



Spatial impact of overseas Filipino workers' remittances on the Philippine economy

Cristela Goce-Dakila and Francisco G. Dakila Jr.*
De La Salle University Bangko Sentral ng Pilipinas

Remittance inflows from overseas Filipino workers have become the second-largest source of foreign exchange for the Philippine economy. In view of this, we assess the vulnerability of Philippine households to an exogenous shock in the form of a five-percent decline in remittances. We utilize a spatial computable general equilibrium model based on a five-region social accounting matrix. A three-level production function is specified, namely, Cobb-Douglas between labor and capital to produce value added; then Leontief between non-transport inputs and value added to produce output net of transport, which is then combined with transport inputs at the third level, using again a Cobb-Douglas production function. Capital and labor incomes accrue to the households who then allocate these to consumption and savings with a constant marginal propensity to consume. Overseas remittances enter as transfer payments to households. Consumption is allocated among different commodities, using a Cobb-Douglas utility function. Final demand is then built up in a standard way. Results indicate that in absolute terms, Northern Luzon middle- and low-income households bear the highest percentage reductions in income. On the other hand, Mindanao households are the least vulnerable. These results are then compared with those of a two-region model using a single-level Leontief production function and Cobb-Douglas utility function.

JEL classification: F24, D58

Keywords: spatial impact, overseas Filipino workers' remittances, computable general equilibrium modeling, Philippine economy

*The views and opinions expressed in this paper are the authors' and do not necessarily reflect those of their respective institutions.

1. Introduction

Remittance inflows to a number of emerging market economies have increased substantially as the stock of overseas workers has grown and shifted toward more skilled jobs. The subject has, therefore, received much recent attention.¹ In the Philippines, in particular, second to exports of goods and services, remittances have become the largest foreign exchange source.²

Past studies of the impact of remittances on the economy have relied either on econometric estimation, which yields partial equilibrium estimates, or survey approaches. This paper uses an economy-wide (general equilibrium) approach that allows for interactions involving all major sectors in the economy, while ensuring consistency of results. A major feature of the paper is its interregional approach, which gives a spatial dimension to the analysis. The basis of the approach is the social accounting matrix, a version of which, covering the year 1994, was especially constructed for several papers authored by C. Dakila.

The framework is of the applied general equilibrium (AGE) type. A general equilibrium is described, which consists of a set of "economic agents" (such as consumers and producers), each of which demands and supplies goods or services, with each agent aiming to solve its own optimization problem. Agents are assumed to be price takers. Equilibrium is defined as a state of the economy in which the actions of all agents are mutually consistent and can be executed simultaneously.³ In the model, adjustment to equilibrium is implemented by specifying that markets adjust to minimize the sum of excess supplies.⁴ It can be noted that although several AGE models have been estimated for the Philippines, all previous models were national in scope. This is thus the first model to offer a spatial dimension to the analysis. It is also the first attempt to analyze the impact of remittances in the Philippines using an economy-wide approach.

A three-level production function is specified. At the bottom level, a Cobb-Douglas function combines labor and capital to produce value added; then, on top of this, a Leontief production function combines non-transport inputs and value added to produce the output net of transport. Output net of transport is then combined with transport inputs to produce the final, delivered output, using a Cobb-Douglas production function. Capital and labor incomes

¹One of the latest comprehensive studies is undertaken by the World Bank [2006].

²Studies of the impact of overseas Filipino worker (OFW) remittances include Chami, Fullenkamp, and Jahjah [2005]; Burgess and Haksar [2005]; and Asian Development Bank [2004].

³See Shoven and Whalley [1992] or Ginsburgh and Keyzer [1997] for more details on applied general equilibrium models.


⁴Quantities adjust in the model; prices follow to equate the notional and effective demands for labor.

accrue to households, who then allocate these to consumption and saving, with a constant marginal propensity to consume. Overseas remittances enter as transfer payments to households. Consumption is apportioned between different commodities using a Cobb-Douglas utility function. Final demand is then built up in a standard way.

Empirical results indicate that the main beneficiaries (measured in peso terms) of remittance increases are the middle-income classes across all regions. The second-best beneficiaries are the low-income household, again for all regions, with the notable exception of the National Capital Region (NCR), where the high-income households are the second-highest beneficiaries of remittances. The paper highlights the data requirements for the modeling approach, which is instructive for emerging economies in similar situations.

