Patterns of Migration and Indices of Urbanization in

Belize, British Honduras

by

Jocelyne Kharusi Department of Anthropology Master of Arts

Abstract

This study examines the degree of urbanization of British Honduras from both a demographic and a socio-economic perspective. A traditional demographic index is calculated and explicated by means of a sociological index, based on a random sample survey of Belize, the Capital. This index is derived from the degree of urban commitment found among the population of Belize and is related to the patterns of migration through factor analysis and discriminant analysis. The population of Belize is found to be highly urbanized and this situation exists independently of the urban or rural origins of the inhabitants. Migration, which has always been a prominent factor in the history of British Honduras, contributes to the maintenance of a link between the Capital, the interior and the outside world; and consequently the inhabitants are found to adjust more rapidly to an urban value system than their counterparts in African or Latin American countries.

Patterns of Migration and Indices of Urbanization

Jocelyne Kharusi

Patterns of Migration and Indices of Urbanization in Belize, British Honduras

by

Jocelyne Kharusi

A Thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

Department of Anthropology McGill University Montreal.

Ø

July 1970

TABLE OF CONTENTS

				Page		
Ack	nowledge	ments		i		
Abs	tract			ii		
CHAP	TER					
I	Introdu	ction		1		
	1.1	Introduc	tion	1		
	1.2	Backgro	und literature	2		
	1.3	The rese	earch problem	5		
1.4 Sample 1.5 Multivariate analyses Footnotes						
	1.5	Multivar	iate analyses	10		
		Footnote	S	15		
II	The Na	tional Pict	ure	16		
	2.1	Geograpi	nic and regional diversity	16		
		Map 2.1		17		
	2.2	History				
		2.2.1	The foundation and growth of the community	19		
		2.2.2	The question of sovereignty	23		
		2.2.3	The instability of the economy	26		
	2.3	Racial ar	nd ethnic diversity	27		
	2.4	Belize: a	a primate city	30		
		2.4.1	Employment patterns	34		
		2.4.2	The educational system	35		
		2.4.3	Social and recreational facilities	36		
	2.5	Urban pr	oblems	36		
		2.5.1	Unemployment and under-employment	37		
		2.5.2	Housing and urban services	37		
		Map 2.2		39		
		2.5.3	Transportation and traffic	41		

.

۰.

CHAPTER

	2.6	Social Structure of the community			
		2.6.1 Social differentiation	43		
		2.6.2 Family structure: Household composition and mating patterns	44		
	2.7	Demographic index of urbanization	47		
		Footnotes	50		
III	Pattern	as of Migration	52		
	3.1	Definition of subgroups	52		
	3.2	Streams of migration	58		
	3.3	Demographic patterns			
		3.3.1 Sex distribution	75		
		3.3.2 Age distribution	76		
	3.4	Small scale movements	80		
		Footnotes	83		
IV	Present	tation of the variables	84		
	4.1	Level of education	86		
	4.2	Professional skill			
	4.3	Attitudes towards the possibility of changing • one's occupation			
	4.4	Proportion of time spent in a city during adulthood			
	4.5	Proportion of life spent in a continuous residence in a city	96		
	4.6	Place of birth of respondents' parents categorized as rural or urban	98		
	4.7	Attitudes towards city life	101		
	4.8	Preferences in places of living	104		
	4.9	Standards of living	105		
	4.10	House tenure	109		
	4.11	Family status	110		
		Footnotes	112		

Page

CHA	PTER			Pag	
v	Multiva	ariate Anal	yses	113	
V	5.1	Factor a	nalysis	113	
	5.2	Comparison groups: Factor scores			
		5.2.1	Socio-economic factor	119	
		5.2.2	Rural/urban preference factor	121	
		5.2.3	Residential (time) factor	122	
		5.2.4	Familial stability factor	123	
		5.2.5	Residential socio-economic factor	125	
	5.3	Discrimi	nant analysis	127	
	5.4	The urba	n and rural born	129	
		5.4.1	Classification matrix	129	
		5.4.2	Discriminant functions and the relative contributions of the variables as discriminators	131	
	5.5	Sub-cate	gories of urban and rural born	133	
	5.6	Urban co	mmitment	141	
		5.6.1	Factor scores of the new comparison groups	143	
		5.6.2	Discriminant functions	145	
	5.7	Index of urbanization (sociological frame of reference)			
		Footnotes	5	154	
VI	Summary and Conclusions				
	Append	ix 1 - Sche	dule: Information on each respondent	166	
	Appendix 2 - List of Tables for cross-tabulated data				
	Bibliog	raphy		171	

e

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my gratitude to my research director, Professor Joan Miller, for her guidance and encouragement. I would also like to thank Professor M.C. Corballis of the Psychology Department for his help regarding factor and discriminant analyses.

I wish also to acknowledge the financial support for field research from the Research Institute for the Study of Man, as part of the Inter-University Consortium for Training in the Caribbean.

My appreciation is extended to the Housing and Planning Department of Belize as well as to the people interviewed for their endless cooperation which made possible the realization of this project.

Thanks are due to Ken Zwanzig for supplying the factor analysis program and his help in running it.

I also have to thank my husband for his constant harassment and assistance in the computer work. i

Patterns of Migration and Indices of Urbanization in Belize, British Honduras

ABSTRACT

This study examines the degree of urbanization of British Honduras from both a demographic and a socio-economic A traditional demographic index is calculated and perspective. explicated by means of a sociological index, based on a random sample survey of Belize, the Capital. This index is derived from the degree of urban commitment found among the population of Belize and is related to the patterns of migration through multivariate statistical analyses. Factor analysis is used to reduce to more fundamental dimensions the urban commitment indicators chosen for the analysis and is revealed useful in establishing factor scores between the different groups of migrants and non-It is also useful for determining, in the context of migrants. the population interviewed, which groups correspond to the different socio-economic strata of Belize when considered in relation to their origin and to their patterns of migration. Discriminant analysis is used to discover constellations of variables which maximally discriminate each subgroup from the others and helps greatly in quantifying the relative importance of the variables in this discrimination.

These two techniques, which give profiles of the groups studied, are supplemented by a single perspective approach in order to understand more fully the detailed contribution of each variable.

Despite the medium high degree of urbanization of the country, the population of Belize is found to be highly urbanized and this situation exists independently of the urban or rural origins of the inhabitants. Migration, which has always been a prominent factor in the history of British Honduras, contributes to the maintenance of a link between the Capital and the interior and between the country and the outside world; and consequently the inhabitants are found to adjust more rapidly to an urban value system than their counterparts in African or Latin American countries.

iii

CHAPTER I

Introduction

1.1 Introduction

This is a study of urbanization in British Honduras based on a random sample survey of the capital, Belize. More specifically, it concentrates on the degree of urbanization from both a demographic and a socio-economic perspective. Various methods of measuring urbanization are examined. A traditional demographic index is calculated and explicated by means of a sociological index which is an improved version of Mitchell's approach (1965; 1969).¹ This index is derived from the degree of urban commitment found among the population of Belize and this is related to their patterns of migration.

The study of urbanization, for our purpose, thus implies two meanings: in a demographic sense it is the proportion of the total population living in cities and, as Davis suggested, it is also the placing, in their relative context, of the elements responsible for urban growth such as the country's general population increase and rural-urban migration (Davis: 1968: 34). In a sociological sense it refers to the process of becoming urban. In this case becoming urban includes factors responsible for changes among both rural migrants and the urban born, or, in a modified version of Mitchell's "urban commitment" (1965; 1969), it refers to the factors affecting the choice of these two groups to live in a city.

1.2 Background literature

The process of urbanization has been, in the last few decades, of primary interest to social scientists. Anthropological studies of this phenomenon have focused on the transformation of social structure, the adaptation of a traditional way of life to a new environment, and the adjustment or mal-adjustment of rural In Africa anthropologists were more conmigrants to town life. cerned with tribalism and its transformation or rejection under urban pressures (see: Little: 1957; Gluckman: 1960; Mayer: 1962; In Latin America they stressed the question of Gutkind: 1966). ruralism versus urbanism with an accent on city growth and its socio-economic consequences (Matos Mar: 1961; Brisseau: 1963; Marchand: 1966). Similar methodologies were employed with social phenomena such as kinship, voluntary associations, etc. (Leeds: 1968:31). However, current interests are directed towards a more general theoretical approach that will take into account the "dynamic interplay" of economic, psychological, social and demographic factors (Mangalam and Schwarzweller: 1968).



This study represents a further attempt in this direction. We shall first analyse migration histories of Belizians in order to determine general migration patterns and to show how they do or do not relate to economic streams. We shall also try to show how they are influenced by rural-urban preferences. The data will then be examined against both demographic (Davis: 1968; Breeze: 1966; United Nations: 1968; etc.) and socio-psychological (Mitchell: 1965; 1969) indices of urbanization.

The traditional demographic method of measuring urbanization is to calculate the proportion of people living in places of 20,000, 100,000 or more (Davis: 1968; Breeze: 1966; United Nations: 1968; etc.). This method, however, supposes that the population is static and the results would be elusive in countries where labor migration is a major feature of economic life. As Mitchell and Shaul remarked (1965: 625), the problem in this case becomes "a matter of assessing the degree of "urbanization" of people who live in town." Urbanization is used here in the sense of increasing length of stay in town and has two different connotations: the first is called "stabilization" and refers to "the degree to which migration patterns are changing and people are staying longer in towns than they did before"; the second connotation refers to "commitment to urban residence" i.e., "the kind of decision, or choice, a person makes about his place of residence" (Ibid: 625-26).

Social scientists have tried to set forth such criteria of measurement as, for instance, the proportion of time spent in

town as against time spent in rural areas since an individual first left his village, the number of visits a person pays to his rural area since coming to town, the permanent residence of the wife in town, the possession of land rights in rural areas, etc. (see Wilson: 1941; Hellman: 1956; Mitchell: 1956; Glass: 1964; Mitchell and Shaul: 1965). However, Mitchell and Shaul pertinently noted (1965: 628) that the major difficulty in establishing such indices is the evaluation of one criterion against another when they do not all coincide. In other words, is a man who has been in town for 15 years with his wife and who retains rural land rights more or less committed to town life than one who has been in town for 12 years, has his wife with him but has no rural land rights (Ibid) ? Mitchell offers factor analysis as a means for estimating the degree to which all aspects of behaviour, retained as indicators of commitment to urban life, reflect this commitment. From the "factors" obtained an index or score of commitment can then be derived. (Ibid: 629).

Mitchell's approach is certainly an advance on traditional measures in its attempt to reduce to more fundamental dimensions a battery of urban commitment indicators. Our approach is similar though adjusted to the context of British Honduaras and, as we shall see, used in conjunction with a better scoring method (Harris: 1967). Furthermore, this procedure is supplemented by the use of discriminant analysis which is a superior method for differentiation between groups. The indicators or variables used in both factor and dis-

criminant analysis are first presented individually in order to understand their exact contribution. The results from the different methods, i.e. the single perspective, factor analysis and discriminant analysis, are compared and found to complement each other rather than to duplicate one another.

1.3 The research problem

5

As indicated earlier, the thesis will analyse the patterns of migration of Belizians and then examine the data against both demographic and socio-psychological indices of urbanization. Considerations taken into account in the delineation of the problem were based on the nature of Belize City and on the economic features of British Honduras.

In a logwood economy labor migration was a constant feature. It was suspected to still be a prominent characteristic, at the time of the study, due to the succession of "heydays" and "hard times" the capital and the districts have alternatively undergone (to be reviewed in Chapter II). For instance, the districts have recently experienced greater development and economic expansion than the Belize City region. However, the district economy has remained primarily seasonal and involved in primary production. On the other hand Belize, apart from being a primate city, offered more permanent wage earnings in secondary and tertiary economic spheres. It should, therefore, have been the center of attraction for the rural areas and the pole of attachment for the urban born.

In this context one could ask, what were the patterns of migration of Belizians? Were they related to economic push/pulls of the different parts of the country? Did preferences of living in urban or rural areas affect them? Were rural/urban preferences dependent on the respondent's origin and, if not, to what other factors were they attributable? In other words, the intent of the study was to look upon the degree of urbanization of the inhabitants of the capital according to their degree of urban commitment and in relation to their migration histories. Furthermore, the results will be compared with the one obtained from a traditional demographic measure of urbanization.

1.4 Sample

A simple random sample of Belize households² was drawn. This was made possible by the fact that in1968 the Housing and Planning Department of British Honduras was engaged in a survey of Belize in order to correct and complete the official map of lots. The Department had arbitrarily divided the city into units, depending on the number of lots visited per day. For each lot, the number of dwellings and the nature and material condition of the buildings were

- 6

registered. A residence or a dwelling was defined according to the definition of household given in the Census of British Honduras, i.e. "a group of persons who jointly occupy a whole or a part of a housing unit, that is, who live together, and normally share at least one meal daily" (1960:1:28). In our arrival in May, 1968, the north side of the city and part of the south had been completed. We finished the remaining 25%,³ permitting us to draw the sample from the entire city.

Although the size of the sample to be drawn is usually based on the degree of precision desired, the limited time available (12 weeks) was an overriding factor for our deciding on a sample consisting of 50 households. Furthermore, an estimation of the standard error shows that a sample of at least 200 households would have been required to reduce the standard error of the results to any appreciable degree (Cochran: 1963: 52)⁴.

The reliability of the sample can be examined by comparing it with the 1960 British Honduras Census. Fig. 1.1 compares two age distributions: one obtained from the sample and the other from the census (1960: 2:3.3). We can observe in the age group of 5 to 15 a significant difference between the census and the sample, which could be the reflection of a steady increase of the birth rate. Concerning the age groups between 35 and 55,the differences in the data could be the results of emigration or migration to the districts. However, other factors can account for the differences between the two distributions. The count of house-



--- Sample --- Census

Note: 1) Sample : 1 unit = 10 respondents 2) Census : 1 unit = 111 residents (totals normalised)

FIG. 1.1 Age Distribution of Belize City Male and Female

holds in the sample had two sources, as already mentioned, both possibly contributing to error. In the second place, only the household heads can be considered as random and consequently the individuals under 15 years of age offer an increase in the percentage error since the degree of randomness is reduced. It is fortunate that a big gap is observed only in this latter category which is not retained in the study itself. Thus the reliability of the sample is judged adequate for the purpose of our study. After the count of the south side of the city was completed, a number, from 1 to 6801, was given to each household. A series of 50 random numbers was drawn from a table of random numbers and the corresponding households constituted the sample.

The schedule was built up from informal interviews and tested on a small number of households which were chosen at random but had not been included in the final sample. The investigator personally visited each household and each adult aged 17 and over, including boarders and visitors, was interviewed. The number of non-responses was negligible. There was only one refusal and one household, visited in the last week of our stay, was unavailable for interviewing because the members were on holiday in the United Therefore the total number of households interviewed was States. 48. The schedules were not pre-coded to avoid preconceptions (see Appendix 2 for sample schedule). On return to Montreal the responses were coded for the computer in such detail as to make possible re-combinations. The respondents were divided into six

categories: non-migrants, external migrants, urban-urban migrants, urban-rural-urban migrants, rural-rural-urban migrants, and straight rural-urban migrants. They were also cross-tabulated under the different items to be found in Appendix 3. From the tables obtained we derived the variables used in factor and discriminant analysis.

1.5 Multivariate analyses

Meadows and Mizruchi (1969:6) have argued that the limitations in single perspectives lie in the intuitive appreciation of the differential interaction of the variables, and the capacity to understand is therefore restricted to the knowledge the researcher has of the independent effects of selected variables. We felt that multivariate analyses, which would seem to overcome some of these problems, deserve to be investigated further as techniques in understanding urban processes.

In our use of multivariate analysis we have opted for factor analysis rather than component analysis because of the several advantages of the former method. Firstly, factor analysis has the property of checking to what extent a hypothetical model agrees with the data and of estimating its parameters (Kendall: 1961:37). The "empirical nature" of component analysis, which needs no hypothesis to be made about the variates to be employed (Lawley and Maxwell: 1963:2) makes it less attractive. Secondly,

factor analysis accounts for, or explains, the matrix of covariance by a minimum, or at least a small number, of hypothetical variates or 'factors' (Ibid.) and is consequently more parsimonius than component analysis, for which the aim is to "break down a covariance or correlation matrix into a set of orthogonal components or axes equal in number to the number of variates concerned" (Ibid.), i.e., the new variates are arranged in descending order of importance and reduction in the number of variables can then be performed by simply taking the first few. Factor analysis, on the other hand, looks for a specified number of factors (fewer than the number of original variates) which will best account for the situation at hand, and consequently this method is inherently superior to component analysis in the sense that the procedure is much more parsimonious or frugal as regards the number of final variables for use in interpretation or the checking of hypotheses. Furthermore, component analysis is highly scale dependent (scales of different variables). There are also many other considerations which point to the general superiority of factor analysis as compared to component analysis, see for example Lawley and Maxwell (1963: ch.1,2,4), Morrison (1967: ch.7, 8). In this study factor analysis will be performed on twelve variables which affect urban commitment in an attempt to reduce them to fewer, more fundamental dimensions or "factors". Scores will be estimated for each factor and used to compare, first, each group of urban and rural born and, second, each group committed positively and negatively to urban life.

A second method used in understanding urban commitment was discriminant analysis. The purpose of this method is to classify an individual into one of several predetermined groups. As Kendall noted (1961: 144), the object of the inquiry is not to find the best way of dividing heterogeneous material into classes but "to find rules of behaviour in the assignment of individuals to predetermined groups with optimal properties". The main advantage of the technique is that it permits simultaneous comparison of the differences between several groups in respect to several variables (Kaczkowski and Rothney: 1956: 231-32). While factor analysis is a suitable technique for describing the arrangement of variates within a population, discriminant analysis is more appropriate for specification of between-group differences (Jones and Bock: 1960:162). It is also interesting in its property of determining the measure of importance of the variables for each discrimination, especially in an appreciation of urban commitment. Another advantage of discriminant analysis resides in the avoidance of the factor analysis deficiency regarding the estimation of factor For each individual the method of discriminant analysis scores. calculates the probability of his belonging to each of the specified groups and thus one can judge the effectiveness of the analysis. This overcomes some of the problems inherent in factor analysis, i.e. that factor scores can only be estimated and not determined precisely (Mc Donald and Burr: 1967: 382; Harris: 1967).

In sum, the study will, first, determine the patterns of prior migration found to be present among the inhabitants of Belize and examine how they do or do not relate to economic streams. We shall also try to indicate if they are influenced by rural-urban preferences. Secondly, we will examine via both demographic and socio-psychological indices the degree of urbanization of the population of Belize.

Features encouraging in-migration to Belize will be reviewed in Chapter II which describes the national picture and examines the socio-economic setting of the urban community. A description of the patterns of migration found among the Belizians, the major motivations for their migrating and the demographic impact of migration, is given in Chapter III. Indices of urbanization are presented and discussed in Chapters II, IV and V. In these chapters, variables affecting urban commitment are examined and analysed as a complex whole with two multivariate statistical techniques, factor analysis and discriminant analysis. Factor analysis will look for factor scores in the total population affecting urban commitment and examine the extent to which these are found first in each group of urban and rural born and second in each group recognized as positively or negatively urban committed. Discriminant analysis will be used to discover the constellations of variables which maximally discriminate each subgroup from the Conclusions will be presented in Chapter VI. others.

It is hoped that this study will clarify some theoretical issues concerning the process of becoming urban and will also demonstrate the advantages of using multivariate analysis in urban studies.

FOOTNOTES

CHAPTER I

- This paper is a revised and extended reprint of "Urbanization, Detribulization and Stabilization in Southern Africa: A problem of Definition and Measurement" in Social Implications of Industrialization and Urbanization in Africa, South of the Sahara, UNESCO, 1956, in which findings on factor analysis were presented to the Central African Scientific and Medical Congress in Lusaka, Northern Rhodesia, in August 1963 and published in J.C. Mitchell and J.R.H. Shaul: "An Approach to the Measurement of Commitment to Urban Residence", 1965 (editor's note: 470; and Mitchell's note no. 41).
- 2. Stratified sampling was not employed because of the limited knowledge we had on the migration of Belizians and hence might have led to biased results.
- 3. At the time of the study there were no aerial photographs or a list of phone numbers adequate for the drawing of a sample. The list of voters was too old to record recent migrations and consequently the list from the Housing and Planning Department that we used was the best whole for the drawing of a sample.
- 4. The standard error for results from a sample of 50, if we suppose that the population percentage is at its worst, is 7%. However, the standard deviation would, in fact, be less than 7% since there are 83 other respondents chosen in a semi-random way, i.e. the adults residing in the 50 households other than the heads. The standard deviation for 200 households would be 3-1/2%. It therefore becomes superfluous to give more than two significant figures to the percentages that will be obtained and any decimals will be rounded off to the nearest whole number.

CHAPTER II

The National Picture

Most studies on urbanization have been concerned with either massive migration from rural to urban areas or labor migration involving a high turnover of migrants. However, the formation of Belize City was far from being identical to, say, African or Latin American cities. Its history was one of slavery and colonialism but, as Waddell has noted (1961: 14), it differed considerably from that of the other Caribbean territories in having wood-cutting rather than plantation agriculture as its economic base. Thus, it is important to outline here the geographical, historical, and socio-cultural context of contemporary British Honduran life in order to understand what types of migration are taking place in the community, and to what extent it is urbanized.

2.1 Geographic and regional diversity

British Honduras is located on the Northeast coast of Central America and is bordered on the North and Northwest by Mexico, on the West and South by Guatemala, and on the East by the Caribbean (see Map 2.1). The total population has increased



Map 2.1

rapidly during the last two decades at an annual rate of 3% and is now approximately 112,000 in a territory covering 8,866 square miles, twice the size of Jamaica (Mitchell, Sir Harold: 1967:234).

The country is divided into six administrative districts. Belize District includes the Capital and Belize rural, and lies a few feet above sea level with mangrove swamps giving way to savannahs in the Southwest. In the North are Corozal and Orange Walk Districts where the climate is generally drier. Here there is a forest area of a thousand square miles in the South of Orange Walk District and cultivatable soil between the New River and the Rio Hondo (see Map 2.1) The coastal zone is one of alternate forests and lagoons. The Southern and Western districts are Stann Creek, Toledo and Cayo where the muggy swamps are replaced by pine ridges, scrub forest and cultivated lands in a decor of valleys and mountains reaching 2700 feet above sea level.

In the 1920's internal transportation was still by means of dories, pit-pans, and paddle-propelled boats on the many rivers of the country. In 1908 a railway joining Middlesex to Stann Creek was inaugurated; however, it was put out of operation in 1919 after the abandonment of the banana plantations due to Panama disease. After the Second World War communications were improved, two roads joined the Capital to El Cayo and Corozal towns. In the South the only means of access was by boats or planes until a road was built from the Western Highway to Stann Creek Town and extended, very recently, to Punta Gorda and San Antonio (Donohue: 1946: 51-52;

Caiger: 1951: 142-149; 175). There are many private airstrips in the Country (about 20) constructed by companies and individuals which supplement the small airports maintained by the government. However, there is only one International Airport, in Belize City, which handles medium range jets. It links the country to Miami, New Orleans, Mexico, Honduras and Guatemala (Latin American Report: 1968: 14).

