

FIGHT AND FLIGHT: THE DECISION OF FILIPINOS TO LEAVE

---

A THESIS

Presented to

The Faculty of the Department of Economics and Business

The Colorado College

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

Bachelor of Arts

By

Maria Angelica Martinez

Graduation May 2014

# FIGHT AND FLIGHT: THE DECISION OF FILIPINOS TO LEAVE

Maria Angelica Martinez

May 2014

Economics

## **Abstract**

Today, approximately 10 million Filipinos, either temporary or permanent migrants, are sending about US\$20 billion worth of remittances to their families in the Philippines. The current government seeks to provide better economic opportunities so Filipinos will not see working abroad as the only choice but instead as an option. This thesis project attempts to quantitatively evaluate the extent of both push and pull factors determining a Filipino's decision to migrate, either for permanent or for temporary purposes. Since migration is a national policy issue, understanding these factors that push and pull people to leave would be central to retaining Filipinos who would otherwise seek employment and serve abroad. The Ordinary Least Squares regression models are utilized and separated into permanent and temporary Filipino migrants to better differentiate push and pull factors influencing decisions made by Filipinos when migrating. The final results suggests that push and pull factors have different effects on the decisions of Filipinos depending on their destination countries and whether they are a permanent or temporary migrant.

KEYWORDS: Filipino migrants, Filipino workers, OFW, OFWs, OCW, OCWs, Overseas Contract Workers, push factors, pull factors, push and pull factors, permanent and temporary Filipino migrants, Filipinos abroad, Filipino diaspora

ON MY HONOR, I HAVE NEITHER GIVEN NOR RECEIVED  
UNAUTHORIZED AID ON THIS THESIS

MARIA ANGELICA MARTINEZ

---

Signature

## Acknowledgement

*First and foremost, I would like to thank my thesis adviser Professor Esther Redmount for her patient guidance throughout this process. Since my freshman year at the Colorado College, I have already expressed my great interest on this topic to her and ever since then, she has encouraged me to always bring my knowledge to the next level.*

*I would also like to express my deepest appreciation to Professor Dan Johnson for his mentorship throughout my undergraduate years at the Colorado College and for empowering me throughout this process.*

*I am particularly grateful for the kind assistance and constructive recommendations given by Dr. Tracy Santa in the editing process of this thesis project. I would also like to thank Sir Phoenix Van Wagoner for his assistance on the formatting of this thesis. I would also like to extend my thanks to John Richmeier for his help throughout the process.*

*Finally, I would like to thank my partner, Paulo Macasinag, RN BSN, for his continuous support and enthusiastic encouragement throughout my journey in the thesis process.*

*“That in all things, God may be glorified”*

*Ut In Omnibus Glorificetur Deus*

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. LITERATURE REVIEW.....	10
2.1 Labor Export Model.....	10
2.2 Push and Pull Factors.....	11
2.3 Harris-Todaro Model and the Borjas Immigration Model.....	13
2.4 Culture of Migration.....	15
2.5 Philippine Nursing.....	16
2.6 International Migration and Economic Development.....	19
2.7 Network Effects.....	21
3. DATA COLLECTION AND METHODOLOGY	23
4. DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS	22
4.1 Overseas Filipino Workers: Push Factors.....	32
4.2 Overseas Filipino Workers: Pull Factors.....	35
4.3 Permanent Migrants: Push Factors.....	38
4.4 Permanent Migrants: Pull Factors.....	42
5. CONCLUSION	46
6. LIMITATIONS AND FURTHER RECOMMENDATION	51
7. BIBLIOGRAPHY	54

## LIST OF TABLES

2.2.1 Expected Signs for Push and Pull Factors.....	13
3.1 Summary Statistics for the Push factors model for OFWs.....	23
3.2 Summary Statistics for the Pull factors model for OFWs.....	24
3.3 Summary Statistics for the Push Factors Model for Permanent Migrants.....	25
3.4 Summary Statistics for the Push factors model for Permanent Migrants.....	25
4.1 Push Factors Model for Overseas Contract Workers.....	32
4.2 Pull Factors Model for Overseas Filipino Workers.....	35
4.3 Push Factors Model for Permanent Migrants.....	38
4.4 Pull Factors Model for Permanent Migrants.....	42

## **CHAPTER 1 Introduction**

### **1.1. Overseas Filipino Workers and Permanent Filipino Migrants**

This thesis project is the first attempt in the literature to 1) quantitatively validate the extent both push and pull factors affect a Filipino's decision to migrate, either permanently or temporarily 2) separate a permanent migrant's decision from that of a temporary migrant in the context of push and pull factors. 3) differentiate the importance of one's perception of his/her state of life and the reality of the situation by using the variables self-rated poverty and unemployment 4) differentiate network effects for each top destination countries of Filipino migrants 5) evaluate the significance of the role of recruitment agencies was also included as a push factor for temporary migrants.

“Are you a nurse? Are you taking up nursing? Are you a caregiver? Are you a helper?” these are the questions Filipinos often encounter from foreigners or fellow Filipinos abroad. Filipino migrants, both temporary and permanent, are often called the modern heroes of the Philippines today. They are often praised for having kept the economy afloat through growing remittances in the midst of economic and political turmoil since the previous decades. Overseas Filipino Workers (OFWs) are “those presently or temporarily abroad to fulfill an overseas contract for a specific length of time or who are presently at home on vacation but still has an existing contract to work abroad. They may be land-based or sea-based workers” (Talento, 2004). While OFWs bring pride and honor to the Philippines, they also recreate today's sad reality in the country where “the most talented workers are among those leaving the country, at times to take on lower-skilled jobs not commensurate with their qualifications” (Ducanes & Manolo, 2008). In the other literatures, OFWs cover both temporary and permanent

migrants, and the former is called Overseas Contract Workers (OCWs) instead, but for the purpose of this thesis, OFWs represent temporary migrants.

The OFWs or temporary migrants include “contract workers, intra-company transferees, students, trainees, entrepreneurs, businessmen, traders, and others whose stay abroad is six months or more” (Opiniano, 2007). It is worth noting that these OFWs often aspire to stay in their respective host countries, eventually becoming permanent residents or immigrants, legally petitioning for citizenship for their families for reunification purposes. The permanent immigrants are defined as “Filipino migrants and legal permanent residents abroad. Permanent migrants may be Filipinos who are Filipino citizens, who are Philippine passport holders, or who have been naturalized citizens in the host country” (Opiniano, 2007).

According to the Commission on Filipinos Overseas (CFO) statistics released in 2012, there are currently 10,489,628 Filipinos living and/or working overseas. Of this number, approximately 47% are permanent residents abroad and 40% are expected to return home at the end of their contracts of employment. The remaining 13% are known as the irregular or undocumented migrants who “do not have a valid residence and work permits; [who are]...overstaying workers or tourists in a foreign country... [and] have been in such status for six months or more” (Opiniano, 2007). In 2012, the top three destination countries for permanent migrants were the United States, Canada, and Japan where approximately 4,015,436 Filipinos reside. For temporary overseas workers, the top destinations were Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, and Qatar with approximately 2,054,255 Filipinos. These top three destinations, both for permanent and temporary migrants, will be used in the data analysis section using Ordinary Least Squares

regression models for the quantitative evaluation of the pull factors that attract Filipinos to leave for these specific countries.

## **1.2. Remittances**

Filipinos today receive approximately US \$ 21.3 billion of global remittances. As a result, this makes the Philippines the top 4 recipient of remittances globally, alongside Mexico, India, and China, that contribute to 13% of the country's GDP (World Bank, 2011). The topic of both the temporary and permanent migrants is crucially important because their remittances, according to the Central Bank of the Philippines, supplement national income and aggregate demand as a whole by fueling domestic consumption and entrepreneurial activities. Moreover, employment of Filipinos overseas, both temporarily or permanently, is not only a means for employment generation but also for poverty alleviation (Viajar, 2011). The annual departures of 300,000 Filipinos (Bagasao, 2005) generate remittances that are the second largest source of foreign exchange for the Philippine economy after private capital flows. From a macroeconomic perspective, the short and long run effects of the increasing volume of remittances are seen on macroeconomic indicators such as GDP, Foreign Exchange, and aggregate domestic consumption of the Philippines (Ducanes & Manolo, 2008).

## **1.3. History of Overseas Filipino Workers and Permanent Migrants**

The dictatorship of Former President Marcos that ended in the early 1980s greatly influenced the history of Philippine immigration to today. His regime was marred by political oppression, severe economic depression, and high unemployment rates, which caused Filipinos to leave for better opportunities abroad. After the downfall of the Marcos regime, the economy remained stagnant with "institutionalized corruption, crony

capitalism, bad or weak leadership, and a host of other problems” (Laguatan, 2011) that have been deeply embedded in the Filipino culture. The beginnings of the Filipino diaspora could be traced all the way back to 1972, after Marcos declared Martial Law (Laguatan, 2011). Two years after, the Marcos government launched the overseas employment program as crucial form of temporary stopgap measure that alleviated high unemployment rates coupled with foreign exchange deficits. Juxtaposed to the increasing flow of remittances had been increasing psychic costs, untold sacrifices and exploitations, and brain drain.

The migration of Filipinos before, during, and after the dictatorship regime began with the waves of migrating medical professionals—mainly nurses—to the United States. The medical professionals were known to have had easy transitions and adaptations to the U.S. healthcare system, primarily because of the colonial history between the Philippines and United States. This history “produced two important consequences: the introduction of English as national language and the introduction of American Medical techniques, terminology, and infrastructure, particularly the establishment of a teaching hospital by the American colonial powers” (Sol). The U.S. government program known as the Exchange Visitor Program was utilized as a means to positively promote the American culture and values throughout the participating countries via participating professionals for brief durations of duty.

