

10-25-2018

## Internal Migration in the Philippines: A Review of Research Findings

Ricardo G. Abad

Follow this and additional works at: <https://archium.ateneo.edu/phstudies>

---

### Recommended Citation

Abad, Ricardo G. (2018) "Internal Migration in the Philippines: A Review of Research Findings," *Philippine Studies: Historical and Ethnographic Viewpoints*: Vol. 29: No. 2, Article 8.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.13185/2244-1638.4331>

Available at: <https://archium.ateneo.edu/phstudies/vol29/iss2/8>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Ateneo Journals at Archium Ateneo. It has been accepted for inclusion in *Philippine Studies: Historical and Ethnographic Viewpoints* by an authorized editor of Archium Ateneo.

# philippine studies

Ateneo de Manila University · Loyola Heights, Quezon City · 1108 Philippines

---

## **Internal Migration in the Philippines: A Review of Research Findings**

Ricardo G. Abad

*Philippine Studies* vol. 29, no. 2 (1981) 129–143

Copyright © Ateneo de Manila University

---

Philippine Studies is published by the Ateneo de Manila University. Contents may not be copied or sent via email or other means to multiple sites and posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's written permission. Users may download and print articles for individual, noncommercial use only. However, unless prior permission has been obtained, you may not download an entire issue of a journal, or download multiple copies of articles.

Please contact the publisher for any further use of this work at [philstudies@admu.edu.ph](mailto:philstudies@admu.edu.ph).

<http://www.philippinestudies.net>  
Fri June 27 13:30:20 2008

## Internal Migration in the Philippines: A Review of Research Findings

RICARDO G. ABAD

Like many other countries, the Philippines does not possess a coordinated, well-defined set of internal migration policies. Over the years, however, the Philippine government has implemented a variety of measures which encourage or discourage the movements of Filipinos within the country.<sup>1</sup> Unfortunately, very few of these measures consider the available research findings which might help guide the formulation of such policies.<sup>2</sup> What are seriously considered instead are such migration-related phenomena as urban growth, the proliferation of slum and squatter areas, water shortage, rural poverty, or the deterioration of social services.<sup>3</sup> It is not surprising, then, that programs designed to alleviate these problems hardly alter existing migration patterns. In some instances, as in the case of relocation programs, new problems arise to defeat the very purpose of the planned transfer.<sup>4</sup>

An earlier version of this paper was written as background material for an ongoing study on micro-level migration patterns in Ilocos Norte. The study, conducted by the Institute of Philippine Culture, Ateneo de Manila University, is being supported by the Population Center Foundation and the East-West Center. I wish to thank Gordon F. de Jong, Robert W. Gardner, Elizabeth U. Eviota, Emma Rosario A. Agan, Susana P. Intal, and Rebecca M. Sawyer for their help in completing this article.

1. For reviews of these measures, see Benjamin V. Cariño, "Managing Migration Streams and Population Redistribution: Alternative Strategies and Research Needs," in *Philippine Population Research: Papers and Proceedings of an Experts' Meeting*, ed. Rodolfo A. Bulatao (Makati: Population Center Foundation, 1976), pp. 251-70. See also Romeo Ocampo, "Policies and Programs that Influence Spatial Mobility," paper prepared for the Seminar-Workshop on Migration at the Nutrition Center of the Philippines, Makati, 19 November 1976.

2. See, for example, Amado de la Cruz, "Rural-Urban Migration: Alternative Responses," position paper for HABITAT Forum Workshop at Vancouver, Canada, 27 May-11 June 1976; Sally Findley, *Planning for Internal Migration: A Review of Issues and Policies in Developing Countries* (Washington, D.C.: Bureau of the Census, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1977).

3. Aprodicio A. Laquian, "Coping with Internal Migration in the Philippines," *Solidarity* 8 (1973): 14-20.

4. For various assessments, see Richard P. Poethig, "An Urban Squatter Policy for Metropolitan Manila," *Solidarity* 4 (1969): 20-32; Aprodicio A. Laquian, *Slums and*

A major reason for the absence of comprehensive population redistribution policies in the Philippines is the fragmented, non-cumulative state of migration research.<sup>5</sup> While a body of migration studies exists, the literature is not voluminous compared to studies in fertility and family planning. Also, many migration studies do not focus directly on migration, but incorporate the phenomenon into a larger concern with sociocultural change, urbanization, peasant and urban subcultures, and similar issues.<sup>6</sup> When they do deal directly with migration, the studies tend to focus on macro- rather than micro-level features of the migration process. This paper reviews the macro- and micro-level findings in Philippine migration research, and assesses the usefulness of these findings for policy formulation.