In 1960, 32,867 individuals (Census: 2:2.1), over onethird of the total population of British Honduras lived in Belize City and, at the time of the study, this number was estimated to have reached 40,000. The small towns hold 18% of the population: Stann Creek (5,287 inhabitants), Corozal (3,171), Orange Walk (2,157), Punta Gorda (1,789), and Benque Viejo (1,607) (Census: 1960: 2:1.1). The rest of the population lives in about a hundred villages mainly concentrated between Orange Walk and Corozal towns, in the extreme south, along the coast south of Belize, and along the Belize River and the Belize-Cayo Road; other parts of the country are virtually uninhabited (Waddell: 1961:63-64).

2.2 History

2.2.1. The foundation and growth of the community. Though the beginnings of European settlement in British

Honduras remain obscure, it is generally accepted that the formation of British Honduras is the result of logwood-cutting activities by English buccaneers. A Captain Peter Wallis (or Wallace) is generally believed to have established the first settlement, around 1640, at the mouth of the Belize River, a settlement which later became Belize City (Grunewald: 1965: 19). Craig (1969: 59) reports that in spite of precarious living conditions a certain amount of permanence and stability began to appear in British Honduras around 1667. Settlers spread out along the Rio Hondo and the New River and eventually tradesmen and merchants took up residence in Belize.

The growth of the Colony was mainly based upon immigration from neighbouring countries. At the beginning of the nineteenth century black Caribs deported from St. Vincent to Roatan settled in Stann Creek. The population of British Honduras was then composed of 200 whites, 700 free blacks, 2000 slaves and 150 Caribs. Between 1848 and 1858, Spanish and mestizo refugees escaping from the War of the Castes in Yucatan, settled down in In the 1860's, after the American Civil War, Corozal District. a small number of Southerners established sugar plantations in the Punta Gorda region of British Honduras and imported some East Indians and Chinese labourers who remained in the Colony after the departure of their masters a few years later (Waddell: 1961: 14-18).

In the latter part of the nineteenth and in the present century, Maya Indian immigrants from Guatemala settled in the west and south of the country. Also, at the beginning of this century there was limited immigration of Jamaicans who came to work on railway construction and on banana plantations. The banana plantations also attracted some Caribs and West Indian Creoles from Honduras. Civil Service immigration never exceeded 4% of the total population and has always settled mainly in Belize and in the small towns (West Indian Census: 1946: British Honduras: 3: 17).

Through the Colony's history much of the population has been concentrated around the capital. Table 2.1 compares the growths of Belize and the country as a whole since 1891. Two decreases in the rate of growth of Belize can be observed: the first, in 1911, due to a serious epidemic of Yellow Fever in 1905 and two destructive fires in 1909 and 1910 which involved a great loss of life (Caiger: 1951: 146); The second, in 1946, was a temporary one due to a great number of seasonal workers from British Honduras who were in Guatemala or the U.S. on the Census day. Also absent were those who had left the Colony during the war years to serve either in the Military or as forest workers in the United Kingdom and who had not yet returned (West Indian Census: 1946: British Honduras: 1). In 1960 the annual rate of growth for the country was 3.03%, the highest in its history (Manpower Assessment Report 1964:2.2). This increase can be explained by a drastic

TABLE 2.1

Comparison of the growth of the population of Belize City and of the country as a whole from Census to Census.¹

		Census Po <u>r</u>	Annual		
	Beliz	e City	Br.Honduras	rate per cent	
Year of Census		<pre>% of total population</pre>		B.C.	в.н.
1891	6,972	22.0	31,471	-	-
1901	9 , 113	24.3	37,479	2.71	1.77
1911	10,478	26.0	40,458	1.40	0.77
1921	12,423	27.4	45,317	1.71	1.13
1931	16,687	32.6	51,347	2.99	1.26
1946	21,886	36.9	59 , 220	1.83	0.96
1960	32,690	36.3	90,121	2.96*	3.03

Sources: West Indian Census: 1946: Tables D and E, Chap.l. Census of British Honduras: 1960: Vol.I, Table A; Vol.II, Table 1.1.

* Annual rate per cent compounded annually for the years between two Censuses = Total percentage increase. decline in the mortality rate (from 16.9 per thousand to 8.4 per thousand), a significant increase in birth rates (34.3 per thousand to 46.3) (Ibid.), and also by immigration (see Table 2.2.a). Emigration between 1946 and 1960 appears to be important. Unfortunately, there is no reliable means for appreciating the extent to which it influenced the total increase of the population.

The rate of increase of the Capital which had always been greater than the country itself, took, during this period, second place (2.96 for Belize and 3.03 for British Honduras). This situation might be explained by a higher natural increase in the districts although migration is also an important factor. Table 2.2.a indicates that British Honduras received, between 1946 and 1960, 4,709 immigrants and British Hondurans returning from abroad, out of which only 1,023 settled in Belize City. As far as internal migration is concerned (Table 2.2.b), only 1,618 rural migrants moved to Belize while 3,653 inhabitants from the Capital were settling in the districts, mainly in response to new economic opportunities (to be discussed in section 2.4.1).

2.2.2. The question of sovereignty.

Spain, and later Guatemala as well as Britain, have claimed territorial sovereignty over British Honduras. Spanish claims were based upon rights of discovery and conquest and on the Papal Donation of Pope Alexander VI who granted the Western hemisphere to Spain and Portugal in 1943. In the Treaty of Torsedillas,

TABLE 2.2

E x t	ernal	Movers		
Place of Birth	Last cont from 1 Belize	Total		
Canada Guatemala Honduras Jamaica Mexico United Kingdom United States Br.Honduran born TOTAL:	9 85 194 71 87 153 131 293 1023	642 503 143 112 1783 * 84 58 451 3776	651 588 337 183 1870 237 189 654 4709	

Migrations in British Honduras between 1946 and 1960

	Int	erna	1	Mov	ers			_
	Last continuous residences from 1 to 13 years							-
Place of Birth	Belize rural	Corozal	Orange Walk	Cayo	Stan Creek	Toledo	TOTAL	_
Belize	427	578	621	850	1051	126	3653	
	Bel	Last f Lize	Last continuous residence from 1 to 13 years e					2.2.b.
Belize rural Corozal Orange Walk Cayo Stann Creek Toledo	351 420 336 368 143 -						1618	

* The great majority were Mennonites who settled in Cayo and Orange Walk Districts between 1957 and 1958 and we also suspect that the great majority of Canadians were also Mennonites

Sources: Census of British Honduras: 1960, vol.II, Tables 3.7 and 3.8.

2.2.a.

the following year, Spain and Portugal agreed in fixing the line separating the future colonies of the two countries at 370 leagues west of the Cape Verde Islands, thus allowing Spain to claim rights of sovereignty over British Honduras (Caiger: 1951: 18-19; Encyclopedia Britannica: 22: 301-302; Waddell: 1967: 36). British claims were based on rights of occupation and non-recognition of the Papal Donation (Caiger: 1951). After the declaration of independence in Central America, both Mexico and Guatemala claimed that British Honduras was part of their Spanish inheritance. According to Mexico, British Honduras was part of Yucatan since Spain has always intervened in the settlement through the Governor of this Mexican province. On the other hand, Guatemala claimed that it was part of El Peten. After the Anglo-Mexican Treaty in 1826 Mexico made little attempt to acquire sovereignty over British Honduras. However, Guatemala replaced Spain in a dispute that is still unsettled (Caiger: 1951; Grunewald: 1965).

These events are important for a better understanding of the formation of the country and of Belize City which was the "nucleus of the settlement". For over a hundred years the log-cutters had had to resist Spanish aggression and had finally convinced Britain to clarify the legal situation. However, it was only after 200 years of "vacillating" politics that British Honduras was officially proclaimed a Colony of Great Britain. The country is now working towards independence; however, the enthusiasm is over-shadowed by the still existing Anglo-Guatemalan dispute.

2.2.3. The instability of the economy.

The economy of British Honduras was traditionally based on forest products (logwood, mahogany and chicle). However, at the turn of the century the forest products industry suffered a drastic decline. Logwood exportation was ruined by the development of aniline dyes. By 1946 the total exports of mahogany had fallen to half the volume of the 1920's. The chicle industry, prosperous in Mexico and Guatemala and also organized in British Honduras, suffered a drastic blow after the Second World War due to competition from synthetic substitutes (Waddell: 1961; Mitchell, Sir Harold: 1967).

Agriculture had been prohibited by a clause in the Treaty of 1786. Food was then supplemented by importation except for some crops, like plantains, grown for the subsistence of the slaves. Agriculture was taken up by immigrants: the Caribs and Amerindians for their subsistence; and in the North, sugar-cane was introduced by those fleeing the Indian uprisings in Yucatan. In large scale agriculture, two attempts were made to develop the banana industry and both failed. The first around 1908 in the Stann Creek valley collapsed through Panama disease and the second in 1952 also failed owing to leaf spot disease (Waddell: 1961: 19-26; Mitchell, Sir Harold: 1967: 234-35).

Economic depression in British Honduras led to the emigration of a large number of labourers to the Republic of Honduras

and Guatemala between 1920 and 1923, and labourers who worked on the Panama Canal during the First World War refused to return after the cessation of hostilities. In 1941 over 1,000 men left Belize for the Canal Zone but this time only 200 remained there. At about the same time 843 forest workers sailed for Scotland. In 1944 over 1,000 British Hondurans were working in the United States, nine months after an agreement had been passed between the two countries to solve the high rate of unemployment in Belize City (Donohue: 1946; Caiger: 1951).

2.3 Racial and ethnic diversity

British Honduras, as a result of its settlement history, presents a great variety of racial and ethnic groups. In the 1946 Census, the racial divisions were as follows: the Black or African population, grouping the descendants of the negro slaves of the early days of the settlement with the more recent immigrants from the British West Indian colonies, makes up 38% of the total population. The Caribs are the descendants of immigrants who came from St. Vincent to the north coast of Honduras and later to the southern district of British Honduras and represent only 7%. Maya Indians represent 17%. The White population, making up 4%, includes the descendants of the nationals of the British Isles who established the early settlement and more recent arrivals from Britain, the U.S. and Canada; it also includes persons of Spanish origin who migrated
to the northern districts from Mexico. The "mixed" group, making up 31% of the total, includes two main sub-groups: first, the "coloured" or persons of mixed European and African descent and second, the Mestizo or persons of mixed Spanish and Indian descent. The final 3% are Asiatics, more specifically East Indians, Syrians and Chinese (West Indian Census: 1946:3; Waddell: 1961: 65).

Using language, religion and occupation as well as race, Waddell (1961:70-74) describes the existence of four main communities in British Honduras²: the 'Creole', 55% of the population; the Spanish, 22%; the Carib, 8%; and the Amerindian, 10%. The 'Creole' is the most important community and is mainly concentrated in Belize City and other small towns along the coast and the Belize River; it is composed of one-third 'coloured' and two-thirds negro and a few locally-born whites. The language is English or Creole dialect. Two-thirds have membership in Protestant denominations; the other third is Roman Catholic. Their occupations are mainly of an urban character but they are also the forestry workers.

The 'Spanish' community is concentrated in the North and West of the country, in Corozal, Orange Walk, Cayo and Benque Viejo towns and in the neighbouring villages and cays . It is predominantly 'Mestizo', Roman Catholic and Spanish-speaking. This community is occupied in agriculture, chicle extraction and fishing (from the Cays). Compared with the creoles, they hold a minority position in the affairs of the country.

The Caribs have a distinct language and it is said that the English-speaking Caribs maintain close contact with their ethnic group; 80% are Roman Catholics and another 10% are mainly Methodists. They are concentrated in Stann Creek Town, along with the 'creoles' in Punta Gorda and in most of the coastal villages in the south. They practise subsistence farming and fishing and many are employed in the citrus industry in Stann Creek valley.

The Amerindian population may be divided into three distinct communities: the Yucatan Mayas live in Corozal and Orange Walk Districts; the Mopanero Mayas who migrated from Peten area are concentrated in Cayo, and San Antonio in Toledo District; also in Toledo District are the Kekchi Mayas from the Vera Paz area of Guatemala. The Mayas are mainly engaged in subsistence agriculture; other seasonal activities include chicle extraction and work in citrus and sugar plantations. Most of them are at least nominal Catholics (Waddell: 1961: 70-74).

The Census of 1960 offers no division according to race; it is therefore impossible to verify systematically any change in the racial distribution or to see to what extent the presence of these groups regulates the channels of migration. Our sample is essentially Creole (see Waddell) and cultural barriers, as we shall see, did not prevent Belizians from migrating to the districts; however, they could have refrained the flow of migrants from the districts to Belize.

2.4 Belize: a primate city

Belize City is built on delta deposits, in a shallow bay, a few feet above sea level. The site presents major disadvantages: its low elevation makes drainage difficult and its swampy foundations have to be made firm by bedding (Caiger: 1951:169). Due to the shallow bay ships have to anchor a mile from the docks at Belize and must be loaded by lighters thus adding to the cost of transportation. The mangrove swamps surrounding the city prevents large expansion programs. Furthermore, the city is periodically subjected to highly destructive hurricanes, the last two occurring in 1931 and 1961 (Latin American Report: 1968).

Situational factors undoubtedly have influenced the growth of Belize. Being at the mouth of the Old River which branches into secondary rivers flowing from all directions, and being in a logwood country, it was the ideal junction between the interior of the country and the outside world.

Compared with the other towns in the country, Belize appears surpassingly large: it is over six times the size of the second largest town and contains over one-third of the total population (see section 2.1). Furthermore, in size, it is the only urban center in the country if we follow the now generally agreed practice of reserving the word urban for places of 20,000 or more inhabitants (Breeze: 1966:20). The rationale, as Breeze noted, is that typical characteristics of urban living are likely to appear only when a population has reached 20,000. This practice was also followed in the Census of British Honduras in their definition of urban and rural areas. Belize is the Capital of British Honduras and therefore the locus of political power. It is also the locus of economic power with the headquarters of commercial, industrial and other enterprises and can, therefore, be classified as a primate city.³

In 1960 Belize was absorbing 36% of the total classifiable labor force of the country followed by Cayo and Stann Creek districts which accounted for only14% and 13% respectively. If we compare the distribution of employment in Belize City with that in the districts according to the different industrial divisions (Table 2.3), we can observe that in 1960 there was a sharp distinction in the volume of employment regarding trade and commerce (15% for Belize City and only 4% for the other districts), public and private services (37% against 10% and 12%), and construction (10% against 5% and 6%). The differences were not as great in the manufacturing division (18% against 13% and 14%) but the manufactured products in Belize were more varied (Manpower Report: 1967: tables 13, 21, 29). Furthermore, one can deduce from the respondents' occupations in our sample (Table 2.4) that 78% of the sample or the entire labor force (not including housewives or students) is involved in secondary and tertiary production, while in the districts (Table 2.3) the main employment is in primary production. Consequently all references to rural areas in the thesis will include the small towns since Belize is considered the only real urban center of the country.

TABLE 2.3

Volume of employment in Belize and the Districts by Industrial Divisions *

Industrial	Districts						
Divisions	Belize City	Belize rural	Belize district	Northern districts	Western and Southern districts		
	8	8	શ્ર	ક	8		
Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing, Hunting	4.0	68.0	16.0	63.0	58.0		
Mining & Quarrying	0.2	0.4	0.1	0.4	0.2		
Manufacturing	17.8	8.0	16.0	13.0	14.0		
Construction	10.0	5.0	9.4	5.0	6.0		
Electricity, Water, Gas & Sanitary Serv.	2.0	0.6	1.5	0.7	0.3		
Commerce	15.0	2.0	13.0	4.0	4.0		
Transport, Storage, Communications	9.0	3.0	8.0	3.0	2.0		
Services	37.0	9.0	31.0	10.0	12.0		
Unspecified or ill-defined	5.0	4.0	5.0	0.9	3.5		
		1)			

Source: Census of British Honduras: 1960:vol.II: Table 6.15.

* Public and Private Sectors.

TABLE 2.4

Principal Occupations (in Belize)

		M	F	Combined
		8	ę	ક
I	Professional and Supervisory occupations	7	4	5
II	Clerical and Sales occupations	22	15	18
III	Craftsmen and technical workers	41	3	19
IV	Manual and Service occupations	18	50	36
v	Other (housewives and students)	12	28	22
		100%	100%	100%

M = 59 = 100%F = 74 = 100%Total = 133 = 100%

Source: Sample taken in Belize City for this study.

••

2.4.1. Employment patterns.

As noted, Belize City, when compared with the districts, offers a greater variety of small industries. Furthermore, greater opportunities are found in commerce and both public and private services; and employment offers a pattern of permanent wage-earning (British Honduras: Labour Department: Annual Report: 1966:11). It should thus be sufficient to attract migrants from the districts where agricultural and seasonal employment are the main sources of livelihood. However, in the last decade, the districts have undergone a real expansion in terms of new job formation, challenging the economic advantages found in the Capital. In 1963 Tate and Lyle Ltd. of London acquired the Corozal Sugar Factory.⁴ The Company modernized the Pembroke Hall plant and constructed a fully automated sugar factory at Tower Hill, thus drastically expanding the demand for cane and cane cutters. The citrus industry, located principally in the Stann Creek area and in Cayo District has, also, during the last decade, increased the total quantity of exported products and the need for labor. The cultivation of banana near Stann Creek Town and in Belize District, as well as rice and cucumbers in Belize District, has also expanded recently. The livestock and fishing industries were also developed. The construction industry has also provided an important amount of employment with the construction of Tower Hill Factory inaugurated in 1967, the airport expansion still underway in 1968, and the construction of a new Capital Site near Roaring Creek village in the Cayo District,⁵ etc.

2.4.2. The educational system.⁶

As a primate city Belize offers better education in terms of quality and greater opportunity in secondary education than the rest of the country. There are 7 secondary schools, one Technical College, and one Teacher Training College. Stann Creek District has one agricultural college and two secondary schools; Corozal Town has two secondary schools, and there is one in each of the remaining District towns. There is, however, no university in the country and students go mainly to the University of the West Indies or to colleges and universities in Canada, the U.S.A., or the United Kingdom.

Concerning the quality of the education received in Belize City, there is a clear advantage for the urban student over his rural counterpart (Ashcraft and Grant: unpublished: 13). The secondary schools in the rural areas, most of which are run by the Catholic Church, are poorly staffed, restricted in curricula, too small and ill-equipped. In Belize the Roman Catholic colleges, run by American Jesuits, have a clear advantage over the colleges of the other denominations due to a better financial position (Ibid: 15). Thus British Hondurans, aspiring to better education for themselves or their children, should be attracted to Belize.

2.4.3. Social and recreational facilities.

In Belize the social and recreational facilities are superior in volume and quality to the rest of the country. The Capital had numerous bars, two of them were bar-nightclubs and two others had dances with local orchestras and other attractions on Saturday nights. Each small town had a few restaurants and bars, yet both their number and their quality were far behind those found in Belize. There were also in Belize a few private clubs, several public sports clubs with tennis courts and a golf course, numerous associations for young adults (Y. W. C. A., Young Discussion Group, Friendship Youth Association, Young Adult Club, etc.). Cricket was played during the summer and polo and football during Fishing and hunting were mostly practised by tourists. winter. However, boat outings to the Cays and lagoons from the capital, swimming, skin-diving, and cycling were sports extremely popular among local youths.

2.5 Urban problems

The population of Belize is very small compared with most capital cities. Nevertheless, as a primate city, it shares most of the problems facing urban areas in newly developing countries, i.e. unemployment, lack of proper housing, lack of proper sewage, water and transportation facilities.

2.5.1. Unemployment and under-employment.

The Census of 1960 reported 10.8% of the labor force unemployed, mainly in Belize City (14.2%) (Census: 1960: 2:6.6). They are the unskilled workers and, in increasing numbers, the primary school leavers who are untrained or too young to undertake any meaningful economic activity (Annual Report of the Labor Department: 1966: 11). It was not possible to secure up-to-date and reliable statistics concerning unemployment at the time of the study. However, 8% of the labor force of our sample was unemployed (Table 2.5.a). Unemployment among youths was not only found among primary school leavers but also among high school leavers and is, therefore, an increasing problem. The unemployment in Belize is aggravated by considerable under-employment, mainly among the waterfront workers. The Annual Report of the Labor Department of 1966 presents a figure of 700 workers listed for waterfront work saying that if it was possible to regulate the movements of ships, only 99 men would be needed to work full time for a 48 hour week. Six per cent of the labor force of our sample is However, most of the stevedores under-employed (Table 2.5.b). and laborers interviewed had secondary occupations, thus allaying the apparently severe situation.

2.5.2. Housing and urban services.

Haulover Creek divides Belize City from East to West in about equal halves (see Map 2.2). The heart of the city is located

Unemployment 2.5.a.

Responde	nt	Type	Are	Level of education	Occupation
<u></u>		~150			<u> </u>
Males	1	non-migrant	18	G.C.E. level	- .
	2	urban migrant	49	Primary School	labourer
Females	3	non-migrant	21	G.C.E. level	-
	4	rural migrant	17	2nd form	-
	5	non-migrant	37	Primary School	domestic work
	6	urban migrant	52	Primary School	domestic work

% of labour force: 8%

Underemployment

Respondent		Туре	Age	Occupation	
Males	1	non-migrant	28	Primary School	stevedore
	2	non-migrant	20	Primary School	stevedore
	3	urban migrant	49	Primary School	stevedore
	4	rural migrant	66	Primary School	stevedore
	5	urban migrant	61	Primary School	labourer

2.5.b

% of labour force: 6%

.



Map 2.2

around the Swing Bridge on both sides of the river. Except for a few concrete constructions, 74 dwellings and some commercial buildings, most buildings are on stilts and have wooden frame structures (6,572 dwellings) (Census: 1960: 2:7.5).

Residential segregation is limited to high status residences that are found by the sea or near the center of the city (Fort George neighbourhood, Southern Foreshore, Eve Street and the Barracks). Mesopotamia, Yarborough, and the neighbourhood of Freetown Road, are overcrowded areas. More specifically the South side of the city has about one and a half times the number of dwellings found on the North side for about the same land area (4,041 dwellings against 2,730: Census: 1960:2:7.1). Lake Independence, Queen's Square, Cinderella Town, King's Park, are areas of government constructed low-income dwellings. Some low-income apartments owned by the Government can also be found on George Street and in Yarborough.