In the late 1960s, Filipinos comprised the majority or 80% of the participating medical professionals in the exchange program (Sol) and (Choy C. C., 2003). From this, we could say that network effects were already established—even before the overseas program of the Marcos government—through visitors who would return to the

Philippines with more personalized information and description of their experiences and established relationships in the United States. The training and emigration opportunities were also enhanced by laws such as the U.S. 1965 Immigration Act that had a preference system on the specific skill sets of immigrants and existing family relationships with U.S. citizens. Also, the amendment of the Exchange Visitor Program in the late 1960s, that initially required visitors to return after two years, was amended to support longer stays of the medical professionals. As a result, the numbers of migrating Filipino medical professionals continuously increased as opportunities for permanent residency became easier and more accessible. (Choy C. C., 2003).

In summary, the Exchange Visitor Program caused the first wave of Filipino migration, pioneered by medical professionals, and the second wave was ‘pushed’ by the labor export regime of the former dictator Ferdinand Marcos. While Marcos ended the exchange program with the United States because of recurring reports of Filipinos being exploited, he officially initiated the temporary policy of the labor export of Filipino professionals abroad by stating, “We intend to take care of [Filipino nurses] but as we encourage this migration, I repeat we will now encourage the training of all nurses because...this is a market that we should take advantage of instead of stopping the nurses from going abroad why don’t we produce more nurses? If they want one thousand nurses we produce a thousand more” (Choy C. C., 2003).

#### **1.4. Significance of the Topic**

Since the start of President Benigno S. Aquino III’s presidency in 2010, one of the collective goals of the nation has been to open a world of opportunities for both Filipinos with and without education to secure quality jobs. The incumbent president states in his

2012 State of the Nation Address (SONA), “Whenever I come face to face with an [Overseas Filipino Worker] OFW who tells me, *thank you, because I can once again dream of growing old in the Philippines*, I respond: *You made this happen.*” (President Benigno S. Aquino III, 2012). Also, he respectfully informed the public in his 2011 SONA, “Before, our foremost ambition was to work in another country. Now, the Filipino can take his pick. As long as he pursues his dreams with determination and diligence, he can realize them” (President Benigno S. Aquino III, 2011). His general remarks suggests how this culture of migration has affected economic and social patterns experienced by Filipinos in both negative and positive ways. With all the projects he had initiated—healthcare, education, infrastructure, and others that reach out to families on and below the poverty line—the overall success of these to generate better economic changes comes down to the Philippines’ only precious resource: its manpower, President Aquino celebrates, “This is why, to all the nurses, midwives, or doctors who chose to serve in the barrios; to each new graduate who has chosen to work for the government...You made this change possible” (President Benigno S. Aquino III, 2012). In relation to the thesis topic on the determinants of a Filipino’s decision to leave the country, for temporary or permanent migration, it is crucially important to statistically or quantitatively evaluate both push and pull factors for these are important to understand if the Philippines seek to retain as much of its people.

One of the most interesting points that President Aquino III had addressed in the Philippine culture is the culture of negativism, mostly of Filipinos to their fellow Filipinos:

"Let us end the culture of negativism; let us uplift our fellow Filipinos at every opportunity. Why are there people who enjoy finding fault in our country, who find it so hard—as though it were a sin—to say something nice? Can we even remember the last time we praised a fellow Filipino? Let us stop pulling our fellow man down. Let us put an end to our crab mentality. Let us make the effort to recognize the good that is being done. If you see something right, do not think twice—praise it.

If you see a policeman directing traffic, coatless beneath the rain—go to him and say, “Thank you.” If you fall sick, and you see your nurse caring for you, when she could easily be treating foreigners for a higher salary—say, “Thank you.” Before you leave school for home, approach your teacher who chose to invest in your future—say, “Thank you.” " (President Benigno S. Aquino III, 2011)

President Aquino III asks the Philippines to honor fellow Filipinos who chose to stay to serve the country and to think more optimistically. This culture of negativism affects how certain jobs, especially teaching and nursing, do not receive the well-deserved respect and value. As a result, teachers and nurses may seek for prestige and respect, as well as better wages, through migrating abroad, especially in countries like the United States where these professions are more respected and valued. This culture of negativism also addresses, in a more subtle way, the long-time occurrence of Filipinos generally looking down at their country. This negativism has constantly influenced temporary or permanent migrations.

In President Aquino III’s State of the Nation Address (SONA) in 2012, he talked about the importance of healthcare and its central role in ensuring the future and economic development of the country. The Philippines is well known for being the largest exporter of health professionals, specifically nurses, worldwide (Lorenzo F. , Galvez-Tan, Icamina, & Javier, 2007). However, the Philippines continue to mass-produce and send off human resources abroad, even though there are shortages in well-trained health professionals in the country. In light of this, it is then crucially important to retain health professionals, as well as other Filipinos. Addressing the shortage of health

professionals within the country is of critical importance because as the president lamented, "...four out of ten Filipinos have never seen a health professional in their entire lifetime. Other figures are more dire: Six out of ten Filipinos die without being attended to by health professionals" (President Benigno S. Aquino III, 2012). His statement suggests that in order to optimize and harness the human resources in the country, there is a need for more efficient targeting and deployment of health professionals to Filipino communities in dire need. In the context of nursing, however, in order to implement these strategies, the Philippines also needs to retain health professionals to address these shortages or unequal distribution of professionals across the country by improving health-related working conditions, wages, and benefits. This is because some of the factors pushing out migration have continued to be poor job conditions, limited resources to provide quality care, low wages, heightened stress levels due to extremely higher nurse to patient ratios in contrast to other countries. President Aquino III views recent initiatives, such as efficient targeting, as a systematic approach in retaining health professionals, as well as other Filipino professionals, in the Philippines, "This new system addresses two issues: thousands of nurses and midwives now have jobs and an opportunity to gain valuable work experience; at the same time, millions of our countrymen now have increased access to quality health care" (President Benigno S. Aquino III, 2012).

President Aquino III described in his SONA that from 2010 to 2012 alone, 3.1 million jobs in the Philippines were generated to alleviate the prevalence of unemployment. He acknowledged that some of the main problems causing unemployment are job and skill mismatches. In order to address these, the incumbent government has redesigned curriculums (such as the K-12) and has realigned it with the

demands of the domestic job market to also retain more people in the country. While these job generations are expected to affect the number of people who leave annually, especially overseas workers, it is worth noting that it will take a long time for the changes to occur. Similarly, even though the confidence in the current government has increased both locally and internationally, it is also worth noting that it will take a long time for the existing 'culture of corruption' engrained in the minds and culture of Filipinos to be replaced with positive and trusting relationships.

In the absence of sustainable economic opportunities that could have led to growth and development, this paper seeks to argue that these push and pull factors are a major influence on decisions of Filipinos to pursue opportunities overseas that vary from temporary to permanent. Also, these push and pull factors are the same causes why Filipinos decide to leave the country for good, taking advantage of citizenships or family reunification opportunities abroad. Furthermore, these factors simultaneously determine the decisions of Filipinos to leave the Philippines. By utilizing the available data, this thesis project seeks to quantitatively evaluate the extent of the push and pull factors affecting a Filipino's decision to leave by utilizing an Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) regression analysis or linear regression models.

## **CHAPTER 2 Literature Review**

### **2.1. Labor Export Model**

In the mid 1970's the Marcos government initiated the labor export program that promoted and instilled the culture of migration in the Philippine society. Along with high levels of unemployment and balance of payments crisis, the oil shock of 1973 caused an upsurge in overseas workers who could temporarily work for a specified period of time in the contracts. (Rupert & Solomon, 2006) As a result, large-scale overseas employment became the temporary stopgap measures to alleviate the problems faced by the Philippine economy. The Middle East, particularly oil-exporting countries, during the mid 1970s onwards experienced unexpected and abrupt economic growth which led to the sudden shortage of manpower to accomplish infrastructure projects. Moreover, the literature makes a very strong comment on this: "essentially the Philippines dealt with the massive increase in price for oil imports by trading workers for oil" (Solomon & Eden, 2010).

The labor export regime of the Philippines began since the implementation of the export-led growth strategies by the Marcos government (Tyner, 2005). Today, it is evident that the temporary stopgap measure, such as to improve foreign exchange deficits and alleviate high levels of unemployment, became deeply embedded in the lives of Filipinos and a fundamental part of the Philippine economic policy. The economic policies in favor of labor export programs materialized through the compartmentalization of government agencies, such as the Philippine Overseas Employment Administration. It is worth noting that there could be contradictions between the existence of labor-export policies and the government's recent claims that they do not promote overseas employment for economic reasons. While these government agencies mediate overseas

employment between prospective employers abroad and employees from the Philippines, they also help alleviate and control risks associated with emigration such as human trafficking and illegal recruitments.

## **2.2 Push and Pull factors**

This thesis project attempts to statistically validate both push and pull factors in the context of the Philippine migration. More specifically, this thesis project aims to evaluate the extent of how push and pull factors affect an individual's decision to migrate temporarily or permanently abroad. Extensive literature validates that both push and pull factors drive approximately 9 million overseas Filipino workers and permanent migrants to leave the country. But it is also worth noting that push and pull factors are limited in their own ways and could exclude other possible causes why people leave, such as the embedded culture of migration in the Philippine society since the 1970s. The general literature mainly focuses on the nursing sector—or more generally the health sector—when evaluating both push and pull factors. Push and pull factors are generally categorized in four different ways: economic, individual or family-related, job-related, and socio-political and economic environment (International Labour Office, 2005) and (Lorenzo F. , Galvez-Tan, Icamina, & Javier, 2007).

Push factors that influence motivation of migrants “are related to any number of conditions that might make migration attractive” (Solomon & Eden, 2010). The extensive literature on Overseas Filipino Workers describes the outstanding push factors to be: “limited job opportunities” (European Union External Action, 2009), high unemployment rates, high poverty and below the poverty line rates, “underemployment” (Lorenzo F. , Galvez-Tan, Icamina, & Javier, 2007), “poor health insurance coverage, [...]socio-

political and economic instability in the Philippines” (Lorenzo F. , Galvez-Tan, Icamina, & Javier, 2007), “the institutionalization of migration in the country” (Viajar, 2011), prevalence of natural disasters, and “weak and often corrupt institutions, poor working conditions” (Solomon & Eden, 2010).

