

Tan, Edita A.

**Working Paper**

## Prospects of Philippine migration

UPSE Discussion Paper, No. 2019-02

**Provided in Cooperation with:**

University of the Philippines School of Economics (UPSE)

*Suggested Citation:* Tan, Edita A. (2019) : Prospects of Philippine migration, UPSE Discussion Paper, No. 2019-02, University of the Philippines, School of Economics (UPSE), Quezon City

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/202523>

**Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:**

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

**Terms of use:**

*Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.*

*You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.*

*If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.*



## **UP School of Economics** **Discussion Papers**

Discussion Paper No. 2019-02

June 2019

### **Prospects of Philippine Migration**

by

Edita A. Tan

University of the Philippines School of Economics

UPSE Discussion Papers are preliminary versions circulated privately to elicit critical comments. They are protected by Republic Act No. 8293 and are not for quotation or reprinting without prior approval.

## **Prospects of Philippine Migration**

**Edita A. Tan**

### **Abstract**

The paper briefly surveys recent migration policies in major destinations of Filipino migrants and tries to see their effect on migration flows in the past two decades. Most Western OECD economies have heightened their restrictive immigration programs that covered not only those relating to workers but also those for family unification. Their admission for employment is restricted to the highly skilled/highly educated labor. Despite the tightening of policy, emigration to Western OECD increased in the past three decades. Emigration to the US has been declining but emigration to other countries, though relatively small, rose. Saudi Arabia, the largest employer of foreign workers in the Gulf adopted the Nitaqat policy of imposing higher national to foreign labor ratio in the private sector. This may explain the drop in the flow of labor to the GCC in 2015 and 2016. The drop could be a temporary fluctuation as the state could not easily develop sufficient number of skilled and disciplined citizens to replace foreign labor. The GCC states' heavy dependence on foreign labor is expected to continue. The skill composition of foreign workers may change depending on their future economic and social development.

JEL Codes: J08, J15, and J61

Millions of Filipinos have left the country to live abroad or to find employment. The migrants have reached virtually all countries and Trust Territories of the world though they are concentrated in North America and the Middle East. They have joined the growing migration of peoples worldwide which have reached 257.7 million in 2017 from 166.9 million in 2000. (UN Department of Economics and Social Affairs 2017). Filipino migrants comprise a fairly large proportion of the world total at 5.7 million and are the ninth largest group following the migrants from the much more populous nations of India, China and the Russian Federation and the internal migration within the EU. The large stock of Filipino migrants has resulted from a long and continuous outflow starting with the Ilocano farmers who left to work in Hawaiian and California plantations in the first decade of the American colonial government of the country in 1898-1945. Close association with the United States has allowed continuous emigration to the United States for family unification and employment. Forty-six percent of Filipinos abroad are now in America. The benefits of migration to the US was palpable to those left behind for the migrants not only shared the high standard of life in America but even succeeded to achieve more education and earn higher income than the native born. (PEW Research Center 2018). The fairly rich experience in America developed widespread positive attitude to migration. Filipinos quickly and strongly responded to the job offers that opened up in the Middle East in the mid-70s despite its distance and alien culture and geography. More than 27% of the migrants are now in this region and workers continue to flow to the Gulf Cooperation Council states. Filipinos have found employment in many other countries and many have married foreigners and left the country to settle in their spouses' homes.

Will the large outflow of Filipinos to OECD countries and GCC states continue in the near future? Recent studies on migration policies in major destinations of world migrants show that they have become more restrictive and in the OECD states also more selective of highly skilled labor. (Ruhs 2011 and Biene et al 2015). The 2008 financial crisis in the US and other advanced economies has also dampened the inflow of migrant labor. (Arslan C et al. 2014) Saudi Arabia, the largest employer of foreign labor in the GCC states has adopted the Nitaqat program which imposed higher ratios of national to foreign workers in the private sector. The immigration policy of the advanced economies of East Asia has remained very restrictive with no change to be expected. On the other hand, Filipinos have found employment in many other countries, albeit in small but growing number. The diaspora in North America, Australia and Western Europe provides a regular basis for family reunification. The well-developed overseas employment service industry will continue to find new markets and facilitate emigration processes. We may expect emigration to slow down but to remain large in absolute number.

The paper briefly surveys migration policies in major destinations and tries to see their effect on the Philippine migration flows in the past two decades. Ruhs (2013) and Biene et al (2015) cite four migration corridors: family unification, economic or employment, studies and refugee and asylum. Emigration to the Western OECD economies are largely for permanent employment or residence, that for the GCC and East Asian economies for temporary employment. The paper traces changes in flow of migrants to the OECD countries and GCC states around the past decade and a half. The trend varies across destinations - constant in the US, rising in Canada, Oceania and some Western European countries but falling in GCC states.

The government has no explicit policy of encouraging migration though it has been vocal in its appreciation of the migrants' large contribution to the economy through their fairly large remittances that have amounted to about 10% of national income. Migrants including the lowest skilled workers earn much higher income than domestic wage and have raised their families wellbeing. Only a very small percentage of migrants' families are poor (Ducanes, 2015). The government has been concerned mainly with working and living condition of migrant workers especially those in the GCC states and has initiated fairly effective protection programs. It has sought bilateral agreements with countries for entry and protection of workers. Poor treatment of workers has continued to occur especially in the GCC states.

The paper is organized as follows: Section 2 provides a world perspective of migration based on the UNDESA 2017 Report on Migration. It gives data on the stock of migrants by origin and destination from 1990 to 2016. Other sources show characteristics of migrants. Section 3 reviews recent studies on immigration policies in major destinations of world migrants. It also discusses the policies in the GCC and East Asia that directly affect Filipino migrants. Section 4 describes the dimension, composition and destinations of the country's migrants. It analyzes the impact of the increased restrictiveness of immigration policies on the flow of migrants in the past decade and a half.

Section 5 shows that conditions in the domestic labor market remain poor and therefore encouraging to migration. The unemployment rate of college educated labor has remained high at about 10% and their average wages are still very low relative to the wage offers in major destinations. The last section concludes the paper. The last section concludes the paper.

## Section 2. World Perspective of Migration

The UNDESA 2017 Report on World Migration gives a comprehensive cross country data on the stock of migrants by origin and destination. Migration has grown to millions reaching 257.7 million in 2017. It increased by 10.4% from 2000 to 2005, 15.2% from 2005 to 2010, 12.7% in 2010 to 2015 and then by 4.0% from 2015 to 2017. (Table 1) Though increasing over time, immigrants comprise a very small fraction of the world population of 7.7 billion, 3.5% in 2017. (Table 1) Arguably, there are millions more people in developing economies who are desirous of migrating to richer economies or to liberal democratic countries but face immigration barriers. The high income countries are relatively small countries with a total population of only 1.3 billion and would not allow to be inundated by potential migrants from the less developed economies. The report points out that most migrants moved within their respective regions: 67% in Europe, 60% in Asia and 53% in Africa. North America is an exception for it has admitted the largest number of migrants from all over the world but sent out few of their citizens to anywhere. Asia dominates the number of world migrants with 42.8% of the total and Europe the second largest with 24.8%. The broad pattern of movement may be explained by countries' historical relationship with each other, geographic distance to desired destination and potential migrants' human capital. Short distance and historic commercial and social relationship between peoples in neighboring states likely explain the large intra-regional migration. The colonial links between the United States and the Philippines, France and its African colonies and the United Kingdom and South Asia and Africa partly explain the concentration of migrants in their respective colonial governments. In modern times, those seeking employment must have the kind of human capital that qualifies for jobs that are open in foreign labor markets and financial resources to pay for migration cost. Current migration policy of major destination is generally selective of human capital. The relatively small number of African migrants may be explained by their countries lower state of economic development. The major Asian emigrant countries like India and the Philippines have a sizeable educated population who could qualify for jobs that open up in the richer countries and the financial resources to meet migration cost. Additionally, Asia's developed commerce with the West has familiarized segments of its population about the culture and opportunities there. Africa is more isolated from the Western world despite its colonial links.