The distribution of plumbing and electrical facilities in the community leaves much to be desired. The public water supply with communal taps is used by 57% of the dwellings and this system is mainly supplemented by private rain-water cisterns found in 37% of the dwellings (Census: Ibid: 7.6). Sixty-two per cent of the dwellings have neither indoor nor outdoor toilets but have to use other facilities, such as buckets (Ibid: 7.7). Electricity is available in only 68% of the dwellings (Ibid: 7.8). Though the city has a garbage disposal system, there is no central sewer system and refuse is carried out to the sea by the several canals that cross the city.

Problems of providing basic services such as water and sewers are further accentuated by the lack of proper housing. As already mentioned, the site of the town makes any expansion program unrealistic. Available flats are rare and expensive for the lower income bracket (rents to private landlords range between \$35 and \$50 (B.H.)⁷ per month). Government units for the low income group are of three types: rented, subsidised and mortgaged. The tariffs for the regular rented units vary from \$10 to \$18 (B.H.) the subsidised units are the least expensive, ranging from a month: \$5 to \$10 (B.H.) a month; mortgages range from \$16 to \$20 (B.H.) Table 2.6 gives a few examples of what the for a 20-year period. Housing and Planning Department had at its disposal for low income Most of the flats included a kitchen, living room and brackets. two bedrooms with an indoor toilet and running water. However, the number of low income units was insufficient to meet the population's needs.

2.5.3. Transportation and traffic.

At the time of the study there were no mass transportation facilities and commuting was mainly by walking and cycling. A bus system was established in the Fall of 1968. Traffic is a nightmare, as in most underdeveloped countries, and as Breeze noted (1966: 124), the problem here does not arise because of the

TABLE 2.6

Examples of government units for housing of the low income group

	Form of		No. of		
Location	purchase	Price *	rooms	Material	Facilities
Lake Independence	a) Mortgaged	(1)\$16.65/month for 20 yrs.	4	wood	all
		(2)\$10.93/month for 20 yrs.	4	wood	none
	b) Rented	in general up to \$16.05/ month	4	wood	none
	c) Subsidised	(1) upper flat \$10.00 (2) lower flat \$5.00	4	wood	none
Cinderella Town	a) Mortgaged	\$20.00/month	4	wood	all
	b) Rented	(1) \$17-\$18	4	wood	all
		(2) \$17	4	cement	all
George St.Apt.	Rented	(1) upper flat \$10.00	3	wood	all
		(2) lower flat \$10.00	3	boow	all

* B.H. dollars

great number of cars but is rather due to the many modes of transportation, including bicycles and pedestrians as well as automobiles and trucks. The streets are paved but narrow and bordered by deep gutters. Circulation is further impeded by the absence of traffic lights and the carelessness of the children.

2.6 Social Structure of the community

2.6.1. Social differentiation.

Economic standing more than colour is the basis of social division in Belize. In part, for a large proportion of the population economic position establishes social position (Ashcraft: unpublished: 11). This is not to say that colour consciousness does not exist; from our formal and informal interviews we found that it would take the subtle cover of political and religious distinctions. Africans and mixed groups were represented at all echelons of the society and their occupationsl hierarchy ranged from the unskilled to the professional. Lebanese and Syrians were members of the upper and middle strata and were found to be primarily merchants and businessmen. While some Chinese were found in all strata they were mainly among the middle class and were typically restaurant and store owners (the latter being either grocery or other retail stores).

2.6.2. Family structure: Household composition and mating patterns.⁸

There are three principal mating patterns in Belize: the Christian marriage, the "consensual (common law) union", and the "visiting union"⁹ (Ashcraft: unpublished). In our sample 43% of the household heads were legally married; 10% lived under common law; 12% were single but maintained an extra-residential relationship; 28% were widowed, divorced or separated; the other 7% were single (extra-residential relationships, if any, were not acknowledged). There were also two incidents of "extraresidential mating".¹⁰ In Caribbean literature family typologies are usually based on concepts of marriage and family though as Solien noted, these concepts are often mixed (Solien: 1969: 122); or, if the classification is based on family types, little is said on how such families actually function (Ibid: 128). However, Solien's classification of households on affinal and consanguineal groups is relevant mainly in a context of "recurrent migration" (Ibid.: 11) where "men make irregular journeys, of varying lengths of time, to obtain wage labor throughout their productive years" (1961: 1268). In most cases wives and families are left behind in the native As we shall see in the next chapter, the Creoles of our villages. sample would rather be included in the "permanent removal" type of migratory wage labor described by Solien (Ibid.: 1277) in which "workers move from their home areas to other specific locations which offer more opportunities for employment and in which they

settle more or less permanently". In some cases they are accompanied by their wives and families; in others, they go alone. In this context "matrifocality" and female-headed households" are not necessarily predominant since in most cases they lack the first condition promoting such a family organization, e.g. male absenteeism.

In this study we therefore opted for a less restrictive classification based on family types, i.e. patri- and matrifocal. Patrifocal families in our sample (Table 2.7) were families where the role of the male head was not limited to being an economic he also held the authority in decisions concerning the provider: education of the children and the functioning of the household. The women, if any, were only responsible for the upbringing of the children and domestic chores. In case of migration, the family usually moves as a unit. The household is composed here of the spouses or consensual mates with children and/or grand-children It also refers to households composed of widowers (26 households). or divorcees with their young children (2 households) or single individuals either living with their widowed mother (3 households) or with their daughters and grand-children (1 household).

Among matrifocal families, 5 cases in our sample correspond to the generally accepted definition of female-headed households.¹¹ Nine other female-headed households would be more a derivative form of the nuclear family in the sense that these women were legally married but they are now either divorced or

Family Structure

Male headed households:

<u>No</u> .	Type of union
21	legal marriage
5	common law
2	other (separated, widower)
4	no union
Total: 32	

Female headed households:

No.	Type of union	
11	other (widow (6), divorced (4), separated (1))
5	visiting	

Total: 16

.

_

widowed. These households consist of a mother, her children and/or grand-children; three households also included the brother's or sister's children, and/or the spouses of the married children. In two other cases (1 widow and 1 divorcee) the females lived alone and were economically independent.

2.7 Demographic index of urbanization

It was seen that Belize is the only town in British Honduras which has reached 20,000 inhabitants and therefore the only center to be taken into account in evaluating an index of urbani-The population of the Capital was 21,886 in 1946, representzation. ing 36.9% of the total population; in 1960 it was 32,690 or 36.3% (Census: 1960: 2: 2). This urban percentage, when compared with the level of urbanization in other countries (Breeze: 1966: 34-35), can be rated as medium high (ranging between 30.0% and 39.9%). Other newly developing countries included in that category are, for instance, Mexico and the Union of South Africa. However. British Honduras differs greatly from those countries as far as population size and number of cities are concerned. ¹² Mexico. by 1958, had 14 cities of 100,000 or more which included Mexico City with 3,000,000 inhabitants; by 1940 the country already had 11 cities of 20,000 or more. The Union of South Africa had 10 cities or 100,000 or more by 1958. British Honduras also differs

from the countries mentioned in its pace of urbanization. For instance, indices of urbanization in Mexico ranged from 33.5% in 1930 to 44.1% in 1956 while British Honduras had 32.6% in 1931 and 36.3% in 1960.

It is only in countries with low levels of urbanization (under 20.0% that we can find primate cities similar in size to Belize as, for example, Monrovia (41,391 in 1956) in Liberia, or Fort Lamy in Chad (urban agglomeration of 44, 300 inhabitants in 1957). British Honduras is unique in its level of urbanization for its population size; with countries of similar size its index of urbanization is in most cases double that found in those countries; with countries having similar levels of urbanization it is a David Furthermore, British Honduras and Goliath confrontation. experienced its fastest increase (9.1%) in level of urbanization between 1921 and 1946. For countries having a rapid pace of urbanization (Mexico, Peru, Brazil, Venezuela, etc.) periods of 25 years have meant an increase in their urban population of more than 10%. The slow pace of urbanization of British Honduras (36.9% in 1946 and 36.3% in 1960) can only be compared with countries which were at least 75% urbanized in 1920 (England and Wales: 79.3% in 1921 and 80.8% in 1951; Scotland: 77.3% in 1921 and 82.9% in 1951). In other words, the pace of urbanization for Belize resembles the most urbanized countries which experienced rapid urban growth during the industrial revolution, than newly developing countries.

British Honduras' uniqueness concerning its level of urbanization can be explained by the nature of the early settlement. Belize was the ideal site, in a logwood economy as a junction between the interior of the country and the outside world, and was soon the center of trade and commerce. However, the country never experienced massive immigration and although Belize's annual per cent rate increase has fluctuated between 1.4% and 2.9% during this century (see Table 2.1), the population of the Capital is still small and the country as a whole still under-populated. Scales of urbanization can be elusive in measuring to what extent a population is urbanized. Since the pace of urbanization of British Honduras resembles the one found among urbanized countries, does this mean that its urban population is also highly urbanized and that the urban growth is based mainly on natural multiplication and not on massive rural urban migrations? In the following chapters, among other things, we shall question through an investigation of patterns of migration and the degree of urban commitment of Belizians, if Belize is still in the process of urbanization or already urbanized. In this context the degree of urbanization will be estimated according to the proportion of the population found to be urban committed.

FOOTNOTES

CHAPTER II

- 1. The total percentage increase and the annual rate per cent were calculated from the "de facto" enumeration or list of all persons who passed the Census night in the household. However, the Census tables are drawn from the "de jure" enumeration where those persons "not belonging to the household in a de jure sense are not retained.
- 2. This is a summary of Waddell's description. For a detailed account, see Waddell: 1961: 70-74.
- 3. The definition and characteristics of Belize as a primate city were based on definitions and characteristics of primate cities set by: Jefferson: 1939: 226-227; Hoselitz: 1957 reported in Breeze: 1966; Breeze: 1966: 40-49.
- 4. Information is here taken from the Annual Report of the Labor Department, 1966; Manpower Report No.3, March 1967; Latin American Report "A New Look at Belize (British Honduras) ", 1968.
- 5. After Hurricane Hattie in 1961, it was decided that a New Capital Site should be chosen, Belize City being at the mercy of the sea. The site came officially into being in 1965 and the work was supposed to be completed by the end of 1969 (Latin American Report, Ibid.).
- 6. Information in this section is drawn from the Annual Report of the Education Department, 1966. Similar information is also to be found in the 1960 Census, Vol. 1, Appendices 19-20 and in the Annual Abstract of Statistics, August 1967, No. 5, section G.
- 7. \$1.00 (B.H.) = \$0.63 (Canadian).

- Household composition and mating patterns similar to the ones found in Belize are also presented in the literature on the Caribbean lower-class family structure. See Frazier: 1939; Henriques: 1953; Herskovits: 1958 reviewed in Safa: 1964: 3-5; R.T.Smith: 1960; Solien: 1961; 1969.
- 9. " a conjugal relationship whereby the partners live in separate households " (Ashcraft: unpublished:6).
- A man who has established a visiting union with a woman although he maintains a domestic unit with another woman (by consensual union or Christian marriage). (Ashcraft: Ibib,: 12).
- 11. A consanguineous group (Solien: 1969) or a matrifocal family (see Smith referred in Solien: Ibid.: 128) is a group or family composed of a mother, her daughter and the children of both; adult males who reside with any permanence in the household are sons or brothers of the central core of women. Other adult male members are at various times sexual and economic partners of the women; their residence is temporary or merely visiting (Solien: Ibid.: 69).
- 12. Data on size of cities and proportions of urban population was collected from the United Nations Demographic Yearbook: 1960: Tables 7 and 9; 1967: Tables 5 and 6 (1960; 1968a). From the tables, urban center recognition was based on each country's definition; they differ greatly and proportions of urban population can only be rough estimates for our purpose. However, our comparison is restricted to countries which are reported in Breeze's article and in the Demographic Yearbook, as having a level of urbanization ranging from 30.0% to 39.9%. As far as the dates are concerned, we tried to use dates close to available census years for British Honduras.

CHAPTER III

Patterns of Migration

This chapter will examine the patterns of migration present among the inhabitants of Belize. We will consider the major motivations for migrating, the extent to which these migrations follow streams towards areas offering greater economic opportunity, and the impact of migration on age and sex distributions.

3.1 Definition of subgroups

In the determination of patterns of migration in Belize we first made a distinction between migrants and movers in order to eliminate movements that do not involve changes of domicile. We considered as migrants¹ individuals who at some time in their lives had lived for periods longer than one year in areas different from their places of birth; as movers, persons who had temporarily changed residence for social, recreational and economic purposes. Most of the respondents could be considered as movers at some point during their lifetime. These particular situations will be analysed in detail in section 3.4.

Since the districts rather than the Belize City region have recently experienced development and economic expansion, rural-urban migration cannot be assumed to be the principal pattern of migration existing among Belizians. In the literature it is usually the place of birth and the last destination which qualify the migrant as, e.g. rural migrant, immigrant, etc. In our study it is the place of birth and the total network of moves of the migrant which will define the pattern of migration under which he will be classified. A classification was therefore drawn from a computer program² which considered all possible moves/migrations in a population, based on rural and urban variables. The final result was a classification of five major patterns of migration opposed to one group of non-migrants.

The respondents (all Belize City residents) were classified under the following patterns of migration:

- I. <u>Non-migrants</u>: respondents <u>born in Belize</u> and who had never lived elsewhere.
- II. <u>External migrants</u>: respondents <u>born outside British</u> <u>Honduras</u> classified independently of their internal migrations in any country.
- III. <u>Urban-urban migrants</u>: respondents <u>born in Belize</u> who have migrated from one city to another.
- IV. <u>Urban-rural-urban migrants</u>: respondents who were <u>born in Belize</u> and who have migrated to rural areas and later have returned to a city, or who migrated back and forth between rural and urban areas.

- <u>Rural-rural-urban migrants</u>: respondents who were <u>born in rural areas</u> and who have migrated from one village to another before arriving in a city (either Belize or a city outside British Honduras). This includes migrants who began in a rural area and then migrated back and forth between rural and urban areas.
- VI. <u>Straight rural-urban migrants</u>: respondents <u>born in</u> rural areas and who migrated directly to a city.

This classification retains the general definition of immigration as a change of residence from one country to another; yet, a distinction was made between those we call "external migrants" and those we call "returns". The latter are grouped as follows: those returning respondents born in Belize, who emigrated to other cities are classified under the "urban-urban" category; those returns born in Belize who have lived in rural areas outside British Honduras are classified under "urban-rural-urban" as are respondents born in Belize who lived in the districts prior to returning. External migrants have patterns of migration similar to other Belizians; however, we preferred to consider them as a separate group since it is argued that in most newly developing countries they constitute a selective category (Browning: 1967: 88).

Placement of the respondents into the different categories of migrants (Table 3.1) shows a high mobility in the population (61% of

TABLE .	3	•	1
---------	---	---	---

Repartition of the respondents: migrants and non-migrants

		<u></u>	% of	% of
	Туре	Number	total	migrants
I	Non-migrants	52	39	
II	External migrants	17	13	21
III	Urban-urban migrants	9	7	11
IV	Urban-rural-urban migrants	31	23	38
v	Rural-rural-urban migrants	14	10	18
VI	Straight rural-urban migrants	10	8	12
	Total respondents	133	100	-
	Total number of migrants	81	61	100

a de la d

migrants as against 39% non-migrants). The returns (groups III and IV) are the most common type of migrants to Belize and represent 30% of the sample or 49% of all migrants. The rural migrants (groups V and VI) are also numerous, 18% of the total sample or 30% of the migrant population. However, this is far from being the massive migration found in other newly developing countries, (e.g. Peru: Matos Mar: 1961; the Congo: Vennetier: 1963; Venezuela: Brisseau: 1963; etc.). The external migrants are also numerous, making up 21% of all migrants or 13% of the total sample.

We can only speculate about out-migration. In our sample, 45% of the spouses or children not living with the respondents were residing in Belize and 65% lived either in the districts or outside British Honduras. Table 3.2 shows that, of the latter group, 82% are emigrants (35% have gone to the United States alone) against only 28% who have migrated to the districts; furthermore, the great majority of these migrants are between 15 and 35 years of age. We shall see later in this chapter that American cities offer a strong competition to Belize as a center of attraction for British Hondurans. In fact, 50% of the household heads had at least one close relative (spouse, child, mother, sister) living in the U.S.A.

TABLE	з.	2

.

Address	of	respondents'	spouse	or	children	living	outside	Belize

in the shad that I also the man is a list is a strike an a S arrest Led with it.

4. A

			Outs Br. Hone	side Juras		
Age	United	States	(except	t U.S.A.)	Dist	ricts
	М	F	м	F	м	F
0 - 14	-	1	-	-	-	-
15 - 34	14	9	. 6	4	4	4
35+	5	2	4	-	2	l
Not stated	-	4	-	-	-	-
Sub-Total	19	16	10	4	6	5
Total	3.	5	14	L	11	

c

11.1

57

1.1.11

3.2 Streams of migration

Before analysing the streams of migration we must first mention that in our sample 69% of the respondents were born in Belize City, 18% in the districts, and 17% abroad. The southern districts (mainly Stann Creek) supply the biggest section of migrants to the capital. Immigration from outside British Honduras comes mainly from Mexico, Honduras, Barbados and Jamaica; there is also a growing community from China and the Middle East (Lebanon and Syria).

We shall consider here the main reasons for migrating, the streams of migration, and the extent to which these streams flow towards areas of greater economic opportunity. To do so (see Table 3.3) we have classified the migrants sampled according to their pattern of migration as presented in section 3.1. All places where the respondents had lived were grouped under ten different regions:

- A. Belize rural and the Cays
- B. Northern districts (Orange Walk, Corozal)
- C. Southern districts (Stann Creek, Toledo)
- D. Western district (Cayo)
- E. Central America, Caribbean
- F. United States
- G. Asia, Middle East, Europe, other
- H. Belize City

Migrants classified according to their pattern of migration, their place of birth, and the number and places of migrations during lifetime.

Type of migrants	Place of Birth	Migrant number	Frequency of migration into each region (other than place of birth)	Total no. of migrations for each migrant
Rural-rural -urban migrants	A B C	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	5 2 7 2 7 3 2 7 5 5 2 2 2 5 2 2 5 2 2 5 2 2 5 2 2 5 2 2 5 2 2 5 2 2 5 2 2 5 2 2 5 2 2 5 2 2 5 2 2 5 2 5 5 2 2 5 5 5 5 2 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5
External migrants	E	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	1 3 1 2 6 1 1 1 6 5 3 2 5 6 2 1 8 Total:54

			The street of	
			Frequency of	m-1-7
			migration into	TOTAL NO.OT
	Place		each region	migrations
Type of	of	Migrant	(other than	for each
migrants	Birth	number	place of birth)	migrant
			ABCDEFGH	
Urban-rural	н	1	- 1 1	2
-urban		2	-1 1 1	3
migrants		3	-1112	5
-		4	1 3 1	5
		5	1 1	2
		6]]	2
		7	- 1 1	2
		<i>,</i>		2
		0		2
		9	1 1 3 2	/
		10	1 1	2
		11	1 1	2
		12	1 1	2
		13	- 1 1 2	4
		14	11	2
		15	1 1	4
		16	_ 1 1 2	- A
		17		
		10		2
		10		4
		19	- 1 1 2	4
		20		2
		21	- 1 1 - 2	4
		22	- 1 1	2
		23	1 1 - 2	4
		24	1 1 2	4
		25	- 1 1 1 1 1 - 4	9
		26	- 1 1	2
		27	2 2	4
		28	1 1 2	4
		20	2 - 2 - 4	10
		29		10
		30	1 - 3 2	6
		31	- 1 1	2
·				Total: 113
Urban-urban	н	l	11-2	4
migrants		2	11-2	4
		3	_ 1 _ 1	2
		4	_ 1 _ 1	2
		- -	- 4 - 4 _ 1 _ 1	2
		5		2
		ю — .	1 <u>1</u> - 2	4
		/*	- 2	2
		8	- 2 - 2	4
		9	1 1	2
* visitor				m_{o+o1} . 26
				10Ca1: 20

TABLE	3.3	(continu	ued)
-------	-----	----------	------

TABLE 3.3 (continued)

Place of Birth or Regions:

Α.	Belize rural and the Cays
в.	Northern districts (Orange Walk, Corozal)
с.	Southern districts (Stann Creek, Toledo)
D.	Western district (Cayo)
E.	Central America, Caribbean
F.	United States
G.	Asia, Middle East, Europe, other
н.	Belize City

المراجع والمتحد والمحاج والمحا

1. 1.

In each of the major categories of migration, the migrant was classified according to his place of birth and the number of migrations he had made into or within each region.³ It is therefore possible to compare the types of migrants as to their preferences in places of living and as to how frequently they changed residence.

In Table 3.3 we can observe that individuals in the rural-urban category (born in Belize rural, the Cays, the Northern or Southern districts) whose migration pattern was rural-rural prior to moving to Belize, have migrated mainly within the limits of the Southern districts (Stann Creek in particular, 12 migrations), and to Belize rural (8 migrations). People born in Cayo District migrated within their district (2 migrations) and outside British Honduras (3 migrations). In the case of straight rural-urban migrants (10), the migrations occurred directly from the respondents' place of birth to Belize (see Table 3.4). External migrants migrated mainly in their country of origin prior to coming to Belize City. In British Honduras their preferences were for Stann Creek and Cayo (6 and 3 migrations respectively); they were also (with the straight rural-urban migrants) the only migrants who have never lived in the United States. In the urban-urban category this is a definite priority (10 migrations to the United States and only 4 to Central America and the Caribbean). For the urban-rural-urban migrants the preference is again for Stann Creek (11 migrations), followed by Corozal (8 migrations), Orange Walk and Toledo (7 migrations each).

TABLE 3.4

Data on straight-rural-urban migrants related to

Tables 3.3, 3.5, 3.6

Straight-rural-urban

Place of Birth	No. of migrants	
A	2	
В	1	
С	6	
D	l	

: 40%

: ^{30%}

Migrations:

When

1.

2.

з.

Childhood

Adulthood

Adolescence : 30%

Migrations:

Reasons

Familial : 70%
Economic : ~
Educational : 10%
Other : 10%
not stated : 10%
Apart from contributing the most immigrants to the capital, Stann Creek District was the locus for migrations (29), followed by Belize rural (16), Cayo (14), Corozal (10), Orange Walk and Punta Gorda (9 each). Outside of British Honduras, Belizians migrated mainly to the United States (18 migrations), to Central America (12), and to the Caribbean (5). It was to be expected that the main streams of migration would be towards the United States and Central America (Panama, Guatemala, Honduras) since in periods of depression and high unemployment, British Honduras has experienced significant emigration to these countries (section 2.2.3). Regarding the districts, it is necessary to examine the reasons for migrating more closely in order to explain why the number of migrations to the Southern districts (region C) is greater than the Northern districts (region B).

