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ABSTRACT

Migration takes so many forms and all these have their own challenges, constraints and motivation. In view of this, it is important to identify some of these travel constraints and also further identify the information channels used by some of the migrants and their perceptions about embassies. Against this backdrop, this study examined students’ perception about how embassies influence destination choice, travel constraints and migration information channels on University of Ghana Campus. It specifically examined perception about how embassies influence destination choice and established preferred migration information channels. It also determined perception of potential migrants about travel constraints based on demographic profile of respondents. Drawing on the push pull and network theories of migration, the various factors motivating students to migrate were also examined. Using the case of students of University of Ghana campus, a simple random sampling method was used in selecting 114 students for the questionnaire survey and a focus group discussion was also conducted. The results indicate that majority of respondents have had an encounter with an embassy before via visa application. However, students’ engagement with an embassy were not aligned to a specific sex, age group and level students were in the university. Respondents rated the rate of issuance of visas and the friendly attitude of staffs at the Chinese and Netherland’s embassies very high as compared to the UK, USA and Canada, albeit majority of students preferred to travel to the UK and USA. With respect to respondents ’preferred migration information channels, majority of respondents prefer travel agencies, online portals and family and friends as their information channels as compared to newspapers. Factors such as financial constraints, emerging immigration policies, family attachments, complex requirements and documentations of embassies and long distance to destination regions were some of the perceived travel constraints confronting students. Also, the results suggest that, how one perceives the various problems travelers encounter when migrating or travelling is not aligned with a specific sex, age or level of education on the university of Ghana campus. The study further established that factors such as employment opportunities, better living condition or other economic motives, existing peace and stability within destination countries, the need to experience social and cultural diversity, the need to further one’s education and strong family ties are some of the reasons why students intend to migrate. Consequently, the study recommends the tailoring of appropriate travel packages by various travel agencies that will help in averting most of the travelling constraints confronting students.
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

According to Okólski (2012), migration has been relatively classified as the most unpredictable phenomenon with which precise forecasting of the exact values of immigration flows is virtually impossible. The complexities of the migration phenomenon and problem have aroused the study of the phenomenon from a multi disciplinary approach. Disciplines from classical anthropology to economics, geography to sociology and economics have tried to explain certain aspects of migration with different theoretical backing. International migration has been analysed at the macro and micro level with the macro theories dealing specifically on structural conditions such as politics, economics, demographic, cultural, legal, or ecological. The micro theories on the other hand try to explain the theory at an individual level focusing on how structural conditions influence the decision-making and behaviour of individuals, families and groups.

With increasing levels of number of international migrants worldwide i.e from 232 million in 2013 to 244 million in 2015 (IOM Global Migration Data Analysis Center, 2015), issues of migration continue to surge. The United Nation Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UNDESA) estimates that in 2010 there were some 214 million international migrants worldwide, representing three per cent of the total global population as cited by (IOM & UNDESA, 2012).

In 2000 Africa contributed an estimate of 16 million to the international migrant stock (UN, 2003). Contextual viewpoints of physical movements and settlement as against social imaginary (Gupta, 2016) could be reasons why migration continues to be the most unattended phenomenon with minimum attention. As part of efforts to curb the growing concern of the migration situation, Ghana launched the National Migration Policy in 2016 to help reap the benefits and provide a guideline in managing migration related issues. Beutin (2006), argues that migrant’s perception could be altered based on the information they have. State and non state institution like embassies, travel agencies, family, friends and advocating groups can consciously contribute to the control of demand and
supply. A lot of scholastic work has been done on migrants’ role as a decision maker in choosing a
destination of choice. These theories have assumed that the process of “choosing” and “going” is a
unilinear path without consideration for barriers and obstacles. There are challenges migrants have to
face during this process of which some could be the attitude of embassy staff, the issuance of visa, the
cost of travel, and the distance to destination among others. Because migrants’ perception, constraints
and policy have the tendency to affect each other. However, conglomeration of individual’s decision
has been theorized to mean they have assumed that the social process is simply the aggregation of
individual decisions.

International migration is a growing phenomenon, both in scope and in complexity, affecting almost
all countries in the world. The relationship between intentions and behaviour is basic to micro-level
migration decision research. Migration has been relatively classified as the most unpredictable
phenomenon that exists (King, 2002). The multi-disciplinary approach has several viewpoints
contributing to its complexities. Studies conducted in rural Philippine province of Ilocos Norte,
provides evidence on personal and structural background factors and value-expectancy perceptions of
place utility that predict migration intentions and behavior (Dejong et al, 1986).

In the Ghanaian context, most of the tertiary students often travel to European countries especially
during the summer. Most of these travels are mostly based on family visits, family reunion, or to seek
for temporal employment opportunities – often referred to as “travel and work abroad”. All these
have social, political, economic and cultural implications on the migration. For instance, some
anecdotal evidence suggests that, the processes involved in the visa acquisition and other travel
expenses are often tedious and expensive. Also, most travellers or potential migrants are confronted
with several challenges or constraints.

1.2 Problem statement

Globally, almost all countries have ratified one or more international legal instrument (Seighart,
1983). Ghana not being an exception have ratified 6 major global legal instruments. Among these
instruments are the 1951 Refugee convention, 1967 Refugee protocol, the 1990 UN migrant worker convention and the 2000 Human trafficking and smuggling protocol.

According to Ghana youth policy (2010), youth in Ghana are face with increasing uncertainty in their hope of undergoing a satisfactory transition in the labour market and therefore rely on other avenues of which migration is one of the topmost among all other factors. With University of Ghana as a case study, approximately 5000 students graduate every year (UG online report, 2017) juxtaposed with current unemployment rate at 10 percent (ILOSTATS, 2016) have paid way for graduates and skilled personnel to rely on further studies at destination countries to better equip and train themselves to impact positively on their return. In their quest to migrate many faces a lot of uncertainty and disillusionment regarding embassies, travelling constraints and migration information channels on destinations.

However, several studies have focused on immigration rules and visa restrictions by various destination countries (Silvey, 2004; Haugen, 2012) without paying much attention on potential migrant’s perceptions about embassies and their ability to grant visas to prospective applicants. By pointing ways in which conventional binary opposition like facilitators/ control/legal/illegal, perceptions/real are mutually constitutive to individual perception, the study seek to highlight some of the gaps enumerated and limitations of our understanding of international migration.

1.3 General objectives

To determine perception about embassies, travel constraint and preferred migration information channel amongst students university of Ghana (UG) Legon campus.

1.3.1 Specific objectives

1. To find out potential migrants perceptions about embassies and their choice of destination.
2. To ascertain potential migrants sources of migration information on their decision making.
3. To examine potential migrants travelling constraints and motivation factors to the destination countries.

4. To offer suggestions on how to formulate strategies to handle travelling challenges and perceptions about embassies.

1.4 Research questions

1. What are migrants’ perceptions about embassies that influence their destination choice?
2. What are the sources of migration information channels?
3. What are the travelling constraints and motivation factors do migrants have about destination countries?
4. What are some of the recommendations necessary to increase travel demand?

1.5 Justification of study

In view of the strategic role migration plays in improving the status of the migrants and their left-behind families, any attempt to restrict one’s movement through travelling and visa acquisition is worrisome. However, when it comes to visa application and acquisition, potential migrants views are strenuous especially the procedures one goes through in order to get a visa (Groenendijik, 2011). This create uncertainties coupled with fear anytime potential migrants have to face embassies to get visas.

Considering the above challenges, finance which happens to be a constraint of most travelers and migrants (Khan, 2011), becomes an intriguing aspect of this phenomenon since other wealthy individuals that would not consider finance as a constraint are yet discourage to travel. A critical study into migrants and potential migrant’s perceptions about embassies and it related issues such as travelling constraints will help identify reasons that discourage people from travelling. Hence increasing demand for travel. This study will further identify some of the information channels used by migrants and travelers and their motivation to travel. As such relevant measures will be put in place to help mitigate the issues pertaining to travel with the aim of increasing travel demand.
1.6 Organization of the study

The work is grouped into five chapters. Chapter One which is the first chapter presents the background of the study, problem statement, objective of the study, research question, significance of the study and organization of the study. It is followed by Chapter Two, which include the literature review and relevant issues. Chapter Three identifies the methodology of the study. Here it presents the procedure for the data analysis, the study area, sampling techniques, data collection. Chapter Four shows results and discussion. Finally, Chapter Five presents a summary of findings, Conclusions and recommendation.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

This chapter presents a review of some literature important to the topic. Literature reviewed look at
the overview of migration, travel and motivation factors public perception amidst globalization, travel
constraints, migrants’ perceptions about embassies and migrants information channels.

2.2 An overview of migration, travel and motivation factors

Migration, by its very nature, involves at least three major actors: the migrant, the area or country of
origin and the area or country of destination (Adepoju, 1998). Not until recently, the issues of
migration were dealt with at the macro and micro level that focused mainly on the origin and
destination country. From classical anthropology through sociology and demography to economic and
political studies (Pakot and Robert, 2014) the migrant’s views remained of little concern. In Africa, as
elsewhere in the developing regions, the historical evolution and stages of political development have
shaped the migration patterns from the colonial to post independence era. Hence, a thorough
understanding of migration means an in-depth understanding of the migrant’s perceptions, inhibitors
and the nuances, distinctions and linkages between internal and international migration (Adepoju,
1998). According to Esipova et al, (2015), countries generally develop their immigration policies in
response to labour market needs and in accordance with their demographic objectives. Establishing
whether potential migrants model their attitudes towards migration after existing national immigration
policies or whether such policies reflect the public will, Esipova et al, 2015) says it is unlikely for
potential migrants to adhere to it.

