

Discussion Paper No. 8606 June 1986

TRENDS AND PATTERNS OF INTERNAL
MIGRATION IN THE PHILIPPINES:
1970 - 1980

by

Titus NGUIAGAIN
Department of Economics
Laval University
Quebec, Canada, G1K - 7P4.

NOTE: UPSE discussion papers are preliminary versions
circulated privately to elicit critical comment.
They are protected by the Copyright Law (PD No. 49)
and not for quotation or reprinting without prior
approval.

Bill '86
(Comm)

ABSTRACT

With respect to the growing awareness that migration affects national development, there is a need to keep researchers, planners and policy makers informed of current trends on internal migration. Only updated studies could provide valuable insights on demographic movements, and be helpful in framing policies to alter or regulate the population redistribution.

The purpose of this paper is precisely to determine the nature of more recent geographic patterns of internal migration in the Philippines, as documented by migration data from the two latest censuses (1975 and 1980), with emphasis on regional migration streams (volume and direction). The present study is a methodological extension of previous research, since migration data here are adjusted for information on "Not Stated". Its purpose is to update, verify or correct findings rather than repeat the earlier studies.

In the census tabulation, the term "Not Stated" was used to designate persons 5 years old and over who have not reported their province of residence at the time of previous censuses. The number of this class of enumerated persons was quite high. Therefore, absence of adjustment for "Not Reported" constitutes a serious drawback to analysis and could lead to a truncated view of migration trends and patterns.

The analysis below seeks to provide facts rather than explanations as to why these facts exist. This limitation is due to our exclusive utilization of demographic data, whereas a full understanding of migration motivation needs the consideration of social and economic data.

This research work has seven major findings. Two of these results are related to the intercensal migration status of the population, four are connected with the volume and direction of migration streams, while the last finding concerns the sex selectivity of migration.

TRENDS AND PATTERNS OF INTERNAL
MIGRATION IN THE PHILIPPINES
1970 - 1980

by

Titus NGUIAGAIN*

INTRODUCTION

In the "Third Population Inquiry Among Governments, Population Policies In The Contest Of Development, 1976", all governments of the ESCAP region¹ expressed some degree of dissatisfaction with the present level and geographical distribution of their respective population. However, the unevenness of the population size over areas of a given country is mainly explained by migration.

Actually, there are three interrelated processes of population change, namely: fertility, mortality, and migration. Therefore, in assessing population growth, the contribution of natural increase cannot be clearly separated from the contribution of migration. For instance, regional fertility differentials essentially reflect the age-sex selectivity of migration.

*The work leading to this partial report was undertaken when the author was Visiting Research Associate at the University of the Philippines School of Economics (UPSE, Diliman). I am grateful for valuable discussions, comments and encouragements on this research, received from faculty members of the UPSE. I wish to thank the National Census and Statistics Office (NCSO, Manila), in particular, Executive Director Marcelo M. ORENSE, who upon request was kind enough to furnish the special tabulations. Particular appreciation is due to Mr. Luisito YANGO and Mrs. Socorro D. ABEJO, NCSO-Statisticians, for their patient and careful sorting of the data and preparing the requested migration tabulations, which adjust census data for "Not Stated". Finally, I gratefully acknowledge the financial support of the World Bank, Washington D. C.

Many reasons explain current concern with migration, among them are the relationships between migration and urbanization (i.e. population density) and between the former and the development process. In fact, internal migration and rapid urbanization are the important components of recent demographic trends. Furthermore, disparity of opportunities provides the main motive force behind internal migration, and particularly its rural-urban form. In addition, realignment in the streams of migration are sensitive indicators of demographic and socio-economic changes in the structure of the national economy.

In regard to this growing awareness that migration affects national development, there is a need to keep researchers, planners and policy makers informed of current trends on internal migration. Only updated studies could provide to users valuable insights on demographic movements, and be helpful in framing policies to alter or regulate the population redistribution.

The purpose of this paper is precisely to determine the nature of more recent patterns of internal migration in the Philippines, within a broader perspective, as documented by migration data from the two latest censuses (1975 and 1980). There are very few researchers who explored current trends of internal migration, even though the early studies are confined with regional movements; namely, Aurora E. PEREZ (1985 a), the University of the Philippines Population Institute (UPPI, 1985) and the National Census and Statistics

Office (NCSO, 1981).

All these previous studies instead of analysing the basic information of original census tapes, utilized only published census data of NCSO and the National Economic and Development Authority (NEDA). Unfortunately, these data sources are somewhat unreliable since their tabulations fail to include "Not Stated", and therefore obviously underestimate the volume of internal migration. The official inter-regional migration tabulations by sex, for intercensal period 1970-1975, were published in the "Philippine Statistical Yearbook", (1985). Those for the latest census (1975-1980) are contained in the "Philippine Yearbook" (1985).

✓The present study is a methodological extension of previous research, since migration data here are adjusted for information on "Not Stated". ✓Its purpose is to update, verify or correct findings rather than repeat the early studies. The paper describes the geographic patterns of internal migration with emphasis on regional migration streams (volume and direction). Although the 1975 and 1980 provincial migration tabulations are already available to us, we do not deal here with provincial migration streams, because of lack of space.

Presented in four parts, the paper starts with the definition of some migration-related terms. The second section discusses data and methodology. The third portion of the ensuing study deals with the trends and patterns of internal migration, while the last part is devoted to some considerations about population policies.

DEFINITION OF SOME MIGRATION-RELATED TERMS

Residence

The residence is defined as "usual place of residence" (de jure definition), i.e. the place where the enumerated person "eats and sleeps most of the time"; hence, it may be the same as or different from his actual place of residence at the time of enumeration (de facto definition). Census enumeration was on a de jure basis in the Philippines.

Published statistics on place of residence at the specific dates are confined to persons in the same municipality, other municipality but same province, other province and foreign country. In the Philippines, enumerators were instructed to code the municipality if in the same province as the current residence, otherwise to code the province only.

However, only the cross-tabulating of usual with actual place of residence, which has been ignored in most censuses around the world, could help in tapping non-permanent relocations and identify patterns of circular mobility (see Robin J. PRYOR, P. 12 in PRYOR Eds. 1979).

Migrant

A migrant is defined as a person 5 years old and over, who has moved his residence between the previous and current census dates, across municipal boundaries. Persons who change their residences within one and the same municipality and who could be labeled "local movers" are not counted as migrant. The number of migrants during any particular period of time is obviously a function of the definition of migrant.

Furthermore, in line with the area units of analysis and on the basis of the data at hand, there are three kinds of migrants:

1. Intra-provincial migrants: persons who changed their municipalities of residence within the same provinces;
2. Intra-regional migrants: persons who changed residences across provincial boundaries but stayed within the same region;
3. Inter-regional migrants: persons who changed residences across regional boundaries.

Intra- and inter-regional migrants can be collapsed into so-called inter-provincial migrants.