The economic push factors branch off into local dynamics, such as through wages being low despite years of service and disproportionately low compared to costs of living. More generally, an individual’s desire for higher wages and more stable economic conditions are economic push factors. Individual and family-related reasons encompass a Filipino’s desire to find for a lifetime partner or reunite with a partner living abroad and/or personal advancement of skills and specialization. Also, one’s desire to be independent and distant from difficult relationships in the Philippines could influence a personal decision to leave. Job-related push factors include insufficient benefits and wages from employment that become inadequate to sustain one’s family and self. In the specific case of nurses, job-related push factors are described as “slow rate of promotion, overworked staff, and anxiety over malpractice...” (International Labour Office, 2005). Socio-political and economic environment push factors are caused by corruption, peace order, and unstable political situations.

The literature justifies economic pull factors being higher wages overseas and better benefits. It continues to describe individual and family-related pull factors being the expectations for a better quality of life, improved social benefits, and opportunities for family reunification, travel, and experience other cultures. Job-related pull factors are caused by one’s desire to improve his/her technical skills and experience better working conditions and quality of life. Ultimately, pull factors are perceived to be caused by

economic and environmental factors, such as better job conditions and chances for promotion, improved standards of living, and family reunification, support, or networks in the destination countries (International Labour Office, 2005).

While these push and pull factors are important to understand and internalize to improve incentives for people to stay in the country to serve, it is also crucial to understand the reasons why people who decide to stay have opted out to leave for opportunities abroad, “those workers opting to stay in the country gave as their main reasons: satisfaction with the present situation; the desire to serve their country; and the wish to be with their families” (International Labour Office, 2005).

Table 2.2 Expected Signs for Push and Pull Factors

<b>Push factors</b>		<b>Pull factors</b>	
<i>Variable</i>	<i>Expected sign</i>	<i>Variable</i>	<i>Expected sign</i>
Unemployment	+	Better economic opportunities	+
Poverty	+	Network effects	+
Underemployment	+		
Corruption	+		

### **2.3. Harris-Todaro Model and the Borjas Immigration Model**

While these push and pull factors are important in understanding a Filipino’s decision to leave, it is worth noting that incentives, allocations, and expectations also play very important roles in these decisions. The Harris-Todaro model describes rural to urban migration in the context of expected wages and developing countries. The model has been very influential in the literature of migration economics because “it is micro-founded on the individual decision to maximize the prospect of higher wages...enough to

generate migration, even though some will not realize the higher wage” (Solomon & Eden, 2010).

“The search is constrained by the individual’s financial resources, by the immigration regulations imposed by competing host countries and by the emigration regulations of the source country. In the immigration market the various pieces of information are exchanged and the various options are compared. In a sense, competing host countries make “migration offers” from which individuals compare and choose. The information gathered in this marketplace leads many individuals to conclude that it is profitable to remain in their birthplace (i.e., they find it expensive to migrate to another country). Conversely other individuals conclude that they are better off in some country. The immigration market nonrandomly sorts these individuals across host countries” (Borjas, 1989)

Furthermore, the Borjas Immigration model formalizes that decisions made by economic agents or individuals in the migration process (whether temporary or permanent) are rational. In relation to the neoclassical theory, individuals are assumed to be utility-maximizing agents, who make decisions to temporarily or permanently migrate to specific destination countries to maximize their well being.

In the context of the quote above, Borjas describes the big role of information exchange in the decision-making process of individuals because it allows them to weigh where they could reap higher and more secure benefits both in the short and long run. This information exchange could be generated from networks of prospective migrants (both temporary and permanent), which will be evaluated in the succeeding pull factors models in the data analysis section of this paper. Borjas continues to describe how these migrants could be constrained by legal procedures and regulations enforced by both the destination and source countries. Even in the midst of these constraints, he acknowledges that destination countries in some ways compete for these migrants, which in turn provides migrants with bargaining power to choose from an array of options.

## 2.4. Culture of Migration

The literature also suggests that to understand a migrant's decision to leave the country permanently or temporarily, it is important to look beyond the push and pull factors. One important determinant is also the culture of migration that began during the institutionalization of Philippine nursing specifically to the United States. The literature specifically on migration of health professionals highlights the notion that simply focusing on the push and pull factors obscures the real picture (Solomon & Eden, 2010). Instead, the literature suggests the inclusion of the culture of migration when understanding migration decisions, “rendered invisible is the culture of migration, the ways in which narratives about the promise of immigration to the United States—narratives circulated by the media as well as Filipino nurse migrants already in the United States—shape Filipino nurses’ desire to migrate abroad” (Choy C. , 2003, pp. 60-93).

Choy (2003) describes the popular notion that contemporary nursing migration, placed in the light of U.S. immigration and economic opportunities simply, assumes that nurses are rational economic agents and therefore calculate earning disparities in both countries. As a result, nurses migrate because of the higher wages in the United States. Further, the main point was by just simply focusing on push and pull factors, we oversimplify the true story by ignoring “the very important and complicated roles that both Philippine and U.S. governments, recruitment agencies, and professional nursing organizations, as well as the Filipino nurse migrants themselves, have played in facilitating this form of migration” (Choy C. , 2003, pp. 60-93). The literature describes that a Filipino's decision to leave the Philippines is influenced by many actors that create the deeply engrained culture of migration in the Filipino's mindset. Ultimately, they

suggest the importance of including colonial histories, such as between the United States and the Philippines, where historical relationships embed specific types of cultures such as the culture of migration in the Philippine society where presumptions such as “it is always better abroad” or “it is better in the United States” have strong presence until today.

## **2.5. Philippine Nursing**

In the context of overseas Filipino workers and those who eventually become permanent migrants to specific destination countries, the state of the Philippine nursing mirrors the culture of migration that is not fully captured by the push and pull factor models. This sector also highlights both the positive (such as training and advancement of skills) and negative effects (brain drain, broken families, shortage of skilled nurses in the Philippines) of Filipinos temporarily or permanently working abroad. The migration (temporary or permanent) of Filipino nurses during the first and second waves to the United States eventually expanded as these became central to economic policies (such as labor-export policies) and because of the culture of migration. While the Philippines is the top one source of professional nurses worldwide, it is also the top two source of doctors who become nurse medics worldwide (Galvez-Tan, 2006). Nurse medics are doctors who “have retrained as nurses in order to seek overseas employment are a new and growing phenomenon” (Lorenzo F. , Galvez-Tan, Icamina, & Javier, 2007). Doctors are also leaving behind their licenses in order to retrain as nurses to pursue emigration to Northern America or to Europe (Solomon & Eden, 2010). While there has not been a full documentation on the matter, “In 2005, approximately 4,000 doctors were enrolled in nursing schools across the country and in 2004, the Philippines Hospital Association

estimated that 80 percent of all public sector physicians were currently or had already retrained as nurses” (Pascual, Marcaida, & Salvador, 2003).

A strong statement on these current healthcare issues goes, “Less-developed nations actually aid in developing the quality of health care facilities in developed nations” (Ball, 2004). The depressed state of opportunities in the health sector (such as employment, good working conditions, and decent wages) in the Philippines has created consecutive “push-factors” that encourage the increasing migration of Filipino nurses and doctors. Consequently, the health care in the Philippines has been deteriorating as the nurses and nurse medics who pursued overseas employment are generally the best educated and most experienced, and include many nursing professors. Furthermore, recent research on the care drain experienced by the Philippines has caused closures of hospitals nationwide and 70% of the cause of deaths in the hospitals being the shortage of staff that could attend to patients (Pascual, Marcaida, & Salvador, 2003).

The current global shortage of nurses (approximately 4.3 million) increases the incentive for migrants, specifically Overseas Filipino Workers (OFWs), to leave their respective countries to take advantage of the higher wages and more advanced resources abroad. The external demands for nurses have caused a significant increase in the availability of nursing degrees. While the incentives for Filipinos to pursue undergraduate education increase to acquire specialization in a career that is highly skilled, the literature suggests that the Philippines does not benefit because of mismatches between the availabilities of jobs and human resources. Rather, while the Philippines fully invest its resources to produce highly skilled human capital, it is siphoned away by the push and

pull-factors involved in a Filipino's economic decision to leave the country (Bagasao, 2005).

Filipino nurses largely contribute to the increasing remittances received annually. "The Philippines is the largest exporter of nurses worldwide...a large portion of [the billions of remittances] comes from international service providers, with nurses constituting the largest group of professional workers abroad" (Lorenzo F. , Galvez-Tan, Icamina, & Javier, 2007) for many decades. The country has consistently supplied nurses to the United States, Saudi Arabia, and to the United Kingdom. Both domestic and foreign demand for nurses has generated a rapidly growing nursing education sector. This is made up of about 460 nursing colleges that offer the Bachelor of Science in Nursing program and graduate approximately 20,000 nurses annually, according to the Commission on Higher Education. While it could be said that there is a surplus of nurses in the Philippines, it essentially "loses its trained and skilled nursing workforce much faster than it can replace them, thereby jeopardizing the integrity and quality of Philippine health services" (Lorenzo F. , Galvez-Tan, Icamina, & Javier, 2007).

In relation to the State of the Nation Address (SONA) of the incumbent President Aquino III, it is worth noting that in order to address severe shortages in the remote and rural areas in the Philippines of health professionals, effective targeting of nurses and proper incentives such as better wages and working conditions are central to solving the problems. Moreover, it is important for these incentives to be signaled to the professional nurses and doctors to provide them the options to stay. Since most nursing jobs abroad require a certain amount of time of experience, not all who aspire to work abroad successfully find nursing jobs and instead pursue caregiving jobs or other jobs unrelated

to their fields. This suggests that the experienced and highly trained nurses are more likely to be able to migrate. Also, because of the constraints and barriers to entry to the overseas market, there is a surplus of newly graduated nurses. Consequently, the wages become suppressed which eventually still makes migration a better option and more appealing (Solomon & Eden, 2010).