Psychologists have it that, there are certain inherent biases that lead human beings in making very
often-irrational decisions and judgments. These cognitive biases as referred, play a role in influencing
one’s thinking one way or the other. In a complex world we live in, routines and formal institutions
serving as stakeholders in the migration industry establish more or less fixed human actions to supply
information to migrants. According to Pheby (1989), institutions and routines, other than acting simply as rigidities and constraints, enable decision and actions by providing more or less reliable information regarding the likely actions of others. The fact that institutions and stakeholders have a cognitive function and individual’s taste and preferences are malleable and likely to change or adapt, then the behavior, objectives or preferences of individuals can be molded by the very same institutions as illustrated in the same theoretic framework expressed by Schotter (1981).

In Beutin (2006) publication for the European Union in 2006, it reiterated that though there is a need for policy to look at issues of labor market disparity, hostility towards migrants has led to restrictive policies and strain in the integration agenda. It recommended, however, that until the issues of public perception of migration and for that matter migrants is explicitly addressed, none of the policy responses towards migration shall be effective. According to (de Haas, 2014), conceptualizing migration as a function of peoples’ capabilities and aspirations to move can help to achieve a richer understanding of migration behavior. Hence, understanding the perception migrants have about embassies, related travel constraints to their particular destinations, give the fundamental background for effective and sustainable policy implementation and delivery. In 2016, Ghana produced a National Migration Policy seeking to address the ever-growing emigration and immigration in Ghana. The policy, which focuses on broadening regional and international dialogue on migration with the objective of fostering cooperation and harmonizing instruments with national policies, is daunting. More especially, there are differences in policy governing all governments in relation to migration. State-centric theories have informed us that governments view point about migration continue to vary depending on a country’s interest and perspective as to whether a country would look at the national interest as a starting point of analysis or the collective bargain of inter-states. According to the Ghana Migration Policy, it support the assertion that building capacity of government institution, civil society and private sector in management of migration is key to forestalling the problems faced with migration in the country. Key in achieving this thematic area is to address the perceptions of migrants or potential migrants to have knowledge about embassies who in other words represent the government’s mission in other countries
Liberalists and realists have had different ways of dealing with migrants from an inter-governmental point of view. Migrants who are the real actors in the migration process have been neglected. By understanding the perception carried by migrants, we can help with worrying signs of deteriorating commitment to global cooperation. States are stepping back from mechanisms set up to underpin international security through mutual accountability and respect for common norms (World Economic Report, 2017). With countries like the USA exiting from major partnership agreements like the Trans Pacific Partnership, the withdrawal from Comprehensive Action plans like the Paris Climate Change Agreement, then there is a cause to believe that a phenomenon such as migration is gradually going to be approached from an individualistic governmental point of view and not from an inter governmental level. The phenomenon of globalization has challenged the way in which geopolitical boundaries are changing the traditional boundaries of states. This also in one way or the other affect the way migration is perceived from both public perspectives to individual perspectives.

2.3 Public perception amidst globalization

People have been guided or misled by certain ideas informed by their environment to be either the reality or the façade. Perception is defined by Sharma (2016) as the recognition and interpretation of sensory information including how we respond to the information. She further explains perception as “a process of taking in sensory information from our environment and using that information in order to interact with our environment” (Sharma, 2016:45). It further confirmed that information plays a very vital role in the formation of perception. Public perceptions of migration vary with time and place and are often shaped by contextual factors (UNWYR, 2013). During periods of economic recession, when unemployment levels are high, migrants may be viewed with disfavor and even hostility, especially in transit and destination countries (UNWYR, 2013). Simon and Alexander (1993) endorse the hypothesis that perception of immigrants is more negative amongst the lower status as cited by Fetzer (2000). Other school of thought have it that, in countries of origin, emigrants and their children—even those born abroad—may be considered unpatriotic and are seen by some to have abandoned their home countries. In certain cases, young return migrants must deal with the
perception that their return is due to their failure abroad. In other settings, migrants living outside their
countries or returning home are recognized as heroes. Positive perceptions about migration in
countries of origin can also influence the decisions of potential migrants to venture abroad, especially
when they are given the opportunity to interact with successful migrants and returnees.

Lahav (2004) suggest that there is a disjoint between the public opinion and policy implementation,
in bridging the attitudinal policy gap. Immigrants have had to respond to bad public perception by
shaping their identities to accentuate an image of hard workers whilst strenuously digressing from an
image as criminals (Menjívar, 2016).

2.4 Travel constraints

Travel constraints has been widely studied in the literature, however, only a few articles have used the
theory in a tourism context. Gilbert and Hudon’s (2000) study of a ski market found that non-skiers
were constrained by intra-personal constraints, whereas skiers were constrained by time, family, or
economic factors. Their study also discovered that structural constraints such as cost had the utmost
constraints score. Also, Fleischer and Pizam (2002) studied constraints to travel among Israeli seniors
and found that leisure time, discretionary income, and health were the key constraints for seniors.

According to Backman and Crompton (1989:60) the term constraints was define as obstructions that
impede peoples’ activities. Within the tourism industries Constraints act as sieves for tourism demand,
impeding the potential tourist to engage in travel even though a motivation to travel may exist (Page
& Hall, 2003:30). In this regard, when the constraints exist people’s demand for travel will be
inhibited. A review of literature revealed that travel constraints could be personal or work related and
even economic related. Also, in the leisure constraint model which was proposed by Crawford and
Godbey (1987:81) and was further expounded by Crawford, Jackson, and Godbey (1991) that
leisure-related activities is inhibited by three scopes of constraints: intrapersonal, interpersonal, and
structural. Intrapersonal constraints are individual psychological states and attributes that affect
decisions, rather than intervening between preference and participation and, lead to nonparticipation
(Crawford and Godbey 1987). They further opined that that intrapersonal constraints could include lack of interest, stress, depression, anxiety, religiosity, kin and non-kin reference group attitude, and perceived self-skill. Intrapersonal constraints are somewhat unstable and may show some variation within a short period. Interpersonal constraints occur because of unavailability of other people, which prevents an individual from participating in activities that require at least one partner or in which there is a strong preference for a co-participant. Individuals experience this constraint when they are unable to find a friend, family member, or partner to participate with them in the activities of interest. On the part of interpersonal constraint, there is an interaction between both preferences and participation (Crawford and Godbey 1987). These types of constraints are likely to show some variations across life stages and largely depend on marital status, family size, and types of activities (Garbarino, 2017). Structural constraints are the intervening factors between leisure preference and participation (Crawford and Godbey 1987). Examples of structural constraints include lack of time, money, opportunity, information and access, and bad weather (Walker and Virden, 2005). With regard to personal travel constraints, finance can be viewed as the main limiting travel constraint to partake in leisure and recreational activities (Gilbert & Hudson, 2000:910; Nyaupane & Andereck, 2007:435; Saayman, 2000:40). According to Shaw (1975) "the guiding premise to this approach is that man is economically rational, an economic maximizer, and that he will perceive and evaluate migration on this basis. Given this premise, if significant economic correlates of migration are observed, then, on the basis of objective inference, subjective economic motives are imputed to migrants" (pp. 59-60). It could however be considered that migrants could be motivated to migrate if the economic condition of the receiving country is most favorable. On the contrary, if the economic correlates in the receiving country turn to be negative migrants will not be willing to migrate. According to Portes, (1976) the direction and magnitude of migration focus on the impact of the movement, but it does not explain individual migrant behavior. Carneiro and Crompton (2010:460) also found that the stage of family life-cycle impede potential travelers from travelling as individuals with small children often prefer not to travel. It was mentioned that children could experience discomfort with their ears when flying, thereby preventing families with children from considering travelling abroad by air (Willacy, 2011:1).
Again, Goeldner & Ritchie (2003:319), affirmed that the primary family member cannot be able to travel if the family member is ill and considering that the illness is severe. Furthermore, distance to the destination is another travel constraint as stated by (Carneiro & Crompton, 2010:461). McKercher and Lew (2003) also added that distance to destination serves as a constraint. Willacy (2011:1) added that deep vein thrombosis could occur from sitting for an extended period of time. This implies that travelling that involve long hours will be avoided by some travelers. Even with the above regarded constraints, geographical location (considering culture, political, social and economic possibilities) can affect individual’s decision of what they regard as a constraint and in a sense impact their propensity to migrate. This is echoed by Clark, (1985); Murphy, (1989); Wolch and Dear, (1993) where they stated clearly that geographic circumstances fundamentally influence decisions made by public policy makers.

The demographic profile of the individual also has a bearing on the decision of individuals and can also serve as a constraint. In this case, considering the demographic profile potential migrants can have a varied decision as to what their travel constraints are and in a sense make any prior decisions on migration. According to Cederholm (2014:1), demographical profile of the individuals plays an important role in forecasting travel demand. Jonsson and Devonish (2008:401) state that demographical profile should be considered when predicting tourist buying behavior, as it can act as a catalyst for predicting travel constraints and travel preferences. It is reiterated by Burnett and Baker (2001); Smith (1887); and Waitt (1997) that demographic profile such as age, gender, ethnicity, income, and marital status are also frequently used in tourism literature to explain travel constraints. Kattiy and Miller (2009:90) state that travel behavior and travel constraints are significantly different across levels of age, income and life stage. It is reiterated by Nyaupane and Andereck’s (2007:436) that young people within the ages of 30 years and younger as well as older people within the ages of 71 years and older regard travel cost as a constraint whereas those within the age bracket, 31 to 70 years found time as a constraint. Botha, Crompton, and Kim’s (1999) identified three factors of constraints in their study and they include other domains, fear domain, and cost domain. The items under the other domains were primarily related to significant others and conceptualized as
interpersonal constraints, the fear domain was essentially intrapersonal, and the cost domain was structural in nature. The structural domain had the most diverse items including costs, distance from home, and lack of time. Among the constraints, cost was found to be the most vital factor with the highest score. One part of the study will be concentrated on potential migrants’ perception of travel constraints based on demographic profile.

