UP-ALONG: NEWFOUNDLAND FAMILIES IN HAMILTON

...Where I happen to be is my "abode";
where I intend to stay is my "residence";
where I come from and whither I want to return is my "home."

Alfred Schutz,
"The Homecomer"
Collected PapersII: Studies in Social Theory
The Hague, Martinus Nijhoff, 1964, p. 107.

UP-ALONG: NEWFOUNDLAND FAMILIES IN HAMILTON

By

ANNE ELIZABETH MARTIN, B.A.

A Thesis

Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies

in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements

for the Degree

Master of Arts

McMaster University

April, 1974

MASTER OF ARTS (1974) McMASTER UNIVERSITY

(Sociology and Anthropology) Hamilton, Ontario

TITLE: Up-along: Newfoundland Families in Hamilton

AUTHOR: Anne Elizabeth Martin, B.A. (Memorial University of Newfoundland)

SUPERVISOR: Dr. Richard A. Brymer

NUMBER OF PAGES: ix, 238

ABSTRACT:

This study of Newfoundland families in Hamilton, Ontario, is based on a conceptualization of migration as an interactional (i.e., group-oriented) process, rather than an individual one which examines migrants in isolation from the family-kinship network. This orientation involves a consideration of the migrant's family-of-origin situation in Newfoundland, with whom he moved, and the family-household situation on the area of destination. The basis of this analysis is Frederic LePlay's theoretical construct of the 'stem' and 'branch' families. The fundamental assumption here is that Newfoundlanders constitute a folk culture group representative of a traditionally oriented familistic society. In such a society, strong familistic bonds unite kin members in cohesive family groups and provide for a highly functional role for the extended family.

Popular stereotypes and previous research present Newfoundland migrants as isolated, depressed, experiencing feelings of hopelessness which, combined with emotional immaturity, leads to problems of drinking and fighting. In short, Newfoundlanders are reputedly unable to cope with life in urban, industrialized

settings. This study challenges these notions. We propose that much of the stereotyped behaviour attributed to Newfoundland migrants is actually class-related behaviour. Contact with a relatively large number of Newfoundland families rather than the agencies which serve them, and with migrants from all socio-economic strata rather than merely lower-ranking movers, enables us to judge the accuracy of these stereotypes.

The variables, presented either in the form of propositions or as guidelines for exploratory research, fell into three categories. These included (a.) such 'individual' characteristics as the migrant's age, sex, rural versus urban origin, educational attainment, occupational status, and socio-economic status; (b.) the kinship structure of the migrant, specifically to what extent the kin system facilitates, stabilizes, and channels the migration process; (c.) group cohesiveness among the migrants, particularly the extent to which being a Newfoundlander promotes feelings of consciousness of kind and group identification.

The findings generally supported our propositions. The analysis of 'individual' characteristics revealed that there are definite differences between upper, middle, and working class Newfoundlanders, and that one cannot ascribe certain characteristics to one class and presume that they are applicable to all. Of the respondents, the lower-ranking migrants most closely approximated the stereotyped image of the 'Newfie'. We further discovered that these 'individual'

differences were reflected in the behaviour patterns of the different class groups. In terms of kinship ties, we found that a 'group' process of migration and a strong familistic orientation were generally class-specific, rather than cultural attributes of the migrants. Our analysis of formal community structure confirmed what the investigation of informal patterns of interaction had suggested: that no Newfoundland 'community' exists in Hamilton. No patterns of relationship pervaded their class differences, and being a Newfoundlander was not sufficient criterion to unite classes at either end of the socio-economic continuum.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my appreciation to the members of my committee for their help throughout the writing of this thesis: to my supervisor Dick Brymer, for his enthusiasm, moral support, and guidance; to Camille Legendre, for his suggestions and criticisms; and to Ralph Matthews, for his understanding of what it is to be a Newfoundland migrant, and for introducing me to my first respondent, thus making me realize that this thesis was possible. I am also grateful to my parents for their continuing interest and faith in my work, and to those Newfoundland families in Hamilton whose willingness to participate and kind co-operation made this thesis, after all, a reality.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Chapter One

Approaches to the Study of Migration

Introduction:

In 1961, nearly two million Canadians in this country resided outside their province of birth. They comprised 12.3% of the Canadian-born population.[1] For the most part, these migrants move as individuals, and remain anonymous. Those who tend to be more conspicuous are generally those who have been isolated physically from the more prosperous industrial and dynamic industrialized areas of the country.[2] With respect to the province of Ontario, for example, those migrants who draw attention to themselves are often representatives of regional folk and sub-cultures. This area has long been the favourite destination of "those from the outports of Newfoundland, farmer-fisherman-pulpcutters of New Brunswick, and those from steel and coal communities of Nova Scotia..."[3]

The Newfoundland migrant in Hamilton, Ontario is the subject of this study. Although up-to-date statistics are not available, research reports and census data indicate that, for the last two decades at least, approximately half the out-migrant population of Newfoundland has come to Ontario. A 1960 study by Kari Levitt, based on 1951 census data, shows that of 43,785 Newfoundland-born living elsewhere in Canada, some 19,124 (or 43.6%) were residing in Ontario.[4] Census data from a decade later reveal that in the period

1956-1961, 46.9% of out-migrating Newfoundlanders moved to Ontario.[5]

Because census data omit those who have moved and died before the census enumeration, and also those circulatory migrants who depart and then return to the area of origin during the migration interval[6] (this appears to be a frequent phenomenon among Newfoundland migrants), it is quite likely that the percentage is even greater than these statistics indicate. Since also the regional pattern of net migration tends to remain constant for several decades, presumably reflecting the continued action of a set of redistributive forces,[7] this trend has likely continued throughout the 1960's and will no doubt be confirmed by the 1971 census data.*

Research indicates that there were Newfoundland associations in the Toronto area in the 1930's. Thus, the migrant Newfoundlander in Ontario is not a recent phenomenon. As Tables 1.1 and 1.2 indicate, over the years these migrants have had a strong preference for urban rather than rural areas of Ontario, and for the provincial capital in particular. Indeed, along with migrants from the three other Atlantic provinces, they account for 49% of the Toronto population born in other provinces.[8] The few studies which

---

*At the time of writing, the 1971 census data on inter-provincial migration were not available. Our statistics, therefore, are based on 1961 census material.

have been done on Newfoundland migrants were all conducted in that area.

TABLE 1.1

DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION (FARM, NON-FARM AND URBAN) WITH BIRTHPLACE IN NEWFOUNDLAND NOW LIVING IN ONTARIO COMPARED WITH RESIDENT ONTARIO DISTRIBUTION:

LOCALITY	TOTAL POPULATION ONTARIO	BORN IN NEWFOUNDLAND
Ontario	6,236,092 = 100%	26,935 = 100%
Rural	22.6%	8.9%
Farm	8.1%	0.9%
Non-Farm	14.5%	8.0%
Urban	77.4%	91.1%

Based on figures of the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, Census of Canada, 1961, Cat. 92-547, Bulletin 1.2-7, Table 50.

TABLE 1.2

ATTRACTION OF ONTARIO URBAN CENTRES FOR PEOPLE BORN IN NEWFOUNDLAND - PERCENTAGE CONCENTRATION:

CITY	1951 CONCENTRATION	1961 CONCENTRATION
Toronto	1.03	.903
Kitchener	.599	.553
Oshawa	.346	.326
Hamilton	.321	.332
London	.303	.363
St. Catherine's	.242	.323
Windsor	.226	.223
Ottawa	.204	.329
Peterborough	.125	.134
Sudbury	.124	2.021
North Bay	.111	.218

Based on Census of Canada Statistics, 1951, and 1961.

The recent focus of interest in such migrants from the east coast has been the result of official concern with social factors influencing labour efficiency.[9] In general, these migrants are purportedly characterised by

> an instability of employment..., lack of education and training which make their placement difficult, apparent inability or unreadiness to come to terms with the disciplines imposed by conditions of employment, associated adversely with social background and family factors, isolation and loneliness of migrants coming...into a relatively new technological and cultural environment. [10]

Of the three studies of Atlantic province migrants in the city of Toronto, which have come to my attention,[11] only one is based on direct contact with the migrant himself.[12] Hampered by the apparently extreme mobility of Atlantic province migrants within the area of destination, even this research contains only thirteen interviews, eight with Newfoundlanders. All three studies, however, conclude that much of Atlantic province migration takes the pattern of chain migration, with the migrants joining relatives, friends, neighbours, and former work associates already established in Ontario. This pattern proves especially helpful to migrants in their initial orientation and adjustment to the ways of the urban environment.

From these studies, and also newspaper accounts of Newfoundland migrants in Ontario, a stereotyped picture of 'Newfies' emerges. The migrants are portrayed as lower class young married couples or single males, high school drop-outs,

impulsive movers, living in dilapidated boarding houses where they abuse their rights by drinking and fighting, generally jobless and on welfare, or otherwise drifting aimlessly from job to job, unable to settle permanently at anything. One further gains the impression that Newfoundlanders contribute heavily to the crime rate in Ontario, and that their accents, colloquialisms, and bad grammar distinguish them all from the general population.[13]

> ...There are other problems related to their lack of useful education in terms of finding work, instability brought on by a complete change of environment between the type of community they are familiar with and the Metropolitan centre. The very young simply are "scared" by the City. The majority have not been to Toronto before, may be school drop-outs, and very little planning has gone into their migration. They know little about communities they are moving to but may have a few friends or acquaintances living here. The (Salvation Army) will maintain them until they receive their first cheque. 14

In addition to generally investigating the characteristics of Newfoundlanders in Hamilton, this study will examine the validity of this stereotype for the migrants interviewed. We are not suggesting that these descriptions of Newfoundlanders are totally untrue; but we do suggest that they are true of a very small minority of movers, and that previous research, in focusing solely on these examples, has done may Newfoundland migrants a grave injustice. Through contact with migrants of all class backgrounds, this study is able to determine whether this stereotype is more characteristic of one class than another.

In order to develop a conceptual framework to guide our research, this chapter will investigate the general approaches to migration, including demographic and social problems studies, investigations of kinship affiliation, as well as migration among folk culture groups. The chapter will conclude with an in-depth review of the existing literature pertaining to Newfoundland migrants.

Having completed an overview of general theoretical approaches to migration, and the findings of that research, we will derive our own theoretical orientation and propositions guiding the research. A description of the methodology of the study, including the sampling procedure and interview situation will complete Chapter Two. Chapters Three to Five will present and analyse the data gathered by our research, and deal, respectively, with the 'individual' characteristics of the respondents, their previous migration history and motivation for moving; their relationships with an extended kinship network; and the structure of the Newfoundland 'community' in Hamilton. General conclusions and summary of the findings comprise Chapter Six.

Approaches to Migration:

> How one conceptualizes the phenomenon of migration... has much to do with the conclusions reached about the nature of migration. 15

The four major themes or lines of inquiry emphasised by current research on migration involve: firstly, the more strictly demographic studies; secondly, studies of the motives

for migration; thirdly, the behavioural scientist's emphasis on the 'social problems' aspect of migration;[16] and finally, studies of the nature of kinship affiliation among migrant groups.

Demographic Studies:

The characteristics of migrants, direction of migration, and the description (in economic or demographic terms) of the areas of destination are the focii of demographic analysis. Such research has revealed that differentials of age, sex, rural vs. urban origin, distance, and educational and occupational status are all selective in the migration process.[17] These studies rarely distinguish between those internal or international migrants with and without definite ethnic affiliations, or migrant members of folk culture groups, but have all attempted some generalizations regarding the characteristics of migrants. They dominate much of the literature, and their findings will be briefly reviewed here.

The one migration differential which may be considered definitely established is age. Compared with the non-migrating population, there is an excess of adolescents and young adults among migrants, particularly from rural to urban areas.[18] The stream of migrants to a large metropolitan area tends to be heavily concentrated between the ages 20-29 years.[19] Research also indicates that the more rural the background of the migrant, the earlier the age at which he makes his first move.[20]

With reference to the sex differential, females

predominate among short-journey migrants,[21] while men are more migratory over long distances and when the conditions at the destination are insecure or difficult.[22] Females generally migrate at an ealier age than do males.[23] Due to the sex-selective demand for labour,[24] cities also vary in their propensity to attract more male or female movers. While migration to cities has usually meant the selection of a greater proportion of females than males,[25] certain industrial cities like coal and steel centres notably attract more males than females.[26]

While distance thus differentially affects the propensity of males and females to migrate, it in turn is influenced by the variables of both age and occupational status. There is evidence that long-distance migrants are in the youngest age groups,[27] and of higher ranking occupational status. Distance moved appears to be a function of the status of the migrant. Higher status persons seeking better jobs or opportunities often must move a greater distance than those of lower status, whose skills or aspirations may direct them to look for less desirable opportunities. These lower status migrants seem generally more likely to find a satisfactory situation within a given distance, while managers and professionals often must migrate longer distances to find suitable areas of destination.[28]

The origin of the migrant is one differential which has changed in the literature over the years. While rural

residents once accounted for most migration[29] the majority of movers in modern, industrial settings are between urban centres. Studies in both England[30] and the United States[31] suggest that educated urbanites in skilled occupations predominate among migrants.

The demographic literature contains conflicting evidence regarding how a rural versus an urban background influences the other migration differentials. Freedman's study in Chicago found that migrants of urban origin were of higher economic status than non-migrants while those of rural origin were generally of equal or lower economic status than the non-migrant population.[32] Tilly's investigations in Wilmington, Delaware, however concluded that while migrants varied considerably in the level of economic status, no correlation with their degree of rural or urban experience could be established.[33]

Despite these ambiguities, there is evidence that the characteristics of different types of migrants vary in relation to the rural or urban nature of their place of origin. These considerations seem to have greatest significance when studied in relation to the occupational status of the migrant. The literature suggests that persons in professional occupations are among the most migratory segments of the population, while laborers and operatives are much below average in their degree of mobility. Despite evidence that unemployed persons are on the average more migratory than employed persons,[34] mobility does appear to

be a way of life for young professional people. It is less common in lower white collar occupations where skills are less specified and local candidates more readily available. At lower occupational levels the situation is more complex. The volume and character of migration is more affected not only by personal and family ties, but also by the relationship between opportunities at the local and national level.[35]

The literature also indicates a correlation between the occupational status and the amount of planning made by the migrant prior to moving. Higher ranking migrants tend to accumulate more general information from a wider variety of specialists. Blue collar movers more often have material problems they cannot meet with their own resources, and generally receive direct assistance, in the form of financial aid, transportation, or housing, from family and friends.[36] It thus appears that the different types of migrants, faced with similar problems, vary considerably in the means they employ or the kinds of help they seek in solving them.[37]

Blue-collar workers and rural migrants are also the most inclined to chain migration, the continuous recruitment of migrants from a single distant locality via an informal chain of communication. They most frequently begin their stay in the city by lodging temporarily with kin and friends while exploring for housing and employment.[38] Ascriptive solidarities tend to form the basis of the lower ranking migrant's relation to the city, while structures built around

work provide the nucleus of the higher ranking migrant's relation to the city.[39]

> Migration under the auspices of kinship seems to be the most common among groups which have the least skill in dealing with impersonal urban institutions like markets, bureaucracies, and communication systems, or the most uncertain relationships to these institutions. The support and protection of their kinfolk balances their weakness in these other respects. 40

Closely associated with occupational differentials are variations in the educational level of migrants, with general concurrence in the literature that the better educated are more mobile.[41] This level of educational attainment is, however, influenced by whether the migrant comes from a rural or urban background. Although Freedman's study of Chicago migrants concentrated on the 25-34 year age group, he did find that, with the exception of the rural farm migrant, each male and female migrant group was better educated than the comparable non-migrant group.[42] Tilly's study also affirmed the general superiority of the migrant over the non-migrant population in terms of educational achievement, the migrants from other metropolitan areas being the most superior of all.[43,44]

> It is apparent that there is considerable agreement among the research findings as to the principle...characteristics and qualities of actual or potential migrants, and the location of rural immigrants in the urban environment. 45

In addition to the foregoing 'traditional' (i.e. demographically relevant) variables discussed above, recent studies

also reveal an expansion of interest in attitudes, aspirations, motivations, values, community identification, institutional influences and "...other social and sociopsychological factors intrinsic to an adequate explanation of migration."[46] In addition, the attempt at an explanation of the dynamics of migration and their linkages with population and social change has stimulated the exploration of the complex inter-relationship among sociological and demographic variables.

Motivational Studies:

A consideration of motivation to migrate is necessary for an understanding of the initial attitudes of the migrant, and his subsequent behaviour within the new social (and perhaps cultural) milieu.

> It is this first stage that largely influences the subsequent stages in the migration process, inasmuch as it decides the immigrant's orientation and degree of readiness to accept change. 47

Except to the degree that the motivation of migrants is implicit in the timing and direction of their movements, we know very little about it. In what research which has been done, the 'push-pull' hypothesis has dominated the mode of thinking.[48] This view generally sees migration as due to socio-economic imbalances between regions, with certain factors 'pushing' persons away from the area of origin, and others 'pulling' them to the area of destination. While this tends to be an oversimplification of the problem, an overwhelming majority of studies do impute economic motives to migration.[49] All the findings seems to stress the

importance of work as a means of classifying different kinds of migrants, and as a reason for mobility or stability.[50] On the whole, the extent of migration under work-related auspices appears to rise with rank and secondarily with the level of urbanization of the migrant's previous experience.[51]

Mobility may, however, also be prompted by a desire for union with family and friends, or more satisfactory life-style in the area of destination. But even if a migrant does not consider reunion with relatives or close friends a primary reason for moving, quite often he does have contacts in the area of destination when he moves for career and other reasons.[52] Here again, the 'push-pull' hypothesis applies, with the reasons for moving divided into those which pertain to the decision to move out of the former home (pushes) and those related to the choice among places to which to move (pulls).

> 'Pushes' were caused by evictions or destructions of dwellings and decisions which led to moves included marriage, divorce or separation, and job changes. 'Pulls', where people had a clear choice of going or staying, were prompted by the desire for more dwelling space, better neighbourhoods, and cheaper rents. 53

However, as Bogue suggests, the most significant aspect of the 'push-pull' hypothesis is that it involves independent migration variables which refer to attributes of the areas of origin and destination, while the other migration variables just examined are all characteristics of the migrants themselves. The danger of a 'push-pull' theory of migration is that it tends to treat all the motives for moving

as somehow external to the individual. This is not so. Not all individuals who encounter economic hardship or experience family upheaval decide to move, although, presumably, the same forces of 'push' and 'pull' are operating on them all. Clearly, differences in personality and value orientation influence such decisions. And, in another vein, personal and family factors which weaken the ties with home may underlie many other instances in which there is at the same time a 'good and sufficient reason' for migration. While such factors receive little direct attention in most studies of migration, "it should be remembered that they, as much as the... attractions of training, a job, or a spouse, contribute toward the decision to move."[54]

Social Problems Studies:

The variables of community identification and institutional influences are primarily investigated within the framework of the third major orientation in the migration literature, which emphasizes the 'social problems' aspects of migration. One of the main issues on which most research of general theoretical import has been done in this area is the problem of assimilation of migrants into the host society.[55]

Notable among this type of research have been the works of Milton Gordon and S.N. Eisenstadt. As the latter points out, the migratory process involves a narrowing of the sphere of social participation and the migrant's loss of various reference groups to which he was once oriented.

Feelings of insecurity result and are coupled with the initial wish to resolve the original inadequacy which led to migration in the first place.

> Thus the process of social change inherent in most migrations ultimately involves not only the attainment of specific goals or patterns of cultural gratification, but also...a resocialization of the individual, the reforming of his entire status-image and set of values. 56

Weinberg's study of migration, mental health, and personal adjustment in Israel corroborates this idea that successful adjustment and integration depend to a large extent on adequate role expectation. Insufficient preparedness for change may increase the immigrant's propensity to cling to his own migrant group, and lead to his retiring from the host society.[57] The maintenance of such associations may become a goal in itself, and result in a closed segregating migrant organization.

Different reactions to feelings of insecurity can certainly influence whether a migrant becomes assimilated to the host society or is oriented toward his own migrant group. For example, if the motivation to migrate involves widespread local dissatisfaction with economic conditions, a chain of migration to a specific area of destination may result. Such chains often have the observed effect of facilitating "incapsulation and alienation from full participation in the host culture."[58]

The literature on Mexican-American migrants also

provides some useful insights into these issues of community affiliation and institutional influences. Mexican-Americans who do not intend to settle permanently will usually make little effort to integrate. Their expectations in the area of destination have also been more or less limited to economic ends.[59] This group also views adjustment to the urban industrial community largely in terms of whether or not they have been able to find the economic opportunities anticipated as a consequence of their move.[60]

Because of the size and organized nature of the migration group, Mexican-Americans have been able to provide mutual reinforcement for one another, and eventually to support a full range of separate community institutions.[61] This is in keeping with Raymond Breton's theory that the presence of formal organizations in the migrant community sets out forces that keep the social relations of the migrants within its boundaries. It tends to minimize out-group contacts.[62] The greater the degree of structural completeness of the group, the lesser the chance for assimilation to result. This is essentially achieved through a process whereby the basic institutional activities of the larger society become either completely or in part ethnically enclosed. Broom and Kitsuse speak of these as "parallel ethnic insitutions", having the essential characteristics of the institutional forms of the larger society, and providing avenues for withdrawal and retrenchment of the migrant.[63]

Studies of Kinship Affiliation:

The issue of the relationship between kinship ties and the process of rural to urban migration has perhaps stimulated more controversy in the literature than any other. The origin of the debate, and much of contemporary sociological interest in migration, can be traced to the first quarter of the twentieth century with the development of the Chicago School's programme of urban studies. The influx of migrants from eastern and southern Europe into that city soon became a subject of investigation for Park, Burgess, and their associates.[64] Tilly and Brown provide an incisive summary of the essence of Park's theory on migration:

> ... [M]igration detaches individuals and groups from the traditional restraints and supports, casts them into a marginal position full of personal turmoil and potential social disorganization, and eventually leads to their simultaneous socialization and reintegration into the receiving population, the pace of the reintegration depending on the cultural gap between the newcomers and the receiving population...Migration uproots, and replanting takes a long time. 65

Talcott Parsons lends support to Park's position with his hypothesis that an extended family structure is incompatible with the demands of a modern, complex, industrial order. He contends that

> ...the functional integration of such a society...is contingent upon the flexibility and freedom of movement made possible by a system of isolated, nuclear family units. 66

Many recent theoretical formulations in the migration literature attack this idea that urban society and extended

kinship relationships are incompatible. In substantiating this position, three basic questions are generally answered. 1) What part does kinship play among the major auspices of migration to cities? 2) What forms do relations with kinsmen take during the process of migration itself? 3) What happens to relations with kin during the assimilation of the migratory group to the new community?[67]

In providing answers to these queries, Tilly and Brown reveal that unmarried individuals migrate under the auspices of kinship more often than married migrants.[68] As well, lower status migrants tend to require and actually receive more aid from their kin in the area of destination than do higher ranking migrants. The authors note, however, that this variation by status may be due to the sheer availability of kinfolk in the receiving area.[69] "Relations with kinship provide functional alternatives to personal skill, knowledge, and power in dealing with the receiving community."[70] Migrants who move under the auspices of kinship increase their direct, formal participation in the city's impersonal institutions more slowly than those travelling under work-related auspices. Ties with kin promote continuing intense involvement within the family network, and thereby decelerate the process of assimilation to the formal structures of the city.[71]

The Canadian literature, however, is still divided on the issue of the impact of migration and social change on

extended family ties. Garigue cites evidence in support of the hypothesis that rural to urban migration does not reduce kinship recognition and functions.[72] Whereas Garigue contends that French Canadian values are such as to preserve extended family relationships in spite of migration and urbanization, Marcel Rioux argues that cultural values will be affected by the social changes which accompany urbanization and migration, and that as these changes take place at both the social and cultural level, the situation will be conducive to a weakening of extended family ties.[73] Piddington's study of the kinship network among French Canadians in Manitoba found that migrants do indeed go to areas to which siblings and other relatives have already moved.[74] Women were found to be more interested in their kinfolk and better informed about them than were men. This was attributed to females having more time for visiting, correspondence, telephoning and otherwise keeping in touch with their kin in both the areas of origin and destination.[75] It could also be due to the pressure of isolation which housewives experience while their husbands are at work.

Eugene Litwak has also successfully challenged the position that migration and the urban mode of living are not conducive to the maintenance of extended family ties. His study demonstrates that 'modified extended family relations' can be maintained despite mobility. The socially disruptive forces of geographical distance have been minimized by the technical improvements in communication systems. The extended

family is able to provide important aid to nuclear families without interferring with the occupational system and thus the legitimation of geographic mobility by the extended family ensues.[76] Fundamental to this view is the concept of migration as a response in many cases on the part of the family system to prevailing socio-economic conditions. This challenges the traditional view of migration as consisting of individuals responding to personal values in a context of unfavourably perceived situational circumstances.[77] Litwak's conceptualization here resembles LePlay's ideal type of family, the 'famille souche' or stem family. LePlay's formulations are reaffirmed, with some revision, by Litwak and others who argue that a 'modified' extended family structure is consonant with occupational and geographical mobility in a mature, industrial economy.[78]

Central to LePlay's stem family concept is the assumption that the migration process is an adaptive mechanism tied in with the sociocultural system and functional to the maintenance of family structure.[79] It differs from other research which suggests that a necessary precondition for migration is a 'cultural inadequacy' of the source culture.[80] Slotkin, for example, emphasizes the idea that migration is an "escape valve for those individuals who find their own sociocultural system inadequate for their own role expectations".[81] This perspective sees migration as an 'unnormal' event, i.e. as deviant behaviour by an individual relative

to the normative structure of his society.[82] The perspective of this process as a strategy of adaptation,however, sees migration as

> a patterned reaction by family-kinship groups to preserve traditionally sanctioned cultural values and to maintain group integrity in confrontation with environmental circumstances over which they can exercise little control. Frederic LePlay recognized this possibility many years ago. 83

LePlay considers the family as the elementary and basic social unit, with only one general family type. Fluctuations in the strength of the main form accounted for the three major sub-types of families, the patriarchal, the unstable, and the 'famille souche' or stem family.[84] In the patriarchal family, the emphasis is on keeping the family group intact and preserving traditional family boundaries; the unstable family, on the other hand, encourages a high degree of individualism by freeing children from family obligations. The stem-family was conceived by LePlay as the best suited to the changing conditions of industrial society, incorporating some of the principles of change and continuity from the other family types within the same structural framework.[85] The stem family maintains a parental homestead for its immediate members while other branch family members move elsewhere to make their own living. This 'homestead' may actually refer "simply to a piece of land, a presently abandoned or temporarily rented house, or close kinfolk in the old neighborhoods who offer migrants a 'haven of safety' in time of need."[86]

LePlay's central concern was with the stem family type and what it does for its branches in two ways: facilitating and encouraging migration when conditions demand it, and providing 'havens of safety' to which the branches could return in times of crisis such as unemployment.[87] Although the protective function of the stem family system, so far as the economic aspects are concerned, may not be as important as during LePlay's time, the social psychological aspects, especially in terms of the migration process within a complex society, may be even more important. "Networks of 'branch' families may function as a socio-psychological 'cushion' for the migrants during the transitional phase."[88] However, it is important to stress here that LePlay's concepts describe an 'ideal type', derived from his studies of European families. Consequently, not all migrants come from families manifesting characteristics of the stem family type. The purpose of its consideration here is to demonstrate its particular applicability to the study of migrant representatives of 'folk culture groups.'

We have now reviewed the four different approaches to the study of migration. Although these frameworks of inquiry may be applied to the study of any type of migration, in the following sections we will focus on research on the migration of folk culture groups in general, and on Newfoundlanders in particular.

Migration Among Folk Culture Groups:

Almost by definition, folk cultures are characterised by strong familistic bonds that unite kin members in a cohesive family group and fit individual desires into a framework of family needs.[89] The extended family plays a highly functional role. One study of the migration of such a folk culture group from the southern Appalacian region of eastern Kentucky into Ohio has utilized LePlay's stem family concept as its guiding hypothesis.[90] Modification of LePlay's concept is used to consider the manner in which kinship structure facilitates this migration process.[91]

This study attributes the consistent directional pattern of eastern Kentucky migration not only to economic factors, but to the kinship structure of the migrant families. This kinship structure provides a highly persuasive line of communication between kinfolk back home and in the urban areas of destination. It channels information about available job opportunities and living standards directly, and more meaningfully, to eastern Kentucky families, and thereby tends to orient migrants to areas where their kin groups are already established.

> Because of ascribed role obligations, ... the kinship structure serves a protective function for new migrants to an area - a form of social insurance and a mechanism for smoother adaptation during the transitional phase of adjustment. 92

In essence, the kin system facilitated, stabilized, and channelled the migration stream.[93]

Most Kentucky migrants did not arrive as complete strangers to the area of destination. Many had visited numerous kin living in the area prior to the actual move there themselves. The kin system functioned as a natural advisory service for newcomers. Kin supplied migrants with the essential furniture and necessary equipment for housekeeping. They often helped the newcomer find a place to live, and in more than a third of the cases helped the principle breadwinner of the family find a job. In addition they assisted new arrivals in getting oriented to the city, instructing them on how to get around, what buses to take, how to establish credit, and so forth.[94] "[M]utual aid and norms of reciprocity... were ... a 'natural' state of affairs, i.e., the modus operandi within a familistic social organization."[95] In these various ways, kin functioned to help the newcomer become a stable member of the receiving community.[96]

The family homestead in the mountains also provided the migrant with an additional sense of assurance that during crisis he had a place to which to return. The LePlay 'homestead concept' in this case appears

> as a configuration of elements blending land, neighbourhood,parental household, kinfolk and the like, into, as one Ohio migrant put it, "a 'place' to go if things get rough out here." Zimmerman and Frampton hint at this point when they suggest: "It seems that the spirit and not the form, the strength and not the mould, is the dominant characteristic of this family." 97,98

The majority of migrants perceived a place back home to which to return, if it ever became necessary. This is in spite of the fact that very few held title to or had any property back home. Thus, if forced by circumstances, they felt they could join parents or other kin in the area of origin. To the migrant, the concept of family homestead connotes the kin network in the area of origin.[99]

In most migration studies, the unit of analysis is the individual. Through the process of abstraction, this methodological strategy has tended toward a conception of migration as an individual behaviour. Such an approach often omits the human interactional element in migration, and, as a consequence, concentrates on individual characteristics in a more or less atomistic manner.[100] This is obviously true of the demographic analyses cited earlier in this chapter. Most of the better known studies of migration are in fact couched in these terms, but "...a conceptualization of migration as individual behaviour is much too truncated a view. From a behavioural standpoint, collectivity and interaction are the very heart of the phenomenon."[101]

Although it is evident that Schwarzweller et. al., regard migration from eastern Kentucky as a group process, nearly half of the migrants out of the area to Ohio in fact move alone. A third move with spouses only, or with their spouses and children only. The remainder reflect a variety of patterns; in general they were mainly young unmarried persons who accompanied their parents and/or older siblings.

Migration from the region thus appeared to be an individualistic phenomenon involving a 'nucleated' migration unit.[102] How then may we speak of a 'group' process?

> We chose a sociological appraoch, from the point of view of family units or groups involved in the processes of residential relocation. Taking into account the migrant's family-of-origin situation in eastern Kentucky, with whom he moved, and the family-household situation in the place of destination, we found that the migration ...in most cases was a group phenomenon. Conversely, we concluded that...migration... as individuals seldom occurred as an event isolated from the family-kin network and, therefore, ...the 'big move' was indeed a familial event. 103

One notable finding of this research was that there existed social class differences in the form or strategy of migration.[104] For example, 'higher class' migrants settled in more established residential areas, and were inclined not to locate in the 'little Kentucky' suburban communities of southern Ohio.[105]

> In short, migrants from high-class... families, whether because of situational realities or orientational adjustments to situational realities, do not turn to the mountains and their family homesteads in time of stress nor in their search for identity and stability; they do, however, rely to some degree upon the branch-family network as a stabilizing structure and problem solving unit. 106

Intermediate class migrants from eastern Kentucky appear to rely on the cushioning effect of both the stem and the branch families.

> They are happiest when actively involved with a close-knit family group; they are

> also less inclined to worry about things and not as likely to experience extreme nostalgia for home and the mountain way of life. 107

The complementary interplay between stem- and branch-family networks true for the intermediate class migrant apparently does not hold for the lower class migrant.[108] Those lower class migrants who settled in urban depressed areas or slum neighbourhoods more often than not lacked the requisite skills, training, education, and family resources to capitalize on their willingness to work. They generally were drawn to these areas by kin affiliations.[109] Because these groups generally came from lower class families in the area of origin, they not only had very little stem- and branch-family support, but also had very little to go back to in the mountains had they decided to return.

> In effect, they were trapped by the initial circumstances of migration, and by the situation they encountered in the area of destination;only by sheer luck and/or determination could they overcome these socioeconomic handicaps. 110

From the earlier review of the migration literature, we would expect that the majority of migrants from rural low-income areas would be young people. This is true of migrants from eastern Kentucky. One interesting result of this, with particular reference to the single male migrant, is what Schwarzweller et. al. term 'an extended work visit strategy'.[111] Many of the young unmarried males from the area had originally moved to Ohio in search of work.

> After having enjoyed the experience of an extended work visit, they returned to the mountains for a period of time, married mountain girls and, confronted with breadwinner responsibilities, decided to move 'permanently' to Ohio with their spouses. Likewise, a similar work visit strategy seemed to prevail among the male heads of larger households. 112

This study of Kentucky migrants, then, conceptualized migration as an interactional (group-oriented) process, and explored the part played by the ~~stem~~ branch-family in attracting migrants to a given area of destination, and in their social adjustment upon arrival.

> The two sets of roles we have been most concerned with are in the sectors of kinship and occupation. The migrants originated in a rural familistic cultural situation, and the most obvious determinant for their migration was occupational in the economic sense. 113

Such evidence as this surely constitutes a formidable attack on the earlier findings regarding rural to urban migration, exemplified by the work of Robert Park. It may well be that these earlier formulations were based on the initial impression of urban sociologists that contacts in the city are "...impersonal, superficial, transitory and segmental."[114] At any rate, Tilly and Brown make this final pronouncement on the role of kinship ties in the process of migration:

> The recent explorations of urban life... reveal a lush undergrowth of kinship in what had been charted as an urban desert. Kin groups gather not only on ritual occasions, but also for emergencies and ordinary sociability. The vigour of

> kinship relations prevails in both lower-class and middle-class populations, and offers a means of extraordinary support during crisis. If this is true, it ought to be all the truer of the crisis of migration. 115

Newfoundland Migrants:

The remainder of this chapter will focus on findings relating to Newfoundlanders living in Ontario. Through the utilization of census data and studies in the Toronto area, we will examine the pattern of Newfoundland migration in terms of the migration differentials, social problems studies, and kinship affiliation.