## **2.6. International Migration and Economic Development**

The Philippines is a labor-exporting country where highly-skilled labor is also relatively scarce—with large outflows of educated migrants leaving the country as either high or low skilled, depending on the job opportunities pursued. While the literature seeks to evaluate the positive and negative effects of migration on the source country's economic development, it all comes down to the trade off between the two effects. Remittances, for example, may generate positive effects such as multiplier effects, poverty alleviation, and investments by enhancing the marginal propensity of the receiving households to consume. Ultimately, the impacts of international migration should not be only evaluated through remittances, but also include potential negative effects on the individual and national levels such as brain drain or brain waste, psychic costs, broken families, exploitation of Filipinos abroad, and shortage of high skilled professionals (such as registered nurses and doctors in specific geographic areas).

Current economic studies suggest that “migration and economic development are closely linked to one another: development shapes migration, and migration in turn, influences development...” (Taylor, 2006). However, the complexity arises as researchers also investigate how migration also recreates the reality of underdevelopment: “one does not usually see streams of migrants leaving economies that

are dynamic centers of employment creation” (Taylor, 2006). If migration and underdevelopment work together, it could either be because the loss of highly skilled human capital hinders development or people leave underdeveloped areas because of very limited opportunities for further enhancements of personal skills. Incentives play a great role in the decisions of migrants or in this case Filipinos to migrate—such as comparing current and expected income levels.

Paradoxically, “there are many cases where incomes are increasing and international migration is, too. It is usually not the case that the poorest households send migrants abroad...[as] the answer is usually households that are somewhere in the middle or upper middle of the village’s income distribution” (Taylor, 2006). One possible explanation on the for this is while poorer households have the incentives to send a family member overseas (especially for migration purposes), they are constrained by the long term costs associated with moving out of the Philippines and moving into the destination country. Another could also be because of the limited resources or networks of the poorer households, they could be at higher risk for illegal recruitments and losing all resources exhausted for sending family members abroad to benefit from remittances and reap better opportunities. Another setting is where rich households are expected to migrate considering their liquidity to pay for the short and long term migration costs. However, they are less likely to send a family member abroad even if they have the means. Recent economic research suggests that relative income or relative deprivation “is an important variable driving international migration. The richest household, by definition, is not relatively deprived. Thus, from a pure relative deprivation point of view, it has no reason to participate in migration by sending a child abroad” (Taylor, 2006).

Economic studies suggest that Filipinos who are within the range of middle to upper middle of the income distribution are most likely to participate in international migration.

“Economic studies using survey data find, fairly consistently, that at very low levels of household income the probability of sending family member is low. As income increases, the international migration probability also increases---until one reaches the top of the income distribution, at which point it falls” (Taylor, 2006).

The law of diminishing returns implies that Filipinos at the lowest income distribution are least likely to send a family member abroad because of financial and safety constraints as much as those at the highest income distribution because of little to almost no returns.

## **2.7. Network Effects**

Research on network effects suggests that Filipinos, both permanent and temporary migrants, provide valuable information to other potential overseas workers or migrants through existing interpersonal relationships. As a result, the financial and social costs of successive migrations (temporary or permanent) decrease. (Abrigo & Desierto, 2011). Abrido and Desierto (2011) also mention in their research “...growing migrant networks induce ever increasing migration as more and more households are able to participate.” This implies how network effects create a chain of reactions on the decisions of Filipinos to leave the country, which could be traced back to kinship ties. As the information on opportunities abroad spread within the overseas workers’ or migrants’ family members, the people within the network become more prepared to leave. However, it is not only kinship ties that create these beneficial network effects. Network effects can also be created through the presence of recruiting agencies and word of mouth (through news, access to personal research on opportunities) within and across communities.

Taylor (2006) suggests that the most important determinant of a migrant's decision to leave his or her country is his/her networks through family members or proximity to other people who have migrated (such as neighbors). He continues to highlight that pioneer migrants not only send home remittances most of the time, but also important information that orient prospective migrants about costs and risks, procedures, and contact persons related to the migration process (Taylor, 2006).

The network effects can also provide more tangible benefits to people within the communities or families. The support usually materializes through short to long term financial and personal support that allow new migrants to assimilate by having sufficient time to find for jobs or schools and to expand their own personal networks. An example of a network insuring people against risks is “the sibling will also provide housing, food, and job market contacts.in this way. In this way, family migration networks reduce the economic costs and risks of international migration while offering many other benefits, including a familiar face in a foreign land” (Taylor, 2006). These network effects alleviate risks and costs associated with asymmetries and unavailability of information on migration. It is worth noting that, as Abrigo and Desierto (2011) and Taylor (2006) suggest, these network effects are not limited to family networks. Effects of the expanding networks could also be witnessed through communities where “access to networks eventually spreads across households in migrant-sending areas. The more households in a village that have migrants, the more likely that other households in the village eventually will send migrants abroad” (Taylor, 2006).

### CHAPTER 3 Data Collection and Methodology

In order to statistically or quantitatively validate the extent both push and pull factors affect a Filipino's decision, both for temporary and permanent, to leave the Philippines, the push factors such as self-rated poverty, unemployment rates, underemployment rates, number of college graduates, total number of government-approved recruiting agencies, year, and the corruption perception index were utilized as the independent variables. Moreover, the other potential push factors variables such as the prevalence of natural disasters, health expenditure per capita, and credit constraints to borrow were not included because of less frequent collection of data, limited degrees of freedom, or very small number of observations. In the context of the pull factors, the top three destination countries were used for both permanent and temporary migrants. The pull factors variables included in the models were the number of overseas Filipinos or temporary migrants present in those top destination countries, the ratios of GDPs per capita of the destination over the Philippines GDP to measure relative wealth, and the year. The discussions on these variables follow after the summary statistics.

Table 3.1 Summary Statistics for the Push Factors Model for OFWs

Variable	Obs	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
year	21	2002	6.204837	1992	2012
OFWs	21	269537.9	64562.26	114200	437720
selfratedpoverty	20	57.441	6.138754	47.5	68.25
lagunemp	20	8.87	1.626459	7	11.9
totalnumagencies	21	232.8571	229.7682	108	1168
lagunderemp	20	20.02	1.805139	17	22.6

*OFWs*

Overseas Filipino Workers; annual number of Filipinos who temporarily leave the Philippines to seek job opportunities abroad

selfratedpoverty

annual (average of quarterly data) percentage of household heads who subjectively rate their own families as poor

<i>lagunemp</i>	lagged (for one year) annual unemployment rate in the Philippines
<i>totalnumagencies</i>	annual total number of private recruitment agencies that serve as intermediaries between the recruiting employers in destination countries and prospective Filipino employees
<i>lagunderemp</i>	lagged (for one year) annual “visible” and “invisible” underemployment rate of Filipinos 15 years old and over in the Philippines (percent to total employed)
<i>year</i>	year

Table 3.2 Summary Statistics for the Pull Factors Model for OFWs

Variable	Obs	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
<i>year</i>	21	2002	6.204837	1992	2012
<i>lagsaudiOFWs</i>	20	82329.1	27216.09	51329	133110
<i>laguaeOFWs</i>	20	28152.1	20450.81	10811	76164
<i>lagqatarOFWs</i>	20	15563.95	14581.37	2702	45070
<i>lag2ratiosaudiphils</i>	20	8.971328	1.157759	7.19086	11.07743
<i>lag2ratiouaephils</i>	20	28.64323	6.333572	15.94093	37.24675
<i>lag2ratioqatarphils</i>	20	29.24356	10.741	15.18892	44.69624

<i>lagsaudiOFWs</i>	lagged (for one year) annual total number of Overseas Filipino Workers in Saudi Arabia
<i>laguaeOFWs</i>	lagged (for one year) annual total number of Overseas Filipino Workers in the United Arab Emirates
<i>lagqatarOFWs</i>	lagged (for one year) annual total number of Overseas Filipino Workers in Qatar
<i>lag2ratiosaudiphils</i>	lagged (for two years) ratio of the GDP per capita of Saudi Arabia in current US\$ over the GDP per capita of the Philippines in current US\$
<i>lag2ratiouaephils</i>	lagged (for two years) ratio of the GDP per capita of the United Arab Emirates in current US\$ over the GDP per capita of the Philippines in current US\$
<i>lag2ratioqatarphils</i>	lagged (for two years) ratio of the GDP per capita of the United Arab Emirates in current US\$ over the GDP per capita of the Philippines in current US\$
<i>year</i>	year

Table 3.3 Summary Statistics for the Push Factors Model for Permanent Migrants

Variable	Obs	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
year	21	2002	6.204837	1992	2012
permtmig	21	64900.38	14084.36	39009	86075
self-ratedpoverty	20	57.441	6.138754	47.5	68.25
numcollegegrad	18	399636.7	66020.59	307027	517425
cpi	18	2.745	0.370298	2.3	3.6
lagunemp	20	8.87	1.626459	7	11.9
lagphilsgdpcap	20	1281.705	452.3927	815.0648	2357.571

<i>permtmig</i>	total annual number of Filipinos who permanently migrate outside of the Philippines
<i>lagunemp</i>	lagged (for one year) value of annual unemployment rates in the Philippines
<i>lagphilsgdpcap</i>	lagged (for one year) value of annual GDP per capita of the Philippines in current US\$
<i>cpi</i>	annual values of the Corruption Perception Index
<i>numcollegegrad</i>	annual total number of college graduates
<i>self-ratedpoverty</i>	annual (average of quarterly data) percentage of household heads who subjectively rate their own families as poor
<i>year</i>	year