Migrants have sought work in rich economies. In 2013, 24.7% of migrants were in North America, 23.8% in North and South Europe and 11.7% in the Arab states. (ILO, 2015). The result of the highly selective migration policies of the OECD states is seen in the comparative education attainment of their migrants. (Biene, et al 2015) In 2010-2011, 35.9% of migrants have medium education (equivalent to high school) and 30.5%, high or college education while the native-born, 41.1% medium education and 23.6% higher education. More recent migrants have higher education than earlier migrants, 35% vs. with from 24%. Fewer migrants from within the OECD states have higher education than migrants from non-OECD states – 27.0% vs. 32.6%. In the United States, most Asian migrants have higher education than the native born. (Table 2) Indians are the most educated migrants and have the highest household income and highest full-time regular earnings. Only 17% of them have high school education, 50% have college education and 40% have advanced degrees. Their average household income and average full-time regular workers' earnings were higher than the natives by 75% and 58%, respectively. Second to the Indians were the Sri Lankans with respective education distribution of 24%, 44% and 32%. As much as 68% of Filipino migrants have college education but only 9% have post graduate education. Their average household income was also higher than the natives' by 40%. Except for Vietnam and Thailand, most other Asians in America have more college or post graduate education than the native Americans. Expectedly, the Thais earned lower income. The Asian migrants also experienced lower unemployment and poverty rate.

We look more closely at the distribution of the 87 million migrants from the largest ten origin countries across destinations, (Table 3) These are India, Mexico, Russian Federation, China, Bangladesh, Syrian Arab Republic,

Pakistan, Ukraine, Philippines and the United Kingdom. There was substantial intra-region migration for all except India and the Philippines. Almost 99% of Mexican migrants went to North America, 73.8% of migrants from the Russian Federation and 67.2% from Ukraine settled in Eastern Europe and Central Asia. The Chinese are found mainly in Asia and North America with minimal presence in the Middle East. The United Kingdom is the sole Western country with a large emigrant population that has settled largely in other Western economies - Europe, North America and Oceania. North America and the Middle East have attracted the largest number of migrants from outside their respective regions. Outside their region, most migrants from India, Bangladesh and Pakistan went mainly to the Middle East. Close to one-third of the Philippines' emigrants are in North America and 27.7% in the Middle East. Only a small proportion are in Asia, mainly in the tiger economies of Japan, Hong Kong, Singapore, South Korea and Taiwan. There is also a significant number in the UK and Europe.

Study abroad is another important corridor for migration. Bright and rich students are attracted to pursue higher education in the prestigious universities of the West particularly the United States, United Kingdom and in recent times, Australia. Close to five million students were in various OECD countries with half in six countries headed by the US and UK. (Table 4). Foreign students grew very rapidly in the first decade of this Century from just two million in 2000 to 3.96 million in 2011, rising to 4.9 million only in 2016. America and its prestigious universities have attracted a large percentage of foreign students with their number rising from 26,400 in 1949-50 to 286,000 in 1979-80 to 1.08 million in 2016-17. The distribution of students in the US by country of origin changed substantially. In 1949-50, 30.3% of the students came from Canada and Taiwan, in 2016-2017, only 4.0%. Asian students dominated with 61.0% of the total with the Chinese representing 32.5% and Indian, 17.3% in 2016-2017. Iranian students came in relative large numbers in the early years but were no longer a major group in 2016-2017. It is noted Saudi Arabia is now one of the ten largest sources of students. The Philippines was one of the ten groups in 1949-50 but is now a small source. ADB (2013) reports that among the ASEAN original countries, the Philippines has the smallest stock of students in the OECD countries, 9,000 as compared to 45,400 from Malaysia, 48,200 from Vietnam, 27,500 from Indonesia, 22,300 from Thailand. The stock of foreign students from China was 643,200 and from India, 163,200. (Table 5) China's plan to catch up with advanced technology involved large scale scholarship in STEM fields in the best universities abroad.

Foreign students, especially those pursuing graduate degrees, provide the host country with a ready source of high ability work force. The US Optional Training Program allows firms to employ new graduates for 28 months. Firms may apply for their permanent residence for those they want to hire for good. Universities and research institutes are given the same privilege. Martin (2012) argued that foreign students relatively attractive to firms for those who wish to remain in the US tend to work harder and to be less demanding of promotion and benefits. Moreover, native youths find the long graduate and post graduate studies too costly as an alternative to other college options. In Australia, foreign students also provide a pool of highly skilled labor. Australian universities charge high tuition and the income from foreign students has comprised the largest source of its foreign exchange service income. (Ross and Hare 2012). In the US, 60% of foreign students are funded by their families, 6% from their government and universities and 34% from US universities and government. (Martin 2012) On the whole, foreign students contribute to the enhancement of the host countries' highly skilled manpower.

### Section 3. Immigration Policies in Major Destination

The OECD countries and the Middle East are the main destinations of the world migrants. Immigration policy differs essentially between these destinations in terms of openness, rights and inclusiveness. Ruhs (2013, 2017) finds that in virtually all cases, the high income liberal market economies (LME) have restrictive and selective admission policy favoring highly skilled or highly educated. Given the nations' moral and political values, they grant migrants legal rights and equitable access to social services. Generally, the highly skilled are admitted for permanent residence and allowed their families to accompany them. Some countries give them an opportunity for acquiring citizenship. They could bring their families with them and may request for family reunification of relatives left behind. Marriage to citizens is a common basis for admission in the OECD states including Japan. The GCC states have a more open policy but grant limited human and economic rights to their migrants. The large wealth from oil

allowed them to undertake massive infrastructure development and grant generous consumption and investment subsidies to their people. They did not have sufficient labor force to undertake the massive development activities so had to import workers. They required foreign workers to operate their oilfields, build their infrastructure and produce services. Thus the large import of foreign workers of all skills. At the same time, they have to preserve their national which they fear to be threatened by the massive presence of foreigners. We consider this to be the GCC's immigration policy which has open admission and segregation of foreign labor. Admission is for temporary employment only though employers are allowed to extend their employment terms. Foreign workers are not guaranteed full human rights and equal protection of labor and other laws. Migrants are isolated from the life of the native community for they in separate areas and have restricted mobility. (Farquez 2018, Jureidini 2018).

Migration policies in Western OECD are generally quantitatively restrictive and selective of highly skilled migrants. But as liberal market economies, they guarantee human rights and equitable protection of laws and access to social services. The countries have adopted varying policy measures. The Center on Migration, Policy and Society (COMPAS) of Oxford University surveyed policy tracks or programs adopted in 46 countries: 37 OECD members, 6 GCC states and 3 middle income countries in Asia such as China, Thailand and Indonesia. The 46 countries adopted 104 different programs which Ruhs (2013) classified in terms of their openness, selectivity and rights granted to migrants. He finds that the higher income, the more programs countries adopted. Of the 104 programs, 71 or 68% were adopted by the 30 highest income group whose average income exceeded \$20,000. The 71 programs targeted 91 specific skill categories from those with college and advanced degrees. There were 40 programs that targeted first degree graduates, 41 that targeted advanced degree holders. There were 11 programs that admitted only those with advanced degree. The 9 lower high income countries have only 9 programs, 5 which were selective of first degree graduates and 5 of advanced degree graduates. The three middle income countries had only three programs or one each. The 6 GCC targeted all types of skills. Ruhs (2013) weighted various rights (political, economic, social, residence and family rights) granted to migrants and showed low skilled migrants enjoyed 50% of rights as compared to 75% of rights enjoyed by the highest skilled. North America and Europe grant most rights while the GCC states the fewest rights.