TABLE 1.3

DISTRIBUTION OF NEWFOUNDLAND-BORN POPULATION IN PROVINCE OF ONTARIO AND SELECTED INCORPORATED CITIES GROUPED ACCORDING TO AGE AND SEX:

	ONTARIO	HAMILTON	TORONTO	OTTAWA
TOTAL:	19,124	670	8,017	414
MALE:	9,576	339	4,166	176
FEMALE:	9,548	331	3,851	238
20-24				
TOTAL:	2,788	83	1,373	57
MALE:	1,596	54	804	35
FEMALE:	1,192	29	569	22
25-34				
TOTAL:	4,811	185	1,986	104
MALE:	2,312	89	1,126	32
FEMALE:	2,499	96	860	72
35-44				
TOTAL:	3,027	104	1,185	69
MALE:	1,473	50	567	33
FEMALE:	1,554	54	618	36
45-54				
TOTAL:	2,224	88	928	41
MALE:	1,092	37	451	14
FEMALE	1,132	51	477	27

continued...

	ONTARIO	HAMILTON	TORONTO	OTTAWA
55-64				
TOTAL:	1,537	66	622	45
MALE:	729	37	290	21
FEMALE:	808	29	332	24
65-69				
TOTAL:	523	25	198	17
MALE:	252	8	95	3
FEMALE:	271	17	103	14

Based on Dominion Bureau of Statistics, Census of Canada, 1951. Volume II - Population, Table 12 and 11. Unforunately, the 1961 Census did not include the above analysis in this form. Rather, it collapsed the categories of individual provinces of birth, and considered age and sex distributions according to province of residence vs. migrants from all other provinces.

As with migrants in general, there is an excess of adolescents and young adults among migrant Newfoundlanders in Ontario, as Table 1.3 indicates. Approximately 40% of the Newfoundland migrants in Ontario are concentrated between the ages of 20-34.

TABLE 1.4

DISTRIBUTION OF NEWFOUNDLAND-BORN IN PROVINCE OF ONTARIO AND SELECTED METROPOLITAN AREAS GROUPED ACCORDING TO SEX:

AREA	NFLD.-BORN POPULATION	MALE	FEMALE
Ontario	26,935	13,206	13,729*
Hamilton	1,103	521	582*
Kitchener	1,280	587	693*
London	634	329	305
Ottawa	1,156	546	610*
Sudbury	202	98	104*
Toronto	15,763	7,769	7,994*
Windsor	383	160	223*

Dominion Bureau of Statistics, Census of Canada 1961: Catalogue No. 92-547, Bulletin 1.2-7, Table 53.
*Indicates more females than males among migrant population.

Table 1.4 demonstrates that for Newfoundland migrants in Ontario, the differential of sex selectivity is not upheld according to what we would expect from the literature. In support of the generalization that females predominate among short-journey migrants, census reports reveal that Canadian females migrate more within provinces, while males are more prone to interprovincial migration.[116] But for the province of Ontario as a whole, and for all metropolitan areas except London, female Newfoundland migrants outnumber the males. While cities in general attract more female than male migrants, we might expect the factor of long distance from Newfoundland to counteract this tendency in Ontario. However, census data indicate that female migrants from Newfoundland outnumber the males in all metropolitan centres across the country, with the exception of London, Calgary and Edmonton. Even in these centres there is minimal difference in the proportion of males and females. This is in spite of the fact that certain industrial cities like Hamilton and Sudbury especially should offer more employment opportunities for males, with service cities like Ottawa more likely to attract female job-seekers.

> One development in the study of migration, paralleling that in the social sciences as a whole, is the greater diversity of variables used in researches dealing with complex phenomenon. This is especially true in studies on the selectivity of migration. 117

Unfortunately this development is not reflected in the existing literature on Maritime and Newfoundland migrants. As indicated

earlier, there has been a considerable dearth of such studies, with only three such investigations available to this writer. In general, they have attempted to delineate the characteristics of the migrant group, based on the observations of social agencies and other information sources. Because only one of the studies actually interviewed migrants, and then only thirteen of them, I am wary of their validity in comparison with the evidence from the general migration literature. However, a brief overview of this research material can perhaps provide some guidelines for this study and suggest some propositions to investigate in the research.

The literature suggests a correlation between the occupational status of the migrant and the amount of planning made prior to the move. Studies reveal that the agencies which deal with Newfoundland migrants view their movement as an "impulsive decision", particularly in the case of single male migrants.[118] Much of the migration in fact appears to be "tentative and experimental both among families and unattached migrants..."[119] In the interviews which McCormack conducted with the thirteen Maritime migrants, none of the respondents had jobs arranged before actually embarking for Toronto.[120] Although the actual move may be unplanned, research indicates that in many cases there was an 'ethos of inevitability' involved in the migration of Maritime youth. "Quite apart from economic or family reasons, there appears to be a view of experience in which leaving home becomes an expectation."[121]

Rural migrants are most inclined to chain migration and this is demonstrably true in the case of Maritimers. These migrants tend to °ollow lines established by those relatives, friends, neighbours, and former work associates who preceeded them. The whole may actually constitute a labor reserve for typical occupations and industries that have openings for them at given skill levels. This pattern is closely related to finding work. Informants in Toronto agree that many 'easterners' rely on informal ways of finding employment through friends and relatives.[122] These contacts are utilized to the point of actually looking to the same plants and factories for a job.[123] This process of chain migration provides orientation and support for the migrant upon arrival in Toronto. "Basically, perhaps, it is an uncertain process of relieving the hazards of a job-oriented migration."[124] It tends to work on word of mouth, rumor, and often involves misdirection and lost motion. The process may actually break down on the inability of those who are at the same limited skill level and uncertain social place as the newcomers, to mediate effectively in matters of housing, employment and the like. Studies describe this process in various ways: to the effect, for example, that the feed-back is about "high wages, but fails to mention the higher cost of living"; or "Uncle Jack will get you a job", only to discover that Uncle Jack has just lost his job because, as a relative newcomer himself, he was "among the first to be

fired when things got tight."[125]

This migration chain is paralleled by movement along work-related channels. This includes job transfers within organizations, such as supervisors, managers, or technical personnel.[126] This finding is supported by evidence in the literature that those with higher occupational status are more inclined to migrate under work-related auspices, with lower ranking migrants moving under kin-related auspices.

The level of educational attainment is generally influenced by whether the migrant comes from a rural or urban background. Research indicates that those eastern migrants, who come to the attention of agencies at least, are generally below average in their level of education. None of the thirteen migrants interviewed by McCormack had completed high school.[127] The pattern of low educational achievement is apparently also reflected in the children of migrants. Having come from one or two room denominational schools often with one teacher for as many as five grades, the children were bewildered by the Ontario school system. Often required to repeat a grade or be put back a grade, children become discouraged and do not remain in school for long.[128] Many of the summarized descriptions of school informants regarding migrant children actually amount to differences of a rural-urban nature, tensions and stresses arising from them and sometimes evidence of parental disorganization and drifting because of inability and lack of skills in coming to terms with demands of employment and urban conditions of living.[129]

> The parents do not seem particularly concerned if the children leave school early or underachieve. They do not set high values on education and tend to be content with passing or near passing grades. 130

Other, albeit sketchy, evidence does present a contrasting picture, however. Wadel found that 25% of the graduates from a Notre Dame Bay, Nfld., high school within a three-year period, moved to Toronto. This demonstrates that migrants of a higher level of educational training are also involved in migration. A sample study of 21 of these persons revealed that 18 were less than 25 years of age, and all but one had Grade 9 or more. Wadel concludes,

> From these data, and from conversations with several other people, it would seem that the majority of people going to Toronto are young people and fairly well educated. 131

Could it be that the attention of the previous studies was focused only on the less educated migrants, or is Wadel pointing to a more recent trend among the migrants?

> There seems to be a clear selection according to educational level between those who stay and those who leave. A common complaint in the outports and small towns alike is that 'everybody who has got his education is leaving - only the dropouts are staying.' 132

> There are already numerous cases of educated young people, mainly from the vocational schools, who are not in a position to obtain jobs in the province, and of an increasing drain of people to the mainland. 133

Economic hardship in the Atlantic Provinces is very often cited as motivation for mobility. There are also instances where the move was made to unite a scattered family.

Especially when the family is considered as the economic unit, the poor economic prospects of sons who are potential wage earners may prompt a decision to move.[134] Ofter there is a predisposition to move created to some extent by family drift, scatter, and just plain family disintegration.

Earlier we alluded to the isolation from the dominant group of single Mexican-American adults. Of all the eastern migrants, it is the male group of single migrants, referred to as the 'windbreaker' group[135] that is conspicuous by their dress, way of speaking, and the source of many of the stereotypes of this migrant group. The Social Opportunity Project describes this group:

> Away from their family roots they become lonely and depressed; they find the isolation of rooming house life very hard to bear after small town and rural friendliness. ...the men in this group do not make an emotional investment in their work. They take casual unskilled jobs and change them frequently...They find the city preoccupation with economic security hard to understand and the shortage of casual work upsets their usual pattern of earning a living. The feeling of hopelessness, combined with emotional immaturity, aggravates the drinking problem because a man is more likely to get into a fight when he is drunk and the police represent the 'city system' to him. The police naturally dislike this group because they cause trouble. 136

These are not the only representatives of Maritime migrants, however. Besides this 'windbreaker' group, three other 'types' of migrants are noted in the literature. One group, also inclined to come to the attention of church and social agencies, are young post-adolescents who have left home for the first time with little or no prior work experience.

More difficult to identify are the families with none or few children. Their passing participation in church events, applications for assistance, or presence at special events ("Maritime Nights") are the few means of identifying them. Migrant families with children in school are more identifiable by virtue of records kept by the school boards.[137]

The extreme residential mobility of each of these groups within the city is stressed in the literature.[138] However, special events such as movie nights, 'Maritime' or 'Newfie' clubs which are periodic events under commercial and volunteer auspices, do function to mobilize these migrants and to thus make them more physically visible.[139]

With this, we come to a consideration of the kinship and friendship ties of these migrants. Each of the studies of migrant Newfoundlanders and other Maritimers refer to the effects of common bonds of origin upon the migrant group. From his investigation of Newfoundland associations in Toronto, Orton found that Newfoundlanders associate on the basis of common home ties.[140] Membership in certain clubs, for example, was concentrated around migrants from two particular Newfoundland 'outports', Herring Neck and Bay de Verde. That membership in common associations often reflects common community of origin in Newfoundland is emphasised in his study.

Informants at various reception centres and hostels in downtown Toronto also noted that Maritime females in particular appeared to come from very happy homes. Their family

ties were very close, and they talked much about going back, although most of them stayed in Toronto beyond what agency officials consider the two-year 'point of no return', in spite of their homesickness.[141]

McCormack found that Maritimers varied with respect to the extent to which they kept ties with kin back home.[142] While several migrants missed their families and planned to phone home at Christmas, one respondent at the other extreme no longer had a family back on the east coast. The more affluent migrants made trips back to the Maritimes; in one case, three of the occasions were funerals. Several had relatives from home visiting with them, or younger siblings staying with them while looking for work. Only one respondent (in thirteen) received a local paper.

'Nostalgia for home' was also considered in McCormack's analysis. Her study reports that migrants write home often, telephone home, play 'Newfie' records, and talk of going back "if we can get the money saved up." Interestingly enough, few of the respondents expressed a desire to return to their actual communities of origin. In general, more urban centres such as St. John's or Gander were mentioned by them.[143]

There is also evidence that time weakens the home ties and life revolves more fully around friends and relatives in Toronto. Migrants appeared to gravitate toward one another, sometimes more by chance than choice. One migrant, for example, stated that her friends in the apartment building were mostly other Newfoundlanders; since the other wives were away at work

all day, only the Newfoundland wives remained at home. McCormack however asserts that her interviews in no way suggest 'clannishness' among migrants, dependency on relatives or even a strong preference for others like themselves.[144]

McCormack's research emphasizes at least four factors concerning Maritime migrant's kinship and friendship affiliations: First, neighbours are not necessarily friends. Second, friends are made chiefly through work. Third, migrants appear to have little time for social life with friends. And fourth, there was a noted tendency for migrants to attribute to themselves the failure to make friends.[145] She concludes:

> What seems to emerge from this does not support the hypothesis that the Maritime migrant is family oriented or strongly identified with his own group. Rather, it suggests that the Maritime migrant is somewhat insecure about his social competence in making friends and makes them in a context where it is unavoidable, i.e., work. 146

This is one issue on which there are discrepant findings in the literature on Maritime migrants. While McCormack asserts that migrants are not necessarily oriented to their own group, the report of the Social Opportunity Project in Toronto concludes, "There is much pride and group feeling among Easterners."[147] Based on the fact that there are certain contradictions in McCormack's analysis, the evidence of some group cohesion among Maritime migrants may be more indicative of the actual situation. McCormack herself presents evidence that relatives in the city not only offer immediate shelter to the migrant, but also provide information

about the city, its geography, folkways, laws and services.

> They brought their kin down to the Manpower office, 'worried about the kids getting lost', and 'were well versed about where to go to get your welfare.' 148

Nor does her research deny that migration under the auspices of kinship is a frequent phenomenon for Maritime migrants. Supported by the general conclusion in the literature that unmarried individuals migrate under the auspices of kinship more often than married migrants, McCormack found that young single adults most especially availed themselves of the opportunity to get a ride to Toronto with a returning relative. This then provided them with an immediate place at which to stay, and enabled moving 'on a shoe string.'[149]

Even in the case where the male head of the household migrates ahead of his family, wives and children remain waiting at home, and live on a reduced income. Surely reminiscent of LePlay's stem and branch family concept, McCormack describes the kinship pattern in which relatives may help the wife and children left at home, and extended kin in Toronto house the new arrival there.[150] Such support for the existence of kinship and friendship networks among migrants leads one to question how McCormack could ultimately conclude that these migrants are not family oriented or identified with their own group.

One interesting feature of the migrant's relation to his place of origin is noted in Orton's research. He found that 'being a Newfie' may very well be a matter of playing a role. He explains this as due to the fact that many of

the cultural differences between Newfoundlanders and the general Canadian population become obvious only when a group of Newfoundlanders gathers together. The specific reference here is to the dialect and the music. For this reason, migrants well adapted to the urban mode of living in Toronto still come to meetings of certain 'Newfoundland' associations "where common culture traits still form a focus of group interaction and for an evening he is a 'Newfie'."[151]

Several of the social class differences noted in the Kentucky migrants' pattern of movement are also found in the research on Maritime migrants. Orton demonstrates that differences in concentration of the Newfoundland population in Toronto are related to the particular socio-economic areas of the city. Newfoundlanders and migrants from the other three Maritime provinces are primarily located in the working class and lower middle class areas of the city. Recently, however, many of them have been moving out of the downtown 'receiving areas' and to adjacent areas like Halton, or to the suburb of Scarborough.

The research notes that "while 'classes' at either end of the socioeconomic continuum might feel equally 'Newfie', they certainly feel it in different ways."[152] The Newfoundland associations studied by Orton tend to cater to those migrants at the lower end of this continuum. Contacts with 'higher ranking' Newfoundland migrants revealed a distaste on their part for much of the 'Country and Western' music and peculiar-

ities of dialect associated with patrons of these Newfoundland associations. This prompts Orton to conclude that being 'Newfie' is not sufficient criterion to bring different socio-economic groups together.

The isolated migrant young men referred to earlier seem to largely comprise this lower status group. But they in fact only make up "quite a small proportion of migrants from that region and are 'an embarrassment' to the other, teachers, bank clerks, nurses, who get jobs easily and who are not as visible as others who get into trouble."[153] Many of these young men marry and stay in Toronto. It is easy for them to drift into petty crimes and become hard core welfare cases, because the wages they command will hardly feed and clothe a family, and they lack imagination and incentive to go back to school.[154]

McCormack as well cites evidence from the John Howard Society that Maritimers contribute heavily to the crime rate in Ontario.[155] One should note here however that the experience of the agencies concerned with a particular migrant class are cumulative and conditioned by the constant flux of people in search of living quarters, occupational and social place, and who are not subject to any formal count. The persistence of the problems encountered may well suggest numbers larger than are actually present at a given time.[156]

Earlier we considered the individual versus the group as the unit of analysis in migration studies. In only one instance does the literature on Maritime migrants consider

the group character of the phenomenon. This is in relation to discrimination on the part of the non-migrant population of Toronto.

> Some migrants tend to be seen by the owners [of rooming houses,etc.] ... as members of a stereotyped group rather than as other tenants who come and go as individuals. It is in this context that one may understand negative attitudes held by some rooming house keepers respecting migrants from the eastern provinces. It may be repeated that these are the only ones whose movement into the Toronto area shows a group character. 157

Owners and other informants recognize that the migrants themselves are sensitive to the negative attitudes regarding them. It is evident, however, that the stereotype does not prevent migrants from taking lodgings nor keep the landlords from accepting them. The relationship between the migrants in this group and rooming house keepers is influenced by past experience of damaged plumbing and skipped rents on the one hand, and restrictions on movements, invasions of privacy, and threats of expulsion, on the other.[158] The interviews provided glimpses of young migrants

> living on bread and ginger ale in their rooms, one bed shared with two or three non-paying friends who are 'up against it', domestic quarrels between young couples, and police advice not to rent to trouble makers. 159

How accurate a presentation of Newfoundland migrants are these findings? I myself have several reservations. Hampered by lack of contact with the migrants themselves, or insufficient number of respondents on which to base general-

izations, the conclusions of these studies warrant further investigation. They generally concern only lower class migrants whose situation somehow makes them more conspicuous than the general group of Newfoundlanders. Indeed, writers of the report of the Social Opportunity Project concede that the sole utilization of informants from churches and social agencies may bias many of their results. There is the "risk of some stereotyping, because the accounts are in critical respects incomplete and concern largely crisis situations."[160]

These limitations prompted me to investigate the life styles of a sample of Newfoundlanders in Ontario, in order to determine the validity of the generalizations and popular stereotypes surrounding them. Are the findings of other studies true of Newfoundlanders at all? If so, are they typical of one particular class of migrants? Are Newfoundlanders really as dependent upon one another and as unable to cope with the urban environment as these studies would have us believe?

Contact with a relatively large number of Newfoundland families, rather than the agencies which serve them, and with migrants from all socio-economic strata, rather than merely lower-ranking movers, will enable us to judge the accuracy of these stereotypes. This is, then, an exploratory study which seeks to avoid these class biases and to present a more balanced and informative picture of Newfoundland migrants.

Conclusion:

"Implicitly, if not explicitly, research on migration appears to treat each study as a unique case." In many studies, the derivation of hypotheses and selection of variables is accomplished in an ad hoc fashion as though previous research bore no relevance to the particular case in question.

> One reason...is that useful, general theories are not available and formulating a theoretical framework for a specific study design, by systematically abstracting relevant findings from the mass and maze of migration literature that is available, is a difficult, highly specialized, and time-consuming task. 162

The literature as well perceives internal migration "as basically different from international migration, inter-metropolitan migration from rural to urban migration...".[163] Some researchers regard this as a fundamental misconception in current approaches to the study of migration.[164] While acknowledging that there often indeed are certain distinctive features and specific characteristics of each migration case, they caution against the emphasis on

> superficial differences at the expense of detracting from the pursuit of basic structural similarities...(which) tends to circumvent an essential priority in the development of more useful general theories. 165

In an attempt to overcome these inadequacies, we have reviewed the literature on migration in general, in the quest for variables and guidelines to utilize in the study of Newfoundlanders in Hamilton. This review delineated the broad range of theoretical positions and methodologies employed

in the study of migration and migrant groups. The analysis of demographic factors, social problems associated with migration, kinship affiliation despite geographical distance, and especially migration among folk culture groups has afforded us insights into some of the general approaches to migration. As we will elaborate in Chapter Two, aspects of each of these orientations are applicable to our study. From them, we will derive a series of propositions to guide the inquiry, and then outline its conceptual framework and methodological procedure.

Chapter Two

Conceptual Framework and Methodology

In this chapter, we will present the variables and propositions which we derived from the review of the literature in Chapter One. Although the research overall is explorative, the specific variables considered vary according to whether they are exploratory, or seek to examine propositions established in the foregoing body of literature. These include variables from the areas of demography, ethnic group migration, folk culture groups, and from the small body of research on Newfoundland migrants themselves. After a discussion of these variables, we will outline our methodological procedure, focusing primarily on the selection of a sample, and the interview situation.

Conceptual Framework:

The variables which are investigated in this study were selected from our analysis of the various approaches to the study of migration. Some are presented in the form of propositions, while others are formulated as guidelines for exploratory research. In general, they fall into three categories:

(a.) Characteristics of the migrating Newfoundlander himself: his age, sex, rural versus urban origin, level of educational attainment, occupational status, and so forth.

(b.) Kinship structure of the migrant: studied within the theoretical framework of LePlay's 'stem' and 'branch' family concepts. In essence, the study will examine to what

extent the kin system, like that of eastern Kentucky migrants, facilitates, stabilizes, and channels the migration process. Such analysis will be structured around the three major questions posed by Tilly and Brown with reference to kinship structure and migration: What part does kinship play among the major auspices of migration? What forms do relations with kinsmen take during the process of migration itself? What happens to relations with kin during the assimilation of the migratory group to the new community?

(c.) Group cohesiveness and community identification of the migrants: the extent to which 'being Newfie' leads to feelings of 'consciousness of kind',[1] and group identification. What are the factors which lead to the development of a 'community of sentiment'? To what extent are these present or lacking among Newfoundlanders in Hamilton?

These variables are examined in one of two ways. Approximately half of them (these are specified below) have been explored at length in the migration literature, with general consistency in the patterns which have emerged. In reference to these particular variables, then, we are able to advance certain propositions, and to measure the extent to which Newfoundlanders conform to an 'expected' pattern. Research on the other variables, especially those relating to socio-economic status and kinship ties, either has been sketchy, or the findings themselves have been somewhat ambiguous. In studying Newfoundland migrants in terms of these variables,

therefore, we have no 'expected' patterns of relationships by which we can determine if the respondents are unique among migrant groups. The object of the investigation of these variables is not to ascertain conformity or non-conformity with an established pattern, but rather to discern the pattern itself.

Variables stated as propositions:

A.) Variables relating to the Individual:

All variables except those pertaining socio-economic status

B.) Variables relating to the Kinship Structure:

a.) Greater dependence of rural migrants upon 'branch' families
b.) Migration from Newfoundland as an 'expectation'
c.) Majority of moves made under the auspices of kinship
d.) Strategy of adaptation characterizing the moves of many, particularly young, Newfoundlanders
e.) Reliance on 'stem' and 'branch' families to facilitate work visit strategy
f.) Perception of area of origin as 'haven of safety'
g.) The folk culture value orientation of Newfoundlanders preserves ties with kin in the area of destination

C.) Variables relating to Group Cohesiveness and Community Identification:

a.) Pattern of chain migration serves to encapsulate the migrant within a close-knit group
b.) Group cohesiveness more common among lower than higher ranking migrants
c.) Pattern of interaction based on common community-of-origin
d.) Being 'Newfie' not sufficient criterion to stimulate 'consciousness of kind' among migrants of different socio-economic levels
e.) Lower ranking more likely to identify themselves as Newfoundlanders
f.) The closest friends of migrants are other migrants
g.) Social networks are close-knit, with many relatives and friends in one's network interacting with one another
h.) Other Newfoundlanders, as reference group, are a major influence in the migrant's assessment of his relative degree of satisfaction

Exploratory Variables:

A.) Variables relating to the Individual:

a.) All variables associated with socio-economic status
b.) Motivation for more female than male migrants moving to a highly industrial area like Hamilton

B.) Variables relating to the Kinship Structure:

a.) The 'success' of channels of information about work
b.) Explicit forms of assistance provided by the 'stem' and 'branch' families
c.) Factors which influence change in the nature of migration from one of experimentation to one of permanence
d.) Variations among the migrants in terms of intensity of contact with the 'stem' family, and changes in that intensity over time
e.) Persistence of patterns of mutual aid and reciprocity
f.) Newfoundland migrants family oriented or strongly identified with own group
g.) Degree to which one may speak of a 'group' process of migration

C.) Variables relating to Group Cohesiveness and Community Identification:

a.) Variations in group orientation between different 'types' of migrants
b.) Attitude of embarrassment which migrants hold toward some of their fellows
c.) Number of moves made by migrants and reduction in the 'connectedness' of their networks
d.) Being a 'Newfie' a 'role', for higher status migrants

In the following sections on Individual, Kinship, and Community variables, all of these propositions and guidelines for exploratory research are examined individually.

Variables relating to the Individual:

Age:

The literature confirms that the most mobile age group among Canadian males is that 25-29 years old, and 20-24 years old among Canadian females.[2] Previously cited census figures

confirm this finding with respect to Newfoundland migrants, and we therefore expect that a preponderance of the respondents in the sample made at least their initial move from their home community between these ages. Because the migrants will all have lived in Hamilton for varying lengths of time, we anticipate that the sample will include respondents from a wide age range.

Sex:

Census figures reveal that Newfoundland female migrants outnumber the males in most Canadian cities. Among the variables we will explore in this study is the explanation of why more female than male migrants move to a highly industrialized centre like Hamilton. Since studies show that females rarely, if ever, move alone, (without the benefit of a kinship network in the area of destination), kinship ties may be particularly effective in attracting female migrants to this area. Illsley et. al. found in their study of migration to Aberdeen, Scotland, that males tend to migrate more often when conditions at the area of destination are insecure or difficult. Perhaps in spite of McCormack's finding that most Newfoundlanders did not have a job upon arrival in Ontario, the presence of kin in the area prevents them from perceiving the situation as insecure. In the case of the Kentucky migrants, kin in the area of destination acted as a form of 'social insurance'. Thus more Newfoundland females than one would expect from the industrial nature of the city may be attracted to the area.

Rural versus Urban Origin:

Unfortunately there is no indication in the literature of what proportion of Newfoundland migrants originate in the rural or urban areas of the province. Given an indication of the extent of a migrant's urban experience, the literature would lead us to expect certain characteristics of him. The more urban the background of the migrant, the higher we would expect his socio-economic status to be. Tilly and Brown have also demonstrated the greater propensity of this type of migrant to move under work - as opposed to kinship - related auspices. In addition, we would expect this migrant to exhibit fewer of the characteristics descriptive of the stereotypic Newfoundlander in Ontario; i.e., particular dialect, preference for 'Country and Western' music, participation in many of the Newfoundland associations which Orton suggests primarily attract 'lower status' Newfoundlanders.

Different attributes would be expected of the migrant from rural than from urban Newfoundland. The more rural the background of the migrant the earlier the age at which he generally makes his first move. Here too we should find that the amount of planning done prior to the move will be greater for those higher status migrants of urban origin than for the lower status migrant of rural origin. And, while I have no basis to derive a proposition in this regard, the characteristic differences which obtain in the case of the rural Newfoundland migrant who spends a period of time in an urban area

of the province before going to Hamilton, will warrant note.

Educational Attainment:

In general, the literature on Newfoundland migrants presents a picture of individuals with a low level of educational attainment. None of the migrants interviewed by McCormack had completed high school, and the agencies studied in the Social Opportunity Project all dealt with migrants deemed below average in their amount of education. Only Wadel suggests that Newfoundland migrants actually represent the better educated of the province's population. All that the literature enables us to anticipate about the educational level of Newfoundland migrants, is that the urban-origin migrants are more educated than those from a rural background, and that those higher-ranking migrants are more educated than lower-ranking migrants. Wadel's findings in particular prompt us to explore whether or not the younger, more recent migrants have attained a higher educational level than older migrants in Hamilton for a longer period of time.

Occupational Status:

The findings of both McCormack and the Social Opportunity Project lead us to expect that many Newfoundland migrants arrive in Hamilton without a job. Indeed, Bogue presents evidence that unemployed persons are on the average more migratory than employed persons. The Social Opportunity Project report also suggests that many of these migrants actually constitute a labour reserve for typical occupations and industries with

openings for them at a given skill level. We will explore whether or not this is true of the Newfoundland migrant in Hamilton.

Earlier we noted that, at lower occupational levels, not only personal and family ties, but also the relationship between opportunities at the local and national level, influence the process of migration. This is particularly true of those migrants of rural familistic cultural origin. Although the basic determinant of their migration was occupational in the economic sense, kinship factors also apply, especially in the decision of where to move. We expect that this interplay of kinship factors and occupational factors is inherent in the migration of Newfoundlanders to the Hamilton area.

Socio-Economic Status:

We have now presented our propositions concerning such 'individual' characteristics of the migrant Newfoundlander as age, sex, rural versus urban origin, level of educational attainment, and occupational status. However, considerations of socio-economic status are conspicuously absent. The reasons for this are two-fold. Firstly, the migration literature generally utilizes variables of educational level, and occupational status, in ascribing a socio-economic 'rank' to respondents. In this study, however, we did not wish to have a measure of socio-economic status based explicitly on occupation and education. We neither wanted to obscure possible similarities in education and occupation between classes, nor to artificially

'lower' the social class status of those Newfoundlanders who, for example, are poorly educated but otherwise possess attributes of high social status.

Secondly, previous studies of Newfoundland migrants have focused on only one socio-economic level, thus providing no guidelines for research on migrants from all social strata. In general, these studies have considered only lower ranking migrants, many unemployed and uneducated, and those who draw attention to themselves by their reliance upon social service agencies and so forth. However, this study wished to consider other 'types' of migrants as well: the professional people, teachers, managers, nurses, clerks, tradesmen, and the like. The existing literature would have one believe that no such people leave Newfoundland. They do.

In order to accomplish our task, we adopted a 'grounded theory' approach and 'style of life'* considerations in the construction of our social classes. This involved a conception of socio-economic status as both an operational and an empirical problem.

> Although categories can be borrowed from existing theory,...generating theory does put a premium on emergent conceptualizations... Merely selecting data for a category that has been established by another theory tends to hinder the generation of new categories, because the major effort is not generation, but data selection. 3

---

*This included neighbourhood of residence, social participation in the community, as well as leisure time activities and interests.

In order to avoid the 'selection' of families who fit certain operationalized definitions of class, we entered the study with no specified criteria which determined social class. We therefore developed social class categories only after all the interviews were conducted. From these interviews, certain life style patterns, consistent enough to identify 'groups' of families and to distinctly separate them from other families, emerged. Thus we developed four more or less clear-cut class groupings, which we categorized as upper, middle, working and lower classes.

The working class respondents, by virtue of sheer numbers, were the most easily identified group. In general, they lived in older areas of the city, often in multi-unit dwellings, rarely entertained, and, except for the husband's union participation, for the most part did not belong to any social clubs or voluntary organizations in Hamilton. None of these families had more than one car, and their vacations were spent either "puttering around the back fence" in Hamilton, or driving back to Newfoundland.

The lower class respondents differed from the working class in that they were chronically unemployed, on some form of social assistance, lived in over-crowded flats, had no car, took no vacation, and, while fundamentally unhappy with their lot, felt unable to help themselves.

The middle class respondents differed from the working class migrants in that they lived in newer areas of Hamilton, generally the suburbs, in single family dwellings or modern

high-rise apartment buildings, often had more than one car, and belonged to a number of service clubs and organizations in the city. Many indeed had cottages "up north", or trailers and boats for vacations, and so forth.

The upper class respondents, on the other hand, lived in the very expensive areas of the city; some had housekeepers and foreign cars, entertained frequently, and held membership, even office, in a number of restricted membership organizations, and held office in other voluntary associations.* A number of these families also owned summer houses, and such luxury items as yachts and sailing sloops.

Clearly, then, 'life style' considerations, quite apart from occupation and education, distinguished the social class standings of the respondents. Indeed, several of our findings showed that education was particularly unrelated to social class position, thus supporting our decision not to include education as an index of socio-economic status. For example, the sample included a wealthy real estate investor with minimal education, who is active in community affairs, lives in an upper class area of the city, and whose general life style reflects his higher status. There are numerous similar examples. On the other hand, several members of the sample who have completed high school are truckers and industrial shift workers, and are definitely working class. Although occupation was a better discriminator of social class than education, it still

*For a discussion of the different types of membership groups to which migrants of different classes belong, see Chapter Five, pp. 154-156.

did not fully reflect the life style attributes of social class. As a further example given in Chapter Three elaborates, two men with the same job and approximately similar income, can live in very different areas of the city, and have divergent interests and ways of life.

Thus the variable of socio-economic status or class will provide the main framework for the analysis of data in this study. We will examine whether the upper, middle, working and lower class migrants differ in terms of any of the 'individual' variables described above; in terms of their relationship to a kinship system based on a 'stem' family in Newfoundland and a 'branch' family in Hamilton; or in terms of the degree to which they experience feelings of 'community' of 'consciousness of kind' with other Newfoundlanders in the city. By isolating what differences, if any, obtain between the classes on each of these variables, we hope to demonstrate that an inherent class bias characterizes previous research on Newfoundland migrants, and that much of the stereotyped behaviour attributed to them is actually class-related behaviour.

Variables relating to the Kinship Structure:

(a.) What part does kinship play among the major auspices of migration to cities?

Like the Kentucky migrants research, this study will be based on a conceptualization of migration as an interactional (i.e., group-oriented) process. This means that we will consider the migration event with respect to its involvement in the kinship-friendship network in the area of

destination. In this analysis, we will use LePlay's theoretical construct of the 'stem' family. The fundamental assumption here is that Newfoundlanders, like eastern Kentuckians, constitute a folk culture group. Both are representatives of a traditionally oriented familistic society, and come from an economically depressed region. Strong familistic bonds unite kin members in cohesive family groups and provide for a highly functional role for the extended family.

We would expect channels of information about available job opportunities and living standards to flow between Hamilton and Newfoundland, parallel to those between Ohio and eastern Kentucky. Whether or not such channels work on word of mouth, and rumour, and misdirect the migrant will be investigated. Some Kentucky migrants visited with kin in Ohio before actually moving there themselves, and the applicability of this to the Newfoundland situation will be investigated. We will also determine what explicit forms of assistance, if any, were received by the migrants from their kin; were they, like many Kentucky migrants, provided with a place to live, job, directions about bus routes, and other information facilitating their adjustment to the city?

Tilly's study of migration informs us that those migrants who move under the auspices of kinship are those most likely to have the least skill in dealing with such impersonal urban institutions as markets, bureaucracies, communication

systems, and the like. "The support and protection of their kinfolk balances their weakness in these other respects."[4] Thus we would expect those Newfoundlanders from rural areas to require and accept the direct assistance of kin and friends in adapting to these 'impersonal institutions', for longer periods of time than those with more urban experience. According to Tilly, such migrants often have material problems they cannot meet with their own resources, and generally receive direct assistance, in the form of financial aid, transportation, or housing, from family and friends. This study will test the validity of these findings with respect to the Newfoundland migrant in Hamilton.