2. Theoretical framework

Figure 1. Map of five-region delineation



The model accounts for the interregional linkages of the Philippine economy. The model was originally developed to address the issue of the spatial impact of transportation, thus the transport component of the production sector of the model is relatively well developed. Table 1 summarizes the sectoral structure of the model. The model distinguishes among seven main production sectors, which are further differentiated according to the five regions of origin. These five regions are an agglomeration of the current 17 administrative regions in the Philippines. Since the NCR has an insignificant agricultural sector, there are therefore 34 production sectors. For each region, households are differentiated into three income classes. There are, therefore, a total of 15 household categories. To ensure consistency with official standards, low-income households are defined as comprising all households that earn below the regional poverty thresholds as determined by the National Statistical Coordination Board. The high-income households are those who earn Php 250,000 and above annually (in 1994 terms), which is the highest income bracket in the Family Income and Expenditure Survey (FIES). All the households with incomes between the regional poverty threshold and the highest income bracket in the FIES are classified as middle-income households.⁵

Table 1. Sectoral disaggregation of five-region model

| <i>Production sectors</i> | <i>Regions</i> | <i>Households</i> |
|---------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------|
| Agriculture (Ag) | National Capital Region (NCR) | Low income |
| Industry (Ind) | Northern Luzon (NOL) | Middle income |
| Water transport (Wtr Tr) | Southern Luzon (SOL) | High income |
| Land transport (Land Tr) | Visayas (VIS) | |
| Air transport (Air Tr) | Mindanao (MIN) | |
| Other services (OthrSr) | | |
| Government (Govt) | | |

2.1. Household sector

The model distinguishes among 15 representative households, with three household types (representing the low-, middle-, and high-income classes) for each of the six regional groupings identified in this paper. The preferences of each household type are summarized by a corresponding Cobb-Douglas utility function:

$$U_h = \prod_i C_{ih}^{\delta_{ih}} \quad (1)$$

⁵Mizokami and Dakila [2005] provide a detailed description of the database utilized in the model.

where δ_{ih} is the elasticity of the utility of the h^{th} household with respect to consumption of the i^{th} good. Each representative household maximizes its utility subject to its income constraint, which we describe below.

For each region, household labor income is assumed to be equal to the sum of the labor incomes that each household income group earns from supplying labor within the region. The endowments of labor of different income classes within a region are taken to be constant; these then determine how labor incomes are distributed within each region.

Since capital is fixed, each household income group is assumed to own a fixed share of total capital, and this ratio is maintained through the policy experiments. Household income is calculated as the sum of labor income ($w_i L_i$) plus that portion of capital income that accrues to the households ($\lambda_h \sum_i r_i K_i$), plus transfers from government and from the rest of the world. The latter two are exogenously determined. Thus, if we partition the indices h and i so that the r^{th} partition belongs to the r^{th} region, then we obtain total income per household type as:

$$Y_{h,r} = \omega_{h,r} \sum_{i \in r} w_i L_i + \lambda_{h,r} \sum_i r_i K_i + Tr_{GOV,h,r} + Tr_{ROW,h,r} \quad (2)$$

where the ω 's are the labor income distribution parameters, and, as indicated, the summation is for industries belonging to the r^{th} region. Total disposable income is found by subtracting direct taxes imposed on the household from the foregoing quantity:

$$Y_{h,r} = \omega_{h,r} \sum_{i \in r} w_i L_i + \lambda_{h,r} \sum_i r_i K_i + Tr_{GOV,h,r} + Tr_{ROW,h,r} \quad (3)$$

where Y_d is disposable income and τ_h is the direct tax rate imposed on household h . Note that the summation now runs within each household type, so that we have dropped the subscript r referring to the partitioning across regions.