Beine et al. (2015) analyzed changes in migration policies in nine OECD countries between 1999 and 2008 using the International Migration Law and Policy Analysis (IMPALA) data. The data cover policies on all four migration corridors –economic, family reunification, studies and refugee and asylum. Excepting for Spain, the countries became more restrictive over time. Even admission for family unification has become more restrictive.

The United States publishes through the internet her immigration policy by way of quotas for various groups of migrants. There are six broad bases for admission into permanent residence - family relations to citizens, family relations to permanent residents, employment, diversity, religious and other groups, refugees and asylum and parolees. (Table 6) Admission is unlimited for minor children of US citizens but there is no quota for low-skilled individuals. A quota of 65,865 is set for family unification to citizens and 111,334 for family unification with permanent residents. Quotas for employment are for persons of exceptional ability, academics and researchers of international fame, persons with graduate degree in science and business and persons with special skills. The total quota for employment was 93,405, smaller than the quotas for family relations. A quota of 10,291 was set for investors of at least \$500,000. The quota of 50,000 visas for diversity was to be ruffled in countries that had few immigrants in the US while the quota for refugees and asylum was 70,000. The total quotas including a small number for parolees, religious and other groups amounted to 433,614 per year. To be added are new graduates under the Optional Training Program. There is no stated quota for seasonal farm workers but they are regularly employed. And of course there are illegal migrants passing through the borders and over-staying tourists. Abella, Martin and Kptsch (2006) visitors said that some seasonal workers are able to stay beyond their term of employment. They cited several EU countries that also regularly employ seasonal workers.

The annual admissions on lawful permanent residence was a little over one million a year which is much larger than the programmed quotas. They totaled 7.38 million from 2010 to 2016 of which 44.8% were for immediate relations of citizens and 20.8% for family reunification of permanent alien residents. Only 1.032 million or 14.0% of admissions were for employment, 13.8% for refugee and asylum and the rest for diversity and other bases. The admissions for diversity 315,000 were less than the quota. There was minimal growth in the number admitted

under each visa category despite the increasing number of permanent residents and naturalized citizens who could apply for family reunification. To limit admission to a given quota, applicants have to queue up for years before their case is considered. In the Philippines one hears of a waiting period for the first preference of about eight years.

Abella (2018) discussed immigration policy in the advanced East Asian economies to which a significant number of Filipinos have found employment. Japan, South Korea and Singapore guarantee human right and fair labor treatment. Japan has restrictive admission policy which reflects the population's strong desire to preserve its culture and identity. Japan admits a small number of entertainers who it classifies as professionals and also a small number of production workers under a technical training program. It is opening up its door to nurses but the language and skill requirements are difficult and costly to meet. There is no explicit policy on wage for trainees. South Korea also had a training program for production workers but abandoned it in 2004 and replaced it with a regular admission of production workers for small enterprises. Abella reports that South Korea has explicit policy of fair treatment of its migrant workers. Employers are required to pay migrant workers prevailing wage rates. In East Asia, Singapore is the most reliant on migrant workers. It admits very highly educated persons as well as domestic workers. Its universities and financial system have a strong foreign representation. Domestic workers are permitted to encourage women's labor force participation rate and child bearing. The decision to employ foreign labor is left to the employers. They are, however, imposed a levy per foreign worker at S\$150 for highly skilled workers and S\$450 for domestic workers. The highly educated migrants are allowed to have long term contracts and the opportunity for permanent residence or citizenship. Domestic workers are strictly on temporary contracts, usually two years. The highly educated receive internationally competitive wages and domestic workers the minimum wage. Hong Kong hires mainly domestic workers while Taiwan hires mainly production workers, both on temporary contracts.

The GCC states have been the largest destination of Filipino workers since the oil boom in the mid-70s. The GCC states are small nations and heavily dependent on foreign labor to run their economies. In 2018, Saudi Arabia, the largest economy had 23.3 million citizens, Kuwait 1,81 million, and UAE, 1.1million. Their foreign residents comprised 30.0%, 57.0% and 88.4% of the total population, respectively. Bahrain, Oman and Qatar are also very small countries with population of nationals of only 1.96million, 1.9 million and .174 million and their respective foreign populations comprising 54%, 29% and 89% of the total in 2011. The heavy presence of foreigners who run their economies has fostered fear that they may damage their culture, weaken their national identity and create security problem.

This may explain the harsh GCC immigration policy. (Kapiszenosky 2018). Farguez and Shah (2018) consider immigration policy to be non-inclusive as migrants are on temporary employment contract with no opportunity for permanent residence and citizenship. Migrants are not granted full human rights and equal protection of laws. Low-skilled migrants are strictly on short term contracts, generally for two years but renewed upon application by employers and live in segregated areas. Moreover, the three groups of the population – the nationals, the highly skilled foreign managers and professionals, and the low-skilled migrants live in segregated residences. The segregation results in separate communities - the community of nationals, the community of highly skilled foreigners and the large community of blue collar and low skilled foreign workers.(Jureirdini 2008)

Temporary migrants are subject to the kafala law which gives the employer control over the migrant' entry into and exit from the country and what rights and benefits to grant him/her. (Diop, Johnston and Kien Trung Lee (2018). Employees are not given the right to change jobs or to return home during their employment contract. Employers are also allowed to keep their employee's passport and immigration papers. This limits the employees' mobility of the employees even within the city. The authors stated that visa trading also occurs, meaning trading of migrant workers between employers. Kafala abuses occur mostly among domestic workers who work and live in independent households and are isolated from other workers who could watch and report on abuses. The kafala system has also allowed monetary abuses in the form of non-payment, delayed payment or underpayment of contracted salaries. Pressure from international and philanthropic organizations have pressured the GCC states to abolish the kafala system and Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates have in fact made reforms of the system. The contract for foreign employment has been transferred from employers to the government. Diop, Johnston and Kien Trung Lee 2018) however found strong resistance from the public to give their control over their employees. A survey of opinion on the reform in UAE found that two thirds of the population objected to the policy.



Possibly because of numerous complaints of violation of wage contracts, the GCC states excepting Bahrain, adopted the Wage Protection System whereby employers are required to submit their payroll to appointed banks which are tasked to make direct payment of wages to the employees. The system allows the government to check on the fairness of wage contracts and assure the payment of wages by coursing it through authorized banks. Jureidinia (2018) reports that the rules are not fully implemented for it has not been possible to keep track of the contracts and bank payments of millions of employers. The WPS is difficult to implement on small firms and households who employ domestic workers and other low skilled workers.

The GCC labor market is segmented into the market for nationals and the market for migrants. The public sector employs mainly nationals while the private sector employs foreign workers. The nationals consider employment in the public sector a privilege where they earn higher wages and enjoy greater benefits than are obtainable in the private sector. Majority of migrants are employed in the private sector which pays them prevailing wages. Among skilled workers, the average wage of nationals was 63.8% more than that of Asians, 17.3% more than that of foreign Arabs but 42.7% less than Westerners who occupy top positions. The nationals consider employment in the government a privilege due them. (Alfarham 2018) The inefficiency of this segmentation is palpable. Private firms show strong preference for foreign workers who are willing to accept lower compensations and work harder. The nationals have tended to narrow their job choice to the public sector which has not been able to create enough jobs for them. Serious unemployment among the nationals has resulted. The McKinsey Global Institute (2018) considers this a serious problem for Saudi Arabia as it tries to undertake major structural reforms to create jobs. Reproduced below are the inactivity rates, i.e. non-labor force participation rate and unemployment rate of the labor force in Saudi Arabia.