According to LePlay, the 'stem' family's main function at this stage in the migration process is to facilitate and encourage migration. This study will determine whether this is true for Newfoundland migrants as well. McCormack hints at the 'stem' family's support of migration when she speaks of the "ethos of inevitability" surrounding much of Newfoundland migration. The 'stem' supports the migration of its members to the mainland to the point that, for many, leaving home becomes almost an expectation, the 'natural' thing to do upon completion of education and in seeking employment. From McCormack's evidence, then, we predict that this 'expectation' was experienced by a number of migrants.

In the main, we expect kinship to play a major role, not so much in the migrant's decision of <u>whether</u> to move, but

where to move. The 'stem' family group should generally encourage this migration, especially to areas where the extended family is already located. Because of his familistic value orientation, we expect the migrant to maximize family unity by moving under the auspices of kinship, and, in fact, actually locating near kin in the area of destination.

(b.) What forms do relations with kinsmen take during the process of migration itself?

Related to the function performed by the kinship structure in the process of migration is the idea of migration as a 'strategy of adaptation'[5] for the migrant Newfoundlander, equivalent to the 'extended work visit strategy' of the eastern Kentucky migrant.[6] Both of these concepts are fundamentally linked to LePlay's theory of migration as an adaptive mechanism tied in with the sociocultural system and functional to the maintenance of family structure. They particularly refer to the pattern of circulatory migration, wherein migrants return to and then again depart from the sending area. As stated previously, this is a frequent phenomenon among Newfoundland migrants. This strategy of adaptation can be defined as a

> patterned reaction of family-kinship groups to preserve traditionally sanctioned cultural values and to maintain group integrity in confrontation with environmental circumstances over which they exercise little control. 7

In the Newfoundland literature, Wadel noted that the unmarried migrants in particular move back and forth between Newfoundland and Toronto several times. We expect this to be

true of Hamilton as well. However, this pattern has often been explained in the literature as the failure of the migrant to cope with problems of unemployment, housing, and feelings of alienation in the receiving area.[8] But, for the Newfoundland migrant, this pattern may represent not a failure, but a 'strategy of adaptation'. It may be but one of a number of strategies employed by Newfoundlanders when their traditional adaptation of combining a number of sources of income is disturbed.[9]

The Newfoundland migrant's desire to return to his native province was noted in each of the studies by McCormack, Wadel, and the Social Opportunity Project. The expressed criterion for such a move is generally the gaining of satisfactory employment in Newfoundland. Migrants are able to maximize both the goal of living in Newfoundland and having economic security by the pattern of circulatory migration as a 'strategy of adaptation'. They are able to maintain their family and 'home' in Newfoundland and return there themselves for part of the year, while at the same time achieving satisfactory seasonal employment in Ontario.

This situation is comparable to the 'extended work visit strategy' of eastern Kentucky migrants. Usually single males, or male heads of larger households, these migrants work for part of the year in Ohio and spend the remainder in the mountains with their families. The single men often work,go home, marry local girls, and, confronted with breadwinner

responsibilities, decide to move permanently. For the Newfoundland migrant too, movement to Ontario may not at first involve a decision to establish permanent residence, but rather a temporary measure while families are maintained the communities back in Newfoundland. This study will e how the factors determining the decision to seek seaso temporary employment in Ontario differ from the facto eventually determine the decision to move permanentl McCormack noted that much of Newfoundland migration is er tative and experimental". We will investigate what factors influence this change in the character of migration from one of experimentation to one of permanence.

Central to this type of adaptation and circulatory migration are the functions of the 'stem' and 'branch' families. McCormack's study cites instances where the migrant relies on his family network to facilitate this 'strategy of adaptation' or 'extended work visit' pattern. Relatives (the 'stem' family) may help the wife and children left in the community of origin, while kin in Toronto (the 'branch' family) house the new arrival here. We anticipate that this pattern is also true for Newfoundlanders located in Hamilton.

Tied in with this pattern of circulatory migration and 'stem' family support is the migrant's perception of a place back home to which to return. This will be examined in the study. It is basic to the LePlay 'homestead concept', often connoting a kin network in the area of origin to which the

an return in times of crisis. The Kentucky migrants neir area of origin as a place to which to return "if get rough out there", and we expect Newfoundland mig- s to have much the same perception of their native mmunity. The extent to which the migrants avail of this haven of safety' and return there in times of difficulty will be explored. Wadel notes that young people in particular have the advantage of being able to come home and live off their parents, so we might expect the younger of the migrants in Hamilton to most frequently adopt this form of behaviour.

Orientation toward home is also reflected in the intensity of contact between the migrant and the 'stem' family. The frequency of communication by means of letters, visits, and telephone conversations will yield a measure of this contact. McCormack noted that Newfoundlanders vary with respect to the extent to which they maintain ties with kin back home, but in no way attempted to account for this variation. Hopefully, this study will give an indication of whether intensity of contact with the stem family varies with the sex, marital status, socio-economic status, rural versus urban origin, or recency of the migrant's departure from home.

(c.) What happens to relations with kin during the assimilation of the migratory group to the new community?

An issue intimately linked with the above query is the development of group cohesiveness and a sense of common identity among migrant Newfoundlanders, and will be dealt with

at further length in the next section. At this point, however, we are concerned with whether or not the migrant maintains ties with his 'branch' family after his initial adjustment to the urban milieu has been made. The literature is ripe with references to the role of kin in helping the migrant adjust to the change, find a job and place to live, and providing him with a form of 'psychological cushion' during the transitional phase of adjustment. But, these functions of mutual aid and forms of reciprocity are described by Schwarzweller et. al., as "...a 'natural state of affairs, i.e., the modus operandi within a familistic social organization."[10] These expected duties fulfilled, does the extended family fade out of the migrant's sphere of relevance? Does the migrant become more involved with friends made in the area of destination than with his kin and former friends from Newfoundland?

Earlier we cited evidence from the debate between Garigue and Rioux regarding the role of extended family relationships after migration and adjustment to the new environment. The key factor emerging from that argument is the influence of the the type of society from which the migrant comes, and the extent to which the family plays a dominant role in it. Schwarzweller et. al. affirm that the folk culture value orientation of eastern Kentuckians is such as to maximize family unity. One means is by the maintenance of strong ties with the extended family long after the initial adjustment is made to the urban environment. We would thus expect the folk culture value orientation of the Newfoundlanders to preserve

ties with kin in the area of destination in much the same way. It will be interesting to note, however, if the form of these bonds changes over time: after a certain period of time, for example, is the migrant expected to have achieved a degree of independence which enables him to no longer seek direct assistance from his kin? And is there a decrease in the frequency of contact between kin over time? In what ways, if at all, do relations with kin differ from immediately after migration to, say, two years after migration?

Of course, McCormack's study concluded that Maritime migrants are neither family-oriented nor strongly identified with their own group. A primary concern of this study will be to investigate whether this is generally true of Newfoundlanders in Hamilton, or more true of any one class of migrants than another.

In investigating these variables related to the kinship ties of the migrant Newfoundlander, we will use the framework of Frederic LePlay, as modified in the analysis of Schwarzweller et. al., of eastern Kentucky migrants. However, we should add that we will not use LePlay's stem family concept in order to test the validity of his formulations with respect to migrant Newfoundlanders, or to 'measure' the degree to which the migrants deviate from his ideal type. Rather, we will use this concept merely as a general framework of analysis, as a 'utility' device to assist in the analysis of Newfoundland migration as a group process and a 'strategy of adaptation.'

Variables relating to Group Cohesiveness and Community Identification:

In the earlier review of the literature, Weinberg noted that different reactions to feelings of insecurity can influence whether a migrant becomes assimilated to the host society, or is oriented toward his own migrant group. Following from this, we have McCormack's finding that Newfoundland migrants attribute to themselves an inability to make new friends. It may well be that this 'self-deprecating' attitude is a manifestation of insecurity, and, by preventing the migrant from establishing 'outside' contacts, keeps him within the social boundaries of his own group.

Weinberg's study also noted that chain migration in particular facilitates "incapsulation and alienation from full participation in the host culture."[11] We have previously noted that this pattern of 'chain' migration is common among Newfoundlanders. From this, we expect that Newfoundlanders are kept within a close-knit group by the very nature of their mobility pattern. However, because this process of 'chain' migration is more common among lower - than higher - ranking movers, we would also expect the ensuing group cohesiveness to be more true of the lower-ranking respondents than by those of higher status.

In addition, the group cohesiveness evolving from a pattern of 'chain' migration often involves interaction among people from the same community-of-origin, as Orton found in

his study of Newfoundlanders in Toronto. We expect that a similar pattern of interaction based on common community-of-origin characterizes relationships among migrants in Hamilton.

The Social Opportunity Report's delineation of four different 'types' of Newfoundland migrants poses a number of questions regarding the different behaviour patterns of each of these groups. Does any one 'type' of migrant group demonstrate more cohesiveness than another? Does any one group indicate a propensity to assimilate to the host society more quickly than the others? From the literature cited in Chapter One, we suggest that the group of single male migrants are the least likely to assimilate to the new society, and will thereby retain the stereotyped image of the 'Newfie'. The literature describes them as the butt of negative sentiment, both from members of the host community, and other Newfoundlanders. This study will investigate this purported attitude of embarrassment which other Newfoundlanders in Hamilton hold toward this group. Should we contact a number of single male migrants, some of the reasons for their 'conspicuous unadjustment' to urban conditions may be unearthed.

A related question is whether or not 'being Newfie' is sufficient criterion to stimulate sentiments of 'consciousness of kind' among migrants of assorted ages, backgrounds, and socio-economic status. Orton's evidence leads us to expect that it is not. We will also examine the extent to which 'being a Newfie' is, for higher ranking migrants at least, a matter of playing a role while socializing with a group of

friends of a Saturday evening. Linked to this is the proposition that it is the lower-ranking Newfoundlander who is more likely than other migrants to identify himself as a 'Newfie'. Orton suggests that this is so. The ability to 'pass' as a well-adjusted urbanite seems influenced by class: the middle class migrants usually come as occasional visitors to the 'Newfoundland associations', where common culture traits still form a focus of group interaction and for an evening he is a 'Newfie'.

In general, however, we expect group cohesiveness to obtain between migrant Newfoundlanders. Kin and other Newfoundland friends should play a major role in the migrant's social network, defined as all or some of the social units with whom and individual is in contact.[12] The closest friends of migrants should be other migrants. Since network connectedness depends on the stability and continuity of the relationship,[13] we might also expect that these are close-knit networks, wherein many of the relatives and friends in the migrant's network interact with one another. Whether or not the number of moves made by the migrant tends to reduce the connectedness of his social ties warrants exploration.

As previous studies have also established that the migrant's reference group includes his best friends and those he would turn to in necessity[14] the Newfoundland migrant's reference group will also be considered here.

> (Since)...the degree of satisfaction achieved by migration...must be considered

> relative rather than absolute..., the fact that a migrant is manifestly well off in terms of occupation, income, etc., would not necessarily mean that he was satisfied. 15

We suggest that other Newfoundlanders, as reference group, are the major influence in the migrant's assessment of his relative degree of satisfaction, and in his definition of his new social situation.

Such an investigation will yield an indication of the extent of group cohesiveness among migrant Newfoundlanders in Hamilton. It will also provide an index of the conditions under which 'communities' of migrants (e.g., ethnic communities, folk culture communities) based on 'consciousness of kind' and common sentiment, arise on the area of destination in the first place. If nothing else, we are sure to find, as McCormack discovered, that the migrants are linked together by the kinds of problems which migration poses for them: notable among these are problems of housing and unemployment.

The design of this study is, I feel, succinctly described in the words of Schwarzweller et. al., in reference to their study of eastern Kentucky migrants.

> The scientific aim is neither...to explain the phenomenon of migration in the total sense, nor to achieve a high degree of statistical prediction in the statements derived from our findings. We see this research as theoretically explorative. 16

However, the purpose of this study to a certain extent goes beyond exploratory research's goal of becoming familiar with a phenomenon, or achieving new insights into it.[17]

Although the investigation overall was explorative, we also tested the propositions presented on the preceeding pages outlining our conceptual framework. In this respect, then, we advanced beyond exploration, to the determining of relationships between variables.

Methodology:

The primary methodological problem confronting this study was the selection of a sample. In order to have a random sample, one must be able to identify the entire population under investigation, and this requires some form of 'concrete' representation, such as a list of names and/or addresses. In a country where no records of individual internal movements are kept,* the isolation and identification of an entire migrant subgroup is virtually impossible.

However, the gathering of even a non-random sample is equally fraught with obstacles. Studies of Newfoundland migrants, notably those of McCormack and the Social Opportunity Project, stress the extreme residential mobility of the migrants within the urban receiving area. Because of this,

---

*Perhaps the most precise records of this type are kept in Sweden. In accordance with the Swedish Registration Act, a person who wishes to move from one parish to another must report at the register office of his parish and ask for a certificate of altered residence. On arrival in the new place he presents this certificate to the registrar of that parish within two weeks. All migrations are thus registered twice. One parish records a persons's departure in the out-migration register, and the other his arrival, in the in-migration register. In Sweden the local clergy keep these records. For further reference see Bertil Wendel, A Migration Schema: Theories and Observations (Sweden: The Royal University of Lund, Studies in Geography No. 9, 1953).

addresses provided by schools, church lists, employment and other social agencies are often unreliable. Among other problems encountered by McCormack in her attempt to locate migrants in Toronto were

> ...the general lack of dependence upon specific addresses by residents of the ... (sending)...areas...the high mobility of migrants within the city, and...poor cooperation in keeping appointments by the few who could be found. 18

A further reason for not utilizing the addresses provided by social agencies is that, assuming that the addresses are reliable, this results in contact with only one particular type of migrant: namely, the one whose adjustment to the new environment was in some way problematic, so as to incite him to seek the assistance of agencies in the first place.

The alternative here was to gain access to the migrants through other migrants (the 'snowball effect'), which should yield the best results in terms of the reliability of addresses. This we did. The study proceeded by means of a variation of the sociometric method, as described by Seltiz et. al.

> Sociometry is concerned with the social interactions among any group of people. The data collection is geared to obtaining information about the interaction or lack of interaction among the members of any group...The sociometric questionnaire or interview, as most commonly used, involves simply asking each member of a group to indicate which other members he would like to have as a companion in some activity... Sometimes the individual is allowed to name as many members as he wishes...19

Although the interaction investigated by sociometry may be only

desired, anticipated, or fantasied, in this study we were interested in actual behaviour, rather than statements of preference.[20]

At the outset of the research, I had three initial contacts with Newfoundlanders in Hamilton. One of these was a university professor whom I had known in Newfoundland before he himself moved to Hamilton, while the other two were names and addresses given me by contacts in St. John's.[21] I contacted these people and asked them, as part of the interview situation, to name other Newfoundlanders whom they knew in Hamilton, and also those outside their household who were closest to them. While one of the initial contacts knew no other Newfoundlanders in the area, both of the others did.* Thus the gathering of the sample began. As each successive individual was interviewed, he too was asked to identify other Newfoundlanders in Hamilton, and also his closest Newfoundland friend in the city.

This fulfilled two functions. By naming other Newfoundlanders, the respondent not only provided the study with other individuals to interview, but he also mapped his 'Newfoundland network', indicating the boundaries of his contact within that group. By naming those outside his household closest to him, the migrant provided a measure of the intensity of his involvement with other Newfoundlanders vis a vis non-

---

*Although he did provide reference to Newfoundlanders he knew in Hamilton, the university professor was not interviewed.

Newfoundlanders. This method was thus extremely useful. At the same time that it provided for contacts with other migrants, it also gave

> information about an individual's position in the group, the social subgroups within the group, the relationships among the subgroups, and the group's cohesivenss. 22

The extent to which an individual's closest friends were fellow migrants indicated his orientation to this group. The initial measure of how many Newfoundlanders he knew delineated the 'breadth' of his Newfoundland contacts; the second measure of how many were among his closest friends indicated the 'depth' of his involvement.

By contacting Newfoundlanders named in the networks of other respondents, we determined the degree to which the migrant's ties were with kin, friends from the same community of origin in Newfoundland, or other migrants he met after moving to Hamilton. In addition, we determined the connectedness of the migrant's network by ascertaining whether those named in the work actually knew and interacted with others named by the migrant. As an example: "A" informed us that he knew "B", "C", and "D" who are also Newfoundlanders. If "B" also knew and was a friend of both "C" and "D", then we had a measure of connectedness of this network.

This model may appear to be an oversimplification of the process, but it does clarify how, provided with such information on a sufficient number of migrants, we gleaned a picture of the cohesiveness of the Newfoundland migrant group.

Using this method, we also explored the purposes or functions that ties with other Newfoundlanders served for each individual.

The Sample:

Using the method outlined above, we eventually sent a letter of introduction* describing the study to 65 families in Hamilton. Where possible, we later contacted them again by telephone to arrange a time for the interview. Of these, 61 families** were actually interviewed for a response rate of 93.8. Of the four who were not interviewed, one was a single man who had no telephone, and who was not at home on three separate occasions; the second was a widow who phoned to say she was going to Florida for three months; the third was a man who had just been hospitalized when he was contacted; the fourth was an elderly couple who had not been in Newfoundland in 45 years and did not wish to be interviewed.

> We won't be any help to you, my dear. We're so quiet and that, you know. It's so long since we were down there, I can't remember much about it any more. No, we just can't help you at all. No.

However, in the course of the field work, the names and addresses of a further 79 families were supplied by the respondents. In the early stages of the research, each Newfoundlander identified by the respondents was contacted and subsequently interviewed. But as the sample became larger, and the list of prospective subjects continued to grow, we

---

*See Appendix A, p. 213.

**Where possible we interviewed both spouses when both were Newfoundlanders. This involved contacts, therefore, with 90 separate Newfoundlanders.

began to select respondents from this list. Several of the criteria of Glaser and Strauss's theoretical sampling applied to this process.

> The criterion for juding when to stop sampling the different groups pertinent to a category is the category's theoretical saturation. Saturation means that no additional data are being found whereby the sociologist can develop properties of the category. 23

The early stages of the research involved interviews with a rather homogeneous group of migrants: working class, middle-aged, both spouses Newfoundlanders, all with approximately twenty years residence in Hamilton. As the names of those who were single, of middle or upper class status, married to a non-Newfoundlander, or of recent arrival, emerged, we contacted them rather than those with characteristics similar to the first group. In this way, we attempted to get in touch with every different 'type' of migrant, thereby avoiding the biases of previous research in this area. Although considering the lower and working class single male migrants and young families, we did not make them the focus of the entire study, as earlier investigators of Newfoundland migrants have done. Instead we studied them in comparison with the higher-ranking, often more stable migrants neglected in previous studies.

Despite these efforts, the sample was still inclined heavily toward the working class respondent. This probably reflects the actual class distribution of the whole Newfoundland population of Hamilton. In the study, six upper class, twenty-

one middle class, thirty-two working class, and two lower class families were interviewed. Of the families whom we did not contact, fifty-two or 65.9% were named by the working class, twenty by the middle class, six by the upper class, and only one by the lower class. Even a process of deliberately seeking out middle and upper class families did not counteract the pervasiveness of the working class network of contacts. On the average, each family identified 4.7 other Newfoundlanders not related to them. However, this ranged from 4.0 for the upper class, 4.7 for the middle class, and 5.0 for the working class respondents. Not only were more working class families contacted, but each tended to know of still more migrants than did the members of other class groups. The fact that the working class also had more Newfoundland relatives in Hamilton than did any other group, intensified this situation.

Eventually it became apparent that fewer and fewer different 'types' of migrants were being identified by the respondents. At the time that we discontinued our interviewing, the number of each 'type' of migrant (i.e., single, married to a Newfoundlander, and so on) who were listed as potential respondents was equivalent to the number of that 'type' whom we had already interviewed. No new 'types' were available, and, in Glaser and Strauss's terms, we had reached the point of 'theoretical saturation'.

The Interview:

Earlier in this chapter, we cited McCormack's comment

that the subjects in her study were generally uncooperative and failed to keep appointments. Orton encountered a similar problem, manifested by a certain amount of suspicion on the part of the respondents. He described this as a form of distrust of 'outsiders' asking questions, a distrust "fostered by being the object of much joking, good-natured or otherwise."[24] The reference here is, of course, to the popular 'Newfie' jokes. Orton explains that, being sensitive about the 'Newfie' image conveyed in these jokes, the migrants were often reluctant to answer questions posed by a non-Newfoundlander.

> The question of whether I was a Newfoundlander was always the first one, and the only way to redeem myself when I answered "no" was to point to "a Newfoundland rector", "a New Brunswick girl friend", "a rural background", and several "friends who are Newfoundlanders." 25

I have no doubt that the fact of my being a Newfoundlander accounted for the complete absence of such initial hesitation, or even failure to keep appointments.* The willingness of the migrants whom I interviewed to participate in this study is reflected by the fact that no less than six families (9.2% of those contacted) telephoned me, upon receipt of their letters of introduction. In these, as in the vast majority of telephone contacts which I initiated, the fact of my being a Newfoundlander was commented upon.

---

*In two cases, the respondents were not at home at the time of the pre-arranged appointment, and on both occasions (when contacted by telephone) they apologized for having forgotten the meeting, and were at home when the second visit was made.

> God bless your heart, my dear girl! What part of home do you come from?
> (working class, female, age 48).
>
> What part of Newfoundland do you come from? ...What was your mother's name?
> (middle class, female, age 54).
>
> Oh, come down before tea. We'll be wanting to have a real Newfie cup of tea, sure.
> (working class, female, age 60).
>
> I've been here since 1949. How about you? ...Do you like it up here?
> (working class, male, age 46).
>
> Are you really a Newfie? You don't talk like people from my part of home! I only speak to Newfies who talks like I do!...(laugh)
> working class, female, age 31).
>
> We were wondering when you'd call. Always anxious to hear from a Newfoundlander, you know.
> (upper class, male, age 55).

Visits to the homes* of the respondents ranged from one to five and a half hours, with the average being two and a half hours. A structured interview schedule was utilized, but this generally took slightly less than ninety minutes to complete. The purpose of providing the interview with structure was to ensure that all the subjects responded to all of the questions we wished to have answered. However, the formulative and discovery functions of the research required that the respondents be given the opportunity to raise issues and questions which we had not previously considered.[26]

---

*In all but three cases, the respondents were interviewed in their homes. For purposes of convenience for the individuals, these other three (two upper class and one middle class) interviews took place in the business office of each respondent.

In order to achieve this, we used an interview method featuring characteristics of both the standard structured interview, and the unstructured interview situation. One part of the interview schedule* contained mostly closed-answer items relating to such factual information as age, education, home ownership, number of moves, and so forth. It also contained sections of open-ended questions which constituted a framework of topics to be covered in the interview. However, the order in which they were asked and the length of time allotted to them varied with the interview.

This type of interview strategy allowed freedom to explore reasons and motives, and to probe further in directions that were unanticipated.[27] We were thus able to obtain sufficient information to characterize and explain both the unique features of the case being studied, and those which it had in common with the histories of other migrants. In providing answers to the queries, the respondents helped to test propositions, and, to the extent that they made unexpected responses, gave rise to fresh questions for later investigation.

For the majority of visits, however, the hour or so after the 'interview' period was spent in informal conversation with the respondents. This was evidently expected of me. In thirty-three homes, I was offered "a cup of tea", which invariably also included homemade cookies or sandwiches. In four homes, the respondents insisted that I stay for a meal. While

---

*See Interview Schedule in Appendix B, p. 214.

in two cases, this consisted of a light lunch with a female respondent, the two others had a large dinner with the whole family at table. In the course of these interviews, several individuals used china patterned with the Newfoundland floral emblem or Coat-of-Arms, or played Newfoundland records in the background. One couple even performed a variety of Newfoundland folk dances for my benefit. On numerous occasions albums of photographs from "back home" were displayed.

Throughout many of the interviews, the respondents seemed to rely on the fact that I was a migrant too. This is especially evident in conversations sprinkled with such comments as "Well, you know what it's like. You went through it, too." Particularly with families from St. John's, the conversation often centered around acquaintances common to both the respondents and to me. Always, they made some inquiry as to why I left Newfoundland, if I planned to go back, did I like Hamilton, and so on. "Now, we've told you all about us. What about yourself?" came to be a common refrain.

Even more evident was the migrants' interest in each other. I was constantly asked about how many Newfoundlanders I had met, how they were doing, and so forth. Interestingly enough, the middle and upper class respondents were the most curious in this regard.

> I've been on the bread line...I had to work up to where I am. And now I've lost touch with them all. I often wonder how they made out. I know how rough it can be.
> (upper class, male, age 51).

Such a number of the respondents reiterated these sentiments that I often had to promise to send them a resumé of the research findings. Several were not even satisfied with this, and asked me to notify them when the study was completed so that they could get a copy of it.

One further feature of the interviews was the respondents' desire to regard the visit as part of an on-going social interaction. In most cases I was invited to "drop in anytime". Some families even noted my phone number "so we can give you a call sometime". One rather enthusiastic lady even exclaimed as I parted, "Here's a real Newfie kiss for you!" and promptly acted on that warning! In only one instance did a respondent, a working class woman with virtually no contact with Newfoundlanders in Hamilton, actually aknowledge the terminal nature of the encounter.

> Well I guess I won't be seeing you again. I hope everything turns out well on your study, and I wish you every success in the future.
> (working class, female, age 50).

Conclusion:

Whatever the advantages and disadvantages of this methodology may have been, I feel that its most favourable feature is that it allowed for a different focus of interest than that found in many other studies of migrant groups. The emphasis of this study was not on the social agencies which serve the migrant Newfoundlander, the larger community which receives him, nor on the voluntary associations which enable

him to 'play the role of the Newfie' on an occasional Saturday night, even though they are all considered. Instead, the emphasis was on the migrant himself. We considered his motivation in moving to Hamilton, his expectations, his pattern of interaction with family and friends, and how these affect his adjustment in the new social milieu. In this orientation the focus was

> upon people rather than places. This... should be the heart and soul of any sensible and just policy formulations with respect to rural-to-urban migration streams, whether from the mountains of Kentucky or from other economically depressed regions of the world. 28

Chapter Three

Individual Characteristics and Background Variables

Chapter One of this study outlined the ways in which differentials of age, sex, rural versus urban origin, educational attainment, and occupational status are selective in the migration process. This chapter will identify the sample population of this study in terms of these differentials. The variable of social class will provide the main framework of analysis. Firstly, we will examine whether the different classes of migrants vary in terms of the migration differentials, motivation for moving, and migration history prior to coming to Hamilton. Chapters Four and Five will then focus on the kinship and community structure of the four class groups.*

Individual Characteristics:

Age:

The variable of age was considered for three different stages in the lives of the migrants. These included a measure of age at the time of their first move, at the time of the move

---

*We acknowledge the very small number of lower class respondents contacted in the study, but have decided to include them as a separate group rather than combine them with the working class, for several reasons. As we have noted, most other studies of Newfoundland migrants have focused only on this group; thus we include this group for purposes of comparison with the upper, middle, and working class respondents. We also regard as significant the fact that these were all the lower class migrants we could find. Previous studies would have one believe that these are the only types of Newfoundland migrants, whereas this investigation found that they represent but a small fraction of the sample of migrants. Inclusion of them here will help to emphasize this fact, and also to stress the differences between them and the 'majority' of Newfoundland migrants.

to Hamilton, and present age. The literature suggests that rural migrants tend to move at a younger age than urban migrants, and this is confirmed in the study.* The average age at first move was 18.8 years for those from rural areas, and 22.7 years for those of urban origin. In addition, those whose first move was within Newfoundland (intra-provincial migration) made their initial departure from home at a considerably younger age (17.6 years on the average), than those whose first move was outside Newfoundland (inter-provincial migration). (23.6 years on the average). Of course, for this particular migrant population, the fact that Canada was a foreign country at the time that many of them moved, may well have been a deterrent to their leaving the island at a very young age.

Table 3.1

Age at First Move, by Social Class

Age	Upper Class		Middle Class		Working Class		Lower Class		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
10-14	-	-	2	6.2	3	6.2	-	-	5	5.6
15-19	3	42.8	16	50.0	27	56.3	1	33.3	47	52.2
20-24	4	57.2	11	34.4	6	12.5	-	-	21	23.3
25-29	-	-	2	6.2	9	18.8	1	33.3	12	13.3
30-34	-	-	-	-	2	4.2	1	33.3	3	3.3
35-39	-	-	1	3.2	1	2.0	-	-	2	2.2
Total	7	100.0	32	100.0	48	100.0	3	100.0	90	100.0
Average Age		19.8		19.7		20.2		25.3		20.2

The average age at time of first move was 20.2 years, but as Table 3.1 shows, there were age variations among the classes. Contary to what the literature would have one expect,

there was little difference between women and men in terms of age at first move, which was 19.7 and 19.8, respectively. The only age differences were found in the case of urban-origin migrants, where men moved at an average age of 22.1 years, and women at 23.4 years.

Table 3.2

Age at Move to Hamilton, by Social Class

Age	Upper Class		Middle Class		Working Class		Lower Class		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
10-14	-	-	1	3.1	-	-	-	-	1	1.1
15-19	-	-	1	3.1	11	22.9	-	-	12	13.3
20-24	1	14.3	8	25.0	14	29.1	1	33.3	24	26.7
25-29	3	42.8	8	25.0	12	25.0	1	33.3	24	26.7
30-34	-	-	5	15.6	8	16.6	1	33.3	14	15.6
35-39	1	14.3	3	9.3	2	4.1	-	-	6	6.7
40-44	1	14.3	3	9.3	1	2.0	-	-	5	5.6
45-49	-	-	2	6.2	-	-	-	-	2	2.2
50-54	1	14.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1.1
55-59	-	-	1	3.1	-	-	-	-	1	1.1
Total	7	100.0	32	100.0	48	100.0	3	100.0	90	100.0
Average	26.0		30.3		24.8		27.0		26.9	

The average age at move to Hamilton was 26.9 years, and here again class differences obtain. However, there is no consistent trend in movement from Newfoundland to Hamilton. Indeed, the middle class, who made their first move at a younger age than any other class, arrived in Hamilton at a later age than the rest of the migrants. The differences in the patterns of movement between Newfoundland and Hamilton will be considered in the final section of this chapter.

Table 3.3

Present Age, by Social Class

Age	Upper Class		Middle Class		Working Class		Lower Class		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
20-24	-	-	-	-	6	12.5	-	-	6	6.7
25-29	-	-	2	6.2	2	4.1	2	66.7	6	6.7
30-34	-	-	2	6.2	3	6.2	1	33.3	6	6.7
35-39	-	-	2	6.2	3	6.2	-	-	5	5.6
40-44	1	14.3	2	6.2	10	20.8	-	-	13	14.4
45-49	2	28.5	6	18.7	11	22.9	-	-	19	21.1
50-54	1	14.3	6	18.7	8	16.6	-	-	15	16.7
55-59	2	28.5	4	12.5	1	2.0	-	-	7	7.8
60-64	1	14.3	2	6.2	3	6.2	-	-	6	6.7
65-69	-	-	-	-	1	2.0	-	-	1	1.1
70-74	-	-	2	6.2	-	-	-	-	2	2.2
75-79	-	-	2	6.2	-	-	-	-	2	2.2
80-84	-	-	2	6.2	-	-	-	-	2	2.2
Total	7	100.0	32	100.0	48	100.0	3	100.0	90	100.0
Average Age	52.0		52.6		42.8		28.6		46.5	

Table 3.3 reveals that there was also significant variation among the different classes of migrants in terms of their present age, with those of lower status being younger than the high status individuals. The relevance of this, particularly for the middle class, warrants special attention here. Already we have shown that the middle class migrant made his first move at a younger age than the other respondents, but arrived in Hamilton at a later age than the others. On the average, then, 10.6 years elapsed between the time of the middle class migrant's first move, and his move to Hamilton; the comparable figure for the upper class was 6.2 years, 4.6 years for the working class, and 1.7 years for the lower class. One further statistic also demonstrates the difference between

the middle class and the other respondents. The average period of residence in Hamilton is 21.1 years for the middle class, but only 17.3 for the upper, 17.0 for the working, and 4.5 for the lower class. Thus, in speaking of the middle class, we are referring to a group with a longer history of mobility than the other migrants, and, consequently, with a longer period away from their initial social and cultural environment. Through such a series of moves, then, a working class youth in Newfoundland may well have become a middle class migrant.

Crucial to this analysis is the realization that our study has focused on the present socio-economic status of the migrants, rather than their status either in Newfoundland or at the time of their move. We suggest here that the socio-economic status of the middle class respondents is perhaps related to their age. These migrants are older than the others, and one may suppose that the older the migrant, the more time he has had to move both geographically and socially. It may also be that one reason for the lower class migrant's status position is indeed the recency of his move and his restricted opportunity for social mobility. Age and length of time may be significant factors influencing such a change.

Sex:

The respondents were evenly distributed according to sex, with 46 or 51.1% being women, and 44 or 48.9% men. The sex distributions within each social class were also equivalent, with female migrants representing 42.8% of the upper class,

50% of the middle class, and 52.0% of the working class. Some variations in the level of education of the sexes will be noted further on in this chapter, but differences of sex generally showed no relation to any of the migration variables. With the exception of 15 families wherein the husband moved to Hamilton before his wife, there was no differentiation in patterns of migration between males and females. For example, 36.4% of the male respondents were inter-provincial migrants on their first move, as were 36.9% of the females.

3 Marital Status:

Table 3.4

Marital Status at time of Move to Hamilton, by Social Class

Marital Status	Upper Class		Middle Class		Working Class		Lower Class		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Married: (A.) To Nflder.	2	28.6	18	56.3	16	33.3	2	66.7	38	42.3
(B.) To Non-Nflder.	3	42.8	3	9.3	4	8.3	1	33.3	11	12.2
Single	2	28.6	11	34.4	27	56.3	-	-	40	44.4
Widowed Separated	-	-	-	-	1	2.1	-	-	1	1.1
Total	7	100.0	32	100.0	48	100.0	3	100.0	90	100.0

Table 3.4 indicates that nearly half the respondents were single at the time of their move to Hamilton. These unmarried movers predominate in the working class, with over one-half of this group being single when they arrived in Hamilton, compared with one-third of the middle class and a quarter of the upper class.

Table 3.5

Marriage Patterns of Single Migrants, by Social Class

Marital Status	Upper Class		Middle Class		Working Class		Lower Class		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Married Nflder.	-	-	4	36.4	14	51.8	-	-	18	45.0
Married Non-Nflder.	2	100.0	6	54.6	9	33.3	-	-	17	42.5
Single	-	-	1	9.0	4	14.9	-	-	5	12.5
Total	2	100.0	11	100.0	27	100.0	-	-	40	100.0

As Table 3.5 shows, there were also class differences between these single migrants in terms of their subsequent patterns of marriage. While over half the working class singles married other Newfoundlanders living in Hamilton, only one-third of the middle class, and none of the upper class, did so. Most of these had known one another in Newfoundland, but three of the working class couples and one middle class couple actually met after their arrival in Hamilton. This suggests that the working class movers in particular were linked to a social network in Hamilton, which enabled them to meet, and subsequently marry, other Newfoundlanders.