Each household type is assumed to consume a constant proportion of its disposable income. Thus, households maximize utility subject to the budget constraint

$$\sum_i p d_i C_{ih} = c_h Y_d \quad (4)$$

where $p d_i$ is the domestic price of the good and c_h is the average propensity to consume of household h . Given the Cobb-Douglas utility function, the first-order conditions yield the following consumption demands for each commodity by each household type in each region:

$$C_{i,h,r} = \delta_i c_{h,r} \left[\omega_{h,r} \sum_{i \in r} w_i L_i + \lambda_{h,r} \sum_i r_i K_i + Tr_{GOV,h,r} + Tr_{ROW,h,r} \right] \frac{(1 - \tau_{h,r})}{p_i} \tag{5}$$

2.2. *Production sector*

Production is modeled assuming a three-stage production function. At the first stage, capital and labor are combined to produce value added, using a Cobb-Douglas production technology.

$$V_i = A_i K_i^{\alpha_i} L_i^{1-\alpha_i} \tag{6}$$

where for sector *i* and region *r*, *V* = value added, *K* = capital, *L* = labor, α = share of capital in value added, and $1-\alpha$ = share of labor in value added. This specification of the Cobb-Douglas function assumes constant returns to scale. Capital is assumed to be immobile across sectors while labor is mobile.

In stage 2 of the production process, value added is combined with non-transport intermediate inputs under a Leontief technology, to produce a composite good, which is output net of transport.

$$X_i^{NT} = \min \left[\frac{X_{1i}}{a_{1i}}, \frac{X_{2i}}{a_{2i}}, \dots, \frac{X_{NTi}}{a_{NTi}}, \frac{V_i}{a_{v,i}} \right] \tag{7}$$

Finally, stage 3 combines output net of transport with transport intermediate inputs under a Cobb-Douglas production function to yield total output, gross of transport, of commodity *i* ($X_{T,i}$).

$$X_{T,i} = B_i \left(X_i^{NT} \right)^{\beta_{1i}} W_i^{\beta_{2i}} A_i^{\beta_{3i}} La_i^{\beta_{4i}} \tag{8}$$

where *W*, *A*, and *La* represent the different transport intermediate inputs that go into sector *i*, namely, water, air, and land transport. This specification allows substitutability of the various transport modes. The total output of sector *i* (X_i) is found by summing together total output gross of transport of commodity *i* ($X_{T,i}$), indirect taxes on *i* ($T_{indirect,i}$), direct taxes imposed on firms in sector *i* ($T_{direct,i}$), imports of *i* (M_i), tariffs imposed on *i* (Tar_i), and net dividends from the foreign sector into sector *i* ($Div_{For,i}$).

$$X_i = X_{T,i} + T_{Indirect,i} + T_{Direct,i} + M_i + Tar_i + Div_{For,i} \tag{9}$$

The firm is assumed to maximize profits. Because of the nature of the production function, profit maximization can be described in three stages. The first stage entails choosing the optimum levels of capital and labor so as to maximize the contribution of value added to profits. At the second stage, as noted above, value added is combined with other intermediate non-transport inputs in a fixed coefficients (Leontief) technology to produce output net of transport. Finally, the third stage determines the optimal combination of transport inputs to deliver output to the region of destination. Then for commodity j , the optimization problem is

Maximize

$$\Pi_j = pd_j X_j - \sum_i pd_j Mat_{i,j} - pva_j V_j \tag{10}$$

subject to

$$X_j = B_j X_j^{NT\beta_{1j}} W_j^{\beta_{2j}} A_j^{\beta_{3j}} L_j^{\beta_{4j}} \tag{11}$$

$$X_j^{NT} = \min \left[X_{1j} / a_{1j}, \dots, X_{NTj} / a_{NTj}, V_j / a_{v,i} \right]$$

$$V_j = A_j K_j^{\alpha_j} L_j^{1-\alpha_j}$$

where Π is total profits, Mat_{ji} is the matrix of intermediate inputs of each commodity into commodity j , V represents value added, and pva is its corresponding price.

At the top production level, the corresponding first-order conditions for profit maximization are

$$pd_i^* \frac{\partial X_i}{\partial X_i^{NT}} = p_{NT} \text{ or } pd_i \beta_{1i} \frac{X_i}{X_i^{NT}} = p_{NT} \tag{12}$$

$$pd_i^* \frac{\partial X_i}{\partial W_i} = p_w \text{ or } pd_i \beta_{2i} \frac{X_i}{W_i} = p_w$$

$$pd_i^* \frac{\partial X_i}{\partial A_i} = p_A \text{ or } pd_i \beta_{3i} \frac{X_i}{A_i} = p_A$$

$$pd_i^* \frac{\partial X_i}{\partial La_i} = p_L \text{ or } pd_i \beta_{4i} \frac{X_i}{La_i} = p_{La}$$

There are no corresponding first-order conditions for the second-level production stage, since this is characterized by fixed coefficients technology, and marginal conditions are not defined. However, once the output net of transport is determined, the different non-transport inputs as well as total value added can be derived using the fixed coefficients technology in equation (7).