Table 8. Inactivity and Unemployment Rates Among Saudis

	Not in Labor Force (%)	Unemployment Rate (%)	Inactivity Rate (%)
Youth (20-29)			
Male	39	15	48
Female	77	62	91
With Secondary Education			
Male	32	6	36
Female	88	32	92
With Tertiary Education			
Male	8	5	13
Female	34	35	57

Source: Jureidini 2018

The youth inactivity rate is extremely high especially among women: about 91% among the youth, 92 among high school educated and 57% among the college educated. The respective figures for the male are 48%, 41% and 13%. In response to this challenge, the Nitaqat or Saudinisation program was adopted in 2011. The program set a rather large number of dependency ratios, i.e. nationals/foreign employees for 45 economic activities or sectors. The ratio varies across sectors and across firms by 5 sizes – 1-9, 10-49, 50-499, 500-2999 and 3,000 or larger. Some occupations are reserved for Saudis alone. Firms are evaluated as excellent, good, below average and poor in terms of the ratios. The categories determine whether they can increase their foreign workers or retain all. Employing nationals increases labor cost as they demand higher wage rates and more benefits but work less productively. Employment of Saudis in the private sector did increase significantly from 10.8% to 15.5% of total employed from 2011 to 2014 but according to Koyama-Marsh (2018), some 200,000 firms closed down because they could not bear the higher cost of national workers. Saudi Arabia faces the challenge of producing nationals of competitive skills and work habit. McKinsey Global Institute points to the inadequacy of existing education and training institutions for

creating large numbers of skilled nationals. Table 5 shows that Saudi Arabia sent relatively large numbers of students in the United States. How many would return and how many would enhance their education institutions?

### Section 3. The Philippine Migration Experience

Based on UNDESA 2017 Migration Report, the stock of Filipino migrants worldwide grew from 2.03 million in 1990 to 5.68 million in 2017. The great majority of the migrants were in high income countries which increased from 92.5% in 1990 to 96.3% in 2017. A minimal number were in the least developed countries possibly working for international organizations and multinational businesses. North America has been the principal destination of Filipino migrants. In 1990, 57% of the migrants were in North America but the share gradually dropped down to 45.7% in 2017 migrants as the Middle East and other destinations opened. The GCC states are now the second most important destinations where 27.7% of migrants are located. Unlike China, relatively few Filipino migrants went to the neighboring advanced economies. The share of East Asia was only 13.8% in 1990 and 11.2% in 2017. Africa and Latin America and the Caribbean drew less than 2% of the migrants. Emigration continually increased over the years at fairly steady rate - 20.7% average annual rate from 2005 to 2010, 21.1% from 2005 to 2010 and 20.7% from 2010 to 2017. The recession in the West appears not to have reduced emigration to them for the growth rate between 2005 and 2010 remained high.

The POEA keeps detailed record of the destination and occupation of migrant workers popularly referred to as overseas Filipino workers or OFWs it deploys. Majority of OFWs are land-based but there is a significant number of seamen. The country is considered to be a major supplier of the world's shipping industry contributing as much as 25% of those currently employed. They are regularly employed so that the number of deployed seamen is assumed to approximate the stock as seamen. The deployed land-based workers do not comprise the stock of OFWs for those deployed consist of new hires and rehires, i.e, those who come home to renew their contract, for vacation and other reasons. The total deployed are arguably only a fraction of the stock OFWs abroad. There is not reliable estimate of OFW stock. Of interest is the statistics on new hires we consider to approximate new demand. The POEA provides great occupation detail on the new hires.

The growth rate of new hires was positive but volatile fluctuating from -1.7% to 27.9% annual rate over from 2007-2008 to 2014-2016. (Table 11) In North America, growth was negative in most years except in 2011-2012 and 2014-2015.\* In East Asia, the flow was generally upward from 37,541 in 2007 to 124,326 in 2016. In the GCC states, growth was volatile ranging from -19.7% to 43.7% in 2010-2011. There was a drastic drop in new hires after the financial crisis and again in 2015-2016 that might resulted from the implementation of the Nitaqat policy.

The GCC states' dependence on foreign workers is reflected in the numerous occupations that Filipino workers have filled. In 2016, the POEA listed about 356 occupations of new hires in Saudi Arabia. There were 88 fine occupations under the broad occupation class of managers and professional, 67 under technical associates and technicians, 61 plant and machine operators, 35 under clerical and sales, 60 craft and related workers, 23 under elementary occupations, and domestic helpers. The professional group includes engineers, teachers, artists, doctors, scientists, environment protection specialists. The skilled blue collar workers are engaged not just in common construction skills like painters, masons and plumbers but also heavy equipment operators and personal drivers. There were conference planners and photographers. The elementary occupation includes waiters, cooks and cleaners in hotels and restaurants. Domestic helpers are separately categorized but not consistently reported. Noted is the fairly large number of clerical and sales workers hired in the GCC. Filipinos in the UAE are employed in just as varied occupations.

In East Asia, Hong Kong hires mainly domestic workers while Singapore hires both highly skilled professionals and domestic workers. Taiwan and South Korea employ manufacturing workers. We find shifts in the distribution of new hires across occupation in all destinations. In the advanced East Asian economies, the share of managerial and professional workers dropped from 15.5% to 5.9% between 2007 to 2016. The service sector comprised the bulk of new hires. In the GCC states, the highly skilled occupations continued to employ over 15% of new hires but there was a big shift from production to service occupations. Up to 2010, close to 50% of new hires were assigned to production works and a little over quarter to services. In 2010 and 2015, services became the dominant jobs for new hires. A relatively small number of new hires went to North America averaging only 6,600

annually. These are workers who applied to the POEA under regular employment basis. They were temporary workers whose employment and immigration papers went through the POEA. The bulk of emigrants to North America and Europe are permanent emigrants whose papers are processed by the Department of Foreign Affairs Commission on Overseas Filipino. (Table 10) The share of managerial and profession migrants to North America increased from 17.9% in 2007 to 33.2% in 2016. The share of services occupation fell from 57% in 2007 to 33% in 2016. Beside these major destinations, 10% of the new hires in 2016 went to other countries that numbered 180.

The bulk of migrants to North America and Europe are permanent emigrants whose papers are processed by the Department of Foreign Affairs Commission on Overseas Filipinos (COF). (Table 10) Shown are rising decadal emigration from 1981-1990 to 2001-2010, then 2011-2017 with average annual flow of 51,472, 55,930, 69,90, and 84,014 (588,098/7years). America admitted the bulk but declining share of the emigrants. In 1981—1990, 77.5% of the emigrants went to America but its admission has slowly fell over the whole period. Canada became the next important destination of Filipino emigrants with its share rising from 9.8% to 31.0% from 1981-1990 to 2011-2017. Australia and Japan admitted close to 150,000 for the whole period but at declining rate. Positive growth trend is seen among the smaller destinations such as Italy, New Zealand UK, South Korea, Spain and all other countries. Their shares totaled 11.8%. Among the emigrants in 2005 to 2014, 77.9% had college education. The emigrants included employed and unemployed housewives, retirees, students and minors who must have qualified under family unification quota and marriage to citizen. Marriage to a foreigner was a strong basis for emigration in some destinations. The COF shows that the ratio of spouses of foreigners total emigrants in 2005-2015 bound for Australia was 40.8%, Japan, 63.3%, UK, 100.2%, Germany, 103.4% and South Korea, 107.3%. Note that the flow to the US as registered by the Commission on Overseas was smaller than the visas granted as Lawful Permanent Residents by the US-DHS possibly because those already in the US on non-immigrants visas like students might have applied and qualified for permanent residence.( Table 6)

#### 4. The Supply of Migrants

The country has a large pool of educated manpower a significant fraction of which may be assumed to be responsive to migration opportunities. Many qualify for various jobs varied jobs abroad. There is an extensive educational system that continues to produce high school and college graduates. In 2016, half of the 105 million Filipinos were of working age.

