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ABSTRACT

This thesis is an analysis of the differentials in the levels of migration and the characteristics of migrants to and from Metropolitan Manila between 1970 and 1975 using a five percent sample of the 1975 Census as the principal source of data. Measures are presented of the levels of migration to and from Metropolitan Manila (a) from one region to another, (b) from the urban areas to the rural areas and (c) from one Metropolitan Manila city/municipality to another. Also, the age-sex education, marital status and occupational characteristics of migrants are examined. Factors that influence migration as identified in different migration models and theories are used as guides to explain variations in levels of migration and the selectivity of migrants. Regression analysis of some regional and Metropolitan Manila city/municipality variables on the volume or rate of migration is carried out to determine correlates of migration. The thesis concludes with a discussion of the implications of the findings on population redistribution and the limitations and possible further development of the study.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

On November 7, 1975, Presidential Decree No. 824 created Metropolitan Manila. The Decree effected the integration of four cities and 13 municipalities which make up the nation's political, industrial and cultural capital. To quote from the National Census and Statistics Office (NCSO, 1975, p.xix), Metropolitan Manila was created because:

"A tremendous increase in the population of Manila and its environs since the end of World War II, particularly after 1960, has been observed. As a result of the burgeoning population, the scale and pattern of urbanization in these areas have grown to such proportions that they have become intimately linked, geographically and politically."

The tremendous population growth of Metropolitan Manila and the contribution of migration to its growth are discussed in the first section of this chapter, 'The Setting', which also shows the study area in relation to other parts of the country and enumerates the cities and municipalities that make up Metropolitan Manila. The succeeding section reviews the studies on internal migration in the Philippines and draws attention to the dearth of studies on migration to and from Metropolitan Manila. Section 3 specifies the objectives of the study which are mainly to analyze the differentials in the levels of migration and the characteristics of migrants to and from Metropolitan Manila. The last section describes the data and its limitations, and measures the accuracy of the age and sex statistics.

1.1 THE SETTING

The Philippines consists of more than seven thousand islands classified under three island groups - Luzon in the north,
Mindanao in the south and Visayas in the centre. Each island group is divided into regions, one of which is Metropolitan Manila (Figure 1.1). Each region is further subdivided into provinces and each province into municipalities and sometimes cities. The barangay (village) forms the smallest geographical unit and it is classified as either urban or rural according to various criteria.

1.1.1 Composition

Metropolitan Manila encompasses the following:

Cities:
1.) Manila
2.) Quezon
3.) Pasay
4.) Caloocan

Municipalities:
1.) Makati
2.) Mandaluyong
3.) San Juan
4.) Las Piñas
5.) Malabon
6.) Navotas
7.) Pasig
8.) Pateros
9.) Paranaque
10.) Marikina
11.) Muntinglupa
12.) Taguig
13.) Valenzuela

All of the above cities and municipalities except Manila and Valenzuela are in the province of Rizal. Valenzuela is a municipality of Bulacan while Manila is an independent city and is treated as a province in census tabulations. Prior to 1977,
there was no generally accepted definition of what constituted Metropolitan Manila.

1.1.2 Population Growth

From 1903 to 1960, Metropolitan Manila slowly emerged from the ninth to the seventh most populous region in the country. Between 1960 and 1970, it leapt from seventh to second position. This rank was maintained until 1975. Between 1970 and 1975, Metropolitan Manila registered the highest annual growth rate of 4.6 per cent per annum among all the regions. The rest of the regions registered a growth rate of 1.3 to 4.3 per cent per annum.

Although Metropolitan Manila was second only to the Southern Tagalog Region in size in 1970 and 1975, it was seventy times more densely populated and had a density fifty-six times above the average for the country. Metropolitan Manila, in 1975, contained twelve per cent of the country's population and more than a third (37 per cent) of the urban population. (NCSO, 1978)

1.1.3 Role of Internal Migration in Metropolitan Manila's Growth

Metropolitan Manila is the nation's commercial and industrial capital, the cultural and educational centre and the seat of national government. It is therefore not surprising that it has attracted a substantial number of migrants from other regions of the country, and that it has a very mobile population. However, the exodus to Metropolitan Manila is a recent phenomenon.

---

1 The growth rate was based on the formula: 
\[ p_n = p_0 (1 + r)^n \] where \( p_0 \) is the initial population and \( p_n \) the population after \( n \) years.
Until 1960, the frontier lands of Mindanao were the main destination of migrants. After 1960, the diminishing available lands and the intensifying Christian-Muslim conflicts (Keely, 1973, p.179) in Mindanao diverted migrants to Metropolitan Manila.

For the period 1968-1972, Metropolitan Manila experienced the lowest fertility rates in the age groups 15-19 to 40-44 among all the regions (De Guzman, 1978, p.124). In contrast, the same region had the highest population growth rate. This high growth rate would therefore be largely due to the high volume of immigration and the low rates of mortality and out-migration.

Studies show that for the period 1968-1972, Metropolitan Manila had the second lowest crude death rate among all the regions estimated at 7.2 per thousand population (Zablan, 1978, p.109). Between 1970 and 1975, about 312 thousand persons moved to Metropolitan Manila from other regions while between 178 to 182 thousand moved out. Among all the regions in the country, Metropolitan Manila had the highest number of persons who changed province of residence (interprovincial migrants) between 1970 and 1975. While Metropolitan Manila had a share of 28 per cent of the 1.4 million interprovincial migrants, the twelve other regions' share ranged only from three to eleven per cent (NCSO, 1978).

1.2 STUDIES ON INTERNAL MIGRATION

The first study on internal migration in the Philippines was carried out in 1959 by Nava using 1939 and 1948 census results. Subsequent descriptive net migration studies by Simkins and Wernstedt (1963) and Reforma (1972) followed for the 1948-1960 and 1960-1970 intercensal periods respectively. Using the 1970 preliminary census results, Kim (1972) estimated provincial net internal migration for the 1960-1970 period by means of the census survival ratio method which had also been employed by Nava.
Detailed studies on internal migration were not available until the 1960 census when for the first time, by a census, the place of birth and residence as of a specified date, were asked. Pascual (1966) took a 0.5 per cent sample of the 1960 census to carry out her study on internal migration in the Philippines; Slater (1976) identified nodal in- and out-migration regions using a 1960 lifetime interprovincial migration table; UNFPA-NCSO (1976) utilized a 5 per cent systematic sample of all enumerated households in 1970; Perez (1978) made use of the 1960 and 1970 census results as principal sources of migration data and the National Demographic Survey of 1973 to determine the characteristics of migrants at the time of the survey. Urbanization and rural-urban migration, which has often been equated with migration to Manila and its surrounding areas, have been covered in the above studies but Pernia (1976a, 1976b) made the most extensive study of them. There are other studies on internal migration but they are not as important as the studies mentioned above.

Since internal migration studies have been of relatively recent origin, the thrust of many of the studies has been towards determining broad national patterns of migration. Localized studies have been few. Studies on migration to and from Metropolitan Manila, the fastest growing region and the nation's centre, have been limited. The only study which is more or less focused on Metropolitan Manila is Zosa's (1974) paper exploring the possible causes and implications of migration to Manila and Rizal in 1960. Hendershot (1969), in a survey of two rural municipalities, looked at the characteristics of out-migrants and the reasons for migration. He classified four areas of destination, one of which was Greater Manila. Studies of squatting and slum dwelling by the Office of the President (1968), Viloria (1971) and Laquian (1968, 1975) also discussed migration to Metropolitan Manila.
It is important to note that the composition of Metropolitan Manila or Greater Manila referred to in the above studies is not identical to the Metropolitan Manila created in 1975.

1.3 OBJECTIVES AND STRUCTURE OF THE STUDY

Notwithstanding the significant contribution of internal migration to the tremendous growth of the nation's centre, there is still a dearth of studies on migration to and from Metropolitan Manila. This study attempts to widen and update the present knowledge on the levels and patterns of migration to and from Metropolitan Manila using the latest available census data. Specifically, it tries to answer the following questions:

1.) How much do the levels of migration to and from Metropolitan Manila vary (a.) from one region of origin or destination to another, (b.) from the urban areas to the rural areas, and (c.) from one Metropolitan Manila area to another? What factors influence or contribute to the spatial variation in levels of migration?

2.) Who are the migrants to and from Metropolitan Manila? How do they compare with the total Philippine population or with migrants in other South-east Asian countries? How different are the in-migrants to Metropolitan Manila from the out-migrants from Metropolitan Manila? Are the out-migrants from Metropolitan Manila actually return migrants? Are there spatial (regional, urban-rural, Metropolitan Manila area) differentials in characteristics of migrants? What factors influence or contribute to these differentials?

The study is divided into five chapters. After the introduction, the second chapter reviews the theories and models on migration. Factors which influence or contribute to the variation in levels and patterns of migration are identified.
These factors are then used as guidelines in explaining the differentials in levels of migration in Chapter 3 and the selectivity of migrants in Chapter 4. Chapter 3 examines the first set of questions above while Chapter 4 deals with the second set of questions. Chapter 5 summarizes the findings of the study, discusses the implications, the limitations and possible further development of the study.

1.4 THE DATA

1.4.1 The Data and its Limitations

The principal source of data for this study is the 1975 census of population. The migration variables (as shown in the Appendix) in this census are:

1.) Residence on May 6, 1975:
   a. Province
   b. City or Municipality
   c. Urban-rural classification of barangay.

2.) Residence on May 6, 1970:
   a. Province if different from that of May 6, 1975, and the urban-rural classification of the barangay of residence.
   b. If the same province as in 1975, the respondent's residence was classified as one of the following:
      1. same barangay
      2. another barangay, same municipality/city - urban
      3. another barangay, same municipality/city - rural
      4. another barangay, same municipality/city - unknown urban - rural classification
Thus, the city/municipality of residence as of May 6, 1975 and not 1970 was asked. The only knowledge that can be gathered about the city/municipality of origin (residence as of May 6, 1970) is its urban-rural classification (strictly speaking, the urban - rural classification of the barangay of the city/municipality). Since Metropolitan Manila consists of Manila, three cities and twelve municipalities of the province of Rizal, and a municipality of Bulacan, the out-migrants from Metropolitan Manila cannot be accurately identified. In this study, out-migrants from Manila and urban Rizal are used as proxies for out-migrants from Metropolitan Manila. This is a close approximation since the whole of Manila is within Metropolitan Manila, and 95 per cent of the 3.5 million urban population of Rizal reside within Metropolitan Manila boundaries. Manila and the area of urban Rizal under Metropolitan Manila alone form 90 per cent of the population of total Metropolitan Manila. Thus, the "out-migrants from Metropolitan Manila" referred to in this study consists of migrants from all the cities/municipalities of Metropolitan Manila except Valenzuela. Valenzuela is one of the municipalities of the province of Bulacan and the out-migrants from urban Bulacan number around five thousand but it is not possible to know the proportion of migrants coming from Valenzuela. The out-migrants from Metropolitan Manila would therefore be anything between 178 thousand persons, which is the number of migrants from Manila and urban Rizal, and 183 thousand, which is the number of migrants from Manila, urban Rizal and urban Bulacan.

From a five per cent sample of the 1975 census, two sets of data were segregated and used for this study:

1.) data on persons five years old and over whose place of residence in May 6, 1970 was in any region in the Philippines except Metropolitan Manila but whose place of
1. (continued)

residence in May 6, 1975 was in Metropolitan Manila. These are classified as "in-migrants to Metropolitan Manila".

2.) Data on persons five years old and over whose place of residence in May 6, 1970 was Manila and urban Rizal but whose place of residence in May 6, 1975 was in any region in the Philippines except Metropolitan Manila. These are called "out-migrants from Metropolitan Manila".

The data on residence as of May 6, 1970 contain "not reported" provincial and urban-rural codes. The regional and urban-rural analyses do not therefore include data with the said not reported codes. The excluded data for the rural-urban and regional analysis is four per cent and 15 per cent respectively of the total 312 thousand in-migrants.