2.5 Migrants’ perception about embassies

Embassy on the other hand, serves as a constraint to most travelers. Most travelers perceive that most embassy workers are not friendly. Also, with the rate of visa issuance and denial and the length of time for visas to be processed. As such, their speed of service is always questionable. As noted by Neumayer (2010:171), “obtaining travel related documents can be seen as a problem for tourists for the following reasons:

1. Additional cost and discontent in applying for visas and other travel related documents before travel commences;
2. The individual having to travel to the embassy or one of the few consulates (for some visas) and often having to wait possibly for hours for any service; and
3. The issuing consulate or embassy sometimes denying the application without giving any reason.”

The above listed reasons by Neumayer (2010:171), can affect individuals decisions to migrate to the destination choice. An objective in the study is to determine the extent migrants’ perception about embassies influences destination choice.

2.6 Migrants’ information channels

The migration information channels concept has received significant attention since it was first suggested (Beaverstock, 1991, 1994; Boyle et al, 1996; Champion, 1994; Cormode, 1994; Garrick, 1991; Tzeng, 1995). Most migrants or travelers depend on intermediaries as a means to bridge the information asymmetry that exists in the travel and tour industries. Basically, potential migrants
depend on intermediaries such as travel agencies online, newspapers, friends and family to help them achieve their motive for migration (employment, education, adventure learn new culture and housing) in another country. The intermediaries range from personal offices of large companies to informal networks of families and friends working on behalf of potential migrants in choosing the destination.

Moutinho (1987) defined information search as an expressed need to consult various sources prior to making a purchase decision. The information channels can be external and internal. Either way, it is necessary for choosing a destination and for making onsite decisions such as travel mode, attractions, location activities, and lodging (Filiatrault and Ritchie 1980; Jenkins 1978; Perdue 1985; Snepenger et al 1990). A search which is internal involves the use of one’s past experiences however if the information is not sufficient enough then one turn to use the external environment. In the case of vacation travel, the search is often generally external, involving significant effort and a variety of information sources (Schul and Crompton, 1983). Internal sources include personal experience, either with the specific destination or with similar destinations. Engel, Blackwell and Miniard (1995) classified migrants’ information sources in commercial or non-commercial and received from personal or impersonal communication. The classification has been made demonstrated in table 2.1
Table 2.1: Classification of information channel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of information</th>
<th>Impersonal</th>
<th>Personal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commercial</strong></td>
<td>Brochures</td>
<td>Auto clubs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guide books</td>
<td>Travel agents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local tourist offices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State travel guides</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-commercial</strong></td>
<td>Magazines</td>
<td>Friends or relatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Newspapers</td>
<td>Highway welcome centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Personal experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Engel, Blackwell and Miniard (1995)*

Findlay and Li (1998), for instance, identified a number of channels necessary for engineers to migrate (newspapers and media; friends and family; professional journals; information from expatriates; immigration agency; intra-company transfer and international institutional linkages).

It is the objective of this study to look into in detail, the preferred migration information channel for migrants. In order to explain personal choices of moving or staying and selection of destination, it is necessary to obtain information from individual migrants.

2.7 Migration and Motivation

Most of the literature has delved into migration and motivation. Migration has being viewed to be primarily motivated by economic motive. According to Shaw (1975), economic opportunities motivates man who is rational and economic maximizer to perceive and valuate migration as the underlining factor in achieving one’s goals. Based on this premise, economic-migration nexus is
significant and serves as a pull factor for potential migrants. "the guiding premise this approach is that man is economically rational, an economic maximizer, and that he will perceive and evaluate migration on this basis. Given this premise, if significant economic correlates of migration are observed, then, on the basis of objective inference,

Portes (1976) contribution to this phenomenon is that it predict the outcome of the magnitude of migration either to the origin or destination but fails to explain the individual attitude of the migrant towards the migration process. Aside economic motivations, issues of globalization has brought to bear the unlimited access to information on opportunities available in other countries coupled with cheap transportation fares encourages mass migration. However, questions have been raised in the literature as to the reason why only some people migrate given that economic correlates affect everyone. A vivid discussion and detailed review of the literature will cite clearly some of the reasons why people migrate.

Long and Hansen (1979) ascertained that job-related reasons (taking new jobs, looking for work and job transfers) accounted for 47 percent of the interstate migration of household in the United States. In the work of Winchie and Carment (1989: ), many reasons why people migrate was cited and some of them include; lack of opportunity for job advancement, lack of suitable job opportunity, lack of suitable employment inadequate income, desire for travel or adventure, close family outside India, to earn money for family responsibilities, inadequate educational facilities for self, poor standard of living, inadequate educational facilities for self, political problems religious discrimination, family asset insufficiency and inadequate housing.

2.8 Theoretical Perspectives

The various literature reviewed thus far especially on the factors motivating students to migrate indicates that some theories of migration can be adopted in explaining some of the objectives of this study. These theories include the push-pull theory and the network theory of migration
2.8.1 The Push-Pull Theory of Migration

While other theories of migration are very relevant in explaining reasons why people migrate, the push pull theory remains one of the important theoretical perspective often used in explaining migration. Even in situation where actors motivating people to migrate are deemed complex and multifaceted, the push pull theory gives a better appreciation of the reasons why people move or do not. This theory was propounded by Lee (1996) to explain migration in relation to push factors at the country of origin and pull factors within the destination regions. The push factors are those unfavourable conditions within the country of origin that influence people to migrate whereas the pull factors are those within the destination countries that attracts them (Dovlo, 2003). Some of these push factors include limited and unattractive postgraduate opportunities, poor governance, low remuneration and poor working conditions among others. The pull factors could be social, financial, economic, political, and cultural. These could include past colonial and cultural ties between source and destination regions, employment opportunities, better prospects for postgraduate studies, family reunification (WHO, 2006; Padarath et al., 2003). Most of these students are motivated by these conditions to migrate.

2.8.2 Network Theory

Within the theoretical ambit of the network theory of migration, various concepts, some assumptions and analysis are adopted in examining reasons why people migrate. Unlike the other migration theories that give much credence to why people migrate or reasons why people move, this theory examines the continuity of migration trends. Vertovec (2002) and Dustmann and Glitz (2005) in their studies reported that, the kinds of networks established or made in destination countries often influence their choice of destination when they intend to migrate. This suggests that where a migrant decides to migrate to is largely contingent on the kind of associations or networks they have in that region. Additionally, this theory gives much credence to the role families, friends, acquaintances and other associated contacts play.
in aiding migrants to settle or prevent them from settling in their destination countries. One can deduce that, this largely enables migrants maintain their relationships back home. Moreover, the form of networks migrants have enables them to settle in and find jobs in their destinations. The study by Dolfin and Genicot (2006) corroborates the view that this theory is very useful in assessing the benefits migrants’ networks provide for their families, friends and communities.
CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY

3.0 Introduction

This chapter describes the methodology for the study. The chapter provides a detailed overview of the main approaches that the study adopts including, research design, data needs, target population, approaches to gathering the data and how the data were analysed and presented.

3.1 The Study Area

The University of Ghana is the oldest and largest of all Ghanaian universities and tertiary institutions. It was founded in 1948 as the University College of the Gold Coast, and was originally an affiliate college of the University of London, which supervised its academic programmes and awarded degrees. It gained full university status in 1961, and now has nearly 40,000 students.

The original emphasis was on the liberal arts, social sciences, basic science, agriculture, and medicine, but (partly as the result of a national educational reform programme) the curriculum was expanded to provide more technology-based and vocational courses and postgraduate training.

The university is mainly based at Legon, about twelve kilometres northeast of the centre of Accra. The medical school is in Korle Bu, with a teaching hospital and secondary campus in the city of Accra. It also has a graduate school of nuclear and allied sciences at the Ghana Atomic Energy Commission, making it one of the few universities on the Africa continent offering programmes in nuclear physics and nuclear engineering.

3.2 Research Design

A mixed method strategy was adopted by the study in order to obtain a thorough understanding of the issues examined and achieve the study’s objectives. Thus, both qualitative and quantitative approaches were relied for achieving the study’s objectives. According to Creswell (2012), mixed methods research is an approach to research in the
social, behavioural, and health sciences in which the researcher collects both quantitative (close-ended) and qualitative (open-ended) data, fused the two data and draws interpretations based on the two sets of data. In view of this, the study combines both quantitative and qualitative methods to generate data for the research to ensure complementarity (Sale et al., 2002, Silva and Wright, 2008). Quantitative approach is very useful for analysing quantifiable data and very apt for generalisation and predictions, considering the fact that it resonates within the positivist’s paradigm (Teye, 2012). However, Branen (1992) and Cresswell (2012) opine that, the quantitative approach is flawed in terms of providing detailed description of peoples’ perceptions, emotions, behaviour and experiences. On the other hand, the qualitative approach gives much precedence to subjective interpretation where people’s behaviour, perceptions and experiences are accounted for. All this notwithstanding, Teye (2012) asserts that these two approaches are complementary in nature and make up for each other’s weaknesses when used together. It is against this backdrop that the study adopted both quantitative and qualitative approaches.

3.3 Data Sources

The study relied on both primary and secondary data sources to achieve its objectives. The primary data were gathered through questionnaire survey and focus group discussions. The secondary data were sourced from books, journals, articles etc.