Of this, 33.0 million had high school and 17.5 million had college education. (Table 12). Of those in the labor force, 20.3 million had high school education and 11.1 million college education. More than one million high school educated and .82 million college educated were unemployed. The total inactive manpower estimated as the sum of the non-participants in the labor force plus the unemployed numbered 14 million high school educated and 6.7 million college educated. These total 20.7 million. We may assume that a significant fraction of this manpower would be strongly responsive to job opportunities abroad. Some of the employed may also be responsive to better paying jobs abroad.

Domestic wage rates are still very low in comparison with wages in destinations. The highest wage was earned by managers and professionals which averaged only US\$453 and US\$399 per month in 2016, respectively. Clerical workers earned only US\$246 and Service and Sales workers, US\$155 per month. Those in elementary occupations earned US\$108 per month. The minimum wage per day in Metro Manila was P491 or US\$10.34. (Table 13) The POEA has set a floor monthly wage of US\$400 for domestic workers bound for the Middle East and recruitment fees not to exceed one month's wage. Employment contracts have to meet these conditions before their contracts are approved. Nurses in the GCC states are reported to receive about US\$00 per month which is low by OECD standard but is high relative to the wage paid by hospitals here of less than P20,000 or US421. The reported wage in the US is at least US\$3000 and in the UK US\$1,000. (Tan 2012). Based on the surveys of recruitment and wage rates of low-skilled migrants in Saudi Arabia and Qatar, Abella (2018) shows Filipinos earn an average wage of US\$491 per month in Saudi Arabia. The average wage earned by different nationalities in Saudi Arabia and Qatar significantly varies: Indians earned US\$604 in Qatar but US\$399 in Saudi Arabia, Pakistanis earned US\$491 in Saudi Arabia but Nepalese earned much lower, US266 in Saudi Arabia and US\$292 in Qatar while Nepalese earned US\$286

in Saudi Arabia. Migration cost which consists of recruitment and visa processing varied even more widely among the different nationalities. Filipinos incurred the lowest migration cost of just .7% of monthly earnings as compared to 1.5 months for Pakistanis and 4.5 months for Indians bound for Saudi Arabia. Anecdotal evidence points to zero recruitment cost for highly skilled workers who are recruited by large companies in the GCC states. An international placement company informed the writer that it does not charge any recruitment fee as this is paid for by the companies it services. (Tan 2012). The monetary returns to migration to the GCC states though very much lower than to the OECD economies are still positive.

There are monetary and non-monetary cost to migration. Common to all are the psychological pain of leaving one's kin, the social relationships, the culture and change in identity for those who decide to settle abroad. Labor migration the Middle East is arguably the most psychologically painful for the migrants are not allowed to bring their families with them and they live in isolation of normal community life. They are not guaranteed human rights and equal protection of laws. Domestic workers who work in isolation in independent households are the most vulnerable. They are the most vulnerable to the abuses that the kafala system allows. The government has instituted protective programs for the protection of migrant workers against unscrupulous recruiters. It has sought bilateral agreements with major destinations for fair treatment of workers. It has opened Philippine Overseas Labor Offices (POLOS) in critical destinations. Maliit (2018) found that while the efforts are well grounded, they are not sufficient to fully monitor and protect workers in the GCC. More than 35,000 employment cases or complaints at the work place were filed with the POEA each year from 2001 to 2007. The common complaints are delayed payment or under payment of wages, physical violence and over work. POEA is able to settle only a fraction of the cases and it is regularly left with pending cases. (Table 14) Abuses by recruitment agents also regularly occur but are much fewer than the abuses at the work place. The horrifying cases of murders and rapes that occur at times have drawn public attention to the vulnerabilities of migrant workers. Yet thousands continue to take the risk.

## Section 6. Concluding Remarks on Prospects of Migration

Future prospects for permanent emigration do not appear to be bright considering the increased restrictiveness of immigration policies in the major destinations of Filipino migrants. Total admission of lawful permanent residents in the US has remained fairly constant at about a million a year in the past decade. The anti-immigration policy of the present administration is likely to limit the inflow. Majority of emigrants entered under the family unification quota with only about 100,000 for employment of the most highly educated. Europe has not fully recovered from the 2008 financial crisis and still faces the flood of refugees from the war-torn countries of the Middle East and north Africa. Possibly, the problem fosters negative attitude to immigration. Admission to Europe has been limited for family unification, marriage and for very highly skilled workers. The advanced East Asian economies have always restricted labor import despite evident labor shortage. Japan simply does not want their culture and way of life diminished by foreigners. South Korea admits mainly production workers. Taiwan admits production workers and care-givers and Hong Kong, domestic workers. Singapore allows companies and universities to hire highly skilled and highly educated foreigners and families, domestic workers. The labor shortage in these countries may force them to increase their foreign workers from the current modest level.

Labor migration to the GCC states is expected to remain large but on a downward trend. Saudi Arabia, the largest employer of foreign labor in the Middle East has adopted the Nitaqat program which imposed high national/foreign ratios on private firms. However, it will take time before it is able to fully employ its inactive manpower in place of foreigners. It has to first develop its education and training institutions to produce necessary skilled workers. The nationals have been accustomed to work in white collar jobs in the government at relatively high compensation. Government jobs are considered prestigious and less demanding. Would Saudis accept low-prestige physically exacting jobs in the service, construction and manufacturing sectors? The small GCC states with only a million or two million population will continue to depend on foreign labor to run their economy and social life. We also find that permanent emigration to countries outside the OECD and the deployment of temporary new hires to outside the GCC states grew. The well-developed recruitment industry is expected to continue to find new foreign jobs.

There has been an accelerating of economic growth in the past decade. Sustaining it will help create more formal jobs that pay higher wage rates. As in other economies in East Asia, sustained growth reduced the migration rate of their people.

## References

- Abella I. Manolo (2018), The High Cost of Migration for Work the Gulf in Migration to the Gulf, Farguez,P and N.M.Shah, eds., Gulf Research Center, Cambridge,221-242
- Abella Manolo.I., and C.S. Kouba (2016) in Labor Migration in Asia: Building Effective Institutions, ADB Institute, OECD and ILO, 30-44
- Alfarham,Usmah F.(2018) Earnings Differentials and Nationalisation Policies in GCC's Private Sector Labour Market in Farguez and Shah, eds. 245-267
- Arslan,C., Dumont D.C, Kone Z., Moullan Y, OzdenC., Parsons C., Zenogiani T., (2014) A New Profile of Migrants in the Aftermatch of the Recent Economic Crisis, OECD Social, Employment and Migration Working Paper, No. 160, OECD
- Baruah Nilim (2016) Labor Migration Infrastructure and Services in Countries of Origin in ADB Institute-OECD-ILO *Labor Migration in asia, Building Effective Institutions*,18-28
- Battistella Graziano (2018) Labor Migration in Asia and the Role of Bilateral Migration Agreement, in *The Palgrave Handbook of International Labor Migration*, Macmillan London, 299-324
- Beine M.,Baucher A., Burgoon B., Crock M., Gest J., Hiscox M., McGovern P., Rapoport H., Shaper I., and Thelemann E. (2015) Comparing Immigration Policies: An Overview from the IMPALA Database, *International Migration Review* 1-37
- Diop a., Johston T., and Kien Trung Le (2018) Migration Policies across the GCC: Challenges in Reforming the Kafala in Farguez and Shah eds.
- Ducanes G. (2015). The welfare impact f overseas migration on Philippine households, analysis of panel data, *Asia Pacific Migration Journal*, 79-126.
- Farguez Philip. (2011) Immigration without Inclusion: Non-Nationals in Nation-Building in the Gulf States , *Asian and Pacific Migration Journal*.Vol 20,Nos.3-4,2011, 273-292
- Farguez P. (2018), Shaping Smart Societies: How Migration and Education Policies Meet in the Gulf States in Farguez and Shah eds.
- Farguez, Philippe and Nasra M. Shah (eds)(2018). *Migration to the Gulf, Policies in Sending and Receiving Countries*, Gulf Research Centre Cambridge.
- International Labour Organizatio *Global Estimates of Migrant Workers, Results and Methodologies* (2015)
- International Labour Organization, *Growth,E mployment and Wecent work in the Arab region: Key Policy Issues, Thematic Paper, Arab Employment Foru;m*, Beirut, Lebanon 19-21 october 2009
- Jureidini,Ray (2018) Wage Protection Systems and Programs in the GCC in Farguez and Shah,eds.
- Kadri S.A. (2018). Highly Skilled Professions in the GCC in Farguez and Shah, eds.
- Kapiszewski Andrzej (2006) Arab Versus Asian Migrant Workers in the GCC Countries, United Nations Expert Group Meeting on international Migration and Development in the Arab Region, Beirut 15-17 May 2006