Although the distinction between short- and long-distance migration actually depends on the size of a province and its location relative to the boundary of the region of which it is a part, roughly, intra-provincial migrants can be equated with short-distance movers, and inter-provincial migrants with long-distance ones.

Regional Delineations

Administratively, as of 1985, the Philippines was subdivided into 13 regions (including National Capital Region, NCR), 74 provinces (including Metro-Manila), 60 chartered cities (including cities in NCR), 1848 municipalities, 21 municipal districts, and 41,114 barangays. The barangay (village) is the smallest unit of government in the country.

The regional delineations have undergone frequent changes in recent years. Since 1970, the number of provinces

has increased to 74. This study adopts the 1980 NCSO thirteen-regions system:

NCR: National Capital Region

Region I. Ilocos	Region VII. Central Visayas
Region II. Cagayan Valley	Region VIII. Eastern Visayas
Region III. Central Luzon	Region IX. Western Mindanao
Region IV. Southern Tagalog	Region X. Northern Mindanao
Region V. Bicol	Region XI. Southern Mindanao
Region VI. Western Visayas	Region XII. Central Mindanao

For a long time, between and even within government agencies (NEDA, NCSO and old BCS), no consensus existed as to what municipalities the Metropolitan Manila Region should encompass (see FLIEGER and al. page 8). However, on 7 November 1975, Presidential Decree No. 824 established a new public corporation, National Capital Region (so-called Metropolitan-Manila), taken from Manila, Rizal and Bulacan. This entity consist of 4 cities and 13 municipalities, namely:

Cities:

- | | |
|------------------|----------------|
| 1. Caloocan city | 3. Pasay city |
| 2. Manila | 4. Quezon City |

Municipalities:

- | | |
|----------------|------------------------|
| 1. Las Piñas | 8. Parañaque |
| 2. Makati | 9. Pasig |
| 3. Malabon | 10. Pateros |
| 4. Mandaluyong | 11. San Juan del Monte |
| 5. Marikina | 12. Tagig |
| 6. Muntinlupa | 13. Valenzuela |

Furthermore, for research purposes, it is worth noting that a close look at published migration information by NCSO, as recorded in Tables 16 of the 1975 Census Provincial Reports for Rizal, Bulacan and NCR, reveals some inconsistencies. It seemed that the NCSO had forgotten that NCR had become a new province. Therefore, tabulations for Rizal and Bulacan must be adjusted for "Another Province".

DATA AND METHODOLOGY

Nature and Limitations of Census Data

Nature of Census Data

The main data sources for this report are the 1975 and 1980 Censuses of Population and Housing². These censuses contain information on age, sex and place of residence for all enumerated persons. The latter information is classified in rather broad categories: same municipality, other municipality but same province, other province, and foreign country.

In addition, published information on previous residence is available only in terms of province of residence. Therefore, available census tabulations do not permit the outlining of intra-provincial migration streams. Only inter-regional and inter-provincial migration streams can be delineated, on the basis of the data at hand.

Limitation of Census Data

By their nature, the censuses underestimate the number of migrants. Census data ignore circular and intervening moves. Only one migration is counted for an individual irrespective of the number of moves actually made during the

intercensal period. In substance, census data fail to include those persons who:

a. had changed their residences more than once during the intercensal period;

b. migrated after previous census date but died before current census day;

c. both left from and returned to their previous census residence before current census date, after living elsewhere for a while.

This means obviously that published information provides lower estimate of the number of intercensal migrants. To obtain accurate estimate of actual migrants, more detailed census questions and mortality information about migrants would be needed. However, the missing data, if available, would not result in major changes concerning the volume and the direction of main migration streams.

Moreover, boundary changes among administrative divisions create a further problem for accurate comparisons of origins and destinations. In addition, census data provide only age-sex attributes of migrants. However, the National Demographic Surveys (1973 and 1983 NDS) contain a full description of other migrants's characteristics (see PERNIA, 1975 b and PEREZ, 1985 b). Furthermore, Censuses have generally ignored the motivation of migration and assume that only surveys can investigate this aspect.

Census tabulations contain an urban-rural break-down only as to residence of migrant at current census date. They give no such information for place of origin of migrant (i.e.

previous census residence). Consequently, it is not possible to analyse migration between urban and rural areas. Fortunately, such study can be undertaken using the 1973 and 1983 NDS data. For instance, Ernesto M. PERNIA (1975 a) exploring the 1973 NDS data, showed rural-urban migration has figured prominently once again in recent years; about 41 per cent on average, with the remainder split between the others broad migration streams: rural-rural, urban-urban and urban-rural.

However, utilising the 1983 NDS data, PEREZ (1985 b) made evident that in the future, the most likely pattern of internal migration would be intra-urban. Among her other findings, future migration will continue to be dominated by single females, the better-educated and the younger segment of the population. But, unlike previous rounds, the 1983 NDS instead of analyzing the actual behavior of individuals, dealt with "migration intent" as an indicator. Nevertheless, the weakness of this indicator is reduced by the incorporation of time and space dimensions of the intent.

Methodology

Estimating Internal Migration

In practice, there are four methods³ for estimating internal migration:

- a. the vital statistics method;
- b. the census survival ratio method;
- c. the place of birth census survival ratio method; and
- d. the present residence cross-classified with residence at a fixed date.

This study utilizes the last method which will be discussed below.

Place of residence statistics for a fixed date reveal whether a census respondent was living in the same or another locality at a certain time, for example five or ten years earlier, or at the time of the previous census. Children born and persons dying in the intervening period are not accounted for, and multiple moves are ignored. Moreover, if the fixed date does not correspond with an earlier census, accurate estimates of the migration component of the intercensal population growth cannot be made. Likewise, longer time periods increase errors due to faulty recall. Statements concerning earlier residence are likely to be misstated with longer time interval or with several moves made during the intercensal period.

When information is available on the place of residence at a specified time in the past, like 5 years before a census date, then in-and out-migration may be taken directly from the census tabulation by place of present residence. Given an area, in-migration is taken as the sum of the present residents who were previous residents of other areas like 5 years ago. Hence, net migration is obtained by taking the difference of in-and out-migration.

"Not Stated": Nature, Volume and Treatment

In the census tabulation, the term "Not Stated" was used to designate persons 5 years old and over who have not reported their province of residence at the time of previous censuses (in 1970 or 1975). For intercensal period 1970-75

the number of this class of enumerated persons was quite high, about 274,697 i.e. 10.7 per cent of all the country's migrants. During the latest census (1980) there were only 57,933 "Not Stated", that means 2 per cent of the total migrants. However, in terms of percentage of all persons 5 years old and over who did not report their previous residence, the share of the National Capital Region increased from 18 percent in 1975 to 25.6 per cent in 1980.