At the bottom level, profit maximization entails choosing the least cost combination of labor and capital to produce the required value added. Since capital is immobile, of particular interest is the first-order condition for labor, which is

$$pva_i^* \frac{\partial V_i}{\partial L_i} = w_i \quad (13)$$

$$pva_i (1 - \alpha_i) \frac{V_i}{L_i} = w_i$$

2.3. *Government and the external sector*

The model incorporates the national government sector, i.e., the behavior of local government units is not considered. Government enters the economy in several ways: it purchases output from each sector, imposes indirect taxes on production and tariffs on imported goods, and direct taxes on income of each household type. Government expenditures on each commodity are taken as exogenous in the model, while taxes are endogenous.

Tariff revenues per commodity equal the product of the tariff rates and import values:

$$Tar_i = tar_i (m_i) \quad (14)$$

where Tar_i and tar_i are total tariff collections from i and the tariff rate on commodity i , respectively. Indirect tax collections are given by the product of the indirect tax rate imposed on domestic production and the rate imposed on imports of the product:

$$T_{Indirect,i} = tind_i (d_i + m_i (1 + tar_i)). \quad (15)$$

Direct tax collections per household type in the model are computed as:

$$T_{Indirect,h} = Y_h - Yd_h. \quad (16)$$

At this stage of model specification, imports and exports are taken as exogenous.

2.4. Investment-saving balance

Total household savings in the model are given by the aggregate difference between household disposable income and consumption expenditures:

$$S_h = \sum_h (Yd_h - C_h). \quad (17)$$

One complication is that some of the measured consumption expenditures are of the nature of investments, including pension premiums, pre-need plans, and stock investments. Thus, we introduce a balancing factor (ϕ) to account for any discrepancies between measured savings and investments.

Total government savings are the sum of the various revenue sources minus total government purchases of the outputs of the various sectors, total government transfers to households, and total net transfers of the government to the foreign sector:

$$S_G = \sum_i Tar_i + \sum_i T_{Indirect,i} + \sum_h T_{Direct,h} - \sum_i G_i - \sum_h Tr_{GOV,h} - Tr_{GOV,FOR}. \quad (18)$$

Total foreign savings, S_{FOR} , are given by the current account deficit minus net dividends to foreigners. Therefore, total savings are

$$S_{TOTAL} = S_h + S_{GOV} + S_{FOR}. \quad (19)$$

Conceptually, total savings should equal total investment. As noted previously, our framework allows for statistical discrepancy by introducing a factor ϕ , which transforms savings to investments. Investment distribution per sector is then modeled as constant proportion of total investment, with the distribution coefficients γ_i calibrated according to the sectoral distribution of investment in 1994:

$$I_i = \gamma_i \phi (S_{TOTAL}). \quad (20)$$

2.5. Demand

Total intermediate demand for commodities by the firm arises from its maximization of profits subject to the three-level production function. At the first level, the first-order condition for profit maximization entails equating the marginal product to the marginal cost of labor as in equation (13) above, where the marginal product of labor for each production sector is evaluated assuming that capital is immobile across sectors. For any given employment, equilibrium entails that the corresponding level of production equal the demand forthcoming at the employment level. Similar equations hold for the choice between output net of transport and the various transport inputs, at the third

level of the production function. This equilibrium condition together with (13) determines pva . We turn to this in greater detail in the section on prices.

At the second level, each production sector combines value added and every non-transport intermediate input according to a fixed proportions technology:

$$Mat_{i,j} = a_{ij} X_j^{NT} \quad (21)$$

where i runs through all the non-transport intermediate inputs and value added for each sector, j runs through all the production sectors in the economy, Mat_{ij} is the matrix of interindustry flows in the economy, a_{ij} represents the fixed coefficients technology, and, as before, X_j^{NT} is output net of transport for the j th sector.