Maliit, Froilan T. Jr. (2018) Frontlines of Global Migration: Philippine State Bureaucrats in Farguez and Shah eds.

Martin, Philip, Manolo Abella and Christine Kuptsch *Managing Labor Migration in the Twenty-First Century*, Yale University Press, 2006

Martin, Philip (2012) High Skilled Migrants: S&E Workers in the United States, *American Behavioral Scientist*, 2012 Sage Publication 1059-1076

OECD Data Base on Immigration in OECD Countries (2014) A New Profile of Migrants in the Aftermath of the Recent Economic Crisis, 9-48

Ruhs Martin (2011) Openness, Skills and Rights: An empirical analysis of labour immigration programs in 46 high and middle income countries, Working Paper No.88, University of Oxford, 2011 Center for Migration Policy and Society. 167

Ruhs, Martin (2017), Labor immigration policies in high-income countries: Variation across political regimes and varieties of capitalism, forthcoming *Journal of Legal Studies*

Tan, Edita (2009) Supply Response of Filipino Workers to World Demand, International Organization for Migration, Manila, 1-66

Throllet, Helene, (2018) The Regional Politics of Labour Imports in the Gulf Monarchies in the Palgrave Handbook of International Migration, Macmillan London

Yean-Ju Lee (2011) Overview of Trends and Policies on International Migration to East Asia: Comparing Japan, Taiwan and South Korea, *Asian and Pacific Migration Journal*, Vol.20, No.2.2011, 117-131

**Table I WORLD POPULATION AND WORLD STOCK OF MIGRANTS 2017**

	NUMBER OF POPULATION	MIGRANTS (000)	MIGRATION RATE M/P	% OF TOTAL	GROWTH RATE 2000-2017
TOTAL:	7350.3	257.72	3.4	100	104.2
AFRICA	1256.3	36.27	2.9	14.1	68.1
ASIA	4504.4	105.68	2.3	41.0	62.6
EUROPE	742.1	61.19	8.2	21.7	23.4
LATIN AMERICA & CARIBBEAN	645.6	37.72	5.8	14.6	52.0
NORTH AMERICA	361.2	4.41	1.2	1.7	37.5
OCEANA	40.7	1.88	4.6	0.7	58.3
UNKNOWN		10.56			

Source: UN - DESA 2017

**Table 2 - SOCIO-ECONOMIC CONDITIOION OF IMMIGRANTS IN THE US, 2015**

**EDUCATION**

	S.HIGH SCHOOL	SOME COLLEGES	COLLEGE GRADUATE	POST- GRADUATE	MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME	MEDIAN FULL-TIME REGULAR EARNING	UNEMPLOYMENT RATE	POVERTY RATE, 2008	% HOME OWNED
ALL AMERICAN	41	29	19	11	57,230	47,353	5.0	13.5	64
ALL ASIAN	29	20	30	21	73,060	51,000	6.0	12.1	57
INDIAN	17	10	37	40	100,000	75,000	5.4	7.5	55
FILIPINO	23	31	37	9	80,000	45,000	6.2	7.5	58
SRI LANKA	24	19	25	32	74,000	55,000	6.0	8.7	52
VIETNAM	48	23	21	8	60,000	40,000	5.7	14.3	65
THAILAND	35	22	27	16	54,000	40,000	5.0	16.7	5.7
INDONESIA	23	29	32	16	57,400	41,200	5.6	14.3	4.9
SOUTH KOREAN	25	21	33	20	60,000	50,000	5.6	12.8	47
PAKISTAN	29	18	29	24	66,000	50,000	7.5	15.8	51
JAPANESE	23	28	22	17	74,000	55,050	4.6	6.4	63

Source: Per Research Center, 2018

**Table - 3 GROWTH RATE AND DISTRIBUTION OF STOCK OF THE TEN LARGEST ORIGIN COUNTRIES IN REGIONS, 2000, 2017**

PERCENT SHARE OF COUNTRIES BY DESTINATION											
Share in Destination (%)											
	NUMBER (000)		GROWTH RATE (%)	NORTH AMERICA		EUROPE		MIDDLE EAST		OWN REGION	
	2000	2017	2000-2017	2000	2017	2000	2017	2000	2017	2000	2017
INDIA	7,978	16,588	107.9	17.1	17.5	8.2	7.9	34.6	53.9	35.1	14.6
CHINA	5,787	9,962	72.1	30.4	31.8	8.4	11.0	0.3	0.3	55.6	50.0
BANGLADESH	5,435	7,500	38.0	2.2	3.6	3.6	5.1	20.5	41.6	67.7	42.4
PAKISTAN	3,398	5,979	76.0	9.2	8.9	13.4	14.5	33.4	51.3	40.9	20.4
PHILIPPINES	3,066	5,681	85.3	53.5	45.9	7.6	9.3	16.8	27.2	8.0	11.2
MEXICO	9,562	12,965	35.6	98.9	98.6	0.4	0.9	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.5
RUSSIAN FED	10,735	10,636	0.1	3.7	4.8	15.7	18.3	2.6	2.2	77.3	73.8
SYRIA	706	6,864	872.2	10.2	1.6	14.1	3.6	-	-	67.2	91.2
UKRAINE	5,596	5,941	6.1	6.0	7.6	6.0	14.3	3.4	2.7	76.2	67.2
U.K.	3,867	4,921	27.3	33.8	28.0	20.7	28.7	-	-	20.7	28.7

Note: UK migrants were scattered in Africa, Asia and Oceania respectively 4.3%, 5.2% and 34.8% in 2000 and 3.3%, 5.7% and 32.0% in 2017

Region of Russian federation and Ukraine are taken to be Central Asia and Eastern Europe, the region of Mexico are

North America and Latin America and the Caribbean, The region of UK in Europe, China's region is all of Asia outside

the Middle East

Source: UN-DESA Migration Report 2017



Million	
2000	2.0
2011	3.96
12	4.05
13	4.18
14	4.41
15	4.70
16	4.9

Source: Institute for International Education Downloaded Nov. 9, 2018

Table 5 - Foreign Students in the United States from Ten Largest Countries of Origin 1949-50, 1979-80, 2016-17