Furthermore, it is worth noting that the greater part of "Not Stated" was found in NCR during 1975 census (49,834), as well as during the 1980 one (14,844). This fact may be attributed to both heavy intra - Luzon migration and multiple moves made during the intercensal period, which led to faulty, or even worse, to lack of recall of the earlier residence.

Therefore, to obtain accurate estimate of the volume of internal migration, census data must be adjusted for "Not Stated", since the number of the latter is quite substantial. Absence of adjustment for "not reported" constitutes a serious drawback to analysis and could lead to a truncated view of migration trends and patterns. Strangely, there has been a neglect of "Not Stated" even in migration studies made by NCSO and NEDA. Although for intercensal period 1960-1970, the only author who adjusted the census data for this category of respondents, is Oscar F. PLAMERAS (1977).

In this study, in order to adjust the data, persons 5 years old and over who have not reported their province of residence (in 1970 or in 1975) so that they were classified

under "Not Stated" in census tabulation, were distributed proportionately over the 74 provinces of the Philippines and Foreign Country. The formula for distributing the population not reporting their previous province of residence is as follows:

$$P_{ij}(\text{adj.}) = P_{ij}(\text{n.adj.}) + P_i(\text{n.s.}) \times \frac{P_{ij}(\text{n.adj.})}{P_i - P_i(\text{n.s.})}$$

$i = 1 \text{ to } 74$; $j = 1 \text{ to } 75$ (including Foreign Country)

Where:

i = province of destination (i.e. residence during current census year; in 1975 or in 1980).

j = province of origin (i.e. residence at previous census date; 1970 or 1980).

$P_{ij}(\text{adj.})$ = adjusted 1975 (or 1980) population of province i who resided in province j in 1970 (or 1975), after the distribution of category "Not Stated".

$P_{ij}(\text{n.adj.})$ = enumerated 1975 (or 1980) population of province i who resided in province j in 1970 (or 1975).

$P_i(\text{n.s.})$ = enumerated 1975 (or 1980) population of province i who did not report their province of residence in 1970 (or 1980).

P_i = total enumerated 1975 (or 1980) population (5 years old and over) of province i .

For regional tabulation the adjusted data on province of residence in 1975 (or 1980) cross-classified by province of residence in 1970 (or 1975) are collapsed by region of residence in 1975 (or 1980) cross-classified by region of residence in 1970 (or 1980).

MIGRATION STREAMS: TRENDS AND PATTERNS

Migration Status of the Population

Population Trends

The Philippines total population was about 42 and 48 million in 1975 and 1980, respectively. The recent official estimate of the population is 53.4 million as of mid-1984. The present rate of natural increase (births minus deaths) is about 2.4 percent a year. The average annual rate of population growth had declined slightly from 3.01 percent during 1960-70 to 2.75 percent in the following decade. This population high rate of increase magnifies problems of unemployment, social welfare and poverty. It may be in recognition of this fact that the government has in recent years given increasing emphasis to family planning programme.

In 1980, males constituted more than half (50.2 percent) of the total population. In fact, the slight edge of males over females in the Philippines was manifested in all previous censuses except for 1970 when the masculinity ratio dropped to 49.8 percent; probably because some irregularities occurred in the age-sex data contained in the 1970 census enumeration (see NCSO 1974).

Furthermore, the Philippines remains a predominantly rural country. The urban share of the population advanced gradually from about 31.8 percent in 1970, to 33.4 in 1975 and to 37.3 per cent in 1980. Nearly half of the urban population growth is due to rural-urban migration, which is persisting in spite of high rates of urban unemployment and underemployment.

Migration Status

The internal migration defines movement of persons in space within a country involving change of residence. Data in Table 1 reveal that, on the national level, 7.2 percent of all persons aged 5 years and over reported having changed residence between 1970 and 1975. In reality, the number of migrants during 1970-1975 was even larger than the computed figure of 2,560,032 migrants, since we have already showed that census data, by nature, underestimate the volume of migration. In quinquennia 1975-1980 the mobility of the population decreased slightly by 0.2 percent. This finding contrasts strongly with PEREZ's conclusion that the mobility rate during the latter period gained an increment of 0.6 percent (see Aurora E. PEREZ, 1985 a). These recent patterns may be related to martial law which was declared in the Philippines in September 1972 and lifted in January 1981. Actually, according to Mercedes B. CONCEPCION (1985), the rate of migration was projected by planners to decline very gradually to zero by 2080.

From Table 1 it can be stated that in both periods (1970-1980), inter-provincial migration was slightly larger than intra-provincial one; while inter-regional migration was substantially higher than the volume of intra-regional streams. This is especially true for the latter period when the volume of inter-regional migrants was a little over 4 times larger than that of intra-regional migrants. This finding is further supported by the -0.2 percent change in the intra-regional migration, from the earlier to the latter

Table 1. Intercensal Migration Status of the Population of the Philippines, by Type of Migration: intercensal years 1960-70, 1970-75 and 1975-80.

Migration Status	1960-70 ^a		1970-75 ^a		1975-80 ^b	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total Population ^c	36,642,666	100.0	35,556,007	100.0	40,285,589	100.0
Non-Migrants	31,597,216	86.2	32,995,975	92.8	37,450,648	93.0
Migrants: ^d	5,045,450	13.8	2,560,032	7.2	2,834,941	7.0
Intra-provincial	1,736,293	4.8	1,189,121	3.3	1,359,029	3.3
Inter-provincial:	3,309,157	9.0	1,370,911	3.9	1,475,912	3.7
Intra-regional	727,395	2.0	320,015	0.9	281,882	0.7
Inter-Regional	2,581,762	7.0	1,050,896	3.0	1,194,030	3.0

^aBased on 5 percent sample of population 5 years old and over (10 years old and over for 1970 census date)

^bBased on a 20 percent sample of population 5 years old and over.

^cPopulation 5 years old and over (10 years old and over for 1970 census)

^dThe figures for migrants (1975 and 1980 censuses) were adjusted for "Not Stated". Furthermore these figures exclude migrants from Foreign Countries and "local movers", i. e. persons who changed residence within the same municipality or barangay.

SOURCE: For 1960-1970, see FLIEBER et al., p. 10, Table 2. For intercensal years 1970-75 and 1975-80, see 1975 and 1980 National Summary of Population and Housing Census. The 1975 and 1980 Census Data were adjusted for "Not Stated"

intercensal period.

However, a glance at Table 2 will reveal that during the two decades (1960-1980), the share of inter-provincial migration dropped steadily over time, in favor of a progressive increment in the share of intra-provincial migration. Meanwhile from 1960 to 1980, the share of intra-regional migration decreased gradually.

Broadly, during the decade 1970-1980, the pattern of internal migration was basically one of long-distance movements favored over short-distance movements, although this preference was less pronounced than during 1960-1970. On the provincial level, for instance, movements between provinces exceeded those occurring within provinces by 0.6 percent between 1970 and 1975. And for those who crossed provincial boundaries, nearly thrice the proportion crossed regional boundaries as well. The picture barely changed during the last census interval.