Final demand in the economy originates from households (consumption demand), firms (investment demand), government spending, and the foreign sector (export demand). Consumption demand by households originates from the maximization of the utility function, as described previously in section 2.1. Although, for simplicity, firms' investment demands are not described explicitly in terms of optimization, the level of investment is determined by the transformation of savings into such, as described in section 2.4. Government and export expenditures are taken to be exogenously determined.

The domestic demand for commodity i consists of the total intermediate demand, plus the total final demands for consumption, investment, and government purchases, while the total composite demand, represented by Q_i , is the sum of the domestic demand and exports:

$$Q_i = \sum_j Mat_{i,j} + \sum_h C_{h,i} + I_i + G_i + Exports_i. \quad (22)$$

2.6. Prices and equilibrium

For any given employment level, equilibrium entails that the corresponding level of production should equal the demand forthcoming at the employment level. This requirement, together with the first-order conditions for profit maximization by the firms, determines the price levels in the economy, relative to the price of labor. The labor price is assumed to be the numeraire, and is thus taken to be fixed. Since capital is a fixed factor, we take returns to capital as a residual determined by the identity:

$$r_i = \frac{pva_i^* V_i - w_i^0 L_i}{k_i^0}. \quad (23)$$

The total product cost can then be built up from the components in a standard way. Thus, the average cost per unit is

$$AC_i = \frac{\sum_j pd_j Mat_{j,i} + pva_i V_i}{X_i} \quad (24)$$

where pd_i is the domestic (tax-inclusive) price of i . In equilibrium, the average cost equals the composite price pq_i of the commodity (the composite price is the peso price of both domestically produced and imported commodities).

The excess supply for each commodity is given by:

$$ES_i = X_i - Q_i \quad (25)$$

The model treats all the foregoing relationships as constraints in a nonlinear programming problem. Markets are assumed to operate so as to minimize the value of sum of squared excess supplies for all commodities, i.e., the objective of the programming problem is to minimize the quantity.

$$\Omega = \sum_i (pq_i^* ES_i^2) \quad (26)$$

In equilibrium, therefore, the unit cost is divisible into three parts: (1) $\sum_j pd_j q_{ji} / X_i$, where the j 's are the non-transport inputs that give the cost of non-transport intermediate inputs per unit of X ; (2) the same formula with the j 's taken to be the transport inputs yields the transport margin; and (3) $w_i L_i + r_i K_i / X_i$ is the cost of value added per unit of X .

3. Empirical results: regional impact of overseas workers' remittances

3.1. Five-region model

With overseas remittances accounting for a significant portion of foreign exchange inflows, the sensitivity of economic activity to any disruption in such flows becomes a relevant policy question, especially in the wake of the recent international financial crisis. Remittances from overseas workers are the most important component of transfers from abroad, and it is thus the latter variable that we subject to a shock, in the magnitude of 5 percent. We apply this evenly across household types. The incidence of the shock depends upon household dependence on foreign income. This absolute incidence is summarized in Figure 2 (in million Php, 1994 prices), and the relative incidence, in terms of the percentage fall in income, in Figure 3. In absolute terms, N. Luzon middle-

income households are the most vulnerable, although a greater concentration of the impact of reduced transfers falls on NCR households, particularly the high- and middle-income classes. N. Luzon households generally bear the highest percentage reductions in incomes. The results generally validate the characterization of N. Luzon households as being the most prone to migrate.

Lower income levels will induce reductions in consumption, and therefore on output, which then leads to second-round impacts on the foregoing variables in a multiplier process. The final impacts will depend on the initial incidence of the income reductions across the different household groups, the consumption patterns of such households, and the linkages between the different sectors of production (i.e., the transactions matrix, in an input-output analysis). Figures 4 and 5 show the final reductions in output, both in absolute and percentage terms. In peso terms, it can be seen that the impacts are largest for industry and services other than transport, for NCR and S. Luzon. Percentage-wise, however, agriculture and industry for S. Luzon take the greatest hit. Interestingly, there appears to be some relatively minor increase in output of other services for S. Luzon and N. Luzon; this may validate the observation that the services sector tends to serve as employer of last resort in case of slowdown in the economy.