1.4.2 Quality of the 1975 Census Data

Since the data used for this study is a sample of the 1975 census data, the accuracy of the findings of this thesis greatly depend on the quality of the census data. Only the age-sex data will be evaluated because (a) these are the most basic demographic characteristics, (b) accuracy test techniques for these data have been developed, and (c) the quality of the age-sex data can provide an insight into the quality of the other census data.

Some of the more popular indices that have been developed to determine age-sex accuracy are the Whipple's index, Myer's index, Bachi's index and the United Nation's Secretariat method. The Whipple's index measures preference for ages ending in zero or five while the Myer's and Bachi's indices measure preference or dislike for each of the ten terminal digits. If the Myer's and Bachi's indices were applied to the same age data, both indices will yield almost the same results. However, the Bachi's index has a disadvantage of being more laborious to compute than the Myer's index (United Nations, 1955, p.42).
The U.N. Secretariat method is a measure of the differential omission of persons in various age groups from the census count, tendentious age misstatement as well as digit-preference. It is therefore more truly a reflection of the general accuracy of the statistics. However, unlike the other methods, the resulting index is not very exact and should be regarded as an order of magnitude rather than a precise measurement (United Nations, 1955, pp. 42-43). Thus, in this study, to obtain a precise measurement of digital preference, the Myer's index is computed; to estimate the general accuracy of the data, the U.N. Secretariat method is used.

a.) Myer's Index

To determine preference or dislike for each of the ten digits from zero to nine, the "blended" total population for each of the ten digits is computed first. The "blended" total is obtained by the following steps:

1.) Compute the sums of numbers at all ages terminating in each digit for ages ten and over, and for ages twenty and over.

2.) Multiply the former with the successive coefficients 1, 2, 3 .... 10 and the latter with the successive coefficients 9, 8, 7 .... 0.

3.) Add the results to obtain a "blended" population for each terminal digit.

The "blended" totals for each of the ten digits should be very nearly ten per cent of their grand total. The deviations of each sum from ten per cent of the grand total are added together, irrespective of their sign, and their sum is the Myer's index (United Nations, 1955, pp. 41-42).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Terminal Digit</th>
<th>&quot;Blended&quot; Sum</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Percentage Distribution</th>
<th>Deviation from 10%</th>
<th>&quot;Blended&quot; Sum</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Percentage Distribution</th>
<th>Deviation from 10%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>13,761,189</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>+1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>14,006,689</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10,608,702</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,589,360</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>12,285,153</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>+0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>12,070,731</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11,282,394</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>11,062,862</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>12,215,360</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>+0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>12,056,120</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>14,193,270</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>+1.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>13,930,080</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>11,438,667</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>11,530,345</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>11,757,161</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>11,509,102</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>12,230,263</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>+0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>12,199,231</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>+0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>11,575,720</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>11,723,500</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>121,347,879</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>120,678,020</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Theoretically, the Myer's index can vary from zero, if all ages were reported accurately, to 180, if all ages were reported with the same terminal digit. For the Philippine 1975 census, an index of 6.4 for females and 6.7 for males was obtained showing a low degree of age heaping or digit preference.

b.) U.N. Secretariat Method

In this method, sex-ratios and age-ratios for five-year groups of ages up to age 70 are computed. Sex-ratio is the number of males per 100 females in the same age class; age-ratio is the number of persons of a given age group per 100 of the mean of numbers of the two adjoining age groups, of the same sex. For sex-ratios, successive differences between one age group and the next are noted, and their average is taken, irrespective of sign. For age-ratios for either sex, deviations from 100 are noted and averaged irrespective of sign. Three times the average of sex-ratio differences is then added to the two averages of deviations of age-ratios from 100 to obtain the index.

As in the Myer's method, a relatively low index was obtained suggesting a high accuracy of the census data. Having established the accuracy of the age-sex data, we can now proceed to the analysis of migrants' age and sex with a greater degree of confidence.
TABLE 1.2. COMPUTATION OF AGE-ACCURACY INDEX BY THE UNITED NATIONS SECRETARIAT METHOD USING THE PHILIPPINE CENSUS OF 1975

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Analysis of sex-ratios</th>
<th>Analysis of Age-ratios</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ratios</td>
<td>Successive Difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>105.3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>105.5</td>
<td>+0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>103.9</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>98.3</td>
<td>-5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>97.4</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>+2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>101.3</td>
<td>+1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>102.3</td>
<td>+1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>103.4</td>
<td>+1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>102.3</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>105.6</td>
<td>+3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>106.4</td>
<td>+0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-69</td>
<td>104.8</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-74</td>
<td>108.7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 2

MIGRATION MODELS AND THEORIES

Several authors have attempted to explain migration by means of models or theories. They have identified the underlying forces that govern migration. However, most of these models and theories were based on Western experience and may not necessarily apply to developing countries such as the Philippines.

McGee (1971, Chapter 1) argues that the theories which have been developed out of Western experience are not acceptable in interpreting and predicting the pattern of the growth of the urban population, to which migration is a major contributor, in the Third World. This is because of the different mix of the components of the urbanization process in the Third World which are demographic, economic and social. He backs up his argument with studies by several authors: when Abu-Lughod applied certain broadly-accepted generalizations concerning rural-urban demographic differentials which had been developed out of Western experience to the case of Egypt, she found that Egypt showed startling differentials; Frank's exhaustive review of Western economic theories on urban population growth indicated "the inadequacy of many of these theories particularly in the underdeveloped world"; various researchers such as Lewis, Bruner and Mayer have found the rural-urban theory of social change to be inadequate.

However, in the absence of other materials such as surveys, the Western Models and Theories provide a first approximation to explaining migration. It is not the purpose of this thesis to test these models and theories but to use them insofar as they identify variables which are potentially useful for explaining, directly or indirectly, migration to and from Metropolitan Manila. To illustrate the nature of these variables, the better-known models and theories are reviewed in this chapter. The models and
theories have been broadly classified into three categories according to the forces or factors at play in migration although these may sometimes overlap.

2.1 GRAVITY MODELS

The most important variables in these models are distance and population size. According to the Gravity Model, migration is directly related to the number of persons at the origin and destination and inversely related to distance.

\[ M_{i \rightarrow j} = \frac{K P_i P_j}{d_{ij}} \]

\[ M_{i \rightarrow j} \] migration from source \( i \) to destination \( j \)
\( P_i \) = population of source \( i \)
\( P_j \) = population of destination \( j \)
\( d_{ij} \) = distance between source \( i \) and destination \( j \).

This model was patterned after Newtonian Physics where gravitational energy is the product of two masses divided by the square of the distance separating the masses. Stewart and Zipf simultaneously developed this model from independent angles although it has been implied in the writings of earlier authors on migration (Isaard, 1960, pp.499-500).

2.2 ECONOMIC MODELS AND THEORIES

The economic motive has been considered by many writers as the primary cause of migration. People are believed to move mainly for upward occupational/social mobility or because particular job opportunities are located elsewhere. Thus, income and employment opportunities have often times been correlated with migration. Where these data are not available other economic variables are substituted. Therefore Lowry (Speare et al., 1975, p.167) in his model used three variables that when taken together
should indicate the number of opportunities in an area - the size of the labor force, the wage rate, and the unemployment rate.

\[ M_i \rightarrow j = K \frac{U_i}{U_j} \times \frac{W_j}{W_i} \times \frac{L_iL_j}{D_{ij}} \]

where

- \( M_i \rightarrow j \) = Number of migrants from place \( i \) to place \( j \)
- \( L_i \) and \( L_j \) = Number of persons in the nonagricultural labor force in \( i \) and \( j \)
- \( U_i \) and \( U_j \) = Unemployment rates in \( i \) and \( j \)
- \( W_i \) and \( W_j \) = Manufacturing wages in \( i \) and \( j \)
- \( D_{ij} \) = Distance between \( i \) and \( j \)

From the rural-urban point of view, Todaro and Harris (1970, 1969) postulate that labor migration from the rural to the urban areas in developing countries proceeds in response to urban-rural differences in "expected" earnings \(^1\) despite the existence of positive marginal products in agriculture and the significant levels of urban unemployment.

2.3 GENERAL MIGRATION MODELS AND THEORIES

These models and theories cover a wider scope than the previous models and theories which are sometimes too simple to explain such a complex phenomenon as migration. Foremost among these are Ravenstein's "Laws of Migration" in 1885 and Lee's "Theory of Migration" in 1966.

---

\(^1\) "Expected" earnings are earnings adjusted for the probability of finding a job.
Lee (1966, p.48) summarized Ravenstein's "laws" in his own words below:

1.) Migration and distance
   (a) "The great body of our migrants only proceed a short distance" and "migrants enumerated in a centre of absorption will ....... grow less (as distance from the centre increases)"
   (b) "Migrants proceeding long distances generally go by preference to one of the great centres of commerce and industry."

2.) Migration by stages
   (a) "(T)here take place consequently a universal shifting or displacement of the population, which produces 'currents of migration', setting in the direction of the great centres of commerce and industry which absorb the migrants."
   (b) "The inhabitants of the country immediately surrounding a town of rapid growth flock into it; the gaps thus left in the rural population are filled up by migrants from more remote districts, until the attractive force of one of our rapidly growing cities makes its influence felt, step by step, to the most remote corner of the Kingdom."
   (c) "The process of dispersion is the inverse of absorption, and exhibits similar features."

3.) Stream and counterstream - "Each main current of migration produces a compensating counter-current."

4.) Urban-rural differences in propensity to migrate - "The natives of towns are less migratory than those of the rural parts of the country."
5.) Predominance of females among short-distance migrants -
"Females appear to predominate among short-journey migrants."

6.) Technology and migration - "... an increase in the means of
locomotion and a development of manufactures and commerce have
led to an increase in migration."

7.) Dominance of the economic motive - "Bad or oppressive laws,
heavy taxation, an unattractive climate, uncongenial social
surroundings, and even compulsion (slave trade, transportation),
all have produced and are still producing currents of migration,
but none of these currents can compare in volume with that
which arises from the desire inherent in most men to 'better'
themselves in material respects."

Thus, the variables that Ravenstein took into account were:
distance, urban-rural classification of area of origin, sex of
migrants, technology and other economic factors.

Lee further expanded Ravenstein's laws when he formulated
his "theory of Migration". He summarized the factors which enter
into the decision to migrate and the process of migration under
four headings, as follows:

1.) Factors associated with the area of origin
2.) Factors associated with the area of destination
3.) Intervening obstacles
4.) Personal factors.

Lee did not specify the factors at origin or destination but just
described these as factors which act to hold people within the
area or attract people to it, and factors which tend to repel them.
For "intervening obstacles", he cited distance as the most studied
although it is by no means the most important.

On the other hand, Pryor (1975, pp.33-35) makes a more
detailed classification of the factors contributing to mobility
when he named the following as the factors that contribute to
autogenic (voluntary) mobility: economic, institutional and political, demographic, sociocultural and other behavioural or idiosyncratic factors; and institutional or political forces and environmental factors as contributing to allogenic (non-voluntary) mobility. He further gives examples of these categories.

Thus, some authors were very specific about the factors that influence migration while others just categorized them into classes. Specific factors such as distance, population size, income, unemployment rate, non-agricultural and labor force, for which data are available, and variables although not specified by the models and theories but which can be classified under one of their factors categories will be used in the regression analysis in the next chapter.
CHAPTER 3

SPATIAL VARIATIONS IN LEVELS OF MIGRATION

In this chapter, the spatial units of analysis are the twelve regions of the country, the urban and rural areas and the cities/municipalities of Metropolitan Manila. Volumes and rates of migration from these spatial units to Metropolitan Manila and from Metropolitan Manila to these units as well as migration levels to and from the different areas of Metropolitan Manila are compared. Regression analysis is carried out to determine the correlates of migration. Additional factors influencing migration but which are not quantifiable are also presented.

