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ABSTRACT

In recent years, the number of immigrants from India and Pakistan to Canada has been increasing steadily. So little is known about these immigrants and their migration process, that it would be necessary to conduct an in-depth study of migration behavior and of the decision making processes of immigrants from those two countries.

This study broadly analyzed three aspects of migration: 1. migration selectivity, 2. mechanics of migration, 3. push and pull factors.

Characteristics of migrants were analyzed to determine migration selectivity. It was found that an overwhelming percentage of migrants at migration were male bachelors and belonged to the young adult age group. These migrants were highly qualified even when compared with the residents of Ontario. As these migrants mostly migrated and joined the labour force during the last few years, they have not reached high technical or administrative positions. As such, we find very few migrants in the highest income brackets.

The second aspect of migration dealt with in this study involved mechanics of migration. The main findings in this section were that the majority of migrants had a previous migration experience and more than two-thirds of these migrants made intermediate residence mostly in U.K.
U.S.A. or West Germany before migrating to Canada. There were several channels through which immigrants received prior information about different socio-economic aspects of Canada. Two most important sources of information were friends and relatives. Most immigrants expressed their satisfaction with the levels of information they received before they migrated to Canada. Chain migration from India and Pakistan was not very clearly established, probably due to the fact that the majority of the migrants belonged to the first wave of migration.

Lastly, the study dealt with push and pull factors in migration. An attempt was made to evolve a technique for measuring intensity of individual push and pull factors in a more quantitative form. The results from the analysis established that low salary and poor prospects of advancement in jobs were the two important push factors, whereas improved salary and better promotion prospects were the two important pull factors.
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CHAPTER I

Introduction

Generally, geographers and demographers designate the term migration to more or less permanent shifts of residence.¹ Movements across national boundaries have been usually called external migration as differentiated from internal migration of persons within a single national territory. Immigration and emigration are the usual terms for designating movement into and out of a nation, respectively.² The study of migration is of immense importance to geographers, as the migration process is inherently spatial in character. Migration as a spatial phenomena is reflected in flows of large and small numbers of people with certain socio-economic backgrounds from certain areas and over certain distances and in certain directions.³ Behind these flows of numbers are a variety of decisions made by individual members of family units, who evaluate their immediate environment, the barriers including distance, cost of transportation, number of children, education, income and tradition in new areas.³ The prospective migrants also evaluate place utility of the possible destinations in the light of their own perceptions, attitudes and levels of information.⁴ Before migrating

*The United Nations Population Commission defined migration as movements of persons between areas, involving changes in residence over a certain specific period of time.
to a new destination they also consider intervening opportunities and other competing migrants. \textsuperscript{5}

While all these factors do play a role in decision-making, in the case of international migrations, the role of barriers, in most cases, is quite different from that in internal migration. International migrations are also of greater demographic significance than internal migrations, since, as Clarke has noted, "they mean a gain or a loss in a country's population. In most countries, natural increase exceeds the net gain by migrations, yet modern governments make far greater efforts to regulate and control migrations than they ever do to influence fertility." \textsuperscript{6}

**Purpose and Scope**

In the last 200 years, in addition to massive rural to urban migration within the rapidly industrializing countries, large scale migration took place from European countries to North and South America, Australia and between some of the Western European countries. Rural to urban migrations have accelerated even in the developing countries in the last few decades, causing congestion, pollution and urban blight in the cities. All these movements have aroused a variety of questions among social scientists, such as: "Who is the migrant? What are the characteristics of migrants? Why do some people decide to migrate and why do others stay on? What are the factors which stimulate migration? Do the intending migrants consider
intervening opportunities available to them? To what extent is migration beneficial and/or detrimental for the losing areas as against the gaining areas?" All these questions generated a considerable body of literature.⁷

"A sociological theory of migration which meets the stringent demand of a formal theory is not likely to materialize in the near future. For despite a long history of empirical enquiry, researchers are only beginning to do the hard work of conceptualization of the phenomena, systematically posing causal sequences and testing relevant hypotheses, all of which must necessarily precede a formal statement of theory."⁸

In the field of geography, some attempts at conceptualization and theory-building have resulted in some broad models of migration, which attempt to explain flows, volume, direction and distance relationship, yet so far no comprehensive theory has been evolved. This absence of theoretical construction is particularly felt in the geographers' attempts to explain the phenomena associated with international migrations.

In the case of international migration, very few scientific studies have been conducted concerning migrations from Asian, African and Latin American countries. This is partly due to the fact that migration from those countries has been a recent phenomena and also because available migration data are not detailed enough for analyzing important aspects of migrants and the process of decision-making. Most migration studies are
based on data collected by census or immigration departments, which do not provide an in-depth background information regarding immigrants which could be used especially for analyzing behavioral aspects of migration.

This study is an attempt to examine certain socio-economic and demographic characteristics, information levels, past migration experience and the decision-making process of migrants from India and Pakistan presently settled in the City of Windsor, Canada.

The present study, first of all, will examine migration selectivity. To this end, analysis will be made of age, sex, occupational, income and educational characteristics of the migrants at the time of migration. This will give us an idea as to the characteristics of the people who made the decision to migrate.

Secondly, the study intends to examine the past movements of immigrants from India and Pakistan. It will analyze the sources of information open to the migrants before coming to Canada and their evaluation of the information in the light of their experience in Canada.

Thirdly, the study will search for the factors which influenced the migrants' decision-making process and evaluate the importance of various migration stimulating factors. Bogue has listed a series of migration stimulating factors. Taking migration as a dependent variable, its behaviour will be
analysed by some of the factors suggested by Bogue. He has also classified these independent variables into two categories; 1) factors which induce persons to leave their home countries (known as push factors), 2) factors which attract a person to the destination of migration (known as pull factors). In the present study, Bogue's outline has been adopted with substantial modification to suit the migration behavior of the people from India and Pakistan.*

Specific Hypotheses

Broadly, the purpose of the present study would be to test the following hypotheses;

A) Majority of migrants were young adults at the time of migration.

B) Most of the migrants were male, bachelors and migrated alone.

C) Migrants, at the time of migration, had much higher educational qualifications than the residents of Ontario.

D) As a result of a higher level of educational attainment, migrants, after settlement, were in better paying jobs as compared with the residents of Canada.

*See Appendix B Questionnaire, for push and pull factors used in this study.
E) Migrants had adequate information about Canada before migration.

F) The influence of friends and relations was an important factor in the choice of Canada as destination.

G) Migrants to Canada were mainly those who had previous migration experience.

H) Canada draws migrants from India and Pakistan as it offers an improvement in standard of living.

I) Pull factors played a stronger role in migration-decision than push factors. They migrated not because of poor conditions at origin but because of their evaluation of superior opportunities available in Canada. In other words, we could state our hypotheses that migrants from India and Pakistan to Windsor, Canada, were positively selective of the populations from which they originated.

**Historical Background of International Migrations in Canada**

In the past, when government regulations on migration were not strict and political boundaries were not clearly defined or enforced, massive international migrations took place. Sometimes, these migrations were forced or impelled by political, economic and religious persecution of minority groups in
countries of origin of the migrants. In modern times, it seems that economic considerations have gained an ever increasing importance as the generating factor for a majority of international migratory moves. Studies of migration between Europe and North America have indicated strong correlations with success or failure of harvests in the countries of origin and the pace of economic development in receiving countries. In recent times, people from the Third World countries have been attracted towards the developed countries because of better job opportunities, higher standard of living and by the existence of unoccupied land. But it is very difficult to make an unqualified statement that economic conditions are the supreme consideration in migration. For definitely it has been observed that very poor countries having low standard of living are not necessarily the major source of migrants from the Third World. On the other hand, it has also been observed that quite often economic opportunities attract people from rich to poor countries. For example, recently people from developed countries have gone to serve in developing countries of the Middle East because of high salaries there.

Policies regarding migration vary from country to country. Countries like Britain, the Netherlands, Italy and Japan had actively encouraged emigration, whereas U.S.S.R., China and East European countries totally restricted immigration and partially
or totally restricted or discouraged emigration. Countries like Australia provided financial assistance to migrants, but were selective both in terms of quantity and quality. This was designed to restrict immigration from certain ethnic groups which were considered undesirable. "The White Australia Policy, the quota systems of the United States which have operated in favour of North-West Europeans rather than South and East Europeans, the small quotas of Chinese permitted entry into South-East Asian countries, the restrictions on coloured into Britain.....are many examples of planned selective immigration." 14

In some of the Western countries, like Canada, where population density has been relatively low, they required more population to expand their economy and to attain economies of scale in their production. But these Western countries either hired labourers for certain stipulated periods of time or were reluctant to accept migrants other than from conventional source areas. The reasons cited by the policy makers were either economic or those related to the power of present citizens to absorb and assimilate immigrants from non-conventional areas. 15

Since after the Second World War, some of the developing countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America have been going through demographic transition characterized by high birth rates, rapidly declining death rates and increasing longevity, leading to an accelerated population growth, unemployment or under-
employment, and often stagnation or slackening in economic growth: from these developing countries many skilled and semi-skilled persons aspired to migrate to developed countries or to countries where economic opportunities were available. But the intervening barriers for these prospective migrants were many because of the restrictive immigration laws in the receiving countries.16

Until recently, Canada was open to immigrants mainly from two countries - U.K. and France. Later they allowed immigration from South as well as East European countries. Beset with the problem of utilizing vast natural resources and with empty potentially fertile lands, Canadian Government policy was to encourage immigration with a view to settling the newly-opened-up areas and to tap its natural resources. Also, more immigrants were needed both as labourers and consumers for faster growth and development of the country.17

Since in the past almost all immigrants came from Western European countries, having close religious and ethnic affinity, the process of cultural assimilation of the new immigrants from the traditional areas was fairly rapid.