A further analysis of the marital status of the migrants at the time of the study, shows that the middle and working classes were comparable in terms of the percentage of marriages between Newfoundlanders, and unions with non-Newfoundland spouses.

Table 3.6

Present Marital Status, by Social Class

Marital Status	Upper Class		Middle Class		Working Class		Lower Class		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Married: (a.) To Nflder.	2	28.6	22	68.8	30	62.5	2	66.7	56	62.2
(b.) To Non-Nflder.	5	71.4	9	28.1	13	27.1	-	-	27	30.0
Single	-	-	1	3.1	4	8.3	-	-	5	5.6
Widowed, Separated	-	-	-	-	1	2.1	1	33.3	2	2.2
Total	7	100.0	32	100.0	48	100.0	3	100.0	90	100.0

In the case of the upper class respondents, however, a majority of 71.4% were married to non-Newfoundlanders. The social implications of marriage to a non-Newfoundlander are suggested in the comments of one upper class respondent.

> I don't think there's anything I really miss about Newfoundland. My wife and family are from Hamilton. It would be very different if they were also from there.
> (upper class, male, age 55).

The relationship between these different marriage patterns and such variables as kinship and community ties will be further explored in Chapters Four and Five.

Rural-Urban Background:

As Table 3.7 shows, three-quarters of the respondents came from rural areas of Newfoundland,[1] and the nigher the social status of the group, the higher the percentage of those with urban background. However, 63.3% of the migrants did

move within Newfoundland before going to the mainland, and because of the strong urban direction of this movement, most in fact had some experience of living in an urban area prior to moving out of the province.

Table 3.7

Rural-Urban Origin, by Social Class

Origin	Upper Class		Middle Class		Working Class		Lower Class		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Urban*	4	57.1	9	28.1	7	14.6	2	66.7	22	24.4
Rural	3	42.9	23	71.9	41	85.4	1	33.3	68	75.6
Total	7	100.0	32	100.0	48	100.0	3	100.0	90	100.0

*Incorporated areas of 7,000 or more. In Newfoundland, this includes St. John's, Corner Brook, Grand Falls, Gander, Wabana.

Table 3.8

Rural-Urban Origin, and Movement within Newfoundland

Pattern of Movement	Urban Origin		Rural Origin		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
No moves, place of birth only	16	72.7	17	25.0	33	36.7
One move from place of birth	3	13.6	25	36.7	28	31.1
Two or more moves*	3	13.6	26	38.2	29	32.2
Total	22	100.0	68	100.0	90	100.0

*Also includes those who returned to their place of birth after leaving it. The highest number of moves made in this category was five.

The pattern of internal movement according to rural-urban

origin is summarized in Table 3.8. Of the 25 rural migrants who made only one move in Newfoundland, 17 or 68% went directly to St. John's, and its suburb of Mount Pearl, one to Corner Brook, one to Grand Falls, three to industrial centres in Labrador, and three others to American Armed Forces Bases in the province. In short, not one made a rural-rural pattern of movement.

Of the 26 multiple movers of rural origin, 17 or 65.4% lived in St. John's at one time or other. Of the other nine, four at one point lived in either Grand Falls, Gander, or Corner Brook; one at the American Base in Argentia, and four in Labrador.

Thus, of the 68 rural-origin migrants, 40 or 58.8% had some experience of living in urban areas of Newfoundland (34 or 50% in St. John's), and another 11 or 16.2% had lived in the industrialized settings of Argentia and Labrador. Only 17 or 23.5% of the rural-origin migrants had only the experience of their hometown, as compared with 72.7% of the urban-origin migrants who had lived only in their hometown prior to leaving the province.

5 Education:

Table 3.9 analyses the level of educational attainment of the respondents along the dimensions of class and rural-urban origin. As we would expect from the literature, the urban-origin migrants are better educated than the rural-origin migrants. The urban males showed the highest level of education (10.3 years),

as compared with 9.8 for urban females. Rural females, however, were slightly better educated than rural males, with 9.1 years of schooling compared to 8.9. For the total group of migrants, irrespective or origin, the sexes were equal in their level of education, with an average of 9.3 years each.

Table 3.9

Rural-Urban Origin, and Level of Education,* by Social Class

Origin	Upper Class		Middle Class		Working Class		Lower Class		Total	
	N	Years	N	Years	N	Years	N	Years	N	Years
Urban	4	17.0	9	9.1	7	8.0	2	7.5	22	10.4
Rural	3	10.7	23	8.8	41	8.8	1	8.0	68	8.9
Total	7	14.3	32	8.9	48	8.6	3	7.7	90	9.3

*Defined as the number of years of schooling, in terms of last grade completed. This is referred to as "Years" in the table above.

Table 3.9 further shows that the higher status migrants have, on the average, a higher level of education than lower ranking migrants. However, as Table 3.10 reveals, there was extreme variation in the amount of education of the members within each of these classes. Because of this, education was not included as a component of 'class', and was in no way utilized to predict or determine one's class standing. For example, having only Grade 6 education was a characteristic of some migrants with not only working and middle, but also upper class status.

Table 3.10

Distribution of Years of Schooling, by Social Class

Grade	Upper Class		Middle Class		Working Class		Lower Class		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
3-6	1	14.3	6	18.9	8	16.8	-	-	15	16.6
7-8	-	-	4	12.5	12	24.9	3	100.0	19	21.1
9-11	1	14.3	19	59.0	24	50.1	-	-	44	48.9
Other Programmes*	-	-	2	6.4	4	8.2	-	-	6	6.6
University Degrees and Graduate Work	5	71.4	1	3.2	-	-	-	-	6	6.6
Total	7	100.0	32	100.0	48	100.0	3	100.0	90	100.0

*Commercial Training, R.N., R.N.A., and Some College.

6 Occupational and Socio-Economic Status:

The sample of migrants interviewed included people from a wide variety of occupations, from a surgeon, to a tug boat captain, to a waiter. In most cases these occupations were relatively accurate indicators of the socio-economic status of the respondents, but in some instances, occupation alone did not clearly distinguish between the life styles of the migrants. For example, of the two iron workers in the sample, one is classified as middle class, and the other as working class, in the list of occupations in Table 3.11.* The middle class family lived in a modern well-furnished home in a new housing development, owned a late model car, took a family vacation abroad

*The working class iron worker is included among the list of "20 Industrial Shift Workers."

Table 3.11

Occupation of Households, by Social Class

Occupation	Upper Class	Middle Class	Working Class	Lower Class	Total
	3 medical specialists 1 retired bank manager 1 business investor 1 administrator, large service institution	5 retired: 1 pattern maker (city alderman) 1 hotel manager 1 electrician 1 cable company clerk 1 insurance representative (former city councillor) 3 store managers 2 furniture merchants 1 Manpower councillor 1 garage owner 1 Nfld. store owner 1 automotive parts clerk 3 plant foreman or division managers 1 iron worker 1 tug boat owner and captain 1 pattern maker 1 civil engineer	20 Industrial Shift workers 3 truck drivers 2 carpenters 1 maintenance man 1 security guard 1 waiter 1 real estate salesman 1 office mail clerk 1 hairdresser 1 cab driver	1 separated woman, on mother's allowance 1 unemployed man, on disability assistance	
Total	6	21	32	2	61

*Because of the vast majority of married female respondents did not work, their occupational status is considered in terms of that of their husbands. This is true even where the wife was a Newfoundlander, and the husband not. The only female respondent employed full-time was a hairdresser, and she is listed among the working class respondents.

from time to time, belonged to several church and school organizations, and entertained frequently. The working class family, on the other hand, resided in a much older home in an area of the city slated for urban renewal, did not own a car, did not belong to any clubs or organizations, and rarely travelled or entertained. Explaining why they generally stayed at home and watched television, they said, "We're too much in love with the chesterfield to go anywhere." Evidently, there are differences in general lifestyle and socio-economic status between these families, which a measure of occupational status alone would not detect. For this reason, such other factors as housing and life style were taken into account in the assigning of a 'class' status to each migrant family.

Although McCormack's study found that the migrant Maritimer's standard of living was often the result of several members of the family being employed,[2] only in 7 or 12.3% of the 57 married households did both spouses work. All of these were working class families. In six of these cases the wife herself was a Newfoundlander, while in the one case, the woman was British. Only one woman, a hairdresser, was employed full-time, while the others had such part-time jobs as variety store and supermarket clerks, cleaning staff, and one as a typist. Only three of the families said that the wife worked for a specific economic purpose. "We figure it's the only way we'll ever be able to afford a house." In the other four cases, the wives stated that they preferred to work, as it got them out of

the house, "gives me pin money", and relieved the tedium of a household when the children are grown, and so forth.

The majority of the respondents disapproved of Newfoundland women going to work. "You'd be a poor person before your wife would go out to work in Newfoundland." One woman, who works only part of the year, explained,

> My husband wouldn't allow me to work down home. But he got used to me working up here because all women work. But now that I've been off all winter, he doesn't want me to go back this summer. It's really not the way - for women to work in Newfie. (working class, female, age 49).

Many of the respondents reiterated the feeling that "If the women didn't work here, then the families would be no better off than they are in Newfoundland. They depend on the wife's job here." Evidently the migrants either did not need or did not consider appropriate the wife's working to augment family income.

The respondents have been described in terms of the basic migration differentials of age, sex, marital status, rural versus urban origin, education, and occupation. We will now consider two important aspects of their lives before their arrival in Hamilton: their previous migration history, and their motivation for leaving Newfoundland. *

To this point, the discussion has focused on the more 'individual' characteristics of the migrants, and thus the data was based on information about each one of the ninety respondents. However, this analysis of previous migration history, and, indeed, the ensuing analysis of kinship structure and community

ties, will consider the informants as either 'family' or 'migration' units. For example, any investigation of such family characteristics as kinship ties, orientation toward Newfoundland, or participation in Hamilton organizations, derives from information about the 61 separate families interviewed. In dealing with the actual process of moving, however, the situation becomes more complex. As Table 3.5 summarizes, 35 of the 40 migrants who were single when they came to Hamilton have since married. In the 18 cases where they married other Newfoundlanders, there are obviously two entirely independent moves made by one family. For this reason, analysis of factors related to the actual move to Hamilton is based on 71 separate migration units, composed of:

31 families married at time of move
18 single migrants who moved independently but later inter-married (9 couples)
17 single migrants who have since married non-Newfoundlanders
5 migrants who have remained single

71 separate migratory units

Migration History Before the Move to Hamilton:

An investigation of the migration histories of the respondents before the move to Hamilton includes all the moves made within Newfoundland and all intervening moves between there and Hamilton. Earlier, Table 3.8 considered the patterns of migration within the province, according to one's rural or urban origin, and found that the urban population remained much more stationary in Newfoundland than did the rural population,

with 72.7% living only in their place of birth, as compared with 25.0% of the rural movers.

Table 3.12

Patterns of Movement within Newfoundland, By Social Class*

Pattern of Movement	Upper Class		Middle Class		Working Class		Lower Class		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
No moves, place of birth only	4	57.2	8	25.0	19	39.6	2	66.7	33	36.7
One move from place of birth	2	28.5	12	37.5	13	27.1	1	33.3	28	31.1
Two or more moves*	1	14.3	12	37.5	16	33.3	-	-	29	32.2
Total	7	100.0	32	100.0	48	100.0	3	100.0	90	100.0

*Although we have emphasized that 71 separate moves were made to Hamilton, any discussion related to moves made by the migrants in Newfoundland must necessarily deal with all 90. This is because many of the Newfoundland husbands and wives had very different histories of movement throughout the island before their marriage. The N of 90 will therefore only pertain when referring to moves made before leaving Newfoundland. Also includes those who returned to their place of birth after leaving it. The highest number of moves made in this category was five.

Table 3.12 however reveals that the middle class respondents were the most mobile group within Newfoundland, despite the fact that they are more urban than the working class. Three-quarters of the middle class moved at least once within the province, with over a third moving at least twice. Yet when they finally left Newfoundland, over half went directly to Hamilton.

Table 3.13

Patterns of Movement Outside Nfld., By Social Class

Pattern of Movement	Upper Class		Middle Class		Working Class		Lower Class		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Direct to Hamilton	2	33.3	12	52.1	26	65.0	1	50.0	41	57.9
One Move Before Permanently to Hamilton*	-	-	6	26.0	11	27.5	-	-	17	23.9
2-3 Moves	2	33.3	4	17.4	2	5.0	1	50.0	9	12.6
4-8 Moves	2	33.3	1	4.5	1	2.5	-	-	4	5.6
Total	6	100.0	23	100.0	40	100.0	2	100.0	71	100.0

*In an number of cases, respondents came to the Hamilton area (where they had contacts) for a week or two, then went to some other part of Ontario and worked there for a few years before permanently returning to Hamilton. This first coming to Hamilton was not considered a move to the city; thus these people were not included among those moving directly to Hamilton.

The migrants as a whole were evenly distributed in terms of whether they remained only in their place of birth, moved only once, or more frequently within Newfoundland (36.7%, 31.1%, and 32.2%, respectively). When moving from the island to Hamilton, however, the predominant pattern was of direct migration. From Table 3.14 it is evident that those who lived only in their place of birth in Newfoundland were more likely to go directly to Hamilton and remain there, than were those who had moved within Newfoundland. In all, nearly 60% of the migrants moved directly to Hamilton, and have remained there ever since.

Jansen suggests an explanation for this pattern of

movement:

> ...(M)odern means of communication... (enable) contacts between relatives and friends...despite geographical distance. The pattern of ...migrations no longer tends to be one of progressive absorptions and dispersions...3

Table 3.14

Patterns of Movement & Moves within Newfoundland
Movement after Leaving Newfoundland

Newfoundland Moves	Directly to Hamilton		Two or More Moves		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Place of Birth Only	23	69.7	10	30.3	33	36.7
One or More Moves	31	54.3	26	45.7	57	63.3
Total	54	60.0	36	40.0	90	100.0

Although this will be considered at length in Chapter Four, one should note here that all of those who lived only in their place of birth in Newfoundland and came directly to Hamilton, knew either a Newfoundland friend or relative before moving to the city. Of those who made moves intermediate between Newfoundland and Hamilton, 73.3% had a contact in Hamilton, while 26.7% knew no one at all. (See Table 4.2). Thus, as Jansen contends, there is definitely a correspondence between having relatives in a prospective destination and one's propensity to move directly there.

As later analysis will show, the majority of those who did not move directly to Hamilton made only one move before going there, and for over half the cases, that move was to

Toronto. The remainder of those who made only one intervening move went primarily to Halifax or Montreal. Of those who made two or three moves, most were in Nova Scotia. Another four migrants had four to eight moves between Newfoundland and Hamilton. Of these, one involved a series of moves throughout the United States; two others were job transfers throughout Ontario, and throughout western Canada; and one person moved for a series of medical posts in Europe and Asia.

From the foregoing, a pattern of mobility emerges, characterized by rather few moves most of which were generally direct. Although only 23 or 25.6% of the migrants moved only once in their lives, the majority of the others have made no more than three moves. Rather than an impulsive series of migrations, this suggests that most of the respondents made few moves for more specific reasons. We will now examine the motivation behind perhaps the most crucial of moves, their decision to leave Newfoundland. *

Motivation to Migrate from Newfoundland*

One aspect of the migrants' decision to leave Newfoundland was whether they actually chose to make the move, or whether they felt forced to go. Sixty-four or 90.2% stated that they had actually wanted to leave, while 7 or 9.8% felt forced by economic circumstances, or other factors.

---

*These are the motivations of those leaving Newfoundland permanently for the first time. Several people actually returned after a few years and eventually left again. These will be considered in Chapter four.

> Because my husband was unemployed after the company he worked for closed up, we had to go. We didn't want to go.
> (working class, female, age 50).

> The economic situation in Newfoundland forced you to leave. When I came (1946) there was almost 100 years between here and home. There's not that much difference today. You could be just as comfortable in Lewisporte today as in Hamilton.
> (upper class, male, age 55).

Besides the issue of feeling forced versus wanting to move, the migrants also varied in terms of what made them decide to leave Newfoundland (and for some this differs from the motivation which brought them to Hamilton). In all, 37 or 51.3% reported economic motives as the reason for leaving, i.e., financial and job-related reasons. Despite this fact, only four of the migrants were actually unemployed at the time of the move. "I was unemployed in Newfoundland for eight months. I could have got jobs,but they wouldn't keep you going in cigarettes." Many just left the jobs they had, either because of the work conditions, or because of the salary.

> We were working all right, but we weren't making much more money than to cover room and board. We figured we could do better up here.
> (middle class, female, age 44).

> I drove a truck in the summer time and a school bus in the winter, but I still only earned about $250.00 a month. I figured I averaged 27¢ an hour in Newfoundland.
> (working class, male, age 30).

Table 3.15

Motivation to Migrate from Newfoundland, by Social Class

Motivation to Migrate	Upper Class		Middle Class		Working Class		Lower Class		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Financial	-	-	6.	26.1	20	50.0	1	50.0	27	37.5
Dislike of Job	1	14.2	5	21.8	4	10.0	-	-	10	13.8
Personal & Family	-	-	5	21.8	12	30.0	-	-	17	23.6
Adventure	1	14.2	4	17.3	3	7.5	-	-	8	11.1
World War	3	42.9	1	4.3	-	-	-	-	4	5.5
Education	2	28.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	2.7
Isolation & Climate	-	-	2	8.6	-	-	-	-	2	2.7
Other*	-	-	-	-	1	2.5	1	50.0	2	2.7
Total	7**100.0		23	100.0	40	100.0	2	100.0	72	100.0

*These reasons included:
"Canada never helped us during the war. The Yanks did. That's why I left. I was a bitter son of a gun against Confederation."
"No real reason. My husband is like that. He just looked at the map one day and decided he'd like to go to Hamilton. So off we went."

**There is one person added to the total migratory units here, because of one upper class couple who left Newfoundland independently of one another, but met in Nova Scotia and subsequently married before arriving in Hamilton.

For others, unfavourable conditions of employment provided the incentive for moving.

> I was so fed up after a winter of fishing that I just headed for Halifax. (working class, male, age 53).

> It was so rough and cold on that schooner, I promised myself that I'd never do this another year.

And, from a man who left Newfoundland in 1941:

> I just got fed up working in the Buchans Mines for four years. There, life was like being locked in a cell, nothing to live for but working, and getting a bottle of rum from St. John's.
> (middle class, male, age 55).

And one who left in 1968:

> I wanted to work some place where I could live and have a family, too. All of us grew up with our father in Labrador; I hardly knew my own father. I didn't want that to happen to me. Now here I am with evenings at home with my wife. I knew I had to leave Newfoundland in order to have that.
> (working class, male, age 22).

Seventeen or 23.6% of the movers stated that they left for personal reasons, and in most instances this was a matter of "just wanting to get the family together." In several cases this decision was made after the head of the household had been engaged in a pattern of seasonal employment in the Toronto-Hamilton area for a number of years.

> I didn't feel there was much down there anymore. There was no sense in me going back and forth, working here during the summer. What with the kids and all, it was just as well for us all to be together.
> (lower class, male, age 33).

Others motivated by personal reasons moved because of a family dispute, or because of the prospect of marriage to a person who had already left.

Eight or 11.1% of the movers departed the island for much less specific reasons, in search of 'adventure'.

> I left home like all teenagers, you know, looking for adventure...I just wanted to

> go and see what was on the other side of the fence...I was a real dizzy dame in those days!
> (working class, female, age 30).

> I wanted to see more of the world than there was between Morton's Harbour and St. John's.
> (middle class, female, age 54).

Seven of these eight people left before Newfoundland joined Confederation with Canada in 1949, and several confessed that the lure of a foreign country prompted them to leave at that time.

An assortment of reasons induced the moves of the remainder of the migrants. The four who left because of World War II were those who never returned to Newfoundland to live after their period of service. Three others who were in the war all went back to the island and lived there for a number of years before moving away permanently.

Two upper class respondents left in order to complete university degrees which were not offered at that time by Memorial University in St. John's. Both reported that they had ultimately intended to return to Newfoundland, but subsequently married, and went to Ontario. Isolation and climatic conditions prompted two others to emigrate. One 1955 mover stated that

> It was the isolation there. Here you can go anywhere in so many different directions. But in St. John's every Sunday the big deal was driving to Topsail. There were no paved roads outside the city, nowhere to really go in your spare time, and we were sick of it. We'd been in Montreal before. The final thing was the damn St. John's weather.
> (middle class, male, age 46).

> All the years I was working, I was planning about leaving Newfoundland and getting out of that climate when I retired. (middle class, male, age 81).

Table 3.15 cites the primary reasons for leaving, as specified by the respondents, but they were not necessarily the only motivations.

> The war happened to come along at that time, and that's what got me out of there. But there were also economic reasons why I left. I always thought that anyone from Ontario was very rich. (upper class, male, age 55).

And another man who left because of the war added that he did not go back to Newfoundland because "I would have left even if it had not been for the war. I just couldn't make a living in Newfoundland." Thus, a combination of factors occasioned the moves of some, and reinforced their decision to remain away.

This discussion of motivation to migrate has isolated further differences in behaviour patterns among the social classes. Regarding the general assumption of economic motives for Newfoundland migration, we found the working and upper classes occupying polarized positions, with the majority of the working class leaving Newfoundland for financial and work-related reasons, but the upper class rarely doing so. In a pattern that is repeated throughout this data analysis, the middle class hold an intermediate position, somewhat more motivated by economic factors than the upper class, and generally less so than the working class.

It is interesting to note that the factors which prompted the moves of 85% of the upper class - adventure,

completion of education, and the onset of World War II - all involved a more temporary type of move than, for example, the economic factors which incited many of the working and middle class to move. Indeed, as mentioned above, over half the upper class respondents actually stated that they had not intended to leave Newfoundland permanently when they first went away. For many of the working class respondents, however, there was the inherent assumption that they would remain out of Newfoundland at least until their retirement.

What emerges from this analysis is the realization that other research has perhaps over-emphasised the "push" factor of economic imbalance between regions in explaining migration from Newfoundland. Of course, our own statistics confirm that economic motives accounted for just over half the moves which we investigated, but what of the other half? Personal and family factors accounted for nearly a quarter of the moves, but this fact is rarely acknowledged. In short, our findings suggest that the role of economic factors in influencing Newfoundland migration should not be over-played. Our analysis further shows that their impact on motivation for moving is largely related to the intermediate and lower ranking migrants.

This chapter has described the sample of Newfoundland migrants in terms of their individual characteristics, their histories of movement, and the reasons why they left Newfoundland. In so doing, it has isolated class differences in the lives and life styles of the migrants before their move to

Hamilton. Chapter Four will now examine the relationship between the migrants and their kinship networks both in Newfoundland and Ontario, during the planning of the move, the actual arrival in Hamilton, and following the initial period of adjustment to life in a new environment.

Chapter Four

Kinship and the Process of Migration

The Role of Kinship among the Auspices of Migration:

This section will examine the role played by the kinship network, both in Newfoundland and the receiving area, before the actual move. This involves an analysis of whether kin deemed the migration as 'inevitable', and encouraged the move, of the nature of the contact maintained between Hamilton and Newfoundland, of the types of aid promised to the potential migrant, and of other ways in which they participated in the actual planning of the move.

> Quite apart from economic or family reasons, there appears to be a view of experience in which leaving home becomes an expectation. It may start early in life...1

McCormack's study of Maritime migrants in Toronto noted that an 'ethos of inevitability' characterized their decision to leave their homes. However, our research found that only 15.6% of the respondents had felt that it was 'just a matter of time' before they left Newfoundland. In these cases, moving away was rendered 'inevitable' either by community circumstances, or a particular family situation. As one 72-year-old man who has been in Hamilton for 26 years, noted:

> Moving away from Newfoundland?Girl, I roamed all my life. That's the way it was in Broad Cove, always leaving it and coming back. I never thought I'd stay anywhere. In Broad Cove, all the men went away in the spring. That was the only life we knew in Broad Cove.

> There was nothing to work at there, so men all went on the boats to Boston in the spring, and came back in the winter. (middle class, male, age 72).

A comparison of these comments with those of two young men who have been in Hamilton for two and five years respectively, reveals that the work situation in some outports has not changed over the years. Without an industrial base for employment, these communities see the men leave home for months of the year, often returning for only a month during the winter. From one generation to the next, there is no change in the work strategies of the residents.

> My father worked in Labrador and it just seemed natural to follow him. It just seemed like that was the only way I could work when I got older. (working class, male, age 21).

> My father always had to work in Labrador. I couldn't see there was any future in Newfoundland. You go to Labrador and that's it. (working class, male, age 22).

Although migration may not have been 'inevitable' for the remaining 84.4% of the respondents, it was indeed a 'tradition' in most of the families. Forty-two or 68.8% of the families had a brother and/or sister also living outside Newfoundland. Of the 28 Newfoundland couples (both spouses Newfoundlanders), 13 or 46.4% had siblings of both spouses living outside their home province. Where this pattern occurs in the extreme, migrants often have more relatives living outside Newfoundland than in it.

All of the respondents for whom the decision to move

was inevitable, also noted the role of the family in pre-selecting where their destination would be. In some cases, it was assumed that the migrant would join in the tradition of the men going to Labrador for seasonal work. Others stated that it was taken for granted that they would go to areas like Toronto, Hamilton, Halifax, and Boston, simply because they had sisters, brothers, or aunts and uncles there. Even those migrants who independently made the decision to leave reported that friends and relatives presumed they would go to a place where there were already community contacts established. This trend was decidedly more prevalent among the working and middle classes than for the higher status migrants.

Table 4.1

Previous Contacts in Hamilton, by Social Class

Contacts	Upper Class		Middle Class		Working Class		Lower Class		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Knew No One in Hamilton	4	66.7	5	21.7	-	-	1	50.0	10	14.0
Spouse or friends from Hamilton	1	16.6	2	8.6	6	15.0	-	-	9	12.6
Nfld. friends/ relatives in Hamilton	1	16.6	16	69.6	34	85.0	1	50.0	52	73.2
Total	6	100.0	23	100.0	40	100.0	2	100.0	71	100.0

Tables 4.1 and 4.2 demonstrate the class differences among the migrants in terms of the role of kin among the auspices of their migration to Hamilton, and its effects on the

subsequent pattern of movement. Only one of the upper class migrants had a Newfoundland contact in Hamilton, compared with 69.6% of the middle class, and 85% of the working class movers. None of the working class migrants came to the city without at least knowing of someone there.

> ...(a)scriptive solidarities tend to form the basis of the lower ranking migrant's relation to the city, while structures built around work provide the nucleus of the higher ranking migrant's relation to the city. 2

Table 4.2

Previous Contacts in Hamilton, and Pattern of Movement

Contacts	Direct to Hamilton	One Move Before Hamilton	Two or More Moves	Total
	N	N	N	N
Knew No One in Hamilton	2	2	6	10
Spouse or friends from Hamilton	3	4	2	9
Nfld. relatives/ friends in Hamilton	36	11	5	52
Total	41	17	13	71

Our findings confirm Tilly and Brown's thesis. Clearly, a kinship network in Hamilton was not the attraction for the upper class migrants; only one had any relatives there prior to moving. Of the remaining five, one was transferred in his job, while three came in association with medical practices. The other had trained in the Hamilton area during the war, and, familiar with the city, went there to seek employment after his

period of service. The middle class families were somewhat more divided according to whether kinship-or work-related auspices formed the basis of their initial contact with Hamilton. Five or 21.1% made their initial contact through work, while 18 or 78.3% made connections through relatives and friends. Of these five who knew no one, 3 had jobs arranged before their arrival; 3 of the 4 upper class families with no social contacts also had positions awaiting them. All the working class respondents, however, had contacts in the city, a definite necessity since only 3 or 7.5% of them had jobs upon arrival.*

Table 4.2 reveals that having a 'branch' family already established in Hamilton was related to a pattern of direct migration. Of the 52 movers who had such contacts prior to moving to the city, 36 or 69.2% went directly there, 11 or 21.2% made one intervening move, and only 5 or 9.6% made two or more moves. Indeed, those who had Newfoundland relatives and friends in Hamilton constituted 87.8% of the direct movers. Of the remaining five direct movers, only two knew no one in Hamilton. One of these had been in the area during the war, and the other has arranged a job there prior to moving. Two women came to marry men they had known in Newfoundland during the war, and one working class man arrived with two friends who had uncles living in the city. Clearly, then, the presence of contacts in Hamilton is directly related to the propensity

---

*The job situation of the migrants upon arrival in Hamilton will be considered later in this chapter.

to move directly to that city.

One further indication of the migrants' contacts in Hamilton, and the role which these contacts played, is the fact that 19 or 26.8% of the movers had actually visited Hamilton before moving there.

Table 4.3

Previous Visits to Hamilton, by Social Class

Type of Visits	Upper Class	Middle Class	Working Class	Lower Class	Total
	N	N	N	N	N
Visits from Newfoundland	-	1	5*	1*	7
Visits from Toronto and vicinity	2	3	2	-	7
Temporary stay in Hamilton**	1	1	3	-	5
Total	3	5	10	1	19

*In one of the working class and one lower class family, previous visits involved a seasonal work strategy; the working class respondent made six "work" visits to Hamilton before permanently moving, while the lower class migrant made five.
**The duration of these periods ranged from two weeks, to four months, to nearly a year.

Over half of these were working class migrants, and of these 70% had relatives or friends in Hamilton. Only 52.6% of the overall group had such contacts. All of the seven families who visited from Newfoundland knew someone in the city, as compared with only two of the seven who visited from Toronto and vicinity, and only two of five who had temporarily lived in the city at one time. Only one of migrants who visited from

Newfoundland actually went to Hamilton with the express intention of assessing the possibility of permanent residence there; the others stated that the idea of living in Hamilton occurred to them during, or sometime after, their visit.

Table 4.4

Amount of Planning Time for Move To Hamilton, by Social Class

Planning Time*	Upper Class		Middle Class		Working Class		Lower Class		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
One day	-	-	-	-	2	5.0	-	-	2	2.8
One week	-	-	1	4.3	2	5.0	-	-	3	4.2
2-3 weeks	1	16.6	3	13.0	3	7.5	-	-	7	9.9
One month	-	-	9	39.1	9	22.5	-	-	18	25.4
Six weeks	-	-	2	8.6	2	5.0	-	-	4	5.6
Two months	-	-	-	-	2	5.0	1	50.0	3	4.2
Three months	-	-	4	17.3	5	12.5	1	50.0	10	14.1
4 - 6 months	5	83.3	2	8.6	11	27.5	-	-	18	25.4
Six Months - One Year	-	-	2	8.6	4	10.0	-	-	6	8.6
Total	6	100.0	23	100.0	40	100.0	2	100.0	71	100.0
		4.3		2.6		3.4		2.5		3.2

*Planning time is defined as the length of time between when the decision to leave was made, and the actual move to Hamilton. Although the respondents all stated the period of planning in terms of weeks or months, there were variations in their perception of the period of time. For example, one man who planned his move for a month called it "an overnight decision", as did a woman who planned from Christmas to March. Yet a young couple who planned for two months said they "took a long time to get all our things settled in Newfoundland, and fix it up with my aunt in Stoney Creek."

Another facet of the role of the kinship network among the auspices of migration involves the amount and types of

planning done by the movers. Of the total of 71 separate moves, 30 or 42.2% had an interval of a month or less between the decision to leave and the actual departure, while 34 or 47.8% were planned for longer than three months. Here again, class differences characterized the amount of preparation done by the respondents. The upper class migrants planned for a longer period of time than those of lower socio-economic status. While the upper class took an average of 4.3 months between the decision and the move, the corresponding figure was 2.6 months for the middle class, 3.4 for the working class, and 2.5 for the lower class. Over 83% of the upper class planned for more than four months, while only 8.7% of the middle class, and 37.5% of the working class did so. From the findings, however, there is clearly no linear relationship between the amount of planning time and socio-economic status.

Significant to this analysis is a consideration of what form this planning took in terms of contact with kin and friends in the area of destination. Already we have noted that some migrants visited these contacts, but information on whether respondents already knew Newfoundlanders in Hamilton does not necessarily indicate that the network was utilized during the moving process. For some families, the very suddenness of the decision precluded any forewarning of arrival.

> One day I decided at twelve o'clock that I was going to go, and I was on the 4:30 plane to Toronto.
> (working class, male, age 30).

And of the other single-day decision,

> Anything I done was in an hour. I made up my mind one day when I said, 'That's the last time I'll throw the wheel of that engine!' Everyone was coming up here then. The more that left, the more you wanted to leave too. (working class, male, age 47).

> They didn't know I was coming in the world. (middle class, male, age 31).

Some of the migrants not only failed to tell their relatives that they were coming, but also did not solicit their aid upon arrival. By the time they got in touch with kin, they had already found accommodation and were becoming accustomed to the city on their own. This group was, however, a very small minority. Forty-five or 86.5% of the 52 respondents with friends/relatives in Hamilton made contact with these people before their move. In most cases, this involved correspondence over a period of time, and not just in connection with the move.

Twenty-two or 48.9% of those in touch with a Hamilton network reported that they were "encouraged" to come by Newfoundlanders already in Hamilton. Over three-quarters of this group was working class, with one upper class migrant, one lower class, and the remainder middle class. Advice was usually given in terms of job security and economic gain. Other respondents stated that kin in Hamilton told them to "make up your own mind" about coming, as they did not want to feel responsible if the venture proved unsuccessful.

> I asked my cousin, if I came up, could I get a job. She said I could, but she didn't know if Tom could. She said she could help me find something, but she didn't know about Tom at all. She told us to make up our own mind, in case Tom

> couldn't get a job, and it wouldn't be her fault, you know what I mean. (working class, female, age 49).

In correspondence between the migrants and their network in Hamilton, two basic forms of assistance were offered if the move was made. In all, 41 or 91.1% were promised (and actually received, see page 123) a place to stay while settling in to the city, and 20 or 44.4% were promised assistance in finding jobs, either in the form of recommendation at the industries where these contacts themselves worked, or advice on likely places to look. Such a guarantee was often enough to confirm a decision to leave.

> Emily's father promised to help me get a job, and in the wintertime in Newfoundland I wasn't doing much work. So I left. (working class, male, age 44).

The significance of an offer of assistance in job-seeking becomes clear when one realizes that 60 of the 71 migrants came to Hamilton seeking work. Only ten had arranged jobs prior to the move (three of these were actual transfers within the company), and one man came after retirement. However, the role of kin among the auspices of migration can be over-emphasised. A few of the informants reported that having relatives was not the only or necessarily the most important reason for selecting Hamilton as an area of destination, although it was a factor.