3.1 REGIONAL VARIATIONS

Metropolitan Manila has been the recipient of heavy in-migration from other regions since 1960. During the period 1970 to 1975, 312 thousand persons moved into Metropolitan Manila from other regions while between 178 to 183 thousand moved out. However, volume and rates of migration varied from one region to another.

3.1.1 Volumes and Rates

As seen in Figures 3.1 and 3.2 and Table 3.1, the neighbouring regions were the most important origins and destinations. They had the highest volumes and rates of migration.

The majority of the in-migrants and out-migrants originated and ended, respectively, in the regions of Luzon. Although the island contained less than half of the country's population (Metropolitan Manila excluded), 69 per cent of the in-migrants and 71 per cent of the out-migrants came from and moved to the Luzon
Note: Based on a 5% sample of the 1975 Census.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Island Group/Region</th>
<th>% Distribution</th>
<th>Average 1970-75 Pop.</th>
<th>Migration Rates ((^{000}))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In-</td>
<td>Out-</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luzon</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>70.6</td>
<td>48.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilocos</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cagayan Valley</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Luzon</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Tagalog</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicol</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visayas</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Visayas</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Visayas</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Visayas</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mindanao</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Mindanao</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Mindanao</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Mindanao</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Mindanao</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- (%) Sum of 1970 population of all ages and 1975 population aged 5 years old and over, divided by 2; based on 1970 and 1975 Census Reports (NCSO, 1974 and 1978).
- (\(^{b}\)) Includes not reported regions.
- (\(^{c}\)) If not reported regions included, the total is 312,000.

Note: Migration data based on a 5\% sample of the 1975 Census.
regions (Table 3.1). On the other hand, the percentage share of the Mindanao regions in migration was only about a fourth of the percentage share of the island group in the total population.

To show the disparity of the regional percentage distribution between the total population and the migrants, an index of dissimilarity was computed. The index is simply half the sum of the absolute differences between two populations taken area by area (Timms, 1965, pp.240-241). The index computed in Table 3.1 means that 22.4 per cent of the in-migrants and 31.2 per cent of the out-migrants would have had to come from or moved to another region to reproduce the percentage distribution of the total population. Thus, about a quarter of the in-migrants would have had to come from the Western and Central Visayas and the Mindanao regions instead of the Luzon and Eastern Visayas regions, while about a third of the out-migrants would have had to move to the Ilocos, Cagayan Valley, Western and Central Visayas and Mindanao regions instead of Central Luzon, Southern Tagalog, Bicol and the Eastern Visayas.

3.1.2 Factors Influencing Differences in Levels of Migration

3.1.2a. Regression Analysis

Factors influencing migration or factors that are related to migration have been identified in Chapter 2. The factors which are quantifiable and for which data are available are used in a regression analysis below. These factors may not necessarily explain the differences in migration levels among the twelve regions. They may just be proxies for the real causes of migration. However, directly or indirectly, they no doubt contribute to the differences in levels of migration.

The correlation coefficient is a popular tool used by several authors on migration to show variations of migration streams in relation to different variables. Some authors who have applied this technique are Galloway in 1969, Lycan in 1969,

The correlation coefficient is based on the regression equation which is a mathematical formula for predicting the most likely value of one variable (dependent variable) from the value of one or more other variables (independent variables) for a given case. The correlation coefficient measures the degree to which the regression equation produces accurate predictions. As such, it is also interpreted as a measure of the strength of association between the dependent and independent variables. The correlation coefficient varies from -1 to +1. A correlation of -1 means a perfect negative or inverse linear relationship. A value of zero denotes the absence of linear relationship (Klecka et al, 1975).

For this study, the dependent variables are volumes of in-migration to Metropolitan Manila from the twelve regions and the volumes of out-migration from Metropolitan Manila to the twelve regions. The independent variables are the following:

1.) Distance - the distance in Kilometers between Metropolitan Manila and a region measured from a scaled map.

2.) Population - the number of persons residing in a region as of 1970 (NCSO, 1974)

3.) Density - the number of persons per square Kilometer in 1970

4.) Labor force - the number of persons ten years old and over either employed or unemployed in 1970. Non-economically active persons such as housewives, students, etc. are excluded (NCSO, 1974).

5.) Non-agricultural workers - These consist of persons in the labor force who are not engaged in farming, fishing, hunting, logging and related work in 1970 (NCSO, 1974)
6.) Income - the average income per family received or realized by family members during the past twelve calendar months before the interview, which was in May, 1971 (Bureau of Census or BCS, 1973a).

7.) Unemployment rate - the number of unemployed persons per 100 persons in the labor force. A person is unemployed if he was not at work during the reference week but wanting and looking for work or would have been looking for work except that:
   a.) he was temporarily ill
   b.) he believes no work is available (NCSO, 1974).

8.) Large establishments - the percentage distribution of large establishments by region. Large establishments consist of establishments such as logging, mining, and quarrying, manufacturing, electricity, gas and water, wholesale and retail stores, restaurants and hotels, transport, storage and communication, financing, insurance, real estate, and business services, commercial, social and personal services employing ten persons or more in 1972 (NCSO, 1975).

9.) Manufacturing wages - the average wage per person in a region. It includes all payments, whether in cash or in kind, made by a manufacturing establishment to its operatives and other employees (NCSO, 1975).

10.) Tagalog - speakers - the proportion of persons in a region who can speak Tagalog, the national language and the language spoken in Metropolitan Manila and the nearby provinces in 1970 (NCSO, 1974).

11.) Proportion urban - the proportion of the population in a region residing in urban areas in 1970 (NCSO, 1974).

As shown in Table 3.2, distance was the most important variable for in-migration. Distance alone "explained" 84.7 per
### TABLE 3.2. SIMPLE AND MULTIPLE CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS AND PERCENTAGE OF VARIATION EXPLAINED FOR REGRESSIONS OF VOLUME OF IN- AND OUT-MIGRATION ON SOME REGIONAL VARIABLES: 1970-75

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Volume of In-migration</th>
<th>Volume of Out-migration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Simple Correlation Coefficients</td>
<td>% of Variation Explained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-migration vol.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance</td>
<td>-.921&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>84.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population size</td>
<td>.890&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>79.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density</td>
<td>.473</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor Force</td>
<td>.846&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>71.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-agricultural workers</td>
<td>.851&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>72.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>.374</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment rate</td>
<td>.752&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>56.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large establishments</td>
<td>.455</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing wages</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tagalog-speakers</td>
<td>.825&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>68.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion urban</td>
<td>.582&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>33.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multiple Correlation Coefficients</td>
<td>% of Variation Explained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance and population size</td>
<td>.970&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>94.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance, non-agricultural workers, unemployment rate and manufacturing wages</td>
<td>.961&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>92.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance, proportion urban, large establishments and income</td>
<td>.970&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>94.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Significant at .01 level.
<sup>b</sup> Significant at .05 level.
cent of the variation in the volumes of in-migration\textsuperscript{1}. It is also the only variable which was inversely correlated to volume of migration.

That migration decreases substantially with increased distance has been attributed by a number of researchers (Greenwood, 1975 p.398) to the fact that distance serves as a proxy for both the transportation and psychic costs of movement as well as availability of information. It has been pointed out that the benefits resulting from migration need not be large to offset the direct transportation expenses. However, the psychic cost involved in migration are believed to be substantial and are closely related to distance. Information likewise declines perceptibly with distance, and hence uncertainty increases with distance. Thus, distance as a deterrent to migration, is not only a physical concept but it is also an emotional or psychological concept.

The other factors which were also strongly correlated with volume of in-migration according to their degree of relationship from highest to lowest were: population size, number of non-agricultural workers, size of the labor force, proportion of Tagalog-speakers and unemployment rate. The simple correlation coefficients of these factors with the volume of in-migration were significant at .01 level, i.e., the probability that there is no linear relationship between volume of in-migration and these factors is at most one per cent. On the other hand, the proportion urban was not as significantly correlated with volume of in-migration as the above factors. The probability that there is no linear relationship between the volume of in-migration from Metropolitan Manila to a region and the proportion of persons residing in the urban areas of that region was more than one per cent.

\textsuperscript{1} Per cent of variation explained is the square of the correlation coefficient multiplied by 100.
Contrary to the models and theories reviewed in Chapter 2, the volume of in-migration to a region was not significantly related to density, income, percentage of large establishments and the manufacturing wages of the region. These might be because the data available for these factors are not refined enough to be sensitive to differences in levels of migration. For example in the calculation of density, it may have been better if the timberland areas were excluded in the land area of a region because these areas are not equally distributed among the regions. In addition, the income and manufacturing wages computed were the mean income and wage and not the median which is usually a better indicator of central tendency for income and wages. But then, income may not really be as important in in-migration as it is in out-migration in which it is statistically significant, as seen in Table 3.2. As for large establishments, the great number of large establishments in Metropolitan Manila may be the more important factor in "pulling" migrants to the area rather than the lack of establishments in the region of origin acting as "push" factors.

With regards to out-migration from Metropolitan Manila, the volume of in-migration was the most statistically significant factor. This coincides with the observation of several authors that the size of a migration-stream is more highly correlated with the size of its own counter-stream than with any demographic, spatial or economic variables. According to Olsson (1965, p.32-33), one reason for this is that return-migrants are extremely important and some studies have shown that the two streams consist largely of the same individuals.

As for the other variables, the proportion of Tagalog-speakers, the number of non-agricultural workers and the population size of the regions of destination had stronger influence on the volume of migration to the different regions than distance. However, it is important to note that Central Luzon and Southern Tagalog, the regions with the highest proportion of Tagalog-speakers,
number of non-agricultural workers and population size\textsuperscript{1} are also the regions nearest to Metropolitan Manila. In fact, they are contiguous to Metropolitan Manila.

Unlike in-migration, income was significantly related to volume of out-migration at the .05 level while the proportion of persons residing in urban areas was related to out-migration at .01 level of significance. Thus, income and proportion urban are stronger 'pull' than 'push' factors.

When distance was combined with other independent variables for multiple regression analysis, higher correlation coefficients were obtained. However, caution should be observed in the multiple correlation analysis because of the existence of multicollinearity, i.e. the independent variables are themselves interrelated. The effect of one independent variable on the volume of migration may be confounded by other independent variables.

The first multiple regression in Table 3.2 makes use of distance and population size as the independent variables. This is based on the Gravity Model. The second regression is based on Lowry's Model while the third on Ravenstein's 'Laws of Migration'. For in-migration, distance together with population explained 94.1 per cent of the variation in the volume of migration. With distance and economic factors like number of non-agricultural workers, unemployment rate and manufacturing wages, the variation explained went down by 1.7 per cent, while with distance and factors such as proportion urban, percentage of large establishments and income, the correlation coefficients and subsequently the variation explained were equal to that obtained using the first regression. On the other hand, the correlation coefficients for out-migration increased from the first to the second and from the second to the third multiple regression.

\textsuperscript{1} Western Visayas had a higher population than Central Luzon in 1970 but it was the other way around in 1975.
3.1.2b. Other Factors

Aside from the factors discussed in the preceding section, other factors have contributed to the variations in the volume of migration among the regions. Unlike the above factors, neither these factors nor their effects can be measured. These factors are:

1.) Institutional or Political Forces

The State has the aim of allocating resettlement sites and constructing dwelling units to promote independent home ownership. To effect this aim, the government policies on relocation and resettlement are embodied in various Executive Orders, Presidential Decrees, Letters of Instruction and Memorandum Directives from the Office of the President of the Philippines (Task Force on Human Settlements, 1975b, p.34).