In 1951, for the first time, the Government of Canada allowed immigration from India, Pakistan and Sri Lanka. By agreements with the governments of the above countries, a quota system was adopted whereby immigrants numbering 750 from India, 100 from Pakistan and 50 from Sri Lanka were allowed to immigrate
to Canada.

By 1962, discriminatory regulations were almost abolished, yet certain restrictions on the admission of relatives from non-European countries were maintained. Also, consulate services handling immigration and visa applications were not as adequate as those provided in European countries.

Changes in Canadian immigration laws in 1965-66 removed all existing barriers to immigration from non-European countries, except that immigration facilities in those countries were not fully developed. Since 1965-66, due to removal of restrictions on relations and liberalization of immigration policy, increased numbers of people from Asia, Africa, and Latin America started to settle in Canada. Though the absolute number of people from these non-traditional countries is still small, their rate of increase had accelerated most rapidly in the last few years.

The table in the Appendix A will give an idea of immigrants coming from different source areas in certain specific periods. It is apparent that Europe, even in 1968-73, was the biggest contributor of immigrants to Canada. Though the absolute number of immigrants from Europe had decreased between 1963-67, yet Europe contributed more than 70% of all immigrants to Canada. It was interesting to note that Asia and Africa together contributed 185,684 immigrants, which accounted for 20.2% of total immigrants in the period 1968-73. If comparison was
made between the figures of all the years, it would become
evident that the numbers, as well as the percentages, of immi-
grants from those two continents were increasing quite
rapidly. See Fig. 1.  

Out of a total number of 921,324 who entered Canada in
the period 1968-73, immigrants from India and Pakistan com-
stituted 40,944 which was 4.04% of the total. Table
(No. 1 shows that percentage wise, there was a dramatic change
in the numbers of immigrants from India and Pakistan during
the last 25 years. But in absolute numbers, immigration was
still very small compared to other source areas.

| TABLE 1
PERCENTAGE INCREASE OF IMMIGRATION
TO CANADA FROM INDIA AND PAKISTAN
SELECTED PERIODS 1946-1973 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>918</td>
<td>1,387</td>
<td>2,512</td>
<td>10,331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>2,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>918</td>
<td>1,637</td>
<td>2,846</td>
<td>12,371</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


As a result of the above noted changes in the contribu-
tion made by non-traditional areas in the migration streams
NUMBER OF IMMIGRANTS ENTERING CANADA

SOURCE: TABLE NO. 1
coming to Canada it would be desirable that a scientific enquiry of migration behavior and characteristics of the people (immigrants) from Asia, Africa and Latin America be undertaken. This study in a humble way intends to provide some analysis of immigrants from India and Pakistan through empirical research.

**Literature Review - Theoretical**

Literature on theoretical and empirical aspects of international migration is not as extensive as it is for internal migratory movements. Theoretical work is almost entirely directed towards internal migrations.

Though different streams of migrations have been recorded in history, yet the actual interest in formulating laws concerning processes and determinants of migration started after Ravenstein stated his laws of migration in 1885. Since then, several studies have been made dealing both with theoretical and empirical aspects of migration, particularly in reference to internal migration within the same national boundaries.

Theoretical papers have been written by scholars belonging to different disciplines. Economists have designed cost-benefit models for analyzing economic aspects of migration; sociologists have been interested in causes of migration and cultural and social adjustment of migrants, whereas geographers were more interested in spatial distribution, volumes
and directions of migration flows.

Ravenstein, a statistician and economist, gave a new perspective to the studies of migration by building up a number of laws concerning migration patterns, distance of migration, migration streams, differentials of migration and, lastly, the socio-economic and demographic characteristics of migrants. Despite Stephen Bourne's criticism that although Mr. Ravenstein had spoken of 'Laws of Migration', he had not formulated them in such a categorical order that they could be criticized, Ravenstein's Laws have withstood the test of time and were considered the first attempt in theory-building in migration. Lee observed that three quarters of a century had passed after Ravenstein formulated his laws and yet few additional generalizations had been advanced.

Among the geographers, Hagerstrand's name comes in the forefront as he gave an approximate formula for short-term predictions for volume of migration. In his theory, he first of all assumed all migrants to be passive, i.e. they relied on information and encouragement given by friends and relations, who had already migrated, before taking any decision on migration. He gave the following formula:

$$M \frac{S - R = K VR/IR}{PR}$$

where PR denotes population of the region of immigration, VR - vacancies which have arisen during the relatively short period of time; Population of R (region of immigration) at the time t.
having private contacts with potential migrants of the parish
\% IR (I for information, incitement or impulse.)

He explained his formula in the following terms, "The
number of migrations from \% to R during \( t_1 \) to \( t_j \) is directly
proportional both to the vacancy-density of R and to the num-
ber of existing private contacts between R and potential mi-
grants of \% at the time."

This formula could be used for predicting short-term
internal migrations. But it is of limited value in predicting
international migration because of restrictions imposed,
especially by receiving countries.

A more recent contribution following Ravenstein's
theme was proposed by Everett Lee, a sociologist, in 1966,\(^{22}\)
providing a further elaboration and refinement of Ravenstein's
Laws. He also proposed his own model of migration in which he
tried to analyze the push and pull factors of migration from a
behavioral angle.

According to his model, volume of migration varied with
the diversity of people, the intensity of intervening obstacles
in moving from the area of origin to the area of destination,
dependent upon the variation of economic development in both
the regions of in-migrations and out-migrations and on personal
factors such as life cycle stages. He further stated that most
migrations took place in well-defined streams and in each
stream there was a countermigration. He explained that efficiency
of migration stream increased if minus (push) factors were high at the place of origin. There must be important reasons behind migration decision and that simple (minor) advantages did not create enough force for migration. He considered characteristics of migrants as important variables which controlled migration volume. He further stated that the perception of different individuals of the place of origin and destination was dependent on life cycle as well as individual thresholds. Stages in the life cycle were quite important in migration decision-making process. However, he accepted that one could not completely rationalize migration.

His model could be used for explaining regional migration pattern within a country. Although it may have some general bearing on the study of international migrations, yet it cannot be rigorously employed, because it would be difficult to quantify intensity of intervening obstacles between countries and also due to lack of a suitable index of economic development which could be used for an evaluation of migration push and pull analysis.

Roseman, another geographer, divided migration into two categories based on the assumption that migration involved any human movement in space.²³

First, he defined daily movements undertaken by household members, keeping home as the centre of gravity. Second, type of movement involved shifting of place of residence which
changed weekly movement pattern. The second and most relevant part of Roseman's thesis was concerned with several important aspects of migration, such as:

a) Decision-making unit,
b) Place utility and locational decision,
c) Partial or total displacement migrations,
d) Information gathering process,
e) Variables that established place utilities,
f) Temporal dimensions,
g) Spatial-temporal relationships.

Taking a very broad view of migration as a movement, migration could be divided into two broad categories. These were weekly movement cycles before migration and weekly movement cycles after migration. These cycles of movement varied, depending upon partial and total displacement of migrants.

In a partial displacement movement, considerations such as type of dwelling, neighbourhood characteristics, socio-economic considerations and ethnic composition of the locality played an important role. Whereas in the case of migration involving total displacement, job opportunity and better job availability became more important consideration.

He further described different processes of adjustment and assimilation in two types of movements.
Julian Wolpert, a regional scientist and geographer, described three aspects of migration behavior: 1) field theory approach to search behavior, 2) the life cycle approach to threshold formation, and 3) place utility concept. Finally, he proposed a framework of an operating model taking into consideration all three aspects. With the help of a set of matrices, he proposed to analyze the behavioural aspects of migration.

He accepted a wage theory of economic determination as an important approach in migration research. He also recognized friends' and relatives' influence in directing migration flows. Emphasis was also given to categories of occupation, income, race and especially age, as determinants of migration. Instead of using simple push-pull factors as determinants of migration, he suggested that a 'mover-stayer' approach would be better suited for analyzing migration flows.

The ideas developed by Roseman and Wolpert regarding place utility, life cycle, information gathering and the perceptions of the decision-making units would be of considerable importance in a proper understanding of not only internal and regional migrations but also of international migration flows.