3.3.1 Primary Data Sources

Questionnaire survey and focus group discussions were used in sourcing primary data for the study

3.3.1.1 Questionnaire Survey

In view of the fact that the study aimed at garnering quantifiable data and making conclusions based on responses given, semi-structured questionnaires were used in collecting the quantitative data. It composed of both close-ended and open-ended questions. The target population were students of the university of Ghana, including diploma (sub-degree), undergraduate and graduate students. The
questionnaire was divided into three sections. The first section covered the background characteristics of respondents. The section looked at how perceptions’ about embassies influence choice of destination and the various perceived constraints travelers are confronted with. The third section covers the preferred information channels and the various factors motivating people to migrate. A pre-testing activity of the data collection instruments was carried out to test the adequacy of the questionnaire in eliciting the needed response. Issues focused on were the construction of the English language, validity and reliability of the questions. It was undertaken in University of Professional Studies, Accra which was not part of the study at hand. This university was chosen because it bears similar characteristics as University of Ghana and also because some students are also known to travel outside during vacations. The pilot study was very helpful because it gave the confidence that the questions were going to elicit the needed response required for the study. Due to challenges encountered in obtaining permission, some of the data from questionnaire was converted to an online document and sent to participants via internet to fill. The data were collected with the help of two trained assistants. The data collection process spanned over three weeks with an average of 8 questionnaires collected daily.

3.3.1.2 Sampling Technique

A simple random sampling technique was used to select 114 respondents for the questionnaire survey. A total of 150 respondents were initially targeted for the survey but only 114 responded. The study gives much cognisance to the fact that with a population of over 40000, a sample size of 381 was ideal to warrant generalization of findings in the context of this study. Nonetheless, due to limited resources and time constraints, the research could only sample 150 respondents with only 144 respondents responding. Admittedly, this is a major flaw of the study in terms of its ability to generalize its findings to a larger population.

3.3.1.3 Focus Group Discussion

One focus group discussion was conducted. A total of eight people were selected for the discussion. This comprised of people who indicated during the questionnaire survey that they have travelled outside the country before and have had an encounter with the various embassies before. Also, this
comprised of four males and females each. The major issues were discussed were their experiences, perceptions about various embassies in Ghana, their preferred destination countries and reasons for their choice and the various problems they are confronted with when migrating.

3.3.2 Secondary Data Sources
The secondary data sources used included reports on migration as well as sources such as books, journal articles, publications and working papers related to the exodus of students and other professionals from the country.

3.4 Data Analysis
The quantitative data were analysed using SPSS version 20. The data were manually coded and entered into SPSS. Frequency tables were generated, cross tabulation and chi-square test were also used to test for relationship between variables. Contrariwise, recorded interviews were transcribed, categorised into various themes and subjected to content analysis. Descriptive analysis was used to provide summary description of variables and graphical display of the variables were also done using cross tabulation to form contingency tables. Pearson’s Chi-square test of independence were used to test for levels of variation and association among variables were tested using the
CHAPTER FOUR
ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

4.0 Introduction
This chapter presents an analyses of the field data based on the background characteristics of respondents, respondents’ perception about embassies, preferred migration information channels, perceived travel constraints and motives for migrating. The first section discusses the socio-demographic characteristics of respondents including sex, age and their respective levels at the university. The second section further presents an analyses and discussion on how students’ perceptions about embassies influence destination choice. Following this, the students’ preferred migration information channels will be thoroughly examined in this chapter. Moreover, the next section analyses and discusses the relationship between socio-demographic characteristics and potential travelers’ perception of travel constraints. These socio-demographic features will include sex, age and level of education at the university. Lastly, the factors that motivates students to migrate will be thoroughly examined in this chapter.

4.1 Background Characteristics of Respondents
Out of the 114 respondents sampled, 52.6 percent were females whiles 47.4 percent were males. This suggests that majority of respondents sampled were females relative to males. In terms of the age of respondents, majority of respondents (80.7%) were within the ages of 16-25 years whiles those within the ages of 36-45 years were the least represented age cohort. In addition, 17.5 percent of respondents sampled where within the ages of 26-35 years. Given the age distribution of students on the university of Ghana campus, it is unsurprising that majority of respondents sampled were less than 26 years old. The minimum age of
respondents sampled was 18 years and the maximum age was 42 years. In all the average or mean age of respondents sampled was 24 years which is highly characteristic of a very young age group. Expectedly, 94.7 percent of respondents sampled were single whereas 5.3 percent were married. One can clearly deduce from the age distribution why such distribution in terms of the marital status of respondents exists. Given the fact that most of these students are below 26 years and in school, it is not surprising that a significant majority of them are not married. Lastly, in relation to the level respondents had attained in the university, 78.1 percent were undergraduate students and 17.5 percent were graduate students. This evidence lends much support to earlier results in terms of the age distribution and marital status of respondents. In view of the fact that a preponderance of respondents were undergraduate students (see Table 4.1), it is not surprising that majority were within the ages of 16-25 years and also single.
Table 4.1 Background Characteristics of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Socio-demographic Variables</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>47.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>52.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-25 years</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>80.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35 years</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>94.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level of education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>78.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Graduand, Graduate,</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data, 2017  
Mean Age= 24 years, Minimum=18 years, Maximum=42

4.2 Migrants’ Perceptions about the Influence of Embassies on Choice of Destination

Travelling abroad for vacation, to work temporarily or permanently is not a new phenomenon in most tertiary institutions. Anecdotal evidence suggests that most people perceive it as one of the easiest path to acquire a visa in Ghana. Most of these embassies are noted to give visas to tertiary students who wants to travel “year-abroad” or sojourn in these countries for vacation. Whether an individual’s dream of travelling abroad becomes fruitful or a failure is highly contingent on the embassies or consulate. Against this background, this section begins
with an analysis of respondents travelling experience and their encounters with the various embassies. The study acknowledges the fact that, perception about an event or phenomenon could be borne out of experience, information or rumour. It is against this backdrop that this study examines if respondents sampled have travelled outside the country before. This was examined in relation to background characteristics such as sex, age and level of education. Cederholm (2014) suggests that, demographic profile of an individual plays an important role in travelling. In view of that Cross tabulations and chi square test of association were computed to assess this relationship. The results are presented in Table 4.2.

The results indicate that a higher percentage of respondents (58.4%) had no travel experience whereas 41.6 percent had travelled outside the country before. In terms of the relationship between sex and travelling experience, even though a higher percentage of both males (53.7%) and females (62.7%) indicated that they have no experience, more males than females had travelling experience (see Table 4.2). The chi square test showed no significant relationship between sex and respondents’ experience of travelling outside the country (p>0.05). This could be because majority of both sex had not travelled outside the country before. In terms of age of respondents, the results in Table 4.2 shows that majority of respondents within the ages of 26-35 years (70%) have travelled outside the country before compared to those below 26 years (34.1%). Again, all the respondents above 35 years sampled had travelled outside the country before. In view of this, the chi square test showed a significant relationship between age of respondents and their travelling experience or history. Without any equivocation, one can clearly see the role age plays in travelling outside the country in this country given the fact that, those who are aged tends to have travelled outside the country relative to those who are younger. With regards to the respondents’ level in the university, 60 percent and 36.4 of postgraduate students and undergrads respectively had travelled outside the country before. This suggests that majority of postgraduate students
have travelled outside the country as compared to undergraduate students. However, the chi square test shows no significant relationship between level of education and travel experience.

Table 4.2: Summary of relationship between socio-demographic variables and travelling experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Socio-demographic Variables</th>
<th>Have you visited any country before?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(46.3%)</td>
<td>(53.7%)</td>
<td>(100.0%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(37.3%)</td>
<td>(62.7%)</td>
<td>(100.0%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(41.6%)</td>
<td>(58.4%)</td>
<td>(100.0%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

χ² statistic = 0.94, df = 1, p = 0.33 >0.05

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16-25 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(34.1%)</td>
<td>(65.9%)</td>
<td>(100.0%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(70.0%)</td>
<td>(30.0%)</td>
<td>(100.0%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(100.0%)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
<td>(100.0%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(41.6%)</td>
<td>(58.4%)</td>
<td>(100.0%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

χ² statistic =11.57 df = 2, p = 0.003 < 0.05

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Education</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(36.4%)</td>
<td>(63.6%)</td>
<td>(100.0%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(60.0%)</td>
<td>(40.0%)</td>
<td>(100.0%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Graduand, Graduate, Business)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(60.0%)</td>
<td>(40.0%)</td>
<td>(100.0%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(41.6%)</td>
<td>(58.4%)</td>
<td>(100.0%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

χ² statistic = 4.50 df = 2, p = 0.11 >0.05

Source: Field data, 2017

Figures in Parentheses represent Percentages
The study further sought the need to examine the various destination countries of respondents who indicated that they had travelling experience. The result is presented in Figure 1. Out of the 47 respondents who had travelled outside the country before, a higher percentage travelled to the United States of America (44%), followed by the United Kingdom (32%) and China. Also, 8 percent indicate that they had travelled to European Schengen states such as Germany, Netherlands, Switzerland, France, etc. whereas 6 percent travelled to Canada. This evidence suggests that a higher percentage of people prefer to travel to either the USA or UK. None of the African countries came up as a destination country in this study. This shows the preference for European countries in terms of migration.

![Figure 1: Reported Destination Countries of Respondents (N=47)](image)

Against the backdrop that a higher percentage of respondents had not travelled outside the country before, an attempt was made to ascertain if they have had an encounter with the various embassies before. It is noteworthy to point out that, even though most of these respondents had not travelled outside before, they could have had an encounter with the embassies through visa applications but were either denied or failed in meeting the requirements. As a result, respondents’ experiences with the embassies were examined. This
was examined in relation to background characteristics such as sex, age and level of education. Cross tabulations and chi square test of association were computed to assess this relationship. The results are presented in Table 4.3.