One of these Executive Orders - No. 419 - created the Task Force on Human Settlements in September 1973 to formulate a national framework plan which would serve as a general scheme of development for the country, a Metro Manila development plan and a national housing program. Among the plans proposed by the Task Force (1975a, pp.94-96) which affect migration to and from Metropolitan Manila are:

a) "Adopt a migration policy to ensure Metropolitan Manila will experience minimal in-migration starting in 1980. The policy, to be adopted by national and local agencies in the Metropolitan Manila Area, is essentially linked to the development of the growth centres which will absorb potential migrants to the Metropolitan Manila area."

b) "Formulate an urban renewal program for identified slums and squatter and/or blighted areas."
The program would involve the "relocation of communities within flood-prone areas or portions of highly congested squatter communities to resettlement sites within or outside the Metropolitan Manila core."

The relocation of squatters and slum-dwellers has been going on since the 1960's but with the formulation of a national development plan by the Task Force on Human Settlements in 1974, the relocation of squatters and slum-dwellers has been intensified. The relocation centres for Metropolitan Manila slum-dwellers and squatters which are outside Metropolitan Manila are the following municipalities with their provincial and regional location (Office of the President, 1968, p.101; Task Force on Human Settlements, 1975b, p.37):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. San Jose del Monte</td>
<td>Bulacan</td>
<td>Central Luzon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Carmona</td>
<td>Cavite</td>
<td>Southern Tagalog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Dasmarinas</td>
<td>Cavite</td>
<td>Southern Tagalog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. San Pedro</td>
<td>Laguna</td>
<td>Southern Tagalog</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

San Jose del Monte, San Pedro and Dasmarinas are contiguous to Metropolitan Manila. Carmona is separated from Metropolitan Manila by San Pedro.

Between 1970 and 1975, 38 per cent of the 43 thousand migrants to Central Luzon and 44 per cent of the 48 thousand migrants to Southern Tagalog migrated to these relocation municipalities. It is interesting to note that San Jose del Monte's population in 1975 accounted for only 1.4 per cent of the total population of Central Luzon. The relocation municipalities of Southern Tagalog made up only 2.2 per cent of the region's total population. Another fact of interest is that Meycauayan and Obando, two other
1.) (continued)

municipalities of Bulacan contiguous to Metropolitan Manila, received more than 20 times less migrants than San Jose del Monte. Bacoor, the other municipality of Cavite contiguous to Metropolitan Manila, received five times less migrants than Carmona. From these facts, it can be safely deduced that relocation has made a greater contribution than contiguity, to migration to these municipalities and in general, to the regions of Central Luzon and Southern Tagalog.

2.) Sociocultural Factors

The Moslems constitute the largest non-Christian ethnic category of a country which is predominantly Catholic. In 1970, 99 per cent of the 1.58 million Moslems were enumerated in Mindanao. The Moslems in Central Mindanao accounted for 47 per cent of the region's population; in Western Mindanao, 33 per cent; in Southern Mindanao, 20 per cent; and in Northern Mindanao, less than 1 per cent (NCSO, 1974).

The Spaniards colonized the Philippines for four centuries but they failed to rule the Moslems. Even the Americans and the Christian Filipino leaders were unsuccessful in fully integrating the Moslems with the rest of the country. Because of cultural discontinuity between the Moslems and the rest of the country, it was inevitable for conflicts to arise. The settlement of Christians on territory traditionally held by Moslems aggravated these conflicts. The movement to Mindanao was encouraged by the Philippine government in the early 1900's when it proclaimed some lands in Mindanao as agricultural settlements. The strong affinity with Moslems of other countries has further widened the animosity. The longstanding conflicts finally
erupted in secession rebellions starting in 1971. (Gomez, Chafee, 1969; De Los Santos, 1973). To escape these rebellions, an estimated 90,000 Southern Filipino Moslems have fled to the East Malaysian State of Sabah over the last seven years (Daily Express, Aug. 23, 1979).

Thus, the 'cultural' and physical distance of Moslems from Metropolitan Manila may have deterred them from migrating to Metropolitan Manila while the conflicts raging in some parts of Mindanao have discouraged in-migration.

3.) Economic Factors

Some economic factors have encouraged or inhibited migration to Metropolitan Manila. These factors are usually the result of environmental or topographic factors themselves.

According to Burley (1973, p.190), the Bicol region experiences 40% of the storms in the Philippines with the result that agriculture, the cornerstone of the economy, continually suffers substantial reductions in the output of its mainstays - coconut, abaca, rice and corn. To make things worse, large coconut plantations have been devastated by yellow mottle in recent years (Yambot, 1976, p.95). Coconut is Bicol's primary commercial crop.

On the other hand, two great mountain ranges between Cagayan Valley shield it from crop-destructive typhoons (Yambot, 1976, p.64). A combination of topography, rich fertile soil, low population size and density (lowest in the country) have resulted in making the region the producer of the greatest surplus of rice among the regions. Thus, positive economic factors may have inhibited migration from Cagayan Valley, while negative economic factors encouraged migration from Bicol.
Mindanao is rich in natural resources. Not having been affected by secession rebellions as much as Western and Central Mindanao, Northern and Southern Mindanao were able to develop an industrialized base and a diversified economy. Having more than two-thirds of the country's 178 large logging establishments, Mindanao is the biggest log producer in the country. As of 1972, 26 per cent of the country's logging establishments were in Southern Mindanao and 17 per cent were in Northern Mindanao (NCSO, 1975). Southern Mindanao has likewise been the leading hemp producer in the country and located in it is the first integrated newsprint plant in Southeast Asia. Davao City, the third largest city in the country in terms of population, is situated in Southern Mindanao. On the other hand, Bukidnon, a province of Northern Mindanao has been the top pineapple producer of the country, while off the coast of Surigao del Norte, another province of the region, lies one of the biggest nickel deposits in the world (Yambot, 1976).

These positive economic factors must have contributed to the small volume and rates of migration from these regions. At the same time, these regions have attracted more migrants from Metropolitan Manila than the two other regions of Mindanao.

Of the three island groups in the country, the Visayas averaged the lowest family annual income in 1971. The Visayas had P1,107; Mindanao, P1,164; and Luzon excluding Manila and suburbs, P1,370 (BCS, 1973a). In the same year the Visayas also had a higher percentage of its labor force unemployed than Mindanao. The Visayas registered an unemployment rate of 5.1 while Mindanao had 2.5 per cent. Luzon excluding Manila and suburbs had a slightly higher rate than Visayas, having a rate of 5.3 per cent (BCS, 1971).
3.) (continued)

Of the three Visayan regions, the Eastern Visayas had the highest rate of migration to Metropolitan Manila. Described by Burley (1973, p.193) as the neglected islands, the combination of location and restricted natural resources has placed the region outside the mainstream of commercial and cultural life. On the other hand, the Western Visayas with more than half of the sugar mills in the country is the Philippines' sugarland, while situated in Central Visayas is Cebu City, the fourth most populous city in the country and the commercial, financial and educational centre of the Visayan Islands (Yambot, 1976).

3.2 URBAN–RURAL VARIATIONS

In the previous section, the principal unit of analysis is the region. The region is purely a geographical unit. It is made up of provinces which in turn consist of cities/municipalities which are divided into barangays or villages. However, a barangay or a whole city/municipality can be classified as urban or rural and the agglomeration of all barangays or cities/municipalities classified as urban and those classified as rural are the principal units of analysis in this section.

According to the National Census and Statistics Office (1978, p.xii), the following are classified as urban areas:

1. In their entirety, all cities and municipalities having a population density of at least 1,000 persons per square kilometer.

2. Central districts of municipalities and cities which have a population density of at least 500 persons per square kilometer.
3. Central districts (not included in 1 and 2), regardless of the population size, which have the following:

a. Street pattern, i.e., network of streets in either parallel or right-angle orientation

b. At least six establishments (commercial, manufacturing, recreational and/or personal services)

c. At least three of the following:
   1.) A town hall, church or chapel with religious services at least once a month
   2.) A public plaza, park or cemetery
   3.) A market place or building where trading activities are carried on at least once a week
   4.) A public building like a school, hospital, puericulture and health centre or library

d. Barangays having at least 1,000 inhabitants which meet the conditions set forth in 3 above, and where the occupation of the inhabitants is predominantly non-farming or fishing.

All areas not falling under any of the above classifications are considered rural.

In terms of the above classification 32 per cent of the Philippine population lived in urban areas in 1970 and 1975 and 68 per cent resided in rural areas. Metropolitan Manila made up 34 per cent of the urban areas in 1970 and 37 per cent in 1975.

As shown in Figure 3.3, more of the in-migrants to Metropolitan Manila originated from the rural rather than the urban areas, and more of the out-migrants moved to the rural rather than the urban areas. One reason for this is that there are more persons able to move from the rural areas than the urban areas. The population of the rural areas was more than three times the population of urban areas in 1970. Likewise, because of the high volume of the migration stream from the rural areas, the resultant counterstream was also high.
FIGURE 3.3. VOLUME OF MIGRATION BETWEEN METROPOLITAN MANILA AND OTHER URBAN AREAS, AND METROPOLITAN MANILA AND RURAL AREAS, BY CITY AND MUNICIPALITY: 1970-75

Note: Based on a 5% sample of the 1975 Census.
The squares are proportional to the population size in 1975.
While 62 per cent of the migrants from the urban areas moved to the Metropolitan Manila cities, only a little less than half, 49 per cent, of the migrants from the rural areas did so. The cities of Metropolitan Manila were therefore more popular areas of destination with the migrants coming from the urban areas than those coming from the rural areas.

On the other hand, the municipalities and cities of the urban and rural areas received migrants from Metropolitan Manila in proportion to their population size. The municipalities therefore received more migrants than the cities.

Although the number of in- and out-migrants to and from Metropolitan Manila, respectively, from and to urban areas is greater than that for rural areas, the number of migrants per thousand persons (rate) in the urban areas exceeds that for the rural areas as seen in Table 3.3 below. Contrary to one of Ravenstein's Laws of Migration, the natives of towns are not less migratory than those of the rural parts of the country.

**TABLE 3.3. METROPOLITAN MANILA IN- AND OUT-MIGRATION PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION AND RATES, BY URBAN AND RURAL AREA OF ORIGIN AND DESTINATION: 1970-75**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>% Distribution of Migrants</th>
<th>Migration Rate ('000)</th>
<th>Average 1970-75 Population&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In-</td>
<td>Out-</td>
<td>In-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>66.4</td>
<td>67.2</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>9.8&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>300,000&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>178,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Sum of 1970 population of all ages and 1975 population aged 5 years old and over, divided by 2; based on 1970 and 1975 Census Reports (NSCSC, 1974 and 1978).

<sup>b</sup> Includes areas with unknown urban-rural classification.

<sup>c</sup> If areas with unknown urban-rural classification included, the total is 312,000.

Note: Migration data based on a 5% sample of the 1975 Census.
Why is the propensity to migrate greater for urban areas than rural areas? This can be explained by several factors. First of all, let me cite the step-wise migration theory which states that migration from rural areas to cities moves via smaller centres (Olsson, 1965, p.30). If this idea were valid as has been implicit in many migration studies especially those by Moore, Kant, Wallander and Hagerstrand (Olsson, 1965, pp.30-33) and Ravenstein (Lee, 1966, p.48) the tendency to migrate will be greater for urban than for rural areas. Of course, this theory may not be absolutely true for there will always be people who will move directly from rural areas to Metropolitan Manila and people who move gradually from the most remote rural areas to bigger and bigger centres until they come to Metropolitan Manila, the country's urban centre.