Broader Migration Streams

Broad Areas Delineations

The Philippines is an insular country with two larger islands, Luzon in the North and Mindanao in the South; linked together by a host of smaller islands, the Visayas. Actually, the Philippines is an archipelago of some 7,107 islands with a total land area of 300,000 square kilometers. Luzon, Visayas and Mindanao constitute the three supra-regional units of the country.

Over time, there was a very uneven distribution of population within the Philippines. However, this unevenness of

Table 2. Proportion of Philippine Migrants by Type of Migration:
intercensal periods 1960-70, 1970-75 and 1975-80.

Type of Migration	1960-70	1970-75	1975-80
Total Migrants:	5,045,450 (100.0)	2,560,032 (100.0)	2,834,941 (100.0)
Intra-provincial:	1,736,293 (34.4)	1,189,121 (46.4)	1,359,029 (47.9)
Inter-provincial:	3,309,157 (65.6)	1,370,911 (53.6)	1,475,912 (52.1)
Intra-regional	727,395 (14.4)	320,015 (12.5)	281,882 (10.0)
Inter-regional	2,581,762 (51.2)	1,050,896 (41.0)	1,194,030 (42.1)

SOURCE: Computed from Table 1.

the population size over regions may be attributed mainly to internal migration.

It appears from Table 3 that in 1980 the biggest increase in population was experienced by Mindanao, 36.9 per cent gain over the 1970 figure. Following almost closely, Luzon had a rate of increase of 32.5 per cent. These regional population growth differentials are mainly explained by internal migration, since immigration remains insignificant relative to total population size⁴.

In 1980, Luzon accounted for more than half of the country's population (54.2 percent), with the remainder almost evenly divided between the Visayas (23.1 percent) and Mindanao (22.7 percent). This finding is consistent with previous patterns. In terms of total land area, Luzon possesses the largest share (47 percent); the Visayas claim less than a fifth (19 percent) while Mindanao holds over a third (35 percent). The Mindanao area, which has the lowest population density during the last two decades, steadily under the national average, turned out to be the most demographically disadvantaged of the three island groups.

Supra-regional Migration Streams

As in the past, the major north and south movements, from the Visayas (always with the highest population density) to Luzon and Mindanao respectively, has once persisted during 1970-1980.

It can be gleaned from the data of Tables 4 and 5 that the majority of the inter-regional migrants from Luzon and Mindanao moved also within these island groups. For instance,

Table 3. Land Area, Population Volume, Percentage, Rate of Increase and Density by Broad Area of the Philippines: 1970-1980.

Broad Area*	Land Area (Sq. Km.)	Population: Volume & Percentage			Population Rate of Increase	Population Density		
		1980	1975	1970		1980	1975	1970
Philippines	300,000.0 100.0%	48,098,460 100.0%	42,070,660 100.0%	36,684,486 100.0%	31.1%	160.3	140.2	122.3
Luzon	141,394.9 (47.1)	26,080,694 (54.2)	22,790,274 (54.2)	19,688,100 (53.7)	32.5%	184.4	161.2	139.2
Visayas	56,606.2 (18.9)	11,112,523 (23.1)	10,133,392 (24.1)	9,032,454 (24.6)	23.0%	196.3	179.0	159.6
Mindanao	101,998.8 (34.0)	10,905,243 (22.7)	9,146,994 (21.7)	7,963,932 (21.7)	36.9%	106.9	89.7	73.1

*Luzon area includes National Capital Region (NCR) and Regions I to V; the Visayas include Regions VI to VIII, and Mindanao Regions IX to XII.

SOURCE: National Census and Statistics Office (NCSD), Bureau of Census and Statistics (BCS).
After 1970 the old BCS became NCSD.

Table 4. Number and Percent of Inter-Regional Migrants by Broad Area of Origin and Broad Area of Destination: 1970-1975

Broad Area of Destination	Broad Area of Origin			
	Total (in-migrants)	Luzon	Visayas	Mindanao
Total	1,050,896	573,546	246,250	231,100
(out-migrants)	(100.0)	(54.6)	(23.4)	(21.9)
Luzon	626,596	460,472	124,712	41,412
	(59.6)	(43.8)	(11.9)	(3.9)
Visayas	176,470	82,992	32,311	61,167
	(16.8)	(7.9)	(3.1)	(5.8)
Mindanao	247,830	30,082	89,227	128,521
	(23.6)	(2.9)	(8.5)	(12.2)

SOURCE: Computed from Table 7.

Table 5. Number and Percent of Inter-regional Migrants by Broad Area of Origin and Broad Area of Destination: 1975-1980

Broad Area of Destination	Broad Area of Origin			
	Total (in-migrants)	Luzon	Visayas	Mindanao
Total	1,194,030	662,197	330,603	201,230
(out-migrants)	(100.0)	(55.4)	(27.7)	(16.9)
Luzon	802,164	580,800	176,348	45,016
	(67.2)	(48.6)	(14.8)	(3.8)
Visayas	118,962	48,227	31,564	39,171
	(9.9)	(4.0)	(2.6)	(3.3)
Mindanao	272,904	33,170	122,691	117,043
	(22.9)	(2.8)	(10.3)	(9.8)

SOURCE: Computed from Table 8.

the data suggest that 43.8% and 48.6% of interregional migrants were concentrated in Luzon in 1975 and 1980 respectively.

In 1980, some 67.2 percent of all inter-regional migrants had settled in Luzon, 22.9 percent in Mindanao and almost 10 percent in the Visayas. This fact is not surprising since Luzon accounted for, during the entire twentieth century, more than one half of the total Philippine population. These findings are similar to the patterns previously observed by FLIEGER et. al. (1976) and by NCSO (1981).

Table 6 discloses that during the last decade (1970-1980), the majority (more than one half) of the Visayan migrants moved northward to Luzon, a marked departure from the southward direction observed before 1970.

Table 6 also highlighted the fact that most inter-regional migrants in Luzon (up to 87.7 per cent), as well as Mindanao (up to 58.2 per cent), were migrants within their broader area. In 1975, as before 1970, Mindanao out-migrants preferred Visayas to Luzon. However, in 1980, Mindanao out-migrants had settled more often in Luzon than in the Visayas. In addition, during 1970-1980, Luzon out-migrants preferred Visayas to Mindanao, in contrast with the trend in previous years.

Broadly, since 1970 there are two major changes in trends: first, the new northward movements of the Visayan outmigrants; and second, the recent Luzon outmigrants' preference for Visayas to Mindanao. Officials believe that these new trends may be related to the "unstable peace and order

Table 6. Percent of Inter-Regional Out-migrants From Broad Area of Origin to Broad Area of Destination: intercensal years 1960-70, 1970-75 and 1975-80.