#### REVIEW OF FINDINGS

Analyses of census data and those gathered from national demographic surveys provide the best sources on macro-level migration patterns in the Philippines. They reveal, first, that Filipinos are a relatively mobile people. In 1960, for example, nearly 13 percent of the population of all ages resided in a region other than the place of birth; in 1970, this lifetime figure was close to 14 percent.<sup>7</sup> These studies also show that for the past seventy years,

*Squatters in Six Philippine Cities* (New York: Southeast Asia Development Advisory Group of the Asia Society, 1972); Carlos A. Fernandez II, "Blueprints, Realities, and Success in a Frontier Resettlement Community," in *View from the Paddy: Empirical Studies of Philippine Rice Farming and Tenancy*, ed. Frank Lynch (Quezon City: Institute of Philippine Culture, Ateneo de Manila University, 1972), pp. 176-86; Carlos A. Fernandez II and Gloria A. Fernandez, *Forest Heights: Change, Continuity, and Integration in a Displaced Urban Community*, Preliminary report, (Quezon City: Institute of Philippine Culture, Ateneo de Manila University, 1973); Erlinda N. Salcedo, *The Carmona Urban Resettlement Action Research Project: Baseline Period 1972-73* (Quezon City: Institute of Philippine Culture, Ateneo de Manila University, 1974); Mary Racelis Hollnsteiner, "Urban Planning: A Curbside View," paper prepared for the SEADAG Urban Development Panel on Urban and Regional Planning: The Southeast Asian Experience, Bali, 15-18 April 1974; Richard Ulack, "Migration to the Slum and Squatter Communities of Cagayan de Oro City, the Philippines," *International Migration Review* 10 (Fall 1976): 355-76; John P. McAndrew, "Andam-Mouswag: A Lesson Learned," *Philippine Studies* 26 (1978): 391-425; and Grace R. Dyrness, "A Comparative Study on the Activities of Relocated Low-income Women" (M.A. thesis, Ateneo de Manila University, 1979).

5. Cariño, pp. 251-70.

6. Maria Elena Lopez and Mary Racelis Hollnsteiner, "People on the Move: Migrant Adaptations to Manila Residence," in *Philippine Population Research: Papers and Proceedings of an Experts' Meeting*, ed. Rodolfo A. Bulatao (Makati: Population Center Foundation, 1976), pp. 227-50.

7. Peter C. Smith, "The Evolving Pattern of Interregional Migration in the Philippines," *Philippine Economic Journal* 16 (1977): 121-59.

long-distance migration, involving moves across provinces or regions, prevailed in the country.<sup>8</sup>

Traditionally, i.e., before the 1960-70 period, these migration streams flowed in two major directions: the first was a stream from regions in Luzon and in the Eastern and Western Visayas toward the Metropolitan Manila region; the second was a flow of people from the Visayan regions and from some parts of Luzon to frontier areas in Mindanao.<sup>9</sup> While the 1960-70 interregional patterns remained essentially the same, the percentage of movers headed for the frontier Mindanao regions decreased, while the percentages directed toward Luzon (where Metropolitan Manila is located) and, to some extent, toward the Visayas increased. As both Flieger and others, and Smith observe, advances in Philippine industrialization have led in the 1960s to a shift in the migration patterns away from frontier areas to places with high population densities.<sup>10</sup> Concepcion and Smith add that the 1960s also witnessed a greater circulation among migrants coming from the more developed regions.<sup>11</sup> Compared to movers from poorer regions, who were headed toward areas of high opportunity, movers from the developed regions were choosing a variety of destinations, some developed and others backward.

The recent pattern indicates the popularity of rural to urban movements in the Philippines. As Pernia has shown, based on data

8. Ibid. Also see Wilhelm Flieger, Brigida Koppin and Carmencita Lim, *Geographical Patterns of Internal Migration in the Philippines: 1960-1970*, UNFPA-NCSO Population Research Project (Manila: National Census and Statistics Office, National Economic and Development Authority, 1976); Mercedes B. Concepcion, "Population Growth and Redistribution in the Philippines," in *Asia Urbanization: Population Growth and Concentration and the Problems Thereof*, ed. Social Science Research Institute, International Christian University (Tokyo: Simul Press, 1976), pp. 87-98; and Robin J. Pryor, "The Philippines: Patterns of Population Movement to 1970," in *Migration and Development in South-East Asia: A Demographic Perspective*, ed. Robin J. Pryor, (Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press, 1979), pp. 225-43.

9. For an extended discussion of these patterns, see E. L. Nava, *Internal Migration in the Philippines 1939-48* (Bombay: Demographic Training and Research Center, 1959); Paul D. Simkins and Frederick Wernstedt, "Growth and Internal Migrations of the Philippine Population, 1948-60," *Journal of Tropical Geography* 17 (1963):197-202; Elvira M. Pascual, "Internal Migration in the Philippines," in *Proceedings of the First Conference on Population, 1965* (Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press, 1966), pp. 315-53; Idem, *Population Redistribution in the Philippines* (Manila: Population Institute, University of the Philippines, 1966); and Mercedes B. Concepcion and Peter C. Smith, *The Demographic Situation in the Philippines: An Assessment in 1977*, Papers of the East-West Population Institute No. 44 (Honolulu: East-West Population Institute, 1977).