Secondly, people from urban areas will have more access to information about Metropolitan Manila. More knowledge about Metropolitan Manila may decrease the uncertainties in moving. In addition, people from urban areas by definition, would have a more similar environment and job skills to Metropolitan Manila residents than people from rural areas would have. Furthermore, communication would also be easier for migrants from urban areas since 71 per cent of the urban population can speak Tagalog while only 46 per cent of the rural population are able to do so (NCSO, 1974). Thus, adjustment to Metropolitan Manila by migrants from urban areas may not be fraught with as much difficulties as it may be for migrants from rural areas. Even though the economic pressure for persons from rural areas is greater because the income differential between Metropolitan Manila and the rural areas is greater than the income differential between Metropolitan Manila and the other urban areas (BCS, 1973), the greater number of difficulties that might be encountered may deter a lot of persons from the rural areas from moving.
3.3 METROPOLITAN MANILA AREAS VARIATIONS

In the previous sections, variations in the levels of in-migration to Metropolitan Manila from the different regions and from the urban or rural areas, and out-migration from Metropolitan Manila to the different regions and the urban or rural areas were analyzed. Metropolitan Manila, which consists of four cities and thirteen municipalities (Figure 3.4) was taken in its entirety as an origin and destination. But since each city/municipality has some unique characteristics of its own, the levels of migration may vary from one Metropolitan Manila sub-area to another. This section therefore aims to compare the volumes and rates of in- and out-migration among the different geographic areas of Metropolitan Manila and to present some possible explanations.

3.3.1 In-migration to the Cities and Municipalities of Metropolitan Manila

Manila and Quezon City alone received almost half, 46.5 percent, of the in-migrants. Makati received 9.4 percent, while each of the rest received less than 6.4 percent of the in-migrants (Table 3.4).

The volume of in-migration to the different cities and municipalities of Metropolitan Manila is related to the population size and density of the cities/municipalities in 1970. A high correlation coefficient of 0.962 with a significance level of 0.001 was obtained for population size, while the correlation coefficient with density as the independent variable yielded a correlation coefficient of 0.442 with a significant level of 0.046. Thus, the higher the population size or density of a city/municipality, the higher, generally, the number of migrants it received.

High volumes of in-migration did not necessarily mean high rates of in-migration. Manila, which received the highest volume of migrants, attracted only 59 migrants per thousand of its population, the fourth lowest rate among the seventeen cities/
FIGURE 3.4. VOLUME OF IN-MIGRATION TO THE CITIES AND MUNICIPALITIES OF METROPOLITAN MANILA: 1970-75

Laguna de Bay

Manila Bay

Note: Based on a 5% sample of the 1975 Census.
TABLE 3.4. PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF MIGRANTS AND MIGRATION RATES TO THE CITIES AND MUNICIPALITIES OF METROPOLITAN MANILA: 1970-75

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City/Municipality</th>
<th>Percentage Distribution</th>
<th>In-migration Rate ('000)</th>
<th>Average 1970-75 Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manila</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>1,313,966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caloocan City</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>64.4</td>
<td>307,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasay City</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>74.4</td>
<td>212,792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quezon City</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>84.8</td>
<td>794,914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Piñas</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>115.3</td>
<td>57,448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makati</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>105.5</td>
<td>278,424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malabon</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>62.7</td>
<td>145,895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandaluyong</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>81.4</td>
<td>153,437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marikina</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>104.0</td>
<td>128,653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muntinlupa</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>66.4</td>
<td>72,752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navotas</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>82,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paranaque</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>111.9</td>
<td>117,708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasig</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>81.2</td>
<td>167,369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pateros</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>26,756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Juan</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>95.9</td>
<td>105,934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taguig</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>58,748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valenzuela</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>110.2</td>
<td>113,026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Metropolitan Manila</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>75.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,137,830</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Metropolitan Manila N = 312,000

Note: Migration data based on a 5% sample of the 1975 Census.
municipalities. The discrepancy between volume and rate of migration for Quezon City was not as great as it was for Manila. The Capital City received the second highest number of migrants and had the seventh highest rate of in-migration. Makati, however, had both a high volume and a high rate of in-migration. It was the third largest recipient of migrants and fourth in rank in migration rate. Taguig, Navotas and Pateros ranked fifteenth, sixteenth and seventeenth, respectively for both volume and rate of migration.

The rate of migration was inversely correlated to the unemployment rate and density of the cities/municipalities. Unemployment had a correlation coefficient of -0.516 and a significance level at 0.017 with the rate of migration, while density had a correlation coefficient of -0.419 and a significance level of 0.047 with the rate of migration. Thus, as the unemployment rate and density of a city/municipality rose, the rate of migration generally declined.

The volume and rate of migration to the cities and municipalities of Metropolitan Manila can be explained by several factors. Manila is the oldest city of Metropolitan Manila and the first real Philippine city according to Hollnsteiner (1969, p.147). Although it was replaced by the neighbouring Quezon City as the nation's capital in 1948 (Laquian, 1972, p.605), it still plays an important but diminishing role in the commercial, industrial, political and socio-cultural affairs of the country. Quezon City, on the other hand, being the nation's capital, is still a growing city in that some of the national government offices are still being transferred there.

The high volume and rates of in-migration to Makati may be due to its having the central offices of the country's biggest corporations and financial institutions. The area has the largest and most modern residential development in Metropolitan Manila and the entire Philippines (Philippine Planning Journal, 1971, p.16).
Caloocan City is an industrial-commercial area. Pasay City is chiefly residential with some commerce limited to two principal parallel belts (Philippine Planning Journal, 1971).

In Pasig and Marikina are located the largest concentration of textiles and shoe factories. A large number of manufacturing firms are concentrated along the Pasig River which serves as transportation artery as well as a sewer for industrial wastes (Yambot, 1976, p.94).

Valenzuela is the only municipality of Bulacan which is under Metropolitan Manila. It has never been included in the previous definitions of Metropolitan Manila or Greater Manila. However, Caloocan City and Quezon City, which are both contiguous to Valenzuela and which are 'old' areas of Greater Manila, have greatly influenced its commercial and industrial growth.

San Juan and Mandaluyong are predominantly residential. Commercial development is chiefly oriented along Quezon Boulevard and Aurora Boulevard. Industry and industrial growth potential is limited because of the general residential character of the areas. (Philippine Planning Journal, 1971.)

Las Piñas and Paranaque rapidly developed in the 1960's. With the construction of the Sucat road and the South Super-highway, these two areas became easily accessible and the number of subdivisions and factories began to grow.

The rest of the municipalities have both low volume and rates of in-migration. Malabon and Navotas are mainly fish and fish-products producers. Muntinlupa is mainly residential with some industries. Pateros and Taguig, which are almost entirely residential are still country towns, on the fringe of the City but not greatly influenced by it.
To conclude, the commercial-industrial development of a city/municipality was the key factor in attracting migrants. Population size and density were positive correlates of volume of migration, and unemployment rate and density were negative correlates of migration rates.

3.3.2 Out-migration from Manila and Urban Rizal

As was discussed in Chapter 1, the data on residence as of May, 1970 (residence of origin) is limited only to the province identity and the urban-rural character of the barangay or city/municipality of origin but not the identity of the city/municipality. Thus, Metropolitan Manila can only be subdivided into two broad provincial categories, Manila and urban Rizal and not into the seventeen cities/municipalities as was done in the preceding section.

TABLE 3.5. PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF MIGRANTS AND MIGRATION RATES FOR MANILA AND URBAN RIZAL: 1970-75

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Migrants</th>
<th>Average 1970-75 Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage Distribution</td>
<td>Rates ('000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manila</td>
<td>63.8</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Rizal</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>178,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ a \quad \text{Sum of 1970 population of all ages and 1975 population aged 5 years old and over, divided by 2; based on 1970 and 1975 Census Reports (NSO, 1974 and 1978).}\]

Note: Migration data based on a 5% sample of the 1975 Census.

Table 3.5 shows that both the volume and rate of out-migration from Metropolitan Manila exceeded that of Urban Rizal.
The reasons for this were partly discussed in the preceding section.

Some municipalities of Rizal are fast developing commercial and industrial areas sometimes even surpassing Manila in commercial-industrial growth. Consequently, the unemployment rate is lower than Manila by 2.3 per cent (NCSO, 1974).

On the other hand, Manila has more squatters and slum-dwellers than the other cities or municipalities of Metropolitan Manila (Office of the President, 1968, p.93). Thus, relocation of squatters and slum-dwellers was more intensive in these areas. Of the 42 thousand out-migrants from Metropolitan Manila who moved to the relocation centres, 64 per cent came from Manila while only 36 per cent came from urban Rizal.

Manila is also the centre of higher education in the Philippines. Twelve of the 33 universities of the Philippines are located in Manila. Enrolment in these twelve universities comprised 66 per cent of the total university enrolment in the Philippines (Resposo, 1971, p.189). Many of the out-migrants may therefore be former students who came to Manila to study but who have decided to go back to their home province or another province after completing their university education.

Hence, the level of migration to an area is sensitive to the concentration of institutions or the commercial or industrial development of an area of origin or destination. In a similar manner, the motives for migration together with the developments in the area of origin and destination are reflected in the characteristics of persons who move.

---

1 Metropolitan Manila, as defined by the Office of the President in 1968, consisted of Manila, Malabon, Navotas, Caloocan City, Quezon City, Mandaluyong, San Juan, Marikina, Pasig, Taguig, Cainta, Makati, Pasay, Paranaque and Las Piñas.
CHAPTER 4
CHARACTERISTICS OF MIGRANTS

An individual's characteristics are likely to exert important influences on his or her decision to migrate. With census data however, the personal attributes are those of the migrant at the moment the census is taken and not at the time of migration. This is not a problem for attributes that are constant like sex. But for the other characteristics, such as educational attainment, marital status and occupation, it is not possible to know to what extent the personal attributes recorded at the census are a cause or consequence of migration. However, a study of the latter characteristics can still give us an insight into the reasons for migration.

4.1 AGE-SEX

Among the principal cities of some Southeast Asian countries, the migrants to Metropolitan Manila had the lowest number of males per hundred females (Table 4.1). In all the age groups, the females dominated in the migration to Metropolitan Manila.

On the other hand, out-migration from Metropolitan Manila was not so strongly female-dominated. Only in ages 15-19, 20-24 and 55 and above did the females dominate. Sex ratios of out-migrants were more similar to those of the in-migrants to the other cities of Southeast Asia.

If the sex ratios of migrants to and from Metropolitan Manila are compared to all migrants in the Philippines who changed residence across provincial boundaries, the sex ratio of out-migrants are found to be closer to those of the general migrants than those of the in-migrants. The sex ratio of interprovincial migrants between 1970 and 1975, using the 1975 census data, was 95; that of the 1960-70 interprovincial migrants was calculated as 92
### Table 4.1. Sex Ratio of In-Migrants to Selected Cities of Southeast Asia and Out-Migrants from Metropolitan Manila

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Metropolitan Manila</th>
<th>Kuala Lumpur District</th>
<th>Jakarta</th>
<th>Bangkok</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interregional</td>
<td>Interstate</td>
<td>Interprovincial</td>
<td>Interchangeable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5-year</td>
<td>Born in Penang</td>
<td>5-year</td>
<td>5-year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975 Census</td>
<td>Out-</td>
<td>In- Malys</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>Indians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Except for Metropolitan Manila, Pryor (1977, Table 4).

**Note:** Metropolitan Manila data based on a 5% sample of the 1975 Census.
(UNFPA-NCSO, 1976, p.159). However, Perez (1978, p.71), using the National Demographic Survey data, observed a very much lower sex ratio than those based on the 1970 and 1975 census data for all migrants in the Philippines. Migrants between the period 1965 and 1973 had a ratio of 67. This disparity in the sex ratios might be due to the difference in populations used. The 1960 and 1970 census included the whole Philippine population while the National Demographic Survey was only a sample of the total population. The geographical boundaries used were also not specified. In addition, only 15 year olds and over were included in the study by Perez while the census studies included persons below 15 years old. This has an effect of raising the sex ratios because sex ratios are high at ages below 15 years (Table 4.1). Nevertheless, there is no doubt that migrants to Metropolitan Manila were predominantly female.

Pryor (1977, pp.70-71) partly attributes the predominance of female migrants to the relative equality of educational opportunities open to Filipinos. Kim (1972, p.xvi) suggests that this is perhaps because the Philippine Society is more Westernized than other Southeast Asian countries and females are more independent and free to migrate.