Table 3.5 shows the reasons for and the frequencies of migration in each region. Familian reasons cover migrations undertaken as a child or as an adolescent, the wife following the husband, the parents at an older age joining the household of a child, the sister following a brother after the parents' death, etc.; in other words, all migrations which are consequences of family ties and obligations or migrations undertaken as a member of a family unit. Economic reasons include looking for economic opportunities, success at securing a contract elsewhere and, in some cases, a job transfer. Educational reasons include individuals who migrated in order to obtain a higher education or parents wishing to secure a better

		No.of mi	grations	Total no. of mi-	Re	gio	ons	whe	re	mic	grat	ion
Type of Reason		or classifi	led by	grations classi-			0	ccu	rre	d		
migrants	migrating	reasons	and sex	fied by reasons	<u> </u>	В	С	D	Е	F	G	H
		М	F									
Rural-rural	l. Familia	1 14	17	31	5	1	10	2	2			11
-urban	2. Economia	c 19	-	19	4	2	4	1	2	4		2
migrants	3. Educatio	onal l	-	1					1			
	4. Other	1	2	3								3
	5. Not sta	ted 2	-	2								2
	TO	TAL 37	19	56	9	3	14	3	5	4		18
External	l. Familia	1 11	11	22			3	1	3		6	9
migrants	2. Economi	c 21	2	23	2	1	3	2	3		5	7
5	3. Educatio	onal l	1	2							2	
	4. Other	5	1	6								6
	5. Not sta	ted l	_	1								1
	TO	TAL 39	15	54	2	1	6	3	6		13	23
Urban-urban	l. Familia	1 -	2	2						2		
migrants	2. Economi	c 7	-	7					2	5		
	3. Educati	onal 3	2	5					2	3		
	4. Other	10	2	12								12
	5. Not sta	ted -	-	-								
	OT	TAL 20	6	26					4	10		12
Urban-rural	l. Familia	1 9	34	43	5	6	9	4	3			16
-urban	2. Economi	c 24	11	35	1	9	9	4	5	3	1	3
migrants	3. Educati	onal 1	1	2						1	l	
-	4. Other	20	8	28	3							25
	5. Not sta	ted 4	1	5								5
	TO	TAL 58	55	113	9	15	18	8	8	4	2	49

TABLE 3.5

Migrants classified according to their pattern of migration and the reasons for migrating into each region where migrations occurred.

education for their children. Other reasons cover mainly 'returns' to Belize after the completion of studies or at the end of a contract, where the conditions in the place of migration were not satisfactory or did not meet the aspirations of the migrant. This also includes reasons for migrating after a divorce or a separation, or after the 1931 and 1961 hurricanes which destroyed much of Belize and the Cays.

In Table 3.5 we can see that, except for urban-urban migrants, the migrations are predominantly the result of family ties and obligations: 31 cases among rural-rural-urban, 43 among urban-rural-urban, and 22 among external migrants. Among urbanurban migrants economic reasons dominate. However, if we control for sex, we observe that in cases where family ties and obligations were predominant, economic reasons are also important in that the family has followed an economically motivated husband or parent. This would explain why there was a greater number of migrations in and to Stann Creek and Toledo than in and to the Northern districts since family reasons are given more frequently in the former case than in the latter. In other words, migrations to Corozal and Orange Walk were principally undertaken on an individual basis (70%) while migrations to Stann Creek and Toledo were usually made as a member of a family unit (69%). Therefore neither district could be considered as the main center of attraction: rather, they attracted different categories of individuals with different responsibilities.

It also appears that, contrary to expectation, migrations to Belize for educational purposes are negligible, and are to be found only among those migrating outside British Honduras when University education or special training is desired such as beauty culture, accounting, etc. As we have seen (section 2.4.2), secondary education is offered both in the districts and in the capital and could be a factor accounting for the small number of migrations to Belize for educational purposes. However, we note that among those sampled, the possibility for a better education was never mentioned even as a secondary reason to have migrated to Belize.

We shall now examine the frequency of migrations according to age (Table 3.6). Most migrations were undertaken during adulthood and mainly for economic purposes. Exception is made in the case of straight rural-urban migrants, see Table 3.4; in this case migrations occurred mainly when the respondent was under the age of 17, which would explain why the major motivations were those relating to family ties. Furthermore, if we divide the occurrences of migration by the number of migrants for each category, we can see that most of the migrants had migrated at least three times in their lives, i.e. 249 migrations divided by 71 migrants.

Although there is great spatial mobility among the population, Belize seems to be the "point d'attache" when we look at the number of returns (cf. Table 3.3 for occurrences of migration under H, in the 'urban-urban' and 'urban-rural, urban' categories).

TABLE 3.6

(翻)

and a more thank and the manager of the same states of the

Frequency of migrations according to period of life

Nand Setting

	Rural-rural-	urban				
	migrants		External migrants			
	No. of		No. of			
	migrations	8	migrations	ક		
l. Childhood	2	4	7	13		
2. Adolescence	13	23	10	18		
3. Adulthood	41	73	37	69		
Total	56	100	54	100		

	Urban-urban	migrants	Urban-rura migra	al-urban ants
	No. of migrations	8	No. of migrations	8
l. Childhood	1	4	8	7
2. Adolescence	5	19	14	12
3. Adulthood	20	77	91	81
Total	26	100	113	100

We also saw that the urban born are not necessarily committed to move to urban areas in order to acquire a better status. In fact, if all migrations are regrouped under rural and urban variables independent of the places of birth and migration histories of the respondent, we can see that rural-urban migrations occupy the first place with 32% of the total, followed closely by urban-urban with 29%. Urban-rural migrations are also significantly represented (23%) followed by rural-rural migrations (16%). (Only 48% of the migrations to/within rural areas are made to centers of more than 1,000 inhabitants).

Goldstein has suggested (1958: 216-217) that repeat migrants have little chance to be fully integrated in a community and probably remain marginal persons. On the other hand, Lux argues (1962: 187) that spatial mobility is not necessarily a sign of maladaptation but rather an indication of "rationalized geographical mobility", in which people move in accordance with the respective advantages that are offered in each area for the improvement of their economic status. In our sample, most migrations undertaken for economic reasons also involved a change of economic activity. (A change in economic activity here does not include advancement within the same occupation as, for instance, a promotion from supervisor to manager; however, it can occur within one industrial division or, from one industrial division to another).

We will now examine whether such migration reflects instability or an attempt to improve one's economic status. From

Table 3.7 it appears that migrants, in general, change occupation more often than non-migrants; furthermore skilled workers (rather than the unskilled) and professionals among migrants also change occupations more often than the same category among nonmigrants (though it was before the acquisition of a trade that different However, as Lux noted. economic activities were attempted). (Ibid: 191), employment mobility can be a function of the age of the individual in the sense that the longer the working career is, the greater are the number of probable changes of occupation, since the beginning of a career normally happens around the same age. Therefore, the high turnover of employment observed in Table 3.7 mainly among migrants could be a function of the respondents' age in those categories, apart from the desire to improve one's economic status. Among external and rural migrants (Table 3.8) the mean age decreases for one change of economic activity but the mean increases among respondents who had three or more different occupations in their lives. This suggests that there would be a relation between the number of economic activities and the length of career, such as is clearly indicated for the urban migrants.

Among the non-migrants the number of occupations is not a function of the length of career since the mean age of this group decreases when the number of occupations increases. From the young age of the non-migrants with already two or more different occupations it appears that the practice of "job shopping" (Ibid: 193) rather than migration was chosen here in order to improve economic

Number of different economic activities during lifetime according to migrant groups and professional skill *

	non-	migra	ants	other urban born		rural born			
No.of occupations:	1	2	3+ -	1	2	3 ⁺	1	2	3 ⁺
	8	8	ક્ર	8	8	8	8	8	8
Unskilled	48	16	4	22	10	10	28	11	11
Skilled	28	4	-	22	12	18	11	22	11
Professional	-	-	-	4	2	-	-	6	-
No. of subjects:	4	4		5	0.		1	8	

* excludes students and housewives who have never had paid employment.

TABLE 3.8

Number of different economic activities during lifetime according to age and migrant groups *

.

	n	on-mig	rants	external migrants			
No. of occupations:	_1	2	3 ⁺	1	2	3 ⁺	
mean of age	35.9	28.7	24.5	49.8	45.2	55.6	

	urban migrants			rural migrants			
No.of occupations:	1	2	3 ⁺	1	2	3+	
mean of age	33.7	46.2	49.8	43.5	38.8	46.2	

 * excludes students and housewives who have never had paid employment.



status. It could also be that an improvement of the labour market by migrations from the districts and abroad (external migrants and returns) of individuals in general more skilled than the non-migrants (see Table 4.2.a) predisposed the employers to ask higher qualifications from the workers, to dismiss them more easily and consequently could have provoked involuntary mobility (Ibid: 193).

Table 3.9 indicates the extent to which improved occupational status can be attributed to migration. (Improved occupational status is here restricted only to the acquisition or improvement of a skill, e.g. a passage from unskilled to skilled worker or from skilled worker to professional). Migration did affect the occupational status of urban migrants since 20% improved their status through migration while only 7% managed to do so in Belize. The results also suggest that it is easier to gain a higher economic status through migration since the non-migrants, accounting in the sample for the greatest proportion of unskilled workers (see also Table 4.2.a), had little opportunity to gain a higher status (12% in this group did, which is an even smaller percentage than the one found among rural migrants: 17% via migration and 12% in Belize).

In explaining the high rate of spatial mobility for the inhabitants of Belize, we would therefore accept the hypothesis that repeat migrants follow streams of economic opportunity as Lux has suggested (Ibid.: 186). We also accept his implication of their probable integration into the community rather than Goldstein's hypothesis which considers repeat migrants as a socially non-integrated marginal group.

TABLE 3.9

Initial and present occupational status

-

.

Type of		Occupational status						
respondent	Period	Unskilled		Skilled	Professional			
		8			8			
Non-migrants	Initial	83		17	-			
	Present	71		29	-			
Dural migranta	Initial	92		8	-			
Kurar migrants	Present	63	Advancement via migra-					
			tion	13	4			
			in Belize	12	-			
			none	8	-			
Urban and external	Initial	70		30	-			
migrants	Present	47	Advancement via migra- tion	14	6			
			in Belize	7	-			
			none	26	-			

74

3.3 Demographic patterns

In this section we shall look at the impact of actual migrations on sex and age distributions and we will see that the demographic patterns of the present century in British Honduras have always reflected movement aimed at greater economic opportunities.

3.3.1. Sex distribution.

In all censuses since 1891 the proportion of males to females has declined progressively from 1070 males per 1,000 females in 1891 to 942 males per 1,000 females in 1946. The factors chiefly responsible for this situation have been emigration primarily of males as a result of economic depression and greater survivorship among females (Census: 1946:4:1-2). In 1960 the female population still out-numbered the male population by 1187; however, there was a sex-ratio increase: from 942 (1946) to 985 males (1960) for every 1,000 females. A decrease in the mortality rate of males, immigration of foreign males and males returning to British Honduras, can account for this re-adjustment of the sex ratio. However, it has not affected the imbalance between the In 1960, as in 1946, males were still rural and urban populations. outnumbered by females in Belize and all other small towns over 1,000 (855 to 1000), while there was still an excess of males (1129 to 1000) in the other rural areas (Census: 1946:4:4; 1960:2:1.2). There were more females than males in Belize, Stann Creek and

Toledo districts. On the other hand, males outnumbered females in Corozal, Orange Walk and Cayo Districts (Census: 1960: 1:8).

This situation can be explained by the type and volume of employment among women (Manpower Report 1967:15). Commerce and services in the private and public sectors are the main fields of employment for women; this would explain why females are, first, more concentrated in Belize and in the small towns and second, why they are found to be more numerous in the South rather than in the North of the country. In the Capital the volume of employment is higher in commerce and services which offer a greater opportunity for females (see Table 2.3). And, in comparison, the South more than the North offers greater opportunities for females: in Stann Creek and Toledo 12% of the total volume of employment is in services for the private and public sectors while only 9% is found in the West and Northern districts (Cayo, Corozal, Orange Walk). There are also more women working in the cultivation of citrus in Stann Creek (14%) than in the cultivation of sugar in the Northern districts (2%) (Census: 1960: 2:6.15).

In our sample there is an equal number of male and female migrants (40 against 41) but males in fact migrate more than females (3.8 migrations per male and 2.4 per female).

3.3.2. Age distribution

There are fewer male non-migrants than female non-

migrants (fig. 3. 1. a) which would corroborate the fact that in the population of Belize males migrate more than females. The more mobile period for males and females is between 15 and 45 years old (fig. 3.1.b) and, in fact, people over 55 had migrated during that period of their lives. Belize offers an almost normal age distribution (fig. 3.2) in that migrants from rural areas do not swell the prime working age group as, for instance, in countries where the As previously mentioned, foreign city is the center of attraction. cities seem to deprive British Honduras of its prime working age population more than Belize does, and immigrants and rural migrants tend to compensate for this loss which consists of emigration and migration to the districts. In addition, migrations towards Corozal, Orange Walk and Cayo Districts for economic reasons are more frequent among males than females (12 against 7) and migrations towards Stann Creek, Toledo and Belize Districts are also more frequent among males than females (17 against 6). However, in the latter case migrations of females as members of family units are more numerous than they are among the males (25 against 12). Sex differentials are therefore not solely explained by male-female attraction towards particular types of economic activities but also by the differences in migratory characteristics (as in individual or family units) and by the greater propensity of males to migrate.





3.1.a







TIG. 3.2 Age distribution of total sample (absolute numbers)

3.4 Small scale movements

We will now focus on respondents as movers rather than as migrants. The latter implies an intention of establishing oneself in an area other than the place of birth. Movers, on the other hand, change residence temporarily, mainly for economic, social or recreational purposes. The rationale for distinguishing between the two groups is the presence in the country of both a high degree of seasonal work and of a pattern of prolonged visits to close in both cases the mover still maintains his regular relatives: domicile but often these small movements precede or incite migration. In our sample we had ll respondents who had moved occasionally for economic purposes: 5 of these had gone to the districts for periods ranging from a few days to a month, for trade or construction work; 2 had worked at the New Capital Site and had regularly returned to Belize on alternate week ends. (Considering the size of employment at the Capital Site (about 1000), the number of Belizians working there is small and it is suspected that the labor force is recruited mainly Four males, in the urban-rural-urban category, from the districts). were at some time seasonal workers: chicleros, cane cutters, lumberjakcs, or fruit pickers. British Hondurans who had been in the British Armed Forces during the Second World War were also considered as movers.

A great number (29) of visits to relatives were recorded. Most cases were visits to sons, daughters, brothers or sisters of the household head. These visits lasted for anything from a few weeks

TABLE 3.10

Cases of prolonged stay at relatives' places

		Male	Female
1	l week to 1 month	5	6
2	2 months to 6 months	· 3	5
3	7 months to 11 months	-	5
4	l year to 3 years	-	5

Among female respondents, 14% have lived with their children, brothers or sisters at least once (sometimes up to five times) for a period ranging from 6 months to 3 years. Family ties, between the mother and children, her sisters and brothers, are evidently strong in times of need: pregnancy, divorce, sickness. In the case of males, the relative's house becomes a temporary home while seeking employment. Other visits (16) ranging from 2 to 6 months were recorded but it was not stated with whom the respondents had lived. In 3 cases the respondent has a summer house or a farm and in these cases cultivation was a subsidiary occupation.

Contrary to the situation present in Africa and Asia (Gutkind: 1965: 53-54; United Nations: 1968: 40, 49) we noted that rural migrants rarely visited their areas of origin. Family structure and familial type migration are factors responsible for this situation. This could also be due to the fact that there were no recent rural migrants in our sample (those who have migrated to Belize in the last two years); although visits to the rural areas might have been frequent in the early years of migration, their frequency tends to diminish with the increasing stay in town (Gutkind: Ibid.)

So far we have described the patterns of migration present among the inhabitants of Belize. We have considered the main migration streams and concluded the flow is towards areas of greater economic opportunities with Belize being the pivot. Recently migrations in and to the districts have been as important as emigration. However, foreign cities, mainly American, offer strong competition to Belize, continuing a previous pattern which had occurred mainly during periods of economic depression and which had, at those times, deprived the Capital of its prime working age population. It was also found that being urban-born does not necessarily lead only to a history of inter-urban migration but also to urban-rural and rural-rural migrations.

FOOTNOTES

CHAPTER III

- 1. The definition of movers in the Census of British Honduras is similar, with some restrictions, to our definition of migrants as "all persons who had not lived in their place of birth from birth, i.e. persons who were born outside the territory and those who had not lived in the same census district all their lives." Periods of residence of less than six months are not included (1960: 2:IV).
- 2. Written by M.S. Kharusi specifically for this project.
- 3. For example, the migrations of a respondent classified under 'rural-rural-urban' will be first from his place of birth, which is in the rural areas, to one or several villages or rural areas in British Honduras or elsewhere, and lastly to Belize. In six cases, however, (see Table 3.3) they migrated first to a city other than Belize, or after coming to Belize, migrations to other cities occurred. For urbanurban migrants, migrations occurred only between cities of 20,000 or more, etc.

CHAPTER IV

Presentation of the variables

We shall now examine the different variables that are to be used in the analysis of urban commitment.⁽¹⁾ The variables are first presented singularly in order to permit a greater understanding of the contribution from each. It must be stressed, however, that the importance of many of the attributes in differentiating the groups will be apparent only when the interplay among them is shown. And one of the advantages of multivariate analysis is that it facilitates this.

The rationale underlying Mitchell's approach (1965:629; 1969:485) was that the intention of a respondent to stay or not to sty in town is part of a more general disposition "which may be reflected in other actions or expressions of attitude". These particular aspects of observable behaviour can be selected as indicators of urban commitment (Ibid.). Our intent in this thesis is identical. Nevertheless, the indicators used in our analysis differ in order to accommodate the situation at hand and in order to overcome some of the weaknesses in Mitchell's approach. The variables submitted by Mitchell to a factor analysis were the following:

- (1) Proportion of time spent in town during adulthood
- (2) Period of continuous residence in one town
- (3) Presence of wife in town
- (4) Occupation
- (5) Level of education
- (6) Attitude to town life
- (7) Wage level

High loadings were achieved only by the two first variables thus providing only one factor for use in the building of a score of urban commitment.

Variables chosen for our analysis are:

- (1) Level of education
- (2) Place of birth of respondents' parents (categorized as rural or urban)
- (3) Marital status
- (4) Attitudes towards city life
- (5) House tenure
- (6) Actual address in Belize
- (7) Condition of the house
- (8) Professional skill
- Attitudes towards the possibility of changing one's occupation
- (10) Preference in places of living
- (11) Proportion of adulthood spent in a city
- (12) Proportion of life spent in town in a continuous residence.

Some of these variables are similar to Mitchell's though, in general, they are more pertinent to the context of Belize and to socio-economic criteria influencing urban commitment.

Obviously some of these variables are not quantifiable. Although the method is rough, the usual practice in such cases is to treat the variables by imposing a two state scale (as for dichotomies: 0, 1) or multistate classification (-1, 0, 1; or 1, 2, 3, etc.) (Kendall: 1961: 170). In our analysis we opted for a multistate classification whichoffers a finer spectrum instead of dichotomising the discrete variates at their median value, as Mitchell (1969: 487) did. Furthermore, as we shall see in the next chapter, that apart from using a better scoring method (Harris: 1967) than the one used by Mitchell, we will also extract five factors so as to take into account the socio-economic status of the respondents in the assessment of urban commitment; while Mitchell was limited to the one factor related to the urban experience of the respondent.

4.1 Level of education

As Breeze noted (1966:95), in small newly developing countries, there is an under-supply of university-trained people. In British Honduras the problem is acute. The great majority of the population not onlylacks university training but has never progressed beyond primary school. It has also usually been argued that rural migrants to urban centers are either illiterate or have a very poor educational background in comparison with urbanites (Browning: 1967:83).

In Belize the level of educational attainment of rural born approaches that found among urban born (Table 4. 1), (exception is made for the external migrants who represent a selective group with higher education than the natives). The proportion of rural migrants (54%) who first migrated to Belize before the age of 17 and the availability of school facilities in the districts (section 2. 4. 2) would be factors responsible for an educational level higher than expected. Furthermore, it appears that the level of education is also higher among migrants than non-migrants, especially among urban migrants. For instance, among rural migrants 89% of the population has a primary school leaving certificate or less (Census: 1960: 2: 2. 9) while in Belize this proportion decreases to 71%.

This attribute was retained in an evaluation of urban commitment owing to the implied preference of urban residence when better education is attained (cf. external, rural and urbanurban migrants).

4.2 Professional skill

Due to the low level of education attained by the population of Belize, we expected to find a similar lack of trained and qualified workers in urban and industrial activities. Table 4.2.a. indicates

_		I	II	III	IV	V	
		non-	External	Urban-urban	Urban-rural-	Rural-urban-	
		migrants	migrants	migrants	urban migrants	migrants	TOTAL
_		(52)	(17)	(9)	(31)	(24)	(133)
		90 90	90	8	ક	9 8	8
1.	Primary certificate or less	69	47	67	64	71	65
2.	Secondary education	21	29	11	26	17	22
3.	College or equivalent	10	12	11	10	8	10
4.	Professional	-	12	11	-	4	3

Level of education according to categories of migrants

TABLE 4.1

ļ

·					····	. <u></u>
	I	II	III	IV	V	
	Non	External	Urban-urban	Urban-rural-	Rural-urban	
	migrants	migrants	migrants	urban migrants	migrants	TOTAL
	(52)	(17)	(9)	(31)	(24)	(133)
	8	୫	ક્ષ	8	8	8
l. Unskilled	71	29	45	58	63	59
2. Skilled	29	59	45	42	33	38
3. Professional	_	12	10	_	4	3

TABLE 4.2.a

•

Professional Skill *

* includes males and females

TABLE 4.2.b

.

· •

.

		Rural born (migrants)(24)	Respondents born in Belize (I, III, IV : 92)
1.	Unskilled	63%	64%
2.	Skilled	33%	34%
з.	Professional	48	2%

· .

that the only reasonably trained group are the immigrants, most of them in business and self-employed; they are closely followed by the urban-urban migrants (five respondents in this group had received university or complementary training abroad).

In urbanization studies rural migrants are usually said to have few skills useful in an urban environment (Browning: 1967:89). However, in Belize over one-third of the rural migrants are skilled labourers, a fact probably due to their coming to Belize at an early As a result, the ratios of skilled to unskilled labourers were age. almost identical between rural migrants and respondents born in Belize: 63% against 64% for unskilled labor and 33% against 34% for skilled personnel (see Table 4.2.b). This variable is chosen to aid in the examination of urban commitment because, in accord with Mitchell (1965:630; 1969:487), a person whose training is for an industrial or generally urban activity is more likely to live in an urban center and more prone to inter-urban-migration in his search for a higher status than one who lacks specialized training or whose skills are of a rural nature.