Out of the 114 respondents sampled, 52.6 percent indicated that they have had an encounter with an embassy before via visa application whiles 47.4 percent had no encounter. This suggests that a higher percentage of respondents have had an encounter with various embassies in the country. In terms of sex of respondents, the chi square test showed no significant relationship between the sex of respondents and their personal encounter with an embassy (p>0.05). This is largely because a higher percentage of both males (55.6%) and females (50%) indicated that they have had an encounter, albeit more females (50%) than males (44.4%) had no encounter (see Table 4.3). The case of age of respondents mirrors that of the sex of respondents. Although a higher percentage of respondents within the ages of 26-35 years (60%) relative to those within the ages of 16-25 years (50%) have had an encounter with an embassy, there was no significant relationship between the two variables (p>0.05). In addition, level of education did not significant relate with respondents encounter with an embassy. This shows that, even though majority of respondents had engaged the embassy via visa application, this is not aligned to any specific sex, age or level in the university.
Table 4.3: Summary of Relationship between Socio-demographic Variables and Encounter with Embassies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Socio-demographic Variables</th>
<th>Have you had a personal encounter with the embassy before?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>55.6%</strong></td>
<td><strong>44.4%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>50.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>50.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>52.6%</strong></td>
<td><strong>47.4%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\chi^2$ statistic = .35 df = 1, p = 0.55 &gt;0.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16-25 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>50.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>50.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>60.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>40.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>52.6%</strong></td>
<td><strong>47.4%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\chi^2$ statistic = 2.49 df = 2, p = 0.29 &gt;0.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Education</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>52.8%</strong></td>
<td><strong>47.2%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>50.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>50.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Graduand, Graduate, Business)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>60.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>40.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>52.6%</strong></td>
<td><strong>47.4%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\chi^2$ statistic = .17 df = 2, p = 0.92 &gt;0.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data, 2017

Given the fact that 52.6 percent of respondents have had an encounter with the various embassies, the study further sought the need to examine their perceptions about the modus operandi of these embassies and how it influences their destination choice. To examine these activities, various indicators were chosen. These include Friendliness of Embassy staff, Rate of
visa issuance and Speed of service. They were asked to rank them based on a three point scale, viz. good, neutral and bad. Good in this sense is considered a positive remark whiles bad denotes a negative perception. In addition, these were examined in relation to the various countries respondents were willing to travel to, namely USA, Germany, Netherland, France, China and UK. The results of this analysis are presented in Table 4.4.

4.2.1 Influence of Embassies on migrants’ destination choice in relation to Friendliness of Embassy Staffs

Respondents were asked to rank the friendliness of the Embassy staffs of USA, Germany, Netherlands, France, China and the UK. The results indicate that even though a higher percentage of respondents ranked the friendliness of the embassies staffs as good as compared to either being neutral or bad, the staffs of China (44.7%) and the Netherlands (44.7%) embassies were reported to be very friendly (see Table 4.4). Also, the USA (42.1%) Germany (41.2%) and France (40.3%) were also reported to have very friendly staffs at the embassy. This suggests that most of the respondents were satisfied with the attitude of the staff at the embassies.

4.2.2 Influence of Embassies on migrants’ destination choice in relation to Rate of issuance of Visa

Respondents’ satisfaction with the rate of issuance of visa at the various embassies were also examined (see Table 4.4). Comparatively, a higher percentage of respondents were satisfied with the rate of visa issuance by China (48.2%), the Netherlands (40.3%) and UK (38.6%) as compared to the USA (28.9%). One can allude this to the strict immigration laws and other emerging immigration conundrum under the administration of president Trump. Given the trade prospects and the economic implications of issuing out visas on an economy, it is not surprising a higher percentage of respondents were satisfied with the rate at which China issues visas.
4.2.3 Influence of Embassies on migrants’ destination choice in relation to Speed of service

In addition, respondents’ satisfaction with the speed of service at the various embassies were also examined (see Table 4.4). The results show that respondents were satisfied with the speed of services offered by China (44.8%), USA (43.8%), and Germany (43.8%). Comparatively, most of the respondents were satisfied with the speed of services offered at the various embassies.

Some of the results from the focus group discussions that were held also lend support to most of the findings from the quantitative analysis. Most of the participants were positive about their experience with embassies, including overall quality and performance whiles a few gave a negative rating about their experience with embassies. They reported that they would like to go through similar experiences of acquiring documents and information during the visa process. One participant commented about the interview process as being very fast. Below is the quote of the participants:

“…my questions during the interview was simple but I had to explain myself deeper… I actually thought we were going to sit down and engage in a lengthy conversation...” (28 year old male participant -Participant 1)

Also, another graduate student provided the following insight:

“I think the embassy is a valuable assessment tool … but other than that, I think the whole ordeal and process is cumbersome. Personally, I learnt a lot more through interacting with the professional such as the travel consultants… more than with embassy online information …you kind of appreciate the process better.” (34 year old female participant-Participant 4)

Regarding the friendliness of the embassy staff; participants during the focus group discussion suggested that experiences from the embassies generally showed that the embassies provided friendly and swift services but did not reflect in the issuance of visas. Participants placed high value on the
interview sessions and submission process and the attitude of embassy staff. Amongst the participant, one said:

“… I was welcomed by the receptionist who helped me arrange my document prior to the interview…I think they were very professional in their work and calmed my nerves down…” (29 year old participant- Participant 3)

On the contrary, some of the participants gave a negative perception about the embassies. One viable aspect of the Students experience that became evident was the students’ negative perception about visa issuance at the embassies. For example, some participants reflected on very authentic experiences. A young student said:

“it was really painful when despite all the requirements on the consular website was provided, they didn’t look at it…and yet I was refused.” (24 year old -Participant 2)

A few of the participants believed that the attitude of embassy staff did not reflect in the issuance of visa for travel. An undergraduate student remarked:

“I was expecting to receive the same level of treatment when I came for the interview… the consular barely made eye contact, asked three questions and outright refused my application…” (33 year old Participant 1)

Some believed that consulars at the embassies spend a lot of time on their issue, they believed that the embassies were inundated with a lot of application and hence didn’t receive their full cooperation. A statement by a one of the participants is quoted below:

“… I was told by my uncle who visited the American embassy that he was made to wait under the scorching sun without providing any sort of waiting area or room…” Participant 3
Table 4.4: Migrants’ Perception about Influence of Embassies on Destination Choice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTRY</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Bad</th>
<th>No response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Friendliness of Embassy staff</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rate of visa issuance</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speed of service</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GERMANY</td>
<td>Friendliness of Embassy staff</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rate of visa issuance</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speed of service</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NETHERLAND</td>
<td>Friendliness of Embassy staff</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rate of visa issuance</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speed of service</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>35.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRANCE</td>
<td>Friendliness of Embassy staff</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rate of visa issuance</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speed of service</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHINA</td>
<td>Friendliness of Embassy staff</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rate of visa issuance</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>35.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speed of service</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Friendliness of Embassy staff</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rate of visa issuance</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speed of service</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data, 2017

4.3 Preferred Migration Information Channels

Considering the fact that access to information on benefits of migration at destination regions play a key role in influencing people to migrate and their choice of destination, one of the key objective of this study was to examine respondents’ preferred migration information channels. Aside the fact that these information more often than not influence people’s
migration intentions and destination choice, it also affects their perceptions. In view of this, respondents were asked to indicate whom or where they would rely on for information about the country they intend to travel to when planning their migration. The results of this is presented in Figure 3.

The results show that travel agencies (56.9%) serve as major information source for majority of Ghanaians, followed by online portals (40.2%) and family and friends (40.2%) percent of respondents. Only 12.8 percent of respondents were of the view that newspaper serves as their main information channel. This suggests that majority of respondents rely on travel agencies as their information channel than newspaper.

In addition, evidence garnered from the focus group discussions suggest that, most of the participants preferred using online as the first point of call in acquiring migration information. One applicant was of the view that;

“…I prefer information from online because it gives me a background information on what to do and also it is also very accessible and I get any information I want by the touch of my phone…” (33 year old Participant 1)

Another participant also said “…

In this day and time everything is online… and I have always resorted to search online for any information I want … likewise when I wanted to visit the USA…” (24 year old -Participant 2)

Apart from the online; travel agencies, it was brought to the fore during the focus discussion that, travel consultants and immigration officers were direct information channels that were preferred. Participants attributed this to the fact that, not all information found online are correct and that a direct human interaction with experts could unravel any ambiguity pertaining to the travel process. In
particular, professional skills were highlighted as being a key factor for using these information channels.

As reiterated by an graduate student. He said:

“Upon several refusals, I had to seek the services of travel agents. They gave me directives to acquire the visa which eventually was successful…” (33 year old Participant 1)

Travel consultants provided a more desirable service, a graduate student suggested that:

“…I thought it was better in that they gave you direct feedback … but I felt more distracted when I was doing it myself.” (29 year old participant)

In general, participants also preferred information from family and friends than the newspapers and that the process of acquiring information about destination countries was far superior when it comes from family, peers/colleagues and instructors who are perceived to have knowledge about the process. In particular, when the information comes from family and friends, students felt very comfortable since they anticipated that they had one way or the other an experience or some sought of knowledge in dealing with the process. Furthermore, participants asserted that family and friends were inclined to facilitate the success of the visa acquisition process but periodic changes in the processes might encounter challenges with the application process. This is what a participant has to say:

“…You get awfully comfortable when your family member is doing the application for you…” (33 year old Participant 1)
4.4 Relationship between Socio-demographic Characteristics of Respondents and their Perception of Travel Constraints

Consistent with earlier studies conducted on migration and its consequences on migrants, especially when they are en route to destination countries (Burnett & Baker, 2001; Jonsson & Devonish, 2008; Kattiy & Miller, 2009), respondents were asked if they perceive any travel constraints. This was towards the ascertaining of the various challenges that confront them in travelling outside the country. It is worthy to note that, the study relied heavily on the perceptions of respondents. Respondents were asked to indicate the most prominent travel constraint they perceived travelers are mostly confronted with en route to destination countries. In addition, this was examined in relation to socio-demographic characteristics such as sex, age and marital status. Consequently, cross tabulations and chi square test of association were computed to examine the relationship between these socio-demographic characteristics and perceived travel constraints. The summary of this analysis is presented in Table 4.5.
The results indicate that 44.7 percent of respondents perceive the various documentations and other requirements of embassies as the most perceived travel constraints travelers are confronted with whereas less than one percent reported long distance to destination to destination countries as a constraint. In addition, 20.2 percent were of the view that pursuing education or some job prospects at home often deter them from travelling. Most of them indicated that, as students, more often than not, their parents or guardians are not willing to finance or encourage them to travel because of the idea that they might not return to further their education. One of the respondents indicated that

“Last year, I went through all the process without the knowledge of my uncle whom I stay with and also pays my fees. After I got the UK visa, I asked him to pay for my tickets and also provide some money for my upkeep whiles there. He objected to it and this later became a big family issue. He threatened not to take care of me. I later found out his son left some years ago and never returned when he was in his final year at Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology (KNUST). I had to abandon my hopes of travelling and stay. I will definitely do so when I become independent since going to the UK is a dream (26 year old male participant).”