The Philippines is similar to the Latin American countries in terms of the predominance of female migrants to the metropolitan area. Elizaga (Jelin, 1977, p.131), in his study on the migration rates by sex for the urban areas of seven Latin American countries and for seven important cities, reports that in thirteen of the fourteen comparisons, migration rates for females were higher than those for males and in the remaining case, there was no difference between sexes. The similarity in the predominance of female migrants is perhaps due to similar colonial experience. Both the Philippines and the Latin American countries were former colonies of Spain whereas most Southeast Asian countries had been under European dominance other than Spain.
The Philippines and the Latin American countries, because of Spanish influence, are predominantly Catholic, while the Southeast Asia countries practise Mohammedanism, Buddhism or other non-Christian religions. The impact of differing foreign colonizers and religions will be further discussed in the section on "Usual Occupations" below.

Like most countries, many of the migrants to the metropolitan area were either late teenagers or young adults. Figure 4.1 shows that the proportion of in-migrants of both sexes in the age groups 15-19, 20-24 and 25-29 far exceeded those of the

**FIGURE 4.1. AGE STRUCTURE OF MIGRANTS TO AND FROM METROPOLITAN MANILA AND THE PHILIPPINE POPULATION: 1970-75**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>60-64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>50-59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>40-44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>30-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>20-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>10-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>5-9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Percentage of total population**

- In-migrants
- Out-migrants
- Philippine population

Total in-migrants: 312,000
Total out-migrants: 178,000
Total Philippine population: 35,589,894

*Note: Philippine population data based on 1975 Census Reports (NCSO, 1978). Data on migrants based on a 5% sample of the 1975 Census.*
Philippine population in the same age categories. More than half, 63 per cent, were in these age groups. Distinguishing by sex, 59 per cent of the males and 67 per cent of the females were between 15 to 29 years old. Peak mobility occurred at ages 15-19 for females and 20-24 for males. This difference may be due to a large extent to the migration of many teenage girls to work as domestic servants and the migration of males in their early twenties to work as craftsmen or production process workers in Metropolitan Manila as will be evident in the "Usual Occupation" section of this chapter.

On the other hand, out-migrants like the 1960-70 interprovincial migrants had a bimodal age distribution: aged 5-9 and 25-29 for males, and 5-9 and 20-24 for females. The proportion of out-migrants aged from 25 to 35 for males and 20 to 39 for females exceeded those of the Philippine population in the same age categories. This suggests the movement of many young couples with their children in which the wife is younger than her husband. In 1970, the mean age at marriage for females was 22.8 and 25.4 for males (Smith, 1977, p.139).

As pointed out by Rowland (1979, p.100): "Age itself is far from being a cause of migration. People move not because they are at a certain age but because during particular ages a transition occurs, on average, from one life cycle stage to another. This transition brings new attitudes, opportunities and responsibilities which are the real explanatory factors of migration." Thus, at ages 15 to 29, a transition occurs - the search for first employment, higher education, marriage and family formation - and this is supported by lack of family commitments and a greater ability to adapt to new circumstances.
4.2 MARITAL STATUS

In the Philippines, the singulate mean age at marriage for females is 22.8 and 25.4 for males (Smith, 1977, p.139). With female in-migrants being most mobile at ages 15-19 and males at ages 20-24, it can be expected that the great number of in-migrants would belong to the never married category. Similarly, out-migrants, with their peak mobility at ages 20-24 for females and 25-29 for males, would more likely be married. Figure 4.2 shows that 41 per

![Figure 4.2: Marital Status Structure of Migrants to and from Metropolitan Manila and the Philippine Population: 1970-75](image)

**In-migrants**
- Divorced/Separated
- Widowed
- Married
- Never married

**Out-migrants**

Total in-migrants 15 years old and over: 258,000
Total out-migrants 15 years old and over: 126,000
Total Philippine population 15 years old and over: 23,577,405

Married-legally married or living consensually with husband/wife without the benefit of a legal marriage.

Note: Philippine population data based on 1975 Census Reports (NSO, 1978). Data on migrants based on a 5% sample of the 1975 Census.
cent of the in-migrants were never married females and a quarter were never married males, while 30 per cent of the out-migrants were married males and 35 per cent were married females. The never married female in-migrants particularly stand out in Figure 4.2 for their especially large proportion.

It is interesting to note that the proportions of divorced/separated persons are very low. This is because the Philippines, being a predominantly Catholic country, does not recognize divorce. Only separation is legal. Once a person gets legally married, he cannot legally re-marry unless he becomes a widower or his marriage is annulled which is quite rare.

4.3 EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT

As expected from the literature on migration, the migrants were more highly educated than the total population as is evident in Figure 4.3. The greatest proportion of female in-migrants and out-migrants of both sexes finished grade 6, while the greatest percentage of male in-migrants were high school graduates. The proportions of college undergraduate in-migrants exceeded those of the out-migrants for both sexes, while the opposite was true for college graduates. This suggests that many young people migrate to Metropolitan Manila, the centre of tertiary education; to pursue a college or university degree and then go back to their region of origin or another region after they have finished their studies.

The higher educational attainment of migrants compared with non-migrants or the total population is often times attributed to increased employment information and job opportunities with
FIGURE 4.3. EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT STRUCTURE OF MIGRANTS TO AND FROM METROPOLITAN MANILA AND THE PHILIPPINE POPULATION: 1970-75

Among the different characteristics of migrants that have been discussed, i.e. age, sex, marital status and education, education perhaps plays the most significant role in determining the occupation a migrant will engage in after the move, for it is...
a person's high educational qualifications that usually earns him a high-paying job, or his lack of educational qualifications that leave him with a lowly job.

4.4 USUAL OCCUPATION

The occupation referred to in this study is the usual occupation during the year. As defined by the NCSO (1978, p.xviii), it is the specific job or kind of work performed by an employed person most of the year, or if presently unemployed, the kind of work he used to do most of the year. A person is considered working most of the year if he works for at least 10 hours a week for not less than 26 weeks.

"Usual occupation" is divided into three categories: (1) gainful occupation, (2) new entrants, and (3) non-gainful occupations. New entrants to the labor force are young persons and other new workers seeking employment, who lack work experience and who have no usual occupation. Under non-gainful occupations are housekeepers of own home, students, pensioners, disabled persons, etc.

Among all the characteristics of migrants, usual occupation is the most significant in determining the reasons for migration. Migrants engaged in gainful occupations or who were new entrants to the labor force may have moved primarily for job-related reasons; students, particularly those pursuing a college or university degree in Manila, may have primarily moved for further education; migrants engaged in other non-gainful occupations as housewives, disabled or retired persons may have moved for family reasons, as dependents.

Of the 258 thousand in-migrants aged 15 years old and over, about 29 per cent were males engaged in gainful occupations; 26 per cent, females in non-gainful occupations; 15 per cent, females in gainful occupations; 8 per cent, males in non-gainful occupations; 3 and 2 per cent, females and males new entrants respectively.
For out-migrants aged 15 years old and over, the proportion of males gainfully occupied and females not gainfully occupied were equal, 37 per cent; the percentage distribution of the rest of the categories were not very different from the in-migrants having only a difference of one per cent in the four occupational categories.

The main non-gainful occupation for males 15 years old and over was schooling, while for females it was housekeeping own home. 15 thousand (15 per cent) of the male in-migrants and 23 thousand (14 per cent) of the female in-migrants 15 years old and over were students. On the other hand, only 9 per cent or 5 thousand of the males and 8 per cent or equally 5 thousand of the female out-migrants were students. Furthermore, while 78 per cent of the male and 82 per cent of the female in-migrant students were pursuing college or university education, the proportions for out-migrants were very much lower, 44 and 48 per cent of the male and female out-migrants, respectively. The high number of student in-migrants, especially females, to Metropolitan Manila is understandable in that Manila is the centre of higher education. Located in Manila are the biggest universities in the Philippines. Half of the university students in the Philippines in the school year 1968-69 were enrolled in Manila and half of them were females (BCS, 1972).

Among ten countries in the Far East, e.g. India, Hong Kong, Burma, Malaya, Singapore, Indonesia, Philippines, Taiwan, China, South Korea, Boserup (1970, p.121) found that the Philippines had the highest proportion of female students among adult women and that only in Hong Kong and the Philippines does the girl student population almost equal that of the boys as is also the case in Latin American countries. The fact that females account for such a high proportion of the students in the Philippines is highly significant for it alone among the former colonies was under American influence.
Comparing the migrants and the Philippine population, Figure 4.4 shows that the proportions of migrants in the following categories exceeded those of the Philippine population: professional and technical, clerical, sales, transport and communication, crafts and production process (manufacturing) and service occupations. For both female in- and out-migrants, the service occupation was the most important gainful work. The same was not true for males. While the crafts and production process work was the principal occupation of in-migrants, it was only secondary to agricultural occupation for out-migrants. This is to be expected since Metropolitan Manila is the industrial and commercial centre of the country while the rest of the region are mainly agricultural areas. Thus, the out-migrants followed the occupational structure of the Philippine population more closely than in-migrants.

Female workers in the service and sport occupation particularly stand out in Figure 4.4. Numbering about 59 thousand, they constitute the biggest occupational category among in-migrants. They comprised 19 per cent of the total 312 thousand in-migrants of both sexes; 32 per cent of the total female in-migrants; 26 per cent of females aged 10 to 14; 35 per cent of females aged 15 years old and over; 68 per cent of all gainfully occupied females; 82 per cent of both sexes engaged in service and sport occupations. A great majority, 92 per cent of these service and sport workers were domestic servants (calculated from the 1975 census data sample).

Almost half, 49 per cent, of the female service workers were aged 15 to 19 and a quarter were aged 20 to 24. A great majority, 91 per cent, were single and the biggest proportion, 44 per cent, finished grade 6. Because of their huge proportion, they have dominated the age, marital status and educational attainment structure of the total female in-migrant population as was observed in the preceding sections.
FIGURE 4.4. USUAL OCCUPATION STRUCTURE OF MIGRANTS TO AND FROM METROPOLITAN MANILA AND THE PHILIPPINE POPULATION: 1970-75
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Total in-migrants 15 years old and over: 258,000
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Total Philippine population 15 years old and over: 23,577,405

Note: Philippine population data based on 1975 Census Reports (NCSO, 1978). Data on migrants based on a 5% sample of the 1975 Census.
Why are there so many young women going to the metropolitan area to work as domestic servants? As in Latin America, young women are attracted to the cities because they offer better employment opportunities than the rural areas where women do little agricultural work. Only 12 per cent of the farmers, fishermen, hunters and loggers in the Philippines were females (NCSO, 1978). Females in agricultural work also put in less hours than males. While more than half, 58 per cent, of females worked less than 40 hours, only about a quarter, 24 per cent, of the males did so (BCS, 1973b).

Female migrants were not solely engaged in domestic service. Because of the equal opportunities for education, female migrants were also as active as males in such occupations as professional and technical, clerical and sales work. In fact, Boserup (1970, p.182) reported that the Philippines had the highest percentage of women employed in the modern occupations, i.e. employees in industry and trade and all personnel in clerical, administrative and professional occupations, among the developing countries outside the Western Hemisphere. She attributed this to the American encouragement of female employment in the modern occupations, the Philippines, being the only country in the Far East which was under American rule.

4.5 SPATIAL DIFFERENTIALS

4.5.1 Regional Differentials

That migrants vary in characteristics according to their region of origin is apparent in Figure 4.5.