4.3 Attitudes towards the possibility of changing one's occupation

Degrees of integration in the economic system of the community, expectations of a better socio-economic status, or positive responses to new economic opportunities are factors likely

to influence the individual's desire to change occupations or not and will be reflected in his job satisfaction. In our sample there are more respondents dissatisfied with their occupation than satisfied (41% and 29% respectively: Table 4.3). The ratios of satisfied and dissatisfied respondents are about the same for rural migrants and non-migrants (25% and 42% in the former; 25% and 46% in the latter). External and urban migrants are the groups accounting for the greater percentages of individuals who are satisfied with their occupation and who would not want to change. This variable was retained since urban centers offer greater opportunities for upward mobility and are likely to hold an individual already satisfied with his job and, at the same time, to attract persons in search of a better status. However, we must remember that among Belizians it has already been shown that an improvement of status can also be achieved through migrations to the districts However, in most cases, the districts are an inter-(section 3.2). mediary step through which the migrant can accumulate the money necessary for future migrations to urban centers (this will be discussed in more detail in section 4.8).

4.4 Proportion of time spent in a city during adulthood

Mitchell's argument concerning the choice of this attribute as an indicator of urban commitment, was based on the expectation that a man who has spent more time in urban than in rural areas

TABLE 4.3

Attitudes *	I Non migrants (52)	II External migrants (17)	III Urban-urban migrants (9)	IV Urban-rural- urban migrants (31)	V Rural-urban migrants (24)	TOTAL (133)
	દ્ર	8	8	8	8	8
1	25	35	44	30	25	29
2	46	30	56	35	42	41
3	29	35	-	35	33	30

Attitudes towards the possibility of changing occupation

* Attitudes 1 - Like their work and do not want to change.

2 - Are dissatisfied with their jobs and would like to change.

Males (4) not interested in working because they are too old or retired;
housewives (49) and 3 females working through obligation but not interested in doing so.

since he turned 15 would be more committed to urban life than a man who has spent more time in the country than in the town during the same period (Mitchell: 1965: 629; 1969: 487). This index was, in fact, first presented by Mitchell in a previous paper (1956:704-707) as an "index of stabilization", based on Wilson's (1941:5:42) argument. The advantage of Mitchell's index over Wilson's is that the former takes into account the age of coming to town and compares indices However, Lux (1962: 32-35) argues that even if by age groups. Mitchell overcame the weakness of Wilson's index by taking into account the influence of the absolute number of years passed in town by comparing age groups he continues to commit this error within each group. Lux (1962:34-35) has also reproached Mitchell for having fixed the possibility of migrating at the age of 15. According to Lux the African decides to migrate to an urban center at the first important opportunity and not necessarily at the age of 15. He also noted that stabilization is influenced by the socio-economic context and the indices set forth by Wilson and Mitchell are erroneous when they consider as non-stabilized, migrants who have spent only a short period in town when, in fact, their attitudes towards city life, and thus the socio-economic criteria affecting their migration, are also important elements in any estimation of their stabilization.

Concerning Lux's first criticism, we also noticed that Mitchell, in his factor analysis, dichotomized each continuous indicator at its median value to convert them into discrete variates (1969:487) thus falling back into one of Wilson's weaknesses. In

our analysis the variable had a three state classification as seen in Table 4.4 without comparison by age groups. The argument underlying this procedure is that, although a person of 60 years of age has had a greater opportunity of spending more time in town than an individual of 25, the latter could be, in fact, more inclined to live in an urban center since he is still in his prime working age. The only way to examine this is to take into account, as Lux recommended (1962:35), the person's attitudes towards city life and the socio-economic factors relevant in his migration. Mitchell attempted to do this through factor analysis. However, as already mentioned, the only factor obtained for the calculation of a score of commitment is essentially relevant only to the urban experience of the respondent. In our study we do not compare by age groups: but we do retain socio-economic criteria (variables 1, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9) and attitudes and preferences towards urban living (variables 4 and 10) in the estimation of scores of urban commitment. Furthermore, our interviews also showed that respondents usually made a personal decision regarding migration to urban or rural areas at the age of 17 since this is the normal age in British Honduras to start working. Migrations before this age are, in general, made as a member of a family unit and not as the result of a personal decision. The proportion of time spent in town during adulthood was therefore calculated from Mitchell's formula replacing the age of 15 by 17:

$$X = \frac{Y \text{ ears in a city since turned } 17}{Y \text{ ears lived since turned } 17} \quad 100$$

TABLE	4	•	4
-------	---	---	---

Proportion of adulthood	I External migrants (17)	II Urban-urban migrants* (9)	III Urban-rural- urban migrants (31)	IV Rural-urban migrants (24)	TOTAL (133)
	8	ક	8	8	ક
Over 2/3	76	100	90	71	84
1/3 - 2/3	18	-	10	21	12
Less than 1/3	6	-	-	8	4

Proportion of time spent in a city during adulthood

* Non-migrants have spent all their lives in Belize and therefore all respondents in these two categories spent their entire adulthoods in an urban center.

Among our respondents, two groups have, by definition, spent their entire adulthood in an urban center: the non-migrants who have lived all their lives in Belize and the inter-urban migrants. And 90% of the respondents in the urban-rural-urban category have spent over two-thirds of their adulthood in an urban center. Ruralurban migrants, as expected, included a lower percentage (71%) of people having spent over two-thirds of their lives in an urban center. External migrants have about the same ratios as the rural born (76%). In Table 2.2 we observed that immigrants tend to settle down in the districts rather than Belize and this is true even when the Mennonites are excluded. This is an exception to many countries (see, for example, Browning: 1967:88). The explanation possibly resides in the small proportion of their lives which was spent in an urban center before coming to Belize rather than in racial and/or ethnic barriers.² Immigrants from Guatemala, for instance, tend to settle in the districts but the same phenomenon is also observed among Jamaicans, Hondurans and Mexicans (Table 2.2).

4.5 Proportion of life spent in a continuous residence in a city

We saw that Mitchell employed the "period of continuous residence in one town" as one indicator of urban commitment. He based his use of this attribute on the hypothesis that "if a person has spent a comparatively long time living in one town (in this case, more than 5 years) then this is evidence that he has settled in that

town". (1965:630; 1969:487). However, we feel that both absolute age and the number of years spent in continuous urban residence by a person should be taken into account. Therefore, instead of considering the number of years spent in a continuous residence in an urban center we used the proportion of life spent in continuous residence in an urban center. This was calculated as follows:

X' = 100 Longest period of residence in one city Age of the respondent

Furthermore, the inter-urban migration level was high among the inhabitants of Belize and our variable would be an indicator of urban commitment rather than one of a commitment to a particular urban center in the sense that the longer a person lives in an urban center the greater the likelihood that he will prefer to live in a city. It is assumed that this will affect directly either his decision not to migrate or his decision as to where to migrate to. It could be argued that the rural born have less possibility than the urban born to have a high percentage of continuous residence in a city since they were born in rural areas. However, in our study, two factors minimize this: first, 54% of the rural born first moved to an urban center when they were still under the age of 17; secondly, we are dealing here with proportions e.g. a rural born of 52 years of age who came to Belize when 26 and who has lived in the Capital since then, has the same proportion as an urban born person who has lived in a continuous residence in one city for 26 years and is now 52.

It appears from Table 4.5 that respondents with a greater proportion of life in a continuous residence in a city are more numerous among the urban-rural-urban migrants and less numerous among the rural-urban migrants. However, this table also reflects the spatial mobility of respondents. For instance, the urban-urban migrants are highly mobile with only 22% of the respondents who lived over two-thirds of their lives in a continuous residence in one town, even though they are urban born. Therefore to take into account only the period of continuous residence and not the proportion of life spent in an urban center neglects highly mobile respondents who, in fact, could be as urbanized as individuals who have spent all their lives in a city.

4.6 <u>Place of birth of respondents' parents categorized</u> as rural or urban

If a respondent and his parents were both born in urban areas it can be argued that he has a greater chance of being urban committed, since his integration into urban society started at an earlier age than a respondent who, together with his parents, was born in the rural areas. Table 4.6 indicates that both parents of most of the urban born (groups I, III and IV) were born in urban areas (not necessarily Belize); nevertheless, in the case of 14%

TABLE 4	4.5
---------	-----

Proportion of life	I External migrants (17)	II Urban-urban migrants (9)	III Urban-rural- urban migrants (31)	IV Rural-urban migrants (24)	TOTAL (133)
	ę	96	8	ક	8
Over 2/3	23	22	35	8	23
1/3 - 2/3	59	67	55	54	57
Less than 1/	/3 18	11	10	38	20

Proportion of life spent in a continuous residence in a city
TABLE 4.6

Place of Birth of respondents' parents categorized as rural or urban

Place of Birth of Parents *	I Non migrants (52)	II External migrants (17)	III Urban-urban migrants (9)	IV Urban-rural- urban migrants (31)	V Rural-urban migrants (24)	TOTAL (133)
	8	8	8	8	9 6	8
1	80	88	78	84	17	71
2	8	-	22	10	20	10
3	6	6	-	3	17	7
4	4	6	-	· _	17	5
5	2	-	-	3	29	7

* Place of birth: 1 - Both parents from urban areas.

2 - Father from urban and mother from rural.

3 - One or both parents unknown.

4 - Father from rural areas and mother from urban.

5 - Both from rural areas.

100

!

of the urban born (or 13 respondents included in groups I, III and IV) either one or both of the parents were born in the rural areas. However, among the rural born (group V) only 29% had both parents born in rural areas. This could be a partial explanation of the fact that 54% of the respondents in this group experienced their first migration to an urban center before adulthood (they might have been born in the districts when the family was temporarily settled in rural areas).

4.7 Attitudes towards city life

The actual experience of living in a city does not necessarily compel an individual to remain in a city or to migrate towards urban centers. Consequently it was necessary in our study to examine the attitudes of the respondents concerning their choice of living in urban or rural areas. Our argument here is also similar to Mitchell's, for whom individuals "who express an attitude which reflects an intention to stay in town are more likely to be committed to town than those who express a desire to return to the country " (1965:630; 1969:487). In our study the argument is the same except that we, unlike Mitchell, include explicitly the possibility of inter-urban migrations.

The reactions to the suggestion (see schedule, Appendix 1) that the respondent might move either to rural areas or outside of Belize and the reasons for living in Belize were regrouped into

14 categories according to patterns that occurred most frequently. These configurations were then cross-tabulated with the different types of migrants. The attitudes were again regrouped into 4 major groups according to the preferences with regard to urban or rural areas as places of residence. Table 4.7 indicates that 38% of the respondents categorically prefer to live in a city (1 and 2). Respondents in 1 are attached to Belize and are not interested in migrating; they are a minority in our sample. Respondents in category 2 are also committed to urban life in their attitudes but exhibited a strong desire to migrate towards urban centers outside British Honduras (mainly the United States). This latter orientation seems to be more characteristic of external (41%) and straightrural-urban migrants (50%) than of the others. For 37% of the respondents, Belize City is their 'home town' (in 3); nevertheless, these respondents, for the most part non-migrants, would consider the possibility of moving to rural areas if offered a better job. Twenty-five percent of the sample definitely prefer to live in rural areas in terms of its quietude, peacefulness, better sanitation and, to a certain extent, economic security (some of the respondents considered the districts were more progressive in terms of salaries and chances of advancement).

In general, however, urban areas within British Honduras (Belize City) were preferred to rural areas in terms of the socioeconomic advantages which are offered by Belize City as described in Chapter II. Reasons given for preferring foreign cities, mainly

TABLE 4.7

Attitudes	towards	city	life
-----------	---------	------	------

	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	
Attitudes	* Non	External	Urban-urban	Urban-rural-	Rural-rural-	Straight	
	migrants	migrants	migrants	urban migrants	urban migrants	rurai-urban	TOTAL
	(52)	(17)	(9)	(31)	(14)	migrants (10)	(133)
	90	8	8	ૠ	8	ક	8
1	14	29	11	16	7	10	15
2	14	41	33	16	21	50	23
3	48	18	33	29	43	30	37
4	24	12	23	39	29	10	25

- * Attitudes 1 Prefer city life: not interested in migrating.
 - 2 Prefer city life: interested in migrating towards urban centers.

i

- 3 Attached to Belize: but interested in migrating towards rural areas.
- 4 Prefer rural areas.

.

American (such as New York, Los Angeles, San Francisco, New Orleans, Miami) were not specifically economic in character, e.g. "need for a change", or "life is too hard in British Honduras". For many respondents America is the promised land of abundance. Although there is no television in the country and the radio advocates strong nationalistic sentiments, other mass media such as newspapers, magazines, and American movies could be responsible for such an attitude. However, the greatest source of propaganda for such cities in our sample appeared to be word of mouth since over twothirds of the respondents who wished to go to the U.S.A. had relatives living in American cities.

4.8 Preferences in places of living

The previous variable examines the expression of a desire; some respondents were actually planning their emigration (one household of 4 respondents and 3 other respondents found in different households). However, for most of the respondents emigration was impossible due mainly to economic restrictions but also to family obligations. It was therefore necessary to include the immediate preferences of the respondents as to possible, rather than merely desirous residence. If we compare Tables 4.7 and 4.8, we can observe that in the actual impossibility of a move to a foreign city, most of the respondents, except for the external migrants, (in 2 of Table 4.7) preferred to move to the districts (3 in Table 4.8) rather than to stay in Belize. However, one has to be careful in the interpretation of these respondents' urban commitment. For the great majority urban life is more attractive in terms of economic and social facilities. However, Belize has an acute problem of unemployment, especially among primary and secondary school leavers (cf. section 2.5.1) and falls short of supplying the glamour of American cities. The districts, viewed by the respondents as being more progressive, are therefore considered to be the ideal place to accumulate the money necessary to emigrate out of British Honduras.

4.9 Standards of living

Two indicators of the respondents' standard of living (both a reflection of his economic status) are considered here: (1) his address in Belize City and (2) the material condition of his house. There is no indication, in Belize, of the phenomenon of "squatters settlements" which provide shelter for rural migrants and are an acute problem for many developing countries (Browning: 1967: 101-102; see also Matos Mar: 1961; Pearse: 1961;Brisseau: 1963). There are, however, a great number of slums, i.e. "traditional dwellings for the urban proletariat" and "shacks" built with waste material. They are found mainly in Yarborough,

TABLE 4.8

Preferences in places of living

Preferences*	I Non migrants (52)	II External migrants (17)	III Urban-urban migrants (9)	IV Urban-rural- urban migrants (31)	V Rural-urban migrants (24)	TOTAL (133)
	ષ્ઠ	Ş	સ્	ę	ų	Ŗ
1	60	71	44	42	54	55
2	6 .	12	12	13	8	9
3	34	17	44	45	38	36

* Preferences 1 - Belize

2 - Urban center outside British Honduras

3 - Rural center

Mesopotamia, Freetown Road neighbourhood and on East, West and Collet Canal Streets. Table 4.9, however, indicates that these areas are not exclusively "slum areas" but a mixture of houses ranging from good, through average to poor. Also, these overcrowded areas are not mostly populated by rural migrants but also by the urban born. In the Capital there is no racial segregation in residence, the onlyclear segregation being along lines of economic status and this restricted to high status expensive residences (Table 4.9, area number 1 and section 2.5.2).

「ないない」というないであった。

Although there is no clear area where rural migrants live, they do have a tendency to concentrate on the East Canal, West Canal and Collet Canal Streets and along New South Side Canal, the latter being a new development area. Urban born (groups I, III and IV) and external migrants are mainly concentrated in Freetown neighbourhood, Yarborough and Mesopotamia which are the main centers of activity in the town and also the oldest. In an examination of urban commitment it can be argued that respondents more committed to urban life would be concentrated in those areas. Secondly, the economic status reflected in the condition of the houses can also be considered an attribute to urban commitment since a person who has a relatively high status would tend to live in a city.

TABLE 4.9

Number of respondents classified by categories, actual address, and average condition of houses in each case

	I	n	II		Urban	III	I	V	V	
	migr	ants	migran	nts	migra	nts	urbar	migrants	migrants	
	(5	2)	<u>[</u> 17	7) +	_(9) +	+ 1	(31) +	+ (24) +
Areas*	A	B	A'	B	A'	B	<u>A</u>	В	A	B
1	3	good	-	-	1	goðd	2	average	-	-
2	12	poor	4	good	-	-	7	poor	7	good-poor
3	11	average- poor	3	good	4	average - poor	6	average	11	average
4	20	poor	10	poor	. 4	poor	10	poor	4	poor
5	6	poor	-	-	1 1		6	average	2	poor
	1	I	١	1	1	I	1	1	ι.	I

A⁺: Number of respondents in each area.

* Areas 1 - Fort George; Eve Street; Southern Foreshore.

- B⁺: Average condition of the houses for each area.
- 2 Orange Street; Cemetry Road; New Road.
- 3 East Canal; West Canal; Collet Canal Streets.
- 4 Freetown; Yarborough; Mesopotamia.
- 5 Cinderella Town; Queen's Park; Harmony Housing; Lake Independence.

4.10 House tenure

Owing to the established nature of the areas mentioned in the previous paragraph (this also applies to areas included in number 2 and East and West Canal Streets), the actual experience of urban life in terms of owning property in those areas could also be a factor in understanding urban commitment. However, home ownership is not closely related to economic status since some respondents own extremely poor houses (3 in our sample) in such areas; it would, rather, be a factor in the stability of the respondents. Nevertheless, one has to be careful in the interpretation of this attribute. Urban centers are usually characterized by having a greater percentage of population in rented dwellings than rural areas and thus renting is not necessarily an indication of being less committed to urban life. Since the ratio of the dwelling owners in our sample was greater among the urban born, 65%, than among the rural born, 55%, this attribute was retained.

4.11 Family status

From Table 4.10 we can observe (as mentioned in section 2.6.2) that legal marriage is the predominant type of union among our respondents. There is a significant number of respondents who are not living with their spouses, but the number of widowed respondents outnumbers those who are divorced or separated (cf. section 2.6.2). Furthermore, common law unions and single

TABLE 4.10

2

Union Status

Union Status*	I Non migrants (52)	II External migrants (17)	III Urban migrants (40)	IV Rural migrants (24)	TOTAL (133)	
	<u>ş</u>	8	ę	8	8	
l	25	64	43	50	40	
2	13	18	30	17	19	
3	. 8	-	7	4	4	
4	10	6	7	4	8	
5	44	12	13	25	27	

* Union Status 1 - Married, living with spouse.

2 - Married, not living with spouse.

3 - Common law.

4 - Never married, with children.

5 - Never married.

:

females with children are almost entirely found among the urban and non-migrants. Mitchell considers the presence of the wife in town as an indicator of a prolonged stay in town (1965:630; 1969:487). In our sample, the legally married female follows her husband in the case of migration. The presence of the woman would, therefore, depend on the type of union. Consequently, the union status is considered here rather than the presence or absence of the woman in town.

FOOTNOTES

CHAPTER IV

- 1. This choice is not inflexible for the study of urban commitment nor does it necessarily account for all possible variables relevant to such a study. We shall see that some attributes are more important for between-group differentiation; others, within the community as a whole.
- 2. We will see, however, that a majority of the external migrants among our sample profess to be highly attracted towards urban areas (Tables 4.7 and 4.8).

CHAPTER V

Multivariate Analyses

Two types of multivariate analyses will be described in this chapter, namely factor analysis and discriminant analysis. Factor analysis was performed on the twelve variables described in the previous chapter in an attempt to reduce them to fewer, more fundamental dimensions or "factors". Scores were estimated for each factor and used to compare each subgroup. Discriminant analysis was then used to discover constellations of variables which maximally discriminate each subgroup from the others.

5.1 Factor analysis

Five factors were extracted by a factor analysis program developed by the University of Alberta, Division of Educational Research Services. The program carries out a principal axes factor analysis and includes quartimax, varimax and equimax rotations of the axes. In our study we retained the varimax rotation which has been strongly recommended (Crawford: 1966; see also Kaiser: 1958). The resulting factor loadings and communalities are shown in Table 5.1.

VARIMAX

.

COMMUNALITIES

0.679 0.616 0.596 0.839 0.574 0.580 0.656 0.746 0.635 0.814 0.552 0.699 ROTATED FACTORS

COMMUNALITIES

1	0.679	→ 0.720	-0.031	0.015	0.235	-0.324
2	0.616	-0.036	- 0.098	→ - 0.672	0.337	0.200
3	0.596	0.160	0.118	0.244	→ 0.687	0.161
4	0.839	-0.044	→ 0.885	0.087	0.193	0.102
5	0.574	-0.096	0.138	-0.052	→ 0.733	-0.072
6	0.580	0.123	0.285	-0.030	-0.179	→ 0.671
7	0.656	-0.127	-0.098	0.080	0.276	→ 0.740
8	0.746	→ 0.849	-0.015	-0.051	-0.144	-0.030
9	0.635	→ -0.707	-0.026	0.002	0.008	-0.367
10	0.814	0.014	→ 0.899	-0.036	0.064	0.023
11	0.552	0.042	-0.031	→ 0.729	0.097	0.089
12	0.699	-0.148	0.009	→ 0.767	0.284	0.090
	7.978	1.832	1.727	1.653	1.438	1.337

TABLE 5.1 Communalities and factor loadings after rotation of the axes by the varimax procedure

The highest loadings on the first factor were achieved by the attributes associated with level of education, professional skill, and attitudes expressed in response to an offer to change occupation (variables 1, 8, 9), and will be called a "socio-economic factor". For the second factor high loadings are attained by attributes concerning attitudes towards the preferred choice of living in a city or not (4 and 10) and this is called the "rural/urban preference factor". High loadings for the third factor were achieved by variables related to prior experience of urban or rural residence (2, 11, 12) and it is labelled as a "residential (time) factor". For the fourth factor high loadings group attributes regarding marital status and house tenure (3 and 5) or variates in connection with stability; there is also a significant loading for the place of birth of the respondents' parents (2) and this factor was, therefore, called the "familial stability factor". In the last factor high loadings were achieved by attributes related to standards of living such as the address of the respondent and the condition of the house (6 and 7); significant loadings are also found in 1 and 9 which concern the level of education and the attitudes of the respondents concerning the offer to change occupation which also reflect his status. This last factor is called "residential socio-economic factor".

In sum, then, the five factors obtained for consideration in our examination of urban committment are:

- (1) a socio-economic factor
- (2) a rural/urban preference factor
- (3) a residential (time) factor
- (4) a familial stability factor
- (5) a residential socio-economic factor

To calculate the factor scores Mitchell (1969: 487-488) multiplied the loadings of each factor by each variable score for each respondent. However, as Harris (1967: 372) has pointed out, this method is not regarded as a standard method of estimation by authors such as Harman (1960) or Horst (1965). According to Harris "it is a method that seems to be right even though it actually is wrong most of the time" (Ibid.). Furthermore, Harris discusses several methods available for the estimation of factor scores; in our study we have opted for the method he recommended most strongly.¹

A computer program was written to calculate the scores by both the method recommended by Harris and one similar to Mitchell's. The results are presented in Tables 5.2 and 5.3, giving for each factor the mean scores for the population sample, the standard deviation for these scores, and the minimum and maximum score values. The results for each group selected are compared with the total sample results, which are scaled to have a standard deviation of 1.0 and mean of zero.