10. Flieger, Koppin, and Lim, *passim*; Smith, pp. 121-59.

11. Concepcion and Smith, p. 168.

gathered in the 1973 National Demographic Survey, this is indeed the case.<sup>12</sup> But while about a third of all movements between 1965 and 1970 can be characterized as rural to urban, about 26 percent of the moves are urban to urban flows, nearly 24 percent are rural to rural moves, and around 17 percent represent urban to rural migration. The last type of movement indicates the occurrence of some amount of return migration, a pattern which Smith also detected after observing a decline in the "effectiveness" of migration streams in the 1960-70 period compared to earlier years.<sup>13</sup>

A sex selectivity factor relates to this recent migration pattern. Analyzing the sex ratios of migration flows to different destinations, Flieger and others found that the more agriculturally and industrially developed regions absorb more female than male migrants, while the reverse is true in less developed agricultural or industrial regions.<sup>14</sup> Other studies confirm the sex selectivity factor in cityward migration, and add that female migrants not only tend to be young, but are also inclined to spend their urban experience as students, factory workers, or domestics.<sup>15</sup> But the overall sex differential in the in-migration process remains consistent with earlier patterns: in the first stage of in-migration, the pioneering phase, male migrants outnumber female migrants; in the second stage, when in-migration has reached a certain level of development, female migrants outnumber male migrants. The observation

12. Ernesto M. Pernia, *Philippine Migration Streams: Demographic and Socioeconomic Characteristics*, Research Note No. 51 (Manila: Population Institute, University of the Philippines, 1975).

13. Smith, pp. 121-59; Also see Marilou Palabrica-Costelo, "Return Migration from Cagayan de Oro: Some Ecological and Individual Correlates," *Philippine Quarterly of Culture and Society* 7 (1979): 316-34.

14. Flieger, Koppin, and Lim, *passim*.

15. See, for example, Yun Kim, *Net Internal Migration in the Philippines, 1960-1970*, Technical Report No. 2 (Manila: Bureau of the Census and Statistics, 1972); Marilou Palabrica-Costelo and Michael A. Costelo, *Low-Skilled Working Women in Cagayan de Oro: A Comparative Study of Domestic, "Small-Scale" and Industrial Employment*, IPC Women in Development Special Studies 6 (Cagayan de Oro City: Research Institute for Mindanao Culture, Xavier University, 1979); Michael A. Costelo and Marilou Palabrica-Costelo, *Residential Segregation and Centralization in Cagayan de Oro, 1972-1975* (Cagayan de Oro City: Research Institute for Mindanao Culture, Xavier University, 1980); Beverly H. Hackenberg, Steven V. Lutes, and Teresita Angeles, *Social Indicators of Premarital and Postmarital Labor Force Participation Among Women in Region XI: South Mindanao*, IPC Women in Development Special Studies 3 (Davao City: Davao Research and Planning Foundation, 1980); Elizabeth Eviota and Peter Smith, "The Migration of Women in the Philippines," East-West Population Institute, Honolulu, 1980. (Typescript.)

that Filipino females are just as migratory, or even more migratory, than Filipino males suggests the greater degree of development found in the Philippines during the 1960-70 period than in earlier decades.

Another notable differential is the socioeconomic status of migrants. There is sufficient evidence that, on the whole, migrants tend to be more educated and to engage in white-collar jobs more than either non-migrants at the place of origin or natives at the place of destination.<sup>16</sup> What confounds the picture are the effects of age, sex, and place of destination on socioeconomic status. Using data from the 1968 National Demographic Survey, Wéry points out that while older female migrants tend to belong to professional occupations, younger female migrants cluster around service and unskilled occupations.<sup>17</sup> Similarly, differences in the educational levels of migrants and non-migrants are much smaller for females than for males. The selectivity by education and occupation also varies by place of destination. Hendershot, for instance, argues that by and large, migrants to urban places have higher socioeconomic status than migrants to rural places.<sup>18</sup> In another paper, he contends that because of this positive selection, urban migrants have lower fertility levels than urban natives.<sup>19</sup> Sembrano contributes a related finding: fertility differences are negligible when one compares migrants and natives in various rural destinations.<sup>20</sup>

What is the effect of migration differentials on places of origin and destination? The answers do not come easily partly because

16. See, for example, Pernia, *passim*; Pascual, *Population Redistribution*, *passim*; A. G. Panganiban, "School Performance as a Factor in Philippine Rural-Urban Migration," *Philippine Sociological Review* 4 (1956):2-15; Mercedes B. Concepcion, "Migration Differentials in the Visayas," *Philippine Sociological Review* 11 (January-April 1963): 68-75; Francis C. Madigan, S.J., *Birth and Death in Cagayan de Oro: Population Dynamics in a Medium-Sized Philippine City* (Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press, 1972); and Susan Lopez-Nerney, "Educational and Social Characteristics of Manila Migrants," Institute of Philippine Culture, Ateneo de Manila University, Quezon City, 1975. (Typescript.)