	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
	(000)	Share	(000)	Share	(000)	Share
	1949-50		1979-80		2016-17	
Total	26.4	100	286	100	1079	100
Canada	44	16.5	15	5.3	27	2.5
Taiwan	3.6	13.8	18	6.1	22	2
India	1.4	5.1	9	3.1	186	17.2
United Kingdom	0.8	3.1	-	-	-	-
Mexico	0.8	3.1	-	-	17	1.6
Cuba	0.7	2.8	-	-	-	-
Philippines	0.7	2.7	-	-	-	-
Germany	0.7	2.5	-	-	-	-
Colombia	0.6	2.2	-	-	-	-
Iran	0.6	2.2	51	17.9	-	-
Other	12.1	46.0	129	45.1	311	28.8
Nigeria			16	5.7		
Japan			12	4.3	19	1.8
Hongkong			10	3.5	-	-
Venezuela			10	3.4	-	-
Saudi Arabia			10	3.3	53	4.9
Thailand			7	2.3	-	-
China			-	-	351	32.5
South Korea			-	-	59	5.5
Vietnam			-	-	12	1.1
Brazil			-	-	13	1.2

Source: Jei Zong and Jean Batalome Migrants Policy Institute, Nov. 10, 2018

Table 6. – Adamson Quotes for Permanent Residence in the US, 2018

	Quota
I .Family sponsored preferences:	
IR - Immediate relatives of citizens: spouses, children under 21, parents of citizens	no limit
F2A - Spouses and minor children of lawful permanent residents (LPR)	87,934
F2B – Unmarried sons and daughters, 21 years or older of LPR	23,400
F2 - Married sons and daughters of citizens	65,300
F3 – Brothers and sisters of citizens	585
II. Employment visas:	
EB1 – Priority workers – foreign nationals with extra-ordinary ability in the Arts, science, education and business, internationally recognized Professors and researchers	41,555
EB2 – Professionals with advanced degree (Ph.d., masters ) and persons of Exceptional ability in science and business	41,555
EB3 – Skilled workers, professionals, other	10,295
EB4 – Certain special immigrants: ministers, religion workers, current Foreign US government workers	10,291
EB5 – Investors with \$500,000 investment in rural projects creating over 10 American jobs	10,291
IV - Diversity – lottery for citizens of countries with less than 50,000 residents In the United states	50,000
V - Asylum	70,000
VI – Refugees	
VII – VIII Other	

**Table 7 - Number and Distribution of Lawful Permanent Residence Admission to US  
by Type of Visa 2005 - 2016**

		2005	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Total		1,122,257	1,042,625	1,062,040	1,031,671	990,553	1,016,518	1,051,031	1,183,505
			-7.9	2	-2.9	-4	2.6	3.4	12.6
I	Family Sponsored	212,970	214,589	224,931	202,019	210,303	229,104	213,910	238,087
	% of Total	19.0	20.6	22.1	19.6	21.3	22.5	20.4	20.1
	Growth Rate I	%	0.8	4.8	-9.2	-4.0	2.6	3.4	12.6
II	Immediate Relations of --	436,115	476,414	453,158	478,780	439,460	416,456	465,068	566,706
	% of Total	38.9	45.7	42.7	46.4	44.4	41.0	44.2	47.9
	Growth Rate II		4.4	-4.9	-4.9	-8.2	-5.2	11.7	21.9
	Growth Rate of I & II								
III	Employment-based	246,865	148,343	139,339	143,998	161,110	157,596	144,047	137,893
	% of Total	22.0	14.2	13.1	14.0	16.3	14.9	13.7	11.7
	Growth Rate		-40.0	-6.1	3.3	11.9	-5.9	-5.0	-4.3
IV	Diversity (number)	46,234	40,763	50,103	40,320	45,618	55,450	47,934	49,865
	% of Total	41.0	39.0	4.7	3.9	4.6	53.0	46.0	4.2
	Growth Rate		-11.8	22.9	-19.6	13.1	17.3	-10.4	4.0
VI	Refugees & Asylees	142,962	136,291	168,460	150,614	119,630	134,242	151,995	157,425
	% of Total	127.0	13.1	15.9	14.6	11.8	13.2	14.5	13.3
	Growth Rate		-4.6	23.6	-10.6	-20.6	12.2	13.2	3.6
VII-VIII	Other	36,597	16,350	15,595	9,785	8,519	32,630	28,077	34,027
	% of Total	3.3	1.6	1.1	0.9	0.9	3.2	27.0	29.0
	Growth Rate		-55.3	-4.6	-37.3	-12.9	283.0	-14.0	21.2
								27,107	33,529

Source: US-Department of Homeland Security

Table 9 - Growth Rate and Distribution of Filipino Migrants by Destination 1990-2017

	1990	1995	2000	2005	2010	2015	2017
Total	2,029,190	2,504,918	3,065,883	3,700,591	4,704,919	5,423,323	5,680,682
% share in High Income Countries	92.5	92.6	92.5	95.5	97.5	96.2	96.3
% share in Middle Income Countries	7.4	7.3	7.4	4.5	2.4	3.8	3.7
% share in Low Income Countries	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
Growth Rate Total		23.4	22.4	20.7	27.1	15.3	4.7
% in High Income Countries		23.6	22.2	24.6	29.8	13.7	4.9
% in Middle Income Countries		21.2	24.6	-27.4	-30.6	77.1	2.1
% in Low Income Countries		29.4	22.6	25	20	10.2	1
% Distribution by Destination							
Africa	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2
Asia	33.7	32.3	32.9	32.4	35.5	38.4	38.9
East	7.9	8.7	10.5	10.7	9.3	8.9	8.7
South East	5.9	5.6	5.7	2.9	1.1	2.5	27.7
West Asia	20	18.1	16.8	18.7	25	26.9	9.3
Europe	8.4	7.9	7.6	9.2	9.9	9.2	9.3
North America	50.8	53.2	53.5	52.7	48.8	46.4	45.9
US	45	46.2	45.8	43.1	39.2	37.1	36.5
Canada	5.8	7	7.7	9.5	9.7	9.4	9.3
Oceania	6.7	6.3	5.7	5.5	5.5	5.7	5.6
Latin America and the Caribbean	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.2
Growth Rate every 5 yrs		5.7	13	12.2	17.3	25.4	0.5
Asia		17.8	24.7	18.6	39.2	24.7	6.3
East Asia		36.2	47.1	23.5	10.9	9.4	2.8
South East		17.6	24.5	-38.4	-51	160	2.5
West Asia		11.6	13.7	34.9	69.4	24.3	7.8
Europe		16.4	17.2	47	36.6	7.5	5.4
North America		29.2	23.2	18.8	17.9	9.6	3.4
US		26.7	21.4	13.7	15.5	9	3.3
Canada		48.3	35	48.5	29.1	11.8	4
Oceania		15.2	10.5	15.8	25.2	19	4.1
Latin America and the Caribbean		29.9	29	46.6	64.1	10.7	2.5
Total		23.4	22.4	20.7	27.1	15.3	4.7