TABLE 5	•	2
---------	---	---

Factor analysis results

Factors		1	2	3	4	5
Total sample (133 respondents)	(1) (2) (3) (4)	-0.001 1.003 -1.251 3.254	0.000 1.004 -1.698 1.719	-0.000 1.004 -3.846 1.132	-0.000 1.002 -2.171 2.097	0.000 1.002 -3.142 1.690
Rural migrants (24 respondents)	(1) (2) (3) (4)	-0.123 0.869 -1.242 1.874	-0.006 0.945 -1.216 1.567	-1.351 1.128 -3.846 0.739	0.186 1.150 -1.675 2.097	0.084 0.897 -1.910 1.623
Urban migrants (40 respondents)	(1) (2) (3) (4)	0.091 1.011 -1.172 3.233	0.253 1.084 -1.625 1.681	0.066 0.618 -1.310 1.022	-0.471 0.980 -2.171 1.548	-0.064 0.937 -3.030 1.616
External migrants (17 respondents)	(1) (2) (3) (4)	0.596 1.258 -1.183 3.254	-0.392 0.863 -1.464 1.719	-0.297 0.888 -2.625 1.071	-0.469 0.867 -2.004 2.079	-0.394 1.093 -2.342 1.483
Non migrants (52 respondents)	(1) (2) (3) (4)	-0.209 0.864 -1.251 1.439	-0.063 0.958 -1.698 1.647	0.669 0.346 -0.722 1.132	0.429 0.730 -1.319 1.883	0.139 1.027 -3.142 1.690
All migrants (81 respondents)	(1) (2) (3) (4)	0.133 1.061 -1.242 3.254	0.041 1.031 -1.625 1.719	-0.430 1.052 -3.846 1.071	-0.276 1.055 -2.171 2.097	-0.089 0.975 -3.030 1.623
All urban (109 respondents)	(1) (2) (3) (4)	0.026 1.028 -1.251 3.254	0.002 1.017 -1.698 1.719	0.297 0.679 -2.625 1.132	-0.041 0.962 -2.171 2.079	-0.018 1.023 -3.142 1.690

- (1) Mean scores for this population sample
- (2) Standard deviation for these scores
- (3) Minimum score values
- (4) Maximum score values

117

(method similar to Mitchell's)

Factors		1	2	3	4	5
	(7)	0 001	0.000	0.000		
Total sample	(\perp)	-0.001	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
(133 respondents)	(2)	1.833	1.//1	1.677	1.501	1.3/4
	(3)	-2.477	-3.403	-6.715	-3.155	-4.570
	(4)	6.054	2.740	1.760	2.785	2.408
Rural migrants	(1)	-0.130	-0.110	-2.187	0.053	0.045
(24 respondents)	(2)	1.640	1.538	1.942	1.614	1.212
	(3)	-2.381	-2.180	-6.715	-2.547	-2.584
	(4)	3.662	2.414	0.952	2.785	2.408
Urban migrants	(1)	0.195	0.271	0.062	-0.067	-0.121
(40 respondents)	(2)	1.838	1.882	0.977	1.400	1.217
· <u>-</u> ·	(3)	-2.340	-3.403	-2.294	-3.140	-4.570
	(4)	5.794	2.740	1.628	2.208	1.506
External migrants	(1)	1.101	-0.848	-0.739	-0.935	-0.724
(17 respondents)	(2)	2.288	1.474	1.531	1.282	1.374
	(3)	-1.931	-2.509	-4.827	-3.155	-3.326
	(4)	6.054	2.611	1.512	2.756	1.810
Non-migrants	(1)	-0.445	0.116	1.185	0.790	0.305
(53 respondents)	(2)	1,563	1,789	0.557	1,165	1,460
((3)	-2.477	-3.244	-1.087	-1.886	-4.410
	(4)	2.717	2.722	1.760	2.527	2.403
All migrants	(1)	0 284	-0 074	-0.758	-0.506	-0.195
(81 respondents)	(2)	1 935	1 755	1 723	1 477	1 279
(or respondence)	(2)	-2 381	-3 403	-6 715	-3 155	-4 570
	(4)	6.054	2.740	1.628	2.785	2.408
All urban	(1)	0 053	0.026	0 766	-0 028	-0 027
(100 recondente)	(1)	1 070	1 017	1 212	-0.020	-0.027
(TOP TESPONDENCS)	(2)	-2 177	-3 103 T.OT/	-1 827		-1 570
	(4)	6 05/	2 740	1 760	2 756	2 403
	(**/	0.004	2.740	T. 100	2.100	£ • = U J

- (1) Mean scores for this population sample.
- (2) Standard deviation for these scores
- (3) Minimum score values
- (4) Maximum score values



5.2 Comparison groups: Factor scores

The following discussion is based on the factor scores obtained through Harris' method. The results will be further compared with those obtained from a method similar to Mitchell's. The comparison groups selected are the sub-divisions of migrants used throughout the study (i.e. the urban, rural and external migrants). We also include results for all migrants regrouped together in order to compare them with non-migrants. Finally, the urban born (external, urban-urban, urban-rural-urban and non-migrants) are regrouped together to permit a comparison of the differences in their factor scores with those of the rural born (straight ruralurban and rural-rural-urban migrants).

5.2.1 Socio-economic factor

In considering the socio-economic factor (factor 1) in Table 5.2, we find that the mean for external migrants (0.596) is the highest for this factor. This indicates that external migrants have a high level of education, are skilled and satisfied with their occupations;² however, the standard deviation (1.258) is also high which indicates that this is a heterogeneous group³ also having respondents with a low level of education who are unskilled and dissatisfied with their occupation. At the opposite pole are the non-migrants and the rural migrants; their means (-0.209 and -0.123) reveal a low educational status, lack of skill and dissatisfaction with their occupation. As may be recalled (Table 2.5), it is also among these two groups that the unemployed and the under-employed are mainly found. Their standard deviations (0.864 and 0.869) reveal that they are homogeneous in these characteristics. The group of urban migrants with its mean of 0.091 is the closest to that of the total group; and its standard deviation (1.011) indicates a distribution similar to that of the total population as regards educational level, skill and satisfaction with the economic activity practised.

When we compare non-migrants with migrants, we find that the mean of the first factor scores for the migrants (0.133) is distinctly closer to the mean for the total group than it is for the non-migrants (-0.209); and also that the standard deviation of the migrants (1.061) approaches the mean for the total sample which indicates heterogeneity when compared with that for non-migrants (0.864). This suggests that migration favors upward mobility and that frequent migrations are not necessarily the reflection of instability but of "reasoned geographical mobility" (Lux: 1962: 187).

If we compare the urban born with the rural born, we find that they differ substantially even though some rural born came to Belize when still young. The urban born are close to the mean of the population sampled regarding the attributes discussed while the rural born are internally homogeneous as a group and of low socio-economic standing.

5.2.2 Rural/urban preference factor

In this factor the external and urban migrants are at the opposite poles. The mean of the external migrants (-0.392) depicts them as being far from the mean of the total group; in fact, they are the respondents most inclined to live in urban centers⁴ and the standard deviation (0.863) also indicates that this is a generally shared desire. The mean of the non-migrants (-0.063) is close to that of the population sampled and whereas the first choice for external migrants is a city abroad, for the non-migrants there is an attachment to Belize. However, it is felt that in the latter case it is rather out of obligation and lack of opportunity rather than as a preferred choice that these respondents are attached The rural migrants, according to the mean of their to Belize. scores (-0.006), are also near the mean of the total sample. The minus sign would indicate again that there is a slight tendency to live in urban areas; however, a significant proportion of these migrants would also opt to go back to the rural areas.

Among urban migrants the mean (0.253) indicates a net tendency of preferred choice for rural areas (mainly among the urban-rural-urban migrants), yet divergence in attitudes is reflected by the standard deviation (1.084) which indicates heterogeneity among the group.

The total population of migrants, when compared with the non-migrants, indicates a prevalent attitude of the former group to move to the rural areas rather than to stay in Belize and corrobates

the suggestion, which we offered earlier, that Belizians would respond positively to greater economic opportunity outside the Capital. The standard deviation (1.031) indicates, however, that not only the districts, but also foreign cities are targets for greater economic advancement.

The urban and rural born differ very slightly as to their preferences in places to live (means: 0.002 and -0.006 respectively). The rural born, in general, are somewhat more tempted to live in urban centers while the urban born are more attracted towards rural centers, although the standard deviation (1.017) again indicates diversity in this orientation among the group.

5.2.3. Residential (time) factor.

For this factor the polarization is between the non-migrants and the rural migrants.⁵ The mean for the non-migrants (0.669)as expected, differs sharply from the mean of the total population and the standard deviation (0.346) indicates, furthermore, a high homogeneity. It is obvious that the actual experience of living in an urban center would be highest among the non-migrants since they have spent all of their lives in Belize. The problem arises in the scaling of the migrants and the determination of the differences among these groups. The mean of the urban migrants (0.066) is close to the mean of the total group with slightly more urban experience; the standard deviation (0.618) also indicates that it is a common experience but not as homogeneous as with the non-migrants.

The external migrants, contrary to the expectation that their residential experience would have been concentrated in urban centers (section 5.2.2) have, in our sample, lived more often in rural areas, and this is true for the great majority of them if we refer to the standard deviation of the group (0.888). It was suspected that the rural migrants would have had greater experience in rural areas; however, the standard deviation (1.128) shows that it is not true for a great number of these migrants who had actually lived as long in the rural as in the urban areas. The attribute that accounts for major differences as compared with other groups for rural migrants is mainly that of place of birth of the parents which was rural in most cases.

In this factor the migrants, when compared with the non-migrants, show clear differences (means: -0.430 and 0.669 respectively). This is a reflection of wage labor migration in Belize's history, which meant not only migration to the districts but also abroad(to Panama, Honduras, Guatemala, United States, Scotland and England), as fruitpickers, chicleros, cane cutters, lumberjacks and factory workers. However, when compared with the rural born, the urban born generally have had a greater experience of living in urban centers, as is to be expected.

5.2.4. Familial stability factor.

In this factor the extremes are between the non-migrants and the urban migrants.⁶ The mean for the non-migrants (0.429)is far from that of the total population and indicates great familial

instability; the standard deviation (0.730) shows that this is characteristic of the majority of the respondents. In fact, it is among non-migrants that we find the majority of female-single headed households (4 out of 5) and also a significant number of "consensual unions". This group also has the largest proportion of tenants and respondents who have never been married. On the other hand, the mean and standard deviation for the rural migrants (0.186 and 1.150) indicate that familial instability is present, though The percentage of legally married respondents to a lesser degree. is higher among this group than among the non-migrants; however, there is still a high proportion of tenants and of respondents who have never been married. In this factor urban and external migrants have similar means, -0.471 and -0.469, and both groups can thus be considered to represent stability, etc.

As for the third factor, migrants, when compared with nonmigrants, offer sharp differences, the former having greater familial stability (mean: -0.276) than the latter (mean: 0.429). This corroborates Lux' hypothesis about labor migration: that spatial mobility is not necessarily followed by instability (Lux: 1962: 197). Instability would rather be dependent upon the socio-economic status, such as the precarious living conditions for the low income bracket discussed in Chapter II. In fact, familial instability is found mainly among the rural-urban migrants and the non-migrants who constitute the bulk of the low income group.

Differences between the urban born and the rural born are more diffuse. The urban born present a greater familial stability according to their mean (-0.041) and standard deviation (0.962); however, the rural born have a widespread distribution accounting for varying degrees of familial stability (standard deviation: 1.150).

5.2.5. Residential socio-economic factor.

The extremes here are between non-migrants and external migrants.⁷ In general, non-migrants live in over-crowded areas and their economic status is low; however, the standard deviation (1,027) indicates that there are among them a few individuals with high socio-economic status (cf. minimum value: -3.142). External migrants also include extreme cases. They are, in general, of a higher status than the average of the population having a mean score of -0.394, but the standard deviation (1.093) suggests that individuals with low scores are also included. The urban migrants, with a standard deviation of 0.937, present more homogeneity than the external migrants and the mean (-0.064) indicates that respondents in this group have a slightly higher economic status than the population sample whose mean is zero. On the other hand, the mean for the rural migrants (0.084) implies a slightly lower economic status than the urban migrants, yet they are certainly better off than the The standard deviation (0.897) indicates that this non-migrants. is a common property of the group.

Compared with the urban born, the rural born possess a socio-economic level that is slightly lower; however, the urban born are not homogeneous and include respondents with the highest and the lowest standards of living among the population as a whole (minimum and maximum scores are -3.142 and 1.690 respectively).

Table 5.3 gives the scores calculated by a method similar to Mitchell's. Apart from the unreliability of this method (Harris: 1967), there are also some anomalies and inconveniences such as standard deviations greater than unity for the total population scores. On the other hand, a close examination of the results tends to lead to the same overall conclusions as those already pointed out; and consequently Table 5.3 will not be discussed further but will be retained for possible reference use. It is safe to say that at least in the present context the two methods of scoring do not give contradictory results.

To summarize, the rural-urban migrants and the nonmigrants would, in general, regroup respondents from the low income bracket and would include, mainly in the latter group, cases of familial instability. Rural migrants appear to have a higher standard of living than the non-migrants. However, it is among the latter, as we have already shown, that the highest and lowest standards of living are to be found, with the low standards of living being prevalent among a significant number of the respondents. The urban experience is necessarily predominant among non-migrants yet an absolute commitment to urban life is far from being shared by all of this group.

On the other hand, rural migrants are, surprisingly, more committed to city life than urban migrants in spite of their position in last place in terms of their experience in urban centers.

The external migrants are more skilled and better educated than the other groups and also have, in general, a higher socioeconomic status. On the other hand, the urban migrants could be regarded more as possessing a middle class standard of living in Belize since their standard of living, in general, is higher than the rural migrants and since there are among them no extreme cases. (cf. minimum and maximum scores on socio-economic attributes, Table 5.2 factors 1 and 5). Both urban and external migrants have had a significant amount of experience in rural centers and, although external migrants are definitely committed to city life, urban migrants are more inclined towards rural areas. As already mentioned in section 3.2, this attitude towards migration to areas of greater economic opportunities which in this case are the rural areas, is certainly a reflection of the continuing characteristics of the "woodcutter community" as an acquisitive group.

5.3 Discriminant analysis

We use discriminant analysis because of the two main advantages it can offer in an assessment of urban commitment: i.e. the simultaneous comparison of the differences between several groups with respect to several variables (Kaczkowski and Rothney: 1956: 231-32)

and secondly, because of the possibility of measuring the contribution of each variable towards each discrimination. Discriminant function analysis provides a weighted combination of variables for each subgroup, chosen so that the variation between groups on these weighted scores is maximized relative to the variation within groups. In other words, the weights are chosen so that the weighted scores discriminate maximally between the groups (see Anderson: 1958: 6.7 ff; Morrison: 1967: 130-33; Dixon: 1968: 196-203). For any pair of groups, one can calculate the differences between the two corresponding functions to obtain a difference function which discriminates those two groups. The weights of this difference function, appropriately scaled, can be taken as indices of the relative contribution of each variate to the discrimination.⁸

The same comparison groups used for factor analysis are used for discriminant analysis. At first glance, some variables in the discriminant functions might appear redundant in the sense that they are obvious in the determination of differences among the comparison groups, as for instance, the proportion of life spent in a city during a continuous residence for non-migrants when compared with any other group. However, the same number of variables had to be maintained through the numerous runs of the program in order to preserve consistency, essential in comparison.

5.4 The urban and rural born

5.4.1. Classification matrix.

The discriminant functions for each group permit one to compute a probability that each respondent falls into that group. Thus one can decide to which group each respondent most likely belongs. By tabulating this against the group each respondent actually belongs to, one can construct a classification matrix which indicates the effectiveness of the analysis. For good discrimination, therefore, we expect a classification matrix with high frequencies in the main diagonal and low frequencies elsewhere.

Each respondent's probability of falling in either group is displayed in Fig. 5.1 and strong concentrations can be observed near each axis. In the computing program used for this analysis (Program: BMD05M in the Biomedical Statistical Package, see Dixon: 1968) a probability of 0.5 was taken as the dividing line between groups thus yielding a classification matrix shown in Table 5.4. Although 54% of the rural born migrated to an urban center at a young age and consequently one could have expected to find among them a great resemblance with the urban born, they actually differ greatly Furthermore, the concentration of responfrom the latter group. dents on the leading diagonal of the classification matrix demonstrates that the variables used and the discriminant functions derived from them offer an effective means of differentiating between urban born and rural born.





Probabilities of individuals belonging to one of two groups.

All respondents lie on the line joining the two values of 1.0 and frequencies are indicated for each point plotted.

,

TABLE 5.4

Classification Matrix

Urban and rural born

· • •

Predicted Group

	Function	Function 1		Total		
	Group					
Actual	1	99	10	109 urban		
Group	2	5	19	24 rural		

5.4.2. Discriminant functions and the relative contribution of the variables as discriminators.

We shall now consider the differences between urban born (non-migrants, urban-urban, urban-rural-urban and external migrants) and rural born(straight-rural-urban and rural-rural-urban). Table 5.5 gives the discriminant functions for these two groups and the scale of importance for each variable in assigning respondents to one of the two groups. It appears that the most important variables in discriminating between the two groups are those related to the socio-economic status of the respondents and to their actual experience in urban centers. The urban born in general can be seen to have a greater experience of living in urban centers since attributes regarding the parents' place of birth (variable 2), the proportion of life spent in a city in a continuous residence (12) and the proportion of adulthood spent in a city (11) are major discriminants. The urban born also have a higher socio-economic status than the rural born which can be seen when we examine the relative contribution of attributes such as professional skill (8), attitudes towards the possibility of changing occupation (9), the condition of the house (7), and the present address of the respondents(6). However, we can see that differences between the respondents with regard to their attitudes and preferences in terms of rural and urban areas for living (4 and 10) are very insignificant. However, this does not imply that all respondents prefer to live in urban areas. We have already seen that there are some differences among the population in terms of their choice to live in urban or rural areas (see sections 4.7 and 4.8).

TABLE 5.5

Discriminant functions and scaled differential weights (urban and rural born)

Funct	ion 1	2	σ		
Coefficie *	nt		••••	Scaled differential weights	Order of signifi- cance
l	-0.16401	-0.01494	0.79	0.118	9
2	1.13683	3.09793	1.22	-2.393	1
3	1.29794	1.41746	1.24	-0.148	8
4	-1.89944	-1.85381	1.00	-0.046	12
5	2.32116	2.23115	.84	0.076	10
6	8.96256	9.28971	.55	-0.180	7
7	1.67757	1.41923	.77	0.199	6
8	10.83358	10.04026	.54	0.482	3
9	8.08996	8.35962	.77	-0.208	5
10	2.96891	3.03429	.94	-0.061	11
11	18.96664	18.14705	.40	0.328	4
12	2.27649	-0.00719	.70	1.597	2

- * List of variables
- 1 Level of education
- 2 Parents' place of birth
- 3 Marital status
- 4 Attitudes towards city life
- 5 House tenure
- 6 Actual address in Belize
- 7 Condition of the house

8 Professional skill

9 Attitudes towards the possibility of changing one's occupation

10 Preferences in places of living

- 11 Proportion of time spent in a city during adulthood
- 12 Proportion of life spent in a continuous residence in a city

5.5 Sub-categories of urban and rural born

It is important to examine the extent to which the two broad comparison groups discussed mask the actual differences between the respondents. Urban and rural born are therefore considered according to the different categories of non-migrants and migrants: (1) urban migrants (urban-urban and urban-ruralurban); (2) rural migrants (rural-rural-urban and straight ruralurban); (3) external migrants and (4) non-migrants.

As for the urban and rural born a classification matrix can also be generated to check the effectiveness of the analysis. From Table 5.6 we can see that except for the urban migrants most respondents belong to the pre-determined classes established according to their place of origin. The rural, the external and the nonmigrants can thus be taken as being characteristically different from one another.

Table 5.7 presents the discriminant functions for these 4 categories. It would be possible to compare here six pairs of groups (1, 2; 1, 3; 1, 4; 2, 3; 2,4; 3,4). We were, however, mainly interested in the comparison of British Hondurans; therefore categories including those born in British Honduras (rural and urban) are retained in the discussion (i.e. 1,2; 1,4; 2,4); The external migrants were compared only with the urban migrants (1,3) to verify their special qualities.

TABLE 5.6

Classification matrix

Urban, rural, external and non-migrants

Predicted group

.

	Function	1	2	3	4	Total
	Group					
	l	22	2	6	10	40
	2	5	17	1	1	24
Actual	3	1	2	12	2	17
Group	4	1	1	1	49	52

....

_

..
TABLE 5.7

Discriminant functions for 4 groups (urban, rural, external and non-migrants)

Fu	nction	1	2	3	4		
Coeff	icient						
*							
1		-0.19892	-0.00997	-0.07082	-0.15915		
2		1.14856	3.06975	1.09674	1.18007		
3		1.35378	1.51539	1.36514	1.62690		
4		-1.51645	-1.67764	-2.32487	-1.36535		
5		2.16684	2.39444	2.95521	2.79253		
6		8.36837	8.90045	9.29476	8.01891		
7		1.97859	1.64653	1.46817	2.42610		
8		9.89985	9.42948	11.67936	9.26916		
9		7.64920	8.07320	8.31864	7.44193		
10		2.82790	2.73139	2.59321	2.19384		
11		18.99632	17.65450	17.53737	18.17717		
12		3.37679	1.50042	2.94156	6.68921		
.t.	-· ·						
- -	LIST	or variables	_				
T	Leve	1 of education	n 				
2	Pare	nts' place of	birth				
3	Mari	tal status					
4	Atti	tudes towards	city life				
5	House	House tenure					
6	Actu	al address in	Belize				
7	Cond	ition of the h	nouse				
8	Profe	essional skill	L				
9	Atti	tudes towards	the possibi	lity of changi	ng one's occup	pation	

- 10 Preferences in places of living
- 11 Proportion of time spent in city during adulthood
- 12 Proportion of life spent in a continuous residence in a city

Table 5.8 gives the discriminant functions and the relative contribution of the variables as discriminators. The place of birth of the respondents' parents (variable 2) is a major discriminant when rural migrants are opposed to any group of urban born: it is the most important discriminant between urban and rural migrants and the second most important between rural and non-migrants. However, it is almost insignificant when the urban born are compared internally, i.e. the urban to non-migrants or the urban to external migrants.

