  b) Unemployed  c) Retired
11) B. Before coming to Windsor, was your spouse
   a) Employed/Self-employed    b) Unemployed    c) Housewife

12) A. What type of job did you take soon after coming to Windsor?
   (i) Employed/Self-Employed    (ii) Type of work
   (iii) Duration

B. What type of job did your spouse take soon after coming to
   Windsor?
   (i) Employed/Self-Employed    (ii) Type of work
   (iii) Duration

13) A. Currently, are you a) Employed/Self-employed    b) Unemployed
   c) Retired/Housewife

B. Currently, is your spouse a) Employed/Self-Employed
   b) Unemployed    c) Retired/Housewife

14) How would you rate your present economic conditions compared to your
    earlier economic conditions?

    | Before Migration to Windsor | Right after migration to Windsor (6 months) | Present |
    |----------------------------|---------------------------------------------|---------|
    | Much better                | Better                                      | Same    |
    |                           | Same                                        | Worse   |

15) How would you rate your approximate family income?

    | Before Windsor | Soon after in Windsor | Present |
    |----------------|-----------------------|---------|
    | $6,500         |                       |         |
    | 6,501-10,000   |                       |         |
    | 10,001-15,000  |                       |         |
    | 15,001-20,000  |                       |         |
    | 20,001-30,000  |                       |         |
    | 30,001-45,000  |                       |         |
    | 45,001-55,000  |                       |         |
    | 55,001         |                       |         |

16) If Windsor was not your first place of residence in Canada, where
    did you live before coming to Windsor?  
   (i) Place (s)  
   (ii) Province(s)

17) Did you live in any other countries prior to coming to Canada?
   a) U.K.  b) U.S.A.  c) W. Germany  d) Mid-East  e) Africa
   f) others

18) Before migrating to Canada or any other country list all the places
    where you resided longer than a year in INDIA

    | Place | Duration | Reason: Job/Education |
    |-------|----------|------------------------|
    | 1.    |          |                        |
    | 2.    |          |                        |
    | 3.    |          |                        |

19) Before you emigrated from India, list member(s) of your family who
    had already migrated.

    | Relationship | Year | Country |
    |--------------|------|---------|
    | 1.           |      |         |
    | 2.           |      |         |
    | 3.           |      |         |

20) A. From what source(s) did you obtain information about Canada?
   a) Friends    b) Relatives   c) News media   d) Consulate
   e) Travel Agency  e) Other

B. Can you estimate your level of satisfaction regarding different
   types of information that you received about Canada?

   (see next page)
21. A. From what source(s) did you obtain information about Windsor?
   a) Friends  b) Relatives  c) News Media  d) Consulate
   e) Travel Agency  f) Tourist Board  g) Other

   B. How would you estimate your level of satisfaction regarding the
different types of information that you received about Windsor?
   Extremely  Satisfactory  Satisfactory  Unsatisfactory
   a) Employment Opportunity  b) Employment requirement
   c) Cost of living  d) Racial attitude
   e) Climate  f) Job satisfaction
   g) Educational facilities
   If you came to Windsor directly from India, do not answer Q. 22.

22. At the time of migration to Canada, how important were the following
reasons for your decision to migrate?
   Extremely  Very  Not
   Important  Important  Important  Important
   a) Offer of a job  b) Chance of advance-
   c) Better educational
   facility for you/
spouse/children
   d) To be near friends/
relatives
   e) Adequate information
   about Canada
   f) Relative absence of racism

23. At the time of migration to Windsor, how important were the following
reasons for your decision to migrate?
   Extremely  Very  Not
   Important  Important  Important  Important
   Job opportunity
   Increased salary
   To be near friends/
relatives
   Educational opportun-
ties
   Preference for a small
   city
   Warm weather compared to
other Canadian cities
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low living cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near U.S. Border and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit Metropolitan Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Racism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Crime</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24) How important are the following reasons for your leaving India in the first place?</td>
<td>Extremely Important</td>
<td>Very Important</td>
<td>Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of satisfactory employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor opportunity for promotion and professional advancement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deterioration in personal financial conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family instability (other than personal financial conditions)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25) Did you sponsor/nominate anyone? a) Yes b) No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, state</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td>Year of Arrival</td>
<td>Where located</td>
<td>now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26) Are you in any way dissatisfied with Windsor? a) Yes b) No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, state why</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27) If you are dissatisfied, are you planning/thinking of moving to any other city in Canada or elsewhere? (i) Yes (ii) No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, a) When b) Where c) Why that place?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28) Would you want to return to India? a) Yes b) No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

CANADIAN IMMIGRATION ACT, 1976

Schedule I

Factors used in assessing independent applicants:

a) Education & Training - 1 unit for each year of formal education up to 20.

b) Personal Assessment - Adaptability, motivation, etc. up to 15 units.

c) Occupational Demand - 15 when demand is strong.
   0 when oversupply.

d) Occupational Skill - 10 for professional.
   1 for unskilled.

e) Age - 10 if between 18-35, deduct 1 for each year over 35.

f) Arranged/designated Occupation - 10 units.

g) Knowledge of English/French - 10 to 1.

h) Relative - 5 if goes to same place as relative.
    3 if does not go to same place as relative.

Independent applicant must get 50 points - 10 deducted if no arranged work.
Schedule II
Factors used in assessing nominated/sponsored.

a) Education & Training - 1 unit for each year of formal education up to 20.

b) Personal Assessment - Adaptability, motivation, etc., up to 15 units.

c) Occupational Demand - 15 when demand is strong.

0 when oversupply.

d) Occupational Skill - 10 for professional.

1 for unskilled.

e) Age - 10 if between 18-35, deduct 1 for each year over 35.

According to Act 41, an immigrant can sponsor - husband or wife, finance(e) under 21, unmarried son, daughter under 21, parents, grandparents over 60, brother/sister or nephew/niece under 18, adopted under 18 and unmarried. A migrant who does not have any of above to sponsor can sponsor 1 relative and immigrant family regardless of age, occ., etc.
APPENDIX D

TYPES OF OCCUPATIONS INCLUDED UNDER MAJOR HEADINGS

Professionals: Doctors, Engineers, Professors, Architects, Teachers, Scientists, Nurses.

Managerial: Manager of a company, Administration work, Directors, Salesman or Clerk.

Technical: Draftsman, Computer Mechanic.

Skilled/Unskilled: Tool and die worker, Machine operator, Auto-mechanics, Binding work, other factory workers like Assembler, etc.

Other: Manufacturer, Teller, Ledger Keeper, Bakery work.
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