17. Rene Wéry, *Migration in the Philippines*, Population and Employment Working Paper No. 4. World Employment Programme: Population and Employment Project (Geneva: International Labour Office, 1974).

18. Gerry E. Hendershot, "Characteristics of Migrants to Manila and Other Urban Places from Two Rural Communities," paper presented at the Third Conference on Population, Manila, 1969.

19. Idem, "Cityward Migration and Urban Fertility in the Philippines," *Philippine Sociological Review* 19 (1971):183-91.

20. Madeleine A. Sembrano, "Migration, Fertility, and Social Mobility in Rural and Urban Communities" (M.A. thesis, Ateneo de Manila University, 1980).

there has been little systematic research on the characteristics of migrants by types of move. There is, however, a general concern for the positive selection of out-migrants or conversely, the negative selection of migrants from places of origin. Several works describe, for instance, how the selective character of migration has affected the age or sex structure of selected sending and receiving areas.<sup>21</sup> Others have noted how this same selective process has contributed to the relative deterioration of the skill structure and a great loss of "person years of schooling" in the sending areas.<sup>22</sup>

There is also a concern for the economic consequences of migration in both sending and receiving areas. As far as sending areas are concerned, substantial out-migration appears to bring about favorable results. Pernia found no evidence that "the lands, jobs, and other economic opportunities vacated by migrants could have been made use of by those left behind."<sup>23</sup> Moreover, other forms of assistance to stayers – remittances in cash or in kind, for example, or periodic return visits and communication, or wealth and skills brought to origin by permanent return migrants – are not substantial enough to alter levels of living in the places of origin.<sup>24</sup> Thus, while Zachariah and Pernia admit that massive out-migration has been effective in relieving population pressure at origin, they still insist, based on available data, that this process has been ineffective in raising the level of living of people in the sending areas.<sup>25</sup>

21. Pernia, *passim*; Arturo G. Pacho and Proserpina D. Tapales, "Conditions in an Area Contributing to Rural-Urban Migration," a report submitted to Internet as part of the study on Rural-Urban Migrants and Metropolitan Development, 1972; Benjamin V. Cariño and Ledevina V. Cariño "Principal Reasons for Migration: A Tool for Decision Making," paper prepared for the Seminar-Workshop on Migration at the Nutrition Center of the Philippines, Makati, 19 November 1976; and Richard Ulack, "The Philippines: The Impact of Migration on Iligan City, Mindanao," in *Migration and Development in South-East Asia: A Demographic Perspective*, ed. Robin J. Pryor (Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press, 1979), pp. 244-50.

22. Pernia, *passim*; Madigan, pp. 192-208; *Survival of Humankind: The Philippine Experiment*, "Discussion Paper on Population Control and Distribution," paper prepared for the World Science Conference, Philippine International Convention Center, Manila, 6-10 September 1976.

23. Ernesto M. Pernia, "The Impact of Migration on Rural Areas in the Philippines," *Philippine Economic Journal* 16 (1977): 160-70.

24. *Ibid.*; There is some evidence, however, that remittances from abroad alter the socioeconomic condition of the population or households left behind by migrants. See Filemon L. Lagon, "The Evolving Life Style of the Ilocano Families Who Receive Support from Abroad: A Case Study" (Ph.D. dissertation, Centro Escolar University, 1976).

25. K. C. Zachariah and Ernesto M. Pernia, "Migration in the Philippines with Particular Reference to Less Developed Regions in the Country," paper prepared for the World Bank, Manila, 1975. (Mimeographed.)