In another article, Wolpert explained 'migration as an adjustment to environmental stress'. His analysis examined the process which produced the decision to move or stay. This
model suggested an ecological relationship between individuals and their social and physical environment on a 'continuum of harmony', in the matching of individuals to sites.

He declared that all of man's creative efforts occurred under moderate degrees of stress. Strain on the other hand, referred to the individual's 'reaction to stress'. More precisely, he suggested that individuals and groups would react under strain which had been caused by noxious environmental forces.

In his model it was suggested that in addition to push-pull forces which may be latent in migration decision, the triggering of that decision might frequently be associated with a stress impetus.

Wolpert was considering his ideas of 'reaction to stress' mainly for analyzing social forces which triggered internal migration, although the concept could also be useful in investigating international migrations. However, this study did not take this aspect because of time constraints and the diffidence of the respondents to reveal such personal information relating to triggering effect of certain stress.

Stouffer, a sociologist, in his famous paper, 'Intervening Opportunities: A Theory Relating Mobility and Distance,' tried to improve upon Hagerstrand's model by introducing the concept of intervening opportunities which distort the effect of distance. According to his theory, the
number of persons moving a given distance was directly proportional to the number of job opportunities at the distance and inversely proportional to the number of intervening opportunities,

\[ l_{ij} = \frac{O_j}{O_{ij}} \]

where \( l_{ij} \) = number of migrants moving between \( i \) and \( j \),
\( O_i \) = number of opportunities at \( i \),
\( O_{ij} \) = number of opportunities between \( i \) and \( j \).

Wilson considered Stouffer's theory 'as essentially a restatement of gravity formula with simple distance being replaced by some functional measure of distance and population size by a measure of the attractiveness of that population.'

Free flow 'distance-decay models' of movement cannot be applied to international migration because of restrictions imposed by different governments. As such, these were of limited value in international migration studies.

Larry Sajaastad,\(^{28}\) an economist, proposed a method of cost-benefit analysis in analyzing migration. The author developed the concepts and tools to measure costs and returns to migration, both to public sector and to private individuals.

His goal was to determine the return to investment in migration rather than to relate rates of migration to income differentials. He put monetary evaluations on all the push
and pull factors in determining migration.

His theory may be good for quantification. But the way he quantified in terms of money, the love of one's mother, and so on, seems unrealistic. Maybe in a society where money is everything and everything is accounted for by money, his theory may work.

Mobogunge, an eminent geographer, used the General Systems Approach to rural-urban migration. This approach 'enables consideration of rural-urban migration no longer as a linear, unidirectional 'push and pull', 'cause-effect' movement, but as a circular, interdependent, progressively complex and self modifying system in which the effect of change in one part could be traced through the whole of the system.'

His model of migration was supposed to be used for rural-urban migrations but with modification this model could be used if and when international migration becomes free from governmental restrictions and with the availability of more relevant data.

Bogue listed a series of migration stimulating factors. These factors independently or in combination could induce persons to examine their socio-economic and personal position in their present residence. Also these factors could induce individuals to re-assess and re-evaluate the advantages and disadvantages of moving to new areas and to reach a decision to move. He has categorized all the factors into three
groups;

a) Migration stimulating situations for persons such as;

   1. Graduation,
   2. Marriage,
   3. Offer of good employment, etc.

   There are altogether 25 factors under this heading.

b) Factors in choosing a destination such as;

   1. Cost of moving,
   2. Presence of relatives,
   3. Definite offer of desirable employment, etc.

c) Socio-economic conditions affecting migration;

   1. Major capital investment,
   2. Major business recession or depression,
   3. Technological changes, which render obsolete many new enterprises,
   4. Changes in economic organizations of enterprises which may destroy jobs at one place and create in another.

   He listed ten factors under this group.

   Although he had mentioned, in total, fifty factors in three categories, he also suggested that this list could be supplemented according to necessity.

   His factors were mainly meant for analyzing internal migration but definitely some of these could be used for analyzing international migration.
"When this process is viewed behavioristically, it can be noted that a certain measurable incidence (rate) of migration is associated with the occurrences of each of these situations or combinations of situations." Bogue further noted that comparatively little research had been done in migration with the above framework as a model.

Literature Review - Empirical

Empirical studies of behavioral aspects of international migration are rather scanty, particularly concerning migration from underdeveloped countries to the developed countries. This deficiency may be due to the fact that the data available from census and other sources are inadequate. Moreover, special field investigations are quite expensive and time-consuming. In general, most of the studies in international migrations done by economists, demographers and other social scientists have dealt with volume, direction and, to a limited extent, migration selectivity, while some sociologists have concerned themselves with the post-migration adjustment and assimilation problems of migrants of certain ethnic groups.

There are several studies of a general nature, mostly descriptive, that somewhat lack sound hypothetical base and statistical inference, such as Byrne's "Irish Emigration to the United States," Gamio's "The Mexican Immigrants" and "Mexican Immigrants to the U.S.A."
Most of the recent articles in the scientific journals dealing with international migration are also based on simple tabulations of available data, such as Gillion's\textsuperscript{34} "The Sources of Indian Emigration to Fiji," Compston's\textsuperscript{35} "A Survey of Indian Immigration to British Tropical Colonies to 1910," Commin's\textsuperscript{36} "Notes on Emigration from India to Trinidad."

Gillion's paper on "Sources of Indian Emigration to Fiji" was based on Emigration Proceedings of the Governments of India, Bengal and Madras and also on historical documents which were made available to him in Fiji. In this article Gillion not only tried to find the source areas of Indian emigration to Fiji but also tried to describe their characteristics as well as push and pull factors which played important role in immigrants' decision-making process.

Compston's article dealt with Indian immigrant's numbers in different countries of British Tropical Colonies, their indenture system and assimilation in new countries.

Dr. D. W. D. Commins was sent by the Indian Government to investigate the condition of coolies in British Tropical Colonies. He prepared a list of occupations of Indian coolies and was 'struck by the great difference between the coolie in India and his children born in the Colony. Whatever be the cause, whether change of climate, better food, easy times, more responsible duties...their appearance, manners and intelligence are so much superior to their parents that it is
difficult to believe they belong to the same family'.

Similarly, lots of other international migration studies have been done in other countries using simple tabulations mostly based on census reports and historical documents. Examples such as Agapitidis'37 "Emigration from Greece," Zubrzycki's38 "Greek Immigrants in Australia," and Wen's39 "Japanese Immigration and Economic Growth in Taiwan" can be cited.

Questions such as, Who migrates? Who stays? Do the immigrants come from all over the country or do they originate from a few selected areas? To answer these questions one not only needs data of immigrants at destination but also at their origin.40 The implication of spatial perspective has been recognized by Price,41 who, in his study of Southern Europeans' migration to Australia, remarked, "Over 90 percent of Australia's pre-war settlers came not as a broad scatter from Southern Europe as a whole but in concentrated streams from relatively small and restricted areas of origin, often differing considerably in geography, dialect, religion, social customs, family habits and political traditions. Even with such marked differences between migrants from the various areas of origin in Italy or Spain, the islands of Greece, the Valley of Albania and Yugoslavia, it is clearly misleading to speak in general terms of 'Italians' or 'Greeks' or 'Yugoslavs.' When adequate data is lacking, there is, of course, no alternative,....when
better material becomes available, however, we must grapple with particular villages and districts of origin and particular places of settlement in Australia and re-interpret the migration process in their light.42

Research work on spatial distribution of emigrants at origin was conducted by Price, Jones43 and Zeegers44 but the main thrust of most migration studies has been directed toward an examination of internal movements, as exemplified by the work of such as Happnerberg45 et al, Taeuber46 et al, Myers47 et al, Johnston,48 and Jones49.

The main difference between internal migration and international migration is that in the case of internal migration, migration is elastic and this elasticity is based on economic opportunities and social considerations. Whereas, in the case of international migration, volume of flow depends on demand for particularly trained persons who were needed in development of the countries of immigration and that may not have anything to do with supply conditions in countries of origin.

Several studies have attempted to show an association between life cycle and mobility. It was found that mobility was high among young families and decreased with the age of the head of the household.50

The first major attempt to explain mobility in terms of life-cycle was conducted by Rossi.51 Rossi tried to find
patterns of residential mobility and the factors which entered into the individual decision to move.

Quite a few studies showed an association between migration and vertical mobility. Here some correlations have been found between spatial mobility and societal mobility. Robbs concluded that, 'migrants are superior to non-migrants in those characteristics necessary for socio-economic and occupational success'.

Regression analysis of migration has been conducted by Greenwood in India. In his analysis, most important factors considered were distance, income levels and job opportunities. The same author used regression analysis of labour migration in Egypt. Here he tried to find out 'the determinants of labour migration and the magnitude in which each factor exerts its influence'. Lowry, Nelson, Sahata, and Sjaastad were among the others who used regression in analyzing migration.

Most of the empirical studies in the field of international migration did not have any formal statement of hypothesis and were lacking in depth, particularly in terms of migration differential and the decision-making process at the level of the individual emigrant.