The views of this respondent suggests that the possibility of returning and also giving up on education often serve as a major constraint in regards to students travelling outside the country. This pressure mostly comes from family and other guardians. In addition, the results in Table 4.5 also shows that financial constraints (9.6%) also deters people from travelling or migrating. This is expected given the fact that the cost involved in travelling is very high. Most of these travel and tour agencies charge high prices coupled with the plane tickets and other living expenses. This makes it very difficult for people to travel. One female respondents who is in her third year at the university indicated that;
“Sometimes it is a dream to at least travel outside, especially during the long vacation and do this work there. I tried it when I was in my second year. There was this travel and work abroad agency I contacted and they were willingly to help me. I almost signed up but later realised my parents cannot afford the total cost involved even if my mother sells her piece of land. The risk involved is so high. I was later wondering what if I pay all these costs, get here and I am not able to get any job to pay back. So I opted out.”

The views expressed by this respondent suggests that one has to be financially prepared to travel. In addition to this, 19.3 percent of respondents were of the view that family attachments often serves as a major travelling constraint. The evidence presented thus far shows that embassy requirements, education or job prospects, family attachments and financial constraints are some of the perceived travel constraints and these most of these travel constraints are not mutually exclusive but linked.

With regards to relationship between sex and reported perceived travel constraints, a higher percentage of both males (48.1%) and females (41.7%) were of the view that embassy requirement is the major travel constraints travelers are mostly confronted with (see Table 4.5). In view of this the chi square test showed no significant relationship between sex and perceived travel constraints at the University of Ghana ($\chi^2$ statistic $= 11.90, df = 10, p = 0.29$ >0.05). This indicates that perception about the various travel constraints has no relationship with a specific gender.

In terms of the relationship between age and and reported perceived travel constraints, the results in table 4.5 show that whereas a higher percentage of respondents within the ages of 16-25 years (48.9%) perceive embassy requirement as a major travel constraint, a higher percentage of respondents between the ages of 26-35 years perceive education or job at point
of origin as a major travel constraint. Comparatively, more of the respondents within the ages of 16-25 years (10.9%) perceive financial constraints as a major problem relative to 26-35 year age bracket. However, the chi square test shows that there is no significant relationship between age and perceived travel constraints at the University of Ghana campus ($\chi^2$ statistic $= 2.52$ df $= 5$, $p = 0.77 >0.05$). This finding is similar to studies by Nyaupane and Andereck’s (2007:436) where young people within the ages of 30 years and younger as well as older people within the ages of 71 years and older regard travel cost as a constraint.

Moreover, with respect to relationship between level of education and reported perceived travel constraints, a higher percentage of both undergraduate students (43.8%) and postgraduate students (40%) were of the view that embassy requirement is the major travel constraints travelers are mostly confronted with (see Table 4.5). In view of this the chi square test showed no significant relationship between sex and perceived travel constraints at the University of Ghana ($\chi^2$ statistic $= 6.20$ df $= 10$, $p = 0.80 >0.05$). This indicates that perception about the various travel constraints has no relationship with a specific level students were in.
Table 4.5: Summary of Relationship between Socio-demographic Variables and Perceived Travel Constraints

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Travel Constraints</th>
<th>Financial constraints</th>
<th>New Immigration Policies</th>
<th>Education/Job</th>
<th>Family Attachment</th>
<th>Embassy Requirement</th>
<th>Distance to Destination</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Socio-demographic Variables</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

χ² statistic = 11.90, df = 10, p = 0.29 >0.05

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Travel Constraints</th>
<th>Financial constraints</th>
<th>New Immigration Policies</th>
<th>Education/Job</th>
<th>Family Attachment</th>
<th>Embassy Requirement</th>
<th>Distance to Destination</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Socio-demographic Variables</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

χ² statistic = 2.52 df = 5, p = 0.77 >0.05

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Travel Constraints</th>
<th>Financial constraints</th>
<th>New Immigration Policies</th>
<th>Education/Job</th>
<th>Family Attachment</th>
<th>Embassy Requirement</th>
<th>Distance to Destination</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Socio-demographic Variables</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

χ² statistic = 6.20 df = 10, p = 0.80 >0.05

Source: Field data, 2017
4.5 Factors Motivating Students’ Migration Intentions

Migration has often been viewed to be economically motivated. It is evident in most of the literature that, the main motive for migration is for economic motive. Within the theoretical ambit of the push pull and network theories, one’s decision to migrate is contingent on some unfavorable conditions or factors at the point of origin and some favorable alluring conditions at the point of destination. The unfavorable conditions at the point of origin are termed the push factors and the favourable conditions at the point of destination are termed the push factors. Shaw (1975) also argues that, "the guiding premise of this approach is that man is economically rational, an economic maximizer, and that he will perceive and evaluate migration on this basis. Given this premise, if significant economic correlates of migration are observed, then, on the basis of objective inference, subjective economic motives are imputed to migrants" (pp. 59-60). Although this approach may predict the direction and magnitude of migration fairly accurately, it does not explain individual behaviour (Portes, 1976). To explain personal choices of moving and selection of destination, it necessary to obtain information from individual migrants.

Against this backdrop, the various motives influencing students to migrate or travel outside the country were examined. Cristian and Baragan (2015) points out that the motivation for migration are highlighted as economic – demographic; political and social-religious-cultural. In the context of this study, respondents were asked to indicate the various factors that motivate them to travel. The study gives much cognisance to the fact that, most of the responses given were mostly pull factors which can be categorized into Social motive, political motive, other economic motive, educative motive and desire to travel/adventure. The results of this analysis is presented in Table 4.6.

The results show that 27.2 percent of respondents perceive economic considerations as the main reason why students travel outside the country whereas 2.6 percent attributed existing peace and stability within destination countries as the main reason why people migrate. This suggests that most people travel for the economic prospects. One clearly deduce from the plethora of travel and work abroad agencies that have sprung on campus, where most of these students are convinced of travelling and working abroad. These agencies often influence the decision of students to travel abroad to seek
for greener pastures. Also, observed from the discussion, most of them gave their responses on work which is considered an economic motive. Below are some of the responses:

“I also think working over there is great because considering the exchange rate when I remit money home, I can be used for a lot of things. They pay in hours unlike Ghana it is not so.” Participant 1

“I remember back in level 300, I was working to travel abroad but it did not succeed. If it had succeeded, I would have being grateful because I would be able to get enough money when I work.” Participant 4

“Travelling outside is a great opportunity one will get but it depends on the country you travel to because with some countries the exchange rate is very low unlike countries like America and the UK. But I think when I get the opportunity to travel I will be grateful because it is going to change your life one way or the other” Participant 2

The finding is consistent with Carment and Winchie (1989). Their findings brought to bear that career reasons, lack of opportunity for advancement in job, lack of suitable opportunity were the most important reason given by emigrants. It was also consistent with Shaw (1975) where he argues, "the guiding premise of this approach is that man is economically rational, an economic maximizer, and that he will perceive and evaluate migration on this basis. Given this premise, if significant economic correlates of migration are observed, then, on the basis of objective inference, subjective economic motives are imputed to migrants” (pp. 59-60). No one was of the view that monetary motive influence their decision to migrate. However, it was asserted to be the primary motivating factor (Lansing and Morgan 1967). In economics analysis, money is a derived demand. It is demanded for other economic purposes, so are the other economic activity. They are demanded in order to get money. So, most of the reasons given under the other economic motive were a means to get money. Also, according to the literature of Mihi-Ramirez and Kumpikaite (2013), economic motive such as bigger salary expectations, better job, and less living costs was considered the major reason students will want to migrate. This, however, justifies that economic motive is the major reason people migrate and money
being a subset of economic motive will also be a major reason. So in their decision of migrating to get a good job or improve upon their standard of living, the resultant effect is to get money.