Broad Area of Destination	Broad Area of Origin								
	Luzon			Visayas			Mindanao		
	1960-70	1970-75	1975-80	1960-70	1970-75	1975-80	1960-70	1970-75	1975-80
Luzon	85.7	80.3	87.7	37.2	50.7	53.3	18.0	17.9	22.1
Visayas	6.9	14.5	7.3	8.9	13.1	9.6	22.4	26.5	19.1
Mindanao	7.4	5.2	5.0	53.9	36.2	37.1	59.6	55.6	58.8

SOURCE: For 1960-70, see FLIEGER et al., p. 39, Table 19. For 1970-80, data from 1975 and 1980 Census were adjusted for "Not Stated".

situation" in Mindanao (see NCSO, 1981).

Regional Migration Streams and Direction

Volume and Direction of Migration Streams

Theoretically, 156 (i.e. 12 x 13 regions) separate migration streams and counter-streams between the thirteen regions of the country can be distinguished. The number of intercensal migrants involved in each of these streams is indicated in Tables 7 and 8. It appears from these tables that the volume of interregional migration was 1,050,896 and 1,194,030 migrants in the 1975 and 1980 census, respectively. Obviously, because of the adjustment for "Not Stated", these figures are higher than those published by the NCSO and NEDA.

Regionwise, the data suggest that the National Capital Region (NCR) is the main sending area as well as the biggest receiving region. In 1975, NCR sent 14.8 per cent of all out-migrants and received 29.6 percent of all in-migrants. In 1980, these figures increased slightly to 17.9 and 33 percent, respectively. Many in-migrants of NCR come from Luzon and Visayas. However, NCR movers settle mainly in Luzon (particularly in Regions IV and III) and in Visayas (mostly in Western and Eastern Visayas).

If we look closely at the data, it can be stated that many migrants of Luzon and Mindanao moved within their respective regions. In contrast, probably because the Visayas are sandwiched in between Luzon and Mindanao, Visayan migrants tend to cross the boundaries to migrate either northward or southward, particularly to NCR and Southern Tagalog if it is in Luzon, or Northern and Southern Mindanao if it is

Table 7. Inter-Regional Migration in the Philippines: 1970-1975

Region of Destination	Region of Origin													
	Total (in-migrants)	NCR	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X	XI	XII
Total (out-migrants)	1,050,896	155,737	92,867	35,985	81,044	125,795	82,118	70,026	110,581	65,643	50,821	53,447	63,965	62,867
NCR	310,824	0	49,511	19,352	32,778	47,253	44,958	32,519	26,230	33,717	5,794	4,935	5,799	7,978
Region I	35,655	11,509	0	5,822	5,660	6,529	968	289	1,316	583	454	1,109	670	746
Region II	29,868	3,331	12,755	0	7,520	3,509	696	176	794	192	51	490	133	221
Region III	82,287	24,836	12,807	3,583	0	21,032	5,290	2,936	3,883	3,869	536	1,851	1,223	441
Region IV	127,449	53,514	6,588	1,673	25,123	0	20,110	6,444	3,345	3,644	2,905	1,871	1,385	847
Region V	40,513	10,739	1,525	746	2,754	18,001	0	1,319	2,291	1,165	89	971	485	428
Region VI	62,386	17,280	1,283	514	1,954	9,571	2,115	0	9,704	652	5,238	2,457	8,569	3,049
Region VII	60,913	6,811	1,707	1,005	696	4,366	1,778	7,026	0	5,801	8,405	9,107	9,546	4,565
Region VIII	53,171	18,231	1,195	494	2,397	8,174	3,421	707	8,421	0	1,279	3,446	4,786	620
Region IX	22,564	895	351	125	254	767	121	2,112	5,401	1,182	0	5,128	1,860	4,366
Region X	94,294	3,369	1,753	1,325	464	2,739	1,222	4,095	23,009	7,773	15,049	0	17,995	15,501
Region XI	94,416	4,103	2,547	586	1,148	3,260	1,207	7,448	21,895	6,441	6,452	15,326	0	24,003
Region XII	36,356	1,119	845	760	296	594	232	4,955	4,292	624	4,569	6,756	11,514	0

NOTE: Total excludes migrants from Foreign Countries.

SOURCE: NSO, Population Studies Division; 1975 Census Data adjusted for "Not Stated".

Table 3. Inter-Regional Migration in the Philippines: 1975-1980

Region of Destination	Region of Origin												
	Total (in-migrants)	NCR	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X	XI
Total	1,194,030	213,403	91,530	37,988	96,342	119,800	103,134	109,232	119,181	102,190	38,462	58,865	64,114
(out-migrants)													
NCR	393,722	0	44,354	16,629	53,254	78,340	53,594	45,888	23,891	50,919	5,126	7,216	8,949
Region I	38,703	13,614	0	7,005	7,373	3,931	1,258	944	953	1,011	588	635	624
Region II	35,526	5,251	13,863	0	6,976	2,231	1,408	888	586	718	337	519	515
Region III	106,997	44,345	13,741	4,274	0	14,308	9,125	4,710	3,676	8,510	857	1,522	1,252
Region IV	187,684	92,877	9,638	3,700	16,439	0	28,579	11,678	5,873	11,052	1,965	2,189	2,472
Region V	39,532	17,091	1,286	602	3,486	10,229	0	1,098	1,962	1,989	354	519	646
Region VI	35,405	11,701	823	491	1,515	3,308	1,630	0	7,868	906	1,038	1,421	3,112
Region VII	54,243	6,479	1,204	1,130	755	1,850	2,368	8,112	0	7,553	4,347	9,054	9,140
Region VIII	29,314	10,274	318	270	904	1,659	1,532	831	5,294	0	595	2,604	3,119
Region IX	29,650	1,280	624	763	529	467	330	3,307	9,419	915	0	7,008	2,395
Region X	94,304	4,675	1,361	1,072	948	1,196	1,672	8,668	25,510	8,616	11,272	0	18,522
Region XI	91,278	4,515	2,049	1,329	1,077	1,514	1,147	12,469	24,409	8,811	5,850	15,603	0
Region XII	57,673	1,903	2,248	724	1,088	768	491	10,636	8,739	1,192	6,133	10,585	13,167

NOTE: Total excludes migrants from Foreign Countries.

SOURCE: NSO, Population Studies Division; 1980 Census Data adjusted for "Not Stated"

in Mindanao.

A few migrants from Mindanao crossed the boundaries to settle in NCR or Region IV if it is in Luzon, or in the Visayas, mainly in Central Visayas (Region VII). Meanwhile, the few Luzon migrants who moved to Visayas and Mindanao settled particularly in Western and Eastern Visayas if it is in the Visayas, or in the northern and the southern parts if it is in the Mindanao .