This study may be viewed as an attempt to partially fill this gap in the field of international migration with a view to obtaining a better understanding of emigration from developing countries.
Study Area

The City of Windsor is located (Fig. I) at the southwest corner of what is considered to be the heartland of Canada and a gateway to the heartland of the U.S.A. Windsor C.M.A. is a middle ranking city with 256,655 persons, according to the Census of 1971. This city is not as cosmopolitan as the large metropolitan cities of Canada; nonetheless it is quite diverse in its ethnic composition (Table 2). The English being dominant, it has a substantial number of people of French origin. It also has other minority groups such as Italians, Germans, Polish, Ukrainians. The Canadian census report has not given any breakdown of numbers of immigrants from different Asian countries, which have been put together under 'Asian Group'.

Table 2

ETHNIC COMPOSITION OF POPULATION OF WINDSOR - 1971

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. British Isles</td>
<td>124,340</td>
<td>48.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. French</td>
<td>50,890</td>
<td>20.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. German</td>
<td>13,400</td>
<td>5.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Italian</td>
<td>20,155</td>
<td>7.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Jewish</td>
<td>2,610</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Netherlands</td>
<td>2,880</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Polish</td>
<td>5,880</td>
<td>2.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Scandinavian</td>
<td>1,230</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Ukrainian</td>
<td>6,970</td>
<td>2.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Asian Group</td>
<td>4,095</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Other and Unknown</td>
<td>24,205</td>
<td>9.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>256,655</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The city has also seen a rapid increase in the number of settlers from India and Pakistan since early 1960's, especially because of its location near the U.S.A. border and its University, which was a major magnet for the educated migrants. There were over 200 families from India and Pakistan for which some records were available. Because of this and also because of accessibility and familiarity to the author, the City of Windsor was chosen as the study area.

Methodology

In view of the fact that data regarding the socio-economic characteristics and decision-making of migrants from India and Pakistan are not available from any published official or semi-official (such as ethnic group directories and histories) sources, it would be necessary to collect data from a suitable sample of the population. Therefore, an approximate 25% random sample was arranged for a detailed questionnaire interview to gather the necessary information.

In order to get the current listing of immigrants from India and Pakistan and their addresses, initially listings supplied by the Indian and Pakistan cultural associations were used. Since these listings were incomplete, subsequent additions were made by asking people from those areas about the names and addresses of new immigrants. This updated list was used for random sampling. A total of sixty samples were
picked by using random sample tables from over 230 families. Those picked in the sample were interviewed personally by the author.

The questionnaire was designed to seek information about three main aspects of migration. The first set of questions sought information about the socio-economic characteristics of migrants, relating to the country, province and district of birth, rural/urban status of the birthplace, religion, citizenship at migration, year of migration and arrival in Canada. Questions relating to marital status, age, family size, educational and professional status, income and home ownership were asked to determine migration differentials.

The second group of questions sought information relating to information gathering channels of immigrants as well as previous migration experience. In this section, questions were asked to determine the role of relations and friends in influencing decision to migrate. A direct question sought to ascertain the wife's role in decision-making process. Information was also sought about the status on immigration and whether the immigrants themselves have nominated and sponsored others or intended to do so. The last few questions were intended to find whether there were chains in migration or not.

The third group of questions related to the factors responsible for leaving their countries of origin and selection of Canada for migration. In this section, first of all, the
respondents were asked in an open-ended question to list in order of importance the causes which they thought had induced them to migrate from their own country and also the causes which they (immigrants) thought had induced them to migrate in favour of Canada. Next, a multiple-choice question containing sets of well-known push and pull factors were shown to respondents and they were asked to rank only those factors which were applicable to their individual cases.

Method of Analysis

This study will use simple tabulations for most of the data related to socio-economic and demographic characteristics for gaining an understanding of migration selectivity, migration mechanisms, information levels and chains of migration.

The most intriguing and complex part of the study pertains to causes of migration in terms of the relative role or weight of various push and pull factors as perceived by the migrants themselves. Bogue's ideas about migration stimulating factors would be taken into account. After data were collected, a suitable rank-order technique would be devised to measure the intensity of major push and pull factors.
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CHAPTER II

ANALYSIS

In this chapter an attempt will be made to analyze and interpret the data collected for finding migration selectivity, stages of migration, information flows, chains of migration involved and to establish the relative importance of push and pull factors which had impact on migration decision-making in the case of migrants from India and Pakistan to Canada.

Migration Selectivity

In order to effectively understand the causes of migration, it is necessary to know the characteristics of migrants. It is known that migration is selective. How selective a particular migration stream is, can only be known after an analysis of the socio-economic and demographic characteristics of the migrants. The tendency for certain sections of population to be more migratory than others causes selectivity in migration. This selectivity is also referred to as migration differential. Petersen called this process of self-selection, migratory selection or selective migration.¹ To Petersen, "Whether the decision is made by the migrants themselves is not a crucial distinction in a demographic context. Two centuries ago, a slave trader raiding the African coast would have chosen only young, healthy negroes, or more recently,
various governments have established quotas by which the immigration of certain classes is fostered and that of others impeded or prohibited. Such regulations by an outside force, while quite dissimilar in some respects from a process of self-selection, are also examples of what we termed migratory selection.² The most important migration differentials are age, sex, marital status, family size, level of education, level of employment and type of occupation. Generally, this selection is more dependent upon conditions at the destination than upon the place of origin.³

Of the total sample of sixty individuals, forty-one were citizens of India and nineteen were citizens of Pakistan at the time of migration. Out of the total sample, fifteen were not born in their stated countries of citizenship, forming twenty-five percent of the total sample. They had previous migration experience as a result of the Partition of India in 1947, when huge movements of Hindus from Pakistan to India and Muslims from India to Pakistan were generated. See Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of Birth of Citizens of India Who Migrated to Canada</th>
<th>Country of Birth of Citizens of Pakistan Who Migrated to Canada</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 3
PREVIOUS INTERNATIONAL MIGRATION EXPERIENCE BASED ON COUNTRY OF BIRTH
In addition to previous international migration experience as a result of Indo-Pakistan population transfers, Table 4 shows that people having internal migration experience were more migratory than those who lived all along in one place. This was because people who had already moved from one place to another did not have any inhibitions to move again to further their socio-economic conditions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Always lived at home before migration</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>36.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lived at two places before migration</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lived at three places before migration</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lived at more than three places before migration</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stayed in a foreign country before migration</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the case of immigrants from India and Pakistan it could be noted that 64 percent of the people with previous migration experience in their home country migrated to Canada. Especially in the case of immigrants from Pakistan it was seen that more than half of those people had migrated from India to Pakistan and had previous international migration experience before migrating to Canada.
This proves our hypothesis that 'large numbers of people with previous migration experience migrated to Canada.'

**Age Structure**

Age of migrants is the most important universally accepted migration differential. In the case of both internal and international migration, it has been observed that the number of young adults and late adolescents predominate. One important reason for the predominance of young people was their great adaptability to new conditions, as well as their higher level of expectations from life. Also since these young people had recently entered the labour force, they were more amenable to change in jobs. But there are instances where migration streams were predominantly composed of older people, especially those who had retired, as in the case of migration to Florida. Where advancement in economic or social terms was the main motive, it was the young who tended to migrate. Empirical research in the U.S.A. suggests that 60-80 percent of immigrants to that country were aged between 15 and 40 years.

From Table 5 it is evident that the age of migrants from India and Pakistan to Canada was predominantly between the ages of 21 and 30 years.
TABLE 5
AGE GROUPS OF MIGRANTS
AT MIGRATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Groups</th>
<th>Numbers</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At migration, the age of 83.3 percent of immigrants from India and Pakistan was less than 30 years and if the next age group (31-35 years) was included, the percentage changed to 93.3 percent (Fig. 3). The reasons for this might be that younger people were more adventurous and were more easily assimilated in alien culture. Also, migration laws are extremely selective by giving more points to young people because they are more productive and can be in the labour force for a longer period of time in the receiving country, that is Canada.

Since the age of more than eighty percent of immigrants was below thirty, it proves our hypothesis that a majority of migrants is comprised of young adults at migration.
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Sex and Marital Structure

One of Ravenstein's laws was that, "females are more migratory than males," but he noted that this was true in cases of short distance migration. This might be true in the case of rural to urban migration in the developed countries. But where long distances were involved or where high levels of uncertainty existed, as in a frontier town in the American West a hundred years ago, the predominant characteristic was high male domination in sex ratio. In this respect, examples of Italian and Polish migration to the United States of America could be cited. Until a sizable community of these people was built up, the number of male immigrants outnumbered significantly the female immigrants. The Census of Canada reported 61,669 males to 50,956 females among the Italians and 7,210 males to 4,482 females among Greeks, in 1941.