> I wouldn't say that having relatives here is the only reason for coming to Hamilton. It's also because Hamilton is so industrial. Like I have relatives in Kitchener, but I would never go to Kitchener. My God, what

> would you do in Kitchener? But parents in Newfoundland would never let you go before you could come to someone you knew here.
> (working class, male, age 44).

> Well, I can't really say it was because I had relatives here. If that were true, that wouldn't account for why I came here rather than New York, Boston, or Toronto. I visited people here often enough; it was a smaller city and the people friendly, and I liked it here.
> (middle class, female, age 44).

> Sure I had people here I knew, but I didn't come to this area because the climate was right and the natives friendly. The reason I came was purely economic. I could make money here, it was just as cold as that.
> (upper class, male, age 55).

However, the majority expressed sentiments similar to a young woman who claimed,

> Seeing I had so many brothers and sisters here made it easier for me. If not for them, I would not have stayed.
> (working class, female, age 32).

But they also felt that relatives alone were not enough to draw them to Hamilton. Because so many left Newfoundland for economic reasons, they clearly sought a destination that could provide economic security. An area with that potential, and also the home of relatives and friends, was ideal. For example, a number of the respondents left Toronto for Hamilton, because

> it didn't have the 'cushion' of Newfoundland friends you have when you come here, and the jobs, too.
> (working class, male, age 49).

Thus far we have examined the role of kinship networks first in terms of their 'expectation' of the migrant's eventual

move, and then their role in encouraging the move, the aid they promised to the potential migrant, and their part in the actual planning of the move. Now we will consider the types of assistance provided the migrants when they arrived in Hamilton, some of them with "nothing but what I had in my suitcase."

The Role of Kinship During the Process of Migration:

This part of the study investigates the relationship between the migrant and his kinship network during his arrival in and adjustment to the city. This includes the various strategies of migration, and the forms of assistance provided to the migrants, particularly in the perhaps most crucial task awaiting many of them at their destination: finding a job.

At the time of the move to Hamilton, 32 of the households included a married couple. Of these, 24 had married in Newfoundland, and the remainder after they had left Newfoundland. In the latter case, these couples all moved to Hamilton as a unit with their children, but the situation of these married in Newfoundland was quite different. In 15 or 62.5% of these households, the husbands moved to Hamilton before the rest of their families (all of these moves were directly from Newfoundland). In eight of the remaining nine families, both spouses and children moved together. "When we go, we're going together." In the ninth family, the wife came before her husband, got a job for herself, found a place for them to live, and then phoned her husband.

> He would phone and ask me if I was coming back home. I knew he would eventually come, but sometimes I wondered if I made a mistake. But now I know I didn't. I figured he'd soon get lonely about me and come, too.
> (working class, female, age 49).

As McCormack found in Toronto, there is evidence here of a kinship pattern in which the 'stem' family at home helps the wife and children left in Newfoundland while the 'branch' family network in the receiving area (Hamilton) helps the new arrival there. All but two of the 15 husbands who preceded their families had relatives with whom to stay, as did the women who came before her spouse. In a number of cases, family members and friends in Hamilton helped to "chip in for my passage", and the family back home lived with relatives because the house was sold, or they couldn't manage on the reduced income, and so on. This was one way in which the services of kin groups in both the sending and receiving areas were utilized.

As stated previously, the most common form of aid provided to migrants upon arrival in Hamilton was a place to stay. All 41 families who were offered accommodation actually received it, as well as another 4 who arrived without any fore-warning. Most also received advice on the location of services in the city, help in finding more permanent lodgings, and general orientation to the new environment.

> Jim took me around and showed me east; west, etc.
> (middle class, male, age 46).

> They were really helpful in helping me in getting to know the city, and just being company when I first came.
> (working class, female, age 32).

One other important function of the 'branch' family was that of dispensing advice on possible job opportunities for the migrants, and, in some cases, actually assisting them in getting a job. Nearly 85% of the movers arrived in Hamilton without a job, and yet almost all managed to find employment within the first month, very often with the assistance of their contacts in the city.

Table 4.5

Methods of Seeking Employment

	Method	N	%
A.)	Employment and Manpower Agencies Only	6	10
B.)	Newspapers Only	15	25
C.)	Relatives Only	12	20
D.)	Friends Only	4	6.7
E.)	Application at actual Factories only	9	15
F.)	A & D only	1	1.7
G.)	B & D only	2	3.3
H.)	A & B only	5	8.3
I.)	B & C only	1	1.7
J.)	C & E only	3	5
K.)	A & B & C	1	1.7
One woman had come to Hamilton to be married; she then decided to remain at home rather than work, as she had originally intended.		1	1.7
Total		60	100.0

Thirteen or 21.6% of those seeking employment used a combination of methods, while the remainder used single channels. Thirty-one or 51.7% utilized such institutionalized means of job-hunting as manpower or employment agencies, and newspaper

want-ads. Another 12 or 20% went directly to specific factories, or just "walked the sidewalk, writing applications". The remaining 24 or 40%* sought employment with the help of either relatives or friends.

> It took me five weeks to get a job, but I didn't look nowhere except Dofasco, 'cause Albert spoke for me and I knew he could get me in.
> (working class, male, age 22).

In general, the period during which the migrants relied upon their kin for direct assistance was comparatively short, and there were few cases of extended stays with relatives. The quickness and ease with which most managed to get a job (this may be a reflection of the fact that many of the respondents came to Hamilton in the period 1945-1955, and report that the job situation was better then) enabled them to establish themselves with their own accommodation and income within a few months.

> I stayed with Kevin for a few days. Then I pitched my own tent after that. I got the job on my own, too.
> (working class, male, age 21).

Only three families received financial assistance from their relatives at the time of their move. Although the average amount of money brought by the migrants was $350.00, this ranged from $12,000.00 by one migrant who had sold his home and paid off his debts, to another who came with $2.80.

> I can't believe it now that I think of it. Two dollars and eighty cents! I must have been half crazy, sure.
> (working class, male, age 48).

---

*The percentage is greater than 100 because of those who used a combination of these methods.

These forms of assistance apply only, of course, to those migrants who had Newfoundland contacts in Hamilton, and of this group, only two reported that they received no help from anyone at all. As for the remainder of the migrants, many had spouses from Hamilton whose families helped in the migration process. Most of the others were middle and upper class migrants who had the financial wherewithall and/or a particular training that enabled them to move into the community with relative ease.

An examination of the role of the kinship network, both in Newfoundland and Hamilton, after the migrant's initial period of adjustment to the new community, now remains. This will include analysis of the maintenance of contacts between the migrants and their networks in Hamilton, and the extent to which they themselves become the basis of a network for those migrants who come after them; the types and intensity of their communication with the 'stem' family and friends in Newfoundland; the frequency of their return visits and its relationship to whether they consider Newfoundland or Hamilton as 'home'.

Relations with Kin after the Move:

The extent to which the migrants maintain contacts with their relatives and friends in Hamilton varies considerably, but along age rather than class lines. The younger the migrants, the more frequent and intense the interaction with their 'branch' family. The findings further suggest that the more relatives a respondent had in Hamilton, the more likely he was to keep in touch with them. Several large families of brothers and

sisters, and their spouses, comprised an enclosed network of their own, and were in constant communication with one another. The extent of this interaction will, however, be considered in Chapter Five's analysis of informal patterns of interaction within the Newfoundland community in Hamilton.

Just as the migrants often had a network of 'branch' families and friends established in Hamilton prior to their move, they themselves become contacts for those Newfoundlanders who arrive after them. No less than 41 or 67.2% of the families had a relative who settled in Hamilton after they did. Of these, 32 or 79.5% themselves had had contacts situated in Hamilton before their move. A pattern of chain migration, as described in Chapter One, is evident here.

Earlier we saw that social class was related to whether or not one knew people in Hamilton before moving there. Now we find that it bears a further correspondence with this pattern of chain migration. Only two of the six upper class families had relatives come to Hamilton to live, whereas 47.8% of the middle class, and 65% of the working class families did. This confirms Tilly's assertion that "blue-collar workers... are also the most inclined to chain migration."[3]

Fifty-eight or 95% of the households interviewed have relatives still living in Newfoundland. Of the three families who no longer had kin there, two were rather elderly couples.

> There is nothing there for us anymore. The last time I was home, all I knew was one man. All the rest are dead. (middle class, male, age 72).

The other was a young woman with a large family of brothers and sisters all living in Hamilton. "I think of home, but I got no one down there." (working class, female, age 27).

Of those with relatives in Newfoundland, 54 or 93% maintain contact through letters, phone calls, and the like. The frequency of these contacts vary from once a week to merely a card at Christmas. The majority, however, do keep in touch with Newfoundland on a regular basis, the average being once every two months.* "I'm still waiting for mail from home every day." Most of these contacts are with immediate 'stem' family, especially parents, and, with their passing, communication with Newfoundland dwindles.

> We don't write to anyone in Newfoundland anymore, not since our parents died. (middle class, male, age 45).

Another indication of the migrant's contacts with a kinship network in Newfoundland is the frequency with which he visits the province, and this is further related to his perception of Newfoundland or Hamilton as home. Thirty-one or 50.8% of the families still thought of Newfoundland as home, 47.5% considered Hamilton to be home, and one woman felt no attachment to either. The distinction was often a difficult one for migrants to make.

> Newfoundland is my home, but Hamilton is where I make my bread and butter. I'd go back tomorrow if I had the chance, but I think I'll stay. (working class, male, age 51).

---

*The effect of such mail, particularly that bearing newspapers and community news, on the cohesiveness of the migrant group will be discussed in Chapter Five.

For this informant, as for many others, an acknowledgement of Newfoundland as home is made more difficult by the realization that they may never be able to go back.

> Newfoundland will always be my home, but I'm not going back there to live. I can't see a future at all in Newfoundland.
> (working class, male, age 21).

For some, the feeling intensifies, rather than decreases, over time.

> My home is still Newfoundland, after 60 years. I have thought of it many a time, I don't know why I do. The longer I'm away, the more I love Newfoundland. It's the 'auld sod', where I was born, just like sacred land to me.
> (middle class, male, age 82).

There were also a number of respondents for whom attachment to Newfoundland was coupled with a vehement dislike of Hamilton.

> I had a hell of a lot more in Newfoundland than I ever had here. I get so homesick. Dundas will never be home to me. I know I should have stayed home where I would have been happy.
> (working class, female, age 48).

For the migrants who think of Hamilton as home, decreasing attachment to Newfoundland has come about over time, and with the passing of crucial 'stem' family members.

> I haven't thought of it as home since mother died.
> (working class, male, age 43).

> My parents and my wife's parents are dead, and, in essence, there's nothing there for me. This is home now, so I guess I'll stay here and accept it as my last resting place.
> (middle class, male, age 46).

As the 'stem' family diminishes and the 'branch' family in

Hamilton becomes stronger, attachments change.

> We haven't seen Newfoundland in 23 years. Our son is here and this is home. (middle class, male, age 81).

For the four families who returned to Newfoundland to live for a time, this change of sentiment has been a sudden realization.

> After my husband died, I stayed in Newfoundland for four months. But it was like there was nothing there for me any more. Not that I had that much back in Hamilton, but at least I had a few friends here. (working class, female, age 38).

> It was a real shock to realize that we felt like we were 'coming home' to Hamilton when we returned here after five years in Newfoundland. (working class, male, age 42).

> We went back to try to live there again, a foolish mistake on my part. We found the climate intolerable, the isolation irksome, and the cost of living savage. The longer I stay away now, the less desire I have to return. (upper class, male, age 55).

This type of reaction on the part of the 'homecomer' has been studied by Alfred Schutz. "The homecomer...expects to return to an environment of which he always had and - so he thinks - still has intimate knowledge..."[3] Instead, the discovery that things are quite different from his expectations is frequently the first shock which transforms the 'homecomer' into the 'stranger', as these migrants discovered.

The 31 families who thought of Newfoundland as home have lived in Hamilton an average of 15.9 years, while those who think of Hamilton as home have lived in the city an average

of 21.6 years. This compares with an average residence of 18.4 years for the group as a whole. Therefore, the 'Newfoundland-oriented' migrants have lived in Hamilton for a shorter length of time than those who considered Hamilton as home.

Of the 61 families, only three have not been back to Newfoundland since moving to Hamilton. One of these was a single male migrant who has been in the city only a few months, but who plans to visit in the summer of 1974. An elderly couple who have lived in Hamilton just over a year have also not been back. The third family has been in Hamilton for seven years, but the husband's entire family lives in the area. A working class man, he spoke of Newfoundland: "I cut off all ties. I was finished." His wife, quite disillusioned with living in Hamilton, stated, "I got no desire to go back to visit, unless I go back to live."

For the other 58 families, return visits to Newfoundland have, for the most part, been quite frequent. Many migrants stressed that they like to go back every second year, although there is evidence that this frequency decreases over time, and as the home ties weaken.

> When mother was alive, I tried to go back every year.
> (middle class, female, age 50).

> I miss my mother there, and that's why I go back to visit whenever I can. If she weren't there, it would be different.
> (middle class, male, age 46).

Some migrants find such visits therapeutic, relieving homesickness, or making them more appreciative of their lives

in Hamilton, and consequently more content there.

> I was homesick most of the first two years here, but once I was home again, and saw my parents and family, I was much more calm about it. It sort of satisfies you for a while, anyway.
> (lower class, female, age 29).

> I was a little homesick and I thought that at least a trip back would let me know how I really feel. Well, I was there two weeks, and I got a telegram from here, telling me I was missed. That was it. I had to get home to Hamilton.
> (middle class, female, age 63).

> Last year I went down alone, although I was glad to get back after a few weeks. Once you've seen your family and friends, that's it.
> (middle class, male, age 51).

> I always thought when I first came here, that if I ever got back to Newfoundland, I'd never leave it again. But when I got there, I didn't want to stay.
> (middle class, female, age 69).

For the migrants as a group, the rate of visits to Newfoundland was every 3.7 years. However, this varied among the migrants not only according to class, but also whether or not they perceived Newfoundland as home. 'Newfoundland-oriented' migrants returned at an average rate of every 3.3 years, while those who thought of Hamilton as home returned on an average of every 4.1 years.

McCormack's study of Maritime migrants to Toronto found that the more affluent migrants make trips back to their home, often on the occasion of funerals. Our study in Hamilton found that all class groups made return visits to the island, although the frequency of visits was highest for the higher status

migrants: every 2.6 years for the upper class, as compared with every 3.9 years for the middle class, and every 4.3 years for the working class. Financial ability may be the influencing factor here, but it is difficult to determine.

Contary to the general pattern just discussed, those upper class migrants who thought of Hamilton as home (33.3%) made return visits more frequently than those who thought of Newfoundland as home. However, those upper class migrants who thought of Newfoundland as home visited it on average of every 4.9 years, despite the fact that a 'stem' family no longer existed there (in all cases their parents had died), while those who were Hamilton-oriented visited every 2.2 years because of elderly parents. They all stated that once their parents died, their home visits would quickly diminish.

> I'm completely divorced from Newfoundland. (upper class, male, age 55).

> I've left most of my life in Newfoundland behind...I appreciate what was there, but I would never give up this for it! I have no ties, no loyalties, no emotional contacts. (upper class, male, age 51).

In spite of his statement, this man had visited Newfoundland 14 times in 16 years to visit his parents.

For the middle and working classes, those who thought of Newfoundland as home visited the province more frequently than those who did not. In all, 38.1% of the middle class thought of Newfoundland as home, as did 57.6% of the working class, and both lower class families. In general, those middle and working class migrants who were 'Hamilton-oriented' had

lived in the city for a longer time, and had fewer 'stem' family contacts back home than those who were 'Newfoundland-oriented.'

Table 4.6

Perception of Newfoundland as Home, and Plans to Return

Plans	Perception: Newfoundland as Home		Hamilton as Home		Neither as Home		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Return to Newfoundland	11	35.5	4	13.7	-	-	15	24.6
Not return to Newfoundland	18	58.1	23	79.3	1	-	42	68.8
Undecided	2	6.4	2	8.0	-	-	4	6.6
Total	31	100.0	29	100.0	1	100.0	61	100.0

One further indicator of the strength of the migrant's ties with the 'stem' family in Newfoundland is whether or not he eventually intends to return there to live. (Table 4.6) Nearly three-quarters of those who said they would return to Newfoundland thought of it as home. However, this whole group constituted only a quarter of the total households. Only 35.5% of those who thought of Newfoundland as home said they would return, compared with 13.7% of those who thought of Hamilton as home. Interestingly enough, just over half of those who plan to return to the island intend to return to their home communities, while 46.7% propose to go elsewhere in the province. This is especially true of the five families who still retain property in Newfoundland.

> I got a piece of ground my grandfather gave me. I'll hang on to it, you never know when you may want to go back.
> (working class, male, age 52).

Nevertheless, it is eveident that thinking of Newfoundland as home is no indication that the migrant plans to return, and, indeed, the very idea of returning there to live is not even considered by the majority of the sample.

Where do the migrants plan to go from here? Are they happy with life in Hamilton, and would they do it over again if they had known the consequences? These questions, and how their kinship networks figure in the responses of the migrants will be examined in the concluding section of this chapter.

Assessment of Move and Future Plans:

Over 90% of the families reported that they like living in Hamilton, and in the vast majority of cases their satisfaction was based on the same criteria that determined so many of the moves: economic security.

> I've got a roof over my head, food in the fridge, and I get paid tomorrow. What more could I want? I'm happy here, livin', eatin', getting fat.
> (working class, male, age 60).

> I never lived until I came here. I never came here for no good time, either. I came here to work. It's not a new house I got, but it's home, it's comfortable, and it's mine.
> (working class, female, age 58).

The comments of other of the respondents suggest that they only came to like the city after a period of time, and that their first years in Hamilton were rather unhappy.

> My first impression of Hamilton was that it was filled with untidy women with scwalling children. My first year here all I could think was that I hate this terrible, terrible place.
> (upper class, female, age 47).

> I think a place grows on you. I hated this place the first year. Now I can't ever see myself going back to St. Vincent's. There, everybody knows everyone else's business.
> (middle class, female, age 28).

A number of those migrants who reported that they did not like living in Hamilton actually seemed surprised at such a question.

> Actually I wouldn't say I like living in Hamilton. Liking it or not just isn't the issue, though really. It's where I make my living.
> (working class, male, age 21).

> Are you kidding? Of course I don't like city life. A big town is the loneliest place in the world. But this is my livelihood and I got to stick with it.
> (working class, male, age 52).

> Whether you like it depends on your job. Your job comes before your social life or anything.
> (working class, female, age 35).

Of the six families who did not like living in Hamilton, five felt that they would at least remain there until retirement. Only one woman expressed such total dissatisfaction that she would depart Hamilton at a moment's notice.

> I hate up here. There's nothing here for me. People don't know how to be friendly. They don't have any respect for people here like in Newfoundland. I will never stay in this God-foresaken bloody hole.
> (working class, female, age 48).

Table 4.7

Plans to Remain in Hamilton, by Social Class

Plan	Upper Class		Middle Class		Working Class		Lower Class		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Stay in Hamilton	4	66.7	18	85.7	18	56.3	1	50.0	41	67.2
Move on Again	2	33.3	3	14.3	14	43.7	1	50.0	20	32.8
Total	6	100.0	21	100.0	32	100.0	2	100.0	61	100.0

Indeed, as Table 4.7 indicates, just over two-thirds of the migrants felt that they will stay in Hamilton now that they are settled there. Significantly, all the middle class respondents were happy with life in Hamilton and here again we see that over 85% intended to remain there, compared with 66.7% of the upper class, and only 56.3% of the working class.

> I think I'll stay here. Many, many times I have wondered if a guy like me goes back home and tried to open up a business like I got here. So I have thought, but I guess I'll leave well enough alone.
> (middle class, male, age 46).

> I always got money now, which I never had before. We admits we had nothing back in Newfie. There were times when we didn't know where the next meal came from, but we all came here and bettered ourselves. So we'll stay here now..
> (working class, female, age 49).

Some families face the prospect of remaining in Hamilton with reluctance.

> My husband will never leave the steel mills.

> I guess the security of the job is everything now. As long as he got security, he don't care what he does is like. Look here we are all these years, and we still got nothing.
> (working class, female, age 50).

Those migrants who intended to eventually leave Hamilton suggested a variety of destinations.

> We'll never settle down in one place. We want to go to Saskatchewan.
> (working class, female, age 35).

Others had very specific plans to move. One couple was building a house in Nova Scotia (the husband was a Nova Scotian), and was looking forward to living near friends there. One Newfoundland family was planning to return home within two weeks of the interview. Although they had lived in Hamilton for 25 years, and had decided to return to Newfoundland only after two years of deliberation, the husband described himself:

> I'm a mover. I never could settle in one place much. You leave a place after 40 years as a steel worker, and you wonder what you did with your life. I've planned with my brothers for two years to go back to Newfoundland, in the business with them. It's not just an impulsive move, but the way I feel, "Nothing ventured, nothing gained."
> (working class, male, age 44).

The mother-in-law of this man suggested that such a move back to Newfoundland would eventuate in the whole family returning there.

> Oh, yes, we'll go back. My son-in-law is going down this summer to arrange a job. Well, when he goes, that'll be two daughters down there. Our son keeps saying he wants to go back, and father here, too. So, I'm quite sure that when they go back, the whole family will end up there.
> (working class, female, age 60).

The observations of another young woman further suggest this 'chain reaction' type of move, and also the fact that for some, the decision to leave Hamilton is somewhat more impulsive than that described above.

> Some of these young guys here are just not settled. One or two are here and plan to make the best of it, but the rest all want to be home. One came here yesterday and says he's going home on Saturday. They're always and forever talking of going home. If one of them left tomorrow, they'd all be gone in a month.
> (middle class, female, age 28).

It is interesting to note that all of the migrants who plan to leave Hamilton, either to return to Newfoundland or go elsewhere, intend to move where they already have friends or relatives established. They evidently have utilized, and plan to further utilize their kinship networks in subsequent moves, and not only the move to Hamilton.

Some notable differences characterize the migrant's responses to whether they would encourage other Newfoundlanders to leave their homes and whether they would encourage them to move to Hamilton. As Tables 4.8, 4.9, and 4.10 reveal, the majority would not encourage Newfoundlanders to leave home, but, if they knew someone who was intending to leave anyway, would urge them to move to Hamilton.

The decision not to encourage potential migrants to leave Newfoundland does not necessarily imply that the migrants have made a judgement as to the relative merits and disadvantages of such a move. In many cases, it reflects a general reluctance, particularly among the middle and upper class families, to

suggest to someone what they should do.

> That sort of move has to be self-motivated or it just wouldn't work. When you leave your family, then you have to cope on your own. Therefore you must make that decision for yourself.
> (upper class, female, age 49).

> I never encourage people to go any place. It's got to be up to a person himself. Everyone has a different opinion.
> (working class, female, age 49).

Table 4.8

Advocacy of Out-Migration from Newfoundland, by Social Class

Encourage Newfoundlaners to leave home as you did	Upper Class		Middle Class		Working Class		Lower Class		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Yes	3	50.0	8	36.4	11	34.4	1	50.0	23	37.1
No	3	50.0	14	63.6	21	65.6	1	50.0	39	62.9
Total	6	100.0	22*	100.0	32	100.0	2	100.0	62*	100.0

*Husband and wife disagreed on their response.

Particularly among the migrants who have been in Hamilton for over twenty years there was the opinion that factors which motivated them to leave no longer existed in Newfoundland, and therefore they would not encourage out-migration today. The comments of an older male respondent who has lived in Hamilton for 31 years, are representative of this position.

> That's hard to answer, you see. Look at it in two ways. If I were their age in Newfoundland now, I would never leave it. It depends on what you see in leaving it. You're not so tied now to the island as in our time. We left through force of economic

> circumstances, and those circumstances just don't exist in Newfoundland today. (middle class, male, age 72).

This is in direct contrast to the statement made by a young male respondent who has lived in Hamilton for four years.

> Unless things improve, there is nothing there in Newfoundland for them all. Unless you have a trade or a university degree. Here, education is not as important as there. It's a dead-end, particularly if you don't finish high school. It's different here. (working class, male, age 25).

Table 4.9

Encouragement of Newfoundlanders to go to Hamilton, by Social Class

Would you encourage Newfoundlanders to come to Hamilton	Upper Class		Middle Class		Working Class		Lower Class		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Yes	1	16.7	15	68.2	22	68.7	1	50.0	39	62.9
No	5	83.3	7	31.8	10	31.3	1	50.0	23	37.1
Total	6	100.0	22*	100.0	32	100.0	2	100.0	62*	100.0

*Husband and wife disagreed on their responses.

Most of the respondents felt that Hamilton was 'as good as any' a destination for Newfoundlanders. The only place they vehemently opposed was Toronto.

> Hamilton is the city of opportunity for Newfoundlanders that want to work. Go to Toronto if you want to be a bum. It's overcrowded, and they're all on welfare over there. (middle class, male, age 31).

Table 4.10

Consistency of Responses on Advocacy of Newfoundland Out-Migration and Encouragement of Movement to Hamilton, by Social Class

Responses	Upper Class		Middle Class		Working Class		Lower Class		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Agreed "Yes"	-	-	8	36.4	11	34.4	1	50.0	20	32.3
Agreed "No"	2	33.3	5	22.7	9	28.1	1	50.0	17	27.4
No - Yes	1	16.7	5	22.7	11	34.4	-	-	17	27.4
Yes - No	3	50.0	4	18.2	1	3.1	-	-	8	12.9
Total	6	100.0	22	100.0	32	100.0	2	100.0	62	100.0

Notably, the middle and working class informants were comparable in terms of their replies to both issues. While the upper class was evenly divided on the question of whether to support migration from Newfoundland, they clearly did not advocate moving to Hamilton. However, four of these five families had phrased their responses as "Not necessarily to Hamilton", and were therefore not entirely opposed to the idea of Hamilton as a potential area of destination. The middle and working class respondents were most consistent in their answers to both queries. The proportions of those either supporting or opposing both the move from Newfoundland and the destination of Hamilton were equivalent for each class.

One might suppose that an unwillingness to encourage others to go to Hamilton reflects the migrants' own regret at having made such a move. Table 4.11 indicates that this is not so. An overwhelming 88.7% of the families regarded their

migration positively.

Table 4.11

Satisfaction with Move, by Social Class

If you knew then what you know now, would you move all over again?	Upper Class		Middle Class		Working Class		Lower Class		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Yes	6	100.0	21	100.0	27	81.8	1	50.0	55	88.7
No	-	-	-	-	6	18.2	1	50.0	7	11.2
Total	6	100.0	21	100.0	33*	100.0	2	100.0	62	100.0

*A husband and wife disagreed on their response.

> Knowing what I know now, I would have come 25 years ago.
> (working class, male, age 40).

> If we had the time over again, we would do as we did, except start out younger.
> (working class, male, age 47).

> I would change day-to-day things, but, overall, no, I am happy with the way things turned out.
> (working class, male, age 60).

A number of those who did not regret their decision nevertheless wondered about how their lives would have been had they not moved.

> I have often wondered what it would have been like if we hadn't moved. Maybe we should have waited longer 'till my husband found a job...I don't know.
> (working class, female, age 50).

The upper and middle class were unanimous in their approval of their move, with only six working class respondents and one lower class respondent dissenting. Significantly, four

of these six were female, and their regret of moving generally reflected worry about children being raised in rough neighbourhoods, marriage problems, and the like.

> I shouldn't have come, that's where I made my big mistake. I know I was happy before I came here, and everything has gone wrong since. My husband used to make $49.00 a week when we lived in Newfoundland, and that just wasn't enough to keep the family going on. Now he makes $160.00 a week here. But he started to drink, and go out every night to the hotels and bars, and everything started to go wrong. We've been here six years and we've been separated six times. I never even heard of anyone getting divorced until I came here; everyone does it here. (lower class, female, age 27).

> It was the worst mistake I ever made. All I do is worry about the children. (working class, female, age 40).

> If I had my time over, I would have stayed in Newfoundland. (working class, female, age 30).

Employment problems, marital instability, and the difficulties of child-rearing rather than problems particular to Hamilton per se, were the factors which threatened the happiness of these migrants, and induced feelings of regret. In no case was the cause attributed directly to life in Hamilton. In fact, one migrant who was preparing to leave and return to Newfoundland spoke of the value of his experience of living there.

> Coming to Hamilton has been an education in itself. I learned nothing in Newfoundland, only how to get in a fishing boat and fish. As long as you can read and write, that's all that mattered in my school. I went to a one-room school with just one woman teacher. If there only was someone in school to get you

> going, you would be okay, but there wasn't. I learned a lot here, and in that respect, I definitely don't regret living here. (working class, male, age 44).

This chapter has analysed the role of the kinship network throughout all the stages of migration: from the decision and planning of the move; to the arrival in Hamilton, and subsequent need for assistance in finding shelter, a job, and the like; to the maintenance of contacts between the migrants and both their 'stem' and 'branch' families, frequency of correspondence and visits, as well as perception of Newfoundland as home. This latter section on the migrant's assessment of their move, and plans for the future, reveals that many Newfoundlanders determine satisfaction with life in Hamilton in terms of economic factors and job security, rather than social factors. From the analysis, the middle class emerge as the most consistently satisfied with life in Hamilton, in regard to their evaluation of the city itself and of the move in general, and in their intention of staying there.

Chapter Five

Community

This investigation of the sense of 'community' among Newfoundland migrants in Hamilton will examine both the formal and informal aspects of community life. At the informal level, we will study the social interaction patterns of the migrants in terms of the types and frequency of contact maintained among them, and the extent to which they experience a 'consiousness of kind' with other Newfoundlanders. Analysis of the more formal elements of community will include the Newfoundland food stores, newspapers, and social clubs and associations. The dimensions of this distinction between the formal and informal elements of community are outlined by Gordon:

> The functional characteristics of the migrant community at the informal level provide a basic psychological source of group-identification and the locus of a sense of peoplehood, while the more formal type of community includes a patterned network of groups and institutions which allow an individual to confine his primary group relationships to his own group throughout all the stages of the life cycle. 1

Clearly, the basis of a sense of community lies ultimately in its informal structures. We will consider these first, and then proceed to a discussion of the presence and potential of the more formal structures among the Newfoundlanders in Hamilton.

Social Networks and Patterns of Interaction:

As far as contacts with other Newfoundlanders are concerned, many of the migrants interacted primarily with persons from the same community of origin in Newfoundland, and in a majority of cases, these were relatives. As discussed in Chapter Four, patterns of chain migration were predominant among the working class migrants, and after the move, interaction with relatives and 'home town' people remained more characteristic of the working class than the higher-ranking migrant. The rate of contact between the migrants and their Newfoundland friends/relatives was fairly high: for the majority at least every two weeks, and for many, every week.

This frequency of contact may well be attributed to the extensive 'connectedness' of the social networks investigated. In 31 or 50.9% of the families interviewed, one or both spouses (or single person) was related to another person in the sample. For example, among those interviewed were six pairs of brothers, four of sisters, three brothers-sisters, two mother-daughters, five uncle-nephews, one aunt-niece, and one uncle-niece. As one woman commented, "Most of them we're related to, somehow." There were definite class differences in the 'connectedness' of these networks. In no case did an upper class family have relatives among the other respondents (nor did they have any Newfoundland relatives in Hamilton at all), but 10 or 47.6% of the middle

class, 20 or 62.5% of the working class, and one of the two lower class families, did. Thus, of the families with relatives in the networks investigated, 32.2% were middle class, 64.5% were working class, and 3.2% were lower class. For the working class respondents in particular, much of the interaction discussed in this chapter will involve their relationships with their relatives rather than friends.

None of the upper class migrants reported being close enough friends with other migrants to invite them into their home on a regular basis, and none included a Newfoundlander among their closest friends in Hamilton. Most of the working class families (78.1%) and over half the middle class families (61.9%) did state that a fellow Newfoundlander (often a relative) was a close friend.

Respondents signified that they mainly 'got together' with other Newfoundlanders on the occasions of weddings, funerals, house parties and card games.

> We don't go with other Newfoundlanders to the ale houses or clubs, I tell you. All us Newfoundlanders enjoys a good cup of tea. No, we mostly get together at each others houses for 'auction' or other card games, about once a week. (middle class,male, age 72).

> A lot of them are from our home town and you meet them with other Newfies at weddings and funerals. You see your friends about once a month at weddings and wakes or parties. Sometimes in the summer we go on picnics. (middle class, male, age 46).

Most of the respondents, particularly the working class, meet

other Newfoundlanders through these informal gatherings. "We mostly meet Newfoundlanders through other Newfoundlanders. One tells the other." For those who are not affiliated with such a network, and generally do not interact 'socially' with other migrants, work and church activities provide the main occasions when they come into contact with other Newfoundlanders.

There were also a number of Clubs, not specifically 'Newfoundland' clubs, but many featuring 'Country and Western' music, which some of the younger single and married respondents cited as places to go and meet other migrants. Among these were the Continental Club on Gertrude Street, the Jockey Club Tavern on Barton Street, the Town Casino Dance Hall on Main Street East, the R.H.L.I. Club Rooms on Barton Street, and the Park House Tavern on King Street West.

> We have a party at the Club Continental once a week. It's a real down east club, and all easterners go there.
> (working class,male, age 21).

> Harry Hibbs is playing at the Town Casino. They're Newfoundland dances, not Ontario dances.
> (working class, female, age 35).

> I know a few Newfoundlanders in Hamilton. Actually, you meet most Newfoundlanders where there's good country music.
> (working class, male, age 22).

All of the respondents who frequented such clubs were either working or lower class. Most of those interviewed did not belong to any clubs like these in Hamilton, and showed disdain toward those who did. In many cases they blamed those who patronize such clubs for giving Newfoundlanders a

bad reputation for drinking and fighting. The extent of their scorn, and their opinions on how Newfoundlanders should gather socially on a regular basis, will be examined later in this chapter, in the discussions of 'consciousness of kind', and Newfoundland associations.

Lest the preceding section be misleading, however, it is important to note that, although there were several rather large networks involving a number of migrants, there were also many cases of isolated contact. For example, in several instances, the only Newfoundlander whom the respondent knew was the person who had referred this writer to him. And even in some of these cases, it was not so much a matter of 'knowing' as 'knowing of'. One Newfoundlander worked with a man who had a Newfoundland wife; although he had himself never met the woman, he referred me on to her, and she herself had never come into contact with another Newfoundlander in Hamilton. Another man reported that his son's playmate had once mentioned that his own father was a Newfoundlander; here again, the two respondents had never met. Several were also one-family networks, with very little contact with other migrants in Hamilton. "Sometimes I thinks that, except for my family, I'm the only Newfoundlander in this city." There were, however, a number of inter-related larger networks that warrant examination here, particularly in that they demonstrate the degree to which common community of origin is often the basis of interaction, and how family - especially

marriage-ties link these networks together.