Migration within Luzon was dominated by 7 streams: outmigration from Ilocos, Central Luzon (Region III) and Region IV (Southern Tagalog) to NCR; from Bicol (Region V) to NCR and Region IV; and counter-migration from NCR to Region III and IV. Likewise, within the visayas, the important migration streams were those from Western and Eastern Visayas to Central Visayas, and counter-streams from Region VII to Region VI and VIII. Furthermore, within Mindanao, migration was dominated by 6 streams and counter-streams: streams from Western (Region IX) and Southern Mindanao (Region XI) to Northern Mindanao (Region X); streams from Central Mindanao (Region XII) to Region X and XI; and then counter-streams from Region X to Region XI, and finally from Region XI to Region XII.

Broadly, high in-migration areas lie either in the NCR or in the frontier agricultural and land settlement regions of the country; while out-migration areas are either relatively accessible to metropolitan region, or are more isolated lagging regions with high population pressure on limited resources, particularly the Visayas, whcih always have the

largest population density and even over the national level.

The heavy immigration to NCR (and other big cities) is the root-cause of such urban phenomena as the outgrowth of slums and squatters, the tremendous pressures for housing and employment, the breakdown of urban services (health, education), congestion and traffic, and other related urban problems. However, in-migration has precipitated the development and utilization of rich and fertile, but previously unsettled and uncultivated lands, in Mindanao, Cagayan Valley and some parts of Southern Tagalog. Meanwhile, outmigration areas experienced loss of manpower, particularly the younger and more educated members of their population.

Net Regional Migrants

First and foremost, it is important to note (from Tables 9 and 10) that in 1975, only 5 regions gained population through migration and 3 of these are neighboring regions in Luzon; namely, NCR, Central Luzon and Southern Tagalog, and the other two are in Mindanao, i.e. Northern and Southern Mindanao.

In 1980, the net migration patterns are broadly similar to those of 1975. The most important change was manifested by Central Mindanao which shifted from a sending area in 1975 to a receiving one in 1980, due to its emerging attraction for migrants.

It is also worth noting that Mindanao regions attract migrants with a minimum displacement of their population, i.e. the ratio of immigrants to outmigrants is quite high in these regions. This fact is probably due to the very low

Table 9. Inter-Regional Migration Volumes: Philippines, 1970-75 and 1975-80

REGION	Intercensal Period					
	1970-75*			1975-80*		
	In-Migrants	Out-Migrants	Net-Migrants	In-Migrants	Out-Migrants	Net-Migrants
National Capital Region	310,824	155,737	155,087	393,722	213,403	180,319
I. Ilocos	35,655	92,867	-57,212	38,703	91,530	-52,827
II. Cagayan Valley	29,868	35,985	-6,117	35,526	37,988	-2,462
III. Central Luzon	82,287	81,044	1,243	106,997	96,342	10,655
IV. Southern Tagalog	127,449	125,795	1,654	167,684	119,800	67,884
V. Bicol	40,513	82,118	-41,605	39,532	103,134	-63,602
VI. Western Visayas	62,386	70,026	-7,640	35,405	109,232	-73,827
VII. Central Visayas	60,913	110,581	-49,668	54,243	119,181	-64,938
VIII. Eastern Visayas	53,171	65,643	-12,472	29,314	102,190	-72,876
IX. Western Mindanao	22,564	50,821	-28,257	29,650	38,462	-8,812
X. Northern Mindanao	94,294	53,447	40,847	94,304	58,866	35,438
XI. Southern Mindanao	94,416	63,965	30,451	91,278	64,114	27,164
XII. Central Mindanao	36,556	62,867	-26,311	57,673	39,787	17,886

*Based on a 5 per cent sample of population 5 years and over in 1975.

*Based on a 20 per cent sample of population 5 years old and over in 1980.

SOURCE: NCSO, 1975 and 1980 Census Data adjusted for "Not Stated".

Table 10. Inter-Regional Migration Rates (per 1,000 population): Philippines, 1970-75 and 1975-80.

REGION	Census Dates					
	1970-75 ^a			1975-80 ^b		
	In-Migration Rate	Out-Migration Rate	Net-Migration Rate	In-Migration Rate	Out-Migration Rate	Net-Migration Rate
National Capital Region	69.56	34.85	34.71	72.27	39.17	33.10
I. Ilocos	11.39	29.67	-18.28	11.37	26.88	-15.51
II. Cagayan Valley	16.48	19.85	-3.37	17.13	18.31	-1.18
III. Central Luzon	21.03	20.71	0.32	23.74	21.38	2.36
IV. Southern Tagalog	26.36	26.02	0.34	33.12	21.14	11.98
V. Bicol	13.15	26.66	-13.51	11.85	30.92	-19.07
VI. Western Visayas	18.07	18.04	-1.97	8.17	25.19	-17.02
VII. Central Visayas	18.98	34.45	-15.47	15.12	33.22	-18.10
VIII. Eastern Visayas	21.35	26.36	-5.01	10.86	37.85	-26.99
IX. Western Mindanao	11.52	25.95	-14.43	12.96	16.81	-3.85
X. Northern Mindanao	44.20	25.05	19.15	37.18	23.21	13.97
XI. Southern Mindanao	38.42	26.03	12.39	30.12	21.15	8.97
XII. Southern Mindanao	18.22	31.34	-13.12	26.57	18.33	8.24

^aBased on a 5 per cent sample of population 5 years old and over in 1975.

^bBased on a 20 per cent sample of population 5 years old and over in 1980.

SOURCE: NCSO, 1975 and 1980 Census Data Adjusted for "Not Stated".

population density in Mindanao.

Migration data from the two latest censuses reveal that the whole Visayas is losing population through mobility. Since the desire or initiative of people is to settle where economic opportunities are greatest, data suggest that the Visayas is lagging in these respects.

From Table 10, it becomes obvious that Eastern Visayas manifested the largest increase (although negatively) in net migration, from -5 per thousand in 1975 to -27 per thousand in 1980. Following closely, Central Mindanao experienced almost a complete reversal, i.e. a positive change in net migration rate from -13.12 to 8.24 per thousand. These two findings are somewhat consistent with those of Aurora PEREZ (1985 a).

Although our study used the same basic data of Perez's work, discrepancies in findings are observed in 3 regions, namely NCR, Cagayan Valley and Central Luzon, with respect to their trends of migration, as derived from tabulations of the two latest censuses. See the typology of regions below.

Typology of Regions According to their Patterns of
Inter-Regional Migration Between 1970-1980

Reversal from Negative to Positive Migration	Increasing Positive Net Migration	Decreasing Negative Net Migration	Decreasing Positive Net Migration	Increasing Negative Net Migration
1. Central Mindanao	1. Central Mindanao 2. Southern Tagalog	1. Ilocos 2. Cagayan Valley 3. Western Mindanao	1. National Capital Region 2. Northern Mindanao 3. Southern Mindanao	1. Bicol 2. Western Visayas 3. Central Visayas 4. Eastern Visayas

In contrast with Perez's conclusion, between the two latest censuses the National Capital Region manifested a decrease in net migration rate, while Cagayan Valley and Central Luzon experienced a positive change in net migration (See table 10).