In the receiving areas, the picture is more ambiguous. Again, Zachariah and Pernia suggest that migration has contributed to the development of destination areas in the frontier regions, and on balance, has probably improved the general economic condition of migrants. But the large influx of migrants to cities has been associated with overcrowding and the proliferation of slum and squatter communities.<sup>26</sup> Many migrants also wind up in the poorer sections of the city, and employ belt-tightening measures and other coping mechanisms as survival strategies.<sup>27</sup> But whether in-migration has increased population densities in cities is debatable. Indeed, Pernia has argued that natural increase (i.e., more births than deaths), rather than net in-migration, has been largely responsible for the steady growth of Philippine urban areas.<sup>28</sup>

Part of the difficulty in not obtaining a coherent picture of migration consequences is that the literature offers only a rough understanding of migration determinants. On the macroscopic level, migration has been seen as a response to population pressure,<sup>29</sup> but this observation is misleading since it is not known when the pressure becomes severe enough to prompt a move. It also fails to consider that a population may find alternative responses to population pressure (delayed marriage, for example) and thus prevent out-migration. In any case, the few studies on this topic express caution in associating population pressure and out-migration. As Simkins states:

The lack of close correlation between outmigration and agricultural density, tenancy, and farm size, together with the apparent failure of migration rates to accelerate commensurate with increasing population pressure

26. Laquian, *Slums and Squatters*, passim; Leandro A. Vioria, "Manila," in *Rural-Urban Migrants and Metropolitan Development*, Internet Metropolitan Studies Series, ed. Aprodicio A. Laquian (Toronto, Canada: Mission Press, 1971), pp. 135-50; and A. Bruce Etherington, "Facing the Squatter Problem in Developing Countries," *Solidarity* 8 (July 1973): 3-13.

27. Mary Racelis Hollnsteiner, "City, Province, or Relocation Site? Options for Manila's Squatters," *Philippine Sociological Review* 21 (1973): 207-13.

28. Ernesto M. Pernia, "Trends and Patterns of Philippine Urbanization in the Twentieth Century," in *Philippine Population Research: Papers and Proceedings of an Experts' Meeting*, ed. Rodolfo A. Bulatao (Makati: Population Center Foundation, 1976), pp. 192-226.

29. Pascual, *Population Redistribution*, passim; Paul D. Simkins and Frederick L. Wernstedt, *Philippine Migration: The Settlement of the Digos-Padada Valley*, Davao Province, Southeast Asian Studies Monograph Series No. 16 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1971).

since World War II lends credence [to the supposition that migration is not an automatic response to increasing population pressure].<sup>30</sup>

Since several discussions on the volume and direction of migration streams point out flows from areas of low economic opportunity to areas of high economic opportunity, it is understandable why many macro studies pay special attention to the economic determinants of migration. Reforma points out, for example, that the growth of two Philippine cities, Olongapo and Angeles, is traceable largely to the employment and income prospects which nearby American military bases provide.<sup>31</sup> Using estimated census survival ratios as the migration variable, Cariño demonstrates that migration is related to such factors as family income and employment opportunities in manufacturing.<sup>32</sup> Zachariah and Pernia also find that interregional migration is positively correlated with average family income and the amount of unused agricultural land, but negatively correlated with proportion of poor residents in the rural population and with the urban unemployment rate.<sup>33</sup>

A few macro-studies, however, do not find economic factors as important. Zosa, for example, finds that such geographical-cultural variables as contiguity and ethnic affiliation explain more of the variance in predicting migration than do economic variables.<sup>34</sup> Earlier, Devoretz related migration to absolute differences in wages and growth rates between sending and receiving areas.<sup>35</sup> He found that income growth rates, which represent employment opportunities, were not statistically significant in affecting migration. He also concluded that while large income differentials between

30. Paul D. Simkins, "Migration as a Response to Population Pressure: The Case of the Philippines," in *Geography and a Crowding World*, ed. Wilbur Zelinsky and others (New York: Oxford University Press 1970), p. 266.

31. Míla A. Reforma, "Internal Migration in the Philippines," a report submitted to Intermet as part of the comparative study of Rural-Urban Migrants and Metropolitan Development, 1972.

32. Benjamín V. Cariño, "Socioeconomic Determinants of Internal Migration in the Philippines," a preliminary report of the Cooperative Regional Development Project, NDRC, University of the Philippines, 1973. (Mimeographed.)

33. Zachariah and Pernia, *passim*.

34. Imelda A. Zosa, "A Multivariate Analysis of Migration Flows in the Philippines," paper presented at the Conference of the Organization of Demographic Associates, Manila, 18-22 December 1973; Idem, "Migration to Manila and Rizal: Possible Causes and Implications," paper presented at the Fourth Organization of Demographic Associates Conference, Manila, 21-25 January 1974.

35. D. J. Devoretz, "Migration in a Labor Surplus Economy," *Philippine Economic Journal* 11 (1972):58-80.

origin and destination prompt people to move, these income gains are available only to highly-educated migrants.

Micro-level studies of Philippine migration cast additional doubt on the primacy of economic factors. Pernia's studies, for instance, employ a version of the human capital approach in analyzing decisions to migrate or not migrate.<sup>36</sup> Two sets of independent variables are hypothesized to be associated with migration decisions: personal or household attributes (among them age, education, occupation, and marital status) and external factors (projected income, kinship ties, and size of municipality of residence). After a regression analysis, he concludes that personal attributes are more significant than external factors in the decision to migrate. Of the external factors, the presence of kinship ties (a noneconomic variable) appears to be the most important, while income effects seem critical only for moves to urban rather than rural areas, and for chronic rather than return migration.