As discussed in Chapter 3, the most depressed regions of the country are the Visayan regions and Bicol. Their economic condition is reflected in the characteristics of their in-migrants to Metropolitan Manila. Among all the regions, they had the lowest educational attainment, the highest proportion of service workers and the lowest proportion of students. From 48 to 56 per
FIGURE 4.5. DISTRIBUTION OF IN-MIGRANTS TO METROPOLITAN MANILA BY USUAL OCCUPATION, BY SEX, BY REGION OF ORIGIN: '1970-75
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cent of the female in-migrants 15 years old and over from the
Visayan regions and 37 per cent from Bicol worked in the service
occupations. Western and Eastern Visayas and Bicol sent the
highest number of female service workers to Metropolitan Manila
(Figure 4.5). Although Southern Tagalog sent less than a thousand
more female service workers than Central Visayas, still the Visayan
region had a larger proportion of its in-migrants working in service
occupations. While 51 per cent of in-migrants from Central
Visayas worked in service occupation, less than a quarter, 22 per
cent, of the migrants from Southern Tagalog did so.

On the other hand, migrants from the richer lands of
Mindanao and Cagayan Valley had the highest educational attainment
and, except for female in-migrants from Western and Northern
Mindanao, the highest proportion of students. The higher
proportion of more highly educated migrants from the Mindanao
regions may not be because there are more highly educated people in
these regions. The Mindanao regions are the most distant regions
from Metropolitan Manila and they also have the most diverse culture.
The better-educated presumably would be more flexible to adapt to
a new environment.

These regions also had the lowest percentage of males in
the crafts and production process work but the highest proportion of
in-migrants in white collar occupations. Western Mindanao had the
highest proportion of professional and technical, administrative,
managerial and executive male workers and clerical female workers;
Northern Mindanao had the highest proportion of female professional
and technical workers; Central Mindanao had the highest male sales
workers.

Barring Central Luzon and Southern Tagalog, the proportion
married was highest among the migrants of both sexes from Western
and Central Mindanao. Western Mindanao also had the highest
proportion of migrants below 15 years of age. This is
understandable since Western and Central Mindanao are the centres of
Moslem rebellion and persons who move would likely bring their whole family with them.

For the contiguous regions of Central Luzon and Southern Tagalog, the greater proportion of female migrants were housewives, while the males were in crafts and production process work. Because of their proximity and huge populations these two regions were able to send the highest number of students and migrants in gainful occupations. The greatest number of migrants in professional and technical, administrative and executive, clerical (females only), sales, transport and communication, crafts and production process and service (males only) occupations came from Southern Tagalog and the highest number of male migrants in clerical (males only), mining and quarrying (males only) occupations originated from Central Luzon.

According to Ravenstein (1889, p.288), "females appear to predominate among short-journey migrants". This is true in the in-migration to Metropolitan Manila, where the migrants from Central Luzon and Southern Tagalog, the regions nearest Metropolitan Manila, were predominantly females. However, the number of female migrants also exceeded those of the male migrants in the farther regions of Mindanao and particularly Visayas, where many of the female migrants who worked in Metropolitan Manila as domestic servants, came from.

Regional differentials in the characteristics of out-migrants were not as marked or as significant as those among in-migrants. All the 12 regions had more than half of their female migrants from Metropolitan Manila occupied as housewives. Among the males, migrants to Central Luzon and Southern Tagalog, Northern and Southern Mindanao were the only regions with migrants
not primarily engaged in agricultural work. The greater proportion of migrants to Central Luzon, Southern Tagalog and Northern Mindanao were in crafts and production process work. For Central Mindanao, more than a fifth were in professional occupations while 17 and 13 per cent, the greatest percentage among the regions, were in clerical and sales work respectively.

4.5.2 Urban-Rural Differentials

Because of the aggregation of data, urban-rural differentials were not as marked as the regional differentials. The percentage distribution of urban migrants by age, sex, marital status, education and occupation varied only slightly from the distribution of rural migrants.

Urban areas, which have more varied economic activities and higher income than rural areas, sent and received more in- and out-migrants, respectively, with higher educational attainment and more varied occupations. The greatest proportion of gainfully employed male in-migrants to Metropolitan Manila from both the urban and the rural areas were engaged in crafts and production process work but the urban areas sent slightly higher percentages of male in-migrants in professional, administrative, clerical and sales work and fewer crafts and production process workers than did the rural areas. Likewise, the greatest proportion of gainfully employed female in-migrants from both areas were engaged in the service occupations but there were less in-migrants in service occupations and more in professional, clerical and crafts and production process work from the urban areas than the rural areas. There were also more in-migrants in non-gainful activities like studying or housekeeping from the urban than the rural areas.

Similarly, a great proportion of out-migrants from Metropolitan Manila to the rural areas were concentrated in a few jobs while those who moved to urban areas held more varied jobs.
Thirty-eight per cent of the 32 thousand male migrants to the rural areas were engaged in agricultural work and twenty-one per cent were in crafts and production process work. On the other hand, the greatest proportion of the 15 thousand male migrants to the urban areas, 22 per cent, were in crafts and production process work and 12 per cent each were in agricultural, sales and transport and communications work. The majority of the female out-migrants from Metropolitan Manila aged 15 years old and over were not gainfully employed. These constituted 74 per cent of the 43 thousand migrants to the rural areas and 69 per cent of the 24 thousand migrants to the urban areas. The greater volume and proportion of non-gainfully employed migrants to the rural areas may not be due to the lesser need to work in these areas but to the lack of available work. As mentioned earlier in this chapter, Filipino women are not as involved in agricultural work as the men so they have less chances of working in the rural areas which are mainly agricultural. Of the nine thousand gainfully employed migrants to the urban areas, the highest proportion of them, 40 per cent, were in service occupations while the second highest, 24 per cent, were in professional occupations. The majority of those in professional occupations were schoolteachers. Of the nine thousand gainfully employed migrants to the rural areas, the highest proportion, 30 per cent, were in service occupations and the second highest, 19 per cent, were in sales occupations, mainly as keepers of small retail stores. Only 12 per cent were in agricultural occupations.

4.5.3 Metropolitan Manila Areas Differentials

As in the previous sections, the characteristics of migrants to an area of destination are a reflection of the activities in the area. Manila, which is the centre of higher education, received 46 per cent of the 15 thousand male students 15 years old and over, and 51 per cent of the 23 thousand female students. Twenty-six per cent of the 26 thousand male migrants aged 15 years old and over, and 28 per cent of the females were students. Thus, the
migrants to Manila had the highest educational attainment among the migrants of all the cities/municipalities. The highly populated Manila also received the highest number of migrants in all occupations except in administrative and executive occupations. Quezon City, the nation's capital, received the largest number of migrants engaged in the administrative occupations.

The highest proportion of migrants to Makati, the location of the most luxurious residential areas and hotels and restaurants in the country, were engaged in the service occupations with 16 percent of the 11 thousand male migrants and half of the female migrants 15 years old and over.

For the rest of the cities, the most popular occupation engaged in by the male migrants 15 years old and over was crafts and production process work especially among the more industrialized cities/municipalities. The second most popular occupation was either the service occupations or studying except for Malabon and Navotas. These two municipalities, being mainly fish and fish products producers, had fishing as their second most popular occupation. For the female migrants aged 15 years old and over, the most popular occupation was the service occupations followed by either studying or crafts and production process work.

For the out-migrants from Metropolitan Manila, no significant variations in characteristics between migrants from Manila and urban Rizal were observed. This may largely be due to the aggregation of the municipalities of Rizal into one category, i.e. urban Rizal.

4.6 RETURN AND CIRCULAR MIGRATION

In the previous sections of this chapter, comparisons of the age, sex, marital status, education and usual occupation of in-migrants to Metropolitan Manila with out-migrants from Metropolitan Manila suggests that many of the out-migrants were actually return migrants who went to Metropolitan Manila when they
were single and younger, either to study or to work but after getting married and forming a family, returned to their region of origin for various reasons.

Some studies on internal migration in the Philippines indicate a considerable amount of return and circular migration. Using the 1970 census where residence at four different times were obtained, i.e. at birth, February 1960, February 1965 and May 1970, del Rosario and Kim classified the population into six major types: non-migrants and primary, secondary, tertiary return and circular migrants. A primary migrant experienced a single change of residence from place of birth which was recorded either in 1960, 1965 or 1970. Secondary migrants experienced two changes of residence and tertiary migrants three changes. Return migrants are those who migrated from their birthplace but had returned to it by 1970. Finally, circular migrants had changed residence from birthplace at each reference period and had by 1970 returned to any of the previous residences except the birthplace at a succeeding move. From this perspective, del Rosario and Kim found that 23 per cent of all migrants were either return or circular, with the circular migrants outnumbering the return migrants by a ratio of four to one (Goldstein, 1978, p.30-31). Goldstein suggests that return and circular migration is more extensive than the 1970 Census indicates and this is evident in van den Muijzenberg's study on population movement in Central Luzon.

Stretton's study (1977) on building industry and employment creation in Manila is another proof of extensive circular migration. Data gathered from 47 construction sites in Greater Manila Area, i.e. Manila, Quezon City, Pasay, Caloocan, Makati, San Juan, Mandaluyong, Navotas, estimate that 60 per cent of these workers follow circular migration. The high incidence of circular migration among the building industry labourers is facilitated by

---

1 These are classified under crafts and production process occupation in the Census.
the following factors:

(a) A large proportion of building industry labourers live in villages two to six hours' bus drive from Manila and transportation is relatively efficient and cheap.

(b) Unlike office work, working hours in the building industry is more flexible and contractors and foremen tolerate their labourers taking extra time off to visit their families.

(c) The income earned in the city is not sufficient to allow a migrant to support his family in the city so he leaves his family in the village where the cost of living is lower. Thus, the migrant maximizes his net family income by maximizing his earnings while minimizing the family's cost of living.

(d) While retaining his family in the village and visiting them regularly, the circular migrant retains his ties with his village where he can always come back when there is no work available in the city. He can work on the farm or on other odd jobs or just depend upon other members of the family until he is informed that work is again available in the building sites.

Stretton also reports that construction work sometimes serves as a transitional stage between unskilled, rural agricultural and skilled, urban industrial employment. Those working in the industry leave as soon as more permanent jobs become available in manufacturing or modern service sectors, and their jobs are taken by new migrants on the building sites.

With the 1975 census where only residence in May 1970 and May 1975 were obtained, circular or return migration cannot be measured as was done using the 1970 census. However, a study of the characteristics of migrants suggests the prevalence of these
types of migration.

Table 4.2 shows that the principal ethnic origin of out-migrants to the different regions was the same as the principal ethnic origins\(^1\) of the population of the regions of destination but for two exceptions wherein the secondary ethnic origin of the migration streams were the ones identical to those of the region of destination. These exceptions were the migrants to Western and Southern Mindanao.

In connection with Table 4.2, it should be noted that the Mindanao regions were not originally populated mainly by the Cebuanos and Tagalogs but by various Moslem groups. The encouragement by the government since the early 1900's to migrate to these rich and vast lands attracted people from the Luzon and Visayan Islands, particularly the Cebuanos who come from Central Visayas, and the Tagalogs from Southern Tagalog and some areas of Central Luzon. Thus the Cebuano and Tagalog in-migrants to Metropolitan Manila from the Mindanao regions were themselves or their parents or grandparents original migrants from Central Visayas and the Southern Tagalog and the Central Luzon regions. Likewise, many of the out-migrants may have been former in-migrants to Metropolitan Manila but later returned to the Mindanao regions.

The data, therefore, as well as other studies on internal migration, attest to the fact that many of the out-migrants from Metropolitan Manila are actually return migrants.