Source: US-DESA Migration Report 2017

**Table 10 - Permanent Immigrant to Major Destination 1981-2017**

		TOTAL	US	CANADA	JAPAN	Australia	Italy	New Zealand	Germany	UK	South Korea	Spain	Others
Numbers:	1981-1990	514,723	399,020	50,635	5,928	49,130	366	383	1,847	3,645	44	461	3,264
	1990-2000	559,300	369,194	90,755	44,807	30,302	1,242	3,432	6,110	1,912	1,404	1,181	8,961
	2000-2010	699,022	397,138	143,273	66,013	30,236	15,278	9,518	5,218	4,684	6,325	7,113	14,616
	2011-2017	588,098	272,886	182,192	30,448	31,103	22,395	8,162	3,620	6,322	7,561	6,272	16,447
	Total 1981-2017	2,361,143	1,438,238	466,855	147,196	140,771	39,281	21,495	16,795	16,563	15,434	15,027	43,288
Growth Rate (70%)													
	1981-1990 to 1991-2000	8.7	-7.5	79.2	650.8	-39	239.3	756.1	130.1	-47.5	312.7	156.2	17.15
	1998-2000 to 2000-2010	25.0	20.6	52.9	27.3	-.2	1146.6	179.0	-14.6	125	332.0	4132.3	63.1
	2000-2010 to 2011-2017	-15.9	-31.3	29.2	-53.9	2.9	445	-14.2	31.9	35.0	19.5	-11.8	12.5
% Share in Total													
	1981-1990		77.5	9.8	1.2	9.5	0.07	0.07	0.4	0.7	-	0.7	0.6
	1990-2000		66.0	16.2	8.0	5.4	0.20	0.6	0.3		0.3	0.2	1.6
	2000-2010		56.8	20.5	9.4	4.3	2.2	1.4	0.7	0.7	0.9	1.0	2.1
	2010-2017		46.4	31.0	5.1	5.2	3.8	1.3	0.6	1.1	1.3	1.1	2.6

Source: Philippine Commission on Filipinos Overseas

**Table 11 - New Hires Growth Rate and Distribution by Occupation, 2007-2016**

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Total Number	305,554	337,370	331,722	340,279	435,186	455,584	462,896	481,563	488,784	561,142
Growth Rate		10.4	-1.7	2.6	21.9	4.7	1.6	4.0	1.5	14.8
North America Number	13,018	12,320	9,133	13,058	6,108	6,708	5,700	1,834	1,954	1,834
Annual Growth Rate		-5.4	-25.9	42.5	-53.1	9.8	-15.0	-67.8	6.5	-6.1
% Share in Major Occupation										
Managers & Professionals	17.9	21.2	19.7	17.9	13.5	8.5	8.8	34.1	27.5	30.2
Production Workers	22.1	21.1	21.5	22.1	16.2	26.5	30.4	16.9	22.7	39.3
Service Workers	57.0	53.3	54.4	57.0	66.7	60.4	54.8	35.9	48.0	29.3
Domestic Helper	(3.1)	-	(12.9)	(.2)	(63.9)	(58.6)	(52.5)	-	-	-
Clerical and Sales	3.0	4.3	4.5	3.0	3.6	4.5	6.0	13.2	1.2	1.1
Advance East Asia										
Number	37,542	54,988	56,442	65,964	95,869	-	79,445	124,763	104,763	124,326
Annual Growth		46.4	2.6	16.9	45.3	-		57.0	-	-
% Share in Major---										
Managers & Professionals	19.5	10.3	7.6	11.6	11.1	-	6.6	6.0	6.0	5.9
Production Workers	15.9	40.5	33.5	40.7	33.8	-	44.2	6.8	5.7	10.3
Service Workers	63.6	48.4	58.4	46.9	54.4	-	49.7	87.0	88.2	83.7
Domestic Helper	(63.1)	-	(44.5)	(45.6)	-	-	(17.8)	(64.3)	-	(34.5)
Clerical and Sales	1.4	0.8	0.5	0.8	-	-	0.3	0.06	0.1	0.06
GCC Number	192,979	241,472	240,242	192,986	277,376	503,120	326,151	384,231	334,506	284,232
Annual Growth Rate		25.1	-0.5	-19.7	43.7	81.4	-35.2	17.8	-13.5	-15.0
% Share in Major---										
Managers & Professionals	15.2	15.4	15.8	15.2	15.4	12.9	12.3	11.6	15.8	15.7
Production Workers	47.5	40.1	36.5	47.5	27.1	32.8	30.3	14.6	18.0	19.7
Service Workers	27.1	33.2	38.4	27.1	44.9	47.5	51.3	72.5	64.0	62.9
Domestic Helper	(7.1)	-	(33.3)	-	(36.8)	31.3	(27.8)	(42.3)	(-)	(54.2)
Clerical and Sales	10.2	11.3	9.2	10.2	7.0	6.7	6.1	1.3	2.2	1.8
Oceania										
Number	2,590	3,630	1,162	25,988	2,601	3,567	2,689	-	-	2,587
Annual Growth Rate										
% Share in Major---										
Managers & Professionals	18.9	22.4	21.6	18.9	24.5	18.5	14.4	-	-	19.8
Production Workers	72.0	59.8	65.5	71.8	66	73.5	41.1	-	-	70.1
Service Workers	5.1	7.8	6.8	1.3	6.1	4.8	42.4	-	-	8.7
Domestic Helper	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Clerical and Sales	4.3	10.1	6.0	0.7	3.4	1.9	2.2	-	-	1.4

Source: Philippine Overseas Employment Administration

**Table 12 - Population, Labor Force, Unemployed by Highest Grade Completed  
2010 - 2016**

	Population			Labor Force			Unemployed		
	HS + Post HS	UG CV	College Grad	HS + Post HS	UG CV	College Grad	HS + Post HS	UG CV	College Grad
2010	25,760	9,982	7,559	15,474	5,494	5,915	1,293	621	557
2011	27,052	10,232	7,829	16,086	5,633	6,130	1,268	613	568
2012	29,523	7,724	8,084	18,083	3,826	6,298	1,508	378	554
2013	30,369	7,959	8,347	18,564	3,913	6,510	1,520	401	590
2014	30,549	8,004	8,726	19,067	3,842	6,781	1,407	375	612
2015	31,206	8,236	8,771	19,118	3,898	6,843	1,371	341	568
2016	33,024	8,738	8,738	20,255	4,205	6,858	1,211	328	504

Source: Philippine Statistical Yearbook 2017

**Table 13 - BASIC PAY OF WAGE AND SALARY WORKERS BY OCCUPATION, 2016-2017**

OCCUPATION	2016		2017	
	PESOS ON DAY	US \$ PER MONTH	PESOS PER DAY	US\$ PER MONTH
MANAGERS	978.35	453	917.74	400.6
PROFESSIONALS	862.53	399	865.39	377.75
TECHNICAL & ASSOCIATE PROFESSIONAL	582.71	270	581.13	232.29
CLERICAL	532.06	246	521.98	227.85
SERVICE AND SALES	333.71	155	345.98	150.72
??? AGRICULTURE	388.15	180	307.02	134.02
DRAFT AND RELATED	358.06	166	371.94	162.35
PLANT & ????	388.23	180	405.23	176.89
ELEMENTARY OCCUPATION	232.00	108	233.06	101.73
ARMED FORCES	898.36	416	855.87	373.59
OTHERS	462.55	214		

Note: The daily wage is multiplied by 22 working days and divided by the current peso dollar exchange rate: P47.49 in 2016, P50.40 per US Dollar

Source: Department of Labor and Employment Statistical Bulletin 2017

Bangko Sentral ng Pilipinas, Statistical Bulletin, Downloaded August 20, 2018

**Table 14 - Complaints Filed by OFW to POEA, 2009-2013**

---

A. Welfare Cases at Place od Work					
	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
New cases handled	77,424	66,653	25,348	49,845	36,602
Cases carry-over from previous year	11,237	20,622	13,122	29,416	28,071
Cases solved	68,883	61,312	20,125	25,445	30,213
Workers served	n.a.	79,999	9,753	20,366	56,957

---

B. Illegal Recruitment Cases				
	2008	2009	2010	2011
Pending case	1,285	1,358	1,427	1,365
Cases recorded	402	252	221	135
Cases handled	1,687	1,610	1,648	1,500
Cases disposed	329	183	283	153
Number of persons arrested	98	74	12	2
Number of establishment closed	10	6	6	2
Cases pending at end of period	1,358	1,427	1,365	1,347
Disposition Rate (%)	19.5	11.4	17.2	10.2

---

Source: *Philippine Overseas Employment Administration*