In the case of immigration from India and Pakistan to Canada, most of the migrants came either when they were single or came without family if married (Fig. 4). They first settled down in this country and then brought their families and, in cases where the individuals were bachelors, they went back to their countries of origin, got married and brought their wives back to settle in Canada. Of the sixty heads of the families interviewed, twenty-six were married, thirty-three were bachelors and one widower. The following tables (Table 6 and Table 7) give their number and percentages. This proves our hypothesis that 'most of the migrants were male, unmarried and migrated alone'.
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TABLE 6
MARITAL STATUS OF IMMIGRANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>43.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>55.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widower</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 gives the breakdown of number of immigrants who came to Canada with or without family.

TABLE 7
NUMBER OF MARRIED MIGRANTS WHO CAME TO CANADA WITH OR WITHOUT FAMILY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Migrated with family</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>63.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrated without family</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>34.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number with families</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Educational Composition

Migratory selection process also depends upon educational attainments. It has been observed that people who were highly trained were more migratory. People having specialized education or training migrated more than people with low or ordinary education. If this was generally true in the case of internal migration, it was particularly true in the case of more
recent international migrations especially from the developing countries. In the case of migrants from India and Pakistan to Windsor, Canada, a very high proportion consisted of highly educated persons for the following reasons: highly educated people were more aware of opportunities available in Canada; highly educated people, especially with foreign degrees, find it harder to adjust to conditions of living and work in their home countries where facilities for work and further advancement and research in line with their advanced training abroad in the developed countries are not satisfactory or adequate. It has been suggested that the developing countries have a large surplus of such highly qualified personnel who cannot be fruitfully absorbed in their systems, thus giving rise to a 'Brain Drain'. Immigration authorities also allow people having high educational qualification to migrate. Table 8 gives a breakdown of migrants according to years spent on education (also see Fig. 5.)

To investigate the hypothesis that immigrants (from India and Pakistan) at migration had a higher educational status as compared with the of residents of Ontario, Table 8 shows the educational attainments of the labour force of Ontario and that of immigrants. Although the two data are not exactly comparable because the number of years required in high school vary in Canada and South Asia, yet it gives a
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comparative idea as to the proportions of labour force of
the two groups in different levels of education.

**TABLE 8**

**NUMBERS AND PERCENTAGES OF IMMIGRANTS
AND RESIDENTS OF ONTARIO ACCORDING
TO YEARS SPENT ON EDUCATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Levels*</th>
<th>% of Labor Force (Ontario 1971)</th>
<th>% of Immigrants 1975</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 9th grade</td>
<td>27.19</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 9-11</td>
<td>32.35</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 12-13</td>
<td>24.55</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some University education</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>36.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University degree</td>
<td>8.26</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Levels of education made as per Statistics Canada.

From the table, it is evident that twenty-five percent of migrants had university degrees compared to 8.26 for the labour force of Ontario. When comparison was made of the next lower category the difference was quite glaring; 36.6 percent of migrants had 'some university' education compared to only 7.62 percent for the labour force of Ontario. Twenty-seven percent of Ontario labour force had less than ninth grade education compared to only 1.6 percent for the immigrants.

It may be noted that out of sixty samples collected, six had Ph.D., eight had Masters, and nine had engineering degrees.
From Table 8 we can prove the hypothesis that immigrants (from India and Pakistan) at migration had higher educational qualifications when compared with the residents of Ontario.

**Occupational Composition**

It has been generally noted that people belonging to certain occupational groups were more migratory than others. Skilled and semi-skilled workers were more migratory than unskilled labourers. Professional people tended to migrate more than officials, proprietors and managers. Certain empirical findings tend to minimize the importance of occupation in migration selectivity. For example, four-fifths of the immigrants who came to the United States from Europe prior to World War II did not have any previous experience of working in industries or mines, yet most of them got jobs in those sectors. This emphasizes the fact that economic conditions are more important than selection of jobs by occupation. Empirical studies have found that if the general economic conditions in the home country were bad, these generated a desire on the part of prospective migrants to leave the country. But the volume, direction and timing depended not upon the condition at home but upon the business cycle and economic conditions in the receiving country. These studies further note that, 'pull factors which are defined as pull of opportunities overseas determine the volume of migration.'
While this author does not subscribe to an absolute economic determinism in migration yet it is certainly one of the most important factors. Table 9 gives the breakdown of migrants by occupation.

**TABLE 9**

**BREAKDOWN OF IMMIGRANTS BY OCCUPATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officials, Managers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled Workers</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>46.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled Workers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Income**

Income is an important indication of economic well-being. By comparing income groups of immigrants and Canadian residents, we can judge how well the immigrants are doing economically.

To investigate the hypothesis that, migrants are financially better off as compared to Canadian families, a table (Table 10) showing percentage distribution of Canadian families and immigrants by income groups was constructed.*

*It should be noted that, Canadian families may have both husband and wife working, while in most Indian and Pakistani families, only men may be working. This may itself cause significant differences in family income between Canadian and immigrant families.
TABLE 10

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF CANADIAN AND IMMIGRANTS
FAMILIES BY INCOME GROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Groups</th>
<th>Percentage of Canadian Families*</th>
<th>Percentage of Immigrant Families</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under $6,000</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>3.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$6,001 - 12,000</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>48.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$12,001 - 18,000</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$18,001 - 24,000</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$24,000 and above</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The latest data available for income groups of Canadian families were for 1973.** Since the data for immigrants were for 1975, the two sets of data are not strictly comparable. However, to circumvent this difficulty and to account for inflation factor, twenty percent increase was made on the income of citizens of Canada over 1973.*** This increase was based on the percentage increase in minimum wage from 1973-1975.


***In December, 1973, the minimum hourly wage was $2.00 and in January, 1975, the minimum hourly wage was $2.40. Regulation made under the Employment Standards Act, The Ontario Gazette, p. 5031.
From Table 10 and Fig. 6 it is clear that the proportion of immigrant families in higher income groups (above $18,000) was lower than that of Canadian families. On the other hand, forty-eight percent of immigrants had an annual family income ranging from $6,000 to $12,000, almost twice the proportion of Canadian families in this group. In the middle income group ($12,001–$18,000), the proportion of immigrant families was again higher than that of the Canadian families.

The lower proportion of immigrant families in the higher bracket ($18,000 and over) could be attributed to the fact that immigrants from India and Pakistan had come to Canada mostly after 1965 and particularly around 1970. As such, they were new in their jobs and usually started at the initial salary levels for those jobs. Also because they were new in Canada they had not attained higher administrative or technical positions.

In this case, we may be on safe ground to reject our hypothesis that 'migrants, as family units, are financially better off when compared with residents of Canada'.

Mechanics of Migration

Studies of migration behaviour and decision-making become more meaningful if we examine the previous migration experience, stages and chains involved, information sources and satisfaction levels with those information flows, since
FIGURE 6

DISTRIBUTION OF CANADIAN AND IMMIGRANT FAMILY BY INCOME GROUPS

CANADIAN. IMMIGRANTS

PERCENT

50

40

30

20

10

0

LESS THAN 6000

6000 TO

12000

12000 TO

18000

18000 TO

24000

24000 AND ABOVE

INCOME GROUP

SOURCE: TABLE NO.10
all these are closely related to decision-making process. Broadly, migration can be divided into two parts — direct migration and stepwise migration. Direct migration denotes a process where the migrant proceeds directly from the area of origin to destination without having established any intervening residence. Step migration occurs where the migrant in proceeding from an origin to a destination experiences intermediate residences. In the case of chain migration, migration is analyzed on the basis of relationship between earlier migrants and later migrants.12

Twenty-three migrants forming 38 percent of the total lived outside their countries of origin and then decided to migrate to Canada (See Table 11.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countries</th>
<th>Numbers</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S.A.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.K.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>43.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Germany</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Those places of intermediate residences could be considered stages in migration. It has been observed, especially in the case of migration from India and Pakistan to Canada, that it would be a lot easier to obtain immigration and offer of employment in Canada if the intending migrant had already been in U.K., U.S.A. or West Germany for a few years, either holding a job or as a student.

**Previous Migration Experience**

It has been generally observed that those who had already some migration experience in their home countries were more prone to migrate than those who resided all along at their places of birth. This was because once the initial inhibitions of migration were gone, the individual's concept of place utility broadened. Once this happened, and if the individual did not feel satisfied with his initial destination, he sought another destination. He moved from place to place until he had tried all the feasible destinations or until he became satisfied with a destination. In our sample of migrants, a significant number (63%) stayed away from home either for education or for service for significant periods of time. See Table 4, page 40.
Information Flows and Chain Migration

Information flows are of paramount importance in migration. But because of difficulty in measurement this aspect has not received its due importance in empirical studies. It is also difficult to measure levels of satisfaction about information received by an immigrant.

There are different views as to the flows and directions of information channels. Hagerstrand stated that information in its general term moved in a hierarchical order. That is, information first spread among higher order urban centres, then it gradually filtered down to lower order centres. Olsson's study in Sweden found some empirical evidence in flows of information in an hierarchical order. Ravenstein noted a stepwise movement of persons progressively to large centres through a replacement process. This he thought was due to distance decay in information. His process indicated that people only moved when they became aware of better job opportunities elsewhere. On the whole, it could be said that human migration flows were intricately related with information flows.