\(^1\) Principal ethnic origin is the ethnic origin to which the highest proportion of the population of a region belongs; secondary ethnic origin is the ethnic origin to which the second highest proportion of the population belongs.
TABLE 4.2. ETHNIC ORIGIN OF MIGRANTS TO AND FROM METROPOLITAN MANILA: 1970-75

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>In-migrants</th>
<th>Out-migrants</th>
<th>Regional Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethnic Origin</td>
<td>Ethnic Origin</td>
<td>Ethnic Origin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilocos</td>
<td>Ilocano</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cagayan Valley</td>
<td>Ilocano</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Luzon</td>
<td>Tagalog</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Tagalog</td>
<td>Tagalog</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicol</td>
<td>Bicol</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Visayas</td>
<td>Hiligaynon</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Visayas</td>
<td>Cebuano</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Visayas</td>
<td>Waray-waray</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Mindanao</td>
<td>Tagalog</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Mindanao</td>
<td>Cebuano</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Mindanao</td>
<td>Tagalog</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Mindanao</td>
<td>Maranao</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>Tagalog</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Regional population data based on 1975 Census Reports (NCSO, 1978). Data on migrants based on a 5% sample of the 1975 Census.
CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY AND CONCLUDING REMARKS

5.1 SUMMARY

This study analysed the variation in levels of in- and out-migration to and from Metropolitan Manila, respectively, (a) among the twelve regions of the country, (b) between the urban and the rural areas, and (c) among the cities and municipalities of Metropolitan Manila. The age-sex, education, marital status and occupational characteristics of migrants were also examined. Factors that influence migration as identified in different migration models and theories were used as guides to explain migration differentials in levels of migration and characteristics of migrants.

Regression analysis of some regional variables on the volume of migration was carried out to determine correlates of migration. Results show that the volume of regional migration streams were strongly and linearly correlated with distance, regional population size, size of labor force, number of non-agricultural workers, unemployment rate and proportion of Tagalog-speakers, and moderately correlated with proportion urban. The regional counterstreams were also strongly correlated with the above factors as well as the size of the migration stream, and moderately correlated with regional income. Thus, the volume of the Luzon regions migration streams and counterstreams were generally the highest while those of the regions of Mindanao the lowest. The relocation of squatters and slum-dwellers from Metropolitan Manila to Central Luzon and Southern Tagalog further inflated the levels of migration to these regions. Other sociocultural, environmental and economic factors which are not included in the regression analysis have also influenced the
regional levels of migration to and from Metropolitan Manila.

Volumes of rural migration streams and counterstreams were higher than those of the urban because of the greater number of persons able to move from the rural areas. However, rates of in- and out-migration for rural areas were lower than those of the urban areas because of less socio-cultural distance but more varied employment in the urban areas, and the possible movement from rural areas to the cities via small centres.

Commercial or industrial development or the concentration of institutions like the universities in Manila and the national government offices in Quezon City were the key factors in attracting migrants to the different cities and municipalities of Metropolitan Manila.

Because of the dominance of economic motive in migration, the greatest number of migrants to Metropolitan Manila were domestic servants coming from all over the country particularly from the poorer Visayan regions. Most of them were single, in their late teens and had attained some primary education. Aside from the domestic servants, large number of female university students, greater in number than male students, and housewives or dependents also migrated to Metropolitan Manila. Thus, unlike some Southeast Asian countries but similar to Latin American countries who were under the same Western colonizers, the number of females exceeded that of the male in-migrants to Metropolitan Manila. But like most countries, many of the migrants to Metropolitan Manila were young persons in their late teens or early twenties, single and better educated than the total population. The greatest number of male migrants were engaged in crafts and production process work. There were also large numbers of male students and male migrants in the service occupations. However, there were about five female migrants per male migrant engaged in the service occupations.
Unlike the in-migrants to Metropolitan Manila, the out-migrants from Metropolitan Manila were largely in their early or late twenties, married and with higher proportions of college or university graduates. The out-migrants were closer in characteristics to the total Philippine population than the in-migrants. Greater numbers of the males were in agricultural occupations but large numbers were also in crafts and production process work. More than two-thirds of the female out-migrants were not gainfully employed but of those who were, the greater number of them were in service occupations.

The number and proportion of students or workers in service occupation, in crafts and production process work or in white-collar jobs varied with the economic development of the regions of origin. The less developed regions of the Visayas sent greater proportions of workers in service occupations for both sexes, and lesser students. The Mindanao regions, the physically and culturally more distant regions, sent fewer migrants to Metropolitan Manila; however, these regions sent higher proportion of students and migrants with high educational attainment than the other regions. The nearby more populous regions of Luzon sent the highest number of migrants in all categories except for service occupations.

The characteristics of migrants from Metropolitan Manila to the different regions reflected the activities in the region of destination. The highest proportions of out-migrants from Metropolitan Manila to the different regions were engaged in agricultural occupations except for the more industrialized areas of Central Luzon, Southern Tagalog and Northern Mindanao where crafts and production process work was the more popular occupation of the migrants, and Central Mindanao with more of its migrants in professional occupations.
There were no significant differences between the characteristics of urban and rural migrants, and the characteristics of migrants from Manila and Urban Rizal partly because of aggregation. On the other hand, there were marked variations in characteristics among the cities and municipalities of Metropolitan Manila. Of the 17 cities/municipalities of Metropolitan Manila, Manila, Quezon City and Makati were the most important areas of destinations receiving 60 per cent of the total in-migrants to Metropolitan Manila. Half of the migrants to Manila, the centre of higher education, were students. The highly populated Manila also received the highest number of migrants engaged in all occupations except in administrative and executive work wherein Quezon City, the nation's capital, received the highest number. The largest proportion of migrants, both males and females to Makati, the location of upper class residences and many of the big hotels and restaurants, were engaged in service occupations.

Finally, the data together with some other literature on internal migration suggest that many of the out-migrants were actually return migrants who migrated to Manila when they were single and younger, to work or to study but after some years got married and formed a family of their own and returned to their region of origin.

5.2 IMPLICATIONS

It appears that migration is from the nearer and more populous areas and from the less developed parts of the country to the rapidly developing areas. Migration to Metropolitan Manila would therefore continue to escalate unless commercial establishments, industries or universities are decentralized from Metropolitan Manila or new industries or sources of employment can be created in other regions to absorb would-be migrants to Metropolitan Manila.
The findings of the study has given us an understanding of the factors or forces that come into play in the migration to and from Metropolitan Manila. If we can understand the underlying forces that govern migration, we can contribute towards building a theoretical model on migration in the Philippines and thus are in a stronger position to project levels and patterns of migration for national and regional population redistribution planning and policy making.

5.3 LIMITATIONS AND FURTHER DEVELOPMENT

Because of data limitations, the volume of return migration could not be measured and the out-migrants from Manila and Urban Rizal were substituted for out-migrants from Metropolitan Manila. These could be corrected if the census questionnaire were to be revised so that out-migrants from Metropolitan Manila and the return migrants could be identified.

The study could also be expanded to include topics which may be of relevance to the study but which have not been discussed because of time constraints and the limitation on the length of this paper.

Finally, the study could be extended to measure not only linear relationships between several variables and the levels of migration but also non-linear relationships. The number of variables and the number of cases could also be increased. Instead of using only twelve regions, the 73 provinces could be used in the regression analysis to obtain more significant and accurate correlations. With the identification of the variables which are strongly correlated to the levels of migration together with an awareness of the present developments and the national, regional and provincial policies affecting population redistribution, the next step could be taken - projection into the future.
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## Personal Characteristics, Migration, Fertility and Occupation

![Image of census form page](image-url)

### HOUSEHOLD SCHEDULE

1. **Province:**
2. **City/Mun./Mun. District:**
3. **City District:**
4. **Population/ Barangay (Barrio):**
5. **Urban/Rural:**
6. **Household Serial Number:**

### HOUSEHOLD SCHEDULE

- **Fertility** (To be asked of ever-married woman only)
- **What is the person's usual occupation?**
- **Class of worker**

### PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS, MIGRATION, FERTILITY AND OCCUPATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Relationship to head of household</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Date of Birth (Enter month and year)</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Civil Status</th>
<th>Mother tongue (Ethnic origin)</th>
<th>Residence on May 6, 1970</th>
<th>Highest grade completed or degree obtained</th>
<th>Vocational/Technical Skills</th>
<th>Other relative</th>
<th>Fertility</th>
<th>Class of worker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Codes for Col. 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Relationship to Head of Household</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>Wife/Spouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>Son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>Daughter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>Son-in-law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>Daughter-in-law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>Grandson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>Granddaughter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>Father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Other relative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Other boarder, domestic help, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1975 INTEGRATED CENSUS OF THE POPULATION AND ITS ECONOMIC ACTIVITIES

(PHASE I)

PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS, MIGRATION, FERTILITY AND OCCUPATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship to the head of household</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Civil status</th>
<th>Mother tongue</th>
<th>Residence on May 6, 1970</th>
<th>Highest grade completed or degree obtained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family nucleus</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>(Enter code)</td>
<td>(Enter code)</td>
<td>(Enter code)</td>
<td>(Enter code)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codes for col. 4 (Etn)</th>
<th>Codes for col. 5</th>
<th>Codes for col. 7</th>
<th>Codes for col. 10</th>
<th>Codes for col. 13</th>
<th>Codes for col. 22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - No Family Nucleus</td>
<td>01 - Alakanon</td>
<td>11 - Maranao</td>
<td>1 - Same barangay</td>
<td>11 - Grade 1</td>
<td>1 - Works for a private employer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 1st Family</td>
<td>02 - Bicol</td>
<td>12 - Palawan</td>
<td>2 - Urban area</td>
<td>12 - Grade 2</td>
<td>2 - Works for the government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - 2nd Family</td>
<td>03 - Cebuano</td>
<td>13 - Panagiao</td>
<td>3 - Rural area</td>
<td>13 - Grade 3</td>
<td>3 - Works in own business, profession or trade for profit or fee, with at least one paid employee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - 3rd Family</td>
<td>04 - Cebuano</td>
<td>14 - Panagiao</td>
<td>4 - Urban area</td>
<td>14 - Grade 4</td>
<td>4 - Works in own business, profession or trade for profit or fee, without any paid employee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 4th Family</td>
<td>05 - Cebuano</td>
<td>15 - Tagalog</td>
<td>5 - Rural area</td>
<td>15 - Grade 5</td>
<td>5 - Works without pay on family farm or enterprise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and so forth</td>
<td>06 - Cebuano</td>
<td>16 - Tagalog</td>
<td>6 - Rural area</td>
<td>16 - Grade 6 &amp; 7</td>
<td>6 - New entrant to labor force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Codes for col. 8</td>
<td>Codes for col. 9</td>
<td>Codes for col. 11</td>
<td>Codes for col. 12</td>
<td>Codes for col. 14</td>
<td>Codes for col. 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Single</td>
<td>01 - Alakanon</td>
<td>11 - Maranao</td>
<td>1 - Same barangay</td>
<td>11 - Grade 1</td>
<td>1 - Works for a private employer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Married</td>
<td>02 - Bicol</td>
<td>12 - Palawan</td>
<td>2 - Urban area</td>
<td>12 - Grade 2</td>
<td>2 - Works for the government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - Widowed</td>
<td>03 - Cebuano</td>
<td>13 - Panagiao</td>
<td>3 - Rural area</td>
<td>13 - Grade 3</td>
<td>3 - Works in own business, profession or trade for profit or fee, with at least one paid employee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - Separated/Divorced</td>
<td>04 - Cebuano</td>
<td>14 - Panagiao</td>
<td>4 - Urban area</td>
<td>14 - Grade 4</td>
<td>4 - Works in own business, profession or trade for profit or fee, without any paid employee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - Unknown</td>
<td>05 - Cebuano</td>
<td>15 - Tagalog</td>
<td>5 - Rural area</td>
<td>15 - Grade 5</td>
<td>5 - Works without pay on family farm or enterprise</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fertility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To be asked of all household members</th>
<th>Codes for col. 24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 years old and over</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Occupation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codes for col. 25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - Works for a private employer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Works for the government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - Works in own business, profession or trade for profit or fee, without any paid employee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - Works in own business, profession or trade, for profit or fee, with at least one paid employee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - Works without pay on family farm or enterprise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - New entrant to labor force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - Works without pay for charitable institution or sociocivic project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - Student, housewife, pensioned, retired, disabled, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>