Even the oft-cited economic-related reasons for migration, as uncovered in other micro studies do not fully explain why people move.<sup>37</sup> While Ulack finds that the most significant reason for migration to Iligan City was economic betterment, he sees it as applicable only to long-distance migrants.<sup>38</sup> Family-related reasons and prior contacts with relatives and friends at destination also emerge as critical social-psychological variables. Cariño and Cariño's micro-level case study of Bicol out-migrants is more explicit as far as reasons for migration are concerned:

The case histories support this contention: there is no single reason and often no explicit decision for migration. While employment is indeed cited by our case migrants as a major reason for migration, it is seldom effective

36. Ernesto M. Pernia, "An Empirical Model of Individual and Household Migration Choice: Philippines, 1965-1973," Discussion Paper No. 77-1 (Quezon City: Institute of Economic Development and Research, School of Economics, University of the Philippines, 1977); Idem, "An Intersectoral and Sequential Analysis of Migration Decision: Philippines," Discussion Paper No. 78-8 (Quezon City: Institute of Economic Development and Research, School of Economics, University of the Philippines, 1978).

37. See, for example, Lopez-Nerney, *passim*; M.C. Cabaraban and others, "Migration in Misamis Oriental Province in 1972: A Report on Methodology and Substantive Results," Report No. 18 (Cagayan de Oro City: Mindanao Center for Population Studies, Xavier University, 1975); Filipinas Foundation, Inc., *Understanding the Filipino Migrant: An In-Depth Study of the Motivational Factors Behind Internal Migration* (Makati, Rizal: Filipinas Foundation, 1975); and Antonieta Ig. E. Zablan, *Causes and Effects of Rural-Urban Migration: A Study of 1972 Cebu City Inmigrants* (Cebu City: Faculty of the Graduate School, University of San Carlos, 1977).

38. Ulack, *The Impact of Migration*, *passim*.

in isolation from other factors, e.g., boredom in the farm, family/neighborhood conflicts, pressure of relatives, etc. Besides, many migrations have a strong family basis, ranging from marriage and accompanying a family head, to contracting members of the family for outside employment, or facilitating one's adjustment at the new place of residence.<sup>39</sup>

Indeed, even an obvious economic variable like remittances, when seen in a micro-level context, takes on a different meaning. As Trager observes among Dagupan migrants:

. . . remittances must be seen as part of a wider pattern of interaction among those in a rural-urban network. Those in the urban setting also receive things — mainly food — from home. More than that, though, these exchanges of goods and money take place in a context of strong, interpersonal ties. A daughter or a husband does not send money home just because the family has sent him or her out to the city to earn money for them, but because that is part of a system of exchanges and obligations that develop in the context of a family or household.<sup>40</sup>

It does not follow that persons who migrate for economic betterment actually improve their economic positions at destination. In some instances, as Lopez-Nerney discovers, migrants may experience downward mobility in the receiving area.<sup>41</sup> Wéry's analysis of the 1968 National Demographic Survey data reveals essentially similar points: migration does not bring about greater educational mobility, does not lead to status change among active workers; and except for persons whose original occupations were in agriculture, does not result in occupational mobility.<sup>42</sup> Subjectively, the situation is different. Lopez-Nerney finds that migrants experience little objective economic change after migration, but continue to perceive the city as a promised land, a place which can offer more opportunities compared to those found in the places of origin.<sup>43</sup>

These observations stress the importance of the social-psychological aspects of the migration process, an area which thus far has received little attention in Philippine migration research. Ulack

39. Cariño and Cariño, pp. 5-6.

40. Lillian Trager, "Urban Migrants and Their Links with Home: A Case Study from Dagupan City," *Philippine Studies* 29 (1981): 228.

41. Susan Lopez-Nerney, *Migrant Adjustment in Santa Mesa, Manila*, Policy-Oriented Reanalysis Papers of the Population Center Foundation No. 1 (Quezon City: Institute of Philippine Culture, Ateneo de Manila University, 1977).