**Figure 2. Reduction in transfers
(equivalent to 5% of total, in MP 1994 base)**




Figure 3. Reduction in transfers (equivalent to 5% of total) as percent of total household income




Figure 4. Reduction in output due to 5% reduction in transfers, in MP (1994 base)




Figure 5. Percent reduction in output due to 5% reduction in transfers




Figure 6. Household equivalent variation in absolute value (MP 1994 base) from a 5% fall in transfers, by region and income class





Figure 7. Percent reduction in utility from a 5 % fall in transfers, by region and income class



Although Figures 2 and 3 show the initial incidence of the fall in transfers, the final impact on utility can be quite different, and in general will be further influenced by the successive round effects on regional output, plus the successive impacts on incomes and consumption patterns. Figure 7 shows that the impact can be especially hard on low-income classes across regions, except for the NCR and Mindanao, where the impact is greatest on the middle-income class. The latter result agrees with the finding shown in Figure 3 that foreign transfers are a comparatively insignificant source of support for the poorest families in Mindanao. Alternatively, one can look at the absolute welfare reduction across household categories. One measure of this is equivalent variation, defined as the amount of money a household would have to be compensated for in order to bring it to the original level of utility before the shock being considered. Using this measure, results (Figure 6) indicate that the main costs of remittance declines are the middle-income classes across all regions. The second-best highest costs are the low-income households, again for all regions, with the notable exception of the NCR.

3.2. Two-region model

To further examine the robustness of the five-region model results, we specified a stripped-down two-region model. In the following model, the Philippines has been divided into the NCR, the center of economic and social activity, and the Rest-of-the-Philippines (ROP) region. This dichotomy takes off from the center-periphery theory of development. Since the data requirements for this model are less stringent, our validation enables us to work with a more detailed production sector breakdown, as shown in Table 2. Regional production activities are disaggregated into nine sectors, with a more detailed specification of industry (mining, manufacturing, electricity, gas and water, and construction) and the financial sector separated from other services sector. The aim is to enable us to examine the impact on the formal banking sector and on specific industries of a decline in OFW remittances, brought about, say, by a major external shock.

This two-region model utilizes a simple one-level Leontief production function at the regional level. On the household side, we specify regional consumption functions for four types of households (as enumerated in Table 2) based on utility functions of the Cobb-Douglas type. In a manner parallel to the simulation for the five-region model, the impact of a bigger decline in OFW remittances is estimated on critical regional macroeconomic variables such as output and welfare. The incidence on regional outputs of a 10 percent decline in remittances is shown in Figure 8 and Figure 9. The figures show that the biggest reductions in terms of total regional output are for the manufacturing sector in the ROP and the NCR, and the ROP agricultural sector, in descending order, owing to lower consumption demand for both finished goods and raw material goods due to lower income of households. In terms of percentage values, most of the relative output losses were experienced by NCR production sectors, namely, its small agricultural sector, manufacturing, mining, and the utilities sector (EGW). For the ROP, the slack in final demand for its agricultural sector is the most severe impact of the exogenous shock.

Our inclusion of utility functions into the model specification enables us to say something about the welfare effects of a shock in remittances. The biggest absolute decline in welfare is experienced by high-income households in the ROP region, followed by high-income households in the NCR (Figure 10). However, in terms of relative decline in welfare, NCR low-income households experience the biggest decline, followed by the high-income households in the ROP (Figure 11). This demonstrates the inequitable impact of lower OFW remittances brought about by the current global recession.

Table 2. Disaggregation of two-region model

| <i>Regions</i> | <i>Production sectors</i> | <i>Households</i> |
|--|--------------------------------|----------------------|
| National Capital Region (NCR) | Agriculture (Ag) | Low Income (Low Y) |
| Rest-of-the-Philippines (ROP) | Mining & Quarrying (Min) | High Income (High Y) |
| (includes Northern Luzon, Southern Luzon, Visayas & Mindanao) | Manufacturing (Mfg) | |
| | Electricity, Gas & Water (EGW) | |
| | Construction (Constn) | |
| | Transportation (Trnsp) | |
| | Trade (Trade) | |
| | Finance & Insurance (Fin) | |
| | Other Services (OthrSrv) | |