Sex-age Selectivity of Migration

Sex selectivity

The "typical" internal migrant in developing countries has more often been characterized as young male. In the Philippines (also in some others Asian countries like Thailand) the reality is far from this simple stereotype: internal migration is here female dominated.

Data in Table 11 show evidence of the predominance of female in interregional migration streams. In 1975, on the whole, there were 90 male migrants to every 100 female migrants. The overall sex ratio of inter-regional in 1980 was 86.4, meaning there were only 86 male migrants for every 100 female migrants, indicating greater and increasing mobility of females.

As gleaned from the data, the sex ratio was generally in favor of females except for the Mindanao regions. It is also worth noting that urbanward migration is selective of young single females. For instance, the sex ratio of migrants in NCR from all the 12 regions is quite low, 67.6 in 1975 and 66.5 in 1980. Moreover, the sex ratio of of Visayan out-migrants to NCR even lower, the range being 48.6 to 60.7 in 1975 and 52.5 to 62.3 in 1980.

Table 11. Sex Ratio of Immigrants and Outmigrants by Region:
1975 and 1980

REGIONS	Immigrants		Outmigrants	
	1975	1980	1975	1980
Philippines	90.1	86.4	90.1	86.4
N C R	87.6	66.5	94.6	95.9
Region I	93.5	85.8	93.8	84.9
Region II	113.8	113.1	85.9	73.2
Region III	92.7	84.1	84.3	90.8
Region IV	107.5	97.0	82.5	80.1
Region V	95.4	99.1	80.7	76.9
Region VI	95.4	95.2	79.1	77.5
Region VII	104.1	93.2	91.6	89.0
Region VIII	98.5	97.4	77.5	75.2
Region IX	113.9	109.2	101.3	99.2
Region X	103.7	106.8	95.9	91.4
Region XI	105.5	106.7	105.4	98.0
Region XII	105.9	103.3	100.8	104.1

SOURCE: Computed from data of 1975 and 1980 census tabulations,
NCSO and NEDA.

In contrast, despite sex ratio very often below 100, the sex ratio of out-migrants from the metropolis is in favor of males. The sex selectivity of migration to large urban centers, strongly dominated by female migrants, may probably be attributed to the fact that in the cities, the latter could easily find jobs in the tertiary sector and in domestic services, or even be self-employed (for instance, the proliferation of mobile food vendors).

This preponderance of females in urbanward migration implies the need to strengthen the delivery in the cities, of family welfare activities in general, and of family planning services in particular. This fact also calls for policies which deal with the improvement of working conditions or opportunities and social status of female migrants, the most vulnerable to social exploitation. Our focus here is on relative low salary of female employee, discrimination against pregnant workers and even the organized prostitution in Manila of young girls, a majority of whom obviously come from the Visayas regions.

Age Selectivity

Conforming with the universal age pattern of selectivity, young adult persons, aged about 15 to 29 years, often well-educated, are more migratory than the elderly and the teenage populations. The explanation of this fact is provided by JUAN and KIM [1977, p.7]:

"The young people are more migratory than older people because they are in prime age when they can profit most from their move. They have more working years to reap the returns. Also, the young tend to be preferred by employers due to factors such as physical vitality for manual labor, adaptability

lity to new methods and greater capacity to learn, and in some cases, they have the higher level of education as compared with the older generation. At these ages also, people are less involved in the life of the community and their departure would not be too disruptive. They are more capable of assuming the risk of moving and less burdened with family responsibilities".

SOME CONSIDERATIONS ABOUT POPULATION CONTROL AND REDISTRIBUTION POLICIES⁵

In 1970, the Philippines launched a national population program under the direction of the Commission on Population. The so-called POPCOM was mandated to serve as the central coordinating and policy-making body of the government in matters pertaining to population and family planning.

Unfortunately, the Special Committee constituted by Marcos in 1978 to review the Philippine population program found that the program had remained, to a large extent, a family planning program. Following the Review Committee's recommendations, family planning was redefined as family planning and welfare, in order to emphasize that the ultimate goal of the program is the overall welfare of the family and society and not simply the reduction of fertility; in other words, the focus must be on population control as well as on its redistribution.

Regarding the control of the population level the previous policy direction was obviously able to drop the total fertility rate (average number of children for women aged 15-44 years), in the Philippine as a whole, from a level of 6.3 births per woman in 1970 to 5.2 in 1975 and further to 4.7 in 1980. Meanwhile the problem of population redistribution was left behind and remained in its entirety.

Actually internal migration reflects imbalances between economic opportunities and population distribution. Since these imbalances, already severe⁶ in some regions, will reach crisis proportions unless new patterns of migration are set in train, there is a need to consider internal migration in development programs. In addition, emphasis must be given to an integrated approach for spatial planning, so that regional plan will be consistent with broad national goals. In other words, regional development goals must integrate effectively into the national development plan or, conversely, the national plan must translate into effective action at the regional level.

Although a comprehensive framework in this regard has already been worked out by the National Economic and Development Authority (NEDA), there are many problems or conflicts to be resolved at the implementation level (see CANT, p. 270 in PRYOR Eds., 1979). For instance, in theory the development of agriculture and manufacturing are complementary; in practice, the two compete for development resources. Moreover, in theory there is a strong emphasis on small and medium industries; in practice, the opportunities for these are difficult to identify and initiate. Furthermore, PRYOR (1979, p. 284) pointed out that in the Philippines, "the regional structure of development planning is more fully articulated than the national plans, but population redistribution is generally only implicit within the regional strategy".

Fortunately, in recognition of this need the NEDA, the central policy and planning agency of the government, is

currently implementing a project called the Population/Development Planning and Research Project (PDPR) with financial support from UNFPA (United Nations Fund for Population Activities). This program mainly seeks to integrate population concerns into the development plan and policy.

Actually, the solution for problems of internal migration is mainly structural. Therefore, with the present pattern of investment and economic structural change, which is biased against labour, priority must be given to agro-related industries and those which are more labour than capital intensive, and more geared to the production of mass consumption goods rather than luxury items. However, this shift in priority would not reject growth pole strategies in their entirety. Since in the long run planning, growth pole strategies have a continuing role of sustaining the large-scale manufacturing sector of the balanced economy.

Finally, regarding migration selectivity which lead to the draining away of well-educated and young people from less fortunate areas, the educational system and programs must be reformed so that they will be consistent with development needs and potentials. Hence, the educational structure must be more rural adapted rather than urban oriented, since it reinforces presently urban cultural values.

CONCLUSION

This research work has seven major findings. Two of these results are related to the intercensal migration status of the population, four are connected with the volume and

direction of migration streams, while the last finding concerns the sex selectivity of migration.