42. Wéry, *passim*.

43. Lopez-Nerney, *Migrant Adjustment*, *passim*.

speaks, for instance, about “psychological barriers” to migration but does not specify what these are.<sup>44</sup> Simkins and Wernstedt mention that once a pattern of migration has been established in an area, notions about the attractiveness of the destination area linger long after the objective opportunities have disappeared.<sup>45</sup> But the authors fail to elaborate these important social—psychological data. Other studies go a little further to explore migration reasons, sources of information, and place perceptions, but the analyses lack an adequate theoretical framework to help organize the observations.<sup>46</sup> Only Pernia’s works carry an explicit framework, the human capital approach, but his data were limited to the few migration-related variables which were available in the 1973 National Demographic Survey.<sup>47</sup>

#### ASSESSMENT

The need for more micro-level studies is evident, but the same can be said about Philippine internal migration research in general. While macro studies have been useful in describing overall trends in the volume and direction of migration streams, they are often hampered by a limited data base, and the use of a mechanical, push-pull model to explain migration behavior.<sup>48</sup> Both difficulties do little to advance explanations about why people move to specific destinations, or better, why people stay in their respective places of origin. They also fail to consider why, compared to several possible alternatives, migration was chosen as the adaptive response to a structural imbalance, actual or perceived. Given these gaps in knowledge, it is not surprising that migration research has not wielded a strong impact on population distribution policies in the Philippines. Present efforts at regionalization, resettlement, in-

44. Ulack, *The Impact of Migration*, passim.

45. Simkins and Wernstedt, *Philippine Migration*, passim.

46. Zablan, passim; Filipinas Foundation, passim; Imelda Zosa-Feranil and Aurora E. Perez, “Some Notes on Selected Differentials in Place Perception from a Bohol Survey,” *Philippine Quarterly of Culture and Society* 7 (1979): 296-315.

47. Pernia, “An Empirical Model of Migration Choice,” passim; and Idem, “An Intersectoral and Sequential Analysis of Migration Decision,” passim.

48. For discussions on the limitations of census data, see Flieger, Koppin, and Lim, passim; and Francis C. Madigan, S.J., “The Numbers Game: Measurement Problems in Philippine Demography in 1974,” in *Philippine Population Research: Papers and Proceedings of an Experts’ Meeting*, ed. Rodolfo A. Bulatao (Makati: Population Center Foundation, 1976), pp. 57-80.

dustrial dispersion, and other development projects are all based on the assumption that economic, industrial, or technological considerations primarily affect migration flows. But is this the way potential migrants view their moves?

The inconsistent effect of the economic factor in macro or aggregate studies on migration can be greatly clarified by micro-level researches. These researches have already indicated that economic-related reasons constitute only part of the motivations for migration; they also imply that moves to areas of high economic opportunity are not necessarily accompanied by economic motives. But these constitute only part of what micro-level research can uncover regarding the economic factor in migration. Because Philippine society places a relatively high value on socioeconomic mobility,<sup>49</sup> it is expected that most persons will strive for economic betterment. What, then, differentiates migrants and non-migrants if both groups can be assumed to place a high value on economic betterment? One can hypothesize that persons who find less opportunities for economic betterment at origin are more likely to move than those who have more opportunities at origin. But this hypothesis goes against findings showing that persons who are expected to have the least opportunities at origin — those with lower educational attainment or those in low-status occupations, for example — are the ones who tend to stay. Those who move, the available data suggest, are persons with relatively high educational and occupational attainments. There thus exists, as Simmons and others suggest, a relationship between migration and social class.<sup>50</sup> But what explains this relationship? Is the relationship perhaps spurious, one explained by an intervening factor like the extent of community ties, the ability to finance a move, or the lack of alternatives to respond to structural imbalances?

Further research will answer these questions. They will also help unravel the intricacies of other micro-level determinants. It is generally accepted, for instance, that the presence of relatives and friends at destination may influence migration decisions. But these

49. Frank Lynch, S.J., "Social Acceptance Reconsidered," in *Four Readings on Philippine Values*, IPC Papers No. 2, ed. Frank Lynch, S.J. and Alfonso de Guzman II (Quezon City: Institute of Philippine Culture, Ateneo de Manila University, 1973), pp. 1-68.

50. Alan B. Simmons and others, *Social Change and Internal Migration: A Review of Research Findings from Africa, Asia, and Latin America* (Ottawa: International Development Research Center, 1977).

and similar studies do not cite the presence of relatives and friends at destination as a most critical reason for moving. Indeed, studies of migrant adjustment indicate that the presence of kin does not guarantee socioeconomic mobility at destination.<sup>51</sup> Where, then, does this variable fit into the decision-making process? Is it a critical determinant or simply a facilitating factor? Several micro studies also reveal that once at destination, migrants try to maintain linkages with persons at origin.<sup>52</sup> How are these linkages related to earlier decisions to migrate? Do these linkages increase the probability of return migration? What, in general, is the role of family and friends, whether at origin or destination, in the migration decision-making process?

Regardless of the motivation, economic or noneconomic, it is necessary to place these and other hypothesized determinants in a migration decision sequence. Such a view requires a conceptual framework or analytical model which shows the location of these factors and the interrelationships among them. It demands a design which allows for a comparison among various types of migrants and non-migrants. It also needs a perspective that combines macro and micro factors in a single framework.