There were several sources from which prospective immigrants received information about different aspects of a country and the levels of satisfaction as to information received could vary with the source of information. In the
present study, no attempt has been made to link source and satisfaction levels as to information received. Simple tabulation has been made in Table 12 as to source or sources of information and their percentages have been calculated.

**TABLE 12**

**SOURCES OF INFORMATION PRIOR TO IMMIGRATION TO CANADA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relations</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News Media</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Immigration/High Commission</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relations and Friends</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Relations and News Media</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends and News Media</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Came as Tourist and Remained</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous Visits</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professors</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without Information</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table, it is apparent that the importance of immigration services was negligible in the case of migrants from India and Pakistan to Canada, which may be related to inadequate consulate services and to reluctance of prospective immigrants to use these official sources. The most outstanding contribution was made by relatives and friends and news media separately and collectively. This proves the hypothesis that the influence of friends and relatives was an important factor in the choice of Canada by immigrants from India and Pakistan.
Since prior information received about different socio-economic aspects of a country plays an important role in migration decision-making, the following questions were asked in the course of field survey for the present study to ascertain levels of satisfaction with the information which the migrants received prior to immigration to Canada in the light of their experience in Canada:

'Judging from your and your family's experiences in Canada, do you think that the information about Canada made available to you prior to migration was, extremely good/reasonably good/inadequate?'

Although three alternative answers were given to the respondents, even then, because of the difficulty in both qualifying and quantifying levels of information, the respondents were found to be quite hesitant to choose one of the three answers given to them. Table 13 shows the respondents' individual reactions.

**TABLE 13**

**LEVELS OF SATISFACTION AS TO INFORMATION RECEIVED PRIOR TO MIGRATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels of Information</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Good</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonably Good</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>46.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could Not Guess</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From Fig. 7 we can prove our hypothesis that 'majority of the migrants had adequate information about Canada before migration'.

Chain migration to a great extent depended upon the information supplied by friends and relatives. Chain migration has been defined by the relationship between earlier and later groups of migrants. Subsequent flows of migration are quite dependent upon the type of encouraging news about different aspects of life in a new country, which prospective migrants receive from earlier migrants. Apart from information chain migration makes it easier for the new immigrant to find a job and a place to live and also gives a sense of social security.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Numbers</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>78.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsored</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominated</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A majority of the respondents in the sample came in the initial wave and as such 78.3 percent had independent status at migration (Fig. 8). However, when we look at sources of information, it becomes clear that friends who had already migrated were an important factor in the decision-making even though
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they could not sponsor or nominate the new migrants.

The migrant chain from India and Pakistan becomes clear when analyzing migrants' desire to sponsor relatives and friends. Overwhelming (77%) percentage of immigrants expressed their desire to sponsor relatives and friends in this country. This desire to bring friends and relations was motivated first of all by the need to create a community of immigrants' own ethnic background and secondly to have friends and relations near them. The tendency on the part of the immigrants to bring people from their own countries of origin had been detected by researchers while studying migration behaviour of different ethnic groups in U.S.A. and Canada.

**Determination of Push and Pull Factors**

One of the most important aspects of this study was to find out the important factors (both push and pull) which influenced individual decision-making process in migration.

To assess the relative importance of migration stimulating factors, the respondents were asked to give in rank order the reason or reasons for leaving their original country of residence, as well as the reasons for deciding to migrate to Canada. The maximum number of reasons cited were eight. For analysis, only the first five factors cited were given consideration, mainly for two reasons: a) it was considered difficult for the respondents to rank correctly beyond five factors,
and b) out of sixty samples, only four cited more than five factors in their decision-making process.

In an analysis of responses, it was found that some respondents cited only one factor, say x, while others cited and ranked more than one factor in addition to factor x.

Under such circumstances it would be unreasonable to give the same weight to factor x in the first case, where it was the only factor cited and in the second case where it was ranked first among other factors. In the second case, obviously, the importance of x was much less than in the first case, although in both cases they were ranked first. Since the objective of this study was to calculate the overall intensity of each factor ranked differently by each of the sixty respondents, a technique of rank-order weighing for these factors was devised. If a respondent ranked all five factors a reversed order weight to these five factors was assigned giving a total of 15 points.

In all cases, where less than five factors were ranked, a proportionally higher value was assigned to the ranked factors, which was derived by dividing 15 by the sum of reversed order ranks multiplied by the rank order number of a factor. When each factor's rank-order weight was obtained for each respondent, these values were added up to get the aggregate weight of each factor in the total sample.
If five factors were cited, the points were calculated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of answers with ranks</th>
<th>Reverse order weights for assigning points</th>
<th>( \bar{x} )</th>
<th>Points according to ranks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( \bar{x} = 15 \) (Full number of points)
Sum of reverse order points = \( \frac{15}{15} = 1 \)
Points per rank = \( \bar{x} \times \bar{x} \) reverse order points.

Where four factors were cited points per rank were calculated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of answers with ranks</th>
<th>Reverse order weights for assigning points</th>
<th>( \bar{x} )</th>
<th>Points according to ranks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>5.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>4.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>2.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( \bar{x} = 15 \) (Full number of points)
Sum of reverse order points = \( \frac{15}{14} = 1.07 \)
Points per rank = \( \bar{x} \times \bar{x} \) reverse order points.

Where three factors were cited, points per rank were calculated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of answers with ranks</th>
<th>Reverse order weights for assigning points</th>
<th>( \bar{x} )</th>
<th>Points according to ranks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( \bar{x} = 15 \) (Full number of points)
Sum of reverse order points = \( \frac{15}{12} = 1.25 \)
Points per rank = \( \bar{x} \times \bar{x} \) reverse order points.
Where two factors were cited, points were calculated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of answers with ranks</th>
<th>Reverse order weights for assigning points</th>
<th>Points according to ranks</th>
<th>( \bar{X} \</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>8.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>6.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( \bar{X} = 15 \) (Full number of points)
Sum of reverse order points = 15/9 = 1.67
Points per rank = \( \bar{X} \) \( \bar{X} \) reverse order points.

Where only one factor was cited, points were calculated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of answers with ranks</th>
<th>Reverse order weights for assigning points</th>
<th>Points according to ranks</th>
<th>( \bar{X} \</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( \bar{X} = 15 \) (Full number of points)
Sum of reverse order points = 15/5 = 3
Points per rank = \( \bar{X} \) \( \bar{X} \) reverse order points.

Finally, considering the sum of ranks of all factors (push or pull) to be one hundred percent, percentage-wise influence of factors in the total migration process were calculated. The foregoing statistical procedures were performed to convert ordinal data into more quantifiable form. Tables 15 and 16 give the sum of ranks, percentage influence and order of ranks of both push and pull factors.
### Table 15

**SUM OF RANKS, PERCENTAGE INFLUENCE AND RANK ORDER OF PUSH FACTORS (CONSIDERING OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Sum of Ranks</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Rank Order of Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Was unemployed in the Country of origin</td>
<td>8.35</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Low salary or emolument</td>
<td>175.45</td>
<td>22.15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Poor prospects of advancement in job</td>
<td>161.65</td>
<td>20.41</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Poor work environment such as absence of incentives, recognition of merit, poor personal relationship between subordinates and bosses, absence of research facilities</td>
<td>111.00</td>
<td>14.02</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Deteriorating economy of the country and growing shortages</td>
<td>108.85</td>
<td>13.75</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Deteriorating political conditions</td>
<td>64.15</td>
<td>8.09</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Feeling of being cramped by the high density of population and high growth rate</td>
<td>8.35</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Personal maladjustment in the family, spouse, parents and other relations and community</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Absence of proper training facilities</td>
<td>150.50</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

792.05 = 100.00
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Sum of Ranks</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Rank Order of Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Offer of a job</td>
<td>112.31</td>
<td>13.24</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Improved salary</td>
<td>237.88</td>
<td>28.04</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Better promotion prospects</td>
<td>141.28</td>
<td>16.65</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Many close friends and relations in Canada</td>
<td>125.22</td>
<td>14.76</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Social benefits in Canada</td>
<td>14.56</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Knowledge about Canada by previous visit or visits</td>
<td>12.52</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Absence of civil disorder</td>
<td>45.40</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Low population density in Canada</td>
<td>37.69</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Better education for children</td>
<td>75.73</td>
<td>8.85</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>855.57</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To check the answers of the respondents in open-ended questions, a set of close-ended questions were asked, after a few other intervening questions. Answers from these close-ended questions were tabulated in the same fashion as they were done with open-ended questions. Results of these tabulations are given in Tables 17 and 18.