The proportion of life spent in a continuous residence in a city (variable 12) is necessarily a paramount discriminant when urban and non-migrants, or rural and non-migrants, are compared. One would think that the major difference regarding this attribute, when comparing urban and rural born, is due to the presence of nonmigrants among the former group. However, this attribute is still an important discriminant when urban and rural migrants are compared. It is only in the case of urban and external migrants that this attribute has less importance as a discriminant. The majority of the rural migrants spent a greater proportion of their adulthood in a city than expected (variable 11). Nevertheless, this attribute is still a significant discriminant when urban and rural born are compared due to the presence among urban born of respondents who spent all their lives in a city such as urban-urban migrants and non-migrants.

Professional skill (variable 8) is much less a discriminant between urban and rural migrants than between urban and rural born.

Scaled differential weights - 4 groups

I have been a served a second and a second of the second second second second second second second second second

a)	Urban	and	rural	migrants	(1,	2)
				and gr and co	(1)	41

Variables	Scaled differences	Order of Significance
1	-0.149	11
2	-2.344	l
3	-0.200	9
4	0.161	10
5	-1.910	3
6	-0.293	6
7	0.256	7
8	0.254	8
9	-0.326	5
10	0.091	12
11	0.537	4
12	1.313	2

(2, 4)	b)	Rural	and	non-migrants	(2,	4)
--------	----	-------	-----	--------------	-----	----

Variables	Scaled differences	Order of Significance
1	0.118	11
2	2.305	2
3	-0.138	10
4	-0.312	8
5	-0.334	7
6	0.485	6
7	-0.600	3
8	0.087	12
9	0.486	5
10	0.505	4
11	-0.209	9
12	-3.632	1

• •

TABLE 5.8 continued

c) Urban and non-migrants (1, 4)

Variables	Scaled differences	Order of Significance
1	-0.031	12
2	-0.038	11
3	-0.339	6
4	-0.151	10
5	-0.526	3
6	0.192	8
7	-0.345	4
8	0.341	5
9	0.161	9
10	0.596	2
11	0.328	7
12	-2.319	1

d) Urban and external migrants (1, 3)

Variables	Scaled differences	Significance
· · 1	-0.101	10
2	0.063	11
3	-0.014	12
4	0.808	2
5	-0.662	3
6	-0.510	6
7	0.393	7
8	-0.961	l
9	-0.515	5
10	0.221	9
11	0.584	4
12	0.305	8

138

Between the latter comparison groups the major difference lies in the presence of external migrants among the urban born. As we have seen (cf. section 4.2), the external migrants account for the largest proportion among qualified labourers. The urban migrants are the second most qualified group yet they differ greatly when compared with the external migrants. Between rural and non-migrants, this attribute accounts for little difference although the former group has a greater percentage of skilled workers, though less than the urban migrants. Attitudes towards the possibility of changing occupation (variable 9) appear to be a significant discriminant in all comparison groups, not just between urban and rural born, although for different reasons. Some groups differ mainly in reference to the percentage of respondents dissatisfied with their work (external and urban migrants); others in regard to the proportion of satisfied workers (urban and rural migrants) or the number of respondents not interested in working (external and urban migrants). Nevertheless, it appears that significant percentages of satisfied workers are to be found among groups with the greatest proportion of skilled and professional respondents born in cities.

The condition of the house (variable 7) is only a medium range discriminant in differentiating between urban and rural migrants or urban and external migrants. Nevertheless, its importance is evident when rural or urban migrants are opposed to non-migrants, Here it indicates the low economic standard of the latter group. The actual address (variable 6) is also a medium range discriminant

in all comparison groups corroborating the fact that in general there are no specific residential areas for urban or rural born. The union status (variable 3) has little importance, in discriminating between rural and non-migrants or between urban and external migrants. The mating patterns and the proportion of single persons are different, however, when urban migrants are compared with rural or non-migrants. House tenure (variable 5) is a major discriminant for all groups except in the comparison of the rural and non-migrants who represent the majority of tenants. Educational level (variable 1) appears not to differentiate the different comparison groups, with an exception being made for the external migrants.

Differences in the attitudes of the respondents in regard to their preferences in place of living (variables 4 and 10) were insignificant when urban and rural born were compared. However, attitudes toward city life (variable 4) is a major discriminant when urban and external migrants are opposed and, to a lesser degree, when the rural and non-migrants are compared. Preferences in places of living (variable 10) is found to be insignificant when urban and rural migrants are opposed since the scaled differential weight is very small (0.091); nevertheless, it is a major discriminant in the comparison of non-migrants with either rural or urban migrants.

To summarize, the major differences between the urban born and the rural born involve attributes related to their actual experience in cities and to their socio-economic status. Attributes related to their preferences and attitudes towards city life are

insignificant as discriminators. However, we have seen that the urban born group is in many respects a heterogeneous group. For instance, the external and the urban migrants, though both are urban born, differ a great deal in their attitudes towards city life and their economic status. Furthermore, the differences between the urban and the non-migrants are more pronounced than the differences between the rural and the non-migrants when we look, for example, at the discriminating contribution of some variables such as professional skill and preferences in places of living. The great variety found among the urban born therefore poses a problem in judging their degree of urban commitment as compared to urban commitment among the rural born.

5.6 Urban commitment

Given the urban experience of the respondents, the urban born, with the exception of the external migrants, should have a high degree of urban commitment since, in the majority of cases, the parents were born in urban areas and, on the average, over two-thirds of the respondents' adulthood was spent in a city. Given their socio-economic status, the external and urban migrants should be more committed to urban life than the rural and the non-migrants due to the superiority of their standard of living. However, when we refer to the attitudes of the respondents regarding their preferences in places of living, we arrive at a picture somewhat different from the

one usually presented as existing or assumed to exist in newly developing countries: firstly, one in which rural-urban migrants, although keeping contact with their families in the country, seldom return to the rural areas and, secondly, one in which urbanites are rarely found to move to small towns or to the country. The rural migrant usually prefers to stay in town and, if a desire to return to the rural areas is expressed, it is a move that he does not expect to make in the immediate future (exception is made here of labour migrants who have no intention ot staying in town longer than necessary) (Mitchell: 1969: 483-85).

On the other hand we did not find, in studies done in newly developing countries, suggestions that urbanites (born and raised in towns) expressed a desire to live in rural areas. In our sample not only did we have an important percentage of urbanites who had lived in rural areas, but we also had a large proportion of urban born who stated preferences for living in rural areas. It would seem that urban commitment is here resultant from other factors than that of being born in rural or urban areas.

To investigate this we divided our comparison groups according to the preferences in places of living of the respondents (cf. Table 4.8). Eighty-five respondents preferred to live in an urban center (Belize or a foreign city) and were included in the positively urban committed or group 1, while 48 respondents wanted to live in the districts and were included in the negatively urban committed, group 2.

5.6.1. Factor scores of the new comparison groups.

Factor scores of these new comparison groups obtained through factor analysis are given in Table 5.9. The second factor or rural/urban preference factor is here redundant since the respondents were divided according to one of its attributes. It is therefore not included in the following discussion.

The means of the socio-economic factor scores (group 1: -0.027 and group 2:0.047) are very close to the mean of the total population and indicate that in general the two comparison groups have similar attainments of professional skill and similar attitudes towards the possibility of changing their occupations. However, group 1 has a higher percentage of respondents with a high level of education. Respondents in group 1 have a slightly greater experience of living in urban centers than group 2 (see mean in factor 3: 0.028), although the standard deviation (1.046) indicates that this is not characteristic of all respondents included in this group. On the other hand, the standard deviation of group 2 (0.924) indicates greater homogeneity within this group than group 1, with the accent on rural experience (see mean for group 2 in factor 3: -0.051). Familial stability is more characteristic of group 1 than group 2 as can be seen from the means obtained on the fourth factor (-0.048)and 0.084); however, the standard deviations (0.996 and 1.008) are very close to that of the population sampled, indicating heterogeneity among both groups regarding familial stability. The residential socio-economic status is higher among respondents

TABLE 5.9

. . . .

Factor analysis results

(for positively and negatively urban committed groups)

Factors		1	2	3	4	5
Group 1	(1)	-0.027	-0.686	0.028	-0.048	-0.010
(positively urban com-	(2)	1.026	0.465	1.046	0.996	1.114
mitted)	(3)	-1.251	-1.698	-3.846	-2.171	-3.142
	(4)	3.254	0.107	1.132	2.097	1.690
Group 2	(1)	0.047	1.216	-0.051	0.084	0.019
(negatively urban com-	(2)	0.958	0.316	0.924	1.008	0.765
mitted)	(3)	-1.242	0.560	-2.801	-1.965	-1.973
	(4)	3.233	1.719	0.975	2.079	1.623

10.000

included in group 1 than in group 2 as can be seen from the means obtained on the fifth factor scores (-0.010 and 0.019). On the other hand, the standard deviations (1.114 and 0.765) indicate homogeneity in group 2 while group 1 includes respondents with both the highest and the lowest standards of living (see minimum and maximum scores).

Except for the second factor, and to a lesser extent the fourth, the means are very close to the average. The standard deviations, except for the second and fifth factors, are also very close to the average. This indicates that each group represents a wide cross-section of the community.

5.6.2. Discriminant functions.

In the discriminant analysis, the two attributes denoting rural/urban attitudes or preferences were removed since these two variables would have been too strongly discriminant in analysing the characteristic differences among the new comparison groups.⁹ High frequencies in the main diagonal of the classification matrix (Table 5.10) and low frequencies elsewhere, an indication of good discrimination, are not as stressed as they were with urban and rural born and we can see that the groups overlap much more in this case. Nevertheless, elements influencing the decisions to live in urban or rural areas can still be determined by an examination of the relative contributions of the variables in discriminating. It is also

TABLE 5.10

Classification Matrix

1 Function 2 Total Group (13 urban migrants (9 urban migrants (10 rural migrants (8 external migrants ⁽ 5 rural migrants (6 external migrants 1 52 85 (21 non-migrants (13 non migrants (9 urban migrants (9 urban migrants 17 (4 rural migrants (2 external migrants (2 non-migrants (1 external migrants (16 non-migrants 2 48

clear that a preference for living in urban or rural areas does not rest upon the origin of the individuals since a slightly larger percentage of individuals born in a city is found among the negatively urban committed respondents than among the positively committed (84% against 80%).

The relative contribution of the variables in discriminating the two groups appears in Table 5.11 and the detailed distribution of attributes is found in Table 5.12. The first discriminant is status of marital union (variable 3). The percentage of legally married couples is higher in group 1 (42% against 33%). The difference is also significant in terms of individual freedom, i.e. there are fewer respondents positively committed to urban life who are single (21% against 39%) implying that respondents without familial responsibilities are more inclined to follow migration streams towards immediate economic opportunities. The second discriminant refers to the address of the respondents (variable 6). High residential status is to be found only among respondents of group 1 and the percentage of respondents living in over-crowded areas is also smaller in group 1 than in group 2 (70% against 77%). House tenure (variable 5) is also a strong discriminant between the two groups. There are more house owners among group 1 and more individuals exempt from responsibilities either as tenants or as home owners in group 2. The proportion of life spent in a continuous residence in a city is also a strong discriminant since the percentage of respondents who have spent a greater proportion of their lives in a

TABLE 5.11

Discriminant functions and scaled differential weights (positively and negatively urban committed)

1	2		
		Scaled differential weights	Order of signi- ficance
-0.16782	-0.01754	119	6
1.90123	2.03776	166	5
1.66850	1.32814	.415	1
2.38788	2.16047	.191	3
9.35792	8.85368	.276	2
1.64098	1.73947	076	8
10.59279	10.49980	.050	9
8.05590	8.10364	037	10
17.46573	17.66800	081	7
0.62324	0.86969	173	4
	1 -0.16782 1.90123 1.66850 2.38788 9.35792 1.64098 10.59279 8.05590 17.46573 0.62324	12-0.16782-0.017541.901232.037761.668501.328142.387882.160479.357928.853681.640981.7394710.5927910.499808.055908.1036417.4657317.668000.623240.86969	1 2 Scaled differential weights -0.16782 -0.01754 119 1.90123 2.03776 166 1.66850 1.32814 .415 2.38788 2.16047 .191 9.35792 8.85368 .276 1.64098 1.73947 076 10.59279 10.49980 .050 8.05590 8.10364 037 17.46573 17.66800 081 0.62324 0.86969 173

- * List of variables
- 1 Level of education
- 2 Parents' place of birth
- 3 Marital status
- 5 House tenure
- 6 Actual address in Belize
- 7 Condition of the house
- 8 Professional skill
- 9 Attitudes towards the possibility of changing one's occupation
- 11 Proportion of time spent in town during adulthood
- 12 Proportion of life spent in a continuous residence in a city

TABLE 5.12

Detailed distribution of attributes

(for the positively and negatively urban committed groups)

Union status

		<u>Group I</u>	<u>Group</u> 2
		8	8
1	Married, living with spouse	42	33
2	Married, not living with spouse	25	18
3	Common law, single with children	12	10
4	Single,	21	39

Actual address

		Group 1 %	Group 2 %
1	High residential status	7	_
2	Average	23	23
3	Poor	70	77

House tenure

. دو المحمود منه ويد ترك مع مع فرد مع معود التي علي ال

		<u>Group 1</u>	Group 2
		8	8
1	Landlord (household head)	26	19
2	Tenant (household head)	14	10
3	Other	60	71

وليتر فيلاف كمار للأخذ المترد وتوجر الباسة المتراكرة

TABLE 5.12 continued

Proportion of life spent in a continuous residence in a city

	·	Group 1	Group 2	
		8	8	
1	Over 2/3 of life	55	50	
2	Over 1/3 of life	31	42	
3	Less than 1/3 of life	14	8	

Parents' place of birth (in terms of rural or urban areas)

		Group 1 %	Group 2 %
1	Both parents from urban	70	69
2	Father from urban and mother from rural	11	13
3	Both parents are unknown or one is unknown	6	10
4	Father from rural areas and mother from urban	5	6
5	Both from rural areas	8	2

Level of education

		Group 1	Group 2
		8	*
1	Primary certificate or less	65	67
2	Secondary education	24	19
3	College or equivalent	8	12
4	Professional	3	2

continuous residence (variable 12) is higher in group 1 than in group 2 (55% against 50%); however, the former group is not necessarily more stable since it also has a larger proportion of respondents who have spent less than one-third of their lives in a continuous residence in a city (14% against 8%). Another important discriminant is the parents' place of birth (variable 2). Respondents who have both parents originating from urban areas are more numerous in group 1 than in group 2 (71% and 69% respectively). However, group 1 has also 8% of its respondents whose parents were both born in rural areas while only 2% of the same category is found in group 2. The level of education is also an important discriminant between the two groups. Educational level is generally higher among respondents of group 1, yet the percentage of college trained people is higher in group 2. Other variates (proportion of adulthood in town, condition of the house, professional skill and attitudes towards changing occupation) are of little importance as discriminants.

A preferred choice for living in a city appears to be, in our sample, essentially independent of economic attributes such as professional skill, material condition of the homes, attitudes regarding change of occupation and even the actual experience of living in a city or a rural center. Variates that are important concern familial responsibilities: married couples are less mobile than individuals who are single, do not possess property and may even be free of a lease. It is also understandable to find respondents living in overcrowded areas where the sanitary facilities are poor or non-

existent preferring the districts in terms of their greater quiet, security and better sanitation. The variables accounting here for differences between those positively and negatively committed to urban life are therefore a reflection of both the respondents' dissatisfaction concerning his residential status and the degree of freedom he has to migrate. In other words, his desire to move to rural areas, in many cases, is the expression of a desire for upward mobility in that he could accumulate in the districts the capital necessary to arrive at a tangible amelioration of his condition.

This hypothesis is corroborated by the mean of age of the respondents who prefer to live in the rural areas. The average age of the positively urban committed is 43.5, among the negatively urban committed it is 35.8, and among the non-migrants of the latter group it is 25.1. Consequently the negatively urban committed are not only the members of the lower socio-economic strata of Belize but are, in fact, the working age personnel still capable of and keen to improve their socio-economic status.

5.7 Index of urbanization (sociological frame of reference)

Lipset and Bendix noted that persons born and raised in cities seldom move to small towns or the country (1968: 322). As already mentioned this hypothesis is not only valid in highly urbanized societies but also in countries with a degree of urbanization (from a

demographic point of reference) comparable with that of Belize. The refusal to move to smaller towns or the rural areas is seen as an indication of upward mobility or, in the case of African urbanites, as the emergence of class and status ranking (Lipset and Bendix: 1968: 322; Wilson in Wood: 1968: 26).

In Belize we saw that upward mobility is not always achieved by inter-urban migrations but also may be achieved through ruralurban and urban-rural migrations. Consequently, a desire to move to rural areas is not in our sample an indication of absence of aspiration to higher status but is a positive response to shifting economic opportunities, a response which could, in fact, improve the socio-economic status of the individual. As we have seen in section 2.6, the class structure of Belize is mainly based on economic divisions and migration to the districts is often a step towards upward One can thus argue that the degree or urbanization in mobility. Belize (in a sociological frame of reference) is very high when we look at the number of respondents in our sample who are positively urban committed. Furthermore, the negatively urban committed are, in fact, far from being rural committed, as generally viewed in the They are primarily committed to their personal economic literature. betterment rather than to any specific place of residence.

FOOTNOTES

CHAPTER V

1. It is expressed by the following equation:

$$F = Z U^{-2} A(A' U^{-2} A)^{-1}$$
 (1.1)

where F is the matrix of factor scores, Z is the matrix of scores on the variables, U^{-2} is a diagonal matrix with the diagonal elements constructed as follows:

$$U_{ii}^{-2} = \frac{1}{(1 - C_{i})}$$
(1.2)

where C. is the communality for the ith variable. A is a matrix of factor loadings and A' is the transpose of A. The variables were expressed in standard score form. Using the above notation the method used by Mitchell can be written as

$$\mathbf{F} = \mathbf{Z} \mathbf{A} \tag{1.3}$$

Mitchell also normalized his Z to obtain percentage scores for F.

- 2. In single perspective results the external migrants are the most educated group etc. (cf. Tables 4.1, 4.2.a, 4.3). Therefore in conjunction with those results we can determine that a positive mean will indicate high education, skill, etc., and a negative mean the inverse.
- 3. The total sample results have a standard deviation of 1.0 and consequently a value below 1.0 is considered as indicating homogeneity in the group. Similarly, a value greater than 1.0 indicates heterogeneity.

155

- 4. As in factor 1 the external migrants are used to determine what represents the positive and negative scores. In this case they have a negative mean. Since they were recognized as preferring to live in urban centers (cf. Tables 4.7 and 4.8) other groups with negative means will be assumed also to prefer living in urban cities. Similarly groups with a positive mean will indicate preference for rural areas.
- 5. Non-migrants are known to have spent all their lives in an urban center. Therefore positive means indicate greater experience of urban centers and negative means account for greater rural experience.
- 6. A greater proportion of urban migrants are found to be married and house owners (cf. Tables 4.10 and 4.11). A negative mean score for this factor therefore indicates greater stability since the urban migrants have a negative mean.
- 7. The material condition of the houses is superior among the external migrants (cf. Table 4.9). The negative sign will be used here as an indication of high socio-economic status.
- 8. The measure of importance D_{ijk} of the ith variable for discrimination between groups j and k can be obtained by substracting the ith components of their functions

$$D_{ijk} = (F_{ij} - F_{ik})\sigma_i \qquad (1.4)$$

To scale each variable equivalently, each D_{ijk} has been multiplied by the standard deviation σ_i for ijk that variable, e.g. the significance of the ¹ 6th variable (i = 6) as a discriminator between groups 1 and 2 (j = 1, k = 2) in Table 5.5 is obtained as follows:

$$D_{612} = (F_{61} - F_{62})^{\sigma} 6$$

= (8.96256 - 9.28971) 0.55
= - 0.180 (see 6th row).

9. These two variables act as perfect discriminators, e.g. the positively urban committed all have a value of either 1 or 2 in variable 10 and all the negatively urban committed have a value of 3 in the same variable. Therefore the respondents would be classified exactly according to the predetermined classes of positively and negatively urban committed, being 85 in the first group and 48 in the second.

CHAPTER VI

Summary and Conclusions

In this study we have tried to determine whether British Honduras was still in the process of urbanization or already urbanized. We therefore looked for indices of urbanization using both the demographic method of calculating the proportion of people living in places of 20,000 or more, and an alternative method through which we tried to assess the proportion of urban population found to be committed to urban life. To do this we used an improved version of Mitchell's (1965; 1969) approach. We have also tried to delineate the patterns of migration present among the inhabitants of Belize in order to evaluate the importance of ruralurban migration, a major element responsible for urban growth; and of urban-rural migration, a paramount indicator of the degree of urban commitment of the population studied. Furthermore, we have tried to assess the extent to which these migration patterns follow streams towards areas offering greater economic opportunity. We have also considered how these patterns have been affected by preferences for living in urban or rural areas.

Rural-urban, urban-rural and inter-urban migrations were the major patterns of migration found among Belize's inhabitants. Rural-urban migration is far from being comparable to the massive

rural-urban migrations that other newly developing countries are experiencing in their process of urbanization; and the growth of Belize is assumed to be based mainly on the population's natural increase. Urban-rural migrations are numerically more important than rural-urban migrations and were proven to be a favourable response to new economic opportunities in the districts; migrations specifically undertaken in order to acquire a better economic status. However, it appears that the strongest attraction for the acquisitive population of Belize would be foreign cities, especially American, although an assessment of emigration here could be only speculative.

From formal and informal interviews it appeared that migration to American cities was considered to be the principal achievement to be attained in life. This was noted mainly among middle and lower class members of all ages, though most predominantly among the youth. Through the colony's history one would believe that the strongest influences have come from England. However, the English attitude in the Anglo-Guatemalan dispute and the devaluation of the British Honduran dollar (in 1950), are factors that have contributed to disillusionment of the population of British Honduras in terms of their expectations concerning Britain. On the other hand, the United States, apart from being a close neighbor, has influenced the population through the education given in the Catholic school system without falling into the danger of being referred to as the colonialist power. The mass media also contributed

greatly to the creation and maintenance of an ideal image of America since most of the newspapers, magazines and movies were American. However, the element considered to be the strongest incentive for migration to the U.S.A. is the word of mouth information obtained from parents or close relatives already living in American cities.

The resulting demographic pattern was somewhat unusual compared to what normally is found in newly developing countries. In Africa, cities with rapid and recent growth are still predominantly male cities, young cities with an inflation of the population between the ages of fifteen and forty-five. In older cities, or in cities with greater work opportunities for women, such as in some North or West African cities, the sex ratio tends to be equal. On the other hand, Latin American cities are found to be selective of young adults, but in this case of females primarily. In Belize the females outnumber the males in all age groups. However, the average distribution does not offer a "bulge" between the ages of fifteen and fortyfive but rather a loss of working age individuals, a reflection of emigration and of migration to the districts.