Figure 8. Absolute decline in output due to 10% reduction foreign transfers to HHs




Figure 9. Percent decline in output due to 10% reduction in foreign transfers to HHs




Figure 10. Percentage change in utility due to 10% decline in OFW remittances





Figure 11. Absolute change in utility due to 10% decline in OFW remittances



4. Conclusion

Assessing household vulnerability to shocks is an important aspect of policy design. An applied general equilibrium framework can be an important tool in quantifying the spatial dimension of such shocks. In view of the increasing importance of remittances as a source of foreign exchange, this work can be seen as a first attempt to fill a void in our knowledge of the impact of instability in such flows on the various sectors of the economy.

Figure 10. Percentage change in utility due to 10% decline in OFW remittances





Figure 11. Absolute change in utility due to 10% decline in OFW remittances



4. Conclusion

Assessing household vulnerability to shocks is an important aspect of policy design. An applied general equilibrium framework can be an important tool in quantifying the spatial dimension of such shocks. In view of the increasing importance of remittances as a source of foreign exchange, this work can be seen as a first attempt to fill a void in our knowledge of the impact of instability in such flows on the various sectors of the economy.

This paper presented the results of two models with different levels of sectoral and regional production and household disaggregation. Aside from this, different functional forms were used for each type of model. The five-region model utilized a three-level production function (Cobb-Douglas—Leontief—Cobb-Douglas), whereas the two-region model utilized a Leontief single-level production function. The comparative results showed that while the functional specification of the production function and the level of disaggregation of the regional production sector exert a significant influence on the empirical results, the simulated incidence of a decline in OFW remittances on delineated production sectors and household income groups across the Philippines are broadly consistent across the model specifications that were considered.

The quantitative results presented in this paper can be subject to further refinement. In this regard, timely and detailed information on resource flows in the economy are essential, especially an updated transactions matrix, survey of family income and expenditures, and flow of funds in the Philippines. On the other hand, this paper hopes to contribute to the as yet limited stock of empirical work on the spatial dimension of economic activity in the Philippines, which in this case is focused on the spatial impact of a decline in foreign transfers to Philippine households.

References

- Asian Development Bank [2004] *Enhancing the efficiency of overseas Filipino workers' remittances: final report*. Manila: ADB.
- Burgess, R. and V. Haksar [2005] "Migration and foreign remittances in the Philippines", IMF Working Paper 05/111.
- Chami, R., C. Fullenkamp, and S. Jahjah [2003] "Are immigrant remittance flows a source of capital for development?" IMF Working Paper No. WP/03/89.
- Chami, R., C. Fullenkamp, and S. Jahjah [2005] "Are immigrant remittance flows a source of capital for development?" *IMF Staff Papers* 52(1).
- Dakila, C. and F. Dakila Jr. [2004] "Construction of regional social accounting matrix: methodological concerns and special issues", Proceedings of the 9th National Convention on Statistics, National Statistics Coordination Board, October.
- Dakila, C. and S. Mizokami S. [2006] "Reconciling I-O data with O-D data for SCGE modeling in a developing country", *Infrastructure Planning Review* 23(3): 725-736.
- Dakila C. G. [2007] "Impact of transport infrastructure investment on interregional economic activity and regional welfare: a SAM-based general equilibrium approach", Dissertation submitted to Graduate School of Science & Technology, Kumamoto University, Japan, March.
- Ginsburgh, V. and M. Keyser [2002] *The structure of applied general equilibrium models*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Mizokami, S. and C. Dakila [2005] "An analysis of linkage between 2004 JICA-DOTC commodity-passenger flow survey and interregional flows in multi-region SAM in the Philippines", Proceedings of the 31st Conference of Japan Society of Civil Engineers, Hiroshima University, Japan, June 4-5.
- Round, J. [2003] "Constructing SAMs for development policy analysis: lessons learned and challenges ahead", *Economic Systems Research* 15(2).
- Secretario, F. [2002] "1994 Philippines interregional input-output table: 5 Region", Japan Society for the Promotion of Science-Manila Project.
- Shoven, J. and J. Whalley [1992] *Applying general equilibrium*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- World Bank [2006] *Global economic prospects 2006: economic implications of remittances and migration*. World Bank.