Table 3.4 Summary Statistics for the Push Factors Model for Permanent Migrants

Variable	Obs	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
year	21	2002	6.204837	1992	2012
lag2USFilmig	19	38026.74	7035.156	24123	49522
lag2CANFilmig	19	11937.74	5165.074	5651	27302
lag2JAPFilmig	19	5624.947	1713.989	3766	9742
lagratioUS	20	31.11817	5.563843	21.14621	39.066
lagratioCAN	20	23.13611	3.327333	17.77289	29.21707
lagratioJAP	20	30.60654	7.447389	19.56869	43.3731

<i>Lag2USFilImmig</i>	Lagged value (for 2 years) of the total annual amount of Permanent Filipino migrants at the given time in the U.S.A
<i>Lag2CANFilImmig</i>	Lagged value (for 2 years) of the total annual amount of Permanent Filipino migrants at the given time in Canada
<i>Lag2JapFilEmig</i>	Lagged value (for 2 years) of the total annual amount of Permanent Filipino migrants at the given time in Japan
<i>Lagratiouspihls</i>	Lagged value (for 1 year) of the ratio of the GDP per capita in current US\$ of the United States over the Philippines

<i>Lagratiocanadaphils</i>	Lagged value (for 1 year) of the ratio of the GDP per capita in current US\$ of Canada over the Philippines
<i>Lagratiojapanphils</i>	Lagged value (for 1 year) of the ratio of the GDP per capita in current US\$ of Japan over the Philippines
<i>Year</i>	Year

The dependent variable for the push factors model on the Overseas Filipino Worker's (OFW) decision to leave is the annual stock estimate of Filipinos overseas. The data were obtained from the Philippine Overseas Employment Administration (POEA) to account for the annual number of OFWs who are temporarily abroad. While these do not include irregular migrants, such as those who have an illegal status abroad, these represent the stock of temporary Filipino migrants overseas. Similarly, the dependent variable for the push factors model on permanent Filipino migrants was the annual stock estimates of permanent Filipino migrants. The data from the Commission of Filipino Overseas on the Number of Registered Filipino Emigrants from 1981 to 2012 were utilized to account for the number of Filipino migrants who are permanently abroad.

For the independent variables in the push factors model on the Overseas Filipino Workers (OFWs) decision, the annual number of private recruiting agencies for employment abroad, licensed and verified by the government, is one of the independent variables. The data tallied from the Philippine Overseas Employment Administration (POEA) database were on over 3,489 licensed recruiting agencies sorted alphabetically with information on license validities. The data were collected and tallied from the POEA database in March 2014 to create a tally of how many existing agencies there have been annually since 1992. This was very important to collect because agencies act as an intermediary between the prospective overseas Filipino workers and foreign employers from abroad by providing important information to both agents. In order to evaluate the

role of agencies as one of the push factors, this tallied annual data of existing agencies in the Philippines were used. The agencies that had the following status(es) were excluded from the tally: licenses that were revoked, temporary suspension of operation, suspended, ceased operations, preventive suspension, inactive, denied renewal, cash bond withdrawn, cancelled, and banned. Only the agencies that were in good status and that had their licenses expired or not renewed after the granted license validity, were the only ones included.

The self-rated poverty variable is also included in the push factors models for both the temporary and permanent Filipino migrants. The Social Weather Stations (SWS) provides the data on the poverty indicator, which “is the proportion of household heads who rate their own families as *mahirap*, which is the Tagalog for ‘poor’. This measure of poverty is subjective from the viewpoint of the family, not the researcher, and is thus capable of being validated by independent surveys using the same approach...[the] self-rated poverty is of a much larger magnitude than officially-measured poverty...” (Mangahas, 2004). Since the indices are collected quarterly, the average was taken to generate annual data points. Previous Philippine presidents have also utilized and validated SWS’s poverty indicator, considering that poverty statistics are only collected every three years in the Philippines and could oversimplify the real economic situation of the Philippines in light of poverty.

Underemployment is only included in the push factors model for the overseas Filipino workers or temporary migrants because of the assumption made that being underemployed may only affect a Filipino’s decision to leave temporarily than for good because of financial constraints. This will be further discussed in the data analysis

section. The Philippine Bureau of Labor and Employment Statistics (BLES) along with the National Statistics Office (NSO) provide data on the annual underemployment which was used in the model (covering both visible and invisible underemployment) of Filipinos 15 years old and over (percent to total employed). The BLES and National Statistics Office define underemployed persons as “employed persons who want additional hours of work in their present job; or to have additional job; or a new job with longer working hours” (Bureau of Employment and Labor Statistics & National Statistics Office, 2011). Visible underemployment is defined as the person working for less than 40 hours per workweek while invisible underemployment is the person working for 40 hours or more per workweek. Generally, both visible and invisible underemployment also suggest and reflect people who want both more work hours per week and better employment opportunities that they feel could be a better match to their skills.

The Transparency International Organization provides the Corruption Perception Index (CPI) and has been collecting the index since 1995. The CPI is only included in the push factors model for permanent Filipino migrants considering that they are likely to be more aware of the prevalence of corruption in the source country. The CPI “ranks countries and territories based on how corrupt their public sector is perceived to be. A country or territory’s score indicates the perceived level of public sector corruption on a scale of 0 - 100, where 0 means that a country is perceived as highly corrupt and 100 means it is perceived as very clean. A country's rank indicates its position relative to the other countries and territories included in the index” (Transparency International Organization, 2014). The CPI is not lagged for this model because as tested, CPI when lagged for one or two years is not statistically significant. Both lagged values being not

statistically significant may suggest that current state of corruption becomes more statistically significant in the decision-making process of a permanent Filipino migrant.

The annual unemployment rate is also included in the push factors models for both the overseas workers and permanent migrants. The annual data of unemployment in the Philippines from 1992 to 2012 is from the World Bank Indicators database. Also, the annual Gross Domestic Product (GDP) per capita in current US\$ of the Philippines is from the World Bank Indicators database.

On the economic indicators of the top three destination of Overseas Filipino Workers as of 2012 Saudi Arabia, UAE, and Qatar, the data from the World Bank Indicators database were utilized. Data on GDP per capita to create ratios of relative wealth were utilized for the pull factors model for both permanent migrants and temporary overseas workers. These GDP ratios are used to represent relative wealth between the destination countries and the Philippines. The same data collection method was used for the top three destination countries of Filipino Emigrants as of 2013 U.S.A., Canada, and Japan. Only the top three countries for each type of Filipino migrant were used because of the limited degrees of freedom and small number of observations. These top destination rankings were provided by POEA and the Commission on Filipinos Overseas (CFO) in 2012.

After regressing the independent variables in both push factors models (temporary and permanent migrants) against the dependent variable (either stock estimate of Overseas Filipino Workers or permanent Filipino migrants), the residuals were predicted with the assumption of the push factors being independent of the pull factors that attract Filipinos to leave. The residuals were used as the regressand in both the pull factors

model for permanent migrants and pull factors model for overseas workers to evaluate the extent or magnitude of the pull factors influencing people's decision to leave the Philippines. Time series were used for all models. Also, robust regressions were utilized to correct for the possibility of heteroskedasticity.

On the pull factors models, the stock estimate of permanent Filipino migrants or those who are already living in the top destination countries was lagged for two years and temporary overseas workers abroad was lagged for one year to evaluate the magnitude of the network effects in a Filipino's decision to leave the Philippines. The stock estimates of OFWs were lagged for only one year since it is faster and easier for Filipinos to establish networks for the purposes of temporary migration. Also, the recruitment agencies that assist OFWs to leave, even without a present family member in the destination country, help spread information faster and even establish the networks not previously present. For the permanent migrants, it could take more than just a year for those already present members or more recent family members who just migrated to assimilate and settle down. Thus, it might take time for their other family members who are still in the Philippines to migrate because it is assumed that the family abroad has to be already stable to accommodate incoming family migrants. Ultimately, it is worth noting that these networks play significant roles in both the temporary and permanent migration decision-making processes.

The independent variable, annual number of college graduates annually, is not lagged because graduation in the Philippines is between the months of March to April. Usually, prior to a student's graduation he/she already starts processing migration documents which then makes his/her departure from the country more immediate. This

was only utilized in the pull factors models for permanent migrants because of the assumptions that college graduates migrating abroad are more likely to pursue migration permanently and that employers abroad are more likely to sponsor their permanent residency and citizenship because of their specialized skill sets.

For the pull factors model on OFWs, the annual ratios of the GDPs per capita of each of the top three destination countries (Saudi Arabia, Qatar, and UAE) over the Philippine GDP in current US\$ were taken to evaluate relative wealth or how much richer the destination countries are in contrast to the Philippines. These ratios were also lagged for two years as it also takes time for people to determine countries with the more stable economic and economic situations for work. Also, it can take much more time for temporary workers to deduce how secure these job opportunities are both financially and personally, despite the established presence of Filipino communities in the destination countries. More specifically, the relative wealth measure may also proxy for more stable and consistent job availabilities or opportunities that prospective Filipinos are observing or are taking precautionary measures about. For the pull factors model on permanent Filipino migrants, the annual ratios of the GDPs for each of the top three destination countries were taken (U.S.A., Canada, and Japan) over the Philippine GDP to also evaluate relative wealth in comparison to the Philippines. The ratios were lagged for one year because the information on the economic state of these countries for migrants are much faster to be transmitted if there are family members, relatives, or friends who have already settled for a while in those top migrant destination countries.

## CHAPTER 4 Data Analysis and Results

### 4.1 Overseas Filipino Workers: Push Factors

Table 4.1 Push Factors Model for Overseas Filipino Workers

<i>vars</i>	<b>Push Factors Model <i>OFWs</i></b>
constant	-1.99x10 <sup>7</sup> *** (4195870)
self-ratedpoverty	3486.46** (1753.56)
lagunemp	-6976.46* (3846.97)
totalnumagencies	184.94** (75.96)
lagunderemp	-1981.00 (3754.81)
year	9993.56*** (2043.45)
Number of observations	19
R <sup>2</sup>	0.8547

Note: \*p<0.10

    \*\*p<0.05

    \*\*\*p<0.01

$$OCW_{S_t} = \alpha_0 + \beta_1 \text{self-ratedpoverty}_t + \beta_2 \text{unemp}_{t-1} + \beta_3 \text{totalnumagencies}_t + \beta_4 \text{undermp}_{t-1} + \beta_5 \text{year}_t + \varepsilon_t \quad (4.1)$$

The variables that are statistically significant at the 90%, 95%, and 99% levels are the lagged self-rated poverty, lagged unemployment rates, annual total number of recruiting agencies, year, and the constant term. The  $R^2$  value suggests that 85.47% of the variation in the total annual amount of Filipinos who leave for work abroad caused by the pull factors are explained by self-rated poverty, lagged unemployment rates, total number of recruiting agencies, lagged underemployment rates, and year.