**TABLE 17**

SUM OF RANKS, PERCENTAGE INFLUENCE OF FACTORS AND RANK ORDER OF FULL FACTORS (CONSIDERING OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Sum of Ranks</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Rank Order of Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Offer of a job</td>
<td>76.70</td>
<td>8.50</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Improved salary</td>
<td>238.21</td>
<td>26.41</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Better promotion prospects</td>
<td>203.63</td>
<td>22.58</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Many close friends and relatives in Canada</td>
<td>112.99</td>
<td>12.53</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Better education and future for children</td>
<td>26.75</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Relative absence of civil disorders and social problems in Canada</td>
<td>42.85</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Low population density</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Better educational facilities</td>
<td>86.8</td>
<td>9.62</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Adventure</td>
<td>81.65</td>
<td>9.05</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>901.68</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor</td>
<td>Sum of Ranks</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Rank Order of Factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Was unemployed</td>
<td>26.60</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Low salary or emolument</td>
<td>155.39</td>
<td>19.91</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Poor prospects of advancement in job</td>
<td>212.48</td>
<td>27.23</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Poor work environment such as absence of incentives, recognition of merit, poor personal relationship between subordinates and bosses, absence of research facilities</td>
<td>122.01</td>
<td>15.63</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Deteriorating economy of the country and growing shortages</td>
<td>99.49</td>
<td>12.75</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Deteriorating political conditions</td>
<td>32.95</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Feeling of being cramped by the high density of population and high growth rate</td>
<td>39.69</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Personal maladjustment in the family, spouse, parents and other relations and community</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Absence of proper training facilities</td>
<td>86.68</td>
<td>11.10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>780.29</strong></td>
<td><strong>= 100.00</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Both the tables (open-ended and close-ended) concerning push factors indicate that 'poor salary' and 'poor prospect of advancement in job' are the two most important push factors, followed by such factors as 'absence of proper training facilities,' 'deteriorating economy of the country,' and 'poor work environment.' It seems that economic reasons were the important push factors in decision-making process, whereas influence of such factors as 'deteriorating political conditions,' 'personal maladjustment' and 'high density of population' ranked low in influencing migration decision. See Fig. 9.

A Wilcoxon test for paired samples was conducted to compare the ranks obtained from the two tables showing push factors. The results of the test show that there is no significant difference between the two sets of ranks. (Refer to the test in Appendix C.)

It was found that the responses in open-ended questions varied from those of close-ended questions regarding pull factors. Questions concerning social security in Canada, knowledge about Canada from previous visits, were included in the close-ended questions and they ranked ninth and tenth respectively. Percentage-wise, their total influence amounted to about three percent. In the open-ended questions, none of the respondents mentioned these two factors. On the other hand,
RELATIVE WEIGHT OF PUSH FACTORS
CONSIDERING CLOSE ENDED QUESTIONS

SOURCE: TABLE NO. 18
SEE TABLE NO. 18 FOR FACTOR NAMES
in the case of open-ended questions, a new factor 'Adventure' was mentioned by quite a few respondents as having influenced their migration-decision-making process.

Since the two sets did not have the same factors, it was not possible to run the Wilcoxon test.

Nonetheless, from the tables concerning pull factors it could be seen that improved salary and better promotion prospects were found to be the most important factor. These factors were followed in their ranks by such factors as the 'influence of friends and relations' and 'better educational facilities.' Desire to have adventure ranked 5th, having accounted for nine percent influence among pull factors. See Fig. 10.

People aspire for economic reward for their qualifications and better standard of living. Two factors, 'high salary' and 'better promotion prospects,' accounted for almost fifty percent influence on pull factors. This proved the hypothesis that, 'Canada draws immigrants from India and Pakistan as it offers a better standard of living.'

The last hypothesis in this study was that, 'pull factors played a stronger role in migration decision than push factors.' This was apparent from the fact that eleven persons mentioned no push factors as against two migrants who mentioned no pull factors. Thus the hypothesis gained more strength when
FIGURE 10

RELATIVE WEIGHT OF PULL FACTORS
CONSIDERING CLOSE ENDED QUESTIONS

SOURCE: TABLE NO.16
SEE TABLE NO.16 FOR FACTOR NAMES
analysis was made of points of both pull and push factors.

TABLE 19

SUM OF POINTS (RANK POINTS) OF BOTH
PUSH AND PULL FACTORS CONSIDERING
OPEN AND CLOSE ENDED QUESTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Open-Ended Questions</th>
<th>Close-Ended Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Push Factors</td>
<td>785.0</td>
<td>780.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pull Factors</td>
<td>855.0</td>
<td>900.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table it becomes clear that pull factors had more points than push factors.

From this it could be further concluded that migrants from India and Pakistan to Windsor, Canada, were positively selective of population from where they originated.

According to D.S. Thomas, migration is positively selected when it was the pull of opportunities overseas that determined the migration rate more than that of push factors at origin. Thomas, D.S., Social Aspects of Business Cycle, New York, Dutton, 1925.
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CHAPTER III

Conclusion from Analysis

In the present study an attempt has been made to examine the characteristics of migrants and analyze several aspects of the migration process relating to decision-making that worked for the migrants from India and Pakistan to Canada. To this end, first of all analysis of socio-economic and demographic characteristics of the migrants has been done. The results of the analysis showed that most of the migrants were male and at migration were bachelors. In the case of married migrants, the migrants migrated alone and later brought their families to join them in Canada.

The age of eighty-three percent of the migrants at the time of migration was less than thirty years and when migrants between the age group 31-35 years were included, the percentage figure went up to ninety-three percent. This shows that most of the migrants were young adults and after immigration directly joined the labour force and would be contributing to the Gross National Product of Canada for several years to come.

Migrants from India and Pakistan were highly educated. Twenty-five percent of them had university degrees and thirty-six point six percent had some university education. High educational achievements of migrants could be attributed to two important factors. First of all, the Canadian immigration
authority allocated more points to educated persons in granting immigration visas. Secondly, highly educated persons were more aware of conditions and job opportunities available in Canada. Also, levels of aspiration to better socio-economic conditions were high among educated people.

A significant proportion of immigrants had internal as well as international migration experience before they migrated in favour of Canada. Most of the sample in the present study belonged to the first generation of immigrants and as such most of them (about seventy-eight percent) had independent immigration status at migration. That is why chain migration from these two countries was as yet not clearly established. Nevertheless, the predominance of family ties in India and Pakistan can be observed when the majority of the migrants expressed their desire to sponsor close relations for migration to Canada.

Not all the immigrants from India and Pakistan came directly to Canada. Actually, more than one-third of the sample studied stayed in other foreign countries prior to migration to Canada. Exactly, thirty-percent of the sample tried for immigration to other countries failing which they decided to migrate to Canada. This indicates that approximately thirty percent of the immigrants were disenchanted with socio-economic conditions back home and were interested in migrating to any developed country.
A majority of the migrants was found to be satisfied with the information made available to them prior to migra-
tion. About thirty percent of the immigrants thought that the information they received was extremely good, whereas only thirteen percent of the immigrants expressed some dissatisfaction.

Although analysis shows that migrants from India and Pakistan were highly qualified even when compared to the resi-
dents of Ontario, it was observed that they did not belong to the two highest income brackets. This might be due to the fact that they recently joined the Canadian labour force and as such had not yet attained high technical or administrative positions which carry higher remunerations.

In reference to push factors operating in the decision-
making process, it was observed that, poor salary and poor prospect of advancement in the job were the two most important push factors. These two factors were followed closely by such factors as, absence of proper training facilities, deteriorating economy of the country and poor work environment. Factors such as deteriorating political condition, personal maladjustment and high density of population ranked low in influencing migration decision.

In the analysis of pull factors, it was found that high salary coupled with better promotion prospects exerted signifi-
cant influence on migrants' decision to migrate in favour of Canada. It is interesting to note that desire to have adventure in a new land ranked significantly high among the pull factors.

The main observation underlying the study of push and pull factors was that migrants from India and Pakistan were positively selective of the population from which they originated and that desire to improve economic conditions was the most important cause for migration.

Further Direction for Research

The present study is a modest attempt to illustrate an approach to the study of socio-economic and demographic characteristics and the decision-making process of migrants from India and Pakistan to Canada. In this study, an attempt has also been made to evaluate the channels and levels of information the immigrants received prior to migration, and to systematically assess the influence of several push and pull factors in migration decision-making process.

To gain a more complete understanding of the whole migration process it would be worthwhile to examine more thoroughly the spatial distribution of migrants in their home countries, to analyze and bring forth differences in socio-economic, demographic and psychological aspects between movers (migrants) and non-movers (non-migrants), as well as in relation
to movers from different source areas in India and Pakistan. Another useful direction of investigation would be to make comparative studies of all these aspects of migration behaviour of people from South Asia in different areas of Canada and also in other parts of the developing countries.

Furthermore, it would be of prime importance to investigate the locational aspects of immigrants in countries of immigration. This could lead to useful analysis of concentration and dispersion of immigrants. Another research direction would be to make a comparative study of migration patterns of several ethnic groups.