## CONCLUSION

Demographic forecasts for the year 2000 picture a general increase in net migration rates, the continued dominance of Metropolitan Manila and Mindanao as places of destination, and the persistence of the sex selectivity process observed in the 1960s.<sup>53</sup> To alter these patterns, several structural features of the Philippine

51. See, for example, Lopez-Nerney, *Migrant Adjustment*, passim; B. T. Catapusan and F. D. Catapusan, "Social Adjustment of Migrant Families," *Philippine Sociological Review* 2 (1954):11-16; Fe R. Arciñas and Ofelia R. Angangco, "Adjustment of Migrants in an Urban Area; Pobres Purok," *General Education Journal* 21 (1971):1-29; and Mary Racelis Hollnsteiner, "Metamorphosis: From Tondo Squatter to Tondo Settler," *NEDA Journal of Development* 1-2 (1974-75):249-60.

52. See, for example, Trager, passim; Henry T. Lewis, *Ilocano Rice Farmers: A Comparative Study of Two Philippine Barrios* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1971); Donn V. Hart, "Philippine Rural-Urban Migration: A View from Caticugan, a Bisanan Village," *Behavioral Science Notes* 6 (1971):103-17; and James N. Anderson, "Social Strategies in Population Change: Village Data from Central Luzon," paper prepared for the SEADAG Population Panel Seminar on Population Change and Development in Southeast Asia, the Rural Focus, San Francisco, 6-8 July 1972.

53. Arlyne G. de los Santos, "Regional Projections in 1980: Based on a Migration Regression Model," PREPF Report No. 64, 1976. (Mimeographed.); and Aurora E. Perez, "Internal Migration in the Year 2000," *Philippine Labor Review* 2 (1977):57-77.

condition – population pressure, agricultural potential, access to social services, regional imbalances, among others – will have to be manipulated in the course of implementing migration strategies. What needs stressing, however, is that these macro-level strategies will influence the micro-level migration decision-making process. As Robert Gardner observes, there are:

. . . five places in the decision process where macro factors may be said to be important and hence, where a government might attempt to influence migration decisions through manipulation of the macro factors. These five are, once more: (1) formation of values; (2) place-related macro-factors; (3) factors which affect accurate perception of the place-related macro factors; (4) constraints and facilitators to migration; and (5) factors which affect accurate perception of constraints and facilitators.<sup>54</sup>

Of these five options, only policies and programs which alter place-related macro factors have received serious attention in the Philippines. There have been attempts to facilitate migration via incentives and land settlement schemes, and to constrain movement via travel bans, but these efforts, together with development programs which transform places into viable economic entities, have generally met a low level of success in redistributing the population effectively.<sup>55</sup> Thus, as Gardner correctly argues, the design and implementation of migration and distribution policies have not started to take full advantage of many potential points of influence. There is, therefore, need for studies which incorporate factors at both micro- and macro-levels, and which also seek to identify and examine the linkages between the two.

Meaningful intervention also implies the use of social science data on migration by policy makers and program administrators. Any population redistribution policy adopted by government must integrate with the ideology and resources of the state. Within this context, migration policies will carry a certain priority relative to other government policies. Their priority will also depend on the extent to which the causes and consequences of migration are viewed as critical problems in efforts to improve the citizenry's

54. Robert W. Gardner, "Macro-level Factors and Migration Decision Making," paper presented at the 10th Summer Seminar in Population, Population Institute, East-West Center, Honolulu, Hawaii, 11 June - 13 July 1979, p. 42.

55. Ernesto M. Pernia, "Urbanization Research and Development Planning: A Survey of Indonesia, Thailand, South Korea, and Philippines," Population Council Report (Bangkok, Thailand: Population Council, 1978).

level of living. But a high priority placement only implies that administrators will be receptive to recommendations concerning the control, redirection, or encouragement of migration. What *specific* policies and strategies planners adopt may be something else again, and there is no guarantee that the government will accept the recommendations made by social scientists. Planners weigh a host of desiderata other than the scientific in choosing types of intervention. They also react differently to reports of "program failure" in the field setting, and these reactions may or may not lead to further intervention. Thus, while research data, macro or micro, help to provide more information about migration behavior, there is no clear-cut assurance that recommendations stemming from these data will meet the policy maker's approval. Beyond research, then, is the need to develop structures that will make policy makers sensitive to the usefulness of social science data.<sup>56</sup> If there is a need to bridge the gap between research findings and their use by policy makers and implementors, other issues must be addressed.

56. For further discussion and application, see David C. Korten, "Community Organization and Rural Development: A Learning Process Approach," Ford Foundation and Asian Institute of Management, Makati, 1980. (Mimeographed.); and Ricardo G. Abad, "Cooperative Research Program: Phase II Status Report," Project Development Division, Population Center Foundation, Makati, 1980. (Mimeographed.)