#### **4.1.1 Self-rated Poverty**

For every percentage increase in the self-rated poverty of Philippine households, there are approximately 3,486 people who leave annually to pursue job opportunities abroad, holding other independent variables constant. This suggests that people's perception of their current state of living could influence their decision to leave the country for better opportunities and to improve their current state of living. This goes back to the literature review where relative deprivation and income are also important determinants of a Filipino's decision to leave.

#### **4.1.2 Lagged Unemployment Rate**

For every percentage increase in the lagged unemployment rates in the Philippines, there are 6,976 people who are not able to or who do not leave annually to pursue job opportunities abroad, holding other independent variables constant. The variable is lagged because it takes time for people to find for jobs before finally becoming unemployed and deciding to leave for opportunities abroad. Also, it takes time and great financial constraints for those who are unemployed to save up for the costs associated with working abroad, such as transportation, room, board, and visa processing fees. It takes time for people to reflect on their current state and to cease finding for jobs before resorting to other choices such as working abroad. Ultimately, the regression result suggests that people who are unemployed are less or least likely to leave for temporary migration, which could be because of financial constraints that one cannot afford to overcome due to unemployment. This implies that an unemployed person does not have enough savings or extra money to pursue this endeavor. However, it is also worth noting

that there are opportunities where some agencies and employers cover or waive some or most of the costs—specifically for certain jobs and destination countries.

#### **4.1.3 Annual Total Number of Recruiting Agencies**

For every unit of increase in the number of recruiting agencies in the Philippines, there are approximately 184 people who leave annually to pursue job opportunities abroad, holding other independent variables constant. Recruiting agencies in the Philippines serve as intermediaries between prospective overseas Filipino workers and employers overseas. Since these agencies are licensed and verified by mainly the Philippine Overseas Employment Administration, it reduces the risks such as illegal recruitment and human trafficking. As a result, it increases the confidence of prospective OFWs to pursue job opportunities abroad as they take precautionary measures against illegal recruitments and smuggling. However, as witnessed in the list of recruitment agencies database, there were licenses that were banned forever or revoked which implies that even though the reasons for license revocations were not specified, POEA only has limited control and power over the initial behavior and intentions of agencies.

#### **4.1.4 Year**

For every unit of increase in the time variable (year), there are approximately 9993 people who leave annually to pursue job opportunities abroad, holding other independent variables constant. Each year, there are more people who leave and pursue job opportunities abroad. This may include people who take advantage of networks or those who renew their contracts so they can maintain their legal status to work abroad. Also, this may suggest that overtime people still continue to leave and pursue job opportunities to take advantage of the decreasing costs of working abroad, such as

transportation and accommodation costs. This may also have some implications on how Filipinos perceive and feel the improvements in their economic, social, and personal lives in the Philippines over time.

#### 4.2 Overseas Filipino Workers: Pull Factors

Table 4.2 Pull Factors Model for Overseas Filipino Workers

<i>vars</i>	<b>Pull Factors Model <i>resid</i></b>
constant	-9322913 (1.21x10 <sup>7</sup> )
lagsaudiOCWs	2.16** (0.96)
laguaeOCWs	-1.18 (1.26)
lagqatarOCWs	1.93 (2.75)
lag2ratiosaudiphils	-62191.85 (39864.03)
lag2ratiouaephils	12104.38** (5027.80)
lag2ratioqatarphils	-37.56 (4937.44)
year	4667.73 (6003.09)
Number of observations	18
R <sup>2</sup>	0.3989

Note: \*p<0.10

\*\*p<0.05

$$\text{resid}_t = \alpha_0 + \beta_1 \text{saudiOCW}_{s_{t-1}} + \beta_2 \text{uaeOCW}_{s_{t-1}} + \beta_3 \text{qatarOCW}_{s_{t-1}} + \beta_4 \text{ratiosaudiphils}_{t-2} + \beta_5 \text{ratiouaephils}_{t-2} + \beta_5 \text{ratioqatarphils}_{t-2} + \beta_4 \text{year}_t + \varepsilon_t \quad (4.2)$$

The variables that are statistically significant at the 90% to 95% levels are the lagged (for one year) value of overseas Filipino workers in Saudi Arabia and the lagged (for two years) ratio of the GDPs per capita in current US\$ of the United Arab Emirates over the Philippines in current US\$, or the relative wealth. The  $R^2$  value suggests that

39.89% of the variation in the total annual amount of Filipinos who leave for work abroad are explained by the independent variables or pull factors. The low  $R^2$  value could be caused by the small number of observations and small sample of independent variables.

#### **4.2.1 Lagged values (for one year) of the Annual Number of Overseas Filipino Workers in Saudi Arabia**

For every unit of increase in the number of Filipinos who are at the present time working already in Saudi Arabia, there are approximately two Filipinos who leave the Philippines to pursue job opportunities in Saudi Arabia, holding other independent variables constant. This variable is lagged because it takes at least some time for Filipinos to maintain and establish contacts with the family members or friends abroad for temporary migration purposes. The variable was only lagged for a year because it may not take as long as for permanent migrants to establish networks because of the widespread presence of recruitment agencies and word of mouth about opportunities to work abroad (especially through newspaper ads and news in the television). This result suggests that Filipinos are more likely to temporarily migrate to Saudi Arabia if there are already established and strong Filipino communities there. Ultimately, these communities are strengthened and enjoyed through the presence of Filipino organizations that range from extension of government agencies that attempt to monitor and protect the rights of OFWs (such as the Philippine Overseas Labor Office) to sports organizations to Filipino international schools and so on.

#### **4.2.2 Lagged (for 2 years) ratio of the GDP per capita in current US\$ of U.A.E. over the Philippines, both in current US\$ (measure of relative wealth)**

For every unit of increase in the value of the ratio of the GDPs per capita or relative wealth between the UAE and the Philippines, there are approximately 12,104 Filipinos who leave the Philippines to pursue job opportunities in the United Arab Emirates, holding other independent variables constant. The ratio is lagged for two years because it might take some time for people to reflect and ponder upon the stability of the UAE economy, especially secure job opportunities. This could be related back to the literature review where wages that are perceived to be higher or simply the prospect of higher wages could already attract temporary migrants. These migrants may not directly look at the economic performance of the country but could obtain information on economic opportunities from the news, recruiting agencies, or their own networks of Filipino families and friends already working in this specific country. The country may also signal their relative wealth or improved economic performance through the increased demand for jobs and improved wages and benefits that are disseminated mainly by the recruitment agencies in the Philippines or by the networks.

### 4.3 Permanent Migrants: Push Factors

Table 4.3 Push Factors Model for Permanent Migrants

<i>vars</i>	<b>Push Factors Model</b> <i>permtmig</i>
constant	3426262 (2723769)
lagunemp	-3150.46** (1580.75)
lagphilsgdpcap	-20.04* (11.09)
cpi	-10975.06** (4978.66)
numcollegegrad	0.33** (0.13)
self-ratedpoverty	-864.48** (405.78)
year	-1677.67 (1385.76)
Number of observations	17
R2	0.9331

Note: \*p<0.10  
\*\*p<0.05

$$\text{permtmig}_t = \alpha_0 + \beta_1 \text{unemp}_{t-1} + \beta_2 \text{philsgdpcap}_{t-1} + \beta_3 \text{cpi}_t + \beta_4 \text{numcollegegrad}_t + \beta_5 \text{self-ratedpoverty}_t + \beta_6 \text{year}_t + \varepsilon_t \quad (4.3)$$

The variables that are statistically significant at the 90% to 95% levels are the lagged value of unemployment rate in the Philippines, lagged value of the GDP per capita of the Philippines in current US\$, corruption perception index, number of college graduates annually, and the self-rated poverty. The  $R^2$  value suggests that 93.31% of the variation in the total annual number of Filipinos who leave as permanent migrants are explained by the independent variables.

#### **4.3.1 Lagged value of unemployment rate in the Philippines**

For every unit of percentage increase in the Philippine unemployment rate, there are approximately 3,150 Filipinos who are unable or do not leave to migrate to another country, holding other independent variables constant. Similar to the results in the lagged unemployment rate for the push factors model for OFWs, people are less or least likely to migrate if unemployed because of the financial constraints associated especially with long-term decisions such as permanently migrating to a different country. However as mentioned in the literature review, it is also important to acknowledge that there are family members who are already citizens or permanent residents abroad who are willing to cover short run and long run costs such as flight tickets, accommodation, petition for citizenship, and job applications or school application fees. Ultimately, the presence of cost sharing or coverage by networks alleviates financial constraints of permanent migration to a very large extent.

#### **4.3.2 Lagged value of the Philippine GDP per capita in current US\$**

For every unit of increase of the Philippine GDP per capita in current US\$, there are approximately 20 Filipinos who do not leave the Philippines to migrate to another country, holding other independent variables constant. The Philippine GDP per capita may also proxy for better job opportunities and economic standing of the country and the result suggests that once these economic opportunities are present and improved, people are less likely to leave. As the literature describes, Filipinos are more willing to stay in the country if given the chance to be employed and receive proper wages and benefits enough to sustain the family.