In the study, four persons emerged as central figures in separate networks based on their community of origin in Newfoundland. One man, however, had connections with all four. He and his wife were the central links in a network of about 20 families, and nearly 35% of the respondents (mostly working class) reported that they either knew him, or at least knew of him. This man was middle-aged, and from Green's Harbour. He was well known to the four Green's Harbour families interviewed, and to the four from Burnt Point, who were all relatives of his wife. Through his wife's cousin, who married a man from Shearstown, he also knew the five families from that community. One of these families included a woman whose husband was from Bishop's Cove. Through him, he thus knew the four families from there, and three other families from Spaniard's Bay related to the Bishop's Cove network by marriage. All of these communities are situated along either the south shore of Conception Bay, or the adjacent north shore of Trinity Bay, and are close enough for easy contact among them.

The individual central to all these networks generally undertook to hold house parties, or organize picnics and dances, in order to bring his relatives and friends together. However, even this informant alluded to a trend which he felt was developing among his Newfoundland friends in Hamilton.

> Lately, we're tending to see a lot more of foreign people, too. I like bowling in tournaments, for example, and most

> Newfoundlanders aren't sports-minded like I am. But we still either go to a dance or have a party about twice a month.
> (working class, male, age 46).

Several others reiterated this view.

> Most of them from our part of Newfoundland used to all have parties, but that's gone now. We don't get together too often, too busy, all getting like Canadians.
> (working class, female, age 60).

> There haven't been any Newfoundlanders here for a coon's age, about three years.
> (working class, male, age 52).

One middle-aged man suggested that it is not so much length of time in Hamilton, as age and the growing of children, which affects the rate of interaction among Newfoundlanders over time.

> The last three years have made a difference with the Newfoundlanders I know here. With the children growing up and getting married, you go to your children's houses to visit, instead of your friends. It spreads things out. In a way, I see them less now than I used to. What with visiting children, you don't see them too much. You visit the kids, and see your friends later. Then the hours are gone when you would have been together.
> (working class, male, age 52).

There was also evidence that marriage, particularly to a non-Newfoundlander, decreases the frequency of contact between the migrant and his friends. "We get together less now than when I was single."

A few of the informants referred to a hesitancy on the part of Newfoundland migrants to engage in business activities with their cohorts.

> It's hard to get Newfoundlanders involved with one another in business. I wanted to start a construction business when I came here, and wanted some Newfoundlanders to go in on it with me. But they wouldn't. We'd be millionaires today. But Newfoundlanders make that buck, and they want to hang on to it.
> (working class, male, age 46).

Actually, this was just a specific example of a general sentiment expressed by over half the respondents: "Most Newfoundlanders I know won't stick together."

> Newfies are not clannish here like they are in Galt and Toronto. I couldn't tell you why.
> (middle class, female, age 28).

Several people suggested that sheer numbers forced the Newfoundlanders to cling together in Toronto, while the fact that "All the Newfies in Galt are from Bell Island, sure" accounted for their homogeneity in that city.

> The Newfoundlanders here are scattered all over, insignificant, not like a group.
> (working class, female, age 50).

Most migrants felt that there were very few Newfoundlanders in Hamilton, with the most generous estimate being "a couple of hundred."

Although a number of the respondents have a high rate of interaction with other Newfoundlanders and include them among their closest friends, the social lives of the majority of the migrants are by no means entirely enclosed within their network of Newfoundland relatives and friends. Only 17 of the 61 families stated that most of the people they knew as friends in Hamilton were Newfoundlanders. Here again social

class differences obtain, with the majority of these families (64.6%) working class, and 29.7% middle class. None were upper class. Thus, only 27.9% of the families had a predominance of Newfoundlanders among their friends, and might be said to have a social life confined primarily within a community of Newfoundland relatives and friends.

One measure of the extent to which the respondents seek to extend their social lives beyond their Newfoundland network is reflected in their level of participation in general (non-Newfoundland) groups within Hamilton.

Table 5.1

Family Participation in Social Organizations, by Social Class

Member of Family	Upper Class		Middle Class		Working Class		Lower Class		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Both Spouses*	6	100.0	6	28.4	6	18.7	-	-	18	29.5
Single Male or Husband Only	-	-	8	38.0	12	37.5	-	-	20	32.7
Single Female or Wife Only	-	-	1	4.2	-	-	-	-	1	1.6
Neither Spouse	-	-	6	28.4	14	43.8	2	100.0	22	36.2
Total	6	100.0	21	100.0	32	100.0	2	100.0	61	100.0

*This includes all married couples, even those cases where only one spouse is a Newfoundlander.

In 63.8% of the families, at least one of the migrants belonged to an association in Hamilton. In 32.7%, however, only the male is a member of such a group. In many cases, especially for working class males, this represents membership

in company unions rather than 'social' organizations, and thus somewhat distorts the picture. In nearly a third of the families, both spouses are involved in these activities, with the distribution varying from all of the upper class to 28.5% of the middle class, 18.7% of the working class, and none of the lower class. At the other extreme, nearly a third of the middle class families and 43.7% of the working class families did not belong to an association or group of any kind.

There was also variation, by social class, in the type of associations in which the respondents were members. Among the working class, membership was predominantly in unions, such as the Teamsters, Steel Workers, Pipefitters, Carpenters, and Iron Workers Unions. Most other working class memberships were in church - or school - related groups like the Catholic Women's League, Altar Society, and PTA; or such sports-related clubs as Fishing and Anglers, or a Bowling League. Middle class respondents were more involved in service and business clubs, such as the Chamber of Commerce, Big Brothers, United Appeal, Ontario Mental Health Association, and the Association for the Mentally Retarded. They were also active members in such fraternal and church groups as the Masonic Order, Orange Lodge, Knights of Columbus, or the Canadian Legion, Optimists Club, and Boy Scout organization. The upper class families differed yet again in terms of their membership in the Hamilton Yacht Club, various golf clubs,

hospital auxiliaries, Art Gallery Committee, Junior League, and again, several church and business-related organizations.

This section has analysed the patterns of social interaction among the Newfoundland migrants and the connectedness of their networks. The major conclusion from this analysis is that, even though Newfoundland networks of relatives and friends play an important part in the lives of the respondents, there is no indication that their daily lives are closely bound up with their Newfoundland ties. This is reflected by the large proportion of the sample who are extensively involved in general community organizations which are totally unconnected with Newfoundland or former Newfoundlanders. However, social class is an important differentiating factor here. The findings suggest that lower and working class migrants are more closely tied to their Newfoundland contacts than is the case for the middle class migrants, while upper class migrants appear to have virtually no social contact with other Newfoundlanders. These conclusions have considerable relevance to the following examination of the extent to which a 'community of sentiment' or 'consciousness of kind' exists among Newfoundlanders in Hamilton.

Consciousness of Kind:

One primary characteristic of the respondents is their unwillingness to accept another person simply because he is a Newfoundlander. Throughout the interviews, many of

the respondents noted that

> You can get some bad Newfies,too.
> (working class, male, age 53).

> There's Newfoundlanders I wouldn't want near the door here, or wouldn't walk down the street with.
> (middle class, male, age 58).

This was especially reflected in the insistence of some migrants not to release the names of some of their relatives in Hamilton. One could, of course, infer that this reluctance reflects the unwillingness of some middle class respondents to expose their lower class roots.

> I got other cousins here, but I won't give you their names. They aren't the sort who would talk to you, anyway. I don't think they'd be able to help you very much.
> (middle class, female, age 35).

Many of the informants believe that "Some Newfoundlanders are in a rut, and don't want to better themselves." Orton's study also commented on the 'embarrassment' which some migrants suffer because of the behaviour of their compatriots; there is strong evidence of a similar feeling among migrants in Hamilton. They often blame lower class migrants for giving Newfoundlanders a bad reputation for seasonal work, drinking, fighting, and the like.

> Well, I guess you see the scruff down in the hotels and bars on Friday and Saturday nights. But I don't know where the other Newfies are. I only know my family.
> (working class,female, age 49).

Another respondent spoke with dismay of his neighbour in an apartment building.

> He decided at 5:00a.m. this morning that he's going back to Newfoundland, and they're leaving tomorrow night. They've done this before, quit the job, leave the bills. They're not settled, they'll never settle. My God, they've got to settle sometime. This is what makes it bad for other Newfoundlanders. (middle class, male, age 31).

Nevertheless, the majority of the respondents felt that they would give a Newfoundlander the benefit of the doubt before they would do so for a 'foreigner'.

> If a Newfoundlander came and asked me for help, I would be more disposed toward helping him, than if he was a total stranger. (upper class, male, age 51).

They were divided on the issue of whether they would patronize a store simply because the owner or manager was a Newfoundlander, although the few respondents who were sales personnel stated that they did indeed get business in this way.

> I do believe that someone steers the Newfoundland customers our way, because I'm a Newfoundlander. (middle class, male, age 46).

> I know customers who come into the store and tell me they are Newfoundlanders. I think many do come to me because they hear that I'm also a Newfoundlander. (middle class, male, age 60).

A number of respondents in a position to either hire or help others get jobs have found from experience not to rely on some of their Newfoundland friends.

> Sometimes it's the Newfoundlander's own fault, though, if they have a bad reputation. I got lots of fellas a job at Dofasco and then they leave after a few months. It cost a lot of money to break them in and then have them leave like that. (middle class, male, age 51).

> I hire all Newfoundland fellows, and interview them myself. But I've had a number who stay a few months, and then have to go home. They come and work, but come July, they're gone. Bar none, I'll not hire a single fellow. (middle class, male, age 50).

> I was personnel officer in our company for a time, and I know that, after one or two episodes, we were discouraged from hiring Newfoundlanders because of their seasonal work pattern. So many would return home just at the point where you really had them trained and becoming efficient in a job. Their mother would die, or they would get homesick, or something. It's a shame, because this jeopardizes the chances for other Newfoundlanders who come along and seriously want a permanent job. (middle class, male, age 46).

Despite this, some respondents felt that Newfoundlanders have a good reputation for working, and that the 'down and out ones' just need some guidance when they come to Ontario.

> Newfoundlanders have a reputation as better working people. Once I asked my boss...if I could get a job for my niece from Newfoundland. He took her right away when he heard she was a Newfoundlander. (working class, female, age 49).

> Some Newfies are broke when they come here; other Newfies lend them money, give names and addresses of jobs, things they wouldn't do for other people. (middle class, male, age 51).

The findings suggest that, although many of the migrants in Hamilton would be initially more favourably disposed toward a person if he were a Newfoundlander rather than a 'total' stranger, such sentiment does not necessarily involve a blind acceptance of all Newfoundlanders. Reflected in many

of the comments, as well as in the hiring practices of those in managerial positions, is the reservation, "It depends on the individual."

Table 5.2

Perceived Attitude toward Newfoundlanders in Ontario, by Social Class

Attitude	Upper Class		Middle Class		Working Class		Lower Class		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Feel Nflders. are looked down upon	2	33.3	10	47.6	18	56.2	2	100.0	32	52.5
Don't feel Nflders.are looked down upon	4	66.7	11	52.4	10	31.3	-	-	25	40.9
Unsure*	-	-	-	-	4	12.5	-	-	4	6.6
Total	6	100.0	21	100.0	32	100.0	2	100.0	61	100.0

*Because the responses are calculated by household, the two cases where the spouses disagreed on their response are categorized as "Unsure". The other two cases here involve households where the respondents felt they could not give a definite answer as to "yes" or "no".

Of course, inherent in this issue is the question of how the migrants feel Newfoundlanders are perceived in Ontario. Thirty-two or 52.5% of the households thought that Newfoundlanders are looked down upon, 25 or 40.9% thought they were not, and 4 or 6.6% were unsure. As with the other variables associated with consciousness of kind, social class differences characterize the responses. Only a third of the upper class informants felt that Newfoundlanders were treated as inferior, while nearly half the middle class, and well over half the working

class respondents thought so. Despite the fact that over half the total households thought that Newfoundlanders were treated as "second class citizens" in Ontario, only 11.4% reported that they themselves were ever made to feel inferior, or treated as if they were.

Table 5.3

Experiences of Disapproval, by Social Class

Have you ever been made to feel inferior because you are a Nflder.?	Upper Class		Middle Class		Working Class		Lower Class		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Yes	-	-	2	9.5	3	9.3	2	100.0	7	11.4
No	6	100.0	19	90.5	29	90.7	-	-	54	88.6
Total	6	100.0	21	100.0	32	100.0	2	100.0	61	100.0

Therefore, most of them based opinions on the treatment of other Newfoundlanders on such factors as press reports, and comments made by work associates. Several of the respondents, most of them working class, felt that some Newfoundlanders deserve the reputation that they have.

> Well, you find people making smart remarks like 'stupid Newfie.' That's because many Newfoundlanders came here and made fools of themselves, having a wild time.
> (working class, male, age 25).

> I detest a lot of Newfoundlanders. They get taken so easily, they're so sure of themselves, and yet so gullible. It's no wonder nobody takes them seriously.
> (middle class, male, age 55).

But most of those interviewed contended that this view was

unwarranted.

> When you work with people, you hear them talking about Newfies, about how they have to come up here. I don't think they have to. They just want to try it out, that's all.
> (middle class, male, age 46).

> Newfoundlanders are a shy, naive people, that's why they're looked down upon. They're not stupid, but afraid of making a mistake. Some do give the wrong impression, but for the most part they just don't deserve the treatment they get. It's really pitiful. Just a few of them give all the rest a bad name.
> (working class, male, age 44).

Nearly half the respondents believed that the reputation of Newfoundlanders in Ontario has in fact improved over the years.

> I don't think they look down on them so much now as before. Of course, Newfoundlanders are a lot more educated and sophisticated now than they were when I came up thirty years ago.
> (working class, female, age 50).

> When we came up first, a lot of Newfoundlanders were working in rubber factories, and the beer flowed like water. But today a lot of Newfies have made good for themselves, and so people here don't take offence.
> (middle class, male, age 72).

Those respondents who reported incidences of being made to feel inferior all had a variety of experiences.

> When I came here, I worked for a bit, and saved some money to go back to school to better myself. But I gave up one night when the teacher said to me, "Stupid Newfoundlander, why don't you go back to the land of fish and sticks?"
> (middle class, male, age 35).

> I went to Kitchener once with a group, and one of the women there was making jokes about Newfoundlanders. I nearly cried; I say she was right surprised when I said I was one.
> (working class, female, age 50).

In general, the reported incidents involved being by-passed for promised promotions ("I really felt that part of it was that I was a Newfoundlander"), or such comments as "They make fun of your accent." A number stated that boarding houses tended to feed them only fish, assuming that this was all they ate in Newfoundland, or people presumed that they did not know how to use telephones, irons, and other appliances. There were actually few references to job discrimination, but this may have been because many of the migrants actually sought work where they knew other Newfoundlanders had been hired. However, this strategy sometimes proved disadvantageous.

> When I first came to Toronto, I would have been better received if I had been a Negro. Of course, Newfoundlanders couldn't speak the Queen's english in those days. When I went looking for a job, the bank manager said, "That's too bad", when I told him I was a Newfoundlander. He said this was because several Newfoundlanders who had worked there had not been too good. I asked him if he had ever hired a Canadian who hadn't been too good. I got the job.
> (upper class, male, age 63).

Significantly, most of the migrants who had encountered such disapprobation noted that it had been during their first years outside Newfoundland, when they themselves were perhaps more sensitive to criticism than they are today.

> First when I came here, I felt shy about the way I talked. I had an accent and Newfie sayings, and I wasn't educated like the others. I felt self-conscious, but now I'm accepted as a Canadian.
> (working class, female, age 50).

None of the migrants reported incidences of prejudice

comparable to those presented in the report of the Social Opportunity Project in Toronto, cited in the first chapter of this study. Indeed, a number of them contended that being a Newfoundlander actually benefitted them, particularly in the search for jobs.

> I found that if you say you're from down east, you'll get the preference to jobs.
> (working class, female, age 45).

> They'll always hire a Newfoundlander. Sure to get an honest day's work out of them.
> (working class, male, age 44).

Being a Newfoundlander was not generally an issue which the migrants felt affected their day-to-day interaction with others, either positively or negatively.

> I have never felt it necessary to apologize for or be embarrassed by being a Newfoundlander. I've never felt condescended by.
> (middle class, male, age 45).

Table 5.4

Preference for other Newfoundlanders, by Social Class

Feelings	Upper Class		Middle Class		Working Class		Lower Class		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
More Comfortable with Nflders.	-	-	5	23.9	19	59.3	2	100.0	26	42.6
More Comfortable with Non-Nflders.	-	-	-	-	2	6.3	-	-	2	3.3
No Difference	6	100.0	16	76.1	11	34.4	-	-	33	54.1
Total	6	100.0	21	100.0	32	100.0	2	100.0	61	100.0

Nevertheless, in 42.6% of the households, the informants stated that they felt more comfortable with Newfoundlanders than with other people. Seventy-three percent of these were working class.

> When I'm with Ontarians, I have to sit there prim and proper. With Newfies, you can be what you want to be.
> (working class, female, 50).

> People up here have different ideas, I don't know, and they're not as friendly towards each other as Newfoundlanders are.
> (working class, female, age 58).

> You're freer with Newfoundlanders. You can talk with anyone and have a cup of tea, but it's more on the surface. It's deeper with Newfoundlanders, because of the home ties, I guess.
> (working class, female, age 50).

> Once we were out for a drive in Galt, and stopped at a store there. This mother and daughter were sitting at the counter, and I knew from the cut of her jib that she was a Newfoundlander. So we asked her where she was from, and she was. We had a grand chat about all the old places. You just can't be like that with people from around here. That's years ago now, and I often wonder what ever happened to that woman.
> (working class, male, age 49).

> I definitely feel more at home with Newfoundlanders, more relaxed. Like I have good friends in Mississauga, but I'd have to say I'm not even as relaxed with them as I am with Newfoundlanders. You always have to be watching out for what you say.
> (working class, male, age 21).

Only two respondents reported that they felt less comfortable with Newfoundlanders than with 'mainlanders'.

> Trouble with the majority of Newfoundlanders is that they're a jealous breed. If they see a guy get more than them, they don't come to visit any more.
> (working class, male, age 49).

> All Newfies do is reminisce. You can learn more from people here than Newfoundlanders.
> (working class, male, age 44).

However, for the majority of the respondents (54.1%), it "doesn't make any difference. Maybe the conversation is different, but no less comfortable." Here again, all the upper class migrants said that one's place of birth had no bearing on the ease of interaction, while 76.1% of the middle class, and only 34.4% of the working class felt this way.

One final consideration in this analysis of consciousness of kind involves the extent to which being a Newfoundlander has become a matter of playing a role. There is evidence that this is true for a number of the upper class respondents, as the following comments reveal.

> I tend to use Newfie jargon to my own advantage.
> (upper class, male, age 51).

> Being a Newfoundlander has always been a real good introduction for me.
> (upper class, male, age 63).

> I'm expected to react to Newfies jokes, and so I do.
> (upper class, female, age 49).

These people, all upper class respondents, can and do, as Orton suggests, take on or shed the 'role' of being a Newfoundlander at will. Either they had no Newfoundland acquaintances, or else they were "the only Newfoundlander my friends know", thus facilitating this transition. Several of the upper class respondents also emphasised that, rather than social bonds

between themselves and other Newfoundlanders, there were the common ties of 'island' peoples.

> I think island people, like Newfoundlanders, have a will to survive that continental people don't have.
> (upper class, male, age 51).

> What I miss is not so much Newfoundland, as island life.
> (upper class, female, age 49).

Somewhat surprisingly, over half the upper class respondents noted this type of affinity with other Newfoundlanders.

Formal Structures:

The presence of formal organizational elements within the Newfoundland community in Hamilton will now be discussed. Appropriately, the first of these concerns that basic commodity for existence, food. Forty-five or 75% of the households* reported that they either shopped at one of the several Newfoundland food and fish stores located in the Hamilton area, or they travelled to ones operated by Newfoundland friends in Toronto, Galt, and elsewhere. Only 15 or 25% either did not now, or never had, shopped at such stores.

Table 5.5

Purchase of Goods at Newfoundland Food Stores, By Social Class

Purchase Goods at Nfld. Food Stores	Upper Class		Middle Class		Working Class		Lower Class		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Yes	3	50.0	11	55.0	29	90.6	2	100.0	45	75.0
No	3	50.0	9	45.0	3	9.3	-	-	15	25.0
Total	6	100.0	20	100.0	32	100.0	2	100.0	60	100.0

*This analysis is based on 60 families. One of the middle class respondents is the owner of a Newfoundland store, and was thus not included in these statistics.

Of those who did shop at Newfoundland fish stores, almost two-thirds were working class. In all, 90.6% of the working class shopped there, as did 59.5% of the middle class, 50% of the upper class, and both lower class families. (In addition, three other middle class families shopped at other fish stores, owned by Italians, because they were cheaper.) While the frequency of shopping at these stores varied from every week to every few months,to 'special occasions only', the average was about twice a month. In general, the upper class respondents made purchases there less frequently than lower ranking migrants; they went primarily when they had visitors from Newfoundland.

Many of the respondents attributed a great significance to the eating of traditional dishes, and the frequent serving of them somehow made a person 'more' of a Newfoundlander. Throughout the interviews, the informants described those who regularly serve such dishes as 'real' Newfies.

> My mother is a real Newfie. She grows her own turnip tops here. Whenever she has a meal, I go down for the leavings. (working class, female, age 32).

> We're real Newfies for food, I tell you! (middle class, male, age 58).

> It's nice to make the national dishes. We had fish cakes for supper last night. My cousin had a barrel of corned beef; I'd love to be asked over there for supper. (working class, female, age 50).

> I have often thought that I like this place to live in, but I wish I could go home to eat. (upper class, male, age 63).

Certain specific commodities were listed by respondents as their usual purchases at Newfoundland stores. The vast majority referred to some variation of corned beef, salt cod, salt meat, hard tack, cod tongues, partridge berries, fat back pork, turnip tops, and bake apples.

The second organizational feature is the receipt and exchange of Newfoundland newspapers among the migrants. Only one of the families actually has a subscription, which was given to them as a Christmas gift from a brother. The fish store owner sells the weekend edition of a St. John's paper, but reported that he usually sells less than half of them. One upper class respondent purchases a paper at the Newfoundland store from time to time. Four others subscribed to papers in the past, but all have discontinued. Of these four, all were either born or lived in St. John's at one time. Three are middle, one upper class. They cancelled their subscriptions for generally similar reasons.

> We got the weekend edition of the 'Telegram'. But then I found I didn't know any of the people mentioned in it any more. (middle class, male, age 46).

> We didn't know anyone in Newfoundland any more. (upper class, male, age 63).

> After a while, I found that a lot of the names didn't mean anything any more; I was getting out of touch. (middle class, male, age 29).

However, another 23 families indicated that they have received copies of local Newfoundland papers either from relatives at home, or through friends in Hamilton who in turn

received them from family in Newfoundland. Only eight of these households have obtained one in the past year, however. Of these 23, ten received papers from their mother,four from brothers, three from sisters, and two others from friends, all in Newfoundland; the remaining four receive them from contacts in Hamilton and vicinity. "My mother sends Newfoundland papers to my sister in Galt, and I always get them from her."

The respondents exhibited a variety of reactions to the receipt of these papers.

> They're not all that interesting. I don't know anything about it anymore. My husband just reads the sports page.
> (working class, female, age 40).

> Now and then we get a parcel with some Newfoundland papers, but it really doesn't matter, anymore, because all the names are unfamiliar to us now.
> (working class, female, age 44).

Some find them interesting ("It's always interesting when there's news of the family in the paper."), or just amusing. "Mother used to send me the "Compass", the hit paper of them all. If a guy went to town (St. John's), and stayed overnight, it would make the paper. It was in there when mother was here."

Most of the respondents who no longer received such parcels from home, seemed little perturbed about it, almost indifferent.

> I used to get papers from my sister but she doesn't send them anymore.
> (working class, female, age 40).

Of the 31 families who do not or never have received Newfoundland papers, over half expressed no interest in ever getting one.

"It would be a lie anyway. I'm not interested in the place anymore."

One final institutional structure involving the Newfoundland community in Hamilton is the possibility of forming a Newfoundland association in the city. Of the respondents, 58.4% stated that they would be interested in joining such an association, while 41.6% indicated they would not. While none of the upper class families were interested, 34.7% of the middle class, 60% of the working class, and both the lower class families, said they would be.

Many of those who are interested in joining a Newfoundland association have rather specific ideas about its structure.

> It would depend on other Newfoundlanders. It it was a place where a couple could bring their teenage daughter along, for example, right and proper, a nice place for family people to go. Not like that place in Toronto. They say you go in once and that's enough. But if there was a place, respectable, then I'd say yes.
> (middle class, male, age 46).

Several others reiterated this idea. "If there was going to be a Newfoundland club, then it should be a decent place for a family to go."

Others were more skeptical, and dubious about the utility of such an organization.

> I wouldn't want to join a Newfoundland association. For what purpose? It's not really going to accomplish anything. Maybe it helps forming your own community, but I don't like it.
> (working class, male, age 25).

> If you join a group just for the sake of belonging,it's no good. We don't choose friends that way.
> (working class, male, age 42).

> But we don't dance or play cards. What would we do? We'd be wall flowers.
> (working class, female, age 50).

The skepticism of some respondents is based on past experience either with other Newfoundland associations in Hamilton, or just basic observation of the network in Hamilton. None of them presently belong to an association, although some did at one time. None knew of an association existing in Hamilton now, although there are a few East Coast Clubs patronised by Nova Scotians and New Brunswickers.

> My brother and I were members of an East Coast Club there for a while. It really was ridiculous. The president voted himself in for five years, and his wife was secretary and his brother-in-law the treasurer, etc. And then we got $2,000 at a dance one night, and they said the club only made $78.00. It was crazy. No wonder it folded.
> (middle class, male, age 35).

One respondent spoke of his attempt to start a Newfoundland association in Hamilton.

> I once tried to start a Newfoundland club, by advertising in the paper, but only 13 Newfoundlanders phoned me and said they were interested...Now I don't know if it would work, really. Newfoundlanders don't mind going to see Harry Hibbs [a Newfoundland folk singer] or hear Newfoundland music once a month, but I find that they don't want to associate every week or every night. Harry Hibbs just had two concerts, five weeks apart. There were only six people who were at both dances. Newfoundlanders are just not interested in getting together like that, on a regular basis. I don't think a Newfoundland association would make it.
> (middle class, male, age 31).

The experience of members of two other ill-fated clubs appear to support this contention.

> We did go to one Newfoundland Club in Stoney Creek, but it was a waste of time, everyone fighting and trying to get ahead. It was held on Friday night, and we went on and off for about 1½ years. We usually went by ourselves. My dear, it was a big night if they had 10 couples in that place.
> (working class, female, age 30).

> There weren't many Newfoundlanders and it wasn't run right. When we got tangled up with them east coasters, boy, were we happy to get out of it! I always worried that if the club owes money, then the members are liable for its debts.
> (middle class, male, age 46).

And yet another respondent referred to a further aborted attempt to form a Newfoundland association.

> Several years ago there was a notice in the paper. A woman wanted to start a Newfie club and asked interested people to call her. I phoned, and we had a grand chat, but that's the last I heard.
> (working class, female, age 48).

From the foregoing, it appears that attempts at Newfoundland associations in Hamilton have generally been unsuccessful. Interest in the formation of such a group was but one more example of class-related behaviour. The working class respondents were far more enthusiastic than members of the other classes about such a prospect, but they seem for the present to be content with the more informal patterns of house parties and weddings, as means of socializing with other Newfoundlanders. From our findings we must conclude that only among the working class could a Newfoundland community be said to exist in Hamilton, and even here only at the informal level.

Chapter Six

Conclusions

In Chapter Two of this study, we advanced a number of propositions concerning the individual characteristics, and kinship and community structure, of Newfoundland families living in Hamilton. In addition, two other more general propositions guided our conceptual framework. The first of these involved a conception of migration as a group process rather than an individual one isolated from the family-kin network. The second concerned the variable of socio-economic status, where we suggested that much of the stereotyped behaviour attributed to Newfoundlanders is actually class-related behaviour, and that the different classes of migrants should differ on many of the variables investigated in our study.

While this chapter specifically examines the patterns which emerged from our analysis,and probes those propositions which the findings did not uphold, it will also consider the validity of our assumptions of a 'group' process of migration, and of the class bias inherent in previous migration research. We will further investigate whether a relationship exists between our two major variables: whether a 'group' process of migration is a type of class-related behaviour.

Variables relating to the Individual:

The review of the literature on studies of internal migration revealed that several attempts have been made to establish 'laws of migration' which would hold for all times

and places. However, few of these laws have withstood the test of time, and our study served to confirm that hypotheses based on these laws are generally unfounded.

We expected that the majority of the migrants would have made their first move between the ages of 20 and 29, but in fact only 36.6% of our sample moved within this age interval. Over half moved at a considerably younger age, between 15 and 19 years of age. This is evidently a reflection of the fact that over three-quarters of our respondents were of rural origin, and tend to move at a younger age than those from an urban background. We further anticipated that women would have made their first move at a younger age than men, but here again our expectations were not met. Only in the case of the urban-origin migrants were the men significantly older than the female migrants. One plausible explanation suggested by our research is that rural Newfoundland males often grow up with the expectation of having to make their living away from home, as their fathers have done. Consequently, their initial move away from home is not delayed by a trial period of employment in their area of origin before they finally leave. This pattern is more typical of the urban males, and may account for their older age at first migration.

Although census data indicate that more Newfoundland women than men reside in Hamilton, the sample identified equal numbers of male and female respondents, even though we made a somewhat more concentrated effort to locate female respondents. The group of Newfoundland women married to non-Newfoundlanders

was particularly elusive, as many of the respondents failed to think of a woman as a 'true' Newfoundlander unless her spouse was also one. However, our effort to account for why there is a surplus of Newfoundland women in Hamilton was not completely thwarted.

> There is a series of stages in the development of any migration stream. From initial invasion, it develops into a phase of settlement which at its peak becomes routine, institutionalized. In initial stages, men out-number women, but with the settlement phase, sex selectivity tends to disappear or even favour women...1

Our findings confirm this hypothesis. The women interviewed in our study all made use of this more 'institutionalized' pattern of movement, maintaining particularly close contact with the 'stem' family at home, and, in every single case, moving to Hamilton only when a 'branch' family or friendship network was already established there. Thus, as we anticipated, kinship ties were particularly effective in attracting female migrants to the city.

The study also confirmed that the majority of the respondents were married at the time of their move to Hamilton. We found that marital status at the time of move varied with social class, with the higher percentage of married movers among the upper class. And, while over half the working class single movers subsequently married.Newfoundlanders, none of the upper class single movers did. Although an analysis of our findings on the kinship structure of the migrants will follow in the next section of this chapter, it does bear some relevance to

the marital patterns of the respondents and warrants attention here.

The study clearly found that the upper class respondents generally had non-Newfoundland spouses, and moved as an 'individual' nuclear family unit. This was not true for the other movers. The majority of middle and working class families contained both Newfoundland spouses, but regardless of marital status at the time of move, they did not move as an isolated unit. In the case of married movers, the 'stem' family often maintained one spouse back in Newfoundland while the other was "getting things together on the mainland". For those who were single movers, kinship and especially 'branch' family ties were particularly strong. All of the single middle or working class migrants had contacts in Hamilton. In a number of cases, 'branch' family members actually introduced them to other Newfoundlanders whom they eventually married. Or, the young men worked in Hamilton and lived with friends or relatives until they had earned 'passage' for their fiancées and found a place for them to live.

Several propositions relating specifically to the rural-urban origin of the migrants were also confirmed. As expected, the higher the social class status of the group, the higher the percentage of those with an urban background. Those of urban origin generally lived only in their place of birth in Newfoundland, and made few moves throughout the province. Only a quarter of the rural-origin migrants had lived only in their home town, reflecting the strong differences in patterns

of movement between rural and urban migrants.

The study had hoped to consider the differences obtaining between those rural migrants with experience only of their home town prior to leaving Newfoundland, and those of rural origin who had lived in urban areas of the province before they left. This was virtually impossible. Because such a few of these movers had lived only in their home town, comparisons were difficult to make. And nearly all of those who had lived solely in rural areas of Newfoundland lived in other urban areas of eastern Canada before moving to Hamilton. So one can hardly speak of Newfoundlanders leaving their dories one day and working in the steel mills the next. Nearly 60% of all the respondents had lived in urban areas of Newfoundland and another 16% in other industrialized settings throughout the province. This perhaps reflects a pattern of gradual absorption and dispersion, of a cumulative rather than sudden change in life style. This pattern is also typical of the Newfoundland type of economy, with the husbands and young men working in the urban and industrialized centres, away from 'home'. One must keep in mind that such a high percentage of rural migrants having lived in urban areas does not necessarily indicate that they lived there on a regular basis or indeed with any degree of permanence.

As expected, the urban-origin migrants were more educated than those from a rural background, and the higher-ranking migrants more than the lower-ranking ones. Most of

the literature on Newfoundland migrants attributes a low level of education to this group, and, indeed, the average amount of education of our respondents was 9.3 years. However, this ranged from 14.3 years for the upper class to 7.7 years for the working class, and one cannot therefore conclude that all Newfoundland migrants have failed to complete high school. At the other extreme, however, we found no evidence supportive of Wadel's contention that the migrants represent the better educated of the province's population, or of our own suggestion that recent migrants are any better educated than others.

Our findings in this regard can best be described as ambiguous. For the migrants under 40 years of age, the average amount of education is 9.7 years, while for those over 40, the average is 9.1 years, a very minute difference. Among the group between 20 and 30 years old, the average is 11.1 years of schooling. But because we are referring to groups from different generations and periods of different stress upon educational achievement, it is hazardous to make comparisons, or even attempt to determine whether the more recent migrants are any better educated, comparatively, than those who moved 20 or 30 years ago.

Perhaps the most significant finding regarding the education of the respondents, then, is that it accounted for very little of the differences between the class groups. This is especially true of the middle and working classes, who were identical in their level of education. Only in the polarized

positions of upper and lower class did a significant difference emerge in the amount of schooling of the migrants in each class.

The study contacted migrants from a wide variety of occupational and socio-economic levels, and it was in terms of these characteristics that we analysed the behaviour patterns of the respondents. Both education and occupation were found to be not necessarily related to socio-economic status, but this is not to say that they never were. As just shown, however, the various class groups did differ in terms of the other 'individual' variables. The upper class migrants generally made their first move at a younger age than all but the middle class respondents, but were presently older than the majority of the sample, were less likely to have Newfoundland spouses, were more likely to have been married at the time of the move to Hamilton, and were better educated than the other migrants.