Lastly, a thorough investigation would be extremely important to analyze the levels of satisfaction of immigrants in relation to job conditions, housing, relationship with neighbours, educational facilities for children and other socio-economic aspects of the process of assimilation. Problems which impede assimilation of immigrants in Canadian culture should be investigated, so that problems faced by immigrants can be sorted out and solved. For after all, man's ability is greatly dependent upon the level of his satisfaction with the society in which he lives.
APPENDIX A

IMMIGRATION TO CANADA BY REGIONS OF LAST PERMANENT RESIDENCE
SELECTED YEARS 1946-1973

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>363,673</td>
<td>1,103,539</td>
<td>375,640</td>
<td>568,440</td>
<td>459,881</td>
<td>2,871,172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>84.49</td>
<td>89.07</td>
<td>77.90</td>
<td>73.81</td>
<td>49.91</td>
<td>74.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>7,265</td>
<td>6,290</td>
<td>17,770</td>
<td>30,820</td>
<td>63,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>1,711</td>
<td>9,354</td>
<td>6,485</td>
<td>13,677</td>
<td>16,787</td>
<td>48,014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North &amp; Central America</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>46,773</td>
<td>76,277</td>
<td>64,476</td>
<td>97,862</td>
<td>216,840</td>
<td>502,228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>10.86</td>
<td>6.15</td>
<td>13.37</td>
<td>12.70</td>
<td>23.53</td>
<td>13.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South America</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>1,647</td>
<td>10,182</td>
<td>8,145</td>
<td>12,201</td>
<td>32,827</td>
<td>65,002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>5,306</td>
<td>28,465</td>
<td>18,892</td>
<td>55,751</td>
<td>154,864</td>
<td>263,278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>7.23</td>
<td>16.80</td>
<td>6.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>9,320</td>
<td>1,652</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>4,747</td>
<td>17,276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>430,389</td>
<td>1,238,951</td>
<td>482,165</td>
<td>770,134</td>
<td>921,324</td>
<td>3,842,963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDIX B

Migration Survey of South Asians in Windsor
(to be filled up by the head of the household)

1. Country of Birth     Province     District

2. Rural/Urban     Place     Religion and Caste

3. Citizenship     At migration

4. Year of Migration     Year of Arrival in Canada

5. Marital Status at the time of Migration:
   A. Married: year ....  B. Single  C. Widower  D. Divorced

6. Present Marital Status, if not the same:

7. If you had a family at migration, list members:
   Relation     Age     Accompanied/followed
   1)  
   2)  
   3)  
   4)  
   5)  
   6)  

8. Migrated alone / with family.

9. Age at Migration     Present Age

10. Educational status at migration: School/college/university
    Name of last Diploma/degree     Years spent in securing

11. Professional Status before Migration: list below
    Year from-to     Type of Job     Employer     Salary (approx)
12. Did you own a house or landed property in your native country:
   No/Yes - if yes owned entirely or jointly.

13. Approximate valuation (of your share, if jointly owned)

14. Your annual income before migration:

   Sources                        Amount
   a) Employment
   b) Other sources

15. After coming to Canada, list your occupation from the present to the earliest:

1)  
2)  
3)  
4)  

16. How long did it take you to find a job on arrival in Canada? ................. (months and years)

17. What problems did you face in getting a job? Mention:

18. Did you undertake any educational or vocational training after coming to Canada? No/yes, if yes specify with years spent. .................................

19. Do you rent a house/own a house/apartment.

20. Are you extremely satisfied/satisfied/not satisfied with your living arrangements?

   Why?
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21. In your native country, if you resided away from your native place, complete the following in order of sequence:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Place</th>
<th>Duration of stay with months and years</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Distance from your native place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. Before coming to Canada, if you considered any other countries for migration, list them in order of preference:

1)                                        
2)                                        
3)                                        
4)                                        

23. Were you the sole decision-maker in your migration?
   Yes/no
   If no, list others who influenced your decision to migrate:
   Relationship
   1)                                        
   2)                                        
   3)                                        
   4)                                        

24. What role did your wife play in your decision to migrate:
   Positive/Negative/Neutral
APPENDIX B (Cont'd)

25. If you moved to any other countries prior to coming to Canada, list them below in order of successive moves:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the country</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Duration of Stay</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>
</tbody>
</table>

26. From what source or sources did you obtain information about Canada:

1) Relations        2) Friends
3) News media       4) Professors
5) Canadian Immigration or High Commission
6) Others (specify) ...........................................

27. Judging from your and your family's experiences in Canada, do you think that the information about Canada made available to you prior to migration was:

   Extremely good/ Reasonably good/ Inadequate

28. If no, was it inadequate regarding a) employment requirements b) employment opportunities c) racial attitude d) social life e) cost of living f) climate g) all of these g) none of these

29. Your status on immigration:

   a) Independent b) Sponsored c) Nominated

30. If not independent, who sponsored or nominated you?

   Specify relationship .................................

31. Have you sponsored or intend to sponsor anyone to Canada? No/Yes
32. If yes, mention below relationship:

Relationship
1) 
2) 
3) 
4) 
5) 
6) 

33. Specify in order of importance the causes that induced you to migrate from your country:

1) 
2) 
3) 
4) 
5) 
6) 
7) 
8) 
9) 
10) 

34. What were the special attractions that induced you in favour of Canada. List in order of preference from what you knew about Canada before migration:

1) 
2) 
3) 
4) 
5) 
6) 
7) 
8) 
9)
35. If you lived in other places in Canada before coming to Windsor, list these below in order of succession:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Place</th>
<th>Duration from-to</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

36. List any special reason that induced you to move from one place to another:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From - to</th>
<th>Year of move</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

37. If you lived in Canada before coming to Windsor, what induced you to come to Windsor?

38. Is there any immediate and special pressing reason or reasons which triggered your decision to leave your country? Please specify ..........................................................

39. What did you know about Windsor as a possible place of settling before coming to Windsor? Specify below:
APPENDIX B (Cont'd)

40. How did you know about Windsor?
   a) Personal visit/visits,
   b) Friends living in Windsor,
   c) Department of Manpower,
   d) News media,
   e) Some other contacts, (specify) .........................

41. Now I am showing you two lists of causes which might induce migration. Please rank only those causes which you think have strongly induced you to migrate. Causes which induce persons to migrate leaving their own country:

   Rank

   ..... Was unemployed for months years after graduation.
   ..... Low salary or emoluments in the job considering my qualifications and experience.
   ..... Poor prospects of advancement in my job.
   ..... Poor work environment such as absence of incentives or recognition of merit/poor personal relationship between subordinates and bosses/absence of research facilities.
   ..... Deteriorating economy of the country and growing shortages.
   ..... Deteriorating political conditions. Indicate if it affected you personally, .........................
   
   feeling of being cramped by the high density of population and high growth of population.
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Rank

..... Some disasters (floods, droughts, cyclones, man
made disasters) affecting my personal life style
and well being. Specify ..........................

..... Personal maladjustment in the family, spouse, parents,
other relations or community.

..... Absence of proper training facilities in my pro-
fessional line. If so, specify ..................

42. Pull factors, factors which have induced you to migrate
in favour of Canada:

..... Offer of a job.

..... Improved emoluments commensurate with my qualifica-
tions.

..... Better promotion prospects.

..... Many close friends and relations already settled
in Canada.

..... Attractive social security benefits.

..... Better educational facilities for the children.

..... Familiarity with and knowledge about Canada through
a previous visit.

..... Better future for the children.

..... Canadian spouse.

..... Relative absence of civil disorders and social problems
in Canada, compared to some other countries from what
I knew about at that time.

..... Low population density in Canada and plenty of open
space from what I have heard about Canada.
43. Are you contemplating to move out of Windsor?
   Why may you move from Windsor:
   a) job, b) living conditions, c) social life,
   d) any other reasons, specify..............................
   What role does your wife have in your future migration
decision?
APPENDIX C - The Wilcoxon Test for Paired Samples to Compare Data of Push Factors Considering Open-Ended and Close-Ended Questions

The Ranks of push factors of considering open-ended and close-ended questions: (A - Open-Ended, B - Close-Ended)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>A-B</th>
<th>Ranks of A-B</th>
<th>Assigned Ranks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Dropped from sample because A=B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ R_1 = 18 \quad R_2 = 18 \]

1. Null hypotheses (H_0): the ranked values of factors of close-ended questions are significantly different from rank values of factors of open-ended questions.

2. Alternative hypothesis (H_1): the ranked values of factors of close-ended questions are not significantly different from rank values of factors of open-ended questions.

3. Rejection Level (\( \alpha \)): 0.05.

4. Find A-B, the numerical difference between matched pairs, irrespective of whether A is more or B is more. If the difference between any pair is zero it is dropped from sample.

5. Both the values of A and B were ranked.

6. Sums of Column R_1 and Column R_2 was done.
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If $H_0$ is correct, the difference between A and B would be high. Less the value of T (smaller of the values or $R_1$ or $R_2$), the more likely $H_0$ is rejected. In our case the T observe is 18 and T critical is 4. We reject $H_0$ and accept $H_1$, i.e. the ranked values factor of close-ended questions are not significantly different from rank values of factors of open-ended questions.
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