### **4.3.3 Corruption Perception Index**

For every unit of increase in the Corruption Perception Index, which implies a country becoming less corrupt and a more conducive environment for business, (0 being completely corrupt and 10 being completely “clean” of corruption), there are approximately 10,975 Filipinos who do not leave the Philippines to permanently migrate to another country, holding other independent variables constant. This suggests that as the Philippines becomes less corrupt in the long run, more opportunities are created and resources are better allocated to create a more conducive environment, not only for businesses but also for individuals in the country. The result could also imply that as the confidence of the people in the country increases, the more optimistic they are about the improvement of their lives economically, socially, and personally then the less likely they are to leave the Philippines.

### **4.3.4 Number of College graduates Annually**

For every unit of increase in the total number of college graduates annually, there are approximately 0.33 Filipinos who leave the Philippines to permanently migrate to another country, holding other independent variables constant. This result suggests that since college graduates are more capable of pursuing highly skilled jobs abroad that require specialized skills, they are more likely to obtain sponsorships from an employer for a permanent residency or citizenship. This could also reflect the practice in the Philippines, especially in the context of nursing where parents, who are already citizens of the top destination countries, encourage their children to pursue jobs in demand such as nursing in order to obtain an easier pass to migrate and secure a job right away.

#### **4.3.5 Self-rated poverty**

For every percentage increase in the self-rated poverty of Philippine households, there are approximately 864 Filipinos who are not able to leave the Philippines to migrate to another country, holding other independent variables constant. In contrast to the result in the push factors model for OFWs, this result suggest that since migration is a long term decision and people may not always have access to credit markets or family members to loan them money, people are less likely to migrate. More specifically, as people perceive themselves as poor, they are less likely to move abroad considering that they will also have to eventually bring their family members along with them or in the near future, which entails greater financial commitment, costs, and constraints. In contrast to a shorter-term decision, such as working abroad, people are less likely to migrate or pursue relocation decisions abroad.

#### 4.4 Permanent Migrants: Pull Factors

Table 4.4 Pull Factors Model for Permanent Migrants

<i>vars</i>	<b>Pull Factors Model</b> <i>resid</i>
constant	-3192454*** (570995.80)
lag2USFilmig	0.27 (0.12)**
lag2CANFilmig	-0.58 (0.56)
lag2JAPFilmig	1.45** (0.65)
lagratioUS	-769.54 (576.83)
lagratioCAN	367.73 (529.42)
lagratioJAP	1164.92*** (242.19)
year	1586.65*** (288.74)
Number of observations	17
R <sup>2</sup>	0.7512

Note: \*p<0.10

\*\*p<0.05

\*\*\*p<0.01

$$\text{resid}_t = \alpha_0 + \beta_1 \text{USFilmig}_{t-2} + \beta_2 \text{CANFilmig}_{t-2} + \beta_3 \text{JAPFilmig}_{t-2} + \beta_4 \text{ratioUS}_{t-1} + \beta_5 \text{ratioCAN}_{t-1} + \beta_6 \text{ratioJAP}_{t-1} + \beta_7 \text{year}_t + \varepsilon_t \quad (4.4)$$

The variables that are statistically significant at the 95% to 99% levels are the lagged value (for 2 years) of the annual total amount of permanent Filipino migrants at the given time in the United States, lagged value (for 2 years) of the total annual amount of permanent Filipino migrants at the given time in Japan, lagged value (for 1 year) of the ratio of the GDP per capita in current US\$ of Japan over the Philippines, year, and the

constant term. The  $R^2$  value suggests that 75.12% of the variation in the residuals are explained by the pull factors.

#### **4.4.1 Lagged value (for 2 years) of the total annual number of permanent Filipino migrants at the given time in the United States**

For every unit of increase in the permanent Filipino migrant already staying in the United States, there are 0.27 units of Filipinos who migrate to the United States, holding other independent variables constant. This suggests how network effects are a big consideration especially for those family members and relatives left in the Philippines. The strong and large presence of Filipino communities in the U.S.A. may decrease psychic costs such as homesickness and other social costs—these communities help migrants assimilate during their transition process. Also, network effects in the context of the U.S.A. are significant because these provide security and lessen risks associated with migration as family members, relatives, or friends are more familiar with the processes that are best and safest. Furthermore, these relationships support new migrants through accommodation, expenses for petition for migration, flight expenses, and other fees. Also, the small sample or limited number of observations could limit the accuracy of the result.

#### **4.4.2 Lagged value (for 2 years) of the total annual number of permanent Filipino migrants at the given time in Japan**

For every unit of increase in the permanent Filipino migrant already staying in Japan, there are 1.45 less units of Filipinos who migrate to Japan, holding other independent variables constant. This could be because of specific migration policies or quotas that restrict the continuous flow of permanent Filipino migrants to Japan. An

example of a bilateral agreement between the Philippines and Japan is the Japan-Philippines Economic Partnership Agreement (JPEPA), where some migration policies on flows of Filipinos to Japan were discussed. Since the early 2000s, the immigration laws, specifically visa procedures, have been very strict in response to human trafficking and illegal recruitment of Filipinos in Japan. Consequently, this has decreased the number of Filipinos migrating (either temporarily or permanently) to Japan. Even though JPEPA stated that there are no quantitative targets towards Filipino workers, “neither party shall impose or maintain any quantitative restriction on the number of natural persons to be granted entry and temporary stay” (Amante, 2007), there are qualitative restrictions that serve as barriers to entry to the Japanese job market for Filipinos—such as minimum number of years of education and work experience.

Even though the JPEPA aims to not impose any quota on the number of Filipino workers they accept each year, the Japan External Trade Organization (JETRO), observed that Japan is very strict about the legal procedures and requirements on temporary and permanent migrations and still attempts to set some quantitative restrictions, as mentioned in the JPEPA agreement “Japan will accept a maximum of 1,000 caregivers and nurses from the Philippines under the bilateral economic partnership agreement” (Amante, 2007). This suggests that even though there are already networks established in Japan, Filipinos are not able to take advantage of its benefits because of restrictive immigration policies, whether quantitative or qualitative, despite economic partnerships. This could be related back to Borjas’ model in the literature review that described immigration regulations as constraints to an individual’s choice to migrate.

Ultimately, the small sample or limited number of observations could limit the accuracy of the result.

#### **4.4.3 Lagged value (for 1 year) of the ratio of the GDP per capita in current US\$ of Japan over the Philippines**

For every unit of increase in the value of the ratio of the GDPs per capita, there are approximately 1,164 Filipinos who desire to leave the Philippines to permanently migrate to Japan, holding other independent variables constant. The relative wealth between Japan and the Philippines may influence people to migrate to Japan because of the distance and job opportunities posed by the strong economic performance of Japan. As the relative wealth proxies for job opportunities and better long-term securities, more Filipinos may be attracted to migrate for good. However, it is also important to acknowledge that migration policies could still constrain Filipinos to take advantage of better economic opportunities in Japan reflected by the relative wealth. Also, the small sample or limited number of observations could limit the accuracy of the result.

#### **4.4.4 Year**

For every unit of increase in the time variable (year), there are approximately 1586 Filipinos who leave annually to migrate abroad, holding other independent variables constant. This suggests that there is an increasing trend of Filipinos migrating to not only the top destination countries but to other countries of preference as well. First reason could be family reunification or the opening of other opportunities that could advance skills and knowledge. Another could be the “culture of migration” to pursue greener pastures and a better life abroad. Also, the small sample or limited number of observations could limit the accuracy of the result.

## **CHAPTER 5 Conclusion**

The extensive literature on the push and pull factors that determine a Filipino's decision to leave was utilized. After compiling the list for both the push and pull factors, the factors that could be represented by existing data were used. The data was gathered by utilizing databases, including the World Bank, Commission on Filipinos Overseas, Philippine Overseas Employment Administration, and Transparency International. After compiling the data, the push and pull factors models were generated both for temporary and permanent Filipino migrants.

This thesis project is the first attempt in the literature to 1) quantitatively validate the extent both push and pull factors affect a Filipino's decision to migrate, either permanently or temporarily 2) separate a permanent migrant's decision from that of a temporary migrant in the context of push and pull factors. 3) differentiate the importance of one's perception of his/her state of life and the reality of the situation by using the variables self-rated poverty and unemployment 4) differentiate network effects for each top destination countries of Filipino migrants 5) evaluate the significance of the role of recruitment agencies was also included as a push factor for temporary migrants.

The research focused on the extent that push and pull factors affect the decisions of Filipinos to leave the Philippines. More specifically, while the research validated these factors statistically, it also differentiated the determinants of a Filipino's decision as a permanent migrant and as a temporary migrant (OFWs). This topic is a major policy issue for incumbent and future governments: one of the many reasons is because in order to ensure the success of government projects, such as healthcare, education, and other infrastructures, the Philippines needs to ensure it has sufficient human resources. Since

1992, the number of OFWs has increased at different rates. In light of this, even if the rate of people leaving decreases at certain periods, people are still leaving, which implies that efforts to address both the push and pull factors along with other determinants need to be addressed and understood better.

The push factors model results for temporary Filipino migrants or OFWs suggests that 1) self-poverty or the perception that one is poor influences Filipinos to work abroad while unexpectedly unemployment does not cause them to leave. This may further imply that a Filipino's perception of himself/herself being poor is more significant for his/her decision to leave than the actual reality of the situation such as one's unemployment. Another reason why unemployment does not push people to leave is the financial constraints associated with temporary migration such as the visa processing, flight tickets, and accommodation. 2) The recruiting agencies also influence people to leave because of their roles in disseminating information and serving as intermediaries between prospective migrants and employers. 3) The year variable suggests that the number of temporary migrants increases over time. The pull factors model results for OFWs suggests that 1) Network effects are important to consider for Filipinos deciding to work in Saudi Arabia. 2) The relative wealth between the United Arab Emirates and the Philippines is also significant for Filipinos to consider in terms of job opportunities, and better wages and benefits. Ultimately, it is important to note that the small number of observations only cover from 1992 to 2012 and may limit the accuracy of the analysis to certain extents.