The classes also differed in terms of their previous migration history, both within and outside Newfoundland. The upper class respondents, for example, were generally much less mobile a group within Newfoundland than the other respondents, but, upon leaving the island, were much less likely than any other migrants to go directly to Hamilton. The middle class migrants also moved at an earlier age than the working class, but, in contrast to the upper class, they were the most mobile group within Newfoundland. And, having left the province, nearly half did not go directly to Hamilton, and nearly a quarter made two or more intervening moves. The relatively high

mobility of this group both within Newfoundland and on the Canadian mainland (as compared with the upper class who became more mobile once they left the island) explains why the middle class were generally older than the other migrants when they arrived in Hamilton. The working class respondents, on the other hand, were a very mobile group within Newfoundland, but generally went directly to Hamilton once they departed the island. Of the three groups then, the middle class were generally the most mobile group of migrants.

The investigation of motivation to migrate further isolated behavioural differences between the classes of respondents. We had hypothesized that, on the whole, the extent of migration for work-related reasons rises with social rank. We did not find this to be the case. Only 14.2% of the upper class, as compared with 47.9% and 60% of the middle and working classes respectively, left Newfoundland for work-related reasons. Here one must recall that the upper class respondents were older than the working class, and special conditions were operating at the time that they reached the most mobile ages. Nearly half of the upper class migrants fought in the Second World War, and never returned to Newfoundland to live. Also, this incentive for leaving the island may have obscured other deep-seated motives, and does not mean that these people would not have moved had the war not occurred. As a number of them reported, "The war happened to come along at that time, and that's what got me out of there." Thus, although the war provided the

immediate motivation to migrate, the respondents reported that economic factors also influenced their decision not to return to the island. The predominance of economic motives for leaving carries for all the other class groups, with over half the total respondents moving for either financial reasons or dislike of job. This again confirms our proposition that, even in a group process of migration, family and kin may play a role in where to move, while the actual decision of whether to move often has an economic basis. As we emphasized in Chapter Three, economic factors should not be treated as the only reasons for moving, but the fact that so many of the migrants did leave Newfoundland despite having extremely strong 'stem' family ties there does suggest that they were often very important. However, as we shall see in the following section, migrants are able to minimize the disadvantage of leaving their 'stem' families by settling in an area that provides both economic advantage and a strong 'branch' family network. For many, Hamilton was the obvious alternative.

From this consideration of 'individual' characteristics, it is obvious that there are definite differences between upper, middle, and working class Newfoundlanders, and that one cannot ascribe certain characteristics to one class and presume that they are applicable to all. However, the task of this chapter is now to consider whether these differences are reflected in any of the behaviour patterns of the different class groups.

Variables relating to the Kinship System:

Our research revealed class differences not only in

the extent to which migrants had a kinship network established in Hamilton, but also in the extent to which they utilized it. The basic assumption on which our investigation of the kinship structure was founded was derived from LePlay's 'stem' family construct. Taking as given the fact that Newfoundlanders constitute a folk culture group, we expected to find that strong familistic bonds united kin members in cohesive family groups and provided for a highly functional role for the extended family.

Kinship among the auspices of migration:

Contrary to our expectations, very few of the migrants indicated that an 'ethos of inevitability' surrounded their migration. Surely this indicates a fundamental difference between the respondents in our study and those contacted by McCormack. In addition, 'inevitable' is perhaps too strong a term. To be sure, nearly 70% of the migrants indicated that they had a sibling living outside Newfoundland. The preponderance of this situation suggests that while migration was not 'inevitable' in many families it surely was acceptable, and thereby perhaps even expected, behaviour within families.

LePlay suggested that the 'stem' family's main function at this stage of the migration process is to facilitate and encourage migration, and we found this to be true. The 'stem' family played a particularly strong role in preselecting the area of destination of many of the migrants. It encouraged migration to areas where the 'branch' families were already

located, thus enabling the migrant to maximize family unity and move under the auspices of kinship.

> But parents in Newfoundland would never let you go before you could come to someone you knew here.
> (working class, male, age 44).

One may say that while relatives and friends did not directly 'cause' a person to migrate, they quite often determined his destination.

However, the degree to which migrants moved under the auspices of kinship varied, as we expected, with class. The overwhelming majority of the working class respondents had relatives in Hamilton, as did nearly three-quarters of the middle class. But only 16.6% of the upper class had such contacts. The extent to which a 'branch' family network was operating in the area of destination is indicated by the fact that nearly 60% of the informants moved directly from Newfoundland to Hamilton, and, of these, nearly 90% had Newfoundland relatives in the city. In other words, nearly three-quarters of those who had relatives in Hamilton moved directly there.

That migration under kinship and friendship auspices is especially strong for the working class is evidenced by the fact that not one of them moved to Hamilton without at least knowing of someone there. This was particularly crucial for the working class, because so very few of them had a job awaiting them upon arrival in the city. We also found that 85% of those who did have relatives in Hamilton actually got in touch with them before moving. This was overwhelmingly true for the working

class and slightly less true of the middle class. This may be linked with the fact that the middle class respondents were more likely than the working class to have a job awaiting them in Hamilton and thus were not so dependent on the assistance of their 'branch' families.

In general we found that the shorter the amount of planning time in preparation for the move, the greater the likelihood that one had relatives in the area of destination. How, then, does one account for the fact that the middle class had fewer relatives in Hamilton than did the working class, but that they planned for a shorter length of time? This may be accounted for by the fact that, like the working class, they generally had a family network established in Hamilton but, like the upper class, they were also more likely to have either a job awaiting them upon arrival, or at least a specific type of employment to come to. Therefore, they could rely upon both work- and kinship- auspices, while the upper class had only their job, and the working class had only their 'branch' families.

The specific role played by the 'branch' family in Hamilton was particularly effective for the working class. Nearly half of the respondents who said that they contacted their relatives were actually 'encouraged' by them to move, and over three-quarters of this group was working class. One further role of the 'branch' family prior to the move involved the pattern of visits to the city made by the prospective

migrants. Just over a quarter of our sample made such visits, and over half were working class. However, while all the respondents who visited Hamilton from Newfoundland actually stayed with a relative, those who visited from such areas of Toronto and Kitchener did not necessarily even know anyone in the city.

Kinship during the process of Migration:

One of our primary concerns here was with a conception of migration as a strategy of adaptation or an extended work-visit strategy. Each of these is linked to LePlay's theory of migration as an adaptive mechanism tied in with the socio-cultural system and functional to the maintenance of family structure. It refers to the pattern of circulatory migration, wherein migrants return to, and again depart from, the receiving area. In our investigation, only two of those who had spent time in Hamilton prior to the move were actually involved in such a pattern of seasonal work. One of these, a working class man, had been in Hamilton for six summers before permanently moving, while the other, a lower class respondent now unemployed, had come for five. Therefore, it was almost impossible to assess, as we had hoped, what factors influence the change in the character of migration from one of experimentation to one of permanence. One of the families made the move from seasonal employment to permanent residence because

> I didn't feel there was much down there anymore. There was no sense in me going back and forth, working here during the summer. What with the kids and all, it was just as well for us all to be together. (lower class, male, age 33).

The permanent movement of the second family occurred under somewhat different circumstances. The wife described it:

> My husband was going back and forth here so long that he eventually got things together and he didn't want to come home no more. He just phoned me and said he wasn't coming home and what was I going to do about it. So I had to come up. (working class, female, age 40).

Such sketchy evidence obviously does not offer any clear reason for the transition in migration pattern. However, an equally important concern of our study was why there was such little evidence of circulatory migration among our respondents. One must suppose that either this strategy of adaptation is not as strong as we expected, or that the majority of the migrants interviewed are somewhat older than those generally involved in such a strategy. In addition, the methodology of sociometry is such that we would not likely get in touch with isolated young men living in boarding houses and maintaining a family back home. Another factor might be that our interviewing took place in the winter and spring, whereas this seasonal work strategy is most prevalent in the summer. Indeed, a few of the respondents reported that that they knew of people who worked or had worked in Hamilton only in the summer, but that "they're gone home now." In any case,we did not find a strategy of adaptation or pattern of circulatory movement, as we had expected.

Related to this strategy of adaptation are the functions of the 'stem' and 'branch' families. In examining those

situations where the head of the household moved before the rest of his family, we found that nearly two-thirds of the couples married in Newfoundland utilized their 'stem' and 'branch' families. In all but two cases, the spouse in Hamilton had a network of the 'branch' family with whom to stay. The 'stem' family helped to maintain the family left at home, and often were able to 'chip in' for their travel money.

Even for the families who moved as a complete unit, the 'branch' family in Hamilton did provide some essential services. Over 90% of the migrants who had relatives in Hamilton shared accommodation with them for a period of time, and most received help in terms of orientation to the city, in finding employment (a critical concern since 85% of the respondents arrived in Hamilton without a job), and psychological support. "They were someone to talk to when I needed it." However, we had anticipated that Newfoundlanders from rural areas, less familiar with the institutionalized workings of a large city, would require and accept more basic forms of assistance from their kin for a longer period of time than those of urban origin. This was not confirmed. This is no doubt related to our finding that most migrants had some experience of living in urban areas even before the move to Hamilton. Indeed, although the working class movers were perhaps inclined to receive a greater variety of services from their relatives, there was no real evidence of a lengthy period of dependancy upon their 'branch' family. The migrants generally obtained employment within a month of their

arrival in Hamilton, and were then able to find their own accommodation in the city.

Relations with kin after the move:

Thelma McCormack's study of migrants from the Atlantic provinces found that the informants were neither family-oriented nor strongly identified with their own group, factors of chief concern in both this and the following section of this chapter. She further concluded that there were variations among the migrants in the extent to which they maintained contact with home, but did not account for why this was so. We therefore investigated the degree to which the migrants were family-oriented, perceived Newfoundland as home, and the intensity of their contact with home, and whether there were variations across socio-economic strata.

Contary to McCormack, we found strong evidence of a deep attachment to family among the migrants, and indeed they often cited their ties to family as the thing that distinguishes Newfoundlanders from 'mainlanders'.

> At home, people are more conscious of the family. They don't give a damn about the family here.
> (working class, female, age 48).

> My immediate family comes first as far as I'm concerned.
> (middle class, male, age 55).

> Your heart lies where your family is.
> (middle class, male, age 46).

> It's important that your parents are well looked after.
> (working class, male, age 53).

> We're all for family...it's not the same until you got your own people with you. (working class, female,age 49).

In all, 95% of the respondents had relatives living in Newfoundland, and almost all of these maintain contact with home through letters, phone calls and the like, on an average of every two months at least. This contact is primarily with the immediate 'stem' family, especially parents, and with their passing, communication with home dwindles. Another primary means of maintaining contact with home is through the pattern of return visits, which the migrants made at an average rate of every 3.7 years. All but three families have been back to Newfoundland since their arrival in Hamilton, a strong indication of their ties with home. There is also evidence that the strength of orientation to Newfoundland influences the rate of these return visits, with the Newfoundland-oriented returning every 3.3 years and the Hamilton-oriented returning every 4.1 years.

Who were these families, comprising half the sample, who considered Newfoundland as home? Primarily, they were working class. Approximately a third of the middle and upper class families thought of Newfoundland as home, while well over half the working class felt so. That orientation to Newfoundland decreases with time is evidenced by the fact that those who perceived Newfoundland as home had lived in Hamilton an average of 15.9 years, compared with the Hamilton-oriented who had lived in the city an average of 21.6 years. Orientation to home was

not necessarily an indicator of a wish to return. Indeed, we found that the idea of returning to the province to live had not been considered by the majority of the sample.

In addition to ties with the 'stem' family back in Newfoundland, we also investigated the extent to which the families became a 'branch' family for those who migrated after them. This again was mainly a working class phenomenon. The fact that 85% of the working class had Newfoundland relatives in Hamilton when they themselves moved, and that 65% had relatives follow them to the city confirms our proposition that blue collar workers are the most inclined to chain migration. The issue of whether the migrants maintained contact with these relatives in Hamilton will be explored in our analysis of community variables.

Assessment of move and future plans:

> The degree of satisfaction achieved by migration, both generally and in work, must be considered as relative rather than absolute. For the migrant is apt to consider his position relatively to the position he held prior to migration. 2

The research confirmed that Newfoundland migrants also consider their situation relative to what it was when they left the island, and that over 90% liked living in Hamilton. Over two-thirds felt that they would stay. However, when they compared the situation in Newfoundland at the time they left, and the situation in the province today, many felt that they would not leave it today. Only a third would encourage out-migration today, reflecting the general opinion that conditions have

changed. Despite this fact, and despite their strong attachment to home, the vast majority of the respondents expressed no regret of their movement, and declared that they would 'do it all over again'.

In terms of kinship behaviour, then, what kinds of profiles of the different classes emerge? In most of the variables associated with the auspices of migration, there appears to be a linear relationship between the upper, middle, and working classes, with the latter showing the strongest orientation to the kinship network and the upper class the least. The upper class was most likely to know no one in Hamilton before the move, plan the move for the longest time, have a job arranged before moving, and were least likely to have Newfoundland relatives come to the city after them. In short, our findings definitely confirm the proposition that work-related auspices form the basis of the upper class migrant's relation to the city, while kinship-related auspices hold for the working class movers. Indeed, the stereotypic pattern of Newfoundland chain migration really holds true only for the working class and some of the middle class migrants. The strong orientation toward family and enduring relationship with the 'branch' family in Hamilton were also more characteristic of the working class migrants, than of other movers. Indeed, only in terms of the working class movers can we truly speak of a 'group' process of migration. The upper class respondents most definitely were not linked to a kinship system in terms

of their moves, and only a few of the middle class were, although I would suggest that the middle class pattern of movement more closely approximates that of the working class than the upper class. We must conclude therefore that the 'group' process of migration and the strong familistic orientation were somewaht more class-specific rather than necessarily cultural attributes of the migrants.

In terms of their assessment of the move, and their future plans, the middle class emerged as the most consistently satisfied group. They were unanimous in their satisfaction with life in Hamilton, and the vast majority intended to remain in the city, compared with two-thirds of the upper class and just over half the working class. The middle class were also the most enthusiastic in encouraging other Newfoundlanders to move to Hamilton. This group seemed to feel that living in Hamilton had 'been right' for them, and that therefore it would work for others. While the upper class felt equally satisfied with Hamilton, and were most inclined to advocate out-migration from Newfoundland, they appeared to be more aware of alternatives to Hamilton. The working class were generally somewhat less satisfied with their lot, and more of them planned to leave it and return to Newfoundland. Paradoxically, they were the least inclined to encourage out-migration from Newfoundland but the most inclined to advocate Hamilton as an area of destination. It would appear that many of the working class families, because of their strong orientation to Newfoundland, would not encourage anyone else to leave it, but once a person

has made the decision to leave, they felt that Hamilton was as good a place as any to go. Of course, so many of the working class moved directly from Newfoundland to Hamilton, that they were no doubt less aware of the alternatives of moving to other areas than were the higher-ranking migrants.

Variables relating to the Community:

The primary basis of interaction among Newfoundland migrants in Hamilton is community-of-origin, and, intimately connected with this, arefamily relationships. Particularly for the working class families, Newfoundland contacts were generally other migrants from the same home town, while for the upper class they were other Newfoundlanders in the same profession, belonging to the same church, and so on. For middle and working class migrants, the primary occasions for getting together were weddings, funerals, house parties and card games, but for the upper class there was no such general interaction with other Newfoundlanders on a regular basis.

Here again the strongest feelings of group cohesiveness and community identification are experienced by the working class respondents, and least by the upper class Newfoundlanders. The working class were the most encircled within a network of Newfoundland friends, with two-thirds of them stating that most of the people they knew in Hamilton were Newfoundlanders. Not one of the upper class migrants had a Newfoundlander among his closest friends while over two-thirds of the middle class and three-quarters of the working class did. Further evidence

of the working class being enclosed within a Newfoundland network is their lack of contact with a Hamilton one. Nearly half the working class families had absolutely no contact with formal groups or social organizations in Hamilton. This general lack of social integration of the working class into the Hamilton community is perhaps related to the role of the 'branch' family. As the working class migrant already has relatives and friends in the area of destination, adaptation may be facilitated but integration into the community hindered by the "protection" afforded by the kinship network.[3] Just over a quarter of the middle class families were in the same position, while in every one of the upper class families both spouses belonged to formal organizations in Hamilton. Clearly, then, the working class migrants are more closely tied to their Newfoundland contacts than the middle class, while the upper class migrants have virtually no social contact with other Newfoundlanders.

In reference to some of the variables associated with consciousness of kind, there was general consensus among the classes. We found that although many of the migrants from various socio-economic strata would initially be more favourably disposed toward a person if he were a Newfoundlander rather than a 'total' stranger, such sentiment by no means involves a blind acceptance of all Newfoundlanders. Indeed, we found that many of the migrants, irrespective of social class, are 'embarrassed' by the reputed behaviour of some of their compatriots. Perhaps because of their strong orientation toward Newfoundland, and their own experiences of having been made to

feel inferior, the working class families were particularly sensitive to criticism of Newfoundlanders, and were the most inclined of all the social classes to feel that 'Newfies' are looked down upon in Ontario. Perhaps the most telling measure of 'consciousness of kind' was the extent to which the respondents felt more comfortable with Newfoundlanders than with other people. Nearly sixty percent of the working class indicated a feeling of greater ease with Newfoundlanders, while less than a quarter of the middle class and none of the upper class expressed this preference for their fellows.

Our analysis of the formal community structures among the Newfoundlanders in Hamilton confirmed what the investigation of informal patterns of interaction had suggested: that no Newfoundland 'community' exists in Hamilton. The evidence further suggest that should one ever develop in Hamilton, it would most assuredly be composed primarily of working class rather than higher-ranking migrants. None of the upper class and only a third of the middle class expressed an interest in joining a Newfoundland association, which would probably be the basis of a Newfoundland community at the formal level. While nearly two-thirds of the working class would be interested in such an organization, they seem for the present to be content with their more informal patterns of house parties and weddings as a means of socializing with other Newfoundlanders.

Our research therefore indicates that there are no patterns of relationship which pervade class differences among

Newfoundlanders in Hamilton, and that 'being Newfie' is not sufficient criterion to unite classes at either end of the socio-economic continuum. This is in keeping with the general finding in the literature that friendships occur essentially within social classes and not between them.

Class Profiles:

In conclusion, distinctively different profiles of the three social class groups emerged from our research.

The working class were overwhelmingly from a rural background, most likely to come from families who were also migratory, to move to Hamilton directly from Newfoundland, to be motivated by economic reasons, make more prior visits to the city, to have a 'branch' family established there and waiting to receive them, and to be involved in a pattern of chain migration. They were most likely to think of Newfoundland as home, least likely to want to remain in Hamilton, and least likely to encourage other Newfoundlanders to leave home. They were most likely to have a Newfoundlander as a closest friend, to be enclosed within a network of Newfoundland friends, most likely to feel that Newfoundlanders are looked down upon, to feel more comfortable with Newfoundlanders, to frequent Newfoundland fish stores and to want to join a Newfoundland association.

The working class respondents then were clearly linked with a cohesive kinship system. The 'stem' family encouraged migration to areas where 'branches' were already established, and generally facilitated the process of migration. The 'branches' provided accommodation upon arrival in Hamilton,

information about jobs, and general orientation to the city. The working class families maintained contact with the 'stem' through visits and letters, and their primary orientation was still toward the 'stem', with the ultimate intention of returning to it once the economic considerations involved in migration were resolved. (i.e. upon retirement). Thus, for the working class families, migration clearly was a 'group' process, involving both the migrant and his 'stem' and 'branch' families.

The middle class families occupied a position midway between the 'group' oriented movement of the working class and the more 'individual' movement of the upper class. Fewer of the middle than the working class were of rural origin, had Newfoundland contacts in Hamilton and moved directly there, thought of Newfoundland as home, had a Newfoundlander as a best friend, or had a social network comprised mainly of other migrants. While all the working class had contacts in Hamilton before the move, nearly a quarter of the middle class knew no one, an indication that the 'branch' families played a slighly less significant role in middle class migration. Perhaps the greatest distinction between the middle and working classes was in the stronger orientation to Hamilton which the middle class held.

For the upper class migrants, there was no network of Newfoundland friends and relatives, and in no way can one speak of upper class migration as a 'group' phenomenon. Two-thirds of these migrants knew no one in Hamilton before moving, none of them have a Newfoundlander as a close friend, none feel

more comfortable with Newfoundlanders, and one have any interest in joining a Newfoundland association. Only one-third thought of Newfoundland as home.

Of all the variables which we examined, only one does not support this trend. A measure of the rate of return visits to Newfoundland reveals that the upper class return at a rate almost double that of the working class families. We suggest that this largely reflects the financial ability of the members of each class group, and in no way contradicts our major finding that the working class are most oriented toward Newfoundland. Indeed, it lends support to the possibility that the upper class respondents are in practice more oriented to their 'stem' family than they say they are.

Conclusions:

The findings of this study suggest some guidelines for future research on Newfoundland migrants. Most importantly, studies must no longer operate on the assumption that Newfoundlanders are inherently different from the many thousands of other Canadians living away from their place of birth. Our research has shown that they are not. Investigators must stop expecting, and by their methodology, finding, that Newfoundland migrants are isolated, uneducated drifters, whose 'adjustment' to an urban mode of living is always problematic, involving a constant series of crisis situations and subsequent reliance upon social agencies for assistance. Certainly, in future studies, the class differences among the migrants must be

recognized and further explored.

In order to more thoroughly examine the 'group' nature of migration, and to more fully explain later patterns of movement, migration within Newfoundland needs to be studied. Research in this area could explore whether the working class pattern of movement to areas where the 'branch' family is already established is characteristic of their mobility within Newfoundland as well. And even further, it could examine how the decision to move from one's outport to St. John's or Corner Brook translates into the determination to leave Newfoundland entirely.

An examination of the correspondence between the geographical and social mobility of Newfoundland families surely warrants attention in future research. Our study found that 'being a Newfoundlander' has different meaning for, and is expressed differently by, members of the various socio-economic strata. This makes an investigation of social mobility central to any considerations of identity formation and change among both those who remain at 'home', and, more importantly, those who migrate and often face a challenge to that identity. This type of inquiry has been entirely ignored by previous research. Hopefully it could attempt to explain why most migrants are quietly absorbed into the receiving community, while another constantly visible group of Newfoundlanders sustains the stereotypes and justifies the jokes.

In sum, Newfoundland migrants are not a homogeneous

group. Despite the impression generated by previous studies and popular stereotypes, they are not all on welfare nor are they all uneducated and illiterate. They are to be found in numerous walks of life and on every rung of the social class ladder. Indeed, as we have repeatedly demonstrated, class factors and style of life considerations separate Newfoundland migrants more than their common ethnicity binds them together. If they are united, it is in the realization that, through migrating, they have raised their standard of living above the level it previously was. But like all migrants they uniformly display the ambivalence of the uprooted. While "bettering themselves" they have lost a sense of belonging and the security of home and family ties. Most recognize the impossibility of ever going "home" again. Yet home still remains "the place where you were born and raised... the place of childhood memories. It will always be home."

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER ONE

1. M.V. George: Internal Migration in Canada, D.B.S., 1961 Census Monograph, Ottawa, p. 90.

2. Social Planning Council of Metropolitan Toronto: Social Opportunity Project, Toronto, June 1968, p. 5.

3. Ibid.,p. 5.

4. Kari Levitt: Population Movements in the Atlantic Provinces, Halifax, Atlantic Provinces Economic Council, 1960, Appendix p. 11, Table VIII.

5. Leroy O. Stone: Migration in Canada: Regional Aspects, D.B.S. Census Monograph, 1961, Ottawa, p. 35.

6. Donald J. Bogue: "Internal Migration", in Phillip M. Hauser and Otis D. Duncan (Eds.), The Study of Population: An Inventory and Appraisal, Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 1959, p. 496.

7. Ibid., p. 502.

8. Social Opportunity Project, op. cit., p. 5.

9. Ibid., p. 1.

10. Ibid., p. 1.

11. Thelma McCormack: Maritime Migrants to Toronto: Selected Cases, Ottawa; Canadian Centre for Community Studies, 1968.

    Larry J. Orton: Newfoundland Associations in Toronto, Manuscript Unpublished, The Institute of Social and Economic Research, Memorial University of Newfoundland, St. John's, 1968.

    Social Planning Council of Metropolitan Toronto: Social Opportunity Project, Toronto, June 1968.

12. McCormack, op. cit.

13. Ibid.

14. Social Opportunity Project, op. cit., p. 62.

15. Harry K. Schwarzweller et al: Mountain Families in Transition, University Park, Pennsylvania State University Press, 1971, p. 117.

16. J.J. Mangalam and Harry K. Schwarzweller, "General Theory in the Study of Migration: Current Needs and Difficulties", International Migration Review, Volume 3, Fall 1968, pp. 3-18.

17. Dorothy S. Thomas: Research Memorandum on Migration Differentials, N.Y., Social Science Research Council, 1938, p. 5.

18. Ibid., p. 11.

19. Bogue, op. cit., p. 504.

20. Ronald Freedman: "Cityward Migration, Urban Ecology, and Social Theory", in Ernest W. Burgess and Donald J. Bogue (Eds.): Urban Sociology, Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 1964, p. 95.

21. Everett S. Lee: "A Theory of Migration", in J.A. Jackson (Ed.): Migration, Cambridge University Press, 1969, p.283.

22. Bogue: op. cit., p. 504.

23. P. Sorokin and Carle Zimmerman: Principles of Rural-Urban Sociology, N.Y., Henry Holt and Co. 1929, p. 540.

24. Thomas: op. cit., p. 163.

25. Sorokin and Zimmerman: op. cit., p. 540.

26. Ibid., p. 555.

27. Lee: op. cit., p. 283.

28. A.M. Rose: "Distance of Migration and Socio-Economic Status of Migrants", in Clifford J. Jansen (Ed.), Readings in the Sociology of Migration, Oxford, Pergamon Press Ltd., 1970, p. 90.

29. Bruce H. Herrick: Urban Migration and Economic Development in Chile, Cambridge, M.I.T. Press, 1965, p. 16.

30. Clifford J. Jansen: Research Report: Social Aspects of Internal Migration, Bath University Press, 1968, p. 60.

31. Charles Tilly: Migration to an American City, Washington, U.S. Dept. of Agriculture, April 1965, p. 3.

32. Freedman, op. cit., p. 99.

33. Tilly: op.cit., p. 32.

34. Bogue: op.cit., p. 504.

35. R. Illsley et al: "The Motivation and Characteristics of Internal Migrants: A Socio-Medical Study of Young Migrants in Scotland", in Clifford J. Jansen (Ed.), Readings in the Sociology of Migration, Oxford, Pergamon Press Ltd., 1970, p. 150.

36. Tilly: op. cit., p. 24.

37. Ibid., p. 23.

38. Ibid., p. 24.

39. Ibid., p. 21.

40. Charles Tilly and C. Harold Brown: "On Uprooting,Kinship, and the Auspices of Migration", International Journal of Comparative Sociology, Volume VIII, No. 2, p. 143.

By the auspices of migration Tilly and Brown mean the social structures which establish relationships between the migrant and the receiving community before he moves. We may say that an individual migrates under the auspices of kinship when his principle connections with the city of destination are through kinsmen, even if he comes desperately seeking a job. (see p. 142).

41. Thomas: op. cit., p. 111.

42. Freedman: op. cit., p. 99.

43. Tilly: op. cit., p. 10.

44. Further evidence for the general superiority of urban-origin migrants over the non-migrant population with respect to level of education is found in studies of urban migration in England, Scotland, and Chile. These studies are cited elsewhere in this paper.

45. Donald R. Whyte: "Social Determinants of Inter-Community Mobility: An Inventory of Findings", Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology, Volume 4, No. 1, p. 21.

46. Mangalam and Schwarzweller: op. cit., p. 8.

47. S.N. Eisenstadt: The Absorption of Immigrants, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd., 1954, p. 4.

48. Mangalam and Schwarzweller: op. cit., p. 8.

49. Gino Germani: "Migration and Acculturation" in Philip M. Hauser (Ed.), Handbook for Social Research in Urban Areas, Belgium: UNESCO, 1965, p. 173.

50. Tilly: op. cit.,p. 37.

51. Ibid., p. 3.

52. Jansen: Social Aspects, op. cit., p. 188.

53. Jansen: Readings, op. cit., p. 13.

54. Illsley et. al. in Jansen: Readings, op. cit., p. 138.

55. Mangalam and Schwarzweller: op. cit., pp. 8-9.

56. Eisenstadt: op. cit., p. 5-6.

57. Abraham A. Weinberg: Migration and Belonging, The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1961, p. 41.

58. Germani, op. cit., p. 175.

59. Julian Samora and Richard A. Lamanna: Mexican-Americans in a Midwest Metropolis: A Study of East Chicago, Advance Report 8, Graduate School of Business Administration, Los Angeles, University of California, July 1967, p. 133.

60. Lyle Shannon et al: The Economic Absorption and Cultural Integration of Immigrant Workers, U. of Iowa Press, 1967, p.174.

61. Samora and Lamanna: op. cit., p. 133.

62. Raymond Breton: "Institutional Completeness of Ethnic Communities and the Personal Relations of Immigrants", in The American Journal of Sociology, 1964, Vol. 70, p. 197.

63. Leonard Broom and John I. Kitsuse: "The Validation of Acculturation: A Condition to Ethnic Assimilation", in American Anthropologoist, 1955, Volume 57, p. 45.

64. Ernest E. Burgess and Donald J. Bogue: "Ethnic and Racial Groups in Urban Society", in Burgess and Bogue, op. cit., p. 179.

65. Tilly and Brown: op. cit., p. 139.

66. As cited in Harry K. Schwarzweller: "Parental Family Ties and Social Integration of Rural to Urban Migrants", Journal of Marriage and the Family, Volume 26, Nov. 1964, p. 410.

67. Adapted from Tilly and Brown, op. cit., p. 141-142.

68. Tilly and Brown: op. cit., p. 153.

69. Ibid., p. 163.

70. Ibid., p. 144.

71. Ibid., pp. 145-146.

72. Phillippe Garigue: "French Canadian Kinship and Urban Life" in Marcel Rioux and Yves Martin (Eds.): French Canadian Society, Volume I, Toronto, McClelland and Stewart, 1964.

73. Marcel Rioux: "Kinship Recognition and Urbanization in French Canada", in Rioux and Martin: op. cit., 1964.

74. Ralph Piddington: "The Kinship Network Among French Canadians", in Ralph Piddington (Ed.): Kinship and Geographical Mobility, Volume III, International Studies in Sociology and Social Anthropology, Luden, E.J. Brill, 1965, p. 148.

75. Ibid., p. 155.

76. Eugene Litwak: "Geographic Mobility and Extended Family Cohesion", American Sociological Review, June 1960, Volume 25, pp. 385-394.

77. Harry K. Schwarzweller: op. cit., p. 410.

78. Ibid., p. 410.

79. Schwarzweller et al: Mountain Families in Transition, op. cit., p. 98.

80. Ibid., p. 97.

81. James Sydney Slotkin: From Field to Factory, Glencoe, Illinois, The Free Press, 1960.

82. Schwarzweller et al: Mountain Families, op. cit., p.98.

83. Ibid., p. 98.

84. Ibid., p. 91.

85. Ibid., p. 91.

86. Ibid., p. 92.

87. Ibid., p. 93.

88. Ibid., p. 94.

89. Ibid., p. 73.

90. See Schwarzweller et al: Mountain Families, op. cit., and Brown et al: "Kentucky Mountain Migration and the Stem-Family: An American Variation on a Theme by LePlay", Rural Sociology, Volume 28, March 1963, pp. 48-69.

91. Schwarzweller et al: Mountain Families, op. cit., p. 83.

92. Ibid., p. 84.

93. Ibid., p. 118.

94. Ibid., p. 123.

95. Ibid., p. 127.

96. Ibid., p. 128.

97. Ibid., p. 93.

98. Zimmerman and Frampton also have studied migration from the Ozark mountains using this concept. See Carle C. Zimmerman and Merle E. Frampton: Family and Society, New York, D. Van Nostrand Co., 1935.

99. Schwarzweller et al: Mountain Families, op. cit., p. 129.

100. Mangalam and Schwarzweller: op. cit., p. 13.

101. Ibid., p. 13.

102. Schwarzweller et al: Mountain Families, op. cit., p.110.

103. Ibid., p. 117.

104. Ibid., p. 173.

105. Ibid., p. 124.

106. Ibid., p. 186.

107. Ibid., p. 186.

108. Ibid., p. 188.

109. Ibid., p. 123-124.

110. Ibid., p. 124.

111. Ibid., p. 112.

112. Ibid., p. 112.

113. Ibid., pp. 209-210.

114. Louis Wirth: "Urbanism as a Way of Life" in Sylvia Fleis Fava (Ed.): Urbanism in World Perspective: A Reader, New York: Thomas Y. Crowell & Co., 1968, p. 53.

115. Tilly and Brown: op. cit., p. 142-143.

116. Donald R. Whyte: op. cit., p. 4.

117. Mangalam and Schwarzweller: op. cit., p. 7.

118. Thelma McCormack: op. cit.

119. Social Opportunity Project, op. cit., p. 32.

120. McCormack; op. cit., p. 4.

121. Ibid., p. 3.

122. Social Opportunity Project, op. cit., p. 5.

123. Ibid., p. 31.

124. Ibid., p. 31.

125. Ibid., p. 31.

126. Ibid., p. 32.

127. McCormack: op. cit., p. 16.

128. Ibid., p. 16.

129. Social Opportunity Project, op. cit., p. 41.

130. Ibid., p. 46.

131. Cato Wadel: Marginal Adaptations and Modernization in Newfoundland: A Study of Strategies and Implications in the Resettlement and Redevelopment of Outport Fishing Communities, Memorial University of Newfoundland: Institute of Social and Economic Research, 1969, pp. 72-73.

132. Ibid., p. 70.

133. Ibid., p. 71.

134. McCormack: op. cit., p. 3.

135. Social Opportunity Project, op. cit., p. 38.

136. Ibid., p. 39.

137. Ibid., p. 41.

138. Social Opportunity Project, op. cit., p. 40.

139. McCormack: op. cit., p. 7.

140. Orton: op. cit., p. 128.

141. Social Opportunity Project, op. cit., p. 68.

142. McCormack: op. cit., pp. 24-25.

143. Ibid., p. 33.

144. Ibid., p. 24.

145. Ibid., p. 25.

146. Ibid., p. 26.

147. Social Opportunity Project, op. cit., p. 76.

148. McCormack: op. cit., p. 6.

149. Ibid., p. 5.

150. Ibid., p. 6.

151. Orton: op. cit., p. 118.

152. Ibid., p. 52-53.

153. Social Opportunity Project, op. cit., p. 39.

154. Ibid., p. 39.

155. McCormack: op. cit., p. 28.

156. Social Opportunity Project, op. cit., p. 26.

157. Ibid., p. 53.

158. Ibid., p. 54.

159. Ibid., p. 54.

160. Social Opportunity Project, op. cit., p. 38.

161. Mangalam and Schwarzweller: op. cit., p. 14.

162. Ibid., p. 14.

163. Ibid., p. 14.

164. Ibid., p. 10.

165. Ibid., p. 15.

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER TWO

1. R. MacIver and C. Page: Society: An Introductory Analysis, New York, Rinehart, 1949. Chapters 1 and 12.

2. Whyte: op. cit., p. 3.

3. Barney G. Glaser and Anselm L. Strauss: The Discovery of Grounded Theory, Chicago, Aldine Publishing Company, 1967, p.37.