Also, 26.3 percent of respondents were of the view that most students travel outside to experience social and cultural diversity that exist outside the confines of Ghana and 10.5 percent perceive the desire to travel or adventure as the main reasons why people travel. Others were of the view that they are motivated by scenery and the culture. Below is a quote by a participant:

“I have friends and family I America so when I go I have a place to stay. It gives me the opportunity to see new places I have not seen before and I also get to learn a lot of things which is not done here in Ghana.” Participant 5

Moreover, 7.9 percent of respondents were of the view that family ties at the various destination regions influence people to migrate. More often than not, the kind of associations or ties one has at the destination region plays a key role in influencing their decision to migrate and their choice of destination region. This resonates with the network theory of migration which pays more attention to the role families, friends, acquaintances, and other contacts play in influencing migration decisions, assisting them to settle when they migrate or deter them from settling in their destination countries. For instance, Vertovec (2002) and Dustmann and Glitz (2005) both suggested in their studies that, the destination countries of migrants are often influenced by the kind of networks they have established in those countries. Lastly, 10.5 percent of respondents revealed that they think people migrate or travel purposely to further their education in those region. To them, social conditions such as the need to further one’s education serve as the main reason why people migrate. The views of respondents garnered from the focus group discussion was also consistent with some of the reasons given by the respondents in the interview. Most of them confirmed that they are driven to migration by work or education. Below are some of the responses given under education;

“I want to do my masters in abroad and even go further to do my Phd.” Participant 1
“I also think so. As we speak now I have applied to some schools abroad and I am waiting to be called…… I have an uncle in UK and he is supporting me one way or the other I am hoping that I get a school at the UK……” Participant 4

“I am looking for to doing my master but it would not be in Ghana. Maybe USA or Canada because I have families over there.” Participant 2

Table 4.1: Motivation Factors Migrants have about Migration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivating Factors</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peace and Stability within destination region</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family ties</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further my Education</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire for travel/ Adventure</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience Social / Cultural diversity</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Considerations</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Missing responses</strong></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: field data, 2017
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.0 Introduction

This chapter presents the summary of the study’s key findings in relation to the study’s objectives. Also, this chapter also provides a conclusion based on the findings and theoretical underpinnings of the study. Lastly, some recommendations are made based on the findings of the study.

5.1 Summary

This study examined students’ perception about how embassies influence destination choice, travel constraints and migration information channels on University of Ghana Campus. It specifically examined perception about how embassies influence destination choice and established preferred migration information channels. It also determined perception of potential migrants about travel constraints based on demographic profile. In addition, the various factors motivating students to migrate were also examined. Using the case of students of University of Ghana campus, a simple random sampling method was used in selecting 114 students for the questionnaire survey and one focus group discussion was conducted. The key findings of this study are discussed below.

The results indicate that a higher percentage of respondents (58.4%) had no travel experience whereas 41.6 percent had travelled outside the country before. However, more males than females had travelling experience albeit the chi square test showed no significant relationship between sex and respondents’ experience of travelling outside the country (p>0.05). Also, the result shows that majority of respondents within the ages of 26-35 years (70%) have travelled outside the country before compared to those below 26 years (34.1%). The results indicate that age has a significant relationship with travelling experience. With regards to the
respondents’ level in the university, 60 percent and 36.4 of postgraduate students and undergrads respectively had travelled outside the country before. Out of the 47 respondents who had travelled outside the country before, a higher percentage travelled to the United States of America (44%), followed by the United Kingdom (32%) and China. Also, 8 percent indicated that they had travelled to European Schengen states such as Germany, Netherlands, Switzerland, France, etc. whereas 6 percent travelled to Canada. This shows that higher percentage of people prefer to travel to either USA or UK.

In terms of the encounter respondents have had with embassies, 52.6 percent indicated that they have had an encounter with an embassy before via visa application whiles 47.4 percent had no encounter. The results further indicate that even though majority of respondents had engaged the embassy via visa application, this is not aligned to any specific sex, age or level in the university. In addition, the results indicate that even though a higher percentage of respondents ranked the friendliness of the embassies staffs as good as compared to either being neutral or bad, the staffs of China (44.7%) and the Netherlands (44.7%) embassies were reported to be very friendly relative to the UK, USA and Canada. Comparatively, a higher percentage of respondents were satisfied with the rate of visa issuance by China (48.2%), the Netherlands (40.3%) and UK (38.6%) as compared to the USA (28.9%). Given the trade prospects and the economic implications of issuing out visas on an economy, it is not surprising a higher percentage of respondents were satisfied with the rate at which China issues visas. With regards to respondents’ satisfaction with the speed of service at the various embassies, respondents were satisfied with the speed of services offered by China (44.8%), USA (43.8%), and Germany (43.8%).

With respect to respondents’ preferred migration information channels, majority of respondents prefer travel agencies (56.9%), online portals (40.2%) and family and friends (40.2%) as their information channel as compared to newspaper (12.8%). With reference to perceived travel constraints, 44.7 percent of respondents perceive the various documentations
and other requirements of embassies as the most perceived travel constraints travelers are confronted with whereas less than one percent reported long distance to destination to destination countries as a constraint. In addition, the results also shows that financial constraints (9.6%) also deters people from travelling or migrating and 19.3 percent of respondents were of the view that family attachments often serves as a major travelling constraint. This results is consistent with studies by Gilbert and Hudson (2000) and Nyaupane & Andereck, (2007) where financial constraints was reported as a major barrier to migration. This also mirrors the study by Doucet (2009) where women were reported to feel guilty about leaving their children and going back to work and men feel guilty about leaving their work to care for their children With respect to the relationship between socio-demographic variables such as sex, age and level of education, the results indicate that sex, age and level of education have no significant association with perceived travel constraints. Alternatively, how one perceives the various problems travelers encounter when migrating or travelling is not aligned with a specific sex, age or level of education on the university of Ghana campus.

In relation to the various factors that motivate students to travel or migrate, the results show that 27.2 percent of respondents perceive economic considerations as the main reason why students travel outside the country whereas 2.6 percent attributed existing peace and stability within destination countries as the main reason why people migrate. Also, 26.3 percent of respondents were of the view that most students travel outside to experience social and cultural diversity that exist outside the confines of Ghana and 10.5 percent perceive the desire to travel or adventure as the main reasons why people travel. Moreover, 7.9 percent of respondents were of the view that family ties at the various destination regions influence people to migrate. This suggests that employment opportunity, better leaving condition or other economic motive, are the main reasons why students prefer to migrate. The results are consistent with studies by Mihi-Ramirez and Kumpikaite (2013) who argue that economic
motive such as bigger salary expectations, better job, and less living costs was considered the major reason students will want to migrate. It was also consistent with Carment and Winchie (1989). Their findings brought to bear that career reasons, lack of opportunity for advancement in job, lack of suitable opportunity were the most important reason given by emigrants.

5.2 Conclusion

On the backdrop of the findings of this study, it is evident that, majority of students prefer to migrate outside the country for several reasons. In their quest to seek greener pasture outside the country, seek better living conditions, experience social and cultural diversity, to link up with family members at destination regions and enjoy peace and stability, the evidence suggests that, most of these students intend to migrate because of these afore mentioned reasons. This is consistent with the network theory of migration where various associations or ties at destination regions influence migration intentions, the choice of destination region, and whether migrants will be able to settle or not when they migrate. The results are also in consonance with the push pull theory of migration where several favourable alluring conditions within the destination region influence the migration intentions of respondents and their choice of destination region.

One can clearly deduce from the evidence so far that, with the high preference for travel agencies, online portals and family and friends as migration information channels, most of the students who intend to migrate are well informed by the various measures involved and the numerous expected constraints. An encounter with the embassies also impacts on how one perceives the modus operandi of the embassy, especially in relation to the friendliness of their staff, issuance of visas and the speed of the services they render. Even though countries such as China and the Netherlands are noted to offer very good services, a preponderance of students who intend to migrate or travel outside the country prefer to travel to UK and the USA. The study concludes that, even in the midst of all the various perceived and
experienced challenges or constraints reported by respondents, it would suffice to indicate that, the palpable motives of students’ intentions to migrate or travel outside the country cannot be overlooked.

5.3 Recommendation

Based on the findings of this study, the following recommendations are made:

- With regards to the travel constraint it is recommended that travel agencies should tailor travel packages taking into account the educational level of travellers. There should packages for students who will want to use the long vacations to work abroad and get experience. With the USA J-1 visa work and travel program which gives Ghanaian university students a challenging opportunity to intimately experience life and culture in the U.S. during their summer and winter holiday periods; more travel programs can be created linked to other European countries to give students a much varied opportunity to get to learn a lot of their culture so that when they return, they can be able to implement it in schools and work places they find themselves. Also, students who get these opportunities will be able to enhance their CVs for better career prospect.

- With respect to those who are employed, travel packages should be designed to meet their employment status. Where it is realised that the individual has low level of employment a moderate budgeted flight such as economy class and accommodation could be designed to suit them.

- Measures should be put in place to help enhance performance of staff of the various embassies. The human resource department of the embassy can do an internal marketing such as employee promotion, employee skills development, establishing a unionised work force for bargaining arrangement and reward deserving employees that put in their best. According to Rafiq and Ahmed (2000) internal marketing has a bearing on external marketing for that matter, customers. They argued that, internal marketing is a strategic effort using a marketing-like approach to overcome organizational conflict to transform and to align, motivate and
inter-functionally co-ordinate and integrate employees towards the effective execution of corporate and functional strategies in order to deliver customer satisfaction through a process of creating motivated and customer orientated employees.
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APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR RESPONDENTS

TO MOVE OR NOT TO MOVE?: PERCEPTIONS ABOUT EMBASSIES, TRAVEL CONSTRAINT AND PREFERRED MIGRATION INFORMATION CHANNELS ON LEGON CAMPUS.

Dear Participant,

Thank you for spending time to go through this short survey. I am working to add to the already existing knowledge about the binary opposition of facilitation and control of Migration. By completing this form, you will be helping migration service providers enhance their service and meeting your needs. Please note however that your responses will not be disclosed to any third party but used for the purposes of this survey only.