From a demographic point of view, British Honduras was found to be moderately urbanized. Its degree of urbanization is comparable to Mexico, the Republic of South Africa, etc. However, the population size, the number of cities and the pace of urbanization of the countries mentioned are far from being comparable with the

situation found in British Honduras which is underpopulated, has only one city of importance and has a low pace of urbanization. It was found that countries with only one city of importance were at least 25% urbanized in 1920 while Belize attained 20,000 inhabitants only 25 years later. Primate cities similar in size with Belize's population were found only in countries with a low level of urbanization such as Liberia or Chad. Furthermore, the pace of urbanization resembles more the urbanized countries which experienced rapid urban growth during the industrial revolution such as England, than it does that of newly developing countries. The fastest increase in the level of urbanization of British Honduras (9.1%) was experienced between 1921 and 1946 while countries with a rapid pace of urbanization (Peru, Mexico, Brazil, etc.) had an increase in their population of more than 10% for similar 25 year periods. Countries which had at the beginning of the century an increase of less than 10% for 25 years (Canada, United States) have, since 1940, experienced a higher percentage increase for a smaller period and are, today, highly urbanized.

British Honduras' uniqueness concerning its level of urbanization was explained by the nature of the early settlement which made Belize the center of trade and commerce early in the colony's history. It was an ideal site in a logwood economy as a junction between the interior of the country and the outside world and soon became the center of attraction. However, the population of the capital is still small, mainly because the country as a whole is still under-populated. Despite this average degree of urbanization of the country it was found that the population of Belize is highly urbanized, and this exists independently of the urban or rural origins of the inhabitants. This second index of urbanization was based on an assessment of the urban commitment of the respondents interviewed.

Our approach was similar to Mitchell's (1965; 1969), yet adjusted to the context of British Honduras and used in conjunction with a better scaling method (Harris: 1967). As with Mitchell, the variables were submitted to a factor analysis. Five factors were extracted which permitted us to examine the socio-economic status, the rural/urban preference and the urban experience of the respon-The variables considered here are not necessarily the dents. only ones which might be considered relevant to an understanding of commitment to urban life. For instance, the attitudes of the respondents in their preferences for living in urban or rural areas could be better defined by referring more specifically to the values of the respondent which make him choose to live in a city. However, it is felt that the variables used in this work are amply adequate, and furthermore this study had the advantage of taking into account the socio-economic status of the respondents in its assessment of the urban commitment, while Mitchell was only able to extract one factor related only to the urban experience of the respondent.

The variables were also submitted to a discriminant analysis which permitted us to define more precisely the differences between the groups compared and furthermore to determine the relative contribution of the variables for each pair of comparison groups in the assessment of their commitment.

It was found that, given their socio-economic status, the urban and external migrants should be highly urbanized. And that given this urban experience, the urban born should also have, in general, a high degree of urban commitment. However, the situation appears somewhat different when the attitudes of the respondents are considered with respect to their preferences in places of living, in terms of rural or urban areas. Specifically, the urban born would be more inclined to live in rural areas than the rural born. This picture contradicts the one usually assumed or presented in newly developing countries, i.e. one in which the urbanites (born and raised in town) rarely move to the country and also one in which rural-urban migrants apart from keeping contact with their families in the form of visits or economic support, seldom In highly urbanized countries urbanites migrate back to rural areas. or rural migrants also rarely move to rural areas, and if it happens it is mainly among older age groups. Among our respondents this is not the case since we found that the people most inclined to live in rural areas are those of the prime working age groups. The commitment to urban life, being somewhat independent not only of the origin of the respondent but also of the proportion of his adulthood spent in urban areas, appeared unusual at first glance.

However, it was found that respondents negatively committed to urban life were members of the lower socio-economic strata of Belize. This suggests that they are not necessarily committed to rural life but rather that they are in search of a better economic status, be it found in either rural or urban areas. Furthermore, the great majority of the respondents (again among the low income bracket) who wished to migrate to an American city considered migration to the rural areas as a first step in order to accumulate the cash necessary for emigration. The refusal to move to rural areas in highly urbanized countries is generally assumed to be an indication of upward mobility; in the case of newly developing countries it is seen as the emergence of class and status ranking. In Belize class differentiation is essentially along economic divisions, and a desire to move to rural areas is considered here to be a part of the upward mobility process since, in recent years, the districts have undergone more economic progress than the Capital. We saw that, in fact, upward mobility was not always achieved by inter-urban migrations but also by rural-urban and urban-rural-urban migrations. It follows that a desire to move to rural areas, in our sample, is not an indication of the absence of aspiration to higher socio-economic status but a positive response to shifting economic opportunities which could, in fact, improve the socio-economic status of the individual.

We can therefore conclude that the country's degree of urbanization is far greater than what either the demographic index or a first glance at its unique city would lead us to believe. It can

be argued that the factor mainly responsible for this phenomenon is the type of economy practised until recently, i.e. a logwood economy which contributed to the maintenance of a constant link between the Capital and the interior. Furthermore, the country was never isolated from outside influences since immigration and the return of previous emigrants was a constant factor in its history, and is still a prominent characteristic. Consequently the inhabitants adjusted more rapidly to an urban value system than their counterparts in African or Latin American countries, and what appears to be rural commitment on the part of some respondents is, in fact, a positive answer to decentralization or "rationalized geographical mobility".

Furthermore factor analysis was revealed useful in establishing the factor scores between the different groups compared and in determining, in the context of the population interviewed, which groups corresponded to the different socio-economic strata of Belize when considered in relation to their origin and to their patterns of migration. The urban born appeared, in general, to have a higher status than the rural born. However, when sub-categories were analysed it was found that the majority of the lower class members of the sample were non-migrants which implies that migration was an effective way to acquire a better status. Discriminant analysis helped greatly in determining the order of importance of the variables between groups that were highly heterogeneous; this was true mainly in the case of the urban/rural attitudes and preferences of the respondents. It also helped to clarify the elements that were

important in distinguishing between those positively and negatively committed to urban life.

The two techniques used give only profiles of the groups studied and therefore have to be complemented by a single perspective approach (i.e. the consideration of one variable at a time), if one wishes to understand the exact contribution of the variables. Nevertheless, they are of very great value in aiding the analysis of the interplay of the variables retained and are clearly superior to an augmentation of the single perspective approach either by a purely qualitative assessment of this interplay or by crude variance analyses. And, in spite of the limitations, in their usage on qualitative data they were proven satisfactory in the sense that no contradictions were found when our multi and single perspectives were compared.

APPENDIX 1

Schedule: Information on each respondent

- 1. Respondent: Household number, person number, e.g. 12, 2
- 2. Sex
- 3. Age

4. Relation to household head

5. Level of education

6. Place of birth

7. Father's place of birth

8. Mother's place of birth

9. Marital status

- a) union status
- b) living with spouse
- 1 yes2 - no (a) why

(b) actual address

- c) single with children
- 1 yes 2 - no

10. Number of children in household (under 17)

- a) relationship to head
- b) sex
- c) age
- d) place of birth

11. Respondent's children abroad

- a) sex
- b) age
- c) marital status
- d) place of birth
- e) actual address
- f) particular reason for being away

- 12. Occupations in Belize
 - a) number
 - b) types
 - c) employers
- 13. Female labour engagement
 - a) Housewives

- married, still working
- not working presently
- b) Single females . with children
- c) Single females . without children
- 14. Actual address
- 15. House tenure
- 16. Condition of the house
 - a) exterior
 - b) interior
 - c) materials
- 17. Moves in Belize
 - a) number
 - b) areas
- 18. Residence outside Belize City
 - a) where b) how long c) when 1 - childhood
 - 2 adolesence
 - 3 adulthood
 - d) occupations for each place
- 1 number 2 - types

- c) length of time for each place

1 - worked

- 1 worked before getting married 2 - worked after getting married
- 3 worked before and after getting
- 4 worked before and after marriage,
- 5 never worked
- 1 worked before having children etc., see 13 a)
- 2 never worked

19. Places visited

a) where b) how long

c) reasons

20. Reasons for living in Belize

21. Reactions to the offer to move to rural areas

a) acceptance 1 - why 2 - where b) refusal 1 - why

22. Preference to move outside British Honduras

- a) where
- b) why

23. Possibility of changing job

- a) preferences
- b) reasons

24. Languages spoken

- a) fluently
- b) partially
- c) restriction in getting ajob because of languages spoken
- 25. (a) Religion (b) Religion of children

.

- 26. Race
- 27. Address of visitors

APPENDIX 2

List of Tables for cross-tabulated data

Respondents classified as migrants and non-migrants (see Table 3.1) according to

- 1. Age
- 2. Education
- 3. Place of birth in relation to that of parents
 - a) identical
 - b) from rural or urban areas
- 4. Marital status
- 5. Family structure
- 6. Professional skill
- 7. Number of different types of jobs in Belize
- 8. Number of different types of jobs outside Belize
- 9. Occupations identical in Belize and outside
- 10. Attitudes towards the possibility of changing job
- 11. Unemployment
- 12. Female attitudes towards labour
- 13. Actual address, tenure, condition of the house
- 14. Addresses in Belize
- 15. Number of moves in Belize and age
- 16. Mean of residence in Belize
- 17. Proportion of time spent in a city during adulthood
- 18. Percentage of life spent in continuous residence in a city

- 19. Moves: where; when; why
- 20. Attitudes towards town life
- 21. Preferences in places of living
- 22. Addresses of close relatives (spouse, children) abroad
- 23. Places visited: where; why; how long
- 24. Languages spoken
- 25. Race
- 26. Religion
BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anderson, T.W.	An Introduction to Multivariate Statistical Analysis.
1958	New York, John Wiley and Sons Inc.
Ashcraft, N.	"Some Aspects of Domestic Organization in British
n.d.	Honduras". Unpublished paper.
Ashcraft, N. and (n.d.	Grant, C. "The Development and Organization of Education in British Honduras". Unpublished paper.
Balandier, G.	Sociologie des Brazzavilles noires. Paris,
1955	Librairie Armande Colin.
Bascom, W.	"The Urban African and his World". Les Cahiers
1963	d'Etudes africaines 4:163-185.
Breeze, G.	Urbanization in Newly Developing Countries.
1966	Englewood Cliffs, Prentice Hall.
Brisseau, J. 1963	"Les "Barrios" de Petare: Faubourgs populaires d'une Banlieue de Caracas". Les Cahiers d'Outre-Mer 16:5-42.
British Honduras, 1967	Central Planning Unit Annual Abstract of Statistics. Belize City. Aug. No.5.
British Honduras,	Education Department
1966	Annual Report. Belize City, Printing Department.
British Honduras,	Labour Department
1966	Annual Report. Belize City, Printing Department.
1964	Manpower Assessment Report. Belize City, Printing Department Vol. 1.
1967	Manpower Report. Belize City, Printing Depart- ment. March No. 3.

171

.

Browning, H.L. 1967

"Urbanization and Modernization in Latin America: the Demographic Perspective". In The Urban Explosion in Latin America, a Continent in Process of Modernization. Beyer, H.(ed.), Ithaca, New York, Cornell University Press, 71-116.

• • `

Caiger, S.L. 1951

British Honduras, Past and Present. London, George Allen and Unwin, Ltd.

Carey-Jones, N.S.

1953 The Pattern of a Dependent Economy, the National Income of British Honduras. Cambridge, University Press.

Census, British Honduras

1946 see West Indian Census.

1960 see West Indies Population Census.

Sampling Techniques.

and Sons, (sec.ed.)

Cochran, W.G. 1963

Craig, A.K. 1969

"Logwood as a Factor in the Settlement of British Honduras". Caribbean Studies 9:53-62.

New York, John Wiley

Crawford, C. 1966 Analytic Methods of Rotation in the Determination of the Number of Factors. Unpublished PhD thesis, McGill University.

Davis, K. 1968

"The Urbanization of the Human Population". In Urbanism in World Perspective: a Reader. Fava, S.F. (ed.), New York, Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 32-45.

Dewey, R. 1960

"The Rural-Urban Continuum: Real but relatively Unimportant". American Journal of Sociology 66: 60-66.

- Dixon, W.J.(ed.) 1968 Biomedical Computer Programs: "Discriminant Analysis for Several Groups". Berkeley and Los Angeles, University of California Press, No.2. BMD05M: 196-203.
 - Donohue, W.A. 1946 A History of British Honduras. Montreal, Provincial Publishing Co., Ltd.

Eldridge, H.T. and Thomas, D.S. 1964 Demographic Analyses and Interrelations. American Philosophical Society. Memoirs. Vol. 61.

- Elkan, W.
 - 1967 "Circular Migration and the Growth in Towns in East Africa". International Labour Review 96: 581-589.

Encyclopedia Britannica

1966 Tordesillas, Treaty of. Chicago: Encyclopedia Britannica, Inc.22: 301-302.

Germani, G. 1961

"Inquiry into the Social Effects of Urbanization in a Working-Class Sector of Greater Buenos Aires". In Urbanization in Latin America. Hauser, P. M. (ed.) New York, International Documents Service, 206-233.

1967 "The City as an Integrating Mechanism". In The Urban Explosion in Latin America, a Continent in Process of Modernization. Beyer, G.H. (ed.), Ithaca, New York, Cornell University Press, 175-214.

Glass, Y. 1964

"Industrialization and Urbanization in South Africa". In Problems of Transition, Proceedings of the Social Sciences Research Conference: 1962, Holleman, J.F. (ed.), Pietermaritzburg, Natal University Press, 52-80.

Gluckman, M. 1960

Goldstein, S. 1958 "Tribalism in Modern British Central Africa". Les Cahiers d'Etudes africaines 1:55-70.

Patterns of Mobility, 1910-50, the Noristown Study: a Method for measuring Migration and Occupational Mobility in the Community. Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press.

Goode, W.J. "World Revolution and Family Patterns". 1968 In Urbanism in World Perspective: a Reader. Fava, S.F. (ed.), New York, Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 281-286. Grunewald, D. 1965 "The Anglo-Guatemalan Dispute over British Honduras". Caribbean Studies 5: 17-43. Gutkind, P.C.W. 1965 "African Urbanism Mobility and the Social Network". International Journal of Comparative Sociology 6:48-60. 1966 "African Urban Family Life and the Urban System". Journal of Asian and African Studies 1:35-42. Harman, H.H. 1960 Modern Factor Analysis. Chicago, University of Chicago Press. Harris, C.W. 1967 "On Factors and Factor Scores". Psychometrica 32: 363-379. Hellman, E. 1956 "The Development of Social Groupings among Urban Africans in the Union of South Africa". In The Social Implications of Industrialization and Urbanization in Africa, South of the Sahara. Paris, UNESCO, 724-743. Hoel, P.G. 1960 Elementary Statistics. New York, John Wiley and Sons, Inc. Horst, P. 1965 Factor Analysis of Data Matrices. New York, Holt, Rinehart and Wilson. Jefferson, M. 1939 "The Law of the Primate City". Geographical Review 29:226-232. Jenkins, G. "Africa as it urbanizes: an Overview of Current 1967

Research". Urban Affairs Quarterly 2:66-80.

174

Jones, L.V. and 1 1960	Bock, D.R. "Multiple Discriminant Analysis applied to "Ways to Live" Ratings from Six Cultural Groups". Sociometry 23: 162-176.
Kackowski, H.R. 1956	and Rothney, W.M. "Discriminant Analysis in Evaluation of Counseling". The Personnel and Guidance Journal 35:231-235.
Kaiser, H.F. 1958	"The Varimax Criterion for Analytic Rotation in Factor Analysis". Psychometrica 23:187-200.
Kendall, M.G. 1961	A Course in Multivariate Analysis. New York, Hafner Rublishing Co. (sec. ed.).
Latin American Ro 1968	eport "A New Look at Belize (British Honduras)". A Latin American Report Special, New Orleans, International Trade Mart.
Lawley, D.N. and 1963	l Maxwell, A.E. Factor Analysis as a Statistical Method. London, Butterworths.
Lee, E.S. 1967	"A Theory of Migration". Ekistics 24:211-216.
Leeds, A. 1968	"The Anthropology of Cities: Some Methodological Issues". In Urban Anthropology: Research Perspectives and Strategies. Eddy, E.M. (ed.), Athens, University of Georgia Press, 31-47.
Lipet, S.M. and B 1968	endix, R. "The Patterns of Opportunity in Large Cities". In Urbanism in World Perspective: a Reader. Fava, S.F. (ed.), New York, Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 322-328.
Little, K. 1957	"The Role of Voluntary Associations in West African Urbanization". American Anthropologist 59: 579-596.
1960	"West African Urbanization as a Social Process". Les Cahiers d'Etudes africaines 1:90-102.

Lopes, J.R.B. 1961 "Aspects of the Adjustment of Rural Migrants to Urban-Industrial Conditions in Sao Paulo, Brazil". In Urbanization in Latin America, Hauser, P.M.(ed.), New York, International Documents Service, 234-248. Lux, A. 1962 Le Marché du Travail en Afrique noire. Louvain, Editions E. Nauwelaerts. Mangalam, J.J. and Schwarzweller, H.K. "General Theory in the Study of Migration: Current 1968 Needs and Difficulties". International Migration Review 3:3-18. Manpower Assessment Report 1964 see British Honduras. Labour Department. Manpower Report 1967 see British Honduras. Labour Department. Marchand, B. 1966 "Les Ranchos de Caracas: Contributions à l'Etude des Bidonvilles". Les Cahiers d'Outre-Mer 19:105-143. Matos Mar, J. 1961 "Migrations and Urbanization: the 'Barriedas' of Lima: an Example of Integration into Urban Life ". In Urbanization in Latin America. Hauser, P.M. (ed.), New York, International Documents Service, 170-190. Mayer, P. 1962 "Migrancy and the Study of Africans in Towns". American Anthropologist 64: 572-592. McDonald, R.P. and Burr, E.J. 1967 "A Comparison of Four Methods of Constructing Factor Scores". Psychometrica 32: 381-401. Meadows, P. and Mizruchi, E.H.(eds.) Urbanism, Urbanization and Change: Comparative 1969 Perspectives. Introduction. Massachusetts, Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1-8.

176

Mitchell,	J.C.
1956	

"Urbanization, Detribalization and Stabilization in Southern Africa: A Problem of Definition and Measurement". In Social Implications of Industrialization and Urbanization in Africa Paris, UNESCO, 724-743. South of the Sahara.

1969 "Urbanization, Detribalization, Stabilization and

Urban Commitment in Southern Africa: A Problem of Definition and Measurement: 1968. In Urbanism, Urbanization and Change: Comparative Perspectives. Meadows, P. and Mizruchi, E.H.(eds.), Massachusetts, Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 470-493.

Mitchell, J.C. and Shaul, J.R.H. 1965 "An Approach to the Measurement of Commitment to Urban Residence". In Science and Medicine in Central Africa. Snowball, G. (ed.), London, Pergamon Press, 625-633.

Mitchell, Sir Harold 1967

Caribbean Patterns, A Political and Economic Study of the Contemporary Caribbean. Edinburgh, W. and R. Chambers, Ltd.

Morrison, D.F. 1967

Multivariate Statistical Methods. New York, McGraw-Hill Series in Probability and Statistics.

Pearse, A. 1961

"Some Characteristics of Urbanization in the City of Rio de Janiero". In Urbanization in Latin Hauser, P.M. (ed.), New York, America. International Documents Service, 191-205.

Rodriguez, M. 1965

Safa, H.I. 1964

"From Shanty Town to Public Housing: A Comparison of Family Structures in Two Urban Neighbourhoods in Puerto Rico". Caribbean Studies 4:3-12.

New Jersey, Prentice-Hall Inc.

Secretariat of the Economic Commission for Latin America. 1961 "Creation of Employment Opportunities in Relation to Labour Supply". In Urbanization in Latin America. Hauser, P.M. (ed.), New York, International Documents Service, 118-148.

Central America.

- 1967 "The Assimilation of Migrants to Cities: Anthropological and Sociological Contributions". In Urban Research and Policy Planning. Schnore, L.F. and Fagin, H. (eds.), Urban Affairs Annual Reviews. Beverley Hills, Sage Publications. 1:49-75.
- Shryock, H.S. 1964 Population Mobility within the United States. Chicago, Community and Family Study Center, University of Chicago.

Smith, R.T. 1960 "The Family in the Caribbean". In Caribbean Studies: A Symposium. Rubin, V.(ed.), Seattle, University of Washington Press. (sec.ed.), 67-75.

- Smith, T.L. 1963 Brazil, People and Institutions. Baton Rouge, Louisiana State University Press.
- Solien de Gonzalez, N.L.
 - 1961 "Family Organization in Five Types of Migratory Wage Labor". American Anthropologist 63: 1264-1281.
 - 1969 Black Carib Household Structure: a Study of Migration and Modernization. Seattle, University of Washington Press.
- United Nations. The Population Branch Bureau of Social Affairs. 1961 "Demographic Aspects of Urbanization in Latin America". In Urbanization in Latin America. Hauser, P.M. (ed.), New York, International Documents Service, 91-117.
- United Nations. Department of Economic and Social Affairs. 1960 Demographic Yearbook, 1960, Twelfth Issue. Statistical Office. New York, U.N. Tables 7 and 9. Pp. 285-348; 373-395.
 - 1968a Demographic Yearbook, 1967. Nineteenth Issue. Statistical Office. New York, U.N. Tables 5 and 6. Pp. 132-230.
 - 1968 Urbanization: Development Policies and Planning. International Social Development Review. No. 1. New York, U.N.

مصديدة المارجة المراجعة المراجعة وتعاديان

Vennetier, P. 1963	''L'Urbanization et ses Conséquences au Congo'' (Brazzaville). Les Cahiers d'Outre-Mer 16: 263-280.
Vera, O. 1963	"The Educational Situation and Requirements in Latin America". In Social Aspects of Economic Development in Latin America. Vries, E.D. and Echavarria, J.M. (eds.), Belgium, UNESCO. 1: 279-307.
Waddell, D.A.G. 1961	British Honduras, A Historical and Contemporary Survey. London, Oxford University Press.
1967	The West Indies and the Guianas. New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, Inc.
West Indian Censı 1946	is Census of British Honduras. Part E. Kingston, Jamaica, Department of Statistics.
West Indies Popul 1960	ation Census Census of British Honduras. Jamaica Tabulation Center. Kingston, Jamaica, Department of Statistics, Vols.I and II.
Wilson, G. 1941	"An Essay on the Economics of Detribalization in Northern Rhodesia". Rhodes-Livingston Paper. Livingstone, Rhodes-Livingstone Institute. Part 1 No. 5.
Wingo, L. 1967	"Recent Patterns of Urbanization among Latin American Countries". Urban Affairs Quarterly 2: 81-109.
Wirth, L. 1938	"Urbanism as a Way of Life". American Journal of Sociology 144:1-24.
Wood, E.W. 1968	"The Implications of Migrant Labour for Urban Social Systems in Africa". Les Cahiers d'Etudes africaines 8:5-31.

a har tali asirina ke