First: during the last two decades (1960-1980), the Filipino people became less and less mobile; the migration rate decreased steadily from 13.8 per cent in the 1970 to 7.2 in 1975 and finally to 7.0 per cent in 1980. Actually, planners expected the mobility rate to decline very gradually to zero by 2080.

Second: broadly, during 1970-1980, the pattern of internal migration remained basically one of long-distance movements favored over short-distance migration, although this preference was less strong than during the former decade, 1960-1970.

Third: regarding the direction of migration streams, the major north and south movements, from the Visayas to Luzon and Mindanao respectively, persisted during the last two decades.

Fourth: moreover, from 1970 to 1980, the majority of the Visayan migrants move northward to Luzon, a change from the main southward direction observed before 1970.

Fifth: meanwhile, during the same decade (1970-1980), Luzon outmigrants preferred Visayas to Mindanao, in contrast with the trend in previous years. Officials think that these last two changes may be attributed to the unstable peace and order situation in Mindanao.

Sixth: concerning the volume of migration streams, it is worth noting that the National Capital Region is the main

sending area as well as the biggest receiving region.

Seventh: this last finding is in regard with sex selectivity of migration. On a nationwide scale, migration is observed to be female-dominated, and this pattern is particularly pronounced for urbanward migration.

Furthermore, we wish to emphasize that the analysis above seeks to provide, to policy makers and researchers, facts rather than explanations⁷ as to why these facts exist. This limitation is due to our exclusive utilization of demographic data, whereas a full understanding of migration motivation needs the consideration of social and economic data. Migration can properly be identified as a rational rent-seeking behavior. Integrated with the general theory of rent-seeking, migration analysis becomes a part of the examination of the causes and normative implications of the search for economic rents.

As a general rule, actions of governmental institutions (provision of public goods, taxation, minimum wage) or of the private sector create sectoral distortions, which give rise to the emergence of a positive divergence between the prices of resources and their opportunity costs. This bias generates economic rents whose presence stimulates migration as individuals seek to capture these rents. The latter can either arise naturally - as a result, for example, of a divergence between supply and demand in a particular market - or artificially, through perverse state policies in particular.

NOTES

1. ESCAP is the Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (Under the United Nations, Bangkok, Thailand).
2. Since 1970, the National Census and Statistics Office (NCSO, Manila) undertakes every 5 years a census of population and housing. The latest in the 1980 Census. Unfortunately, because some financial problems at the NCSO, there was no such census in 1985. Probably the next census shall be carried out only by 1990.
3. For details on these methods, see D. COURGEAU (1980) p. 35-47 or O. PLAMERAS (1977) p. 5-6.
4. The number of migrants from foreign country was 20,099 in 1975 and only 12,439 in 1980.
5. For a survey of internal migration policies, and other population-related programs in Asia, see A. S. OBERAL, 1980.
6. See CASTILLO (1979) for some details on these imbalances.
7. For readers interested with some theoretical and empirical explanations of internal migration, see T. NGUIAGAIN (1986, 1985 a, and 1985 b).

REFERENCES

1. CASTILLO, Gelia T. (1979). Beyond Manila: Philippine rural. Problem in perspective. International Development Research Centre, Canada, IDRC-116e, 1979.
2. CONCEPCION, Mercedes B. (1985). The Philippines: population trends and dilemmas. Philippine Population Journal, vol. 1, no. 1, March 1985.
3. COURGEAU, Daniel (1980). Quantitative analysis of human migrations (in French). Masson: Paris, Milan, Barcelona, New-York, 1980.
4. FLIEGER, Wilhelm et al. (1976). Geographical patterns of internal migration in the Philippines: 1960-1970. UNFPA-NCSO Population Research Project, Monograph No. 5, NCSO, Manila, December 1976.
5. JUAN, Maria Lourdes del Rosario and Yun KIM (1977). Migration Differentials by migration typology and differentials in the Philippines: 1970. UNFPA-NCSO Population Research Project, Monograph No. 8, NCSO, Manila, July 1977.
6. NCSO (1985). Philippine Yearbook, 1985. NCSO, Manila, 1985.
7. NCSO (1983). 1980 Census of Population and Housing. National Summary and Provincial Reports. NCSO, Manila, May 1983.
8. NCSO (1981). Interregional migration in the Philippines: 1970-1975. Feature Article in NCSO - Journal of Philippine Statistics, July-September 1981.
9. NCSO (1978). 1975 Integrated Census of the Population and its Economic Activities. National Summary and Provincial Reports. NCSO, Manila, June 1978.
10. NCSO (1974). Age and sex population projections for the Philippines by province: 1970-2000. UNFPA-NCSO Population Research Project, Monograph No. 2, NCSO, Manila, 1974.
11. NEDA (1985). Philippine Statistical Yearbook, 1985. NEDA, Manila, 1985.
12. NGULAGAIN, Titus (1986). Local public goods, migration and unemployment in the Philippines. Final Report submitted to the World Bank. Economic Development Institute, Washington D.C. (forthcoming).
13. NGULAGAIN, Titus (1985 a). Local public and rural-urban migration in Developing Countries (in French). Paper

presented at the meeting of the Canadian Economic Science Society, Chicoutimi, Canada, May 1985.

14. NGUIACAIN, Titus (1985 b). Local public goods and rural-urban migration in Developing Countries (in English). Paper presented at the Seminar in Development Economics and Public Finance, UPSE, Quezon-City, September 1985.
15. OBERAI, A. S. (1980). An overview of state policies and internal migration in Asia. World Employment Programme Research, Working Papers No. 88, Geneva, May 1980.
16. PEREZ, Aurora E. (1985 a). Spatial mobility and development in retrospect. UPPI, Work Agreement Paper No. 8, Quezon-City, August 1985.
17. PEREZ, Aurora E. (1985 b). Potential Migration in a Developing Country: An initial exploration of Philippine data. UPPI, 1983 National Demographic Survey Paper No. 11, December 1985.
18. PERNIA, Ernesto M. (1975 a). Patterns of Philippine internal migration. UPPI Research Note No. 36, January 1975.
19. PERNIA, Ernesto M. (1975 b). Philippine migration streams: demographic and socio-economic characteristics. UPPI Research Note No. 51, June 1975.
20. PLAMERAS, Oscar F. (1977). ... Interregional migration streams in the Philippines: 1960-1970. UNFPA-NCSO Population Research Project, Monograph No. 11, NCSO, Manila, November 1977.
21. PRYOR, Robin J. (Editor, 1979). Migration and development in South-East Asia. Oxford University Press, Oxford, Kuala Lumpur, 1979.
22. UPPI (1985). Philippine Population Data: An Update. University of the Philippines, Population Institute, Diliman, 1985.
23. UPPI (1984). 1983 National Demographic Survey. University of the Philippines, Diliman, 1984.
24. UPPI (1975). 1973 National Demographic Survey. University of the Philippines, Diliman, 1975.