BACKGROUND DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE

1. What is your age: .................................

2. Sex
   1. Male
   2. Female
   3. Other

3. What is your marital status?
   1. Single
   2. Married
   3. Divorced
   4. Separated
4. What is your occupation or Educational Level?
   1. Undergraduate
   2. Post Graduate
   3. Lecturer
   4. Non Teaching University Staff
   5. Others (specify) ……………………

5. What is your current occupation
   1. Student
   2. Lecturer
   3. University staff
   4. Other specify ………………

To determine the extent migrant’s perception about embassies influences destination choice

6. Have you visited any country before?
   1. Yes
   2. No

7. If yes, which country did you visit?………………………………………………………………………………………………

8. How long did you stay?…………………………………………………………………………………………………………
9. What informed your choice in going to country in Q7 above. Explain

........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

10. Amongst the following countries which one are you more likely to migrate to

1. UK
2. USA
3. CHINA
4. EUROPE SCHENGHEN STATE (GERMANY, NETHERLAND, SWITZERLAND, FRANCE etc)
5. None
6. OTHER .....................

11. What informed your choice of this country?

........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

12. Have you ever applied to go to any of your preferred countries above?

1. Yes
2. No
13. If yes, was the visa issued?
   1. Yes
   2. No

14. Which of the following is most likely to deter you from migrating to your preferred country
    (rank in order of importance with 1 being the most important and 5 being least important)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Most important</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Least important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial Reasons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance To Destination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embassy Requirement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education/ Job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Attachment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New immigration policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. In making your travel decision, did you or will you inform anyone?
   1. Yes
   2. No
16. If yes, who will it be or who was it?
   1. Immediate relative
   2. Friends
   3. Spouse
   4. Other

17. In your own estimation how easy is it to access information from the embassy?
   1. Very Easy
   2. Easy
   3. Neither Easy Nor Difficult
   4. Difficult
   5. Very difficult

18. In your own estimation how easy is it to access information from the travel agent?
   1. Very Easy
   2. Easy
   3. Neither Easy Nor Difficult
   4. Difficult
   5. Very Difficult

19. What do you think about rate of visa issuance at the embassy or consulate of preferred country?
   1. Very high
   2. High
   3. Intermediate
   4. Low
   5. Very low
20. What do you think about recent migration policies from preferred destination towards your travel
   1. Very friendly
   2. Friendly
   3. Neither friendly nor unfriendly
   4. Unfriendly
   5. Very unfriendly

21. Overall, from your experience, how would you rate the advice and information provided by the embassy? Would you say it is
   1. Excellent
   2. Good
   3. Neither good nor poor
   4. Poor
   5. Very poor
EMPIRICALLY DETERMINE PREFERRED INFORMATION CHANNEL.

22. In your overall estimation, what is your perception of the following embassies in Ghana?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTRY</th>
<th>PERCEPTION OF……</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Intermediate</th>
<th>Bad</th>
<th>Very Bad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>1. Friendliness of Embassy staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Rate of visa issuance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Speed of service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GERMANY</td>
<td>1. Friendliness of Embassy staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Rate of visa issuance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Speed of service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NETHERLAND</td>
<td>1. Friendliness of Embassy staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Rate of visa issuance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Speed of service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRANCE</td>
<td>1. Friendliness of Embassy staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Rate of visa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>1. Friendliness of Embassy staff</td>
<td>2. Rate of visa issuance</td>
<td>3. Speed of service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHINA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23. Have you had a personal encounter with the embassy before?

1. Yes
2. No

24. Where did you get the information from?

........................................................................................................................................................................

..............................................

........................................................................................................................................................................

..............................................

........................................................................................................................................................................

..............................................
25. In planning your migration, whom or where would you rely for information about the country you intend to visit or visited?

1. Travel agency
2. Online
3. Newspaper
4. Friends and family
5. Press release/statement

26. Overall, from your experience, how would you rate the advice and information provided by the information channel in question 24? Would you say it is

1. Excellent,
2. Good,
3. Neither good nor poor,
4. Poor or
5. Very poor

27. Thinking about all of your obligations dealing with migration service providers, would you describe the process of overcoming your constraint and fulfilling your obligations as

1. Very easy
2. Quite easy
3. Neither easy nor hard
4. Quite hard
5. Very hard
28. After all your experiences with migration service providers are you satisfied? And will you like to go through similar experience again?
   1. Yes
   2. No
   3. Maybe

29. With all your experience would you prefer to use the services of a consultant about your migration issues?
   1. Yes
   2. No
   3. Maybe
APPENDIX B

TO MOVE OR NOT TO MOVE?: PERCEPTIONS ABOUT EMBASSIES, TRAVEL CONSTRANT AND PREFERRED MIGRATION INFORMATION CHANNELS ON LEGON CAMPUS.

Transcript

Focus group discussion

Date: 25th June, 2017.

Location: Legon

Interviewer: Gilbert Ekow Monney

Interviewer: Can you please tell u about yourself? (Probe for name, sex, age educational level and occupation and marital status)

Res 1: my name is Desmond, I am 26 year old and I am a national service personnel. I am not married.

Res 2: My name is Richmond, I am 21 years old, I am a student

Res 3: My name is Rosemary, also a national service personnel, I just got married and I am 25 years old

Res 4: My name is Jeff Osie, I am a graduate student, read economic as a major and information studies minor. I am 25 years old and I am not married

Res 5: My name is Joyce I am a secretary, I am married and I am 39 years old

Interviewer: Have you ever being to the embassy before?

Res(All): Yes

Interviewer: What is your perception about the embassies in terms of staff friendliness?
Res 3: I think some of them are friendly but from my point of view most of them are friendly. There was a time I went for an application of visa, when I got there. I was welcomed by the receptionist who helped me arrange my document prior to the interview...I think they were very professional in their work and calmed my nerves down.

Res 1: I was expecting to receive the same level of treatment when I came for the interview... the consular barely made eye contact, asked three questions and outright refused my application

Res 4: I think the embassy is a valuable assessment tool ... but other than that, I think the whole ordeal and process is cumbersome. Personally, I learnt a lot more through interacting with the professional such as the travel consultants... more than with embassy online information ... you kind of appreciate the process better.

Interviewer: What is your perception about the embassies in terms of the rate of visa issuance of visa?

Res 2: it was really painful when despite all the requirements on the consular website was provided, they didn’t look at it...and yet I was refused.

Interviewer: What is your perception about the embassies in terms of speed of service?

Res 3: The speed of service is not encouraging. Sometime when you go you will be made to stand outside even if it is raining no one cares. You mostly see people standing in the scorching sun all day waiting for their turn. I was told by my uncle who visited the American embassy that he was made to wait under the scorching sun without providing any sort of waiting area or room I think that is very bad. This part is very terrible.

Res 1: I think their speed of service is good. Before going there I heard a lot of rumours about how about people are treated over there but I was proved wrong. When I sat for the interview process, my questions during the interview were simple but I had to explain myself deeper... I actually thought we were going to sit down and engage in a lengthy conversation...”

Interviewer: What is your preferred information channel?
Res 1: I prefer information from online because it gives me a background information on what to do and … it is also very accessible and I get any information I want by the touch of my phone.

Res 2: In this day and time everything is online… and I have always resorted to search online for any information I want … likewise when I wanted to visit the USA

Res 1: Even with the online it cannot be certain because not all information found online is correct. There was a time I was searching for how to acquire my visa online but I was not able to get a good help. Upon several refusals, I had to seek the services of travel agents. They gave me directives to acquire the visa which eventually was successful.

Res 5: A I also had the same challenge with the online so I contracted a travel agent and he help me with the process easily. I thought it was better in that they gave you direct feedback … but I felt more distracted when I was doing it myself.

Res 1: I think sometimes when you give it to a family member to do it for you, it can be trusted. So you get awfully comfortable when your family member is doing the application for you.

Interviewer: What is/are your motivation for migration?

Res 5: I have friends and family in America so when I go I have a place to stay. It gives me the opportunity to see new places I have not seen before and I also get to learn a lot of things which is not done here in Ghana.

Res 1: I want to do my masters in abroad and even go further to do my Phd. I also think working over there is great because considering the exchange rate when I remit money home, I can be used for a lot of things. They pay in hours unlike Ghana it is not so.

Res 4: I also think so. As we speak now I have applied to some schools abroad and I am waiting to be called.

Interviewer: which countries?
Res 4: I have applied to schools in the UK, America, Japan and Canada. I have an uncle in UK and he is supporting me one way or the other I am hoping that I get a school at the UK. I remember back in level 300, I was working to travel abroad but it did not succeed. If it had succeeded, I would have being grateful because I would be able to get enough money when I work. I had a lecturer of mine who told me about her experiences, she travelled abroad during her third year in school and when she comeback she was able to buy her first gulf car.

Res 2: Travelling outside is a great opportunity one will get but it depends on the country you travel to because with some countries the exchange rate is very low unlike countries like America and the UK. But I think when I get the opportunity to travel I will be grateful because it is going to change your life one way or the other. If it about education or work.

Res 3: I am looking forward to doing my master but it would not be in Ghana. Maybe USA or Canada because I have families over there.
APPENDIX C

INTERVIEW GUIDE

TO MOVE OR NOT TO MOVE?: PERCEPTIONS ABOUT EMBASSIES, TRAVEL CONSTRAINT AND PREFERRED MIGRATION INFORMATION CHANNELS ON LEGON CAMPUS.

Dear Participant,

Thank you for spending time to go through this short survey. I am working to add to the already existing knowledge about the binary opposition of facilitation and control of Migration. By completing this form, you will be helping migration service providers enhance their service and meeting your needs. Please note however that your responses will not be disclosed to any third party but used for the purposes of this survey only.

1. Can you please tell us about yourself? (Probe for name, sex, age, educational level and occupation and marital status)
2. Have you ever been to the embassy before?
3. What is your perception about the embassies in terms of staff friendliness?
4. What is your perception about the embassies in terms of the rate of visa issuance of visa?
5. What is your perception about the embassies in terms of speed of service?
6. What is your preferred information channel?
7. What is/are your motivation for migration?