4. Tilly and Brown: op. cit., p. 143.

5. This idea was suggested to me by Dr. Ralph Matthews, who indicated that it might be an explanation for much of Newfoundland migration.

6. Schwarzweller et al: Mountain Families, op. cit., p. 112.

7. Ibid., p. 98.

8. McCormack: op. cit.

9. Wadel: op. cit.

10. Schwarzweller et al: Mountain Familes, op. cit., p. 127.

11. Germani: op. cit., p. 175.

12. Elizabeth Bott: Family and Social Network, London, Tavistock Publications, 1971, p. 320.

13. Ibid., pp. 313-330.

14. Jansen, Social Aspects, op. cit., p. 75.

15. Ibid., pp. 15-16.

16. Schwarzweller et al: Mountain Families, op. cit., pp.208-209.

17. Claire Selltiz et al: Research Methods in Social Relations, New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1959, p. 50.

18. McCormack, op.cit., p. vi.

19. Selltiz et al: op. cit.

20. A similar method was used by Festinger, Schacter, and Back (1950) in a study of the effects of location of dwellings on friendship formation. Ibid., p. 270.

21. My sincere thanks to Mrs. Theresa Martin, Mrs. Isobel Connors, and Mr. Nelson Stowe of St. John's, and Dr. Ralph Matthews of Hamilton.

22. Selltiz: op. cit., p. 270. This will be dealt with again later.

23. Glaser and Strauss: op. cit., p. 61.

24. Orton: op. cit., p. 29.

25. Ibid., p. 29.

26. Selltiz: op. cit., p. 57.

27. Ibid., p. 264.

28. Schwarzweller et al: Mountain Families, op. cit., p. 208.

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER THREE

1. The fact that out-migration has traditionally been a way of life for rural people in Newfoundland, and yet may now be equally true for the urban populace, is reflected in a recent quote from The Evening Telegram, St. John's, Newfoundland, Saturday, October 27, 1973, p. 3, in a column by Mr. Ray Guy.

> At last, St. John's has been struck by the "Goin' down the road" phenomenon which for years has decimated the smaller towns and communities of Newfoundland. Nearly everyone in St. John's these days knows of someone else who has packed it in at last and made the move to the Mainland. This trend may be a surprise to those Townies who had felt smug and secure in their bastardized bastion until

now, but it is nothing novel to those of us who have been watching it happen "out around the Bay" for the past 10 years.

2. McCormack, op. cit., p. 9.

3. Jansen, Social Aspects, op. cit., p. 178.

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER FOUR

1. McCormack, op. cit., p. 3.

2. Tilly, op. cit., p. 24.

3. Alfred Schutz, Collected Papers II: Studies in Social Theory, The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1964, p. 106. My thanks to Dr. Victor Marshall who suggested that Schutz's concepts of the 'homecomer' and the 'stranger' might be relevant to my analysis here.

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER FIVE

1. Gordon, op. cit., p. 38.

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER SIX

1. Jansen, Readings, op. cit., p. 10.

2. Ibid., p. 15.

3. Ibid., p. 20.

APPENDIX A

McMASTER UNIVERSITY

HAMILTON, ONTARIO, CANADA

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY AND ANTHROPOLOGY

Dear

I am a Newfoundlander studying for my Masters degree in Sociology at McMaster University. As part of my degree, I am required to do my own research project, and so I am doing a study of Newfoundlanders who are living here in Hamilton. I want to find out about why they moved from Newfoundland, what problems they have had in adjusting to life here, etc.

In order to do this, I plan to talk with about sixty Newfoundlanders, from different age groups and walks of life. Since the main difficulty in this type of study is finding out who and where the Newfoundlanders are, I have asked each Newfoundlander I talk with, to give me the names and addresses of Newfoundland relatives or friends he has in this city. Your name was given to me by another Newfoundlander whom I visited.

I am writing this letter to let you know that, sometime in the next few weeks, I will be visiting you to ask you a few questions and listen to your ideas. I am especially interested in how moving from Newfoundland has changed your style of life, opinions, and contacts with other Newfoundlanders. I hope that, when I call on you, you will be able to give me the hour or so of your time that this conversation will take.

When I have finished these visits, I will write the study, based on the meetings I have had. No one but myself will ever see the record of my conversation with you, and the study will be a general report on the information provided by all the Newfoundlanders as a whole. I hope that this information can later be developed into guidelines for other Newfoundlanders who decide to move in the future.

I look forward to seeing you and talking with you. If you have any questions or if you would like any further information, you can contact me at the address given above, or by phoning 529-5438.

Yours truly,

Anne Martin

APPENDIX B

Interview Schedule:

Newfoundland Migrants in Hamilton

Code number _____

Respondent's Name _____
(if wife, include husband's name)

Respondent's Address _____

GENERAL INFORMATION:

1. INTERVIEWED NEWFOUNDLANDER:

1. ( ) Male alone, Nflder.
2. ( ) Female alone, Nflder.
3. ( ) Husband & wife together, both Nflders., and married at time of move.
4. ( ) Husband and wife together, both Nflders., but NOT married at time of move. SEE INSTRUCTIONS BELOW.
5. ( ) Husband & wife together, husband Nflder.
6. ( ) Husband & wife together, wife Nflder.
7. ( ) Other _____
(specify relationship and explain)

INTERVIEWER: If there are two separate moves involved, then interview the respondents separately. For example, if husband and wife got married AFTER they had each individually migrated, interview separately. This is also true of siblings who, although now living in the same household, moved individually. Otherwise, interview the husband & wife as a unit. Where both are Nflders., interview the head of the household as the chief respondent.

2. Marital status of respondent:

1. ( ) Single
2. ( ) Married
3. ( ) Widowed
4. ( ) Separated or Divorced

INTERVIEWER: If respondent married, widowed or separated, ask questions 3-5. Otherwise, skip to question 6.

3. Were you married when you came to Hamilton?
1. ( ) No
2. ( ) Yes

4. Where and when were you married? _____

_____

5. How did you meet for the first time?

1. ( ) On the job
2. ( ) Through friends
3. ( ) Known one another many years
4. ( ) Recreational Activity
5. ( ) Other

6. Occupation: Husband or Single Man (also get for deceased husband)

7. Occupation: Wife or Single Woman (also get for deceased wife)

8. Education: Husband or Single Man
   Highest grade obtained: _____
   Other training: _____

9. Education: Wife or Single Woman
   Highest grade obtained: _____
   Other training: _____

10. Age: Husband or Single Man _____

11. Age: Wife or Single Woman _____

12. Who besides you (and your spouse) lives in this house?

	Name	Age	Relation	Nflder.	Occupation
(1).					
(2).					
(3).					

INTERVIEWER: If respondent single person, skip to question 15.

13. Do you have any sons or daughters (besides any listed above in question 12)?

1. ( ) No. Skip to question 15.
2. ( ) Yes

14. Where do these sons and daughters (who don't live in this house) live?

	Name	Address	Age	Occupation	Marital Status
(1).					
(2).					
(3).					

15. Religious Denomination: Husband or Single Man

1. ( ) N/A (Respondent single, widowed, divorced woman)
2. ( ) Anglican
3. ( ) Roman Catholic
4. ( ) United Church
5. ( ) Salvation Army
6. ( ) Pentecostal
7. ( ) Other _____

16. Religious Denomination: Wife or Single Woman

1. ( ) N/A (Respondent single, widowed, divorced man)
2. ( ) Anglican
3. ( ) Roman Catholic
4. ( ) United Church
5. ( ) Salvation Army
6. ( ) Pentecostal
7. ( ) Other _____

17. Have you (or your spouse) ever belonged to a different religious denomination?

Husband or Single Man:

1. ( ) N/A (Respondent single, widowed, divorced woman)
2. ( ) No
3. ( ) Yes_____( )Before Move ( )After Move

(Denomination)

Wife or Single Woman:

1. ( ) N/A (Respondent single, widowed, divorced man)
2. ( ) No
3. ( ) Yes_____( )Before Move( ) After Move

(Denomination)

18. Do you feel that religion has played a greater or lesser role in your life since you've moved to Hamilton?

1. ( ) Greater
2. ( ) Lesser
3. ( ) Other (Don't Know, etc.)

_____

_____

PRESENT ORIENTATION TOWARD NEWFOUNDLAND:

19. Of all the places where you have lived, which do you think of as home?

1. ( ) Newfoundland
2. ( ) Hamilton
3. ( ) Other

20. Do you think you will ever return to Newfoundland to live?

1. ( ) No
2. ( ) Yes

21. If you ever did return to Newfoundland to live, would you go back to your home town or to some other area of the province?

1. ( ) Hometown
2. ( ) Some other area of the province

Why? _____

22. What do you miss most about Newfoundland?
Husband or Single Man: _____

Wife or Single Woman: _____

23. When you die, where would you like to be buried?
Husband or Single Man: _____

Wife or Single Woman: _____

24. Would you encourage Newfoundlanders to leave home as you have done?

1. ( ) No
2. ( ) Yes

25. Would you encourage them to come to Hamilton?

1. ( ) No
2. ( ) Yes

26. What is your reaction when you hear 'Newfie' jokes being told?

27. Do you ever tell them yourself?

1. ( ) No
2. ( ) Yes

28. Do you think that Newfoundlanders are looked down upon here in Ontario?

1. ( ) No
2. ( ) Yes
3. ( ) Don't know

If yes, give evidence: _____

29. Do you feel more comforable with Newfoundlanders than with Ontario people?

1. ( ) No difference
2. ( ) More comfortable with Newfoundlanders
3. ( ) More comfortable with Ontario people

30. Do people from other provinces ever make you feel inferior because you are a Newfoundlander?

1. ( ) No
2. ( ) Yes

LIFE IN NEWFOUNDLAND AND THE DECISION TO LEAVE:

INTERVIEWER: If respondent is married and spouse is not present, or if respondent is widowed or separated (but migrated with spouse), ask respondent to answer questions regarding spouse.

31. Place of birth: Husband or Single Man (also get for deceased or separated husband)

1. ( ) Newfoundland_____(Specify)
2. ( ) Outside Newfoundland_____(Specify)

Wife or Single Woman (also get for deceased or separated wife)

1. ( ) Newfoundland_____(Specify)
2. ( ) Outside Newfoundland_____(Specify)

32. Length of residence in place of birth:

Husband or Single Man: (get also for deceased or separated husband)

_____

Wife or Single Woman: (get also for deceased or separated wife)

_____

33. Did you ever live for more than a month in any other Newfoundland communities?

Husband or Single Man: (get also for deceased/or separated husband)

1. ( ) N/A (Husband not a Nflder., or never lived in Nfld.)
2. ( ) No
3. ( ) Yes

If yes:

	Place	Age When Moved	Why Moved There	Occupation
(1.)	_____	_____	_____	_____
(2.)	_____	_____	_____	_____

Wife or Single Woman: (get also for deceased or separated wife)

1. ( ) N/A (Wife not a Nflder., or never lived in Nfld.)
2. ( ) No
3. ( ) Yes

If yes:

	Place	Age When Moved	Why Moved There	Occupation
(1.)	_____	_____	_____	_____
(2.)	_____	_____	_____	_____

34. Father's Occupation:

Husband or Single Man: (also get for deceased or separated husband) _____

Wife or Single Woman: (also get for deceased or separated wife)_____

35. Respondent's Occupational History in Newfoundland:

Husband or Single Man: (N/A if husband not a Nflder., or never was there)

	Occupation	Address	Dates From - To
(1.)			
(2.)			

Wife or Single Woman: (N/A if wife not a Nflder., or never was there)

	Occupation	Address	Dates From - To
(1.)			
(2.)			

36. Did you ever have any difficulty getting a job in Newfoundland?

1. ( ) No
2. ( ) Yes. Skip to question 38.

37. Were you ever unemployed in Newfoundland?

1. ( ) No
2. ( ) Yes

_____

_____(For how long, financial support,etc.)

INTERVIEWER: Where both husband and wife are present, and both are Newfoundlanders, ask the head of the household the following questions.

38. How old were you when you first thought about moving away from Newfoundland?

_____

39. When you were growing up in Nfld., did you ever feel that it was just a 'matter of time' before you eventually moved away?

1. ( ) No
2. ( ) Yes

If yes, why?_____

40. How long had you been thinking about the change before you left?

1. ( ) Less than 3 months
2. ( ) 3 - 6 months

3. ( ) 6 months - one year
4. ( ) One-two years
5. ( ) Over two years

41. IF ANSWER TO Q. 40 was 'over one year', then why did it take you that long to make up your mind?

42. Did you want to leave Newfoundland?

1. ( ) No
2. ( ) Yes

43. IF MARRIED, which partner wanted most to leave?

1. ( ) N/A (Unmarried when moved, spouse not a Nflder., or never lived there)
2. ( ) Neither spouse wanted to move
3. ( ) Both wanted equally to move
4. ( ) Husband wanted to move more than wife
5. ( ) Wife wanted to move more than husband
6. ( ) Other _____(specify)

44. Was there a 'final event' that made up your mind to move?

1. ( ) No
2. ( ) Yes

45. Did you own a house or property in Newfoundland?

1. ( ) No. Skip to question 48.
2. ( ) Yes_____(Specify)

46. Do you still own this house or property?

1. ( ) No. Skip to question 48.
2. ( ) Yes

47. Why are you still holding on to this house or property?

48. Would you please tell me how much money you brought with you when you left Newfoundland?

49. Possessions brought with you when you left: (INTERVIEWER: TICK all items brought)

1. ( ) Car or truck
2. ( ) Furniture

If yes to No. 2.

3. ( ) Radio
4. ( ) Television
5. ( ) Kitchen range
6. ( ) Refrigerator
7. ( ) Washing Machine
8. ( ) Clothes Dryer
9. ( ) Sewing Machine
10. ( ) Record Player
11. ( ) Vacuum Cleaner
12. ( ) Floor Polisher
13. ( ) Chesterfield, Chairs, Bed, etc.
14. ( ) Other _____

_____

INTERVIEWER: If respondent married at time of move, ask questions 50 and 51. Otherwise, skip to question 52.

50. Did both spouses (and/or children) leave Newfoundland at the same time, or did the husband go by himself first?

1. ( ) Husband went alone first.
2. ( ) Couple went together. Skip to question 52.
3. ( ) Couple and children went together. Skip to question 52.
4. ( ) Other _____ (Specify)

51. If the husband went alone at first, when and under what circumstances did wife and children join him?

_____

_____

52. When you left Newfoundland, where did you go first?

1. ( ) Hamilton
2. ( ) Other _____

_____

INTERVIEWER: If respondent moved from Nfld. directly to Hamilton, skip to question 55.

53. Why did you go there? _____

_____

54. Now I would like to get a history of the moves you made until you came here to Hamilton.

	Address	From - To	Occupation	Why Moved
(1.)				
(2.)				
(3.)				

55. Why did you come to Hamilton?

56. Did you ever visit Hamilton before moving here?

1. ( ) No
2. ( ) Yes

If yes,

	When	Duration	Purpose	Accommodation
(1.)				
(2.)				

57. When you moved to Hamilton, how did you get here?

1. ( ) Airlines
2. ( ) Train, boat, or bus
3. ( ) Your own car or truck
4. ( ) Friend's or relative's car or truck
5. ( ) Other_____(Specify)

58. What time of year did you arrive here?

1. ( ) Spring
2. ( ) Summer
3. ( ) Fall
4. ( ) Winter

EXPECTATIONS AND ARRIVAL:

59. Before you came here, what did you think Hamilton would be like?

60. Did you expect to meet any other Newfoundlanders here?

1. ( ) No
2. ( ) Yes

61. Where did you think you would live when you first came here?

1. ( ) Alone
2. ( ) With relatives
3. ( ) With friends
4. ( ) Other

62. Did you have a job arranged before you came?

1. ( ) No
2. ( ) Yes

INTERVIEWER: If respondent answers "No" to question 62, then ask questions 63-66, and skip question 67.
If respondent answers "Yes" to question 62, then skip to question 67.

63. What kind of work did you think you would be doing when you arrived in Hamilton?

_____

_____

64. How much money did you think that people in that line of work would be earning in Hamilton?

_____

_____

65. How did you look for available jobs in Hamilton?

1. ( ) Employment or Manpower Agencies
2. ( ) Newspapers
3. ( ) Through Relatives
4. ( ) Through Friends
5. ( ) Other

_____

_____

66. How long after moving here did you find a job?

_____

_____

67. (INTERVIEWER: Ask only of those who answered "Yes" to question 62).

How did you arrange to get a job in Hamilton before you moved here?

_____

_____

68. Did anyone in particular help you out when you first came to Hamilton?

1. ( ) No
2. ( ) Yes

If yes, who, and in what ways_____

_____

69. Could you please tell me your job history in Hamilton up to your present job?

Husband or Single Man:

	Occupation	From - To
1. ( )	_____	_____
2. ( )	_____	_____
3. ( )	_____	_____

Wife or Single Woman:

	Occupation	From - To
1. ( )	_____	_____
2. ( )	_____	_____
3. ( )	_____	_____

INTERACTION WITH RELATIVES AND NFLD. FRIENDS:

70. Do you, or did you have any brothers and sisters?

Husband or Single Man:

1. ( ) No
2. ( ) Yes_____(number)

Wife or Single Woman:

1. ( ) No
2. ( ) Yes_____(number)

71. Do, or did, any of them live outside Newfoundland?

Husband or Single Man:

1. ( ) N/A (No brothers or sisters)
2. ( ) No
3. ( ) Yes

If yes,

	Name	Address
(1.)	_____	_____
(2.)	_____	_____

Wife or Single Woman:

1. ( ) N/A (No brothers or sisters)
2. ( ) No
3. ( ) Yes

If yes,

	Name	Address
(1.)	_____	_____
(2.)	_____	_____

72. Do you have any other relatives (aunts, uncles, cousins etc.) also living in Ontario?

Husband or Single Man:

1. ( ) No
2. ( ) Yes

If yes,

	Name	Address
(1.)	_____	_____
(2.)	_____	_____
(3.)	_____	_____

Wife or Single Woman:

1. ( ) No
2. ( ) Yes

If yes,

	Name	Address
(1.)	_____	_____
(2.)	_____	_____
(3.)	_____	_____

73. Before you came here, did you know anyone in Hamilton?

1. ( ) No. Skip to question 81.
2. ( ) Yes

If yes,

	Name	Friend or Relation	Address
(1.)	_____	_____	_____
(2.)	_____	_____	_____

74. Did any of your friends or relatives in Hamilton ever write to you before you came here?

1. ( ) No. Skip to question 79.
2. ( ) Yes

75. Did they tell you anything about life in Hamilton?

1. ( ) No
2. ( ) Yes

---

76. Did they try and get you to come here?

1. ( ) No
2. ( ) Yes

---

77. Did they offer to help you find a job here?

1. ( ) No
2. ( ) Yes
3. ( ) N/A (Respondent already had job arranged here)

---

78. Did they offer you a place to stay until you got settled here?

1. ( ) No
2. ( ) Yes

---

79. When you actually arrived in Hamilton, did relatives help you in any way?

1. ( ) N/A (Respondent had no relatives, only friends, in Hamilton before moving here)
2. ( ) No
3. ( ) Yes

_____(INTERVIEWER: Probe for place to live, financial assistance, directions around city, finding a job, etc.)

80. When you actually arrived in Hamilton, did friends help you in any way?

1. ( ) N/A (Respondent had only relatives here)
2. ( ) No
3. ( ) Yes

If yes,

_____(INTERVIEWER: Probe for place to live, financial assistance, directions around city, finding a job, etc.)

81. Since you came to Hamilton, have any relatives or Nfld. friends of either you or your spouse come here to live?

1. ( ) No. Skip to question 84.
2. ( ) Yes

If yes,

	Name	Friend or Relations	Address
(1.)			
(2.)			
(3.)			

82. Did you try and get them to come here to Hamilton?

1. ( ) No
2. ( ) Yes

---

83. Please tell me if you helped these relatives and/or friends in any of the following ways when they first came to Hamilton?

1. ( ) Let them stay with you when they first came here.
2. ( ) Help them to find a job.
3. ( ) Help them to find a place to live.
4. ( ) Give information about transportation and the city generally.
5. ( ) Financial Assistance if necessary.
6. ( ) Other

---

84. Please tell me about how many of the following you and your relatives here in Hamilton do together.

1. ( ) N/A(Respondent has no relatives in Hamilton)
2. ( ) You phone relatives.
3. ( ) Relatives phone you.
4. ( ) You visit them in their home.
5. ( ) They visit you in your home.
6. ( ) Go to a movie or club with them.
7. ( ) You borrow an item from them.
8. ( ) They borrow an item from you.
9. ( ) You do favors for them - help repair item, drive them somewhere, etc.
10. ( ) They do similar favor for you.
11. ( ) You lend them money.
12. ( ) They lend you money.
13. ( ) Other

---

85. Do you still have any relatives living back in Newfoundland?

Husband or Single Man:

1. ( ) Parents
2. ( ) Brothers
3. ( ) Sisters
4. ( ) Grandparent(s)
5. ( ) Aunts
6. ( ) Uncles
7. ( ) Cousins
8. ( ) Others _____.

Wife or Single Woman:

1. ( ) Parents
2. ( ) Brothers
3. ( ) Sisters
4. ( ) Grandparent(s)
5. ( ) Aunts
6. ( ) Uncles
7. ( ) Cousins
8. ( ) Others _____.

86. Do you still keep in touch with these relatives in Nfld.?

1. ( ) No
2. ( ) Yes

If yes,

	Name	Letters, phone calls, etc.?	Frequency
(1.)			
(2.)			

87. Since you moved to Hamilton, have you been back to Newfoundland at all?

1. ( ) No
2. ( ) Yes

If yes,

	Year	Transportation	Purpose	Anyone come back with you
(1.)				
(2.)				

88. Besides any relatives and friends mentioned earlier, do you know any other Newfoundlanders in Hamilton?

1. ( ) No. Skip to question 93.
2. ( ) Yes

If yes,

	Name	Address	Nature of Acquaintance Work, Social, etc.
(1.)			
(2.)			
(3.)			
(4.)			
(5.)			

89. Do you ever "get together" with any of these other Newfoundlanders?

1. ( ) No
2. ( ) Yes

If yes,

	Place	Activity	Frequency
(1.)			
(2.)			

90. Would you say that you know most of these Newfoundlanders well enough to visit them in their own homes?

1. ( ) No
2. ( ) Yes

91. Would you say that most of the people whom you know here in Hamilton are Newfoundlanders?

1. ( ) No
2. ( ) Yes

92. In what situations would you say you are most likely to come into contact with other Newfoundlanders? (INTERVIEWER: Probe for Church, clubs, lodges, unions, and work activities.)

93. Are you a member of any club for Newfoundlanders, Maritimers, etc.? (e.g., the East Coast Club)

1. ( ) No
2. ( ) Yes

(INTERVIEWER: Probe for how long a member, why respondent joined, how often and with whom does he attend.)

94. Do you ever shop at any of the Newfoundland food and fish stores in Hamilton?

1. ( ) No
2. ( ) Yes

If yes:

	Address	How often go there	Meet other Nflders. there
(1.)	_____	_____	_____
(2.)	_____	_____	_____

95. Would you be interested in joining a Newfoundland association if it formed in Hamilton?

1. ( ) No
2. ( ) Yes

_____

_____

96. Do you think such an organization would succeed in this city?

1. ( ) No
2. ( ) Yes

Why or why not? _____

_____

INTERACTION WITH NEIGHBOURS IN HAMILTON:

97. Could you please tell me which of the following you and your neighbours do together? (INTERVIEWER: Tick all items to which respondent gives a positive response)

1. ( ) Do you know the names of most of the families in this neighbourhood?
2. ( ) Do you know most of your neighbours well enough to say "Hello" or "Good Morning" to them on the street?
3. ( ) Do you and your neighbours ever exchange or borrow such things as magazines, recipies, tools, etc.?
4. ( ) Have you ever had a friendly chat with a neighbour?
5. ( ) Have you ever talked to your neighbours about a problem and asked for their advice?
6. ( ) Have any of your neighbours ever talked to you about their problems and asked for your advice?
7. ( ) If you were giving a party, would you invite any neighbours?
8. ( ) Have you ever been invited to a neighbour's house for a party, etc.?
9. ( ) Do any of your best friends live in this neighbourhood? (INTERVIEWER: Note whether respondent got to know them before or after moving to the neighbourhood.)

_____

_____

98. Are any of your neighbours Newfoundlanders?

1. ( ) No
2. ( ) Yes

_____

_____

99. Who would you say are your closest friends in Hamilton?

	Name	Address	Nflder.?	Length of Acquaintance
(1.)				
(2.)				

100. If you have any problems now, such as needing a helping hand, family or financial troubles, to whom would you go for help?

_____

_____

HOUSING AND LIFE STYLE:

101. Do you own your own house here in Hamilton?

1. ( ) Yes, own it outright.
2. ( ) Yes, but payments still being made.
3. ( ) No, paying rent.
4. ( ) No, living with relatives.
5. ( ) No, living with friends.
6. ( ) No, other _____

INTERVIEWER: If respondent answers "Yes" to question 101, then ask questions 102-103, and skip question 104.
If respondent answers "No" to question 101, skip 102-103, and proceed to question 104.

102. About how old is this house? _____ (years old)

103. How many rooms does this house have? _____

How many bedrooms? _____

104. INTERVIEWER: If answered "No" to question 101:

Have you ever owned your own home in Hamilton?

1. ( ) No
2. ( ) Yes

If yes,

	Address	Dates From - To
(1.)		
(2.)		

105. INTERVIEWER: If answered "No" to question 101:
Do you think you will ever own a house in Hamilton?
1. ( ) No
2. ( ) Yes

106. Do you own any other property in Hamilton? Land, store, etc.?
1. ( ) No
2. ( ) Yes

_____(Specify size and location)

107. Since you moved to Hamilton, have you always lived at the same address, or have you moved within the city?
1. ( ) No, always lived at the same address in Hamilton.
2. ( ) Yes, have moved within the city.

	Address	Dates From - To	Why Moved
(1.)			
(2.)			
(3.)			
(4.)			

108. Which of the following items do you own? (INTERVIEWER: Tick all items owned.)

1. ( ) Radio
2. ( ) Television
3. ( ) Refrigerator
4. ( ) Washing Machine
5. ( ) Electric Dryer
6. ( ) Sewing Machine
7. ( ) Telephone
8. ( ) Record Player
9. ( ) Vacuum Cleaner
10. ( ) Floor Polisher
11. ( ) Kitchen Range
12. ( ) Musical Instrument

109. Do you own a car or truck?
1. ( ) No
2. ( ) Yes
If yes,
Type _____ Year _____

110. Do you or your spouse read any papers or magazines regularly?
1. ( ) No
2. ( ) Yes

If yes, specify which types:

Daily Paper: _____

Weekend Paper: _____

News Magazine: _____

Religious Magazine or Paper: _____

Other: _____

111. Do you ever receive any Newfoundland paper or magazine?

1. ( ) No
2. ( ) Yes

If yes, which ones:

_____

_____

COMMUNITY SATISFACTION AND COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT:

112. Do you like living in Hamilton?

1. ( ) No
2. ( ) Yes

Why? _____

_____

113. Do you think you will stay in Hamilton, or do you think you will move on again in a couple of years?

1. ( ) Stay in Hamilton
2. ( ) Move on again

_____

_____

114. If you ever did move on again, where do you think you would go?

_____

_____

115. If you had a choice, where would you most want to live?

1. ( ) Hamilton
2. ( ) Some other place where lived on the mainland
3. ( ) Some place where never lived on the mainland
4. ( ) Place where respondent grew up in Newfoundland
5. ( ) Some other place in Newfoundland
6. ( ) Other

Location: _____

Why would you want to live there? _____

_____

116. Do you belong to any organizations, boards, or committees? (INTERVIEWER: Church groups, lodges, school boards, political groups, etc.)

Husband or Single Man:

1. ( ) No
2. ( ) Yes

If yes,

	Organization	Length of Membership	Position
(1.)	_____	_____	_____
(2.)	_____	_____	_____

Wife or Single Woman:

1. ( ) No
2. ( ) Yes

If yes,

	Organization	Length of Membership	Position
(1.)	_____	_____	_____
(2.)	_____	_____	_____

117. Would you say that there are any leaders among the Newfoundlanders in Hamilton?

1. ( ) Don't Know
2. ( ) No
3. ( ) Yes

If yes,

	Name	Address	Why do you think of them as leaders?
(1.)	_____	_____	_____
(2.)	_____	_____	_____

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bott, Elizabeth: Family & Social Network, (2nd edition), London, Tavistock Publications, 1971.

Breton, Raymond: "Institutional Completeness of Ethnic Communities and the Personal Relations of Immigrants", American Journal of Sociology, Volume 70, (1964).

Broom, Leonard, and John I. Kitsuse: "The Validation of Acculturation: A Condition to Ethnic Assimilation", American Anthropologist, Volume 57, (1955).

Brown, James, et al: "Kentucky Mountain Migration and the Stem-Family: An American Variation on a Theme by LePlay", Rural Sociology, Volume 28, (1963).

Burgess, Ernest W., and Donald J. Bogue (Eds.): Urban Sociology, The University of Chicago Press, 1964.

Eisenstadt, S.N.: The Absorption of Immigrants, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1954.

Fava, Sylvia Fleis (Ed.): Urbanism in World Perspective: A Reader, New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1968.

George, M.V.: Internal Migration in Canada, Dominion Bureau of Statistics: 1961 Census Monograph, Ottawa.

Glaser, Barney G., and Anslem L. Strauss: The Discovery of Grounded Theory, Chicago, Aldine Publishing Company, 1967.

Gordon, Milton M.: Assimilation in American Life, New York, Oxford University Press, 1964.

Guy, Ray: Column, The Evening Telegram, St. John's, Newfoundland, October 27, 1973.

Hauser, Philip M. (Ed.): Handbook for Social Research in Urban Areas, Belgium, UNESCO, 1965.

Hauser, Philip M., and Otis D. Duncan (Eds.): The Study of Population: An Inventory and Appraisal, The University of Chicago Press, 1959.

Herrick, Bruce H.: Urban Migration and Economic Development in Chile, Cambridge, M.I.T. Press, 1965.

Jackson, J.A. (Ed.): Migration, Cambridge University Press, 1969.

Jansen, Clifford J.: Social Aspects of Internal Migration: A Research Report, Bath University Press, 1968.

Jansen, Clifford J. (Ed.): Readings in the Sociology of Migration, Oxford, Pergamon Press, 1970.

Levitt, Kari: Population Movements in the Atlantic Provinces, Halifax, Atlantic Provinces Economic Council, 1960.

Litwack, Eugene: "Geographic Mobility and Extended Family Cohesion", American Sociological Review, Volume 25, (1960).

Mangalam, J.J., and Harry K. Schwarzweller: "General Theory in the Study of Migration: Current Needs and Difficulties", International Migration Review, Volume 3, 1968.

MacIver, Robert, and C. Page: Society: An Introductory Analysis, New York, Rinehart, 1949.

McCormack, Thelma: Maritime Migrants to Toronto: Selected Cases, Ottawa, Canadian Centre for Community Studies, 1968.

Orton, Larry J.: Newfoundland Association in Toronto, Unpublished Manuscript, Memorial University of Newfoundland, The Institute of Social and Economic Research, 1968.

Piddington, Ralph (Ed.): Kinship and Geographical Mobility, (Volume III), Luden, E.J. Brill, 1965.

Rioux, Marcel, and Yves Martin (Eds.): French Canadian Society, (Volume I), Toronto, McClelland and Stewart, 1964.

Rossi, Peter: Why Families Move: A Study in the Social Psychology of Urban Residential Mobility, Glencoe, Illinois, The Free Press, 1955.

Samora, Julian, and Richard A. Lamanna: Mexican-Americans in a Mid-west Metropolis: A Study of East Chicago, Advance Report 8, Graduate School of Business Administration, Los Angeles, University of California, July 1967.

Schutz, Alfred: Collected Papers II: Studies in Social Theory, The Hague, Martinus Nijhoff, 1964.

Schwarzweller, Harry K.: "Parental Family Ties and Social Integration of Rural to Urban Migrants", Journal of Marriage and the Family, Volume 26, (1964).

Schwarzweller, Harry K., et al: Mountain Families in Transition, University Park, Pennsylvania University Press, 1971.

Selltiz, Claire, et al: Research Methods in Social Relations, New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1959.

Shannon, Lyle, et al: The Economic Absorption and Cultural Integration of Immigrant Workers, University of Iowa Press, 1968.

Slotkin, James Sydney: From Field To Factory, Glencoe, Illinois, The Free Press, 1960.

Social Planning Council of Metropolitan Toronto: Social Opportunity Project, Toronto, June 1968.

Sorokin, P., and Carle Zimmerman: Principles of Rural-Urban Sociology, New York, Henry Holt and Company, 1929.

Stone, Leroy O.: Migration in Canada: Regional Aspects, Ottawa, Dominion Bureau of Statistics 1961 Census Monograph.

Tilly, Charles: Migration to an American City, Washington, U.S. Dept. of Agriculture, 1965.

Tilly, Charles, and C. Harold Brown: "On Uprooting, Kinship and the Auspices of Migration". International Journal of Comparative Sociology, Volume VIII, No. 2.

Thomas, Dorothy S.: Research Memorandum on Migration Differentials, New York, Social Sciences Research Council, 1938.

Wadel, Cato: Marginal Adaptations and Modernization in Newfoundland: A Study of Strategies and Implications in the Resettlement and Redevelopment of Outport Fishing Communities, Memorial University of Newfoundland; Institute of Social and Economic Research, 1969.

Weinberg, Abraham A.: Migration and Belonging, The Hague, Martinus Nijhoff, 1961.

Wendel, Bertil: A Migration Schema: Theories and Observations, Sweden, The Royal University of Lund, 1953.

Whyte, Donald R: "Social Determinants of Inter-Community Mobility: An Inventory of Findings", Canadian Review of Sociology & Anthropology, Volume 4, No. 1, (1967).

Zimmerman, Carle C., and Merle E. Frampton: Family and Society, New York, D. van Nostrand Company, 1935.