The push factors model results for permanent Filipino migrants implies that 1) A Filipino's perception of his/her relative income or deprivation, named as the self-rated

poverty variable, affects his/her decision to leave as a permanent migrant. If a person views himself/herself as poor, the less likely he/she is to migrate. 2) When a Filipino is unemployed, he/she is less likely to migrate. This could imply that financial constraints associated with migration are great barriers on a person's decision to leave for good. As the literature also suggests, people who migrate are usually those who are in the middle class to upper middle class strata and if one perceives himself/herself as poor and if they are unemployed then they are actually less likely to migrate. 3) People do not leave the country when the Philippine economy, indicated by the GDP per capita variable, offers better employment opportunities, higher wages, and enhanced benefits. 4) Since college graduates are more likely and capable to pursue highly-skilled jobs abroad, they could seek employment abroad and have stronger chances to find employers who could sponsor their permanent migration in the long run. 5) As the Philippines become less corrupt and better able to allocate resources and opportunities for people who are staying and those who would otherwise leave, the less likely that Filipinos permanently migrate abroad.

The pull factors model results for permanent Filipino migrants suggests that: 1) Filipinos are likely to consider the presence of networks, such as family members, friends, and employers, when migrating to the United States. As a result, Filipinos are more likely to migrate as these networks decrease social and financial costs associated with migration. 2) However, Filipinos are less likely to migrate to Japan despite the number of established networks and Filipino residents. This suggests that restrictive migration policies also come into play. 3) Filipinos are more likely to migrate to Japan as the relative wealth between Japan and the Philippines increases. This implies that as Japan has better economic status it has better job opportunities, wages, and benefits over

that of the Philippines. 4) The year variable suggests that the number of permanent Filipino migrants increases over time. Ultimately, it is important to note that the small number of observations only cover from 1992 to 2012 and may limit the accuracy of the analysis to certain extents.

The first presumption before running the regression models was that unemployment causes Filipinos, both permanent and temporary migrants to leave. The discovery was that unemployment actually does not cause people to leave because it acts as a constraint on their financial abilities to break into the migration market. Second was that underemployment causes Filipinos to migrate and find better economic opportunities abroad. The discovery was that underemployment, when tested for the OFWs model, is not statistically significant which suggests that it is not significant in a Filipino's decision to leave. Third, was that as long as there are strong and established Filipino communities in the destination countries, Filipinos are more likely to migrate to those specific countries. The discovery was that network effects actually vary per country and region, depending on historical or colonial relationships or specific migration policies that support family reunification or pose annual quotas. Fourth, was that the determinants of the decisions of both temporary and permanent Filipino migrants were the same in both the short and the long run. As the literature described in this thesis indicates, push and pull factors affect Filipino migrants. It is not clear how these factors may differ between the types of migrants and how these also exclude important factors such as network effects and the culture of migration. The discovery was that push and pull factors are different for temporary and permanent migrants. Ultimately, it is important to note again

that the small number of observations only cover from 1992 to 2012 and may limit the accuracy of the analysis to certain extents.

## **CHAPTER 6 Limitations and Further Recommendations**

As the extensive literature on Philippine migration also discussed regarding the limited data availability, the most common limitation of their research has been the unavailability of data consistently collected for a longer period of time. In relation to this, the first limitation of this thesis is the small sample size covering 17 to 19 years of observations. Due to the limited number of observations and small degrees of freedom, only the top three destination countries were included to evaluate network effects in the pull factors model. Also, only selected push and pull factors were included because of the small degrees of freedom and limited data availability for the other factors also mentioned in the literature.

Furthermore, the push and pull factors models were general representations of decisions made by both permanent and temporary migrants. It is worth noting that these results do not specifically represent each profession that leave and is limited to the general overview of why Filipinos leave. In order to create a better representation of each profession that leaves the country, it is important to generate a large sample of interviewees sorted by their profession prior to applying for specific jobs abroad.

In the literature review section of this thesis, the literature highlighted the importance of not limiting the analysis to only push and pull factors. Instead, it was highly recommended to look beyond these factors and incorporate the extent of how the culture of migration also affects a Filipino's decision to leave. In order to incorporate this for future research, an extensive survey could cover different samples of Filipino migrants such as: Filipinos with family members abroad and currently living in the

Philippines, Filipinos who are working and living overseas temporarily, and those Filipinos working and living permanently abroad.

Since most of the research done on the push and pull factors models in the literature have been on the Philippine nurses and doctors, it would be more helpful to also test these factors for other professions to also understand the reasons why they leave the country either as a permanent or temporary migrant. More generally, after future improvements on data sets essential to proxy for push and pull factors along with other determinants such as the culture of migration, the generation of models sorted by profession would generate a more individualized analysis of decisions made by these migrants. Also, as the data improve over time and more observations are available, more top destination countries may also be included in the pull factors model to generate a better understanding of why Filipinos continue to migrate to those specific countries.

Further improvements on this research could also include colonial, legal (such as the challenges associated with the visa and migration processes), cultural (such as language) and historical relationships and differences between the Philippines and the top destination countries, to generally differentiate what influences these distinctive pull factors per country. More specifically, to better measure network effects or the presence of Filipino communities in these top destination countries, a proxy or proxies can be created to highlight the presence of Filipino international schools, Filipino organizations, and favorable laws for Filipinos (such as when the ministry of Qatar reserved approximately 120,000 visas exclusively for Filipinos in 2009). To also validate the literature on middle class and upper middle class being the most likely to migrate, either

permanently or temporarily, surveys and data from the overseas employment agencies in the Philippines could also be included in the push factors model in the future.

## CHAPTER 7 Bibliography

- Abrigo, M. M., & Desierto, D. A. (2011). Contagious Migration: Evidence from the Philippines. *Philippine Institute for Development Studies* , 1-15.
- Amante, M. S. (2007). Labor Dimension of the Japan-Philippine Economic Partnership Agreement (JPEPA).
- Bagasao, I. F. (2005). Tapping Filipino Migrant Remittances for Local Economy Development: Case Studies, Issues and Recommendations for Policy Consideration. 1-31.
- Ball, R. (2004). Divergent development, racialised rights: globalised labour markets and the trade of nurses—The case of the Philippines. *Women's Studies International Forum* , 1-15.
- Borjas, G. J. (1989). Economic Theory and International Migration. *International Migration Review* , 23 (3), 457-485.
- Bureau of Employment and Labor Statistics & National Statistics Office. (2011, April). Labor Force Survey. *Primery of Philippine Labor Force Survey* .
- Choy, C. C. (2003). *Empire of Care: Nursing and Migration in Filipino American History*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Ducanes, G., & Manolo, A. (2008). Overseas Filipino Workers and their Impact on Household Poverty. *ILO Asian Regional Programme on Governance of Labour Migration* , 1-16.
- European Union External Action. (2009). Migration Profile: Philippines. 1-16.
- Galvez-Tan, J. (2006). Regulating the Movement of Doctors –Supply and Demand: The Philippines. Philippines: University of the Philippines College of Medicine.

- International Labour Office. (2005). Migration of health workers: Country case study Philippines. *Institute of Health Policy and Development Studies* , 1-73.
- Laguatan, T. (2011, September 21). *The Filipino Diaspora*. Retrieved from Inquirer Global Nation: <http://globalnation.inquirer.net/13127/the-filipino-diaspora>
- Lorenzo, F., Galvez-Tan, J., Icamina, K., & Javier, L. (2007). Nurse Migration from a Source Country Perspective: Philippine Country Case Study. *Health Research and Educational Trust* , 1-13.
- Lorenzo, F., Galvez-Tan, J., Icamina, K., & Javier, L. (2007). Nurse Migration from a Source Country Perspective: Philippine Country Case Study. *Health Research and Educational Trust* , 1-13.
- Mangahas, M. (2004). *The SWS Survey Time Series on Philippine Poverty and Hunger, 1983-Present*. Manila: Social Weather Stations.
- Opiniano, J. M. (2007). Statistics on Filipinos' International Migration: Issues and Steps Towards Harmonizing the Data. *Institute for Migration and Development Issues* .
- Pascual, H., Marcaida, R., & Salvador, V. (2003). Reasons Why Filipino Doctors Take Up Nursing: A Critical Social Science Perspective. *Philippine Health Social Science Forum* .
- President Benigno S. Aquino III. (2011, 07 25). *Official Gazette*. Retrieved 04 01, 2014, from Benigno S. Aquino III, Second State of the Nation Address, July 25, 2011 (English translation): <http://www.gov.ph/2011/07/25/benigno-s-aquino-iii-second-state-of-the-nation-address-july-25-2011-en/>

- President Benigno S. Aquino III. (2012, 07 23). *Official Gazette*. Retrieved 04 01, 2014, from (English translation) Benigno S. Aquino III, Third State of the Nation Address, July 23, 2012: <http://www.gov.ph/2012/07/23/english-translation-benigno-s-aquino-iii-third-state-of-the-nation-address-july-23-2012/>
- Rupert, M., & Solomon, M. S. (2006). *Globalization and International Political Economy: The Politics of Alternative FUTURES*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Solomon, S., & Eden, A. (2010). Beyond 'Push and Pull': Rethinking Medical Migration from the Philippines. *Migration: A World in Motion* (pp. 1-28). Maastricht: -.
- Talento, R. J. (2004). Measurement of the Migrant Workers in the Philippine System of National Accounts (PSNA). *United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs Statistics Division* .
- Taylor, E. (2006). International Migration and Economic Development. *International Symposium on International Migration and Development* , 1-28.
- Transparency International Organization. (2014, - -). *Corruption Perceptions Index Overview*. Retrieved March 1, 2014, from <http://www.transparency.org/cpi2013/results>
- Tyner, J. (2005). *Iraq, Terror, and the Philippines Will to War*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Viajar, V. (2011). Filipino migrant domestic workers: Implications on development and migration trends in the Philippines. 1-2.
- World Bank. (2011). *Migration and Remittances Factbook*. Washington DC: International Bank for Reconstruction and Development / World Bank.

